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This study examines program planning in adult education units in a school district, a community college and a university. Program planning is conceptualized as technology which is defined as activities undertaken to change program ideas into planned educational activities. This definition and a framework of three kinds of technology (long-linked, mediating, and intensive) and eight program planning activities allowed specific tasks performed by program planners to be examined for differences. The study was undertaken to determine if differences in program planning exist among units and if the concept of technology can be usefully employed in describing program planning.

The case study method is employed in this investigation. Depth interviews with thirty individuals, organization reports, records, and publications contained data which were analyzed and used to describe the technology of each unit. Most interviews dealt with how programs were planned. They were tape recorded and conducted in two phases. Other interviews dealt with the relationships between the units and the organizations to which they belonged. The reports, records, and publications were used to help describe the organizational context of a unit and corroborate data from interviews.

Program planning was accomplished in similar ways by individuals within a given unit. Degree of conformity varied among the units and technology was not a standard undertaking, although patterns of a technology were present in each unit. Individuals exhibited personal consistency more than they exhibited consistency in a unit. The historical
or contextual setting of units influenced the pattern of technology employed.

The investigator concludes that mixed technologies exist in the units and they are affected by unit purpose, leadership, and history. It was also concluded that integrating a unit with its organization was an important goal for unit and organizational heads and this goal also affected the kind of technology pattern used by unit.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The education of adults is provided by a variety of institutions ranging from universities involved in public higher education to private business firms involved in the production of goods and services. Such organizations conduct adult education in numerous formats and use various methods. Adults learn in classes, small groups, or individually within the organizational boundaries of churches, armies, and professional associations. Possibly because of the dispersed nature of adult education a number of attempts have been made to define and describe this organizational activity.

Several authors, Verner, Houle, Boyd and Apps, and Schroeder, who have discussed or studied adult education have noted several common or closely related elements. For example, Verner observed that all institutions have a common interest in the processes of adult education and called these processes methods and techniques. Methods basically involve organizing people around an institution so that systematic learning might take place. Examples of methods are classes, discussion groups, assemblies, and internships. Techniques, on the other hand, are the relationships established between learners and the knowledge to be learned. Examples of techniques are lectures, group discussions, role playing and drills. Boyd and Apps appear to use Verner's concept of method when they propose "transactional modes" as an element in defining adult education.
Houle suggested an analysis that considered two aspects of adult education. The first was an examination of the situation or category of an educational program. The specific situation was defined by the source of authority and direction of planning and control. The second aspect was the design of the educational activity. Houle noted this aspect was comprised of several design elements relating to planning and instruction. He further noted these design elements were greatly influenced by the situation in which they exist.

Verner's methods seem to be related to, but not identical with, Houle's categories. Verner's concept of techniques is contained within Houle's design aspect of education. Although Verner separated the concepts of method and technique for analytical purposes, Houle combined situation and design for description of a dynamic activity—adult education.

Schroeder maintained that order in adult education, although difficult to find, could be discerned by studying the process of planning adult education programs. His objective was to establish order in adult education by analyzing the relationship among agents, clients, and program planning in adult education.

These authors proceeded from a belief that common processes existed in adult education. This commonality, however, allowed for differences in program planning. This study investigates program planning as a process of adult education which may provide some rational base upon which comparisons of adult education organizations may be made and which will contribute to understanding of organizations that have received little consideration from the discipline of adult education when contrasted to other areas of study within adult education such as learner motivations.
The Problem

Although the majority of studies in adult education have been conducted in organizational settings, little research has been done on the agencies which sponsor adult education. The exiguity of organizational research in adult education exists in spite of the fact that some definitions of adult education assume an organized base of activity. Griffith noted that because organizations of adult education vary greatly in form, aim, and content it becomes difficult to think systematically about the field. He also noted that classification and development models have been used to aid systematic thinking. The classification approach was used by Houle, Verner, Knowles and Schroeder to produce typologies of institutions involved in adult education. The developmental model approach enabled Griffith and Carey to conceptualize adult education organizations as growing and thus moving through stages of development. However "neither the classification approach nor the developmental model approach has been sufficiently refined to make it of practical use . . . neither of the approaches affords an appreciable power of prediction."

Organizational research in adult education has provided the practitioner and the researcher with few empirical tools or variables useful in the practice and study of adult education. Most such research efforts are descriptive in nature as they attempt to establish the order sought by Schroeder and others. This current study is an investigation of program planning as an organizational variable and as such seeks to establish a concept which may provide a useful way to view program planning. If program planning activities vary from one kind of organization to another, then the discipline of adult education may be able to use organizational structure, development, and purpose to explain why
specific program planning patterns are found in one organization and not in another.

The Purpose

This study will investigate the processes used by adult education units to produce educational programs. The term "adult education unit" is used to refer to those organizational departments having education of adults as a primary function. The processes of adult education are defined as the technologies used by adult education units in transforming input or raw materials into output or finished products. There are at least two broad divisions of adult education processes, each possessing a number of operations. This study will consider the processes involved with planning an adult education activity and will not be concerned with the second broad division, the instruction of adults. Some dimensions involved in program planning include: defining a problem; reaching an audience; setting objectives; selecting instructors; securing resources; developing a schedule; and selecting instructional techniques.

This idea of process can be conceptualized as an adult education unit's technology which is defined as "the actions that an individual performs upon an object with or without the aid of tools or mechanical devices, in order to make some change in that object. The object or 'raw material', may be a living being, human or otherwise, a symbol or an inanimate object. People are raw materials in people-changing or people-processing organizations." This definition of technology will be employed to examine the ways an adult education unit attempts to plan and administer its programs.

Thompson posited that technology can vary from organization to organization and that there are three kinds of technology: long-linked,
mediating, and intensive. This study employs Thompson's suggested typology to assist in an examination for variation in program planning among three adult education units and thereby determine the appropriateness of using the concept of technology in the study of adult education units. Can adult educators use this concept to study adult education units and their processes? To answer this question an examination of some adult education units and their technology was carried out. The research questions posed in the following section guided this investigation.

Research Questions

The questions presented deal with the ways adult education units are similar to or different from one another and the reciprocal influences between a unit and an organization. The hypotheses are stated as research questions to accomplish two purposes: first, they allow the consideration of hypotheses that may ordinarily require different and incompatible research designs; secondly, they aid the researcher in determining the relevance of subject matter. As Gottschalk explained, "the investigator . . . seeks for particulars that will enable him to answer his interrogative, ruthlessly eliminating those that do not lead to an answer or a suspension of judgment." The questions deal with the technology used by a unit and its organizational context.

1. Does the classification proposed by Thompson describe the technologies employed by adult education units? Because technology or organizational action is a characteristic of all organizations and their units, Thompson built an argument for specific kinds of technology existing in certain types of organizations. The descriptive capacity of the typology will be tested against the findings of three case studies.
If Thompson's classification was shown to have limited descriptive power for adult education units, the following question was to be raised:

(1a) Is there a discernible pattern of technology used by adult education units? One dominant technology may exist for all units, or there may be various technologies used by single units.

Questions two, three, and four were asked regardless of the use of question one or its alternative.

(2) Do adult education units in different public education organizations differ from one another in technology? Because public adult education units are found in similar environments, share similar clients and are concerned with learning, they can be expected to share common characteristics. This question focused data collection and analysis upon the comparison of technologies of adult education units belonging to different public educational organizations.

(3) What, if any, influence does an organization have upon the technology of its adult education unit? Because adult education units are part of a larger organization, the expectation was they were influenced by the organization. This question focused data collection and analysis upon the context of a unit's technology.

(4) What, if any, influence does the technology of an adult education unit have upon its organization? This question introduces the issue of reciprocal influence of a unit's technology upon the organization.

These questions were used to guide data collection and provide answers intended to establish the utility of Thompson's typology in adult education study.

**Definition of Terms**

Crucial elements dealing with organizational variables and program planning concepts are defined in order to make the material and data used
in this study meaningful and concise. The program planning concepts are presented first.

A program is a specific structured period of learning involving a learner or learners, an instructor, and an organizational sponsor.

Program planning is a collection of certain tasks performed by an adult educator in order to change an idea into an organized learning activity. Program planning occurs before, during, and after the learning activity takes place and is synonymous with technology.

Program planning tasks are specific activities undertaken during program planning in order to complete an operation. An example is writing an instructional objective.

Program planning operations are clusters of specific and related tasks. These include (1) originating an idea; (2) developing the idea; (3) establishing objectives; (4) securing resources; (5) selecting and sequencing learning activities; (6) ensuring participation; and (7) evaluating.

An adult education unit is a component of an organization having a discrete structure and a primary function of educating adults. It may serve other functions for the larger organization, but these are compatible and subordinate to adult education. For example, public relations may be a function of the adult education unit but the performance of this function is secondary to its adult education function.

Organization is used to refer to any one of the following three publicly supported educational institutions: a school district; a community college; and a university.

Technology in this study will be used to refer to those program planning actions performed to change ideas, needs, and impulses to teach or learn into organized learning situations. It is a synonym for program
planning. Long-linked, mediating, and intensive types of technology are defined and described in some detail in Chapter II.

Assumptions of the Study

This study makes certain assumptions about organizations and technology. First, the organizational assumptions are presented.

(1) Every organization exists in an environment over which it has less than total control and as a result it is affected by environmental changes.

(2) Adult education units are sufficiently different from other units within the same organization to warrant a study of the characteristics of a unit's technology before attempting quantitative measurement and analysis.

(3) The technology of an adult education unit is observable and subject to qualitative interpretation.

Plan of the Dissertation

This document is comprised of ten chapters including this introductory chapter. Chapter II presents efforts of a literature search dealing with the concepts of technology and program planning. Chapter III describes in some detail the conceptual framework built upon three kinds of technology and seven program planning operations. Chapter IV is an explanation of the methodology used in gathering and analyzing data. Chapter V presents the three research subjects by describing their organizational contexts and historical development. Chapter VI is an analysis of program planning processes used by a school district. Chapters VII and VIII treat a community college's and university's program planning processes. Chapter IX compares the analyzed program planning processes and provides evidence for the descriptive capacity of Thompson's typologies. Chapter X concludes the study with some suggestions and implications for further research.


3Schroeder, "Typology of Adult Learning Systems," p. 43.


7Griffith, "Implications for Administrators," p. 176.


CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter explores literature from two disciplines. Organization theory provided perspectives on technology and its relationship to organizations while adult education provided perspectives on program planning. These two concepts were combined to develop a conceptual framework briefly introduced in this chapter by presenting definitions of three kinds of technologies, a brief discussion of each definition, and examples of each technology using Houle's program planning model. The three kinds of technologies are discussed more fully in Chapter III.

The Concept of Technology

Organizations exist for a purpose. They are "social instruments that produce things needed by some sector of society." The concept of technology is a vital part of an organization. Litterer began with the production process as he defined an organization:

To begin with, an organization produces something. Typically, we think of it as producing an object such as an automobile, or a service such as medical care. Organizations of this kind are called formal organizations, because they entail some degree of conscious planning and their purposes or objectives are more observable. What they produce is consumed by portions of society outside the organization itself.

As Litterer pointed out, any study of an organization's production must be concerned with the formal organization. The workflow is part of planned relationships within an organization.

Harvey defined technology as "the mechanisms or processes by which an organization turns out its product or service." His definition was
solidly in an organizational context. Indeed, it was Harvey's purpose to demonstrate a relationship between the technology employed by an organization and the organization's structure. A number of other authors (Hickson, Pugh and Pheysey; J. Hunt; and R. Hunt) considered technology and its effect upon industrial organizations.5 "People-processing" organizations were studied by Hage and Aiken using Perrow's definition of technology.6 They explored the relationship between technology and structure in those organizations that provided social and health service.

Perrow's definition is broad, inclusive, and supplies much information for the researcher. The definition lets one consider the influence of the raw material to be changed, the nature of the process itself, the use or non-use of tools, and the stages of transformation within a process. It can be used inside or outside an organizational context. The definition can apply to an industrial, service, or educational organization. Although the nature of the definition allows its application to the study of adult education units, caveats mentioned in the following section should be observed.

**Adult education and technology**

Borrowing and reformulating concepts from other disciplines and applying them in the study of adult education has been a conscious activity since Jensen outlined the steps.7 Recently Boyd and Apps warned adult educators about problems inherent in such an undertaking.8 Two major problems are allowing other disciplines to define adult education and improperly utilizing conceptual frameworks in which these concepts exist.

The first problem of letting other disciplines define adult education is not an issue in this study because it proceeds from observations about the phenomenon of adult education and seeks to add to the understanding of
what Houle, Schroeder, and Verner called common processes of adult education. Conceptual frameworks from other disciplines can be used to provide insight into adult education units. A conceptual framework which posits technology as an organizational variable may be used to explain why adult education units differ from one another.

To achieve this capability the processes of adult education must be conceptualized as its technology. As noted earlier both Houle and Verner recognized that the processes of adult education were common to all organizations involved in helping adults learn. These processes can be thought of as transformation procedures for two kinds of entities. Ideas of can be transformed into educational programs and individuals who learn during an educational experience can be transformed in capability, skill or attitude, or all three. This study deals with the transformation process of ideas into educational programs.

According to Perrow's definition of technology as applied to adult education, the objects can be thought of as inputs such as needs, problems and, as Houle noted, impulses to learn or teach. Such inputs are the basis for program ideas. The transformation of program ideas into output or planned educational activities is the result of technology. Figure 1 illustrates the flow of input, technological application and output of an adult education unit.

![Figure 1. Adult education technology.](image-url)
The inputs for an adult education unit can take the form of needs, problems, and desires to teach or learn. The felt needs of individuals supply much of the content of adult education programs. These needs range from technical skills required for social survival to needs of creative expression. Technical skills can be found in programs which emphasize vocational training and basic education. Needs stemming from creative expression can be found in hobby programs such as wine making and photography. Problems facing individuals as they move into new social roles are the basis for programs teaching skills in single parenting, or buying and maintaining a home.

Inputs can also take the form of impulses to teach or learn. The impulse to teach is exemplified by individuals who approach an adult education unit and request the opportunity to share a special talent which they possess. The impulse to learn is represented by individuals who enjoy learning and can be found in course after course with no apparent pattern to the choice of the subject matter learned.

Organizational needs can be expressed in courses dealing with staff training, organizational interpretation (public relations) and performance of organizational purpose. Just as individuals assuming new social roles face problems, organizations also face problems as they change roles or purpose. When this happens problems form one source of needs for adult education activities in an organizational context.

The actions of a unit in transforming input into adult education programs comprise its technology. Technology as an organizational variable was considered by a number of writers and researchers (Hage and Aiken, Harvey, Hickson, Mintzberg, and Woodward), most of whom have attempted to establish a relationship between technology and organizational structure.9 After reviewing a number of empirical studies, Mintzberg noted "Technology
is clearly a major factor in the design of organizational structures.\textsuperscript{10} Thompson, postulated that technology was related to an organization's growth pattern.\textsuperscript{11}

For technology or program planning to be useful as an explanatory characteristic of an adult education unit, such technology should possess the quality of variability. This chapter seeks to establish variability by proposing a framework of technological variance and then relating it to program planning.

Development of the Framework

Program planning has been the subject of a number of treatises and some empirical research. Four studies have contributed to the development of the framework used in this investigation. Houle, Pennington and Green, Robbins, and Knox produced studies which delineated either broad areas or specific tasks of program planning, or both.\textsuperscript{12} Each study is briefly reviewed; a synthesized concept of program planning is presented by comparing four planning approaches found in the literature; each study is compared to the framework; and finally the comparison is displayed in tabular form.

Houle's design system

Houle created a two part system for analyzing educational planning. The first part was identifying the kinds of situations in which programs were planned. Houle classified eleven major categories of design situations. Each category was distinguished by "the source of authority and direction so far as planning and control are concerned."\textsuperscript{13} Examples of three of the eleven categories are: an individual designing an activity for a larger group; an institution designing an activity in a new format; and
an individual, group or institution designing an activity for a mass audience.

The present study is concerned with situations in which an institution plans an activity in a new or established format. While Houle maintained that the program planning process was affected by the major category of design situation involved, the present investigation seeks to demonstrate variability due to technological differences within a single category of educational design situation.

The second part of Houle's system was comprised of seven decision points, several of them containing a number of components. They were: (1) identifying a possible educational activity; (2) deciding to proceed; (3) identifying and refining objectives; (4) designing a suitable format; (5) fitting the format into the larger patterns of life; (6) carrying out the program and (7) measuring and appraising the results of the activity.

Pennington and Green's clusters

Pennington and Green developed six program planning clusters from their investigation of professional continuing education. Clusters were formed by grouping tasks and decisions involved in program planning as identified through interviews with planners of continuing medical education programs. The researchers began with specific program planning tasks and moved to more abstract levels of clusters in developing a model of program planning. The identified clusters were: (1) originating the idea; (2) developing the idea; (3) making a commitment; (4) developing the program; (5) teaching the course and (6) evaluating the impact. The authors noted that these six clusters were not performed sequentially, however, each cluster was used at some point in the program planning process.
Robbins's steps

Robbins, after reviewing seven studies of program planning, presented the following synthesis of major steps in the process; (1) establish an operational base for delivering services; (2) originate a program idea; (3) form a planning group; (4) analyze relevant systems; (5) identify participant needs; (6) formulate program objectives; (7) design program structures; (8) determine program content and methods; (9) acquire resources; (10) promote program and recruit participants; (11) initiate and operate program; and (12) evaluate program. He used this framework to discover which tasks and sequences program planners used in developing programs. Robbins hypothesized that steps would be valued differently by program planners grouped according to function and role orientation. While he found there was high agreement on the importance of planning steps he found little variation on role orientation and as a result could make no conclusion about different valuing by groups defined by function or role orientation.

Knox's concepts

Knox edited the volume dealing with program development, administration and evaluation in the 1980 Adult Education Handbook Series. His initial chapter sets a framework for program planning by listing the components of the process. The organization of the book reflected the framework by describing in separate chapters the components involved. Knox made two divisions in his framework. One was program development and included (1) origins, (2) objectives, and (3) evaluations. The second division was program administration and included (4) participation, and (5) resources. Other components which were not usually identified as steps in program planning were noted by Knox as staffing and leadership. These two
functions dealt with organizational concerns which indirectly influence program planning. These broader issues are not considered in this investigation.

**Synthesized operations**

The following operations have been identified by at least three of the four studies cited and represent a synthesis of the four author's ideas:

1. Originating a program idea
2. Developing the idea
3. Establishing objectives
4. Selecting and sequencing learning activities
5. Ensuring participation
6. Securing resources
7. Evaluating

Each of the operations is now considered and compared to four studies reviewed. Three authors propose originating the idea as an initial undertaking. The only exception to this is Robbin's use of establishing an operational base for delivering services.

Pennington and Green identified developing the idea as a cluster of tasks which seems to include forming a planning group and analyzing relevant systems as delineated by Robbins and deciding to proceed as noted by Houle.

Establishing objectives was identified by three of the four studies as beginning a step, component, or activity of significance. Only Pennington and Green did not make this a separate component as they included it in developing the program.

Selecting and sequencing learning activities was identified by Knox and is descriptive of the kinds of activities which are involved in this part of program planning. Houle's component of designing a suitable format is a parallel notion as are the two steps Robbins called determining program structure and determining program content and methods. This
operation was included in developing the program as noted by Pennington and Green.

Ensuring participation describes what Robbins called promoting program and recruiting participants, what Knox noted as participation and persistence, and what Houle described as fitting the format into the larger patterns of life. This operation is included in Pennington's and Green's work as part of developing the program.

Securing resources is the sixth operation identified in program planning. Three authors listed this as a major step in program planning. The exception is Pennington and Green who included it as part of developing the program.

Robbins, Houle, and Pennington and Green make note of operating the program. The synthesized framework does not include this step because it seems to be conceptually different from planning a program. Pennington and Green did not list any task for the cluster they labeled "teaching the course" and Houle treated this part of his design system with more brevity than other parts.

All four studies included evaluation as a component of program planning.

The framework contrasted

The program planning formats identified in each study differ in one or two ways from the operations outlined above. The following comparison of the operations framework with the four frameworks from the literature disclose apparent differences. Attempts to harmonize those differences are presented.

Houle's design system of decision points and planning components seems more comprehensive than the framework of operations presented here. His
system identifies two areas, making a decision to proceed and putting the plan into effect, which are not specified in the current framework. Deciding to proceed, however, is represented by the operation "developing the idea". Putting the plan into effect, as noted earlier, is considered as conceptually different from planning.

Pennington's and Green's first two clusters parallel the first two operations. Their third cluster, making a commitment, is included in the other operations belonging to the synthesized framework. Making a commitment includes selecting instructors, facilities, and formats which entail commitments to people, suppliers and course content. These tasks are appropriately placed in the operation labelled "securing resources". Other tasks Pennington and Green listed in this cluster are consideration of target audiences, and recruitment. The first task is appropriately placed in the operation "developing the idea." The second task is placed in the operation "ensuring participation."

The synthesized framework includes four operations which Pennington and Green included in one cluster. The operations establishing objectives, selecting and sequencing learning activities, ensuring participation and securing resources are part of the cluster labeled developing the program. In order to be precise about the activities involved in program planning, this framework specifies four operations.

The last cluster that is substantially different from the present framework is teaching the course. The authors list no tasks for this operation. This absence of tasks may be due to the essential difference between planning a program and its execution in that if such tasks were included they would deal with instruction and learning and not with planning. The major difference between the synthesized framework and that
Comparison of Robbins's framework with the operations framework demonstrates close agreement between the two, although Robbins's planning steps seem to provide unneeded detail at the broad level of program planning analysis. The first step which Robbins notes is establishing an operational base for delivery services. The synthesized framework is used in an organizational context which assumes the established base, thus making this step redundant in the present investigation.

Forming a planning group, analyzing relevant systems, and identifying participant needs are included in the first two operations of the current framework. The synthesized framework uses selecting and sequencing learning activities as the operation which includes the steps Robbins noted as determining program structure and determining content and methods. The basic differences between the program planning steps as outlined by Robbins and those operations used in this framework seem to be establishing an operational base, which is assumed in this study, and initiating and operating the program, which has been discussed previously.

The most evident difference found when comparing Knox's framework to the framework used in this study is the major division Knox made between program development and program administration. This study does not use the divisions because criteria are not offered for classifying components. It would be difficult to place evaluation, for instance, in one or another of the two divisions. The only other major contrast between the two frameworks is the absence in Knox's framework of program idea development. Of these two contrasts the most noteworthy is the operation titled "developing the idea." The inclusion or exclusion of the divisions has little effect
upon the parts of program planning because it seems to be a categorization with low utility to this study.

Table 1 is provided to summarize and visually aid in identifying differences among the four frameworks and between these four and the synthesized framework. The synthesized framework is presented under the heading Operations. Houle's framework is listed under the heading Design System. Pennington and Green's components are labeled Clusters and Robbins's are identified as Steps. Knox writes of Procedures and this term is used to identify his framework.

Tasks and operations

All authors reviewed wrote about tasks performed in each of the major program planning operations. Most tasks were given as examples of how a particular operation was performed. Pennington and Green used the term activities to describe tasks and because they used activities to form the clusters, their study is an especially rich source of tasks. Each chapter of the book Developing, Administering, and Evaluating Adult Education considered in detail concepts of program planning making it another rich source of tasks. These two works are major sources of program planning tasks for this present study.

Tasks used in this study are not meant to be an exhaustive listing of ways to perform operations, however, they are used to provide examples of different ways to plan programs. Tasks seem to be limited only by the insight and imagination of individual program planners. The value of using the tasks listed in detail in the section "The Framework" of Chapter III is in helping to classify tasks by operation and technology.

Tasks selected from the literature were placed within operations based upon the logical agreement of the purpose of a task and an operation. Some
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operations</th>
<th>Design System</th>
<th>Clusters</th>
<th>Steps</th>
<th>Procedures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Originating the idea</td>
<td>1. A possible idea is identified</td>
<td>1. Originating the idea</td>
<td>1. Establish operational base</td>
<td>1. Program origins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Developing the idea</td>
<td>2. A decision is made to proceed</td>
<td>2. Developing the idea</td>
<td>2. Originate program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Establishing objectives</td>
<td>3. Objectives are identified and established</td>
<td>4. Developing the program</td>
<td>3. Form a planning group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Selecting and sequencing learning activities</td>
<td>4. A suitable format is designed</td>
<td>6. Formulate program objectives</td>
<td>4. Analyze relevant systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Insuring participation</td>
<td>5. The format is fitted into the larger patterns</td>
<td>7. Determine program structure</td>
<td>5. Identify participant needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Securing resources</td>
<td>6. Learning resources are selected and a leader is chosen</td>
<td>8. Determine program content and methods</td>
<td>6. Making a commitment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Evaluating</td>
<td>8. The results are measured</td>
<td>9. Promote program and recruit participants</td>
<td>7. The plan is put into effect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11. Initiate and operate program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12. Evaluate program</td>
<td>5. Evaluation of program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a* Design system proposed by Houle  
*b* Clusters proposed by Pennington and Green  
*c* Steps proposed by Robbins  
*d* Procedures proposed by Knox
tasks seemed to have purposes which allowed them to be placed in more than one operation. When this happened the task was assigned to one operation and notation was made that it could be an extension or continuation of another operation.

Tasks and technologies

Tasks were placed within operations and assigned to one or more of the technologies as defined by Thompson by matching task characteristics with technology characteristics. Where tasks were used in more than one technology, differentiation was made by how those tasks were performed.

The assignment of the tasks to technologies was validated by asking graduate students of adult education in a program planning seminar to assign the tasks to the three technologies. The following definitions and characteristics of technologies were provided to each individual along with a set of cards containing program planning tasks. The students were asked to sort the cards into three categories representing each of the technologies. The criteria for deciding where to place a card was the student's perception of a task's congruence with the definitions and characteristics of the technologies.

Long-linked technology

"A long-linked technology involves serial interdependence in the sense that act Z can be performed only after successful completion of act Y, which rests upon act X, and so on. . . . It approaches instrumental perfection when it produces a single kind of standard product, repetitively and at a constant rate." In this brief description Thompson provided a few of this technology's characteristics. For him serial dependence, unitary products, repetition, constancy of rate and concern for the process were hallmarks of long-linked technology. A unit using this technology
would tend to perform the various operations of program planning in a sequential fashion. The use of this technology allows the planning process to be scheduled in advance and modified only slightly. Serial dependency lends inflexibility and linearity to the process because a change in any step has implications for following steps.

Unitary products refers to outcomes which are similar in type and quality. In adult education the products of program planning are learning activities that are highly similar in format and of constant quality. A unit using long-linked technology will produce learning experiences of similar duration and format, and for similar clientele, cost, place and time. Because the process is standardized the quality and kinds of programs produced will vary only slightly. The variation which does exist may be largely related to different instructors in programs.

Repetition refers to recurrent use of content, personnel, format, and client groups in a specific program. Even if program titles are used more than once, unless formats, kinds of participants, subject matter and instructors are used again, production of programs is not considered to be repetitive.

Constancy of rate is indicated by a more or less stable number of programs produced which is subject to minor variation but will exhibit stability from year to year. It is also indicated by control of the production process which means that the process can be queued and as a result is somewhat predictable in terms of where a program will be in the process at any given time. Constancy of rate is related to the last characteristic noted for this technology—instrumental perfection.

Instrumental perfection is used to indicate efficiency of process. Controlling the production process allows a program planner to develop several programs at the same time, thus increasing efficiency. Because the
process is repeated more than once, it can be modified for efficiency as experience is gained. An assembly line process is an example of long-linked technology.

Long-linked technology as a program planning process can be illustrated by applying it to Houle's education design system. Identifying educational activities is accomplished in limited but highly efficient ways. The decision to proceed is usually understood to be a positive one. Exceptions to this occur when the identified activity is extraordinary in terms of what the adult education unit usually plans. Definition and refinement of objectives will be largely accomplished by the instructor rather than the program planner, however, when the program planner does undertake this part of the developmental system, objectives will be defined and refined in a systematic manner. A format is usually selected based upon the unit's familiarity with formats rather than designed. Fitting a program into larger patterns of life is generally accomplished by advertising the program and letting individual learners fit their life patterns to the program. The program is implemented by adhering closely to the original design or plan with minor deviations. Measured results are used to make judgements about the system. These results along with other information about program planning deadlines and completion of assignments are part of the assessment made about the process. Long-linked technology is characterized by efficiency, sequence, and firmly established plans.

Mediating technology

Thompson described this technology as "linking of clients who are or wish to be interdependent. . . . Complexity in the mediating technology comes not from the necessity of having each activity geared to the requirements of the next but rather from the fact that the mediating
technology requires operating in standardized ways and extensively; e.g., with multiple clients or customers distributed in time.\textsuperscript{21}

The hallmarks of this technology are interdependence, client participation and extensive operations. Interdependence refers to a linkage between clients: both learner and teacher. Learners are traditionally viewed as the clientele of an adult education unit, however, the concept of mediating technology includes two classes of clientele; teachers and learners. For the client group composed of teachers the adult education unit supplies an audience of learners. Interdependence is the result of performing a brokering function between the clients. Not only are the two kinds of clients brought into an interdependent situation with one another but also the adult education unit is dependent upon each of its client groups for accomplishing program planning. Client participation is one result of an adult education unit's performance as an education broker. This kind of adult education development has been elaborately explained by Schroeder who basically views adult education as "a developmental process that links various agent and adult clients systems together for the purpose of establishing directions and procedures for programs of adult learning."\textsuperscript{22}

Client participation can occur in an active or passive way. Active participation in the program planning process is exemplified by participants attending planning sessions and making decisions about learning activities. A passive role is exemplified by participants offering opinions about what should be done. These opinions can be volunteered but more likely they will be sought out by program planners.

The term extensive operation was used by Thompson to designate the involvement of multiple customers. The concept is useful in adult education because not only do adult education units deal with more than one client, but also such units deal with diverse clients at the same time. In
a given educational activity the participants may be individuals with varying levels of education who attend because of personal or organizational interest. Although adult education units deal with individuals in learning situations, organizations are often part of its clientele.

Thompson noted that mediating technology also "requires operating in standardized ways." Standardization permits linking of customers suspended in time. Thompson used examples of bank depositors and borrowers as being suspended in time which points to the necessity of standard operating procedures in linking these two groups. Adult education seems to be different from these examples and as a result does not always require the degree of standardization cited by Thompson. Adult education may begin with its customers suspended in time and space, however, these customers are eventually brought together at some time and place with the obvious exception of distance education where the learner and teacher are usually in different places. By using films, videotapes and correspondence the teacher may deliver a lecture at a time different from the time the learner listens to it. When this is the case, standardization of materials, formats, and devices becomes critical. An example of mediating technology would be a financial institution which lacks borrowers and depositors.

To illustrate the effect of mediating technology, Houle's system will again be employed to demonstrate some effects this technology has upon program planning. The identification of a possible educational activity is a function of a unit's service orientation. A unit which uses mediating technology considers ideas which are as far ranging and diverse as the clientele it serves. Ideas have their genesis with both learners and teachers and decisions to proceed with development are based upon expressed interest of clients. The definition and refinement of objectives is a collaborative effort involving the learner, teacher and program planner.
The design of a suitable format is not constrained by tradition, but rather it is a function of the interaction of the dependent groups. At times the adult educator may propose formats, however, decision making is greatly influenced by the clients. Fitting the format into larger patterns of life is accomplished by allowing the learner and teacher to design a format which fits their patterns of life. The participation of learners and teachers in the planning process helps ensure programs under development will fit the larger patterns of living. Effecting the plan is once again a cooperative venture. This cooperation can range from consultation given by the adult educator as clients implement the plan, to consultation given by clients as the adult educator implements the plan. The measure and appraisal of result are based upon how well the client was served in addition to how well the program produced the desired effects. Mediating technology is characterized by client participation, interdependence and variety in limits. These three elements are present in, but subordinate to, feedback and variety in techniques in intensive technology.

**Intensive technology**

"This third [technology] we label **intensive** to signify that a variety of techniques is drawn upon in order to achieve a change in some specific object; but the selection, combination, and order of application are determined by feedback from the object itself. When the object is human, the **intensive** technology is regarded as 'therapeutic' but the same technical logic is found also in the construction industry and in research where objects of concern are nonhuman." 24

This technology is characterized by feedback, a variety of techniques, and change. Feedback, while present in each of the three technologies, has two distinguishing features in this technology. The first feature is its
formative nature; it is present throughout the process. The second feature is that the subject of feedback is the program itself. In other technologies the subject is usually the participant, his feelings and the learning which has occurred; the process; or other indicators of the outcome. Feedback in intensive technology is used to provide information about the program under development. This feedback is used by the adult educator to choose which task or tasks to perform and when to perform them. Use of feedback for this purpose gives variability to the planning process which has implications for the adult educator. One implication is that he cannot easily predict when program planning will have been completed. Another is that when a planning framework is established, it is at best an estimation of when and how planning will take place. Variability of process is a function of feedback and the use of alternative tasks.

Alternative tasks refers to the existence of a number of ways to accomplish the needed objectives in program planning. For example, originating an idea can be accomplished by assessing needs, surveying for ideas, or receiving ideas from clients.

Change, noted as a characteristic of intensive technology deals not with the object of technology but rather with the technology itself. Based upon feedback from the idea, a program planner may change the tasks, the way they are performed and the order in which they are performed.

The three major characteristics of this technology--feedback, variety of techniques, and change--combine to produce a distinctive process of accomplishing the transformation of ideas into programs. Other technologies might exhibit one or two of the characteristics, however, it is only when all three characteristics operate in conjunction with one another that intensive technology is employed. A hospital provides an example of the use of intensive technology.
Applying intensive technology to Houle's design system produces the following example of program planning. Because this technology uses information in determining later steps to be taken in the planning process, the identification of educational activities will involve procedures which initially supply much information. The decision to proceed is a tentative one which is repeatedly considered after every step in the procedure. Identifying and refining the objectives are accomplished as part of designing a suitable format. The format is designed by the adult educator acting upon information about what the educational activity requires in order to be a viable activity by fitting into identified patterns of life. These three elements, 1) objectives, 2) formats, and 3) fit, are all considered by the adult educator in designing the educational activity. In this technology it becomes difficult to place the components in discrete sequential planning steps. The program is implemented by the adult educator who uses a large variety of resources to make the program a reality. The measurement and appraisal of results are activities which occur continuously throughout the planning process. This component of the design system is a hallmark of the intensive technology.

Summary

Exploration of organization theory literature has provided several views on the concept of technology as a factor in organizational structure. Students of organization theory are not in agreement on the importance of technology's influence upon structure. However, all acknowledge its status as an organizational variable. Perrow's definition of technology is broad enough to allow a concept of adult education, namely program planning, to be viewed as technology.
A review of program planning literature has provided four views of planning educational activities and enabled production of a synthesized view of program planning. The review has demonstrated that the four program planning frameworks used are at such a sufficiently abstract level as to be fairly similar. This similarity helped produce a synthesized model, but failed to provide sufficient variation needed for an organizational variable. Chapter III details the synthesized model at a level which helps demonstrate variability in program planning by placing program planning tasks in operations by kind of technology.
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CHAPTER III

THE CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

This chapter presents the planning framework in detail by describing planning operations in terms of the three technologies. Each technology is discussed in terms of which planning tasks are used in an operation. Finally, a three-by-seven contingency table is presented to compare and contrast each task within an operation and technology.

The Framework

The critical operations of adult education technology identified earlier are: (1) originating program ideas; (2) developing the idea; (3) establishing objectives; (4) selecting and sequencing learning activities; (5) ensuring participation; (6) securing resources; and (7) evaluating. Each of these operations is comprised of specific tasks relating to its function. By completing an individual task or some combination of tasks, an operation is performed. For example, originating a program idea can be undertaken by one or some combination of the following tasks: assessing needs; replicating programs; responding to client requests; reviewing literature; and soliciting ideas from advisory boards. Each of the seven operations has a number of possible tasks which, when any one of them is completed at some level, fulfills the function of that operation. These tasks may take on a characteristic form depending upon the kind of technology used in program planning.

Originating the Idea

This operation gives birth to the ideas which are subjected to a number of other operations. Not all ideas originated will be developed
into programs. Some will remain as ideas, others will move through operations and for various reasons be rejected as potential programs. Still others will be transformed into formal learning experiences. Although this is the logical operation to examine first, thoughtful consideration of the total framework can disclose the distinct possibility of several nonlinear progressions in program planning.

**Long-linked technology**

This technology is represented by performance of one or some combination of the following tasks which are characterized by efficiency, learner concern, and standard products. Tasks include: assessing needs by administering a questionnaire to potential learners in an effort to identify educational needs; considering market demand by measuring the popularity of programs offered in similar contexts; complying with sponsor requests, which reflects institutional and learner concern; and reviewing other program ideas by surveying program catalogues from other units in similar circumstances. Expertise of programmers is directed at maintaining the process.

**Mediating technology**

This technology depends heavily upon client (learners and teachers) participation and interdependence and reflects a service orientation held by the unit. The opinions of clients are valued as much as the opinion of experts. Tasks include: assessing needs by discussion with potential teachers and learners; considering client requests in order to estimate the success of a program; valuing client consensus (which reflects the interdependent characteristic of client relationships); and deciding upon a program idea once the consensus is determined and ideas are understood by the clients.
Intensive technology

This technology is characterized by reliance upon expert opinion about the idea, the use of feedback, and by diversity in possible outcomes. Expert opinion can be internal or external to the unit and may also be found in the professional and academic literature. Tasks include: assessing needs by expert diagnosis; considering the nature of the problem by critical thinking and by involving informed, knowledgeable people; valuing expert opinion; and generating intuitive program ideas based upon concepts and comments of experts about learner needs and problems.

Developing Program Ideas

Within this operation a number of events take place that are crucial for the continued transformation of the idea into a program. Houle made special note that a decision was made to proceed with the development of an idea. Pennington and Green found that an idea was developed to some extent before a commitment was made to carry forward a program. The operation presented here combines the development and commitment events, where ideas may or may not receive favorable support.

Long-linked technology

This technology is characterized by a concern for the organization and efficiency in terms of producing programs that will be well received by learners. Tasks include: talking with unit personnel to informally test ideas with colleagues, maintaining the institutional perspective, and refining the idea to specific and manageable levels; reviewing other program approaches to consider how other organization have implemented ideas which are similar to the one under development; determining unit interests which Pennington and Green note as "assessment of institutional interests and capabilities"; adopting unit definitions of interests; and
determining the feasibility of a program idea to estimate availability of the unit's resources for the program idea.

**Mediating technology**

Interdependence of the learner, teacher, and program planner is the major characteristic of mediating technology. The service orientation of adult education units using this technology is evident because of interdependent relationships. Participation of clients is also evident in the tasks listed as examples in this technology. Tasks include: talking with clients to maintain links between potential instructors and potential learners; reviewing client opinions to make some judgments about the validity of client opinions; and determining client interests by involving the learners and teachers as well as the adult educator. An additional task of adopting client definition of interests helps ensure program feasibility, points to the service orientation that comes from performing the broker function in adult education, and seems to be related to what Clark termed a "catering relationship to . . . clientele."²

**Intensive technology**

Feedback about the ideas to the program planner is a noticeable characteristic in this technology. Another characteristic is reliance upon expert opinion and diagnosis about support for the ideas. Ideas are easily thought of as problems in this technology. Examples of tasks include: talking with experts to test program ideas; reviewing data about the problem from expert sources to provide information about an idea; determining expert diagnosis of learner needs from collecting information about the program ideas or problem; adopting assessment of expert interests and needs by choosing among differing opinions about the problem; and
determining feasibility of a program by valuing expert opinions from a variety of sources and perspectives.

Establishing Objectives

After tentative commitments to ideas are made and ideas receive some development, objectives may be established. Activities within this operation indicate that a decision to proceed with the transformation has occurred and mark the change of an idea into a program. Pennington and Green stopped referring to ideas at this point in their program planning model and began referring to the program, and Houle saw the objectives giving shape to an educational program. The idea seems to change by gaining a discernable configuration in this operation.

Long-linked technology

A major characteristic of this technology is production of similar objectives in type and content. For example, the objectives produced by a unit using long-linked technology will be mostly behavioral in nature. Another unit using this technology will use mostly goal statements. Other kinds of objectives can be used by a unit, but a preference will be shown for one kind over another. Unitary objectives also refers to content. There will be a tendency for the same or similar objectives to be repeated by a unit. Such repetition is related to another characteristic of this operation: efficiency. Examples of tasks include: formulating objectives in light of learner desires, organization purpose, and sponsor requirements; emphasizing harmony between organization purpose and program outcomes to ensure that the investment of planning efforts will be realized in an actual program; and writing objectives in customary ways to allow the process to remain an efficient one.
Mediating technology

Characteristics of this technology that have effects upon the establishment of objectives are interdependence and client participation. Interdependence comes from linking the two client groups of instructors and learners. Client participation in the planning process is a result of establishing and maintaining the linkage. Examples of tasks include: formulating objectives in light of, and in conjunction with, learner and teacher desires; emphasizing feasibility for teacher and learner which, as Szczypkowski points out, may be a screening activity; and writing objectives in light of learner and teacher desires, which reflects a concern for service orientation.

Intensive technology

This technology is characterized by involvement of the expert in the establishment of objectives. It involves feedback about the objectives in light of the program. Examples are: formulating objectives in light of expert opinion about learner desires or needs or both; emphasizing expert opinion about appropriateness of the formulated objectives in light of learner needs; and writing objectives in conformity with widely regarded criteria.

Selecting and Sequencing Learning Activities

This operation adds to the program's distinctive shape initiated in the preceding operation. The goals or objectives often delimit the selection of learning activities. However, familiarity with one or a group of similar activities can also set boundaries for establishing objectives, developing ideas, and originating ideas. This process again demonstrates why program planning is at times a nonlinear undertaking. This operation may be viewed as instructional design.
Long-linked technology

This operation is performed minimally by adult educators working in long-linked technology. Selecting and sequencing learning activities is usually performed the first time a program is produced. When it is reproduced the sequence usually remains the same. Another way the operation is minimally used is by allowing the program instructor the opportunity to select and sequence the activities. The program planner may be minimally involved in an operation area because it is only tangentially related to program planning or because of unfamiliarity with the range of instructional techniques. These two elements will cause an adult educator to use an activity pattern repeatedly once it has been established.

Repetition lends itself to unitary products, efficiency, and a constant rate of production. Because the same pattern of learning activities is repeated, the products of this technology tend to be similar. Using the same pattern is efficient because it requires less effort to reproduce a pattern than to develop a new one. If a programmer can assign the responsibility for selecting and sequencing learning activities to other people, he may be more likely to plan additional work than if he completed this operation himself. Examples of tasks within this technology include: relying upon the instructor to set activities which frees the program planner from detail relating to specific programs and allows him to concentrate energy upon other program planning operations; determining effectiveness of activities which gives the adult educator an opportunity to review the activities set by the instructor thus reflecting concern for the process and providing the occasion to ensure the product fits the organization aims; and reproducing learning activities which ensures standard products, helps maintain a constant rate of production, and is efficient.
Mediating technology

Tasks in this technology reflect interdependence and participation. The adult educator maintains the linkages among the three groups involved in order to perform the following tasks: involving learner and instructors to set activities; determining suitability of activity with clients; and modifying learning activities in conjunction with the clients. This involvement allows for previous learning activities of the learner, instructor, and program planner to be considered and utilized as appropriate in the program plan.

Intensive technology

Tasks in this technology are characterized by the use of feedback provided by skilled observation. The feedback comes from a variety of sources but it is usually mediated by expert opinion. The following are examples of tasks used in this technology: relying upon expert opinion in setting activities by valuing expert opinion from literature, consultants, or course planners; determining appropriateness of activities for the objectives and content of the program; and designing learning activities by careful consideration of instructional development experts because no activity is considered as appropriate solely because of prior application or experience. This results in a variety of products.

Ensuring Participation

Ensuring participation is accomplished by marketing the program, counseling the participant, cosponsoring the activity, or some combination of these efforts. This operation requires the program to be relatively stable in shape or form. Houle suggested that a program is interpreted to a unit's many publics when marketing occurs. In the same way counseling can be seen as interpreting a program on a one to one basis. Cosponsoring may
also be viewed as interpreting a program when it is done for the purpose of making a program legitimate to a potential group of participants.

Long-linked technology

Tasks in this technology are usually efficient, sequenced, and effective. They are historical in that the tasks used are generally ones familiar in a unit's context. Efficiency is obtained by using familiar processes with sequential tasks that allow the operation to be controlled and queued. Effectiveness is determined by how manageable the process is with a given level of secured participation. Examples of long-linked tasks include: developing a general vehicle based upon unit and/or organization requirements; using broad means of distribution; producing public information campaigns; counseling learners through printed materials; and cosponsoring the program with known organizations.

A general vehicle refers to newspaper advertisements, large brochures, and electronic advertisements all of which are generic in nature or contain a complete listing of program. A broad means of distribution means general mailing lists intended for addresses and not specific people.

Mediating technology

Tasks in this technology reflect interdependence between the clients of a unit, participation, and extensive operations. Interdependence is reflected by the use of instructors in counseling learners. Participation is reflected in the counseling function and in the public information campaign. Extensive operations reflect the involvement of many people in the planning process. Examples of tasks in mediating technology include: developing a general vehicle based upon client requirements, which is similar to the task used in long-linked technology; encouraging word of mouth campaigns, which rely upon learner and teacher involvement to
communicate with potential learners or teachers; counseling learners through instructor contact, which reflects a high degree of interdependence between the adult educator and learners; and cosponsoring programs, which locates clients within organizations and secures their participation by coopting the organizations.

**Intensive technology**

This technology reflects variety in the form and content of marketing vehicles, of products, and the use of expert skills. Varied products of this technology will manifest the numerous ways of advertising programs. The technology involves the use of expert skill in production of vehicles and other means of securing participation. Tasks within intensive technology include: developing a specific vehicle based upon program requirements; using highly specific means of distribution because programs are developed for specific purposes which have limited or specialized appeal; producing professionally developed public information campaigns which can represent the use of internal (a trained staff member in public relations) or external (a consultant from the field of public relations) skills; advising learners through professional counselors which helps learners understand the variety of opportunities for study; and cosponsoring programs with organizations having expertise which allows an adult education unit to increase participation by elevating or emphasizing its level of expertise.

**Securing Resources**

Resources can be considered as those materials, efforts, and energies necessary to produce and carry out a program. Resources needed for a program can be determined by considering the selected objectives, or available resources can influence which objectives are selected. Certain
objectives may require specific resources. For example, some performance objectives require specific devices in order for the learner to demonstrate his capabilities. The availability of resources may limit the range of objectives dealing with business administration because the adult education unit or its organization possesses a costly, sophisticated computerized business simulation. This two-way direction of an operation again points to the difficulty of using a linear process to explain program planning.

**Long-linked technology**

Tasks in this technology are characterized by repetition, constancy of rate, and standardization. Repetition refers to using the same kind of resources. Constancy of rate is achieved by a unit having a high degree of control over resources. Such a unit can anticipate resources with some degree of confidence. Standardization refers to using a resource in a consistent manner and producing similar products. Tasks in this technology may include: relying on internal resources such as money, personnel, and materials, which allows a unit some degree of control over the planning process; selecting instructors based upon knowledge about past performance, which is usually done from a pool of instructors well known to the unit either by reputation or by first hand experience; and using facilities under control of the unit, which means they can be scheduled easily and fit into the total program of the unit.

**Mediating technology**

This technology is characterized by interdependence and is a result of coopting as explained in the following tasks. Participation is reflected in using facilities that clients have indicated as preferable. Examples of these tasks include: relying upon coopted resources refers to the sharing of decision making power to gain access to resources; selecting
instructors based upon wants and availability of clients refers to indicated preferences of learners for specific instructors in terms of their content expertise, personality, or both and the indicated desires of the potential instructors to teach specific content; and using facilities based upon client desires refers to securing facilities based upon quality and suitable location as perceived by clients.

**Intensive technology**

Tasks in this technology reflect a variety of resources used. Which resources are used is a function of the information about what is needed. The nature of the content has an effect upon resources used. These kinds of tasks include: relying upon resource development assumes that no resource is readily available or appropriately useable for all programs; selecting instructors based upon program requirements narrows the range of possible instructors to those with expertise in the content area; and using facilities based upon program requirements allows for specialized labs and equipment, environmental conditions or location in relation to the participants.

**Evaluating**

This operation can involve a specific period of time and be a discrete activity. It can also involve the entire program planning process and be inseparable from the process itself. Evaluating can also be a dimension of other operations considered in this chapter.

**Long-linked technology**

This technology is concerned with efficient evaluation. Efficiency is aided by performing evaluations in standardized ways and at a constant rate and frequency. Tasks in this technology include: using unit-developed
instruments and standardized criteria for evaluative purposes; selecting criteria of unit concern usually includes the number of participants in a program, the efficiency of the planning process, and the effectiveness of a program; reporting results to the unit and sponsor demonstrates a concern for data which reflect efficiency, learner happiness, and quality of the program; and using results to improve the planning process includes such items as meeting deadlines, and controlling expense.

**Mediating technology**

This technology is characterized by participation or interdependence and emphasizes the service orientation of the unit. The use of mediating technology makes the following operations extensive in nature because of the involvement of multiple clients (both teachers and learners). Examples of tasks include: selecting criteria of client concern by conversation with the learners and teachers; using a client developed instrument about what the learner or teacher considered to be important and how well important parts of a program were handled; reporting to clients which uses the linkage established among the three parties involved in the adult education experience; and using results to improve service by bringing additional services to people and improving the quality of current service on the basis on information obtained from evaluation activities.

**Intensive technology**

This technology is characterized by the involvement of the expert, the use of several kinds of evaluation, and concentration upon both a program and process. Tasks include: selecting criteria recommended by an expert usually means that a unit will collect data in a number of areas such as numbers of participants, learning, and effectiveness; using professionally developed instruments could be the utilization of standardized instruments
purchased commercially, or instruments developed for a specific program by trained evaluators; reporting results to expert audience means reporting to professional or academic audiences through a journal or in-house means; and using results to improve program outcomes means the concerns of efficiency give way to concerns of effectiveness.

The Technologies Compared and Contrasted

Each technology shares similar tasks whose differences become apparent only after comparing the purposes and specific actions taken in completing a task. When these actions are juxtaposed, contrasts become more evident that when they are presented in a narrative form. Table 2 presents task characteristics grouped by operations within technologies to aid in comparing and contrasting.

Tasks of long-linked technology are characterized by considering agency interests, reproducing both learning and evaluating activities, reproducing program ideas, marketing to general audiences, and using internal and other resources. Agency interests are used by programmers to help define the kinds of program ideas developed. These ideas are developed by the planner in consultation with other unit personnel. Unit or organization goals can be used to establish objectives. Instructors' knowledge of other programs helps them to select learning activities. A general marketing approach is used to ensure participation. Internal or well-known resources will be used by units employing long-linked technology. Unit concerns shape and influence the kind of evaluating that takes place. These characteristics were derived from a review of the task assigned to long-linked technology and can be used to help locate that technology as program planning.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operations</th>
<th>Long-linked</th>
<th>Mediating</th>
<th>Intensive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. singular need</td>
<td>a. client needs</td>
<td>a. variety of needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. questionnaire to learner</td>
<td>b. discussion with client</td>
<td>b. discussion with experts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Consider Market Demand</td>
<td>2. Consider Client Requests</td>
<td>2. Consider Nature of Problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Requests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Review Other Program Approaches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Adopt Unit Definition of Interest</td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Adopt Expert Assessment of Interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emphasize Unit Resources and</td>
<td>Emphasize Client Commitment</td>
<td>Emphasize Expert Opinions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>Long-linked</td>
<td>Mediating</td>
<td>Intensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Selecting &amp; Sequencing Learning Activities</td>
<td>1. Rely Upon Instructor to Set Activities</td>
<td>1. Rely Upon Program Planner to Set Activities in Conjunction with Clients</td>
<td>1. Rely on Expert Opinion in Setting Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Determine Effectiveness of Activities</td>
<td>2. Determine Suitability of Activity with Clients</td>
<td>2. Determine Appropriateness of Activities for Objectives and Content of Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>Long-linked</td>
<td>Mediating</td>
<td>Intensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Ensuring Participation</td>
<td>1. Develop General Vehicle Based Upon Agency Requirements</td>
<td>1. Develop General Vehicle Based Upon Client Requirements</td>
<td>1. Develop Specific Vehicle Based Upon Program Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Use Broadbased Mailing List</td>
<td>2. Use Cultivated Mailing List</td>
<td>2. Use Highly Specific List</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Produce Public Information Campaign</td>
<td>3. Produce Word of Mouth Campaign</td>
<td>3. Produce Professionally Developed Public Information Campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Cosponsor with Known Organization, but Retain Control</td>
<td>5. Cosponsor with Organizations Having Influence with Clients</td>
<td>5. Cosponsor with Organizations Having Expertise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Securing Resources</td>
<td>1. Rely Upon Internal Resources</td>
<td>1. Rely Upon Coopted Resources</td>
<td>1. Rely Upon Resource Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Select Instructors Upon Knowledge of Past Performance</td>
<td>2. Select Instructors Based Upon Wants and Availability of Clients</td>
<td>2. Select Instructors Based Upon Program Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Use Facilities Over Which Unit has Control</td>
<td>3. Use Facilities Based Upon Client Desires</td>
<td>3. Use Facilities Based Program Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>Long-linked</td>
<td>Mediating</td>
<td>Intensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G. Evaluating</strong></td>
<td>1. Select Criteria of Unit Concern</td>
<td>1. Select Criteria of Client-Concern</td>
<td>1. Select Criteria Recommended by Expert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Use Unit Developed Instrument</td>
<td>2. Use Client Developed Instrument</td>
<td>2. Use Expert Developed Instrument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Report Results to Unit or Sponsor or Both</td>
<td>3. Report Results to Clients</td>
<td>3. Report Results to Expert (Academic or Professional Audience)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Use Results to Improve Process</td>
<td>4. Use Results to Improve Service</td>
<td>4. Use Results to Improve Program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tasks of mediating technology are characterized by considering learners' and teachers' needs, discussion with clients, determining teachers' and learners' desires, and involving other organizations. Clients' needs and therefore interests are used in originating program ideas and designing evaluation. Desires of teachers and learners influence the establishment of objectives and the selection of learning activities. Cosponsoring with other organizations in addition to serving as a broad marketing mechanism helps to ensure participation. Coopting helps secure resources. These characteristics can be used to identify mediating technology as program planning.

Tasks of intensive technology are characterized by considering expert opinion, reviewing program requirements, and relying on professional assistance. Expert opinion helps generate program ideas and develop them. It also influences the evaluation of programs. Program requirements affect the kinds of resources and how those resources are used and obtained. It also affects the methods used for ensuring participation. Expert opinion largely affects the kind of evaluations performed and how the results are used. These characteristics will assist in typing program planning activities as intensive technology.

A total of 81 tasks have been identified (Table 2) and placed within a technology and program planning operation. These tasks are related either by the object of the task or the way the task is completed. When these tasks are both related by objective and method they are identifiable by operation and technology. Chapter IV explains how data were gathered and how they were analyzed using the framework presented here.
1Floyd Pennington and Joseph Green, "Analysis of Program Development," p. 18.


CHAPTER IV

METHODOLOGY

This study uses a method of investigation built upon the nature of the problem. Some effort has been spent trying to label the methodology as "naturalistic," "scientific," "qualitative," or "grounded theory." A number of books about qualitative research, by Guba and Lincoln, Bogden and Taylor, Mann, Franklin and Osborne, and McKinney were reviewed to help select a research method. Some of these works defend and promote a growing emphasis on qualitative research and seek to establish it in a different paradigm from scientific research. Others, such as Bogdan and Taylor, note that

Since the positivists and the phenomenologists approach different problems and seek different answers, their research will typically demand different methodologies. The positivist searches for "facts" and "causes" through methods such as survey questionnaires, inventories, and demographic analysis, which produce quantitative data and which allow him or her to statistically prove relationships between operationally defined variables.

This study incorporates positions, techniques, and analysis which seem to belong to both the positivist and phenomenologist positions or paradigms. The research questions were stated prior to collection of data, a sequence commonly followed by positivist researchers. Data were collected through case study techniques, which have been assigned by some to naturalistic research. Naturalistic or scientific research labels have not been applied to this study. A brief description of the research subjects, procedures, and techniques may help in understanding the nature of this inquiry.
Selection of Research Subjects

The subjects for this study were three adult education units, each located in a different public educational organization in Greater Vancouver, British Columbia. Organizations included a school district, a college, and a university. Selection of subjects involved two levels of operation. One level was conceptual and was concerned with finding subjects which might provide the greatest variation in program planning processes among one another. This was done to avoid problems such as one experienced by Robbins:

The continuing education program planners who participated in the study should have proved to be an extremely differentiated collection of persons. They represented different types and sizes of institutions and communities, worked under different types of state college systems, were educated and employed under different circumstances, and planned different types of continuing education programs. However, a dominating characteristic of those persons is their consistency in regard to the data collected by means of the questionnaire. Their organizational role orientations are generally the same, their opinions on the importance of program planning steps are quite similar, and their approaches to planning typical programs and involving others in planning are rather close.

Robbins did not consider his sample to be a possible reason for lack of variance. His claim that institutions were of differing types could be questioned because his sample was restricted to public community colleges. The present investigation used three different kinds of public education organizations to increase the probability of variation in program planning.

Subjects were selected that share either part of all of their geopolitical service area with one another. The school district's area is nested within the college's, which is nested within the university's service area.

The second level of operations concerned practical considerations. These included, organizational cooperation, economic feasibility, and
repeated accessibility when necessary. Organization cooperation was obtained from unit directors in two instances. The dean of Continuing Studies in the university independently made the decision to allow his unit to be studied after he was assured the investigation would not be dysfunctional to the unit's operations. The director of Community Education in the school district consulted with the superintendent prior to allowing his unit to be studied. In the third instance, consent to study the Community Programs and Services Division of the college was obtained from the principal after the college's research and ethics committee reviewed a formal research proposal.

Latitude to study each organization varied considerably. The college provided any and all information deemed necessary by the investigator. The school district allowed interviews with individuals after clearing them with the director or his assistant. Few records were provided by the district and access to minutes was limited. The university allowed the investigator to choose data sources and pursue collection somewhat independently of any clearance mechanism. An offer to help set up appointments was made by the dean and used within his unit. Contextual interviews outside of the unit were set up independently of the dean.

Economic feasibility dictated selection of research subjects within a reasonable driving distance of the investigator's residence, thus limiting subjects to the Greater Vancouver area. Repeated accessibility was a function of organizational cooperation and economic feasibility. Follow-up interviews were necessary to clarify some information obtained in initial interviews and data from written sources.
Case Study Techniques

Case study was used as a research technique for at least two reasons. The research subjects were portrayed in a more holistic manner than most statistical approaches seem to allow. Such a broad approach allowed consideration of variables not identified before data were collected and analyzed but which could have been significant in drawing conclusions about the subjects. The second reason for using case study was based upon a felt need for an expansionist stance toward the problem under study. This study is an initial application of the concept of technology in adult education program planning and is among a small number of studies which have applied a technology framework to administrative processes in organization theory. Initial thoughtful applications are usually done with some apprehension and the correctness of using a concept in this manner has not been assumed. Case study seemed to provide a stance that allowed for determination of validity.

Definition and use of case study

Case study is conceived as an approach that may use any one or combination of the following research techniques: using personal documents; probing many facets of a respondent's life; sharing experiences; and collecting life histories. This investigation used in-depth interviews and documentary research.

Interviews. The interviews were conceptualized as interpersonal communication, which tended to enhance data validity by recognizing differences between a message and its meaning, based upon both interviewer's and respondent's perceptions. Conceptualizing interviews in this manner during the present study was consistent with Kahn and Cannell's definition:
We use the term interview to refer to a specialized pattern of verbal interaction—initiated for a specific purpose, and focused on some specific content area, with consequent elimination of extraneous material. Moreover, the interview is a pattern of interaction in which the role relationship of the interviewer and respondent is highly specialized, its specific characteristic depending somewhat on the purpose and character of the interview.9

Most interviews in the present study were used to obtain an understanding of program planning operations from the perspective of individuals working within adult education units. This was accomplished by focusing the interaction upon concrete examples of program planning tasks from the experience of the respondent.

These interviews were conducted in two distinct phases to ensure planning tasks were from the experience of respondents and not reactions to the framework outlined in Chapter III. The first phase allowed the respondent to lead the interviewer through the program planning process as the respondent used it. Any probes used in this phase were extremely broad. They usually consisted of the phrase "and then what did you do?" or its equivalent.

The second phase of each interview was begun after the respondents signaled that the program planning process as they used it had been thoroughly discussed. The beginning of this phase was usually characterized by a reference by the interviewer to some planning operation outlined in Chapter III but not mentioned by the respondent in phase I of the interview. Respondents were informed or reminded that program planning was not a standardized process and that the operations about to be mentioned might not be part of their practice. Respondents were invited to comment on the appropriateness of these operations in reference to their work.

This two-phase interview enabled a more complete coverage of the synthesized operations than the use of only one phase could have allowed.
This combination resulted in data which were complete and in a situation where voluntary data and solicited data could be differentiated.

Other interviews focused upon a unit's environment and relationships between units and their organizations as well as relationships among units. These interviews were more structured than framework interviews. Structure was provided by asking respondents similar questions to begin discussion in specific areas. Probes in these areas were more focused and varied than probes in the framework interview.

The interviewer attempted to establish a productive climate, listen analytically, probe thoughtfully, motivate the respondent, and control the interview. A productive climate was sought in part by locating the interview in the office or home of the respondent whenever possible. Seven of the total 32 interviews were conducted somewhere other than respondent's offices. Six interviews were held in respondents' homes, and one interview was held in a restaurant. The location of interviews in either the office and the home accomplished two things: the respondent was located in familiar surroundings, which generated questions that could be used to establish rapport through conversation thus enhancing a productive interview. Establishment of a productive climate was also aided by matching respondent's degrees of formality in speech, maintaining an open attitude, being willing to trust, accepting whatever information respondents gave, and avoiding making any overt evaluation during interviews. An open attitude was initially indicated by stating that the purpose of the interviewing was to collect information about how program planning was actually done as opposed to prescribing what should be done.

Listening analytically influenced relationships between the interviewer and respondents in a number of ways. The most important was
allowing the interviewer to determine the respondent's frame of reference. Some respondents were highly critical of the organization for which they worked. By carefully listening it was determined in some cases these persons had characteristically exhibited critical outlook in organizations for which they formerly worked. This was confirmed in one instance by a discussion with a former supervisor.

Thoughtful probing was based upon analytical listening. Downs et al. and Kahn and Cannell list several kinds of inadequate responses that require probing. The most common responses in the present study that required follow-up questions were incomplete because respondents often assumed the interviewer knew more than he did about provincial and organizational adult education. Probes were based upon responses given and were of one of the two general types. Directed probes focused upon well-defined areas of interest to the interviewer and were more commonly used during the contextual interviews and during the second phase of framework related interviews. Indirect probes focused upon the process of the interview and were designed to maintain information exchange. This type of probe was used extensively but not exclusively during the first phase of framework related interview.

Motivating the informant to remain intellectually involved in the interview was attempted by explaining that the interview was part of a study of the ways adult education programs were planned in educational organizations. Recognition was given to the informants' responses by emphasizing the study's focus upon what was actually done in program planning rather than what should be done.

Controlling interviews resulted from adhering to the four principles just outlined. Discipline used by the interviewer resulted in open but
controlled interviews. This issue of control was deemed more important in framework interviews than contextual interviews.

Development and refinement of interview techniques occurred during three practice interviews. A past director of continuing education, and two program planners who work at universities not included as subjects in this study were used. After an initial interview the tape recorded results were reviewed and suggestions about interviewing techniques were made and incorporated into the remaining practice interviews. These techniques led to interviews that were open thus allowing respondents to provide data they felt were important.

Open interviews served three purposes. First, the respondent was asked to give a narrative account of a general area of planning, thus allowing the interviewer to probe using either a funnelling or an inverted funnelling technique. Funnelling refers to the direction of questioning: moving from broad to narrow and concrete concerns. The second purpose was to communicate the feeling that responses were not evaluated as to their correctness. The third purpose was to couch the interview in language familiar to the respondent. Because the respondent did most of the talking, it was he who established the degree of formality during the interview.

Substantive areas covered during framework interviews were those operations identified in Chapter III. Contextual interviews focused upon relationships between a unit and its organization as perceived by the unit director and the organizational head. The following equation is an example of the investigator's introducing the initial area for discussion during framework interviews.
Ideas for adult education programs come from a variety of sources. I'm interested in the way you find program ideas. Can you describe what you usually do to get ideas? Give specific examples if you can.

After respondents enumerated the ways program ideas were obtained and indicated they could think of no others, an indirect probe was used to facilitate the process. An example of this type of probe is given below. Note the absence of any hint to subsequent program planning operations. "After you got the idea for the Women's Management Program, then what did you do?" This kind of probe was used extensively throughout the first phase of framework interviews.

All interviews were tape recorded enabling the interviewer to concentrate upon analytical listening and consequently formulate probes rather than devoting attention to accurately recording oral data. Accuracy of recorded data was perfect, thus limiting problems of validity to researcher interpretation.

Equipment failure presented one problem in taping interviews. The second half of one interview was inaudible. That interview was with an organizational head and thus the data did not pertain to program planning. However, it meant that he had to be reinterviewed. Notes were taken from the audible half of the initial interview and reviewed by both the respondent and the interviewer before the makeup interview was begun.

Interviews were conducted with individuals in three public education organizations. The selection of these three organizations is treated later in this chapter. The selection of informants within these organizations was made by their meeting one of two criteria. Job positions were used as indicators of persons having first hand knowledge of the program planning process used in a unit. Selecting people by this criterion provided a minimum of seven interviews in each organization.
The second criterion was identification of knowledgeable individuals by previously selected informants. Informants were asked to identify persons who had an understanding of the unit. Individuals so recommended were interviewed whenever it was practical to do so. Unit heads provided guidance in identifying individuals. Occasionally, when it was felt to be useful, they were asked to make initial contact about the proposed interview.

Table 3 displays the number of people interviewed by position and type of organization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Organization Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Planners</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time Program Planners</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Education Instructors</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary/Clerk/Administrative Assistant</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director/Dean</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Board Member</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Vice President</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past Director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent/President</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Total number of interviews = 30
Interviews in the school district were arranged by working through the director of Community Education who offered advice about individuals who might be able to explain program development in the unit. As interviews proceeded, it became apparent that part-time program planners played an important role in program planning. Therefore, an interview was arranged with one of the longest employed part-time programmers. The superintendent, board member, and director supplied background and contextual data for the study. A lack of organizational records necessitated the interview with the school trustee who provided some historical data.

Interviews in the community college were arranged through the principal who introduced the investigator to the dean of Community Programs and Services, a personnel officer, and the college librarian. He explained that the investigator was to be allowed free access to college information and documents. As interviews proceeded, one particular program planner was recommended as a person who would provide a valuable and somewhat different perspective about program planning. The past director, principal, and dean all provided contextual data.

Most interviews in the university were arranged through the dean of continuing studies. A few were arranged by the investigator himself. Contextual data were obtained during interviews with the dean, the university president, the past director, and associate academic vice-president.

Issues of validity and reliability

This investigation is concerned with validating the application of the concept of technology to program planning in adult education. Validity of data collection through qualitative methodologies has been reviewed by
Guba\textsuperscript{11} and Deutscher\textsuperscript{12}. Guba notes validation problems arise because of researcher presence, researcher involvement with respondents, bias on the part of the investigator or respondents, and finally distortion due to manner of data collection.

The first item is not a concern in this study. Researcher presence may have an effect when participant observation is the data collection technique, however, this study used in-depth interviews as a collection technique. The remaining three items listed by Guba are at issue when interviews are used. Involvement with respondents was friendly. Rapport was established by showing interest in the respondent before the actual interview began. This interest was demonstrated by asking questions which concentrated upon a person's family, career, hobbies or interests, or some combination of these areas. Questions about a person's career may have been interpreted as gathering data, however, this aspect was modified by the fact that the tape recorder was turned on after the rapport building session. The act of turning on the recorder was meant to be a signal that the data collection phase was beginning.

Rapport is sometimes treated as a state of relationships that can be achieved and then forgotten. Experience in the field demonstrated that rapport once achieved needed constant attention throughout the interview process. This was accomplished by a conversational mode of interviewing. Respondents were often interrupted for clarification observations, or by questions that changed the direction of the interview.

Another problem in the area of researcher involvement is becoming inappropriately involved and losing objectivity. The nature of the research design helped minimize the possibility of overinvolvement by calling for in depth interviews rather than participant observations.
Interviews were usually one hour in length, the shortest was thirty minutes and the longest was almost two hours.

The problem of bias has two aspects. One is bias on the part of the researcher as he collects and interprets data. This aspect was minimized by three techniques. First, interviews which focused on program planning were led by the respondent. No framework of program planning was described by the interviewer until the respondent indicated he had given as much data on program planning as possible. One respondent seemed uncomfortable in leading the interview and asked a number of times "Is this what you want," or "Is this what you are looking for"? Second, interviews were with individuals in equivalent positions across organizations. Any variation from equivalent positions usually occurred in contextual interviews. The only exception was the part-time programmer in the school district. There were no equivalent positions in the other two organizations. Third, application of the framework in analyzing data was done after data had been synthesized into program planning profiles for each unit. The process seems more rigorous than immediate application of the framework to data from individual interviews.

The second aspect of bias comes from informants as they attempt to please, placate, or deceive interviewers. This threat to validity was minimized by letting respondents report how program planning was carried out with little or no reference to any framework.

The last problem Guba mentioned was distortion due to data collection techniques. This was minimized by using a tape recorder to ensure accurate note taking and to allow the investigator to concentrate upon the interview process and interaction rather than accuracy in note taking. Recordings were analyzed and reanalyzed for consistency within a single interview and among interviews within a unit. This cross checking was also supplemented
by cross checking between interview data and data obtained from documents and reports. Cross checking is similar to triangulation, which is used to establish structural corroboration or the validation of evidence by other pieces of evidence.¹³

These threats to validity have been considered and techniques have been employed to help minimize them. Reliability on the other hand poses problems that because of the nature of this study are not as readily minimized as threats to validity. The concept of reliability has importance in studies where measurement is fine and discrete. Studies using these kinds of measures use reliability as indices of consistency of measuring instruments.

One technique of establishing consistency in qualitative studies is auditing findings of investigators by independent experts. The audit is a review of reasonableness of decision and inference made based upon data. The ultimate test of reliability in qualitative studies is replication of investigations using similar subjects and the same methodology. Guba noted several characteristics of interviewing that indicate this data collection technique's inability to satisfy the requirements of reliability:

The materials are difficult or impossible to pretest (unless one is using a highly structure interview with predeveloped protocols). The results are unpredictable and may be nonaggregatable or more equivalent over several interviews. Since only small samples can be handled by unstructured interviewing techniques the generalizability of the results is moot. Such interviews are also difficult if not impossible to standardize (that is, to put into standard content or form), although, this is to be expected since the respondents for unstructured interviewing are themselves of "unstandardized" and unique subject. Nevertheless, interviews are difficult to replicate, since the data collection device is a human being, and the technique is also highly vulnerable to interviewer bias.¹⁴

The very nature of unstructured depth interviewing calls for the investigator to make judgements regarding which line of inquiry to follow
with which individual. Replication and auditibility stand as major techniques in judging the reliability of qualitative studies.

Use of Written Records

Most organizations produce records in one form or another. Interviews can be viewed as collecting oral records of people. This section deals with evidence that has been committed to writing in the form of records or documents. Reports refer to published sources of information about an organization, including: financial, statistical and annual reports as well as program listings. Documents refer to unpublished organizational sources of information, including: letters; memos; minutes of meetings; program summaries; job descriptions; and statements of goals and purposes.

These sources were used to collect information about numbers of staff employed in units, formal structure of the unit and its relationship to the organization, number and kinds of programs planned per year, populations served, financial information, and number of program enrollments per year. These data helped establish a historical background of each unit within its organization. The background provided a setting for information obtained from interviews.

Another use of reports and documents was to locate corroborative data. For example, one respondent indicated he conscientiously evaluated most if not all programs he developed and then, a few minutes later, he noted evaluation was the most neglected area of program planning and one that he felt could be greatly improved. In a subsequent meeting, copies of evaluation forms he had used were requested. Within a few minutes three different instruments that he had developed and used were located. These documents provided corroborative data needed to establish the accuracy of
the interview data and helped resolve an apparent internal inconsistency in an interview.

Data from documents and reports were the most useful in establishing a contextual setting for the units. Each unit shared a similar geographical location and demographic situation, although their historical and organizational settings were unique. Data from records and documents helped establish the context of the units in this regard.

Validity of documents is established through external and internal criticism. External criticism is basically establishing the authenticity of documents. This process was not used in this study because documents were obtained directly from organization archives or some official representative of an organization. Internal criticism was used extensively in some situations where the accuracy of a claim needed to be established because it either differed from data obtained from interviews or from records and could influence the subsequent interpretation of other data. The major method of internal criticism was comparing information from interviews with people who were actors in documented activities with documented information from those activities.

Written documents and records were not primary sources of data about program planning. However, they did supply data helpful in providing historical and contextual data about research subjects.

Data Collection

Data were collected in two ways. The first was interviews, which provided the major amount of information about the planning process as well as the contextual setting of that process. Supplementary but important information in terms of uniqueness of data and its corroborative value was obtained from document and record analysis.
Data from informants were obtained by using two different kinds of interviews. The first kind was the framework interview conducted in two phases and designed to gather data about the unit and its organizational relationships. Table 4 presents a contrast of phases in terms of when operations were mentioned by informants.

Most operations were mentioned by interviewers in Phase I of the interviews. There was some variation among the respondents when the position is considered. For example, 80 percent of the time program planners mentioned operations in Phase I of their interviews, and instructors mentioned operations with equal frequency in Phase I and Phase II. Only 30 percent of the responses were operations mentioned in Phase II when all respondents are considered. Such data provides some confidence that the majority of data collected were provided by the respondent with only broad and nonspecific probes provided by the researcher.

Programmers, secretaries, directors, and instructors all received the same kind of interview while deans and directors received interviews consisting of two distinct parts. The first was similar to interviews received by programmers, secretaries, and instructors. The value of interviewing deans and directors about program planning was in comparing and contrasting what they thought their staffs were doing with what their staffs reported. The second part was conducted immediately after the first. Content of the interview centered upon the unit director's perceptions of his unit's relationships with the organization. Other contextual data were obtained from two past unit directors, a former academic vice-president and organizational heads.

Records and documents were obtained from the three research subjects. University archives proved to be a rich source of organizational minutes and memos. Individuals from the school district supplied some documents
## TABLE 4

OPERATIONS MENTIONED IN PHASE I CONTRASTED TO OPERATIONS MENTIONED IN PHASE II BY POSITION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positions</th>
<th>Phase I</th>
<th>Phase II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Programmers</td>
<td>Secretaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>A B C D E F G %</td>
<td>A B C D E F G %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>10 10 7 7 9 2 9 81</td>
<td>3 2 1 0 3 0 3 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>0 0 3 3 1 5 1 19</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 0 3 0 43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: A = Originating Ideas; B = Developing Ideas; C = Establishing Objectives; D = Selecting and Sequencing Learning Activities; E = Ensuring Participation; F = Securing Resources; G = Evaluating.
but few records were obtained from the organization because of either a lack of a record keeping system or an unwillingness to share its records. The fourth organizational source was the Ministry of Education which supplied two years of comparable statistical data on all three subjects and three years of comparable statistical data on two research subjects.

Data Analysis

Data were analyzed by first indexing each of the interviews. This index was used to locate comments and observations about the planning process or the contextual setting or both. As program planning process descriptions were written, data were cross checked among program planners in each unit. Few conflicts in substantive matters were found. Data were also cross checked among programmers in each of the organizations. A final cross check was made between the director's or deans' and the programmers' perceptions of the planning process.

Data were also compared and contrasted within and among units. This allowed program planning profiles to be developed by identifying similar tasks. If no common tasks could be identified for a unit, then multiple patterns of planning were identified. Patterns are more global than common tasks and include items such as shared philosophies, attitudes, and priorities. Once profiles or patterns were established, the total framework was used as a tool for analysis. Profiles were examined and typed according to the technology they most closely resembled. Planning patterns were used to categorize each unit as to its approach to program planning.

Data Presentation

Data from documents, reports, and contextual interviews are presented in Chapter V as descriptions of the three adult education units and their organizations. The data are both statistical and narrative in nature.
providing some idea as to the scope and kind of adult education activities each unit encourages. Data from interviews about program planning are presented in Chapters VI, VII, and VIII with each chapter focusing on one of the subjects.

Data from each interview are reported anonymously to assure the confidentiality promised to each interviewee. To further assure confidentiality, all interviewees are reported as male and referred to as such even though 13 of the interviews were with women. To assist the reader in placing interviews in the proper unit, organization, and position, they are referenced with a coded acronym. For example, CI2 indicates the interviewee is from the college (C) and is the second (2) instructor (I) interviewed; and UPl indicates the first (1) programmer (P) interviewed from the university (U). Each acronym is explained when initially mentioned and again in the bibliography.

Summary

This chapter began with a discussion of scientific and naturalistic inquiry. Reasons for using case studies techniques were next discussed. A definition and explanation of case study as used in this investigation was given. Data collection by source and process was identified, and finally data analysis was described as a series of cross checks and comparisons to arrive at planning profiles. Planning patterns were mentioned as ways to account for multiple planning profiles within a single unit. Chapter V provides an example of the use of case study in examining the contextual settings of three adult education units.


6. Ibid., p. 45.


11. Guba, *Effective Evaluation*


CHAPTER V

DESCRIPTIONS OF THREE ADULT EDUCATION UNITS

The adult education units in a school district, a community college, and a university that were included in this study are described in the next three sections. Data for unit descriptions consisted of two types, statistical data describing size, age, and program offerings for each of the units studied and observations made by unit and organization administrators about the context of the adult education units and their organizations. Some comments about external relationships with other units and organizations are also presented. These data offer evidence of historical and organizational influences on program planning.

The Community Education Department

Data for the statistical description were obtained from the school district and the Ministry of Education reports. Data for the narrative description were obtained from interviews with the Community Education director, school district superintendent and a school board trustee.

Statistical description

This description provided data about the relative size of four contiguous school districts; their enrollment rates and comparable data for a local community college district, and a content profile for the school district included in the sample. Content profile referred to the kinds of programs offered by an educational organization. For example, a vocational institute might be expected to offer a number of programs related to
vocational training. Such a profile was useful in drawing some conclusions about the kind of adult education programs being conducted by the school district included in this research.

The Community Education Department served an estimated adult population of 112,647 individuals or 83.4 percent of the total school district population. Of the four school districts which comprised a community college region, this was the largest number of adults and the second largest percentage of adults within a district.

Using information from a consultant's report on continuing education relationships in the college district, enrollment ratios between the college and school districts within its region were calculated. If a ratio had the value of one there would be an equal number of enrollments in school district programs and community college programs. Enrollment ratios and actual enrollments are presented in Table 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School District</th>
<th>School District Enrollment</th>
<th>College Enrollment</th>
<th>Enrollment Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>15,420</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>162:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>12,854</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>36:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>3,537</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>54:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>6,316</td>
<td>1,027</td>
<td>6:1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The college had fewer enrollments than the school districts with the smallest difference between the college and the School District D and the greatest between the college and School District A.

Contrasting enrollment ratios with enrollment rates provided an interesting comparison because these statistics demonstrated that when
enrollment ratios were low the enrollment rates were high. Enrollment rates in Table 6 were calculated by dividing the number of enrollments reported in the four districts by the adult population.

TABLE 6
SCHOOL DISTRICT AND COLLEGE ENROLLMENT RATES BY SCHOOL DISTRICT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School District</th>
<th>Adult Population</th>
<th>School District Enrollment</th>
<th>School District Enrollment Rate/1000</th>
<th>College Enrollment</th>
<th>College Enrollment Rate/1000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>112,647</td>
<td>15,420</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>74,398</td>
<td>12,854</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>29,834</td>
<td>3,537</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>31,762</td>
<td>6,316</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>1,027</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The enrollment rates of the college in each school district and the school district enrollment rates demonstrated a positive relationship. These data presented a comparative view of the subject school district with three other contiguous school districts and the community college which serves all four school districts. School District A had the largest adult population of the four districts, the second lowest school district enrollment rate, and the highest enrollment ratio of the four school districts. The level of college activity in adult education programs was positively related to the level of activity in school district adult education programs.

The number of school district enrollments was highest in District A which had the largest adult population. Its enrollment rate, however, was second lowest of the four districts, and the college's enrollment rate was
the lowest in District A. These data indicated a variable relationship between the college's and the school district's enrollment rates within its region. In some districts the college had more enrollments in its programs than in other districts. As will be noted later, school districts and the college have varying degrees of cooperation. Additional observations about District A's relationship to the college are reported in the narrative description of the school district.

The following tables and figures deal exclusively with School District A. Table 7 presents enrollment data supplied by the Director of Community Education in the district. Data for 1976 through 1978 were confirmed by comparing these data with data from the Ministry of Education.\(^3\)

### TABLE 7

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF ADULT EDUCATION ENROLLMENT IN SCHOOL DISTRICT A BY YEAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>3,667</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>9,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>3,348</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>9,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>11,036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>13,026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>14,708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>5,155</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>15,527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>6,380</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>16,513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>8,563</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>15,783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>18,642</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 presents the number of classes held each year in School District A and reported to the Ministry of Education. The decrease in classes held in 1980/81 was explained by a labor strike which curtailed the activities in adult education during the spring programming period.
The data indicated that a fairly constant rate of program production was maintained by the school district. For example in 1977/78 44 more programs were held than the year before. This represented a 5 percent change from the previous year. Percent changes vary from 2 percent to 6 percent in four of the five years years presented in Table 8. Even when the district's usual production capabilities were threatened by a labor dispute, the change was limited to 18 percent of total production.

Steady growth in enrollment was interrupted by occasional and small decreases and has been accompanied by growth in staff positions. Until 1972 adult education programs were managed by a director and secretary. Since then, the number of people on staff has grown to seven full-time and fifteen part-time employees.

Table 9 displays data related to the content of the adult education effort of School District A. Data from 1976-1977 were obtained from the Ministry of Education's Annual Statistical Reports. Data for 1980 were obtained from Community Education's Annual Report to the school district superintendent.

In the year after 1978/79 two additional categories were used to report enrollment data. General trends, however, can be seen even though
TABLE 9
NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF REGISTRATION BY COURSE TYPE
AND YEAR IN SCHOOL DISTRICT A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>High School Completion</th>
<th>Academic Upgrading</th>
<th>Language Training</th>
<th>Vocational Prof. Devel.</th>
<th>General Interest</th>
<th>Comm. Ed.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976/77</td>
<td>823</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>2,499</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>12,134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977/78</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3,254</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>11,957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978/79</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3,407</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>8,989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979/80</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4,179</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)This figure is a total of "Profession/Business/Technical" (n = 919) and "Vocational" (n = 1,580) as reported in 1976.
the data are reported more discretely in the last two years. Even though the total numbers of registrations increased by 637 between 1976/77 and 1977/78, the categorical changes between the years were slight. What change did occur were decreases in general interest and high school completion course enrollments. Academic upgrading course enrollments more than doubled, while vocational and professional development course enrollments increased by nearly a third.

The number of general education course enrollments continued to decrease in relative number to other kinds of course enrollments between 1978 and 1980. The number of vocational and professional development course enrollments remained virtually unchanged in relative number as did enrollments in English language training courses. The greatest area of growth from 1979 to 1980 was Community Education which was defined by the Ministry of Education as "Courses and processes which assist individuals and groups to identify, assess, and meet their learning needs in order to improve the quality of life." The categorical changes in enrollment may be attributed to at least two factors. The first was a qualitative change in the school district approach to adult education. The second factor may merely be a change in reporting procedures or the availability of more discrete reporting categories than was previously available. The first factor seemed to account for shifts which occurred over the entire four year period where the second factor could account for only changes from 1977/78 to 1978/79.

Contextual description

The Community Education Department seemed well integrated with the administrative structure of School District A. Factors which affected this integration were a supportive board of trustees, a professional community
education director and a committed superintendent. Each of these factors contributed uniquely to the department's integration.

The board of trustees demonstrated their support for adult education in at least three ways. First, when presented with a proposal to increase fees for adult education programs the board supported the department with a budgetary allocation rather than a fee increase as reported in a personal interview on June 25, 1981. This support was reflected in the 1980 Financial Statement which reports that Community Education was subsidized by the district with $24,871. The board member expressed his attitude by saying "when we're subsidizing other things, why not continuing education?"

A second way support was demonstrated was the board's approval of the department's proposed programs. Before each program period, a listing of courses was presented to the board for approval. The director in a personal interview on May 29, 1981 reported never having had a course disapproved, but he also noted that he filtered programs before they were presented to the board and that "most of the problems have been worked out." Filtering referred to eliminating programs that might be controversial. Examples of controversial courses that were "filtered" included programs dealing with drugs, sex education, medical self help, and barbering.

The third way support for adult education was demonstrated was in the way the Director of Community Education was viewed in terms of his level of responsibility by the board of trustees member. "[SUH, (school unit head)] is almost, he hasn't got the title but almost, the level of a [sic] assistant superintendent, at least the way the fellows [superintendent and assistant superintendent] work with him."

This view of the director was partly a function of his professional activities in the province and the district and his interaction with the
board of trustees. The director had been active in a professional adult education association (the British Columbia Association of Continuing Education Administrators) for 11 years. He had served as an executive officer in the Association and encouraged his staff to be involved in professional activities. The director's professional image was furthered by interacting with board members on a regular and sustained basis. The director explained how he gained support from the board:

I'm a member of the Superintendent's Caucus, I go to all of the board meetings, I talk to board members, I work closely with board members. There's an interaction with board members. When the board has retreats, and they go somewhere, then I go to those. Of course, you develop support by providing information and data on programs. You don't develop support by answering questions at the board table.

The support of the board was partially generated by the way the director acted out his organizational role. This role was a result of planning by the superintendent who reported purposely building into the school district and Community Education Department overlapping and inter-related parts. For example, the director's membership in the Superintendent's Caucus allowed the director to help make decisions about issues which were not directly related to Community Education. Some of these issues included overall district personnel decisions. In addition to membership in the Caucus, the director was given responsibility for a number of non-adult education activities in the district. Some of these responsibilities were management of the district's summer school, three community schools, and the district's public relations which included publishing a regular newsletter.

All three of these factors, a supportive board, a professional director and a committed superintendent, affect and were affected by the tendency of school district administrators to look internally for
nontraditional educational programs. The superintendent (SCEO, school chief executive officer) in a personal interview on June 17, 1981 commented on this tendency.

If [District A] needs to offer certain programs like ABE programs or equivalency programs, we are conditioned to think that Community Education can do that. As a matter of fact our Community Education director sits in the Planning Caucus, meets every Monday morning with the rest of the assistant superintendents and myself, so the question is simply posed "[SUH], can you do so and so next week?"

Some school districts were perceived by District A's superintendent to look to community colleges or institutes for adult education program delivery. He supposed that sometimes ideas were carried from school board meetings to colleges or institutes by the college liaison board member without ever consulting the adult education director.

As I read my counterparts in [School Districts B, C, and D], more likely somebody there might go to PVI or [College A] and say "can you offer this?" In fact it might never come to that planning group. It might come directly from the board, secretary/treasurer or the superintendent who would phone over. It might even be conveyed through the . . . college or council rep who would take it.

The Community Education Department cooperated with other adult education providers. For example, municipal parks and recreation departments are often major providers of adult education program and sometimes compete with the other adult education units. However, in School District A Community Education and the Parks and Recreation Department have a written set of guidelines which were jointly developed by the two units and reflected an intention to cooperate in offering activities and learning experiences which do not duplicate the effort of either unit. Three times a year these units jointly published a catalogue of programs each unit offers.

Community Education also cooperated with another school district and a community college in publishing another catalogue of courses. Both the
The relationship between the Community Education Department and the community college which served School District A was one of articulated cooperation. Evidence of this articulation was found in an annual report:

Our relationship with [College A] has continued to grow and develop this year. A number of courses were cosponsored and in addition several meetings were held with the continuing education administration in order to define ways to integrate and articulate school district programs with college programs throughout the ... College [A] region.

This statement seemed more appropriately regarded as one of hope rather than one of operational procedure. The superintendent commented on relationships between the district's Community Education Department and other adult education departments in the college region. He felt competition with other school districts was a result of their having similar academic missions. The community college, however, had a different academic mission but shared the same geographical territory. Such common territory compounded problems stemming from overlapping and duplicating program areas. The superintendent noted that a number of program areas exist for which responsibility had not been fixed. His feeling was these areas and the positive growth patterns of both adult education units have led to a somewhat competitive atmosphere and that growth of the community college programs was viewed by the director as occurring at the expense of the Community Education Department programs and clientele. The superintendent viewed this competition as non-malevolent and healthy:

I'm confident that there is not a degree of malice, but there is certainly a degree of discomfort, a watching one another over their shoulder, making sure that if there is a meeting where somebody is, they are there too, to make sure their interests are watched. I haven't been at the meetings, but I suspect that there is a competition, kind of indirect taking issues with one another in meetings with the Ministry .... I'd be surprised if that wasn't the case. I think, frankly, its healthy.
The superintendent's suspicions were an accurate description of the relationship between the two units. The lack of cooperation was recognized by several people in the community college. One of these is CS, the secretary in the college's adult education unit who was interviewed on June 19, 1981. He perceived the situation in terms of school district facilities used by the college. While he was grateful for the assistance given by the school district, he felt that it could be improved.

What I've found, and I said this to him over the phone, "Well [SP2], you always come up with a room for me, and don't think I don't appreciate it, the problem we have is that it's some little out of the way school. This one class of ours is the only thing that is going on at night. The building is dark, the only people that are there are the janitors. The students drive up, they think the school is closed." So we do have one awful problem with space.

CS's perception came from the college side of the problem. From the school district side one contributing factor to the competitive situation is "piracy" of program ideas. A school district programmer interviewed on May 14, 1981, made this observation.

The other major source of ideas would be the lower mainland meetings. All of the CE [continuing education] directors from colleges, universities, institutes get together usually once every program period or twice and talk - they used to talk - [it is] a little more clandestine now, but they used to talk about what would work, what didn't work and... When schools were the only guys involved in the whole thing it was a lot easier because everybody had their [sic] own district and you didn't have to worry about piracy.

A mutual distrust existed between the school district and community college. The people working for the school district were concerned with losing ideas and clientele to the college. College personnel were puzzled about the district's attitude. The perceptions of college employees toward the school district are treated extensively in the Community Programs and Services Division section later in this Chapter.
The unit's technology influenced its parent organization in at least two ways. First, the organization had adopted materials developed by the unit as it developed an organization sponsored program. Second, the organization was influenced by the way the unit insures participation in its programs. The department director reported that the unit's "way of communicating with the public" has been recognized by the district and adopted by it. "The school district itself produces a little newspaper that goes out to all the people in the school district. It looks just like the community education program brochure, only with a different heading."

Integration of the Community Education Department with the school district allowed each to influence the other. The department has established job descriptions which have been used by the district. It has also piloted a number of programs which later have been adopted by the district as part of its curriculum. The superintendent used the Community Education Department as one way of changing the K-12 curriculum. An example he offered was the "Tots to Teens" program which was originally developed and conducted in the Community Education Department and then adopted by the board of trustees for inclusion in the tradition K-12 curriculum. The superintendent viewed the department as "... by far our most flexible delivery system. We can deliver virtually anything our community wants through Community Education. We are far more restricted in the other [K-12]." He also characterizes it as the district's "most dynamic change mechanism."

The roles played by the Director of Community Education and the Community Education Department tended to influence the departmental personnel to think in terms of the district rather than the department. His membership in the Caucus may have been one reason the director reported that it was "hard to think of just adult education." While it was
difficult to determine in which direction the influence is greatest, it is interesting and perhaps meaningful to note that most examples of influence given during interviews were of the department influencing the district.

Summation

Comments from a school board trustee, the Director of Community Education, and the district superintendent have described an adult education unit integrated with its school district. Other comments have described a competitive relationship between this department and a college's adult education unit. A statistical comparison of enrollment numbers and rates among school districts and the community college has also provided some evidence of competition by demonstrating varying levels of cooperation with District A having the lowest college course enrollment rate of four school districts. This comparison may be influenced by integration as evidenced when the District A looked inward for adult education services rather than outward toward the college. This integration affected competition between the school district and the college and was noted by informants from the college.

The Community Programs and Services Division

Data for the statistical description were obtained from the college and the Ministry of Education reports. Data used in the contextual description were collected from an accreditation report and interviews with the Dean of Community Programs and Services, a former Director of Continuing Education, and the principal of the college. These data were used to provide a context for the division within the college and for the program planning process used within the division.

The Community Programs and Services Division has been an organizational unit since the formation of the college in 1970. Its name was
recently changed from the Continuing Education Division to the current title. The unit was undergoing some degree of restructuring due to a major organizational change which divided the college into two separate organizations. This division provided an opportunity to restructure the college, and as a result, change the unit's relationship to the organization. This may be a cause of some feelings of uncertainty expressed by some of the informants. The elevation of the director's position to a dean's level was viewed as a part of an attempt to integrate the division with the college. More on integration will be noted later.

Statistical description

Until April 1, 1981, the college served a region consisting of eight school districts, 13 municipal governments, and 680,000 people. After that date the college was divided into two organizations. The statistical data presented were for the period prior to the college division because little, if any, comparable data have been available after the separation.

Two statistical comparisons seemed useful in describing the college. The first was a comparison of enrollment ratios similar to the ratios presented for school districts in Table 5. Ratios presented in Table 10 were calculated by dividing the total number of college adult education enrollments into the total number of school district adult education enrollments. The table provides two subtotals for each of the regions of the college district which eventually became discrete college districts. The enrollment ratio was highest for the college region which contained the subject school district, indicating this was the least active region on a per capita basis in adult education participation as far as the college was concerned.
TABLE 10

COLLEGE AND SCHOOL DISTRICT ENROLLMENTS AND RATIOS BY COLLEGE A REGIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College District</th>
<th>School District Enrollment</th>
<th>College Enrollment</th>
<th>Enrollment Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Region</td>
<td>38,127</td>
<td>1,541</td>
<td>25:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Region</td>
<td>29,747</td>
<td>2,582</td>
<td>12:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67,874</td>
<td>4,123</td>
<td>16:1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11 presents college enrollment rates per 1000 population from thirteen British Columbia community colleges. College A was the subject of this study and Colleges A, B, C, and D were located on the lower mainland. The mean enrollment rate for lower mainland colleges was 118 per 1000 with College A having the lowest rate in the Province.

TABLE 11

COLLEGE ENROLLMENT RATES IN BRITISH COLUMBIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Adult Population</th>
<th>College Enrollment</th>
<th>Enrollment Rate/1000</th>
<th>Density Per Sq. Mile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>462,040</td>
<td>6,328</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>168.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>346,215</td>
<td>23,121</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>472.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>113,925</td>
<td>6,934</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>11.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>81,765</td>
<td>12,306</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>6.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>20,703</td>
<td>5,618</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>31,355</td>
<td>9,498</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>184,705</td>
<td>12,100</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>88.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>149,745</td>
<td>24,784</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>90,600</td>
<td>12,323</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>48,380</td>
<td>3,225</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>84,190</td>
<td>7,538</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>75,915</td>
<td>5,067</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>47,020</td>
<td>4,677</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>96,540</td>
<td>9,578</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>9.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another useful comparison was course type by year. Table 9 contained data about course types in School District A. Table 12 presents three years of course type offered by the college.

College A was more typical of its neighbors on the lower mainland than it is of the colleges throughout the Province. No established trends were demonstrated in the data for these three years. Course profiles for College A seemed generally typical of other course profiles in both the Province and on the lower mainland. College A, however, exhibited some differences. For example, it usually had a larger percentage of vocational and professional development courses than the Provincial mean. College program composition seemed to demonstrate some vacillation. In 1976-77, vocational and professional development enrollments represented between 39 and 46 percent of mainland and College A enrollments. In 1977-78 that had dropped 13.6 percent in College A, an average 13.1 percent in the lower mainland colleges and an average 1.5 percent in the Province. College A seemed more community oriented than other colleges in the Province. The first year in which community education was a reportable category saw College A with almost double the average percentage of other lower mainland community education enrollments.

Contextual description

The statistical analysis of kinds of programs presents little evidence of direction in the kind of courses or programs planned. Other evidence indicated the direction of College A was not entirely purposeful. A recent 1980 evaluation of College A found little effort within the college to move in a unified direction. An observation of the external evaluation team provided one possible reason for this lack of direction:

Although institutional objectives may be widely understood, they do not appear to be generally accepted. The administration does not
### TABLE 12

**NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF REGISTRATION BY COURSE TYPE IN COLLEGE A, BRITISH COLUMBIA AND THE LOWER MAINLAND**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>College A, British Columbia, Lower Mainland</th>
<th>High School Completion</th>
<th>Academic Upgrading</th>
<th>Language Training</th>
<th>Vocational Prof. Devel.</th>
<th>General Interest</th>
<th>Comm. Ed.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Number %</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Number %</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Number %</td>
<td>Number %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976/77</td>
<td>College A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,875.0</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>3,422.0</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>6,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BC X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LM X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,722.0</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>5,610.7</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>9,422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977/78</td>
<td>College A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,937.0</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>4,035.0</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>5,972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BC X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LM X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,915.5</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>5,273.5</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>7,269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978/79</td>
<td>College A</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2,563.0</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>3,117.0</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>445.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BC X</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LM X</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>7,599.7</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>5,497.3</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>265.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: BC = British Columbia; LM = Lower Mainland.
provide organizational direction that relates closely to College purposes. Recent expansion seems to bear little relationship to the implementation of College goals. 

As part of an overall organizational evaluation, College A was recently the subject of a two part assessment study. The first part was an Institutional Self Study conducted in 1979 which was comprehensive in scope, but criticized in the second part by the external evaluation team because "there was no real review of the institution's goals and activities, nor any true analysis of the college's achievements and needs." The Self Study Report was a review of college units and a report of survey responses to questions about the effectiveness of units.

The section of the Self Study Report on the Continuing Education division began with a descriptive statement about the division which was used for the college's Annual Report. The section concluded with summaries of two survey efforts. One survey was designed to measure opinions of the residents of the college region, the other to measure opinions of faculty and administration. The response rate and questions answered "not known" were high and indicate either an inappropriate survey technique or a hostility toward the evaluation process. Comments about the administration of the Continuing Education Division were different from the comments about the college in general. The external team found

... nearly universal strong support for the administration of this division. Comments about the strength of the division were favorable from both the Continuing Education staff and various other departments in the College. Comments such as "the only division that is still alive around here" were not atypical. Continuing Education staff perceive that they are consulted on all internal matters.

Problems found by the external team included poor physical facilities and a lack of college and Continuing Education integration. This was demonstrated by a comment on the college and Continuing Education goals
and seemed to reflect the overall problem of college goals as discussed earlier.

... there is not a good understanding, [sic] of how the Continuing Education goals fit into the College-wide set of goals. This is somewhat understandable when the goals and objectives are examined. These goals are not specific enough to measure nor do they seem specific enough to provide the clarity that is needed to the Continuing Education Division. The Director seems to know the College-wide mission, but that is not generally shared by the community consultants.12

A number of changes which seem directed to the goal of integrating the college with Community Programs and Services have occurred in this division over a period of years. While integration of the adult education unit and the organization is the same concept as discussed in the preceding section, there is one major difference. In the school district integration was attempted by making the Community Education Department as much like the rest of the organization as possible. In the college integration was being attempted by making the rest of the organization as much like Community Programs and Services as possible.

These attempts included a structural change in the organization and a change in the status of the unit's top administrator. The structural change was one of a series of changes that occurred over several years as the adult education unit attempted to carry out its mission. At one time, continuing education programmers were faculty members with released time to plan and administer continuing education programs. Supervision of these programmers was performed by academic department chairmen and facilities were coordinated by the Director of Continuing Education who had no line authority or responsibility for continuing education personnel. A former Director of Continuing Education in a personal interview on June 4, 1981 explained some problems associated with this kind of decentralized structure.
My biggest problem was that nobody worked for me. Each one of these community consultants worked for a teaching division and I could never say yes to anybody. If I got a phone call from somebody in the community and they wanted help in a certain area, I couldn't say "yeah, I'll have somebody come over," because I have no authority to ask anybody to come over. I had no influence in the quality of the program except, my only influence anywhere was I could say "That course will never run again" or "That course will not run a first time." So my control was a negative kind of control and often departments didn't have the same set of priorities that I did. So I found that to meet community needs and run the organization was very frustrating when I had nobody to do it.

When the present dean, CUH (college unit head), came to College A, he recognized these problems and made efforts to change the structure. He changed the organization by centralizing the continuing education function. In a personal interview held on June 19, 1981, he reported that

One of the first things I did was bought myself six months when I first got here to sit back and it became pretty apparent that nobody really gave a damn. I had to find a way of keeping campus principals happy that things were happening on their campus, and go ahead and build my own organization. We created the environment in which people left and was able to replace them with highly dedicated and motivated people. . . . what people had seen as part of their departmental mandate was taken away from them and centralized.

Rather than relying upon the instructional departments for programming as was done in the past, the Community Programs and Services staff became actively involved in promoting continuing education programs. The division was trying to influence the organization to become a comprehensive community college. This influencing was largely up to individual programmers, however, the dean established a structure which seemed to facilitate that activity. Within this structure programmers had a responsibility to academic departments in helping them become involved in continuing education. The dean's comments described a structure which qualified the centralized continuing education function.

Those programmers have a first responsibility of assisting, helping people in those divisions develop skills and knowledge within those divisions so that they can do their own programming, so those divisions can be comprehensive, so they can offer courses and
programs mandated say on a full-time basis and build those companion or parallel activities that are non credit. That's one mandate I have people assigned.

Qualified centralization was also evidenced by the fact that programmers were assigned to various college units: they answered to both the Dean of Community Programs and Services and the unit administrator. The dean was responsible for the selection and assignment of programmers. Academic deans were involved in the process, but the line relationship was to the Dean of Community Programs and Services. The structure was closely related to the dean's overall strategy.

It's as much a strategy and a tactic... as it is a structure. It's one that attempts initially to assist all sections of the College to participate in continuing education activities; not to stake continuing education as the territory of Community Programs and Services. Continuing education is a mandate of all the organization. Community Programs and Services as a division has a mandate to do part of that itself. At the same time it has another mandate equally important, and that is to assist and facilitate the rest of the college to participate in the provision of continuing education.

This arrangement was designed to achieve involvement of the college in continuing education. The mandate spoken of often by the dean was embodied in an act of the Provincial Parliament and the dean expressed commitment to the mandate as he described a back-up system if college units fail to become involved in continuing education.

If a division or a department is saying no to that [the mandate] and indeed it's not doing that, then that programmer has the right and mandate to do it. Because it must happen by law. We must have that comprehensive program in continuing education.

Another perspective on this problem was offered by the principal of College A. He has recently been appointed principal after serving as a campus principal and before that as Dean of Continuing Education. His comments were about organizational structure and integration of continuing education with the college. He was interviewed on July 2, 1981 and when asked about the most hindering influence on continuing education at the
College he responded: "The lack of a very clear and accountable structure, I think has been the most hindering thing in people's lives."

He described the old organization as radically integrative which attempted to avoid Clark's concept of marginality. The goal of this structure was to "totally integrate adult education or community education into the full fabric of the college via integration." In his opinion this attempt accomplished a value shift. The college viewed adult education as a legitimate part of its enterprise, however, this accomplishment carried a price:

They [the college faculty] mostly have come to accept a, not just a rhetoric, but a fact of the legitimacy of time and energy being spent in community education. But in so doing we denied ourselves the clarity of an organization through which people could do their unique kinds of work. They were forced to use channels and modes of work and behavior that fitted other forms of education, but didn't fit community education. So there was a terrific organizational trade off in my judgment.

This organizational structure and its limitations were dysfunctional to continuing education activities. The positive aspect to this structure was that the departments and divisions of the college were inclined to view programs as theirs. However, these programs were not tied to the community and they did not serve community interests in the principal's judgment.

The principal viewed the present structure postively:

Since then we have been uneasily trying to find our way, with increasing success, I believe, in that particular area of integration versus separate organization. I think that we're probably in not too bad shape right now.

Set against the background of radical organizational change that has produced two colleges in recent months is a change of less impact for the total organization, but significant in terms of the division. This change was instituted before the college division and seems to be continuing. Continuing education has gone through at least three discrete phases at College A. Phase one can be termed radical integration as described by the
principal. Phase two can be termed centralization and can be viewed as a transitional phase. It was less discrete than the other two phases but of critical importance to phase three. Phase three can be termed integration under a centralized organizational structure. An important part of the new structure was the position of the dean. As Dean of Community Programs and Services the head of this unit can speak as one of the college's senior managers to the college's mandate in continuing education. Phase three was a new model for the college and had two elements. One was a centralized structure and the other an integrated function. The dean assigned programmers to academic divisions and was responsible for their select and training. The line authority and reporting responsibility was to the Dean of Community Programs and Services. These three phases can be termed internal influences on the unit's technology. External influences also existed.

The principal perceived that continuing education in the college was influenced by other educational organizations in the same geographical area.

We have... come up with long, long lists of things we would like to do and then used our external colleagues as conditioners. We said "well we can't do this because BCIT is doing that, we can't do that because PVI is doing it," and there's SFU and obviously we've got to pay close attention to our school districts. And we walk very consciously on a matter of policy, that if...[School District A] can do it, or feels they [sic] should do it, then by and large we try to steer out of it, or feel perhaps very apologetic at moving into it, which takes up a lot of time and energy. So a corollary of that, then is that we have probably been other directed in terms of trying to coordinate ourselves. Coming from a position of perceived difference, perhaps a little exaggerated sense of difference to what others are doing and try not to collide and back off almost in automatic fashion.

Sensitivity to other organizations may have an impact upon the way programs are planned. The dean felt this historical situation was still present and affected the current operation of Community Programs and
Speaking of the program planning process CUH identified one problem as cooperation:

I think there are some agencies within our area that are highly competitive and highly territorial and that really—it's hard not to be territorial and competitive yourself when faced with that. Especially when the system of which we are a part rewards competition and noncooperation.... It would be nice if we could sit down with other agencies and organizations and say "Look there's a need for family services, let's look at that as a large program area, let's identify those aspects that each of us as an organization can best handle." So that we are not duplicating effort. So that we are indeed coordinated and providing the best, the maximum service in the region.

The statistical profile of school districts indicated that the most competitive is School District A. The ratio for District A and College A is 162:1. Such a wide difference in the number of program enrollments helped identify this district as the most vigorous and perhaps territorial of all school districts within the college region.

The dean inherited a tradition of allowing, if not encouraging, other organizations to be primary continuing education providers. This was characterized by the college principal as being "other directed". A former Director of Continuing Education for the college expressed his perception in more positive terms than the principal or the dean:

Our original idea was that my responsibility as Director of Continuing Education was to see that our community needs were met. Which didn't necessarily mean that we met them. And one of the problems when we first started out was that community consultants tended to go out there and feel that any work they did was theirs and nobody else had any right to this. They were their programs and they were going to mother them and make sure they happened. Whereas, when the idea came back to me if I felt the YMCA, or a school district or somebody else could do the job as well as or better than us, then my idea was let them do it if they would.

Budgetary requirements produced the need for continuing education programs which provided income and altered this community approach. Programs which were not revenue producers were usually the ones which were left to the college.
If a thing was a money maker, other agencies were only too glad to take it away from us. If it was a money loser and if you're doing a lot of community kind of stuff--putting on courses for people on welfare and that sort of thing--nobody else would touch it with a ten foot pole. . . . financially it became impossible.

The former director reported that these financial problems caused personnel from the college and school districts to agree upon criteria for deciding which organization would do which programs. Generally it was agreed that the college would do "higher level things."

One of the former director's duties was to communicate with the school districts in order to avoid duplication. The former director felt this system worked well and made no mention of competition between the college and the school districts. This may be a result of his philosophy that the college should do those things not done by other organizations. The former director commented that he would not develop programs where school districts were doing similar kind of programs. This kind of cooperation might be termed deference to the school districts.

Community Services and Programs' internal relationships to other college units depended upon the perceived role for the unit. Each of the administrators interviewed identified a different role for the unit. The former director saw the role as innovator for the college and an alternative access to the college for students. He offered adult basic education as an example of a program developed in the continuing education unit and then adopted as part of the regular offerings of the college. Continuing education was also viewed as an entry mechanism for people who could not enter the college through academic departments.

We attract a lot of people who take their first introduction to the college in a CE course. Then they look around and see other things that are associated with that and end up as part time or full time students here.
Another role of the division as perceived by the former director was equalizing the opportunities for education within the community. He thought individuals who financially support the college through taxes were more likely to participate in college sponsored programs through continuing education than enroll in regular classes.

It's given a fairer distribution to the community because many of the people who would take kinds of CE things that we do, would never utilize the college in any other way. And yet, they are supporting the damn thing. So I think they are getting use out of it that they would not get otherwise.

The dean viewed the role of Community Programs and Services as an organizational conscience. He noted the division influenced the college "in developing a broader understanding of community and what it means to work in a community and be part of a community." This was done on an organizational level by "helping and assisting the rest of the organization to change and develop in the role of community development."

The dean saw college influence upon the division as being virtually nonexistent under the former organizational structure. As long as continuing education was "ticking along, doing a good job, getting more numbers, not creating too many waves" the college leadership did not interact with the division.

The new structure is perceived by the dean as increasing the college's influence on the division. Within the new structure the division is an equal partner in providing philosophical and administrative leadership to the college. Upgrading the position of the Director of Continuing Education to that of Dean of Community Programs and Services was the college's attempt to provide a collaborative administrative model at least as far as the function of continuing education was concerned.

The principal listed several organizational roles for continuing education as he spoke about organizational influence upon continuing
education. He perceived the college directly and indirectly affecting continuing education programs. He noted that faculty members had a social value system which affected continuing education programmers. These values "are the primary direction setters" for continuing education because of programming initiatives faculty may take. This direct influence was augmented by an indirect but significant influence.

The programmers tend like all of us to take on the ideological coloration of the total group. Schools tend to be conservative institutions composed of conservative people. I think that there are many subtle and not so subtle sanctions that bear on community program people. They want very much to be accepted as we all do. To the degree that they are very different from the rest of the organization, acceptance becomes something that has to be consciously rejected. You can do that verbally, but deep down it's very hard to do that over long periods of time. You tend to want to be like other people. So I would say... there's enormous influence on the community education people by the rest of the institution.

The principal thought the matter of influence was reciprocal. He saw continuing education influencing the college board and senior administrators.

[Continuing education] influences the college board and the senior administration of the college because it does tend, at best, to act as kind of a standing conscience to the college, as exemplifying opportunities, all of which could be followed up... you're talking of an institutional conscience of a positive type, not a guilt type, but an incentive type. It can be guilty too.

These examples of influence were related to the roles and functions of continuing education. CCEO (college chief executive officer, the principal) listed several functions the adult education unit performs for the college. The first was provision of organized learning experiences for adult learners. It shares this function with all other academic units of the college.

The Community Program Division exists like every other area of the college, to either directly offer the opportunity to learn things or to support people in learning things. There is nothing else. And, therefore it, like every other line department of the college, offers learning experiences to adults.
The principal explained any differentiation of Community Programs from other college units occurs because of thematic, financial or clientele parameters within which it operates. He noted the thematic parameters allowed the Division to offer a wide range of program content; financial parameters required that participants pay for a higher portion of a program's cost than participants in a regular class; and clientele parameters limited community programs to those people who make a tenuous and short term commitment to learning.

A second role was that of institutional conscience which reminded the college of what could be and made it feel good about what the college had done.

It acted as a salver of actual institutional shortfall or inadequacy or accusations... in that it is a cheap way of saying "look at all the good things we are doing." And it's frequently at an unspoken level. Frequently, I'm positive, boards especially, and some senior administrators tolerate community ed simply because it acts as a convenient answer to any number of criticisms.

This role was basically one of public relations. It allowed the organization to use the adult education unit's activities as a counter argument for organizational failure or at least as a diversion from the issue of failure.

The third role CCEO reported was boundary maintenance for the organization. Community education programs have to be marketed to the public, thus providing a public relations process for the college. He noted community education people are pushing out on the environment. CCEO felt most of the units of College A were concerned with the internal organizational health and did not care to be involved with boundary maintenance.
Summation

The adult education unit of the college has been the focus of attempts to integrate continuing education and the college. Initially the division had no responsibility for programming because that activity was directed by administrators of academic departments. After a period of ten years as a single institution with branches, the college has been divided into two separate colleges with the northern college and subject of this study using a centralized model of adult education administration. The chief adult education figure is now a senior administrator in the college who hopes to move the college into fulfilling its legal mandate of continuing education. The college's adult education activities are largely other directed because of historical ways of planning adult education which has provided some opportunity for competition between the college and School District A. A competitive environment, nondefined goals, and changing internal relations between the unit and other organizational units supply the context for program planning explored in Chapter VII.

The Continuing Studies Division

Data for this section were obtained from university senate and senate committee documents, memos, reports, and adult education unit reports and memos. Senate documents contain statistical data about the kind of courses and numbers of participants in adult education activities. Committee documents contained minutes and terms of reference for committee work. All of these documents were located in the university archives.

Description of the continuing studies division

The Division of Continuing Studies was established in 1970 following recommendation to the Senate that:
... a Program of Continuing Education be introduced under the direction of an individual responsible to the Vice-President, Academic. The initial emphasis of this program should be on the offering of late afternoon and evening academic degree credit courses and programs at the upper division level, which complement the regional college lower division offerings. Emphasis should also be placed on the undertaking of feasibility studies and pilot projects relating to the offering of such courses and programs at locations other than the current locations, at times other than the current times and in ways other than the current ways.13

This recommendation was influenced by the existence of extension efforts of another university in the Province which was referred to numerous times in the document containing the above recommendation. These references indicated that University A should "reassess the rather negative goals expressed earlier in this statement, i.e. "of not duplicating programs and facilities offered at [University B] and to look at the position of [University A] in the community of the 70's."14 While non-duplication was one factor in establishing an extension program, it was also a factor in providing a sense of urgency. The same document contained comments that no university offered individuals the opportunity to obtain a Bachelor's degree through evening classes except in a limited number of fields. The general conclusion of the recommendation was that the university extend usual class offerings into time periods that were more convenient to nontraditional students. This recommendation as a founding concept of the university's adult education unit affected the unit's programs by limiting them to subjects that could be adequately treated by resident staff or faculty. This principle appears as part of the unit's model for program planning and any deviation from this principle occurred only with academic department allowance. The following statistical description provides evidence that the initial emphasis of the unit was traditional credit courses.
Statistical description

University A was one of the universities in British Columbia which served a population of about 2.5 million people. The closest university is about 20 miles away. The population of the Greater Vancouver area where Universities A and B are located is about 1.12 million. University C which appears in Table 13 is located about 60 miles from the Vancouver area and serves a somewhat isolated area with a population of approximately 175,000. Table 13 presents noncredit registration for three years for three Provincial universities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>1976/77</th>
<th>1977/78</th>
<th>% change</th>
<th>1978/79</th>
<th>% change</th>
<th>1979/80</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>8,822</td>
<td>13,285</td>
<td>+51</td>
<td>10,283</td>
<td>-23</td>
<td>15,443</td>
<td>+50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>53,011</td>
<td>41,211</td>
<td>-22</td>
<td>53,058</td>
<td>-129</td>
<td>82,742</td>
<td>+56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>4,080</td>
<td>5,397</td>
<td>+32</td>
<td>15,079</td>
<td>+179</td>
<td>13,005</td>
<td>-14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


It became clear that University B had the largest noncredit registrations of any university in the Province. However, the percentage increase in program registrations for University A was larger than for B.

Data in Table 14 were obtained from reports to the senate of University A and include figures on credit and noncredit enrollments and programs by year. Because they are reported as credit and noncredit programs by the adult education unit to the University Senate, they will be reported discretely here beginning with 1974 and ending with 1980. The beginning year was selected because it coincided with the appointment of the present Dean of Continuing Studies.

Credit courses demonstrated a steady increase of enrollments for each year reported. Noncredit activities demonstrated a variable pattern of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Credit Courses</th>
<th>Credit Enrollments</th>
<th>% Change Courses</th>
<th>% Change Enrollments</th>
<th>Noncredit Courses</th>
<th>Noncredit Enrollments</th>
<th>% Change Courses</th>
<th>% Change Enrollments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>74/75</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>9,829</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>196</td>
<td>6,172</td>
<td>-25.5</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75/76</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>12,027</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>6,098</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>44.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76/77</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>14,152</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>8,822</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>50.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77/78</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>14,802</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>13,285</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td>-20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78/79</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>16,131</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>10,551</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>41.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79/80</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>17,105</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>14,906</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Totals Courses</th>
<th>Totals Enrollments</th>
<th>% Change Courses</th>
<th>% Change Enrollments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>74/75</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>16,001</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75/76</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>18,125</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76/77</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>22,974</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77/78</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>28,087</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>-5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78/79</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>26,682</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79/80</td>
<td>887</td>
<td>32,011</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
increases and decreases. Some years, such as 1977/78, enrollment was reported to have increased 50.6 percent while other years, such as 1978/79, enrollment was reported to have dropped 20.6 percent. Possible reasons for this contrast of sustained and steady growth in credit activities and erratic growth in noncredit activities could include any or all of the following factors. Reporting noncredit activities was a more difficult task than reporting credit activities because of the wide variety of activities classified as noncredit. Another possibility was the reports were an accurate reflection of relative growth. Yet another factor which was supported by some evidence and could account for either of the preceding factors was the emphasis given to credit activities by the division.

One datum that supported this idea was the legacy the division carried from the initial recommendation made to the senate. Regular credit courses were recommended to be offered in late afternoon and early evening. It became evident that this emphasis was carried forward by the division. Credit free activities seemed to be an appendage and were not given equal emphasis with credit activities.

The reporting format of division activities underscored the credit emphasis. The 1974/75 report was completed in two installments. The first was made October 15, 1975 and included information on credit classes. This installment consisted of seven pages of narrative followed by five tables and one figure. The second installment about noncredit activities was made November 13, 1975 and consisted of five pages of narrative located in the midst of course listings by semester. The 1975/76 report to the Academic Senate was also completed in two installments. Credit courses were reported on November 12, 1976 in four pages of narrative which contained one table. The second installment about noncredit activities was made three months later and consisted of the listing of activities and
appropriate totals. No narrative was included in the report. The 1976/77 report was made in one installment on October 7, 1977 and consisted of three pages of narrative and two tables relating to credit activities. Noncredit activities were listed with appropriate totals. This same pattern was repeated for 1977/78, 1978/79, and 1979/80.\textsuperscript{16}

The reporting categories for noncredit activities changed somewhat over the examined six year period. For example, initially two categories of programs were reported: community education courses; and student, staff and faculty courses. Table 15 presents categories with enrollment totals in an effort to provide some indication of emphasis within noncredit activities.

From 1974/75 to 1976/77 noncredit activities appeared to be either community education courses or courses for university related persons. The largest number of courses and enrollments was in courses for "students, faculty, and staff." In 1977/78, the reporting categories for noncredit activities were changed to terms more familiar to university faculty. "Courses and Lectures" and "Conferences and Symposia" seemed more appropriate at a university than "Community Education".

This brief analysis of reporting mechanisms for the division has described a difference between the way credit activities and noncredit activities are reported. The conclusion that noncredit activities are not given equal emphasis with credit activities is apparent. The question remains, "why?"

A number of possible answers are offered including the one previously mentioned. The original recommendation for continuing education concerned itself with credit only. However, it was obvious from division reports that noncredit activities have been part of its planned programs. Credit activity was the only function of the Continuing Education Division from
### Table 15

UNIVERSITY NONCREDIT ACTIVITIES REPORTING CATEGORIES AND TOTALS BY YEAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollments</td>
<td>2,535</td>
<td>2,509</td>
<td>5,757</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students, Faculty, &amp; Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollments</td>
<td>3,637</td>
<td>3,589</td>
<td>3,065</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses &amp; Lecture Series</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,458</td>
<td>4,862</td>
<td>5,049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference &amp; Symposia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,204</td>
<td>1,342</td>
<td>3,766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lectures</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,623</td>
<td>4,347</td>
<td>6,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollments</td>
<td>6,172</td>
<td>6,098</td>
<td>8,822</td>
<td>13,504</td>
<td>10,551</td>
<td>15,211</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
its beginning until about 1974. A detailed account of the division's development is next presented as an analysis of how its activities were gradually broadened to include noncredit activities.

**Historical description**

In order to more fully explain the genesis of the Division of Continuing Studies a brief description of two university non-adult education units is presented. The senate recommendation establishing the division was essentially conservative, extending traditional credit programs to late afternoon and early evening. It could be interpreted to be an effort to reschedule regular university classes at a time which might be convenient for part time students. The recommendation mentioned three reasons for establishing a continuing education division which would offer credit courses. First, a neighboring university was already providing "a diversity of offerings." Second, regional colleges were offering a number of first and second year courses which could be transferred to university. Third, only Bachelor degrees in Psychology, Sociology, Anthropology, and English were available to people in British Columbia on a part time basis.

Potential courses were viewed as revenue generating programs. Not only were the regular classes thought to be self supporting but also it was hoped summer courses could make money.

... new programs introduced must almost necessarily be of a revenue generating type; indeed, self-supporting programs would offer the most attraction ...

By restricting the minimum size of classes, such summer session programs can be self supporting and indeed are money makers at several universities in Canada.

The potential of self support was perhaps another reason a continuing education unit was established at University A.
University A seemed to accept limitations to development and growth established by one other university. The senate document referred to that limitation and noted it should no longer be accepted without question.

Perhaps it is time to reassess the rather negative goals expressed earlier in this statement, i.e. "of not duplicating programs and facilities of [University B] and to look at the position of [University A] in the community of the 70's. Such a total review is not the subject of the present paper which is directed solely to one aspect of such a review: the topic of continuing education."

The limitation of nonduplication seemed to have been used rather subtly to point out a reason for University A to act quickly on the recommendation.

While [University B] is considering such a step [allowing completion of a Bachelor's degree by attending evening classes] and has formed a Senate committee to examine this possibility, any recommendations appear to be at least a year away. Thus, by taking such a step now, [University A] has an opportunity to lead the educational community of British Columbia in meeting a real educational need.

This leadership would have relieved University A of its policy of nonduplication and allowed it to enter the extension credit course area of adult education.

The preceding analysis of the Senate Recommendation has demonstrated the initial emphasis of Continuing education to be credit courses. This emphasis is also demonstrated by comments from the first director of continuing education at University A, who was interviewed on June 8, 1981. "My real conception was that this university should simply extend its operation day and its range of scheduling right across a longer time period."

This view was cause for some interaction between the Director of Continuing Education and the Senate Committee on Non Credit Instruction (SCONCI). Establishment of the committee was a result of a concern over the spread and lack of control of noncredit programs as expressed by a former member of that committee in a personal interview held on May 2,
1981. The committee was not concerned with credit activities while the
Director of Continuing Education was minimally involved in noncredit
activities and interacted with the committee only because the division
offered support services for the committee.21

At one point the committee asked the Director of Continuing Education
about his involvement with noncredit activities. His response was that his
division was emphasizing credit offering:

[A committee member] asked if noncredit courses has [sic] been
offered through Continuing Education and other mechanisms on campus
in the past. [The past director] said that no particular area had
jurisdiction of noncredit activities, which had been promoted and
offered by many departments or areas. The Division had done very
little in noncredit in the past as it saw credit offerings as a
priority.22

By asking these questions, the committee had begun a process of
finding a suitable method for controlling the noncredit offerings at the
university. In a meeting in August the committee decided to take an
aggressive stance toward noncredit activities.23 The committee asked the
senate to amend its terms of reference as follows:

To consider for approval all noncredit courses of study, instruction and education not otherwise approved by the Senate, which are proposed under the auspices of [University A] or any of its Faculties or Departments, including nonacademic departments.

All such proposals should be submitted to the Director of the Division of Continuing Education for his referral with recommendation to the Committee on Non Credit Instruction.24

The motion evidently was passed by the senate because the terms of
reference as published in January, 1974 include the recommended
amendment.25 The committee established a five step procedure for reviewing
course proposals. In addition to reviewing and recommending proposals the
division was to:

... arrange for the preparation of publicity materials, the
distribution of publicity, the payment of fees and the registration
of students (where necessary), as well as other details of the
advertisement and operation of courses in consultation with the agency mounting the course.26

The division was to be actively involved in noncredit programs. However, the director was a nonvoting member of the committee and it was the committee's responsibility to approve or disapprove programs.

Evidently the division was not as active in noncredit courses as the committee felt it should be. By March 1974, some members of SCONCI were urging the Division of Continuing Education to become actively involved in noncredit offerings. This is demonstrated by committee members asking for a meeting with the Director of Continuing Education to urge him to help the division become more active in noncredit undertakings.27

Originally the division was given the charge to develop credit offerings as a continuing education effort for the University. SCONCI was established to help bring some order to the noncredit offerings of the university with the division providing support services for this effort. Gradually, the director and the division became more involved in the noncredit area.

A new person, UUH (university unit head), was hired to lead the division as dean. Shortly after he was hired by the university, UUH, met with members of SCONCI "to discuss certain concerns held by [the new dean] with respect to where Continuing Education was going to move."28 It was generally held by most committee members present and the dean that the committee should be restructured. Part of this restructuring was an expansion of the powers of the dean and a reduction in the power of the committee plus a broadening of its responsibilities to include credit and noncredit activities. The committee directed the new dean to draft "a title, terms of reference, etc., for a committee having broader responsibilities within the whole spectrum of continuing education."29
In November of 1974, the new dean offered two motions to be considered by the senate. Motion one was to establish a new senate committee titled "Senate Committee on Continuing Education" that would succeed SCONCI. The second motion was to establish membership of the committee with the dean as chairman, establish terms of appointment, and to set the terms of reference. The terms of reference included advising in the area of continuing education and approval of programmatic efforts in the noncredit area. The motion was passed as evidenced by Senate Document 75-120 which lists the terms of reference as moved by the dean.30

The present dean's views about changes which occurred in the senate committee structure related to continuing education corroborate the evidence and conclusion based upon documental research. When UUH was employed by the university he began to initiate changes in the Senate Committee on Noncredit Instruction. He noted in a personal interview held on May 27, 1981:

The Committee on Noncredit Instruction first of all . . . it was on noncredit instruction, rather than continuing studies which is far more comprehensive so it had to deal with credit which it did not do at that time. And secondly, the Committee looks at every single course and its budget and everything else and that was just simply not appropriate. I didn't have the discretion that I felt I needed and we'd get so drowned in paper that it was just not workable.

Changes came about gradually and with the help of the vice president, academic. UUH felt this support was an enabling factor which allowed the changes to take place. He characterized the vice president as a very strong person in terms of influence. "I couldn't have pulled it off without the VP academic's support. He was a very strong man . . . in the university."

UUH stated that he had to be chairman of the newly formed senate committee. As previously noted that realization was met and currently he
serves as chairman of the Senate Committee on Continuing Studies. The committee has the expanded responsibilities and limited power that the committee feels are appropriate.

The period between 1971 and 1975 was one of evolution from a narrowly constructed credit effort in the division to one of a broadened effort which included noncredit activities. As the analysis of the division's reporting procedures pointed out, credit courses seemed to be given more effort and importance than noncredit programs. This conclusion is supported by a number of comments made by division personnel about the unique programming planning model at the university. Comments from these people form the basis of the contextual description.

**Contextual description**

Continuing Studies at University A seems to be bounded by the academic expertise of its faculty. This bounding refers to the division's hesitancy to offer programs which do not extend or otherwise involve faculty expertise and may be related to the historical development of the division as it evolved from a unit offering only traditional credit programs into one which seems to offer noncredit programs circumscribed by traditional faculty values.

In an interview with the past director the undesirability of duplicating efforts was given as a reason for emphasis of credit programs. Because the past director of continuing education was also the first director, his comments reflected the concerns of the initial director of a new organizational unit. The past director was given a mandate which he interpreted as being "to take the university and extend it into times other than the normal times, into places other than the normal place and by means other than normal means". In an effort to carry this mandate forward, he
convened a meeting of "all the lower mainland directors of school districts levels, the regional college levels and at [University B]." At this meeting the kinds of programs being carried out and the needs being met well by established programs were reviewed in an effort to establish some kind of unique area for the University to be actively engaged in. "I didn't want this institution to duplicate things that were already being done." This helped define what University A would offer in terms of kinds of programs.

The [University B] program already appeared to have a pretty extensive range of noncredit offerings, for example. And my feeling at that time was that the credit university continuing education market may have had a greater need for service than did the noncredit . . .

I sought information from those people who were already involved in the enterprise and what they said to me was basically . . . that the universities were not adequately providing for degree completion for part time students by either evening study, by correspondence or by various means.

Based upon this information, a decision was made to establish an evening program exclusively offering credit courses which led to a degree. The concept of extending the university and thus being bounded by the resident faculty expertise is traceable to this initial decision and the philosophical position taken by the past director. The concept has been somewhat altered by the inclusion of noncredit programming in the extension efforts of the University, but seemed to exist among the division staff members interviewed for this study. As will be demonstrated in planning process interviews, the idea of extension of university expertise helped define the kinds of programs the division sponsored. This concept of extension is based upon the desire of division staff to have the division integrated.

Integration for the division means becoming as much like the rest of the organization as possible. This seems to be more like the notion of
integration in the school district than in the college. However, the means of achieving integration in the university differ from the means used in the school district. In the university integration is sought through at least two mechanisms. The first is limiting programs to those areas in which the faculty have expertise. This is operationalized by requiring academic department approval and preferably academic department sponsorship of all continuing education programs.

The second way the division seeks integration with the university is through the reward system for faculty participation in adult education programs. The past director commented upon this tool for integration:

It was basically up to us to make the program work within the context of the institution. It meant being a good politician in dealing with existing University interests. The university didn't . . . give us any legislative authority. It committed the university to the style of operation in a general sense with the motion or set of motions, but it did not say that every department shall do this, it didn't say that all faculty members shall do this as part of their workload or whatever. Now over the years, I negotiated and [UUH] has done since, some changes in the faculty policy such that work in continuing education programs can be recognized as part of promotion and tenure, that's important. . . . We negotiated change away from overload stipends towards redefinition of what constituted normal working hours and places as well.

Faculty reward systems and program content are two identifiable mechanisms used to achieve integration in the university. Because traditional clients in school districts differ more from adult education clients than do university clients, the school district mechanisms for integration are based on organizational tasks assigned by the superintendent. In the university mechanisms for integration are based upon program content. Integration has been a goal from the beginning of the division with economic insecurity as an original reason for integrating. As the first director of the division, he expressed it:

I think that we've done a pretty good job of making continuing education intrinsic to the university's operation, rather than extrinsic. I argued from the beginning that this should be a built
in integral function of the way the university operates—its style. Not something tacked on. Because if we ever come to a day of hard times in the budget, I know what would go first. It would be anything to do with continuing education if it was seen as just sort of a luxury or an adjunct. It was just nice to have around if things were O.K.

These feelings of insecurity seemed to still affect the past director. He expresses concern over "inappropriate courses" and defined them as noncredit, avocational, lifestyle courses. These courses, he noted are currently being offered by other institutions in the local community. The past director viewed his role as a pioneer in an organization that had no precedent for continuing education. He worked for the integration of the division using the two mechanisms mentioned previously plus a third which was the cultivation of the idea that his successor should be a dean and not a director.

A former Dean of Education, in a personal interview held on June 13, 1981, provided some evidence that the desire to integrate continuing education for purposes of control was also felt by some faculty members in the university. For example, he reported some film showings and panel reactions were not felt to be as "academic" as programs sponsored by a university should be. These kinds of events, according to the former Dean of Education, caused the Senate Committee On Noncredit Instruction to be especially diligent in monitoring program approval.

The former dean provided other comments which indicate he viewed the role of continuing education to be one of extending the university and providing leadership in development of new programs.

I still see the Office of Continuing Studies as being one of stimulating and providing leadership and focusing the university's efforts in extending its programs and developing new and appropriate programs for making the university more accessible whether that's through evening or off campus activities. I believe however, that it's terribly important to leave the ownership of the programs with the academic department and faculty. I believe I'm very much on [sic] rapport with [UUH] in that comment.
New programs are appropriate for the university when departmental ownership is present. This factor seems to be a second element in a defined model of program planning at University A and is related to the first element of extending faculty expertise.

The university president, UCEO (university chief executive officer), noted in a personal interview held on June 23, 1981, that ideas for programs are somewhat defined by other universities. His organization is a relatively new university and

... is continually striving to identify new areas in which to strike out and areas which are not duplicative of something that's already going on at [University B].

He stated that continuing education programs are functions of departmental interests.

The other thing that is very important to recognize ... and in my view is quite fundamental to our success in continuing studies has been that the [sic] Continuing Studies has not been willing to take anything on that was not jointly sponsored by an academic unit on campus. In other words, it does nothing in the way of program initiatives totally on its own. In my perspective anyway that is very critical to its success.

Relying upon department approval and sponsorship could limit efforts in adult education activities to those which are conservative and uncreative. However, this does not seem to be the case at University A. One reason department sponsorship may not effectively limit the range of nontraditional programming is the youthfulness of University A. The president referred to the university as entrepreneurial indicating that program ideas come from a variety of sources. He also commented upon the flexibility of the organization and its effect upon continuing education.

The fact that the place is young allows it a lot of flexibility that one might not find in a traditional university. I've worked at three previous universities.... I would say that the general attitude towards continuing studies here is much more positive than it would be at any of those three institutions.... People here regard continuing studies as an important part of the overall mandate of this institution.
The president seemed to feel the entire organization was supportive of continuing education. If this is the case, then departmental sponsorship may not be a limiting factor in program planning because the organization is innovative. The president commented that the division has resisted efforts to develop programs independently of departments. UCEO seemed to take some pride in the model of continuing education at his university.

As the president considered organizational roles the adult education unit performed, he noted that it increases enrollments and builds morale because it helps initiate new programs. He also noted that he and the dean "share a viewpoint that says that the resources that exist in a university ought to be shared as widely outside as you possibly can and that when you go about important planning phases of a university's development you do so as much as you can in conjunction with government and the private sector."

From this comment it can be inferred that continuing studies is viewed as a bridging mechanism for University A. This inference is supported by another comment made by UCEO about a public relations function. "The positive kinds of generally good attitudes that people have toward this university, I think, are a reflection of what Continuing Studies does." These attitudes are a result of linkages with outside agencies. He cited two university sponsored conferences which involved the secretary of state and the prime minister. UCEO noted these kinds of linkages are performed in addition to the primary educational function.

Those kinds of things [linking to external groups], I think, play a very significant role not only in doing what they were designed to do ... but much more importantly in my view, or at least as important is the fact that it ... [had] a very effective interface ... [with] a whole variety of different constituents. So it does that kind of thing well.

These linkages are formed through appropriate programs which UCEO defined as degree completion and noncredit programs. When asked about
programs which might be inappropriate for Continuing Studies to be involved in, UCEO used the extension model to define those kinds of programs.

If there are aspects of university work that can be delivered in part with the assistance of Continuing Studies, then it seems to me those are legitimate kinds of activities. I can't conceive of any particular dimensions of what we normally do, that one could say they ought not to be involved with.

Another role Continuing Studies performs is development for the university. This was acknowledged by the president when he commented upon a new title and role given to the Dean of Continuing Studies.

His new appointment as Vice President for Development and University Extension will simply mean that the kind of status people accord that role will be even higher.... He at the the same time is continuing with a whole variety of other extension like functions which are typically called development which lend themselves if anything to enhancing his role. It's not just a title, it's just that you get into things like fund raising, or work with alumni, university news service, ceremonies and special events, a lot of those kinds of things relate to the same kinds of clientele.... At least in my own mind, I can conceptualize that as one large entity and that somebody who's good at marketing a whole variety of products in a continuing studies mode will also be able to do a variety of these other things well, and the interaction of those two, I think, if anything will make him ... more effective.

The president of the university is aware of at least the five roles he listed above that are played by Continuing Studies. He is positive about the unit's performance of these roles as he articulated the model of extension bounded by academic department support.

The present Dean of Continuing Studies views the adult education unit in a manner similar to the president. Similarities exist in terms of the organizational roles of the unit, the model of extension, and the experimental nature of Continuing Studies' programs. The dean sees program planning as being based upon a programmatic effort rather than an ad hoc effort which he feels characterizes school district and college adult education. Speaking about school district and college adult education UUH noted:
A lot of it is not programatic . . . although they categorize programs under various themes or whatever, that just happens to be the course that they've got and they categorize them under various themes. And we've program areas, ethnic studies, or labour, or whatever. We consciously plan events within that overall program area.

While his contrast of adult education from each of the organizations may be accurate for most programmers, it seems not to describe the efforts in some areas such as the business programs established by SP2 in School District A.

The influence of the university upon Continuing Studies is viewed by UUH as a positive one. This positive influence was noted as a collaborative climate. "Programmers at our place unlike some universities, not all universities . . . interact daily with faculty and deans and the president will phone any programmer up and they can phone the president up, a dean or anybody else, it's a very interactive collegial community."

Continuing Studies helps the university be aware of other clientele such as lifelong learners. UUH attempts to accomplish this without much visibility. "I try very very hard not to . . . identify Continuing Studies as the agent which does that. Its a collaborative exercise." This collaboration also establishes the parameters for program efforts. Collaboration seems to be one method to achieve integration of the unit with the organization. UUH noted:

The nature of programs . . . obviously influences Continuing Studies because that's your resource base. That's a fundamental, basic influence particularly when one takes the philosophy that I do and that all my colleagues do, that we are a part of the university and we're not an independent unit and we are very influenced by that.

Because the unit is integrated with its organization it does not produce programs that are beyond the resource base of the organization. This seems to be a crucial difference between the university and the two other organizations studied. The resource base helps define appropriate and inappropriate programs. UUH further commented:
[Programs] are appropriate if we have the resources for them. Clearly any program that a department or faculty will not approve is inappropriate. We absolutely don't do anything that a faculty or department won't approve.

These comments are based upon the notion of the extension model as defined earlier. He also noted this model does not affect organization experimentation. Commenting upon the role of experimenter UUH noted:

I think we have a role in program development for the university. Clearly it's not the sole agent for program development, probably not even a primary agent, but it is an agent, ... very often the objective is that they [continuing studies programs] become part of academic programs so that it moves out of Continuing Studies and moves into a faculty.

This developmental role is one of several others UUH mentioned which include university public relations and making contact with organizations which the university may not normally have contact with. An influence that the unit's technology has according to UUH is to bring the organization in contact with other groups.

Because of the nature of what we do, we tend to be in contact with a lot of community organizations which I think otherwise the university might not be in contact with such as art galleries, museums and colleges ... and we interact with those kind of people and feed this back to other people in the University.

The unit's technology provides opportunity for contact with community organizations and helps the organization to be aware of its community.

**Summation**

The ten year history of the division is best characterized by the term evolution; its present role and status within the university has been affected by its historical development. Its method of conducting adult education is perhaps best described as extending the university resources. This method with its limitations is traceable to two factors. The first is the division's original concern with credit programs, which were traditional classes held at nontraditional times. The second factor was
the desire of the first director and his successor, the present dean, that the adult education unit be an integrated part of the University. These factors have combined to establish a program planning model based firmly on university resources and ideas explored in Chapter VIII.

Units Compared and Contrasted

Each of the units is now compared to and contrasted with one another in an effort to demonstrate how units are similar to and different from one another. Each unit has as its chief administrative officer a member of the organization's senior management staff. These people interact extensively with organizational heads in all three cases. The Continuing Studies Division and the Community Programs and Services Division have been adult education units about the same length of time. These two divisions also have a tradition of being influenced by other organizations as they attempt to define programmatic areas. Approval for programming is given in both the Community Education Department and the Continuing Studies Division. Approval in the university is given by a senate committee which approves programmatic efforts of the division. In the school district it is given by the board of trustees which approves specific programs. The latter kind of approval would seem to exert a more conservative influence than the former. The Community Education Department and Community Programs and Services Division each emphasizes community education in reporting its activities. The Continuing Studies Division minimizes reporting of community education.

A comparison of fees charged by the Community Education Department and the Community Programs and Services Division demonstrates that fees charged for programs in Fall, 1980 and advertized in the units' general brochures were on the average higher in the college unit than in the school district
unit. As Table 16 also demonstrates there is greater variability in the fees charged by the college.

**TABLE 16**

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF COLLEGE AND SCHOOL DISTRICT REGISTRATION FEES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>School District Fees</th>
<th>College Fees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>$27.03</td>
<td>$33.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>13.40</td>
<td>27.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another contrast was made using data from the general catalogues of the school district and the college. Subheadings are listed in Table 17 which demonstrates that a wider variety of topics is represented by college unit programs than school district programs.

The existence of a larger number of different programs in the college may be influenced by the wider geographical service area of the college and a more diverse clientele than the school district.

The Continuing Studies Division and the Community Programs and Services Division have legal mandates which require their organizations to perform adult education. The school district has permissive legislation which allows it to conduct adult education. This has caused the dean of Community Programs and Services to feel some pressure to make certain that adult education occurs. In the school district one programmer reported that long term unit goals are sometimes dysfunctional because of the lack of such a mandate. SP2 reported that unit goals may become incongruent with organizational goals over time.

All three units were regarded as experimental in nature by at least one informant from each unit. In the case of the school district, the
superintendent reported purposely using the unit to develop some programs that were later adopted as a part of the district's regular curriculum. A similar observation was made by the past director of community education in the college. In the university the president noted the experimental nature of the adult education unit.

Each of the units was reported to have some kind of evolutionary development. The school district unit moved from offering traditional programs like adult basic education and general educational development to offering more entrepreneurial programs based upon clients' wants and desires. The college unit has moved through three phases of development with varying degrees of centralized adult education programming. The university unit has moved from a narrowly defined area of credit offerings to a broadly defined area of credit and noncredit programs.
All three units are attempting in their own ways to be integrated with their organizations. The Community Education Department or its director performs tasks which are not necessarily related to adult education: conducting public relations; making personnel assignments; administering summer school and community schools. These tasks bring the personnel in the unit into contact with more traditional kinds of school district activities than performing only adult education tasks would. The Community Programs and Services Division is trying to make the college more of a community oriented organization than the dean perceived it to be. Rather than attempting to be like the rest of the organization, the unit seems to be attempting to make the organization like itself. Attempts to do this include the modified centralized structure where a programmer is assigned to an academic unit. The university unit attempts to integrate with its organization in yet a third way. While extending the faculty and other university resources the Continuing Studies Division in effect attempts to be like the rest of the organization.

The outcome of these three different activities in three units seems to have a singular purpose: integration. Each unit strives to be a central part of its organization in some way. The units share this common goal and some others as noted previously. Means and methods may vary, however the goals remain constant across organizations. Similarities rather than contrasts are common. What contrasts do exist may account for variance in program planning as described in the next three chapters.
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CHAPTER VI

PROGRAM PLANNING IN A SCHOOL DISTRICT

This chapter describes a program planning process used in the Community Education Department of a large metropolitan school district in British Columbia. The program planning process is explored in detail from the perspectives of three full-time programmers, a part-time programmer, a secretary, and the director. The process is analyzed using the seven planning operations developed in Chapter III. Finally, a unit profile is established by synthesizing the analysis of the program planning process and commenting on its context and influence on the Community Education Department.

One dimension of the conceptual framework of program planning and technologies is employed as an analytical tool in presenting a program planning process used in the Community Education Department. Each program planning operation is used to categorize the comments about program planning related by staff in the Community Education Department.

Originating ideas

Ideas for adult education programs come from a variety of sources. A total of seventeen different sources was identified by informants with some sources being reported by more than one informant. The range of sources reported by any one informant ranged from one to nine. Nine of ten respondents used sources that depend upon other people. Only one person reported a source that was basically introspective. Iterative sources are
reported and elaborated only when they appear to be a primary idea generator for the informant.

Programmer One, SP1, was responsible for programs in language and adult basic education (ABE) and had been employed by the district for twenty years, sixteen of which were in a teaching capacity with the remaining in administrative positions. For the last three years, he has been a district coordinator.

SP1 reported a total of six ways he used to obtain program ideas, five of which were described in less detail than the sixth. Those mentioned but not elaborated include: requests from community groups; evaluation of programs; comments from part-time supervising programmers and community school coordinators; personal experience with previous programs; and a District wide survey.

SP1's most detailed description involved listening to potential instructors present program ideas, which he described by using two courses as examples: Speed Learning and Conversational Cantonese. SP1 reviewed these courses for hours as he deliberated about their program potential.

Although SP1 invested time in idea generation, he seemed to be philosophical about program success. "I guess it's safe to say that if you fly a number of courses, that a certain percentage of them are going to be cancelled. The market is very competitive out there."

He also noted that there was not a great deal of creativity in developing new programs within his primary area. The reported usual method of program development began with a joint review of past programs between SP1 and a supervising programmer followed by a judgment about the adequacy of participant attendance and a decision to repeat a program in the same or a different location.
Programmer Two, SP2, had been employed by the District for eight years. Previously, he had attained a masters degree and two undergraduate degrees and spent two years as a YMCA program director. Like programmer one, SP2 also reported reviewing past programs for ideas but in a more extensive manner. Brochures advertising adult education programs in distant school districts and community colleges were reviewed for ideas; one of which, the Business Skills Certification Program, came from San Diego Community College. Another source of program ideas used by SP1 and SP2 were gathered from potential instructors. SP2, however, noted that he also used ideas from a teacher in one subject area for ideas about programs in another subject area.

Other sources of ideas and methods used to originate them included: community college liaison; neighboring school districts; committee membership; consultants, and supervisory programmers. Although it was difficult to detect a preference for certain sources or methods, a strong disinclination toward one particular source appeared--advisory committees.

The community college liaison was used whenever resources were not available to the Community Education Department and were perceived to be located in or accessible to the community college. One example offered was in the area of women's studies. School District A had decided not to develop this area of study and as a result SP2 had a working relationship with CP2, a programmer for the community college, to offer jointly sponsored programs. Cooperative efforts with a local university in this subject area were also noted.

Ideas were shared among lower mainland school districts in an attempt to decrease competition. SP2 reported that agreements were made about which districts would offer similar programs at different dates and locations. He also noted that strategic placement of a program within a
district could provide convenient public transportation access or highway access or both. Lower mainland meetings were examples of inter-district cooperation; however, their effectiveness decreased because of the advent of colleges and institutes.

Committee membership provided program ideas but SP2 considered it inefficient, thus ideas were not usually generated by this method because of his unwillingness to invest the needed time. The following quotation includes comments on both advisory committees to the department and advisory committees to individual programs.

We don't really have a large community based group that I meet with to generally kick over programs with. That's missing. That's something we've actually considered getting into for some time, but we haven't done it. Mostly because we find that as soon as you set up a committee and you start getting this kind of program planning process going the time commitments become absolutely horrendous. Like the ... Committee is a great little committee, if it does its thing. But, the amount of time involved, normally I plan those programs out in about 15 to 20 seconds. If it takes 4 to 6 hours, it increases the amount of time you have to put in tremendously.

SP2 used committees when he became involved in an area of programming that included other organizations or had promise of a series of courses tied to a common theme. Parenting courses provided an example of inter-organizational cooperation and personal financial management courses were an example of courses thematically unified.

Committees serving these two programs differed from each other in at least two ways. The parenting advisory committee was composed of organizational representatives, parents and community leaders concerned with families. The committee members, except for one organizational representative, served voluntarily. The personal financial management committee was comprised of individuals who were professionals in the subject area and who were paid by the district for working on the committee. SP2 defined this
group as both a committee and a consultant group. The latter term seems appropriate because these professionals work with SP2 on a retainer basis.

Supervising programmers were involved in idea generation in two ways: first, they brought ideas to SP2 and second, he mentioned ideas to them. Closely associated with the way SP2 and supervising programmers worked was the way he reported working with community school coordinators. The coordinators who worked in a community school and with the school council suggested program ideas they and their committees thought were needed or would be successful or both. Commenting on the community school councils, SP2 expressed his opinion about the quality of ideas from the committees:

They [community school coordinators] each have contact with a local community council and they discuss programs with their council. That's a connection with people in the community. Usually we get ideas, no reflection on the council, but usually they are noninformative, they are just the same as anyone else's idea. They are not particularly good or bad.

SP2 rarely utilized committees to generate ideas. He seemed to characterize them as time-consuming with little qualitative difference from the ideas produced in other ways. While it may be inappropriate to infer from things not said about committees, it is still interesting to note SP2's lack of comments about the potential of committees to legitimize program ideas with a community. SP3, the third programmer interviewed, recognized this value and offered a somewhat different analysis about committees.

**Programmer Three**, SP3, had a degree in education and eleven years' work experience in community education. This training and experience seemed to affect his approach to originating ideas, which was a qualitatively different approach from that of the other district informants. For example, committee membership was one of two major sources
for ideas for this person. The second source of ideas was involvement in community meetings in which he had no official function.

SP3 reported numerous contacts with community groups and agencies which allowed him to define "emerging needs or concerns" which in turn produced ideas for programs. SP3's community involvement through organizational contacts allowed him to identify ideas for programs.

Programmer Four, SP4, had worked as a full-time school teacher and most recently as a part-time supervising programmer. He viewed his role in the latter position as an idea generator and recruiter of instructors. Ideas seemed to come from a number of sources among which were his daily activities and interests. For example, he said that an idea for a cooking class for recreational sailors developed from his personal interest in boating. Reading newspapers, listening to the radio, and asking friends: "What do you think we should do in night school?" also provided ideas. Ideas that had little personal appeal were not developed into programs. Another source of ideas were full-time employed colleagues. For example, SP1 who works fulltime made suggestions about ideas which could be developed. Program brochures from other school districts, community colleges, and institutes also provided ideas for SP4.

Talented people were given as yet another source for ideas. Sometimes when SP4 read a newspaper feature on a person with a unique talent, he contacted that person and asked him to teach a course. SP4 provided macrame as an example of a program idea coming from social trends and fads.

SP4 viewed the role of community school coordinators as mostly selecting courses rather than generating ideas. "I just had to go to the community school and they tell me what they want, . . . it's not really new ideas, they just order."
This programmer's methods of idea generation were varied, and he seemed to be constantly receptive to ideas from many sources. He summarized the methods used as "The more places you are, the more you find out information."

Two instructors interviewed demonstrated different levels of involvement in idea generation. SI1 reported that he taught courses in Financial Management and seemed to react to ideas suggested by SP2. SI2 reported that he taught courses in Ballroom Dancing and reported no involvement in idea generation. Each instructor did mention originating ideas about subjects covered within specific programs; however, these were not program ideas.

The secretary, SS, had worked for the District full-time for four years and before that part-time for five years. His other work experience included clerking for a large chain department store and delivering mail for Canada Post. He was acutely aware, if not involved in, the operation of originating program ideas. He received ideas from the public as people called the Department and requested programs or suggested ideas for programs. Magazines were mentioned by SS as sources for popular fads or trends, which in turn produced program ideas. These ideas were given to the full-time staff for implementation. He seemed aware of a reactive stance to idea generation and felt more time should be available to originate ideas.

You've got a core of programs that you offer every time and you just go with it and the new ones come in when we get the input. There should be someone sitting there saying, "OK, I have a day or three days or a week to come up with new classes, new programs. I'm going to phone around and see what they've done in these districts.

SS's perception that idea generation was a little used operation and that the core programs were offered on a continual basis was reinforced by SP2's estimate that 95 percent of the programs were repeated each program
period. When idea origination did take place, it was usually accomplished by someone other than full-time departmental staff.

The Director of Community Education, SUH, had the longest tenure of anyone in the Department. Prior to serving as Director for the past ten years, he had been a part-time counselor and part-time adult educator in a neighboring school district, and before that, had been a teacher and a counselor. His comments reflected years of experience on the one hand and a somewhat detached perspective on the other hand. The detached perspective was related to his involvement with administrative and district duties rather than day to day involvement with planning specific adult education courses.

Sources of ideas already mentioned by other informants and reiterated by the Director included: full and part-time programmers; teachers; surveys; program brochures from other districts, colleges, and institutes; and a general awareness of activities in society. SUH explained how he gained this awareness.

By watching television, reading the newspaper, and magazines you sort of sense what people are getting into.... Basically we will run almost anything that people seem to want. We will run anything that works, provided somebody else isn't doing it.

Programming direction for the Department seemed to be set by the clients' desires and interests. These desires and interests represented an influence external to the Department and District.

Another external influence was the Ministry of Education. SUH reported that the Ministry of Education provided funds for programs it wished to see implemented. An example was the Ministry's emphasis on ABE which is supported mostly, if not entirely, by ministerial grants to school districts. SUH seemed to be primarily influenced by external sources of ideas.
Summation. Informants most often cited brochures and teachers as sources of ideas. Brochures not only contained ideas but also provided some indication of the level of participation. For example, if a program was listed with multiple sections, then it was usually included in a listing of new programs offered by Community Education because the multiple sections indicated a popular program.

Teachers not only supplied ideas for programs but also provided critical information relating to program success. The longer instructors had been employed by the Department the more valued their opinions seemed to be. For example, SP2 used instructors to locate and set the day of the week for a program.

I would phone all the teachers and say, "Listen, we thought we'd do this with your course on this night at this school, what do you think?" And they'd say, "Well, OK" or "I think you're making a mistake there." After you got a teacher who has been through this a couple of times they start to understand geographical placement of courses, evening of courses, and other sort of things.

Other sources of ideas mentioned by more than one informant but not mentioned as often as brochures and teachers were community school coordinators, repetition of previous courses, neighboring school districts, and popular trends and interest. Some informants used more sources than others. The instructors did not mention sources of program ideas, but did mention ideas for subjects to be treated within programs.

Developing ideas

Developing ideas is the next operation to be considered, following the program planning framework. Informant comments about this operation will be noted as either self-directed or directed. Self-directed refers to respondents leading the interview into the operation. Directed refers to the investigator leading the interview into the operation. Each respondent was asked to talk about the program planning process used in developing a
specific program. The informant selected the program and explained how it was developed.

Programmer One gave examples during the interview of three programs. One, the Walk in Learning Centre was one of SP1's major responsibilities and was available to adults who needed to upgrade their basic academic skills such as reading and writing. No idea development operation was mentioned for this area.

The other two programs were Conversational Cantonese and Speed Learning which were both suggested by potential instructors. Comments about developing these ideas were self-directed as SP1 explained both programs. Idea development occurred as these programs were explained in detail by hopeful instructors for four hours. These sessions with the instructors also helped SP1 make judgments about the instructors' capabilities.

Conversational Cantonese was further developed by testing the program's market appeal to office staff.

I ran it by a couple of people. I said to them, "What do you think, do you think a program like that would go?" I talked to [SP2], I talked to [SP3], I talked to the girls in the office. They've been around, they handle the phone, they know what people want. So I say, "Yeah, it might. We haven't got a great deal to lose by trying it."

Few resources and minimal time involvement produced a low-risk program, which allowed SP1 to "advertise among the language section of our brochure and just wait for people to register. Nothing special, not big hype. It's just listed under the languages."

Conversational Cantonese was held twice and then cancelled because of declining enrollments. After a year, it may be held again. "I think we're going to try it again in the fall. It's been a year now. Just as a
curiosity piece to see if it will go or not. It costs us a little bit to do it, but it may go again."

Extensive idea development seemed lacking in the process described by SPL. The process seemed to be one of using marketing potential as a criterion in selecting programs of public interest. Minimal effort was made to develop the idea.

Programmer Two's comments were self directed. SP2 reported usually using an instantaneous planning process he previously described. Sometimes, however, he used a more deliberate one. When inter-organizational cooperation or new courses were involved, then idea development occurred in two phases. The first was talking with colleagues and considering their evaluation of and suggestions about ideas.

The second was seeking "people that I know, who are working with us in some capacity, either instructors for us, or staff people in the District who have a personal interest in the thing, and bounce it off of them." An example of this approach was a planning committee consisting of SP2, a school district counselor, and an instructor for the Community Education Department. This group produced a scheme of possible programs centered on personal finance. These two phases were separated by a year's time from subsequent planning operations. SP2 estimated these processes were involved with about 7 percent of programs offered by the department. Five percent were new programs and an additional 2 percent were programs cosponsored by the department and some other organization.

Programmer Three's self-directed comments about developing ideas contrast with the two previous programmers' comments. SP3 characterized idea development as "selling" the idea to people who should be involved. An example of a program on municipal government involved going "over to the municipal people and tell them--try to suggest to them--the worth of the
The Secretary's comments were minimal but self-directed. SS viewed idea development as an operation that received little, but was deserving of more, time.

I think we should have another program person like [SP2]. The areas should be divided in half. ... If they had another one, you'd have much more time to really plan. There isn't all that much planning gone into this. It's sort of--like [SP1] says, instead of action--reaction, it's just reaction, reaction, reaction, reaction.

Though he felt more time should be given to planning programs, he did not feel that more people should become involved in the process; for example, SS felt the Board of Trustees were becoming more involved in adult education than they have been in the past. This involvement was viewed as potentially limiting to the Department's flexibility because the Board approved new courses as they were proposed each program period. SS hoped this would not curtail the responsiveness of the Department.

The Director viewed this operation as requiring small amounts of time. His self-directed comments were similar to SP2's views on the amount of time required to develop programs.

It's a very simple process actually. I mean [SP2] could walk in here now and say, "I want to run a course in underwater basket weaving, what do you think?" I'd say, "It sounds fine ...." I wouldn't even ask him if he had an instructor. And it can be just like that.... In fact, we do courses like that in less than a minute. And that's the process. It can be very fast.

This operation became more involved and took longer when other organizations were involved. For example, when a voluntary health association and the Department cosponsored a program, facilities, fee structures, and cost had to be resolved. In this instance, it seemed as though developing ideas was closely associated with the entire planning process for SUH.

Summation. Inasmuch as the comments about developing program ideas were self-directed, this operation was an integral part of the planning process in the district. It was accomplished by several methods in the
department. The most common method seemed to be consultation with colleagues in the office or a testing of an idea's marketability. "Bouncing ideas off" another person helped assure a programmer that the idea was likely to attract a number of people.

Another method involved using representatives of community groups to help develop the idea. Yet another method involved negotiating between the programmer and instructor to explicate the idea. The community-based and the instructor-based methods seemed to be more time-consuming than the more commonly reported approach of using colleagues to develop the idea.

**Establishing objectives**

This operation was often viewed as occurring on three levels. One was a programmatic level and dealt with program outcomes, the second was an individual level and dealt with learning outcomes, and the third was an organizational level and dealt with the Department. Most comments resulted from direct probes about this specific operation; it was usually neglected by respondents when they volunteered data.

**Programmer One** was a case in point. Only after being questioned specifically about objectives, SP1 stated he viewed objectives being set on two levels. The first was a broad programmatic level of which he cited Learning Centres as an example. SP1 established the objective to provide a non-threatening atmosphere for people who wish to improve skills in specific areas. The second level of objectives came from the instructor and SP1, and dealt with learner abilities and achievements. They were set on the individual level, were specific, and were contained in general educational development (GED) programs.

**Programmer Two** commented about objectives only after he was asked about how they were determined. SP2's opinions were somewhat atypical of
views encountered during the data collection process. He used objectives sparingly and as a communication device between planners. SP2's comments are quoted at some length because of the unique opinion they represent.

My view is, whenever you decide to run a program, there are obvious objectives that don't need to be stated for specific programs. In my planning notes for that particular series of courses [financial management] you'll find a general objective kind of statement. "What we want to do is provide information to help people make financial choices and decisions ..." I did that because I was working with other guys at the time. So I expressed that objective and that's the way it worked through.

When you talk about an individual or single program, or a couple of programs, in many cases you obviously have an objective in running the program, that's why you're developing it. In a lot of cases it really doesn't get expressed and I don't think it really needs to in a lot of those particular cases. You spend three weeks trying to write your bloody objective out and in a lot of cases it's not necessary. Sometimes it is because it can skew what you're going to do. But a lot of time that effort is just not, in my view, worth the time you put into it.

This comment fits the rather rapid method of program planning SP2 described in the operation "Originating the Idea." Utility in planning seemed to be the criterion used in deciding when to use objectives.

A similar and critical view was held by SP2 about organizational objectives. SP2 questioned the usefulness of objectives that limit an organization and that might even commit a unit to potentially undesirable purposes. His comments also reflected a perception of an unstable environment.

In our situation and in every school district in adult education in this Province ... there's no mandate, no legislation for [continuing education]. The school board can cut this whole enterprise off right now, with not even blinking an eye, there's no problem in doing it. And when you're looking at setting objectives in that kind of framework you've got to be very careful that what you pick doesn't look foolish three years down the road. Because you just might have put yourself in a position to be extinguished.

SP2 saw value in remaining flexible as a unit within the school district organization. Survival may be a reason the Community Education Department attempts to integrate with the district. These opinions were different
from opinions about objectives expressed by other programmers in the Department.

Programmer Three responded consistently with his community education philosophy when asked about setting objectives. SP3 saw objectives as necessary for valid evaluation because program objectives provided a foundation for evaluating programs, instructors, and learners.

He reported objective setting as a shared activity between the programmer and instructor. Broad outcomes were stated by the programmer and the instructor responded by stating how those outcomes could be achieved. These objectives were then shared with the learners as a way of achieving a standard for performance evaluation. His views on objective setting were linked with evaluation of performance of learners and educators. The involvement of instructors and learners in setting objectives corresponded to SP3's cooperative approach to program development.

Programmer Four offered comments in a self-directed mode and reported relying upon instructors to set objectives. SP4 provided instructors with a book on teaching which contained some information on setting themes or goals and communicating expectations to program participants. Setting goals was left largely in the hands of instructors, although SP4 claimed to check on objectives through outlines submitted to him by instructors. He also reported some informal objective setting occurred as program ideas were developed in some detail. Objectives, however, seemed to receive little emphasis from SP4.

Instructor One did not use educational terminology such as "setting objectives" in his self-directed comments. However, SI1 was aware of and seemed to have objectives fixed in his mind as he planned programs.
At a broader program level objectives and content were determined by SI1 by asking and answering the question "What do people want to know about?" On a more specific level of an individual course the objective and content were determined by asking and answering the question "What do people need to know in order to perform certain tasks?"

In establishing objectives for a payroll development program, SI1 reported looking "all the payroll associated things that somebody has to do who employs people in order to select content material." There seemed to be a reliance upon performance tasks as defined by the workplace in establishing objectives. The term objective was never used by SI1 but he seemed to possess an understanding of value associated with using objectives founded upon performance tasks.

Instructor Two reported few changes in a program inherited from previous instructors four years ago. SI2 noted that multiple sections of this program teach the same content. "We do ballroom dancing, we always teach five particular dances. Every teacher teaches the same. They have the same program so that you can go from one class to a different class and you should be up to the same level."

Objectives for SI2 helped determine what content should be taught. SI1 and SI2 were not professional educators and hence did not use educational terminology. However, they seemed to understand the usefulness of defining what content would be considered within an instructional period. These two instructors sought proficiency in their own ways and seemed as concerned about meeting objectives as an educationist who understands the various parts and purposes of behavioral objectives.

The Secretary, when directly asked about objectives, reported that the general interest programs had no goal other than entertainment or attaining some minimal level of enrollment. He reported other programs such as those
in business had specific goals and described the programmers' activities in setting objectives.

I know they caucus about it and ... talk and meet and go here to interview these people. So they're really trying to form a cohesive program with a goal for each course. Like when they leave there, they should know how to invest in real estate successfully. The people that are handling the courses are professionals and they are used to dealing in that realm so the courses come off a lot more professional and goal oriented than the courses I work in.

SS also noted that the vocational, business, and office skills programs are all goal-oriented. He felt objectives or goals were set by programmers and made no mention of instructor involvement.

The Director on the other hand, saw some instructor as well as programmer involvement in setting objectives. His limited comments were responses to a direct question about setting objectives. He reported that objectives were set by use of a course outline. Formerly instructors in all courses filed an outline with the department; presently, only instructors in certificated courses file outlines. SUH noted this was done to ensure consistency among courses over a time period.

Summation. Most informants responded with observations about objective setting after being asked questions about this operation. The exceptions were the two instructors; they voluntarily responded in broad terms without using educational terminology in describing objective setting.

Objectives were used for certain kinds of courses by most programmers. These included: new, cosponsored, and certificated courses. Objective setting took place on at least three levels: program, learning, and organization. Objective setting may not have appeared or would have been given minimal attention if the interview framework had not been employed in this investigation. Perhaps SP2's observation about objective setting
Selecting and sequencing learning activities

This operation was discussed briefly by most informants. Half of them answered in a self-directed mode. Both instructors and two programmers reported activities in this operation without probing from the interviewer.

Programmer One's involvement with the Learning Centre influenced him to respond with "we're not laying anything on them" when asked about selecting and sequencing learning activities because there was no set curriculum in the centres. Each participant was involved in establishing learning activities best suited for him. Instructors were available to assist learners in the selection of activities. SP1 reported that learning activities in some programs were specified by Ministerial curriculum developers. These activities were selected and sequenced by curriculum specialists who had minimal involvement with the department. SP1's area was one of polar extremes; either the learner was highly involved and assisted by the instructor, or neither the learner nor the instructor was involved.

Other programs involved both SP1 and the instructor as learning activities were selected and sequenced. In response to a question about the operation, SP1 stated: "We did that together. I wanted to make sure he knew what he was doing."

Programmer Two responded to the probe about selecting and sequencing learning activities as being crucial. This operation was closely linked to selecting and sequencing the content of a program in SP2's mind. SP2 reported it was accomplished by the programmer identifying areas people should know about within the parameters set by subject matter. The
sequence depended upon what made most sense to participants. Marketing concerns were also considered because the sequence, according to SP2, had to appeal to people.

At a general program level, professionals were consulted to help determine specific program topics. At a specific program level the instructor was relied on heavily. As a programmer, SP2 had little time to work out sequences within a course. His main task seemed to be one of locating a potential instructor who was capable of selecting and sequencing learning activities.

I only have so much time to put into the thing. What I do there, when I have an instructor is, I say, "OK, here is a two-night module. How would you teach this?" And we work something out together. It's the same process [as selecting and sequencing courses], you write the topics down and work the thing through with the instructor. And if I feel that instructor has a basic savvy of how to put these things together; then I say, "OK, let's give it a crack."

SP2 estimated that he used instructors for this operation in about 60 percent of the programs he planned. The remaining 40 percent were general interest courses and received little or no attention in this operation. These programs were "just done." The programs which received attention were new programs consisting of sets of courses.

Programmer Three demonstrated a broad base of involvement as he described the selection and sequencing operation. He used an eight week program as an example in illustrating this operation.

After putting that [time] sequence we try to fit in the different departments, (what should be covered), then send out a draft to all those people that are involved and ask for their suggestions. Then come back and tighten it up in terms of publicity and start to publicize it after everything has been secured.

The proper sequence and format were decided upon by SP3 and consequently approved or modified by the various representatives of involved organizations. This was similar to involving the programmer and instructor
as previously described by other informants because organizational representatives were often instructors.

Programmer Four voluntarily reported helping instructors in activities related to this operation. For example, SP4 gave hints about some instructional techniques. "If it's a demonstration course for food, I give them ... little tips on demonstrating."

Another way instructors were helped by SP4 was through a meeting prior to the course. "Hopefully, by the time I meet them, we've already over the phone asked them to do an outline. So they come with an outline.... I also show them outlines, I have from any other classes...." This meeting was held far enough in advance of the program to allow instructors the chance to "get the class organized." SP4's comments indicated that instructors were primarily responsible for this operation. SP4 did offer some assistance and guidance especially for new instructors.

Instructor One viewed the operation of selecting and sequencing individual courses as a joint effort between him and the programmer. Within a course, however, SI1 saw his role as producing an agenda that was reviewed by the programmer, handouts, and securing guest lecturers. However, SI1 noted the programmer "gives me a fairly free hand."

Instructor Two's involvement presented an interesting contrast to instructor one's involvement. The inherited content and activities of ballroom dance courses were used with little modification.

The dance selections were made by a professor of ballroom dancing ... years ago. Evidently he was an excellent teacher, a master of teaching of some sort. He developed this. He brought the elderly couple who brought us along into the system. And when this Vincent died and they carried on with it. And now we're carrying on with it.
Inherited learning activities were accepted by each generation of instructors. If changes occurred, they did so gradually and without a conscious realization of modification.

The Secretary noted after some probing that the Ministry funded courses, and that other courses linked closely to the Ministry were sequenced by that organization. These kinds of courses usually included academic programs of ABE, ESL, and GED. SS also noted that other courses which were a part of a thematic group of courses were sequenced by SP2 and certain instructors.

The Director's brief responses were a result of probing. SUH noted that sequencing and selecting learning activities occurred on two levels. One was a broad program level and was accomplished by the programmer. Another was the specific course level and was done by the instructor. As director, SUH was not involved.

Summation. This activity was highly instructor centered. Two levels seemed to exist: one at the general level and involved sequencing programs and another at a specific level and involved learning exercises within a program. Programmers and instructors were usually involved at the general level, while at the specific program level only the instructor was usually involved. SP3 was the exception as he provided data that indicated that he used organizational representatives to order the sequence of activities.

Ensuring participation

Data about this operation from most interviewees were similar and indicated that securing participation was the responsibility of the full-time department staff. Ensuring participation usually meant among other things producing a brochure or catalog.
Programmer One voluntarily reported several methods used to ensure participation. Which method used depended upon the kind of program being promoted. For example, the Learning Centre was promoted using three media by a person hired for that purpose. Phone calls, brochures, and a catalog were used to contact social agencies whose clients might be likely to use the services of the Learning Centre. The phone calls and special mailings went to churches, agencies of Human Resources Ministry, and ethnic group organizations. When compared to other district interviewees, SPI's activities represented a relatively comprehensive effort to secure participation.

Other courses which SPI developed were advertised in what was a routine manner for the Department. SPI described this process: "We advertise it among the language section of our brochure, and just wait for people to register. Nothing special, no big hype. It's just listed under the languages. This method of advertising seemed to be the most commonly used in the Department.

Programmer Two reported using the brochure and direct mail efforts almost exclusively to secure participation. Some deviation from using the brochure occurred for new and potentially popular programs. Commenting on such a program, SP2 noted: "We advertise it just the way we normally do, just in our brochure--our little brochure first of all. Now that program, we advertise through our brochure, also special spot announcements in the newspapers."

Wording of program description was thought to be crucial by SP2. "One word in the description, one word, can mean the difference sometimes between filling the course and having it empty." Finding that "one word" involved interacting with the course instructor and was critical in the success of some courses, while in others, the title was sufficient to secure participation. SP2 provided an example of the importance of one
word in a French cooking program, where the mention of a certain dish was the crucial factor.

Program listings were actually published in two brochures. One was published in cooperation with the Municipal Parks and Recreation Department; the other was published in cooperation with another school district and community college which are contiguous to, but outside of, the college district to which School District A belongs.

SP2 reported these brochures were produced on a quarterly basis and listed about 95 percent of programs sponsored by the District. Much effort was expended in listing all of the programs because the brochure served important departmental functions besides advertising.

We try to get everything in the brochure because that's the basis for...our "school by night sheets." It breaks down into different schools according to night, which are our control sheets for payroll and a whole bunch of other things. We try to get everything in there.

The use of the brochure for multiple functions, some of an administrative nature, emphasized the program queuing that took place. This queuing undoubtedly had some effect upon the planning process. One effect might be a specific period of time for idea origination, development, and other operations. This could limit the variety of ideas by not considering carefully new ideas just before press time or just after press time. Queuing might also contribute to reliance upon former programs which have been sponsored by the District.

SP2 noted that some specialized mailing lists were used sporadically. These were small and used only for specific programs. The general brochure was mailed or otherwise delivered to every household in the district and much of the Greater Vancouver Area.

Programmer Three viewed participation coming from publicity efforts. SP3 voluntarily noted such efforts included use of a program specific
brochure, use of the district's brochure, and use of involved individuals. He noted that a brochure about specific programs was produced and sent to every community organization. The district brochure would also be used, if the planning of the program coincided with the brochure's publication deadlines. A third factor in publicity efforts involved organizational representatives who helped plan the program. They were used to announce the program through their organizational newsletters and community newspapers. SP3 seemed minimally affected by the queuing process established by the production of the district brochure. Organizational networks were relied upon more by SP3 than SP2 or SP1.

Programmer Four reported being minimally involved in this operation. With no probing he noted that "I try and think of ways of advertising, other than the normal ways. That isn't really, I guess, it isn't my job. Occasionally, I've done that."

When asked how involved in this activity he was, his response again indicated minimal activity.

I do the write up for [programs]. I supply everything, but, like when I was talking to the coordinator at the school, I suggested another way of advertising for her to do. If I have ideas about the advertising, I'll put my two cents worth in. I'm not that involved.

Insuring participation was a minimal activity for this part-time staff member as well as for both part-time instructors. Instructor One was not involved in securing participation. He stated securing participation was the responsibility of the school district after he was asked a question by the interviewer.

Instructor Two, on the other hand, reported becoming involved to a limited extent. SI2 voluntarily noted that he wrote the course description for the District brochure and personally invited people to participate in his programs. These invitations were limited and occurred in an
opportunistic way. He and his wife enjoyed public dancing and when people approached them and commented upon their skill, SI2 usually invited them to attend the classes.

The Secretary's voluntarily noted that some programs were advertised along with other District programs, which inferred the use of a common brochure. However, he noted that if a program did not do well, it would be advertised or tried again. "If it does successfully well the first time, of course we'll keep on, and often even if it doesn't he'll try it again. Sometimes it takes a couple of semesters before people start going. It's kind of a slow process with some of the courses."

Even though SS's comments about this operation were limited, he did contribute one datum of some significance. Some courses were advertised at least twice because he believes people needed some familiarity with a course before they were prepared to register.

The Director in a self-directed mode recounted the evolutionary process of departmental advertising efforts. Originally the Department exclusively used newspaper advertisements, which listed the program's title, location, date and time, and fee. The newspaper ad was preceded by a flyer intended to alert each district household to the publication date of the ad.

SUH reported that the first departmental brochure was published with the Parks and Recreation Department as a result of a suggestion by some school board trustees who thought there was some public relations value in a joint advertising effort. For a time, the department used newspaper ads and the brochure. When SP3 was added to the staff, his interest and expertise in public relations was used to help the department's advertising efforts. He seemed to have influenced departmental advertising policy by producing content specific brochures. These brochures were mailed to
businesses and organizations which might benefit from programs. A small mailing list of about 200 organizations and individuals was used.

SUH noted that a newspaper strike stimulated the district, another school district and a community college to jointly produce a brochure listing the programs of all three organizations. This was mailed to over 300,000 households and largely replaced newspaper ads. Occasionally an ad had been placed in a newspaper. The major district efforts to ensure participation, however, were the two cooperative publications.

**Summation.** This operation seemed to be the responsibility of the full time department staff. Most of the efforts centered upon the preparation of two catalogs, both jointly published with three other educational organizations. Only two people mentioned efforts other than mass advertising: SP1 used telephone contacts, and SP3 used people who were involved in the planning process to ensure participation.

**Securing resources**

This operation was a rather complex undertaking for most informants. Although resources in this study were broadly conceived, most informants seemed to concentrate upon securing instructors and facilities. The comments and observations were usually self-directed.

Programmer One voluntarily discussed funds, facilities, learning materials, and instructors as resources. Funds were largely from federal and provincial grants, which were secured by the efforts of the director. SP1 reported that he was not extensively involved in the fund raising process.

Another kind of resource mentioned was facilities that were largely provided by the district. SP1 noted that facilities were becoming easier
to obtain because of declining enrollment in the traditional school age population. This resulted in more schoolrooms being available for his use.

Yet another kind of resource mentioned was learning materials purchased from commercial suppliers in small quantities. Specific materials were decided upon after clients had come to a Centre and interacted with an instructor. Instructors ordered materials or sometimes used those which they developed.

Still another kind of resource mentioned by SPI was instructors some of whom were secured through want ads. Others were located through applications on file with the department. SPI further noted that some instructors employed by the department worked as instructors for other school districts or community college adult education units. Some potential instructors approached SPI with ideas for programs they would like to teach. As discussed earlier, SPI invested some time in listening to an instructor explain how a program would be taught. This served at least two operations. One was selecting and sequencing activities, the other was securing a resource—the instructor. Part of securing this resource was evaluating the instructor's ability. When asked about sequencing activities, SPI responded with information about securing resources:

That's what we spent the day doing. I wanted to make sure he knew what he was doing. Being a language teacher, I know how to teach language. I know how you move from point A to point B. It just happened to be an area I have some expertise in so I sat down and said, "You teach me your first lesson."

In this task, two discrete program planning operations from the framework were blended and are difficult to separate. The phenomenon of using one task to accomplish multiple operations points to the nonlinear nature of program planning.
SP1 mentioned still another source of securing instructors: full-time district employees. These people were known to the department staff and hence represent known quantities. Reputation was a criterion used by SP1 in selecting instructors, especially in the academic area.

Programmer Two in a self-directed mode reported selecting instructors as program resources. Consultants used to help in idea generation may become instructors in a program. Their involvement was dependent upon SP2's assessment of their potential as instructors, and their availability.

SP2 noted that locating instructors for a specific program was difficult at times. To ease this difficulty he attempted to form a pool of potential instructors. Letters describing the personal finance courses and asking for ideas, suggestions, and willingness to teach such courses were sent to individuals listed as "Independent Financial Advisors" in the Yellow Pages of the local telephone directory. Those responding positively to the latter query comprised a possible resource base for related courses.

SP2 selected instructors who were known to him in some way. He approached one group of instructors who were "particularly good," and had been referred to him by another instructor.

So I phone them, wrote them a letter, and they said, "Hum, let's take a look at it." So we got together and kicked the thing around. They felt comfortable with several different aspects. They had connections here and connections there. And I felt comfortable with them because [they] had been in her course, they had good standing relations for years. She ran a good course for us.

These potential instructors were evaluated upon their reputation. Some knowledge of their ability seemed important in the selection process.

SP2 was asked about facilities during the interview, and he noted that several criteria were used in selecting facilities. For example, public accessibility was important because courses which attracted older participants were usually located near major bus lines; while courses likely to
attract participants who drive automobiles were located near the Trans-Canada Highway. Other factors which influenced location of courses were staff support and cooperation, parking availability, class size, special facilities, and ethnic mix. Courses which appealed to a wide range of learners were sometimes placed near the School District boundary in an attempt to encourage intradistrict participation. Such strategic placement was a critical marketing procedure in SP2's view. No mention was made of using any facilities except schools.

Another resource the researcher asked about was finances. SP2 reported that financial resources were usually secured from program participants. Programs were usually planned with ABE, a noted exception on a self-sustaining basis even if grant support was available. SP2 seemed to prefer the flexibility of participant supported financing because in his opinion it allowed him to run any program he wished.

Programmer Three commented about instructors without probes from the investigator. Facilities and funds, however, were specifically asked about by the investigator. Instructors were from a pool of individuals involved in the other planning operations. These individuals, it will be recalled, were selected upon the basis of organizational affiliation and were more likely to be members of the community than instructors used by SP2 or SP1. Facilities were selected on the basis of "the nicest facilities" in the community, which according to SP3 were the schools. Even though he looked to the community for facilities, he usually held programs in schools.

When asked about funding, SP3's response was that some programs conducted by the department should be done on a public service basis. He noted that this view was not shared by some of his colleagues. SP3's views about securing resources were grounded in the community. His training as a
community educator seemed to consistently influence his approach to program planning.

Programmer Four mentioned being actively involved in securing some resources. SP4 reported his job as mainly generating ideas and then locating instructors to teach programs. At times, locating instructors and idea generation occurred simultaneously. One example he provided was reading newspaper features about people (potential instructors) who have unique talents (potential programs).

SP4 noted other sources of instructors included friends, community college department heads, telephone directories, and other adult education units. He reported maintaining a directory of names, talents, and phone numbers. As part of securing resources SP4 also did some instructor development which consisted of providing handouts for instructors which explained how they obtain copy service and other departmental support activities. SP4 noted that a book about teaching adults was given each instructor as well as an outline of the book. In addition to the handouts and directed reading SP4 reported doing some individual tutoring. All of these activities occurred before the instructor taught.

Facilities and funding were two resources in which SP4 reported not being involved. When asked about facilities, he noted they were assigned by the Department. SP4 requested certain kinds of facilities but had no responsibility for program location. While SP4's involvement in securing resources was less extensive than the other three programmers, it seemed more intensive in securing and developing instructors.

Instructor One's reported concern in this operation was to secure course materials which were usually government publications. SI1 was also involved in securing instructors. One criterion he used in selecting was
their willingness to participate. He felt professional qualifications were not realistic criteria because of low or no compensation offered to workshop instructors. SI1 reported instructors often gave up weekends to participate in programs.

Instructor Two performed tasks similar to SI1 and SS. Securing resources was perhaps the most involved operation for SI2. This occurred in locating and developing dance instructors. Locating instructors was an ongoing process. People who wished to teach dance usually made application with the Department. They were referred to SI2 who interviewed them to determine competence in terms of knowledge and presentation skills. After a person was selected to teach in the program, he attended about eight hours of training in dance instruction by SI2. The purpose was to help new instructors with teaching techniques and provide a unified program in terms of content.

SI2 was also involved in selecting the location of the class. He specified to the department where classes would be held, when they would be held, and who would teach them. The department then made the arrangements.

Part-time and nonprofessional employees of the department all seemed to be involved in the selection of instructors in a more intensive way than the professional programmers. This was evident by the developmental process described by SI2 and SS.

The Secretary further supported this observation as he located instructors and sometimes hired them. When asked about securing instructors, SS noted that applications from people who want to teach specific courses were on file. SS perceived some interdistrict cooperation in sharing instructors and noted unwritten guidelines in this area of cooperation.
There is sort of an unwritten code "you don't take instructors from other districts." We needed a calligraphy teacher. A class was full, it was a one-day class. So you can phone them and say "Look, I know you need yours, it's only one day and that's all we'll use her for." "OK, no problem." That works really well. Everybody's open about giving leads.

Another source used by SS was the phone book. He called companies or agencies that were likely to employ individuals knowledgeable about a program's content and asked for someone with teaching experience. Hiring instructors was done by SS if he was certain of the person's capabilities or familiarity with the subject. Otherwise SP2 made the decision to employ. SS's perception of available facilities was limited to school district properties which, at times, was a limiting factor in the range of programs offered by the department.

The Director viewed cosponsoring programs with other organizations as one way to secure resources otherwise unavailable to the department. SUH offered women's studies as one example.

We saw that there was a program area there, but we didn't really feel that we had the resources or that we should bother to develop the resources to mount a lot of programs in the women's area. That's one area we have sort of stayed out. So we asked [College A] to bring those courses in and so they have.

The involvement of other educational organizations in the district was done by cosponsoring and as a means for securing resources. While cosponsoring could legitimize a program with clients, it was mentioned only by SP3 who seemed to be more community oriented in his approach to program planning than the other informants.

Summation. Securing resources received attention from all informants. The level of activity varied from one person to another, depending upon their jobs. The two resources most often mentioned and extensively described were facilities and instructors. Facilities used were are usually school district properties. Only one programmer mentioned other
community facilities but even then he demonstrated a bias for school facilities. Instructors were found in a number of ways which included the common element of some personal knowledge of a potential instructor's ability. This was the most commonly reported operation among the department informants and the one performed with the widest range of activities.

Evaluating

A standardized evaluation instrument was used to measure reactions to most programs offered by the district. The instrument consisted of two sections: the first section contained two questions about content and one question about facilities; the other section contained four questions about instructor knowledge and abilities. Each of the seven questions used a five point Likert Scale as a response mechanism and three lines for comments. The instrument was a two-copy form: the original was given to the department and the copy was given to the instructor. Evaluation seemed to be a routine matter. Attendance was noted, retention rates calculated, and standardized instruments were filled out and sometimes reviewed.

Programmer One described three ways evaluation was handled. The first approach to evaluation was reported without probes from the investigator and was termed "constant monitoring." SPl noted that the number of hours spent by learners and teachers at the Learning Centre and their reactions to the service provided were two measurable indicators. Monitoring of these indicators produced some changes in the staffing patterns of the Centre. The number of instructor hours in the Centre were distributed among more teachers than originally planned. This, according to SPl, improved service to the adult learner.
SP1's response to a question about evaluation contained descriptions of two additional modes of evaluating. One was unsolicited letters which served as indicators of learners' satisfaction. The other and perhaps the most often used was drop out rates. SP1 referred to it and talked about it more than other evaluation methods. He used drop out rate as a measure of a program's usefulness to the participant or the instructor's abilities to positively relate to adult learners. "If suddenly we've had fifty people enrolled in the Learning Centre and for no legitimate reason, we're down to twenty, I'm going to get very concerned. Either the instructor is very antagonistic towards those people, or they're not getting what they asked for.

SP1's evaluation procedures were designed to initially locate problems, which were then thoroughly investigated. He assumed development of instructors had occurred and provided one example of removal of an instructor whose program had a drop out rate of 60 percent.

Programmer Two in a self-directed mode described evaluation in terms of a newly planned program. This operation offered some contrast to other operations in the way it was performed. SP2 noted that in order to plan quickly, he preferred planning without committees. However, evaluation involved a committee and seemed to be fairly detailed.

The program example used in describing this operation was over-subscribed and on the basis of numbers was considered a successful program. This may have been the reason for the fairly extensive evaluation described by SP2. The evaluation of the Personal Finance Course was done by a committee of professionals retained as consultants and involved in the planning and teaching of the course. Items considered by the review committee included: number of people attending; instructor observations about content and the amount of time available; additions to the program;
and restricting the programs. Instructors were rated by the committee and if evaluation instruments were used, they were also reviewed.

This evaluation process was primarily internal. The planning committee provided data about the program from its own members. Learner reactions to the program were considered in terms of attendance and sometimes in terms of student reactions from an evaluation form. However, emphasis seemed to be upon observations from the instructor and other people involved in the planning of the program or course.

SP2 made no mention of evaluating courses that were held on a consistent basis or that were planned in a rapid manner. He did note that the committee evaluation method was used on a regular basis; he attempted to meet with such committees after every program period.

Programmer Three, without probing, reported that evaluations were flexible and tailored to specific programs. The use of a standardized instrument seemed unlikely in any program planned by SP3. Data were collected, summarized, and distributed to individuals who were involved in planning the programs. These organizational representatives shared in the decision to continue, change, or abandon a program based on evaluation results.

Criteria upon which decisions were made were not explicitly mentioned by SP3. An inference, however, from a comment about objective setting and evaluation were made. SP3 stated

I think that it [an objective] has to be shared with the students from day one. I walk into a class—"Here's what we hope to accomplish in our ten weeks. Here's our target for this particular program." Because I think only when you share your objectives or share your goals can you be evaluated on them, on your performance. And if we are going to do any kind of evaluation that's got to be a valid thing. If we don't share then we don't really justify what we do.
From this idea it was inferred that the most important criterion for SP3 was learner performance. This contrasted to SP1's and SP2's opinion about attendance and retention rates being of highest importance.

**Programmer Four** described evaluation in terms of instructor development. He attempted to visit each new program at least once and to tactfully discuss problems he observed with the instructors who, SP4 noted, seemed to welcome feedback about their performance. When data from the department's standardized evaluation instrument indicated a problem in a course, he talked with the instructor and attempted to alter either the instructor's behavior or program content.

SP4 further noted that participant evaluation also came informally. Comments were picked up in conversation with learners and weighed against enrollment and retention figures. SP4 noted that he trusted retention rates more than client observations.

... I was interviewing a girl last week and she was saying that one of our best--well, the teacher that has been teaching the longest for us, like thirteen years--she had taken her class and found things wrong with it. But... I haven't even touched that class, because her enrollment--she gets the people back every night. She has fantastic attendance. And even though she's doing the things this girl was saying that she really didn't like, and I know--I was in there one night too--everybody keeps coming back, so I guess she's doing something right.

SP4 seemed to place a higher value on attendance figures than any other measure of teaching performance.

SP4's evaluation efforts were directed to development of the instructor or course content. He reported working with instructors or content to develop a better program rather than releasing an instructor or terminating a program.

**Instructor One** used intuition and the department's standardized instrument in evaluating. Intuitive evaluation was based upon SI1's
personal assessment of course content and the way courses were conducted.

For example, he spoke about a new course, "Starting Your Own Restaurant."

That course, ... was a qualified success, ... because it was a flyer, an experiment. I was happy with it, to a degree. A lot of things we could have done better, but it was the first time. We had about 33 people come out.... I say it went over fairly well. But we have a long way to go, we have a lot to learn.

At other points during the interview, SII noted that he "felt good" about a program. Part of this good feeling and intuitive approach to evaluation may be tied to use of the standard instrument. These were read by both SII and SP2 who informally classified comments as either justified or nonjustified. SII noted justified comments were esteemed to be of value and given attention, while nonjustified comments were largely ignored. An example of program change resulting from evaluation was the expansion of a one-day program to one and a half days. SII's concerns were with learner satisfaction and he seemed less involved in evaluation than most of the programmers.

Instructor Two after he was asked about evaluating, reported using enrollment data provided by the department and participants' informal comments as a means of evaluating programs. SII2 visited those programs with exceptionally poor retention rates and attempted to correct the problem. He mentioned "letting an instructor go" as a method of improving a program. Enrollments seemed to be the most critical measure of success for SII2's programs.

The Secretary noted four items used in evaluating programs: participant's comments, instructor's comments, supervising programmer's visits, and attendance data. He reported these means were used by department personnel to make judgments about the success of a program. SS had little involvement in evaluation unless a complaint was received. Then
either he or SP2 talked with the persons making the complaint in an effort to gain information.

When enrollment data indicated low retention rates, then instructors were contacted. The department collected course attendance information, calculated retention rates, and gave a summary of these data to each supervising programmer.

If it [retention rate] goes down, they see it at the bottom. It's a retention rate through the whole semester. And if it's low, it's "What's the problem? Maybe you could check this out." So that's a way, a really good way of ascertaining what are problem courses, even if we haven't had any input.... if their enrollment starts out at thirty and ends up at five, there's something wrong. He'll find out what it is by either phoning them or phone the supervising programmer.

SS noted that once problems were identified, whether they were content or method based, the supervising programmer worked with them in one-to-one teaching situations to improve skills or to modify course content.

The Director noted three sources of evaluation data after he was questioned directly about this operation. The first was a standardized evaluation form used in most programs or at least in some sample of programs. The second method, and according to SUH the most important, was consideration of enrollment data. The third was participant comments. SUH noted negative comments were followed up by departmental personnel. SUH noted that results of evaluation efforts were used for two purposes: to either help an instructor improve or to remove an instructor from departmental employment.

Summation. The evaluation efforts of the department as a whole seemed to be centered on enrollment data. Three of the four programmers mentioned enrollment as a measure of success or as the most important indicator of a good program. Five of the eight people mentioned enrollment data as the
best measure of a program’s success. Participant comments were obtained by use of a standardized instrument and used as a supplement to attendance data.

**Community Education Department Profiles**

The preceding analysis is now used to provide a synthesis and overall description of the technology used in the Community Education Department. Comments about the context of the unit's technology and the context's influence on the process are also given as a summary to this case study.

**Program planning.** The technology used in the department was varied generally rapid, and efficient. SP2's approach to program planning seemed most representative of the process used in the department because he has responsibility for the majority of programs planned. He carried out his planning by delegating at least three operations to part-time supervising programmers. These operations included: generating ideas; securing resources; and evaluating programs.

In order to further understand the nature of this unit's technology, it is useful to consider the number of new programs offered each semester and the total number of programs offered by the department. Figure 2 displays the number of programs offered in spring, fall, and winter program periods. Some courses are offered in all three. Data for the figure came from three catalogs advertising programs in spring, 1980, fall, 1980, and winter 1981. Perhaps a more normal cycle than the one used would be using spring 1981 rather than spring 1980. This cycle could not be used because of a labor strike which made spring 1981 program period rather atypical in terms of both program offerings and advertising.

The number of programs offered during any program period was lowest in spring with 207. In winter session 241 programs were offered. Fall
Figure 2. Bar graph of programs by semester and semester combination in School District A.
represented the largest number of programs with 262. This number can be seasonally adjusted because seven programs were planned expressly for the holiday seasons in December. This figure illustrates the level of new programs contrasted to administration of courses previously developed and offered two and three times. Most courses were offered in all three periods.

Figure 2 illustrates that the largest number of programs sponsored by the department were offered at least three times. These programs did not require all of the program planning operations specified in the framework. For example, if a program were offered in all three periods, then generating an idea, developing the idea, establishing objectives, and selecting and sequencing learning activities need take place only once, at the time when the program first developed. Many of the activities associated with securing resources could also be considered completed in the initial planning period: instructors could be used again; facilities could be reused; and the budget and fees need only be slightly adjusted. The most important operations would be ensuring participation and evaluation. These operations were performed by departmental personnel with patterns approaching repetitiveness. New programs which require the performance of all seven operations in one form or another represent varying percentages of programs offered throughout the year: Fall Semester had 14 percent, Winter Semester had 11 percent, and Spring had 16 percent.

Efficiency in the process was also evidenced by programmers using one task to perform two operations. Working with potential instructors to set objectives also allowed the programmer to evaluate the abilities of the instructor. The use of one task to accomplish two operations and the lack of any sequence also indicated program planning was nonlinear.
Some variations to fast efficient program planning were exemplified by both SP1 and SP3. SP1 described a process more determined and deliberate than SP2 described. For example, SP1 used a needs assessment process based upon client supplied data, while SP2 used an intuitive approach to clients' needs. SP3 described a process built upon community involvement, which was operationalized by him as organizational representation in planning. This approach was avoided by SP2 except under certain circumstances already mentioned.

The majority of programs sponsored by the department were planned or administered by SP2. SP1's area of emphasis was academic programs and languages, and SP3 was less involved in program assignments and more involved in public relations for the district. These changes in SP3 job responsibilities were results of the integration of the department with the school district. The context thus influenced program planning.

*Context.* Program planning occurred within an adult education unit that was well integrated within its organization. This integration has been previously documented by referring to School District A's organizational structure, the adult education unit's roles and functions.

Integration in this instance was accompanied by isolation in terms of cooperation and coordination with other adult education units in the community college district. Some data indicated integration within the organization and isolation outside the organization were at least related, if not linked in some causal manner. For example, the district superintendent reported that District A was more inclined than other school districts to look internally to the Community Education Department for assistance in nontraditional education. Other districts were perceived as being more inclined than District A to seek assistance from the community college or vocational institute in nontraditional education.
Another factor in integration which affected the technology was approval of new programs by the school board of trustees. The board had not refused to approve any proposed programs possibly because the director and superintendent were cautious about the kinds of programs they proposed. This integrative step of involving the board of trustees in approving programs seemed to influence programming in a conservative way because of an awareness of the approval process by programmers. Isolation from other adult education units seemed to encourage innovation and experimentation in areas that may be the usual domain of a community college. Examples were programs leading to certificates in business management and commercial sciences. Isolation seemed to be a stronger influence upon the department than integration as manifest by board approval of courses. If it were otherwise, the department would not offer "community college type" courses. Integration and isolation seemed to work together to enhance and perhaps helped create an organizational role of school district change agent for the department. This role was also a result of deliberate planning on the part of the superintendent and the director.

These internal factors produced an external environment of competition and suspicion between the department and the adult education unit of the community college. Program planning in the community college is next presented as a case study in Chapter VII.
CHAPTER VII

PROGRAM PLANNING IN A COMMUNITY COLLEGE

This chapter describes the program planning process used in a community college located in the lower mainland of British Columbia. The sequence of Chapter VII is similar to that followed in Chapter VI. The Program planning process is explored in detail by using the operations dimension of the framework presented in Chapter III. Data for the analysis were obtained from interviews with four full-time programmers, two instructors, a senior clerk, the Dean, and a former director. As in Chapter VI a unit profile is established by considering the planning process within the context of the Community Programs and Services Division.

Originating ideas

Ideas for college adult education programs come from a slightly larger number of sources than was identified by people in School District A; nineteen sources were identified by the eight people interviewed. One person identified thirteen sources and two others identified only two. Community contacts and personal interests were mentioned by all but two of the informants.

Programmer One, CP1, has been employed by the College for about two years and has had some formal university courses in adult education. He is presently completing a Master of Arts degree in Education at a local university. He reported using numerous community sources and methods to obtain program ideas.
I make myself as well known in the community as possible. I visit organizations, groups and service agencies and describe my position and tell people they should call me if they have any ideas and people do. In those discussions with people, I identify community needs. . . . Through a discussion a need becomes clear.

CP1 indicated when deadlines for advertising in the college brochure approached, he contacted these organizations and actively sought ideas from community groups. The college faculty was another source of community based ideas for CP1. He reported that he was working more closely with faculty than he ever had in the past. Faculty interests formed the basis for programs if he could determine community interest for the ideas or if the idea made "sense in terms of a community based program." Personal needs and interests of CP1 and his friends were used for program ideas because it seemed to him "we're normal people in the community too." CP1 described a third source of ideas as "the most formal thing I did." Surveying faculty and staff of the college for program ideas was accomplished to identify their needs and interests as members of a community, not as employees of College A. A fourth source of ideas which was community based was an assessment of telephone requests for programs. Three other sources which were less community related were proposals from potential instructors, referrals from school boards, and continuing education brochures from other educational organizations in the local area.

CP1 seemed to be oriented to community sources for program ideas which were evaluated in terms of community interests. A community network was used by CP1 in place of a formal needs assessment.

I think that I am constantly doing informal needs assessment and developing a network. . . . I formally visit and then develop informal relationships with the people who do the planning for the school board and parks and recreation department and for the Coordinating Center which offers a number of social services. [1] made appointments, went to see those people, got to know them, called them up, said "deadlines are coming up. What's happening and what are you working on?"
CP1 perceived himself as highly involved in community organizations in efforts to gain program ideas. The kinds of organizations he described were mostly educational agencies and while the diversity of the kinds of organizations may be limited, his commitment to the community seemed to influence his source of ideas.

Programmer Two, CP2, a high school teacher and counselor was also a feminist whose interests shaped his program planning. He reported more sources of ideas than any other informant in this study. He noted national publications provided issues which he translated into ideas for "the west coast culture." Another source of ideas were community groups such as school boards, recreation centers, and health and government agencies. He reported developing and using a network of contacts in these agencies to produce and trade program ideas. Gaps in program efforts and gaps in clients served provided two more sources of ideas. Other sources included informal need assessments, questionnaires, instructors, other programmers, "people who phone in", and interests of friends and acquaintances. Ideas also were reported as coming from the process of balancing programs among beginning and advanced levels, therapeutic and intellectual offerings, and career and homemaker audiences. CP2's efforts were diverse and community centered.

Programmer Three, CP3, was middle aged and seemed to be relatively new to the practice of adult education. He mentioned fewer sources of ideas than did programmers one and two. Personal interests and imagination, colleagues, community groups, and other colleges were sources reported by CP3. He noted that the relative importance of these sources had shifted due to a structural change in the department.

There are frequently suggestions especially in the job I'm getting involved with now which is [as] a programmer assigned to a
division which is the Academic Division. I'm in the position of being much more a facilitator and deliverer of programs than one committed to generating them myself. There is obviously communication going both ways, but a lot of the ideas are going to be coming from the faculty in trying to generate from their point of view a comprehensive curriculum that includes community education and non credit courses.

CP3 thought that this change would make his organization much less community oriented than it used to be and decrease the amount of ideas coming from the community.

For example, having programmers assigned to divisions brings about the fact that a lot of the programming is going to be generated through the faculty or out of existing programs. Whereas, having independent programmers a lot more is going to come out of personal imagination, ideas from colleagues especially from the outside. A heavy duty community development organization is going to be doing a lot more program generation through community contacts, advisory boards, and so forth.

Before being assigned to a division, CP3 was more an independent programmer than he perceived he is now or will be in the future when he anticipated being more concerned with program ideas from academic units within the college than with program ideas from the community.

Programmer Four, CP4, had extensive experience in adult education in higher education. Even though the research design for this study called for interviewing three programmers, CP4 was added because he was mentioned by several people who noted his perspective was different from most others in the organization.

For CP4 program ideas came from four primary sources: personal concerns and interests; "active plagiarism"; organizational assignment; and completed programs. Personal concerns and interests was a source of ideas much like those previously described by other interviewees. "Active plagiarism" was CP4's terminology used to describe a process of requesting brochures from other organization, reviewing them, and considering their programs as potential ones for College A sponsorship. Organization
assignment also provided ideas as this example demonstrates where the dean
gave CP4 a programming task: "We [College A] want to set up continuing
education programs for senior citizens in this high rise. ' [CP4] do you
think you can take a look into that?''

CP4 characterized himself as "very much a community development
person," working from a community development model which he felt was
becoming increasingly difficult to do. In his perspective from this model,
CP4 saw ideas and needs as being difficult to separate.

It is very hard to separate ideas from needs. So you are
looking at what do you think are the needs that this population has.
... You see a need and you try to find a way that you may trans­-
late it in a way in which people will respond. And now I'm talking
about community development.

His community development model included discussion with community members
which accomplished two things: first was a discovery of felt needs or what
people think they want; and second was making those needs or program ideas
meaningful to a target group. CP4 gave an example of a completed program
which "turfed up a whole set of other problems that had not occurred to me
before. Like I found out these people are hungry for programs."

Informal discussion was mentioned as rarely contributing ideas for
programs. Programmer four mentioned relatively few ways of originating
program ideas, however, those mentioned seem highly community oriented.

Instructor One, CI1, was a graduate student in Russian Literature who
taught two Russian Language courses and one Ukrainian Arts workshop for the
college. CI1 came up with the idea to teach Russian because he wanted to
get his "toe in the door of [College A]." He approached the college about
offering a non credit course with the hope he would be considered for a
regular faculty appointment when the college once again offered Russian as
part of the credit curriculum. The idea for the Ukrainian Arts workshop
came from CP3 the college programmer. This idea was a variation of similar workshops in Greek and Japanese cultures.

As was the case with the instructors for the school district, this instructor described limited activity in this operation. CI1 was an example of a potential instructor approaching an adult education unit with an idea. It is interesting to note his motivation was for future personal gain rather than a sense of commitment to learning or community development.

Instructor Two, CI2, has had five years of teaching experience with the college in adult education. He was initially contacted by CP2 to provide workshops in the Women's Studies area dealing with budgeting and money management. CI2 taught for a Provincial ministry, another community college and a local university before teaching for College A. CI2 felt the women's studies programmer became aware of his activities and "called me because he was looking for someone who would do a money management workshop."

Over time the relationship between the instructor and programmer developed to the point of allowing an exchange of program ideas to occur.

He [CP2] sometimes calls and says "Would you do this particular workshop that you did last year again?" Other times he will call and say "What do you want to do this term?" or "Such and such didn't work very well last term," and "Shall we look up a new angle on it?"

CI2 was involved to a degree in generating program ideas that were tied to his experiences in teaching workshops.

This instructor seemed to have a greater degree of involvement in generating ideas than the two school district instructors and CI1. While he was not the first instructor in this study to be approached by the adult education unit, he was the first one to suggest program ideas in areas different from the one in which he was hired to teach.
The Senior Clerk, CS, had been in the Division longer than most other informants. Even though his major responsibilities did not include idea generation, he offered his perceptions about this operation. He was selected for the interview because of his long service with the college.

CS perceived ideas coming from the community to the division programmers who were in the community actively looking for program ideas. He used CP2 as an example of this kind of activity.

He's out talking to people in the community, at community meetings. He also interviews women who come into the office... but from his work out in the community and from talking to these women that came in to see him, I think this is where he gets the ideas for some courses.

CS also reported calendars were a source of ideas. He seemed embarrassed to list this as a source of ideas, as he characterized this as "stealing."

Everybody puts out a calendar--UBC puts out one all, the school districts put one out. And I feel that each school district, universities, they all steal from one another... Alright, if one programmer in some school district comes up with something new, say it was assertiveness training for women, the others sure latch onto it in a hurry. I mean it's not something that stays with the person that instigated it. It suddenly spreads like wild fire. And the only thing I can think of it that they read each other's calendar and get these ideas.

This comment contrasted with other views about reviewing brochures. Programmers in both the school district and the college routinely reported reading brochures from other educational organizations as one way of originating program ideas. CS, on the other hand, felt this method of idea generation was more than routine.

CS also felt ideas came from individuals who telephoned and asked for specific programs, or offered services as instructors for a specific program. CS identified four ways of generating program ideas and two of these, telephone calls from clients and instructors, and receiving
brochures, were common to School District A. The involvement of programmers in the community seemed unique to College A.

The Dean, CUH, had been at College A for a relatively short time. Even though he had not been involved in program planning for a number of years, he was able to identify and briefly comment on five sources and methods of generating ideas. The first source of ideas mentioned was employees which he characterized as "sitting at their desks and staring blankly into the middle distance." This was similar to the view expressed by all four programmers about personal interests, values and concerns. The second method mentioned was programmer contact with agencies and associations. The third source CUH mentioned was "individuals in the community" who would contact the college and request a program or offer to teach one. The fourth source was social science research findings which might provide ideas for programming in specific areas. This source was reported more as a hoped for occurrence than as an actual fact. The fifth source was calendars from other providers of adult education. The dean's brief comments included one new source of program ideas: research. He seemed to be aware of some community involvement by programmers in the college.

**Summation.** Idea generation for the college's adult education unit is highly influenced by community contacts. Informants seemed aware of generating ideas to meet community needs, requests and desires. This is quite different from the way ideas are generated in the school district's adult education unit. Another difference is the greater number and variety of sources mentioned by informants from the college unit than mentioned by informants from the school district unit.
One similarity between idea generation in the college and school district is the level of involvement of instructors in this operation. These informants play a limited role in both organizations. Differences between these two units continue to be more pronounced than similarities in the next operation reported.

Developing the idea

Developing ideas in the community college seemed to be a function of several tasks. Most tasks were performed by one or two individuals and only one task seemed to approach universal usage: advisory committees were reported as being used by all of the professional programmers.

Programmer One provided two examples of developing ideas. The first example was considering an idea generated by potential instructors. CP1 reported his reaction to a course on stimulating development of infants suggested by a psychologist and her husband who was a teacher.

I thought "now that's an interesting program." So I met with them, they brought me a brief course description. We discussed their background. They showed me their resumes. I said "Leave it with me for a while." I called around a few people I know in the community to see where it would be reasonable to locate the program.

Much of the idea development occurred outside of the professional staff for this particular program. However, CP1 did check to see if this operation had been adequately performed by checking with some community contacts.

Another example involved CP1 directly in idea development when a conference was developed in consultation with another programmer in the division. They were aware of a specific problem facing a part of the population.

... it became clear to me that we should do something about [it]. ... I mentioned this to another consultant, [CP3], and we said, "Let's do something. Like have a conference." And we drew
together an advisory committee and over three months we planned a big, huge, major conference.

This program offers a contrast to the first program example because in the second example CPI played a major and central role in the development of the idea. In addition to talking with a colleague, he used key community contacts to check and aid in idea development.

We identified the key agencies in the community that should be involved. We knew some individuals in the field and asked them to sit on the committee and asked them for advice on other people. We tried to have geographic representation given the kind of region that the college served.

The advisory committee was not used for program administration tasks but rather for aiding idea development and later for another operation: ensuring participation.

They were basically, for the first part they were an advising group. We brought proposals to them in terms of content and structure and they played a very significant role in what eventually happened in the agenda and planning of the conference.

This involvement of an advisory committee stands in direct contrast to the absence of advisory committee usage in the school district. Some school district committees were maintained on a retainer fee basis. Selection for committee membership was largely a result of the programmer's decisions. College programmers, on the other hand, selected this advisory committee on a geographic and organizational basis. Additionally, community members had some influence on the composition of the committee because they were asked to recommend other people for possible committee membership.

**Programmer Two** performed this operation in three ways. The first mentioned was discussion with individuals who were selected because of the kind of idea that was being developed. Other programmers within the college, other programmers in the same field in other colleges, and community contacts were all mentioned as people that were used in developing an idea. Potential participants were also reported as being
used in this operation. When a client expressed a need of or desire for a specific course, CP2 asked for his reaction to related program ideas.

CP2 considered himself in an "enviable position" because he had the ability to teach many of the programs he planned. This may be one reason he used a unique approach to idea development. "I usually do some reading up on the topic myself... so I usually hit the books and see what level of development that topic has been taken to." Not only did reviewing literature help CP2 develop programs, it also gave him some criteria upon which to evaluate instructors. He used community contacts and his own understanding of the subject matter to develop ideas. Except for personal research, CP2 reported using basically the same kinds of tasks as did CP1.

Programmer Three used the same example as CP1 to talk about idea development because both CP3 and CP1 planned the conference referred to earlier. This provided an opportunity to do some cross checking for reliability of data. The idea for the program came from their experiences. CP3 reported talking "to other people casually and ... found this was a major concern of a lot of people on different levels." They formed a representative advisory committee which included people from many organizations that were concerned with the problem. CP1 and CP3 developed a proposal to submit to the advisory committee for feedback. The programmer made certain that the committee realized its role in the program planning process. "We did establish from the beginning the group was an advisory group in the sense that if there was any major conflict among groups within the committee we'd have to make the final decision." This report of how the advisory committee was used is essentially consistent with the report from CP1 with one additional datum: the relationship of the programmers and advisory committee was made clear. CP3 explained in explicit language
that the programmers maintained decision making power in regard to the conference.

A program in Japanese language was offered as another example of program planning and provided an opportunity to view this operation in a slightly different way. The idea was a result of CP3's desire to expand the language offerings of the college in community programs. He thought Japanese would be successful because of a significant Japanese population in the area and because of increasing trade relations between Canada and Japan. The idea was developed by talking with other programmers, one of whom referred CP3 to a potential instructor. He and the other programmer and the potential instructor met together and discussed possible approaches to the program and established CP3's expectations with the instructor. He also reported doing some research to determine if there might be a sufficient Japanese population to support such a language program.

CP3 reported four ways of developing ideas, all of which were mentioned by both of the first two programmers interviewed. His methods of idea development seemed community oriented but perhaps not as much as the first two programmers because of his use of colleagues and instructors in developing ideas rather than community contacts.

Programmer Four's approach to this operation seemed basically different from the other three programmers. This difference may be related to CP4's apparent dislike for the status quo which was reflected in his concern for the way most programming was directed in a certain area.

We've decided at the college to go into ...[this] area... I think this is something a lot of people are interested in now... I don't know why. I think it has something to do with the Moral Majority myself. That's one of my concerns at least, that one seems to see...[this problem] equals status quo. I'm finding a way of coming around that...
His way of "coming around that" status quo was a two-stage procedure that helped him develop programs ideas. Stage one was a review of literature much like the way both CP3 and CP2 reported using literature review and research. What made CP4's approach unique was stage two. "I've looked through the literature and decided in my head, there are three kinds of things that one can do . . . ."

Using the literature to develop a philosophical guide to programming was an approach reported only by CP4 in this study. This philosophical guide required CP4 to examine the assumptions behind his programming efforts. These assumptions were, according to CP4, always grounded in some kind of ideology. He then provided an example of examining assumptions while explaining his own.

So everything comes through certain kinds of ideological filters . . . what I'm saying is there is ideology, that it must be recognized, that if you are programming in a blind, you are not programming in a blind because nobody moves without values. So they are implicit or explicit . . .

This philosophical examination allowed CP4 to establish three categories of programs: preventive; remedial; and developmental. He chose to concentrate on program ideas for the third category. The use of philosophy and examination of assumptions was unique to CP4 in this operation.

Another way CP4 developed ideas was through personal involvement with the community. The process of identifying needs and then developing ideas involved going "out to the community people and [talking] both to the formal and informal sectors of the community." His approach to developing ideas seemed to be highly community oriented. "I work, and this is part of my ideology, very, very strongly with community groups."
These community groups were represented on a standing advisory board which played a role in developing ideas which CP4 described in terms of a specific program.

I have a community advisory board which is another way I operate very strongly, and I said, "I want to put on something in the Region [about this problem]." And after months of going back and forth they decided, not me,--I was totally opposed to it--the advisory committee decided the best thing to do would be to have this day for professionals and volunteers. And they totally turned me around on my head.

The advisory committee seemed to play an important and decisive role in the development of program ideas. CP4 proposed program ideas to the committee which had a great deal of influence with him. CP4 was unique in using personal philosophy as a developmental mechanism. Other programmers may have been unknowingly limited by philosophical boundaries, while CP4 seemed to use philosophy as a tool in developing community programs.

Instructor One described idea development by using two examples: a sequential course and a weekend workshop. The developmental processes for them were different. The course was largely developed from one session to the next while, the workshop idea was developed jointly by CI1 and a program programmer before the workshop. CI1 was asked about how development occurred for the series of courses in Russian. His response was:

Basically, I played it by ear. I set the course up for about the first two or three lessons and then just developed it from there because, well, first of all there's a Doukhobor population on the Lower Mainland and there's been a larger percentage of my students that have been of this origin. So that means they know a little bit of Russian already. So quite often in a beginning Russian class you'll get people that really aren't beginners in terms of speaking the language but certainly are in terms of grammar so you always get a mixed level of people. So in terms of development you really do need to play it by ear after a certain point.

This evolutionary development process for the class is contrasted to the developmental process used for the workshop where idea development
occurred before the workshop was offered. It involved the instructor and the programmer. "It was a general idea first of all. We had to sit down and decide what it was that the community at large would be interested in about Ukrainian culture." The first workshop was used to help design succeeding workshops in areas such as time for content presentations, participant involvement, and socializing.

This instructor used experimentation to a large degree as he developed program ideas. Any consultation that occurred was between the programmer and the instructor and dealt with only the workshop. Even though consultation took place with the planning of the workshop, experimentation was still used to further develop the program.

Instructor Two seemed to be highly involved in developing ideas. This may be due to the fact that the program idea was his to begin with. The example he used was a one day workshop on financial and legal matters. After coming up with the idea CI2 talked with the coordinator of Women's Studies who suggested a woman lawyer as a possible co-instructor. From that referral CI2 got together with the lawyer and we discussed it and decided we could probably team teach the thing effectively. . . . The lawyer and I discussed very generally the problem areas that we thought on the basis of her experiences as a lawyer and mine as an accountant were most likely to crop up, and how we could most effectively organize the workshop . . . And, I had a good amount of printed material available for the sort of financial end of it. And we went with that because she had never done a similar workshop and wasn't sure just what materials would be useful. Now we are going to do it again this Fall and we are going to, this time 'round, collect certain materials for use more at the legal end of it . . .

This process seemed to be one of using past experiences and materials as a foundation for new programs. Even though the workshop CI2 described was essentially a new one dealing with added and conceptually different content, it was influenced by past programs in which CI2 had been involved. The lawyer's influence was minimal possibly because of her inexperience.
After the first workshop, the program idea was reviewed and subjected to further development.

Development occurred by experimentation from a base familiar to the instructor. This particular task in developing ideas seemed to reduce risk involved in offering new programs. It could have also reduced the likelihood that new programs might meet the needs of learners or be uniquely different from other courses taught in the past.

At times evaluation and idea development were difficult to separate. For example, when CI2 spoke about program evaluation he seemed to be talking about idea development.

So that the planning is on going in the sense that you don't just pick one topic and keep offering the same thing year after year. ... You're constantly evaluating what you're doing and looking for some new aspect that might be more relevant or more interesting or draw a group of people that wouldn't be drawn to a similar but different aspect of the same problem.

This constant evaluation of ideas seemed to be evolutionary taking a long time for a totally new program to develop. However, those programs which did evolve were usually grounded in participant comments about past programs.

Development of ideas using participant comments was perhaps best evidenced by CI2's actions when a course was cancelled because of low enrollments.

But I met with them anyway. ... I was going to talk with them for an hour. We ended up being there five hours. ... But it was useful to me to sort of run through it and use part of the material and find out whether it seemed useful or not. So as far as I was concerned it was good.

This instructor spent a good deal of time and energy in the development of ideas. Development was sometimes experimental and part of the evaluation process. This kind of idea development seemed to be a type of
formative evaluation. CI2 noted that there was little involvement of college staff in this part of the planning process.

The Secretary saw developing the idea as providing a difference between programmers and other staff members. He described a couple of programs which he termed "off the shelf" which referred to programs largely pre-planned by some outside organization or group, or programs repeated on a regular basis. When asked if he could "think of anything else the investigator should know about program planning", CS's response was

I really don't think so because you see that's really not my field... We had someone doing floristry design years ago... Well that... programmer is no longer with us. It's one I call off the shelf courses... I don't program it. I just call them up and say "Tony can you give a course in the summer for us and he sets the date and I just do the budget sheet and that's it.

In addition to repetitive courses, programs which are pre-planned by other organizations were also considered "off the shelf." CS provided an example of this type.

Any of the Ministry courses. Like we had an adult basic education conference in January... Because it was an office thing they requested that I program it. We had it out at the Richmond Inn. I made arrangements for lunch and went and stayed to see that everything went all right. That's the kind of programming I do. Nothing innovative. I'm not an academic. So I do what we call the in-house ones.

When CS was questioned about the nature of off the shelf programs he noted that such programs as the floristry course "had been going on here for so long I had just pulled it off the shelf and we put it on."

When questioned about how the Ministry ABE program was planned CS noted

They knew what they wanted to do and... it's better if I'm going to make the arrangements and look after it, that I know what's going to go on so then I draw up a budget for it. We told the Ministry how much it was going to cost. Put through the special project, or contract or whatever it was. But we considered I programmed that course although the Ministry already knew what they wanted to do.
CS estimated that he does about 10-12 of these kinds of programs each semester. He felt the number of "off the shelf" programs will increase because some programmers and their "off the shelf" programs have been lost in the splitting of the college. The kinds of activities they had been involved in for College A will continue and may be handled by CS. At least he had given consideration to this possibility. CS referred to developing ideas only when the interviewer mentioned this operation. It was his perception that interaction between the programmer and instructor was used to develop ideas for other than "off the shelf" programs.

The Dean's perspective was fairly unique and seemed to be influenced by his administrative tasks. Also, his comments dealt with larger program areas than did the comments of the programmers.

Family studies was the area which the Dean used to provide examples of program planning. The idea for family studies had been developed through conversation between the dean and representatives of the BC Council for the Family. The dean also held discussions with a newly assigned programmer to explore ways in which the program area could be developed. Together they established a three year development plan. In explaining the use of an advisory board, the dean also described a philosophical categorization similar to the one described by CP4.

[an advisory committee] will be used to test the idea, develop our program field. . . . The advisory group will be knowledgeable individuals who will be selected for their knowledge of the family and of the programming that is presently going on for and about the family. One of their tasks will be to help us define what unique role we can play in the community without duplicating other agencies and organizations. . . . Now that group . . . may advise us, that we shouldn't do a damn thing. It's already being done. I would suspect if that was the one thing that came up, we would concur if we selected that committee well enough.
The dean also noted that survey research on community needs was being done which would aid in the development of this program area. He expected it to provide harder data than the data provided by the advisory committee.

CUH listed four ways of developing specific program ideas when he was asked directly about this operation. The first was to "bounce an idea off a colleague." The second was to check with other organizations or agencies. The third was to consider the results of advertising for a program. The fourth was to evaluate the results of research.

Developing ideas for the dean occurred on a general level of program and had at least two components which were combined in the same task. Advisory committees allowed the use of expert advice and also provided community involvement in the planning process.

**Summation.** Developing the idea was a shared operation. Programmers shared it by involving other programmers and to some extent participants. The secretary was the only informant to report he was not involved in this operation. The use of community contacts and advisory committees were the most commonly used tasks in developing ideas. External influences were encouraged by actively seeking involvement of individuals in the community.

**Establishing objectives**

Objectives were established in a number of ways and used for several purposes. Some informants described a complex procedure of discussion between programmers and instructors. Others viewed establishing objectives as an operation completed by either the instructor or the programmer. Most of the respondents were asked directly about objectives before they offered any comments on this operation.

*Programmer One* described two broad methods of establishing objectives. The first was direct involvement and was done by CPI and another
programmer. When CPI had some knowledge about subject matter he participated in establishing objectives. Involvement in this operation provided some continuity between establishing objectives and selecting learning experiences because CPI reported using objectives to select and structure learning experiences. The second broad method of establishing objectives was external to CPI. He reported an instance where potential instructors provided him with objectives. "We met. We talked at length about what they had in mind, who they were directing it at, what their objectives were."

These two broad methods had implications for other operations in the program planning process. For example, if CPI had established objectives, then finding an instructor was accomplished differently from the way he would have done it without objectives. Objectives which CPI developed guided him in locating an instructor who had some influence in modifying the objectives.

If I have an idea or have identified a need ... then I go looking for an instructor who could teach a course that meets those goals, or I discuss it with them. If ... they are knowledgeable in their field, that might get changed a little bit.

CPI offered an example of changing objectives in consultation with an instructor. He planned to offer a film festival and located a film historian to serve as an instructor who insisted upon changing the program and establishing specific goals. CPI recognized his capabilities and turned much of the developmental role over to him.

Specificity of objectives changed from program to program. Sometimes objectives are stated and other times they are not.

Because of the range of programming that we offer and because of the fact that we are dealing with adult learners who take courses for their own reason, not for ours, objectives are more or less specific in particular courses. In some general interest courses
that I offer like "Invitation to Thinking", which is a noncredit philosophy course, I don't set any particular objective except that the people who will come will find it interesting.

Objectives were usually based upon learner needs. When asked if he used objectives and needs as synonyms, CP1 noted that while objectives were based upon a general understanding of needs, they were discrete. Establishing objectives seemed to be a conscious effort on the part of CP1. He volunteered information about establishing objectives which served as a bridge from learner needs to the arrangement of learning activities and the selection of instructors.

**Programmer Two** volunteered data that indicated he usually established program objectives with the instructor. Therefore, finding an instructor was usually accomplished before the objectives were established. Two factors were considered as the objectives were set: the nature of the student; and the course content.

CP2 and the instructor discussed the goals and what was expected.

It varies with the instructor. I don't do this overtly with every instructor. I do it very carefully and systematically with people who I think are reasonably new and who I don't know very well yet. After a while I get to know somebody. If I've seen their evaluations and they're positive and if I sense they know how to go about planning a course, then . . . we don't do it very much in detail, because I feel like I can trust them to do a professional job. But particularly with the new ones we talk about what they're hoping to accomplish. And one of the things I usually have to do is . . . back them off what they are going to do until they decide why they are doing it, which is usually a problem with new instructors. They've got their little bag of tricks and they want to haul them out and display their wares.

After the objectives are established CP2 helped instructors set the length of the course and helped them understand the resources available. The establishment of objectives through a dialogue with instructors was important for CP2. This operation was a shared activity between the programmer and the instructor.
Programmer Three also volunteered information as he reported establishing objectives with an advisory committee. He and CP1 submitted proposals to a committee which helped them formulate objectives which served as a basis for selecting formats and resource people.

Establishing objectives for the Japanese language course was done in a different way from the way they were established for the conference on day care. An instructor was first selected for the language course and then the programmer and the instructor discussed the establishment of objectives. CP3 reported giving some consideration to the nature of the potential participants as objectives were established.

CP3 did not seem to be as aware of the importance of objectives as did CP1 and CP2 and did not relate objectives to other planning operations. He did report using objectives to help select resource people. All of the professional programmers provided this information without use of leading questions except CP4.

Programmer Four provided a contrast to the other three programmers in the College. When asked about the establishment of objectives he stated his resentment of the use of educational jargon. His sensitivity to this area was demonstrated by the following dialogue between CP4 and the investigator.

I: Now that you have gone through that process of developing the idea, you've firmly fixed it with an ideology, you know where you are going, what's the next thing you do?

CP4: Aha--you want me to use terms like marketing... I've got to tell you, I've got to put in a shaft here. I absolutely loathe and detest the jargon that we are falling into in continuing education.

CP4 did not mention establishing objectives as he described the planning process. A probe was used to direct his comments to this operation. Again a dialogue between investigator and informant is
presented to enable CP4's feelings about some issues in adult education to be understood.

I: Some [authors] say that it is important to establish objectives for a program. How do you feel about that?

CP4: I don't know what to do with all this stuff. I'm very impressed by the changes that have taken place in continuing education in the past ten years. I mean it has become so, corporate is the only word I can use. There's a lot more hard thinking that's going on. People are far more oriented towards planning, towards objectives, towards management, towards evaluation forms and performance appraisal, and on and on and on. I think those are lovely, they're fantastic techniques. They are very important. I'm sure that we generate a lot of well thought out programs. And I'm not knocking it. I don't operate that way. That's all there is to it. I simply don't. I do it because I'm forced to do it and because it really makes a lot of good sense to do things that way. But in a lot of respects the most important ideas I've ever had have never been generated by good sense. They are generated by intuition, they are generated by excitement, and they are generated by passion.

CP4's discourse continued to reveal him as a person who firmly believed that thoughtful planning was a block to meaningful educational programs and never described how objectives were established. At least three factors play a part in establishing objectives in programs planned by CP4. Data were not complete enough to allow conclusions to be drawn. However, from the data it can be inferred that philosophy, ideology and advisory committees played important parts in establishing objectives. For example, his views about the possible kinds of educational programs and the interaction of his advisory committee produced a set of objectives for the program described previously.

This programmer refused to use the terminology of education and seemed to exhibit an antipathy toward program planning as a concept which can be explained. Establishing objectives was only one of a number of program planning steps that he described as "hard thinking."

Instructor One did not mention establishing objectives until he responded to a probe, and then he noted that the college as well as the
instructor had objectives. CI1 noted that the college's objective was "providing the community with what the community wants" and mentioned the Russian language course as an example. Its continuation was a result of demand measured by enrollment. Objectives for the learner were established by CI1 at the beginning of the course. He specified the objectives as learning conversational skills and using the Russian alphabet.

The workshop on Ukrainian culture had objectives which seemed much broader and nonspecific than the objectives in the language course. These objectives seemed to deal with creating cultural awareness.

I think that people who came that were of Ukrainian origin were people or are people just starting to become more aware of that. Not admit it, because quite often they'll admit, "you know, my grandfather was Ukrainian." Where at the end of the course they are saying, "well . . . its nice to know that I can share these things and maybe it just wasn't my grandfather that was Ukrainian."

Objectives could also be set by individuals participating in the workshop. Some skills were taught such as embroidery and egg painting. It seemed conceivable that some individuals would participate to gain these skills rather than or in addition to an appreciation of Ukrainian culture.

CI1 was aware of objectives on the college or organizational level and the individual level. He reported being involved in establishing objectives on the learner level and he did not use educational terminology as he described the operation. The second instructor interviewed seemed to use terms that were common to the ones used by the programmers.

Instructor Two, reported using general and specific objectives as he planed programs. These objectives were set just prior to conducting a workshop.

I do force myself to sit there and say, "all right what specific areas am I going to cover with this group and approximately how much time am I going to spend on each area." I think that this is good self-discipline for me. Both in disciplining myself and also
keeping the group more or less on track. And I think it is also useful to indicate approximately the amount of time you are going to spend on each topic for the group too.

CI2 referred to this as a "plan" and used it to keep the workshop on schedule and within specified content. The plan seemed to be built upon objectives. But this plan was tentative and subject to change after CI2 met the workshop participants.

... depending on the age group you are dealing with, your subject material really has to vary quite a bit.... Obviously I don't know who is going to be at that workshop until I get there or until they get there. And I then have to look at the group and judge the average age. And so to that extent the outline covers the topics, but what I emphasize within the topics is something that is not frequently decided until I look at who is sitting in front of me and what their problems are.

In response to a question about setting objectives CI2 noted he had a general objective for his workshops and specific objectives for each workshop. The general objective was creating confidence within individual participants about their ability to perform. His specific objectives are stated and used in a goal free evaluation.

... my objectives are verbal, usually in my introductory remarks. And we come back to it [sic] from time to time. And I was pleased at their evaluations because I had not finished the workshop by saying "This is what you should have gotten from this." I had left it to them to say what they had got, and they had gone right back in fact, I think, unconsciously to what I had said at the beginning.

The specific objectives were usually stated by CI2 after the participants had introduced themselves and he had some background information. CI2 frequently mentioned the two levels of general and specific goals. It was evident that objective setting was a part of his overall plan for a workshop and formed some basis of evaluating. Interestingly, both instructors did not mention objectives until a specific question was asked about them.
The Secretary was asked about establishing objectives and responded with extremely brief comments which are reported completely in the following quotation:

A general interest program . . . I don't think would fall under that heading. It would have to be a business program where they are going to possibly have one type follow another. That's all I can truly give you because I don't know what the programmer has in his or her mind.

Objectives for CS were usually found only in sequenced programs. He had limited understanding and few observations to make about this operation. It seemed to be another area that helped him distinguish the professional programmers from the rest of the staff.

The Dean mentioned developing a curriculum, but did not mention establishing objectives until he was asked about this operation. Then he noted it was accomplished in two ways. The first included the programmer.

... depending upon the needs identified they're probably using those as a basis for establishing learning objectives when that needs assessment process has been done.

The second way objectives were established involved instructors. The dean recalled a relatively short program about gold panning to provide an example of an instructor setting the learning objectives.

And in that case, the instructor who was an experienced gold panner and a geologist simply sat down and said "OK if people want to try their hand at this on a first time basis, what do they need to know". . . I think very ably identified what the learning objectives would be for his students.

The dean felt that objectives could be set by programmers as they considered results of needs assessments or by instructors as they considered the subject matter to be learned. This belief was in contrast to the experience reported by CP1 and CP2 who are familiar with subject content and become involved in the establishment of learning objectives for learners.
Summation. Establishing objectives was an operation that had to be probed for in five of the eight interviews. All but one of the programmers mentioned this operation without probing. Needs assessments, the nature of the subject matter and the nature of the learner are all factors which contributed to or modified the kinds of objectives established. This operation was completed by joint effort between programmers and instructors or it was accomplished by individual effort on the part of the instructor. Most of the informants realized that there were general and specific levels of objectives. One programmer was reluctant to discuss this area and seemed to be an intuitive individual who had strong feelings about discussing a structured approach to program planning. Programmers and instructors seemed to be equally involved in accomplishing this operation.

Selecting and sequencing learning activities

This operation provided the greatest opportunity for programmer and instructor interaction. It also seemed to be the operation that provided the most independent action on the part of the instructor. The data presented here dealt with at least two aspects of selecting and sequencing learning activities. One was how activities are selected and what influences the selection of one activity over another. The other was who does the selecting and sequencing.

Programmer One described selecting and sequencing learning activities as he related how a conference was planned in conjunction with the advisory committee. He mentioned that structuring learning experiences received attention as the conference was planned when asked how it was determined to structure these experiences. Objectives, learning theory, experience and comments from informed individuals influenced the structure of learning
activities. The structure was planned to ensure meeting the objectives of providing recommendations and follow up action.

As CPI described another program he commented upon a major role some instructors play in selecting and sequencing learning activities. This role seemed to result from the programmer consciously releasing some of the planning function to the instructor. CPI decided to run a program on film comedy because the college had a number of old Charlie Chaplin and Buster Keaton films. His idea was to find an instructor who could talk briefly about the films and then show them.

So I got referred to me this instructor and of course this instructor is a film historian and he takes it all very seriously. It's not just a matter of showing Charlie Chaplin and talking twenty minutes afterwards. And we have to be clear on what theme we are having. I'm sort of going "Anything you want. You want to have an international view of comedies from the 30's to the 70's--great--put it together." ... I learned a lot about film. And obviously he's the expert.... He's much more on top of film and can probably put together a much more interesting package than I can.

CPI turned some planning operations over to instructors who are competent in a content area. This observation is confirmed by a comment CPI made in response to a probe about selecting learning activities.

In some courses I have very little to say about it. I don't know anything about stress management. The instructor is a therapist, she knows. She decides the learning activities.

When CPI did select the learning activities he reported using a "standard" way of performing this operation. He considered objectives, learners, time, and outcomes. In addition to considering these factors CPI reported talking with people and trying some activities in an effort to determine their usefulness. CPI seemed to use this operation in a thoughtful manner.

Programmer Two extended his collegial approach of establishing objectives to selecting and sequencing learning activities. He reported
talking with instructors and together selecting the learning activities to be use in workshops.

CP2 had a classification system which helped in selecting appropriate activities by labeling them either educational or therapeutic. When instructors sometimes confused the two and used therapeutic activities in educational programs, and if an instructor was valued by CP2 and if the instructor felt uncomfortable in an educational program, then the program was recast in a therapeutic context. Learning activities were selected much the way objectives were established by CP2. It is a collegial approach if instructors were new or slightly known to CP2. Otherwise he let instructors select the learning activities on their own.

The sequence of establishing objectives first and then selecting learning activities second was important to this programmer. Once objectives were stated then CP2 assisted the instructor in deciding what kinds of activities were most appropriate. He attempted to make instructors aware of proper sequencing and available resources and techniques. CP2's approach to selecting and sequencing learning activities was also associated with professional training for his instructors. He actively trained new instructors by discussing available techniques with them.

The selecting and sequencing of learning activities was a joint effort and contrasts with the process described by CP1 which was one of either his or the instructor's selecting the learning activities. CP2 was careful to make sure the objectives were specified before he allowed an instructor to use a technique or learning activity from his "bag of tricks."

Programmer Three explained that selecting learning activities was part of the planning process he used and that instructors were sometimes
involved. He gave the conference as an example of his involvement in this operation.

After he and CP1 established the objectives and selected a time frame for the program, the "delivery style" was decided upon. Choosing a delivery style included deciding upon lectures, workshops or other kinds of activities. After these decisions were made instructors were selected, brought together, and exposed to the group processes selected for the conference. For CP3 selection of learning activities was a crucial operation in planning this program.

I think the really crucial aspect of putting the whole conference together was in fact the content development of going from overviews of the problem being addressed or the question being addressed so people had really basic information.

CP3 went on to describe the kinds of learning activities used during the conference. These included lectures, brainstorming, group discussions, and a synthesis process. These activities were selected because they allowed the whole process of going from the very general down to very specific recommendations and commitment of people to time and energy in the future that was able to turn the thing from an education exercise to one thing which people felt that education actually applied to something.

CP3 stated he felt the content development was a critical aspect of the conference. This development occurred through careful selection of learning activities and in a logical, rational manner to aid in the achievement of the established objectives. Learning activities also influenced the selection of instructors. They were selected because of their skills in conducting learning activities and not solely because of their knowledge of the conference subject matter.

It was very important that the major characteristic of the person being a facilitator was their [sic] ability to work well with a group as opposed to their [sic] expertise in a theme area being considered.
Selecting and sequencing learning activities was performed in a thoughtful way by CP3. The advisory committee gave some input and presumably had some influence upon the programmer. One additional example of performing this operation was described by CP3 and provided a different view of this operation. Selecting and sequencing learning activities for the Japanese language course was accomplished mainly by checking what the language instructor had been using for learning activities in teaching Japanese for another educational organization. This checking was accomplished by discussing with the instructor what and how it would be taught. As the number of courses increased additional instructors were hired and the original instructor performed some tasks of a programmer.

... and since, we've had other instructors join and they have been collaborating with T and he's been acting in kind of an additional coordinator function: getting the three of them so they are teaching the same curriculum.

A similar process of checking proposed learning activities occurred between the first instructor and the two additional instructors.

CP3 reported two ways of selecting and sequencing learning activities. The first was largely programmer centered. The learning activities were selected by the programmer and these in turn influenced the selection of instructor. The second way was a collaborative effort between CP3 and an instructor: learning activities were selected by the instructor and reviewed by the programmer.

Programmer Four also described a collaborative effort in selecting and sequencing learning activities, which differed in one area from the way programmer three described it. Rather than have a discussion with an instructor, CP4 discussed these activities with his advisory committee as illustrated by CP4's comments about the process of selecting a panel discussion as a learning activity. "I think we called them reactor, but I
didn't decide, I proposed it to my advisory committee. They thought it was a good idea. As a matter of fact, they even gave me suggestions for people to contact." CP4 mentioned selecting group discussions as learning activities using the same method. CP4's comments about selecting learning activities were brief but direct. The method described was a joint effort between the programmer and his advisory committee with little or no input from instructors.

Instructor One provided a contrast to the collaborative efforts described by most of the programmers as he reported selecting and sequencing learning activities largely on his own. Some of the learning activities were selected on the basis of experience and experimentation. This was the case in terms of the length of instructional periods.

I found as a teacher and the students found that two hours a week rather than one is a better learning situation. Then the commitment that's required in night school, especially for a noncredit course is quite different than [sic] something that's for credit. And I found that in the two evenings a week the class really kind of jelled and became very committed to attending class and to you know, doing any kind of assignments that I suggest they do.

The specific activities were decided upon by CI1 from his experience in teaching and upon the kind of participant in his class. Learning activities were selected in a manner similar to the way CI1 set objectives: after meeting with the class in two sessions, the succeeding activities were selected. Experimentation also was part of selecting learning activities. When asked how he decided upon learning activities for succeeding course periods he responded, "Basically, the response of the class to the things that I tried with them and always I'll be setting up situations." A substantial amount of thought was put into program activities. CI1 reported constantly thinking about what might be successful in class.
I... would always sit down and think what is going to go over in class because obviously there is a certain amount of presentation, of almost acting, role playing that you as a teacher, have to do... you really have to perform in front of that class. So both in terms of setting down and preparing lessons and driving out there, I really found that I needed to psyche myself... into it.

Planning learning activities for a workshop required more trial and error attempts than did planning learning activities for the language course. CI1 termed this trial and error procedure experimentation. Amounts of time and kinds of learning experiences were subjected to this procedure. Speaking about the workshop CI1 noted

This was an experiment, ... and we found out very quickly that we needed both more time... but I also told [CP3] that I would not be lecturing but just speaking a little bit about embroidery, a little bit about eggs, a little bit about... the different topics at the beginning of each session... So I would give like a general introduction to these things and as the class progressed they [the instructors] would sort of share their knowledge in a much less formal way.

This experimentation demonstrated a need for increased time for the workshop. Other changes made, based upon the experience of the instructor, were the introductory presentation and inclusion of socializing time for the learners and sharing of cultural artifacts associated with the subject material. Even though CI1 used several teachers in the workshop, he was able to create a unified and organized approach to the workshop by discussing with the instructors which learning activities they had selected and how each individual session could be conducted.

Using empirical evidence, CI1 selected learning activities with little help from the programmer. He involved other instructors in this activity and became a coordinator of the learning activities used by them. Selecting and sequencing learning activities seemed to be a major role for this instructor.
Instructor Two described selecting and sequencing learning activities as choosing from techniques he traditionally used. One of these activities was a climate setting exercise where participants introduced themselves, the instructor gave an overview of the subject matter, and an atmosphere of informality was established. This activity aided in promoting group participation which CI2 considered to be effective in teaching.

Learning activities seemed to be selected for their usefulness in building a group identity and sharing problems among learners. This was important because of the unique nature of the participants. They were usually newly independent women who needed some financial skills.

One of the most significant problems faced by CI2 as he taught was the reluctance of participants to discuss financial problems in group settings.

... financial things are still things that people are reluctant to talk about because they think they're the only ones who have problems. And so it becomes vital that you get the group to relax. ... I find that if you put people together for a whole day ... they begin to relax after two hours, they keep on relaxing for the rest of the day and that holds over the week until the following Saturday. ... By the end of the second Saturday they were exchanging names and telephone numbers and addresses and that's what we were aiming for in part.

Time became important for CI2 as he attempted to develop some group cohesiveness which allowed him to use activities he felt were most effective. He perceived a great deal of flexibility in working with the College in this operation had evolved over time.

One thing that I have been very pleased about in dealing with [CP2] and ... College [A] is the flexibility that I have in being able to suggest "Let's try it this way or let's try it that way" ... I've been doing it for enough years that ... obviously if they've got a topic and they've got a location and they simply want to plug someone into the gap—that's a different thing. I've got [sic] to the stage where ... it's a case of what do I want to do and how, do I want to do it. ... From a teaching point of view it's very nice to be in that situation.

CI2 selected learning activities which were subject to some modification before a program began. Just as established objectives are subject to
change depending upon group needs and characteristics, learning activities are subject to alteration based upon group characteristics and the experience of the instructor. When directly asked how he selected learning activities, CI2 reported that

I do that . . . again on the basis of having done it a long time. I've changed the sequence somewhat . . . I have now got [sic] into a sequence which I feel is logical and it progresses from how do you keep your records . . . up into actually constructing a budget . . . So I'm really progressing from the easiest everyday material up into something that is a bit more specialist [sic] or has more terminology.

This comment seemed to confirm CII's previous comment about flexibility. CI2 is an experienced instructor who used his understanding of teaching and clientele in selecting learning activities.

The Secretary provided a brief description of this operation with information that was both probed for and volunteered. Because he was not directly involved in this operation, his comments were more impressions than empirical observations. CS reported the programmers and instructors negotiated about program formats and outlines. The programmers described to the instructors what was needed in programs and the instructors responded with what they could do. Instructors might provide a course outline which was "written out, or scribbled out, or may just be talked out. It's not necessary that we do have a course outline". In response to a question about selecting and sequencing learning activities, CS reported very briefly and certainly the operation was performed by the programmer and instructor.

The Dean reported two ways in which learning activities were selected and sequenced as a response to a probe. One way was for the instructor to do it totally when the program was not a part of a series of related programs. The other way learning activities are selected and sequenced was
by the programmer when the program was one of several in a programmatic area. He reported some programs taking a year to develop.

We've had courses or programs here, noncredit ones, that I've worked on with advisory committees that have taken a year to work out the course outlines . . . the idea being that these would eventually become credit courses and in that case we were using a community based advisory committee, then hiring content curriculum writers, people who were very knowledgeable in content. Then I would try to give them help in developing that content from a learning point of view.

At least three identifiable elements were mentioned in this complicated approach to selecting and sequencing. One was the advisory committee from the community, another was the content specialists, and the third was the adult educator making this the most elegant approach to this operation described by college informants.

Summation. Some variation seemed to exist among the programmers in the college. The variation, however, was limited and most informants reported one common method in selecting and sequencing learning activities. For example, using a community based approach was mentioned by the programmers, and all programmers reported using some type of collaboration between themselves and the instructors. The instructors on the other hand reported more independent action in terms of selecting and sequencing learning activities. Many of the informants described this operation as a well integrated part of the program planning process. Objectives, learning theory, subject matter, and the nature of the participants reportedly influenced the selection of activities.

Ensuring participation

Ensuring participation was accomplished in a variety of ways which ranged from routine to creative tasks. All of the informants described at least two tasks performed to ensure participation. One informant viewed this operation in negative terms as he divided operations into routine and
exciting. Other informants described interinstitutional cooperation as a task that helped secure participation as well as performing other operations. A number of times contrasting methods of ensuring participation were described by informants as they offered examples of program planning.

Programmer One presented two examples of program planning which provided contrasting views of this operation. The program on infant stimulation was proposed by potential instructors and to a large extent objectives and learning activities were established and selected by them. Ensuring participation however seemed to be an operation carried out by the programmer. CP1 asked the instructors to leave the course outline and description with him for a time while he

... called around a few people I knew in the community to see where it would be reasonable to locate the program. Where we would have a good market for that kind of course, on campus, off campus, where? Good response in _______ which is always a good community in which to offer new courses. So decided to cosponsor with _________ Community Schools.

The decision about where to hold the course was based upon where the market was perceived to be most supportive. Also influencing this decision was a philosophical choice to expand the college's audiences.

One of my priorities as a programmer over the last two years has been to offer college courses in all sorts of places. Community schools particularly and community centers where people ... come. And if people do take a ... College [A] course at an elementary school in _____, they may be much more likely next time to look at the ... College [A] brochure and just start to come to the college.

In addition to selecting a location that would help ensure participation, CP1 mentioned two forms of advertising programs. One form was the college catalog which will be explored later. The other form was related to placement of the course in community agencies and involved cosponsoring programs with these agencies and sending out notices about the programs through these agencies. The notices were either written or oral
and were often included in agency newsletters or passed around by word of
mouth. Cosponsorship meant that the program was developed and financed by
the college and housed by a community agency. Cosponsoring was done to
expand the college's clientele.

And so when we're offering new courses that will probably appeal
to people who may not be plugged into the college system, I often
offer them first of all in a community location cosponsored with
another agency that does have that kind of market, . . . And then
people can come to their local community school that they usually go
to for macrame. Take a course which may be of a . . . more
specialized . . . level. And then see, yes, they can take a college
course and next time they'll read over our brochure as well.

Most programs developed by CPI were held off campus because of a lack
of adequate facilities on the campus and increased community contact to
ensure participation. Community contact occurred in ways other than
holding a course in a community facility. CPI reported calling community
agency personnel and asking if they thought there was a need for a program;
if they knew about programs addressing specified needs; if they knew of an
established program that might be adapted; and would the agency refer
people to a program? This community contact occurred either before or
after a course had been decided upon.

That can go on before we make a decision to run a course or
after we've made a decision to go with a course in order to recruit
people and to let people know we are doing it.

Additionally CPI estimated that about 95 percent of the programs were
advertised in the college continuing education catalog. Of these, 25
percent were advertised by an additional flyer or letter with 5 percent
advertised by flyer only. CPI noted that these figures represented numbers
of courses and not number of participants. If number of participants was
considered, then about 50% of participants came from flyers and media
advertising other than the catalog. This method of advertising was similar
to the use of a general brochure in the school district.
However, the catalog offered some flexibility to the college programmers not mentioned by school district interviewees. If a program was still in developmental stages when the catalogue was to be printed, then partially developed programs were advertised. A title, time, and place are the minimal requirements for inclusion in the catalogue. CP1 described how such courses were advertised.

Sometimes I have a fair amount of work to do. Sometimes I'll advertise a course... with the instructor to be announced. So I have to locate an instructor. That will be either a course I have figured out in my head and kept the description general enough, so that an instructor can come in and fit into it... sometimes I have a fair amount of curriculum planning to do.

This flexibility allowed late developing programs to be included in a system which generally was regulated by firm deadlines. Programmers had greater flexibility in terms of when various program planning operations were performed when compared to the school district interviewees.

CP1 was not limited to one method of advertising. Many of his comments stressed the use of cosponsors as a means of ensuring participation. Most of the programs developed by CP1 tended to be advertised through the catalog but were supplemented at times. He consciously choose to advertise programs in the college catalog, in flyers, through cosponsoring or in any other way that he imagined was economical.

Programmer Two was involved in a subject matter area which he felt was unique so that it required its own identity in terms of publicity. Programs which he planned were advertised in the college catalog in addition to a brochure which listed only women's programs. The contents of the brochure consisted of descriptive paragraphs which were jointly developed by CP2 and various instructors. The brochure was mailed to about 2000 people whose names appeared on a mailing list which CP2 developed by keeping names of people who participated in women's programs over the past
two years, people who inquired about women's programs, and selected agencies involved in social issues.

Newspapers and organizational newsletters were also used to advertise courses. The college public relations department had recently provided CP2 with assistance in developing press releases about selected programs. New releases were sent to radio stations, cable TV as well as local newspapers in an effort to gain publicity. Another dimension of publicity which was directed at ensuring participation was interviews. CP2 described this activity.

Then I am often available for interviews. I'll do radio interviews, or TV interviews, or a newspaper article or whatever. Also I have done cable shows where I go to the cable station where I do a half hour or several half hours on programs that are coming up in women's programs. Either I will bring the instructor, or I'll talk about... the whole thing.

CP2 also ensured participation through his community activities. He reported appearing before community groups to discuss women's programs at the college. These groups included professional groups that may have members interested in the feminist area.

Selecting the setting for the course was perceived to affect participation because CP2 felt that some programs were more likely to have better participation in some communities than in others. CP2 gave this task some thought as he discussed with the instructor the best possible site for a program.

Sometimes a program was reportedly cosponsored with another adult education unit in another organization. CP2 described one instance of cosponsorship between the college and a school district which provided a location and advertising for the program. Related to cosponsoring was a coordination effort which indirectly ensured participation and provided benefits to the program. CP2 described coordination activities.
If I've decided to put [a program] in an area, I'll check with or be aware of all the other people who program for women in that area. What I'm working towards in a couple of the areas actively and in another couple not so actively yet, is to try to get a community planning committee for women's service where we meet a couple of times a year, talk about the types of clientele and the types of courses that we're aiming at and looking for fruitful areas to cosponsor, to cooperate, to find extra funding.

Cooperation, coordination and cosponsoring all seemed related and affected the levels of participation in adult education courses. Attempts were made by CP2 to avoid offering courses similar to those sponsored by other agencies. His attitude toward this activity was positive and was evidenced by his support of coordinating activities. He concluded, "I find that works a lot better than planning in isolation. If I haven't done that in the initial stages, I make sure that at the final stages, I touch base with the major programmers if I have time."

This programmer was conscious of his community as he performed a variety of tasks to ensure participation. The variety of tasks included writing news releases and catalog descriptions, speaking before groups and giving interviews on radio and television. The community consciousness was evidenced by his efforts to establish a community planning group and his efforts to cosponsor programs with other community agencies. This cosponsorship had some aspects of coopting as defined by Selznick in 1949, but it seemed more comprehensive.¹

Programmer Three provided two contrasting examples of ensuring participation and a different view about coordination from the view presented by programmer two. Participation in the conference was ensured through a number of methods. Although publicity for the conference was the responsibility of programmer one, CP3 made some observations about how this operation was completed for the conference. Press kits were developed and personal appearances on radio and television were made by CP3. Both of the
programmers made contact with people in the community who were working on problems associated with day care services. CP3 termed this "consciouness raising."

A flyer was developed by CP1 and CP3 and mailed to professional associations, other adult education units such as YWCA, unions, a university, and related societies and service centers. Panel members were selected in part for their ability to draw attention of the news media. All of these tasks were used to ensure participation in the conference.

Tasks intended to ensure participation in the Japanese Language program seemed different from the tasks associated with the conference. For example, one task in the language program was the establishment of an appropriate fee that would not discourage participation. Publicity for the language program was basically a descriptive paragraph written for the general course catalog by the programmer and instructor.

Participation was also affected by the very nature of the course. CP3 described the first attempt at a Japanese Language course as a marginal success.

I tried the first time through a Japanese course--a reading and writing Japanese course --for Japanese speakers in ____. And it went, but not with that much of an enthusiastic response. The _____ school system has a pretty good Japanese program for the community already established. Also . . . I think it was misdesigned. . . . It was obvious it was a limited interest group. That was only a marginal success. So I said "next time I'm organizing this course for English speakers. It was kind of a misjudged thing at the onset.

Ensuring participation for this programmer was affected by decisions made when developing the ideas occurred. For this programmer, desired participation affected idea development and the reverse was also true. This was another example of program planning being a fluid and dynamic process, rather than a sequential progression.
Programmer three's perception of cooperation with school districts was negative. He considered it to be a useless effort with little or no return.

Having to deal with school boards is a hassle. Having to worry about what they are doing, and whether they've decided to do this now, and if we are doing it they are going to get all upset.... The reason it's an irritation is because we are consistently reminded we are a threat to them; but we don't consider them a threat to us so we don't think about them that much. But they sort of show up to bitch.

This attitude concerned only the school districts and did not extend to other organizations in the community. CP2 in contrast viewed school boards as allies in ensuring participation. CP3 was not anticommunity planning but he did exhibit a narrower view of the community than CP2.

Programmer Four's observations and comments provided two perspectives on this operation. The first was viewing publicity as a routine activity which should be done by someone other than a programmer. CP4 spoke in negative terms about this task and resented the perceived lack of support from the college for publicity. He contrasted tasks performed to ensure participation at the college and a former place of employment.

At ... College [A] my biggest fight is the organization.... I'm a developer. I've done a lot of very original things. But when I had a idea at [my former place of employment] and I went in and said to [the director] this is what I want to do. He would just faint with excitement "What can I do to make this possible for you?"... And then everything fell into place. The publicity I didn't have to worry about [or] designing logos, how many copies I wanted. Who's going to mail them, who's going to stuff the envelopes where am I going to get a room. ... College [A] is simply poorly, inefficiently organized. They do a lot of remarkable things.... But they make it extremely difficult for a continuing education programmer to get the tacky stuff out of the way. We do not have a public information officer. We do not have an efficient publicity team to go out and do something to get it in the papers.

This attitude seemed different from that expressed by the other three programmers. They reported performing many of the tasks outlined by CP4 without resentment at having to perform them.
The second perspective was about community advisory board and contacts. Speaking of community involvement CP4 noted

This our college is very supportive of [my efforts]. They know I'm going to spend time paddling out into the community, going to meetings of the different family agency boards, getting to know them, listening, making very sure that they don't see us as territorial, or rather as competitive and duplicative . . . . So there has to be a lot of time spent with those people. I wouldn't have gotten a hundred and seven people out to that . . . [program] if I didn't have a community advisory board of eight people who then went back to eight organizations, sold the idea and each one of them brought me back five people.

CP4 saw this task as important and evidently not as distasteful as the publicity related tasks--especially those related to the media. Commenting upon publicity for a program CP4 noted the difficulty he perceived was gaining help in publicizing programs. "I personally sat on our publicity person to see if we couldn't get something in the paper . . . . I made some calls to the Vancouver Sun myself."

Additional tasks were personally done by CP4 to ensure participation.

I make a lot of phone calls, a lot of phone calls. For example, I phoned the Ministry of Human Resources personally. "I'm going to be sending you a letter. Would you let your staff know about this?" Manpower, a lot of people that I have known for years. Then I sent a personal letter to them . . . . I do a lot of promoting. I do it formally and informally.

CP4 performed these last two tasks of placing telephone calls and writing letters with resentment and classified them as clerical kinds of tasks.

To make me do clerical work at a $150.00 a day or whatever my value is, is nonsense, just nonsense. I should be out there all the time in the community.

This last comment may aid in understanding CP4's resentment of tasks associated with publicity. Among his reasons for not willingly doing publicity kinds of tasks was the high value he placed on community contacts. It was obvious he perceived himself as a developer and generator of ideas. However he also valued community involvement to the point of
resenting tasks that did not appear related to making community contacts. Like the other three programmers, CP4 was aware of and valued community contacts. This awareness and judgement were shared to some degree by instructor one.

**Instructor One** seemed more involved in ensuring participation than the instructors in the school district and the other instructor in the college. As a supplement to the college catalog, CI1 wrote and mailed letters to ethnic organizations and some individuals whom he personally knew from his participation in ethnic groups. He characterized this as a "general community approach right down to the individuals." CI1 reported using a similar approach to ensure participation in the workshop on Ukrainian Culture. Flyers and letters designed and written by CI1 were sent to organizations such as ethnic groups, universities, church groups and local newspapers. CI1's involvement was unique among instructors interviewed in the school district and the college.

**Instructor Two** reported writing a description for the workshop which was published in the college catalog. In spite of the fact the public relations department sent information to the news media which resulted in an interview and an article in the **Vancouver Sun**, CI2 commented that the college public relations department did not obtain as much media coverage as he thought they should. The tasks of writing the description and being interviewed was the limit of CI2's involvement in this operation. Both instructors reported a limited involvement in this operation. They were, however, more involved than their counterparts in the school district.

The **Secretary** reported being involved in this operation by performing routine tasks, including, among others, inserting prepared course descriptions into a catalogue and distributing course information to
college admissions offices. Course information came from a card which was prepared by individual programmers. This card listed the name, date, place, time, cost, and the minimum number and maximum number of participants. The purpose of these cards was explained by CS: "That's so that anybody from the general public can drop in to any campus, or phone any campus and ask about a course, because everyone knows about it." This procedure seemed mechanical and required little or no decision making and most programs offered were subject to this routine. The information card was usually accompanied by an advertising paragraph written by a programmer which was either typed or retyped by a secretary and then proofread by the secretary and CS before it was submitted for publication in the college catalog.

CS noted sometimes a program was offered when it was not feasible to advertise in the catalog. At such time, flyers or brochures were used and he had no responsibilities in these situations. He described the brochure as being developed by a programmer and the college publicist. Data obtained from interviews with programmers indicate they felt the involvement of the college publicist was not as great as CS supposed.

Another part of ensuring participation which seemed mechanical was obtaining and updating mailing lists. These lists which were comprised of libraries, public senior secondary schools, government agencies, interested people, and lists of attendees at previous programs, presented two problems. First he reported that mailing lists "don't get used too often"; and second, he noted problems associated with maintaining mailing lists. "We haven't been keeping up too well on these mailing lists of students because it gets a little too heavy for us." CS estimated that about fifty to seventy five programs each year are advertised through flyers and most
of these were health related programs. Flyers announcing these programs could be easily posted on hospital bulletin boards.

Other methods of ensuring participation such as paid advertisements on radio or in newspapers were sometimes used. CS noted these ads were not common and estimated that perhaps of 100 programs one or two would be advertised in this manner. The college publicist produced news releases for community newspapers. CS thought localized papers used these releases as fillers, but questioned the effectiveness of news releases because what he found "is that very often it is printed the night the course is going on . . . I don't feel they are much help."

One final way of ensuring participation identified by CS was repeating a course once or twice.

"... when you are trying to get a program off the ground, you know there is a need for it. We will try it several times so that the public will hear about it. And then sometimes you try it one semester and you barely scrape by. And the third semester you haven't got enough room for the people."

CS is the only person interviewed in the college to mention repeating a course in order to ensure participation. Others such as CP3 chose to redesign a course with low enrollments in an effort to increase registrations.

The tasks described by CS were assigned to him by someone else, usually a program planner. Other tasks such as preparing copy for the college catalog were routine and done much the same way each time.

The Dean's comments and observations were not narrowly focused on one aspect of securing participation. He expressed a viewpoint that this operation was a mechanical one and less than exciting and professionally fulfilling. In describing development of a program, CUH provided an almost routine pattern and limited view of ensuring participation.
The programmer would go through the mechanics of filling out the budget sheet, making decisions about fees, levels of payment, advertising, etc.

CUH further reported after decisions about advertising were made the central continuing education office took "it over and if it's going into the calendar, takes the calendar copy that the consultants provided, works that up into [a] form that goes to the publicist for inclusion into the calendar."

Because the dean was not as close to the program development process as were the programmers, and in an effort to elicit additional comments about this operation, the interviewer asked directly about ensuring participation. CUH responded that it was accomplished mainly thorough advertising. When asked what kind of advertising was used he noted two ways.

[A] Calendar produced twice a year. That's been distributed to every household in the region. Distribution of flyers and brochures to professionals, agencies, organizations, about particular course or courses, and limited newspaper advertising.

The dean felt this was an operation that was performed poorly by college personnel because of two programming directions taken by the college. It has offered programs of wide appeal and programs of narrow appeal. The college has attempted to be "all things to all people," and the dean hoped this problem may be affected by the addition to the staff of a public relations expert. He anticipated that this action will help the college "do a better job of marketing in the best sense rather than just advertising."

The dean's comments were entirely centered around advertising through the calendar, newspapers and brochures. His views on ensuring participation are limited when contrasted with programmers and at least one
instructor. Even when asked directly about ensuring participation he did not mention any tasks associated with actions unrelated to advertising.

**Summation.** Ensuring participation was generally viewed in one of two ways by informants in the college. The first was as a community based operation involving placement of programs in community facilities, advertising through community groups, cosponsoring programs with other organizations and cooperatively planning programs with other organizations. All programmers expressed a positive attitude about most organizational cooperation. Other informants in the college viewed this operation somewhat differently. One instructor, the secretary and the dean offered comments which characterized securing participation as mechanical and generally limited to mass advertising in newspapers, the college catalog, or by mass mailings. These informants did not mention community involvement as a way to ensure participation. The fact that the dean did not mention it is surprising because he appeared to be community oriented in other program planning operations.

**Securing resources**

Resources for adult education programs can be widely conceived and cover many areas. The informants in the college collectively described four basic resources. Instructors, including group leaders, and resource persons; meeting facilities; instructional materials; and finances were mentioned by at least half of the informants. Tasks associated with this particular resource seemed to be either community or organizationally oriented. One programmer felt lack of facilities forced him to be a community developer. Programmers approach these tasks differently, but the common element of the community is present in most of their approaches.
Programmer One reported securing resources in terms of instructors, facilities, instructional materials, and finances. Securing instructors was both an active and a passive task. That is to say, at times CP1 sought instructors and at other times they sought him. If the latter occurred, then two operations were performed by accomplishing one task: ideas were generated and resources secured.

The previously mentioned conference was used as an example of securing instructors where some members of the advisory committee were used as instructors. Referrals from colleagues in and out of the division were reported as another way to find instructors. CP1 attempted to maintain strong relations with people in other college units as a network of people that could provide referrals because he perceived college academic units as a resource base. He explained integration of the division with the rest of the college in terms of being able to secure resources.

I believe that continuing education has to be integrated with the rest of the college. And that we need to win the support and cooperation of regular programs and faculty... I check with them also because they're experts in the field and they can suggest good instructors, or they know the person who I'm considering or may want to teach themselves.

In addition to utilizing college relations CP1 used community involvement to secure resources. This involvement seemed to be forced because of a lack of college facilities.

Some consideration is given to the physical facility. Although not as much as I would like to see because we don't have very many options... The college has zero facilities. You can barely get a room, let alone one that you choose. There are no large open spaces in the college. We don't have lounge kind of space with comfortable furniture. We don't have those kind of facilities. We're lucky to have a room.

These comments seemed to imply that CP1 felt he was limited to using college facilities. When asked if this was the case, he responded, "No, I do tremendous amounts of, in fact most of my programming has been off
campus. And there you have a bit more leeway." Because of limited facilities on the college campus cosponsoring was used to coopt some community resources.

I first arrange with Community School to cosponsor the course. At this point I phone up my friend at Community School and say "are you interested in the course?" She says, "yes." I say, "I'll program it. This is what it's going to cost. These are the nights. You book a room. You advertise it in your brochure. You provide on site facilities."... And I will get a letter and a copy of our budget sheet to the cosponsor outlining our responsibilities and theirs.

When a program was not cosponsored and college facilities were used, they were assigned to a program from the central division office.

Another resource mentioned by CP1 was instructional materials. He was involved in printing materials for use in programs and securing audio visual equipment. He reported that the amount of these kind of resources varied from program to program. Some courses required vast amounts and a wide variety of materials and others required very little.

Still another resource mentioned was financial support for programs. CP1 indicated that finances for a workshop were sometimes obtained through cosponsoring programs with agencies that were able to provide funding. Through his comments about setting budgets and registration fees, he implied that most of the financial resources for a program come from participants. This operation provided an example of CP1's community orientation as he reported on the kinds of tasks used to secure resources.

Programmer Two also reported using resources found in the community as he mentioned finding instructors, meeting places, and indirectly talked about budgets and learning materials.

CP2 reported three phases in finding an instructor. The first was considering what kind of instructor was needed. Through reading about the subject he gained "a feel for the type of instructor that's needed." Phase
two was a review of instructors CP2 knows. If an appropriate person was not located he would "start putting out the word that I'm looking for a particular type of person." The appropriate instructor was determined by the subject and the location.

... this time around I've got a couple of beginning assertiveness courses. ... I've got assertiveness for single parents and for teenage girls. And each one of those requires a specific person. Some of the instructors could do all of them. But, like the woman who's doing it for teenage girls, I don't think I'd use her for the other ones, except maybe the introductory because the way she relates to people--her style. She's excellent with that one group.

Each of the instructors CP2 mentioned had special characteristics which were used in determining what subjects would be taught by specific instructors.

Location of a program also affected the selection of an instructor. Some locations were new areas for women's studies programming. As a result, CP2 selected instructors who were low key and feminist ... [and] would move from a feminist philosophy but needn't talk feminist politics.... Whereas the person who works out of the Women's Center or the Women's Center ... would need to be a lot more overtly feminist.

CP2 was the only programmer interviewed who reported giving consideration to subject matter and location as he selected an instructor. CP2 gave consideration in these areas because he had developed a pool of instructors from which he selected. He added to this pool by interviewing potential instructors to determine their commitment to feminism and their educational or therapeutic philosophy.

The third phase was a maintenance task. Instructors who were used repeatedly were notified of opportunities for development as an instructor of adults and as feminists by a periodic letter sent to instructors by CP2.

What I have been doing for the last couple of seasons, at least for the fall season anyway, is I send a very complete letter to each
instructor outlining procedures, the rules, who to phone if they can't find me, where to find me, sources of information if they want to look things up, people they might want to talk to. . . . I talk about things I'm aware of happening in the next few months that they might want to attend as professionals--different conferences or workshops or visiting lectures. . . . It's almost like a newsletter.

CP2 perceived that instructors were pleased to receive this kind of information. There seemed to be at least two functions for this "newsletter": to promote a feeling for professionalism as adult educators; and to promote development of the instructor.

These three steps represented one of the most comprehensive and conscientious efforts to secure instructors that was found in this research project. Most programmers interviewed consider a potential instructor's technical competence only. This programmer took competence, audience, and community into account as he selected instructors.

Meeting places were a second resource mentioned by CP2. He reported using a survey to develop a listing of possible meeting places for his programs providing a backup to his two major sources of facilities. One source was the college. Most of his programs were held on weekends resulting in few conflicts and relatively easy access to college facilities.

When programs occurred in the evening, CP2 reported they were often held in a cosponsor's facility. "... One of the reasons why I cosponsor is to expand my range of facilities." He provided an example of cosponsoring for this purpose.

I approached . . . School District [A] Continuing Ed and asked if that was a course we might cosponsor. And they thought it was great. And then we talked about what we would need in terms of facilities. And they'll provide a suitable facility for that.

This programmer had a relatively broad view of facilities and did not seem constrained to offer programs exclusively in college or community facilities.
Funds for programs were largely self generated and came from at least three sources. The first was the participant through registration fees. The second was through donated moneys to a bursary fund to which CP2 personally contributed and encouraged some instructors to contribute also. The third potential source was from the financial aid office of the college.

One of the things that I have on my list to do this month is to go and talk to the financial aids officers and tell them what we do and that it's something that they should give some money for occasionally.

Another potential source was corporate gifts which CP2 hoped will be secured by the Women's Program advisory board.

CP2, like CP1, is community oriented in performing tasks in this operation. However, he seemed to also use college facilities and finances more than CP1 reported using.

Programmer Three spoke of securing resources in terms of instructors, facilities, learning materials and finances. The conference and the Japanese Language program were used as examples in explaining how these resources were obtained. Conference instructors included resource people and facilitation experts identified by using the advisory committee. When CP3 was asked how instructors for the conference were selected, he described an active role for the committee.

We did that through the advisory committee. We did it through brainstorming the advisory committee. We started out with . . . names on the board and sharing . . . And we described who they were and what their abilities were and that was very important.

Abilities such as leading discussion groups were important because they helped determine whether a person would be a facilitator or a resource person. The role of the advisory committee seemed central in this task.

Instructors for the Japanese course were selected in a different way. As the program idea was discussed, one of CP3's colleagues who had
done graduate work in Tokyo suggested a potential instructor. The three individuals met and discussed the program idea which helped establish CP3's expectations and relations with the instructor. These discussions gave CP3 enough confidence in the instructor to allow him to make suggestions and help locate additional instructors.

A second kind of resource discussed by CP3 was meeting facilities. His answers to a question about how facilities for the conference were secured appeared to indicate few if any problems were encountered. "We did it at a college site, so we had the facilities available for free." This comment seemed incongruous with another comment about facilities made later in the interview when he described how he obtained two additional classrooms near the original room used for the first Japanese course.

It was really just luck, because other times it's been horrendous. We have a terrible space problem. We're the last on the list for allocation of space--community ed courses. We really have to scramble.

CP3 spoke as though other people in the college felt community education was expendable. He attributed this attitude to confusion of the kinds of programs the division offered with the kinds of adult education programs offered by school boards which CP3 characterized as primarily recreational in nature. A third resource, learning materials, was only briefly mentioned. CP3 indicated these were developed by the instructor and reproduced by the college. A fourth area also mentioned briefly was financial resources. These resources were secured by developing a budget and collecting enough fees from participants to pay the costs outlined in the budget.

CP3 seemed to use resources from both the college and the community. College resources in this case were facilities and community resources were
instructors. CP3 was less inclined than the other college programmers to consider a wide variety of resources.

Programmer Four continued to demonstrate a critical attitude as he discussed some tasks associated with securing resources. Other tasks were characterized by CP4 as "exciting."

The first task CP4 described was finding instructors which was begun by using his personal contacts. After a person was identified CP4 talked with him in order to evaluate his ability. CP4 described this complex activity. "I have a way to get people to instruct this or to staff it for me... And that's a toughie because I usually start from personal... as soon as they respond I know I'm on the right track." CP4's comment started as a description of how he located instructors and ended as a description of developing the program idea, thus demonstrating that the operations of securing resources and developing the idea were closely related for him.

CP4 secured group leaders for the previously mentioned profession program and gave them an orientation to the kind of experience he perceived taking place. "I got six group leaders, very high caliber people. And [I] had a training session with them to talk about why they were there." These activities were described in at least neutral if not positive terms by CP4, while other tasks associated with securing resources were talked about in negative terms and viewed critically by CP4. Finding rooms and financial support were both discussed as a involving a fight with the college.

They make it extremely difficult for a continuing education programmer to get the tacky stuff out of the way... we have to fight to get rooms. That is not the college's fault... [As] a matter of fact, if you want to know how community programming gets done, I do a lot of, as I have had to, put a lot of my programs off the college and therefore develop relationships with people in the community because I have no place to go with it.
CP4 presented a view of community involvement that classified it as expeditious cooperation in order to obtain facilities. This was evidenced further by another comment.

What do I do with this panel evening . . . ? Put it on in that site? You know that's a loser. Forget it. So [what] I have to do is phone the Y. Whine and beg a little bit, "Isn't this a terrific idea? We'll do it jointly with the Y. It's natural." So it appears as cosponsored with the Y.

The same attitude toward locating facilities was also expressed when CP4 talked about budgets or financial support. When asked if he develops budgets CP4 replied,

I'm paid a salary. I do not have a budget. Now that's the first stranglehold. I really do not have the power to make decisions. . . . We have a budget sheet, incidentally I drew up ten years ago, and it says honoraria, rentals, . . . [etc.] You add that up. You put on administrative costs, then you figure out--it's cost recovery . . .

Even though CP4's attitude was less than positive about the "tacky" tasks of finding rooms and developing cost recovery budgets, he acknowledged their importance as he recalled a time when the extension director of a university for which he worked would encourage his creativity by supplying administrative assistance. The assistant director would ask if the ideas were practical and how programs would be financed. CP4 noted that "I think you need that kind of teamwork. . . . Then you have the most beautiful kind of team you can get."

Programmer four demonstrated positive and negative attitudes about tasks within this operation. These different attitudes suggest different approaches to the same planning operation. One approach is creative and challenging; the other is routine and boring. CP4's community orientation was explained as expeditious as he described the lack of adequate facilities on the college campus. However, this may not be the total reason for his use of community contacts in developing programs because he
seemed to demonstrate a strong community orientation as he described other operations in program planning. A strong community approach was also demonstrated in instructor one's comments.

Instructor One shared views about selection of learning materials, facilities and resource people for a workshop. This was the third instance where instructors have been used to secure other instructors for adult education programs. Both instructors interviewed in the school district secured additional instructors.

Learning materials were the first resource mentioned by CII. He chose materials that were familiar to him and had been previously used by him.

Basically, I have my own set of text books. I made the decision as to the material we would use. College [A] was very good as far as Xeroxing material because to obtain textbooks is both costly and sometimes difficult since I use textbooks from the Soviet Union.

These textbooks were described by CII as "very excellent." The securing of material was CII's responsibility, but the selection of the material was a function of learner interests. Which material was selected seemed to follow the same pattern as selecting and sequencing learning activities in that he used learner reactions to help guide his selections.

The workshop on Ukrainian culture involved another set of tasks used in securing resources. One major difference between these two programs was the selection of resource people. In the workshop, CII was solely involved and reported receiving no help from the programmer. Using his personal knowledge of local ethnic groups, CII selected selected instructors and allowed them to establish their own approach to the subject matter. In answer to some probing questions about selecting instructors CII explained,

I just told them I would be talking on the topic [for the] beginning twenty minutes and the rest was really up to you. I knew what they were going to do basically, but they took over...
CII discussed the learning session with each instructor prior to the workshop where a review of needed equipment and instructional approach took place. CII seemed to influence in which college facility the workshops would be held. When asked if he selected the meeting facilities CII responded,

...[yes] for the workshop I did because of course I wanted to see the kinds of facilities for the cooking class, what kind of equipment was there, what kind of things I would need to bring and my resource person would need to bring or my demonstrator would need to bring. And just in terms of light, ... because for the different arts and things like that, you need proper lighting, atmosphere, I think, ... We decided upon two rooms we used for the Ukrainian Arts Workshop. Basically so that people would be together and could socialize and yet there would be enough room to move around slowly.

This instructor reported a larger degree of involvement in this operation than most other instructors interviewed. Usually instructors had been involved in suggesting resource people when appropriate while CII was involved in selection of materials, people and facilities; and the training of resource people.

Instructor Two commented on tasks associated with securing resources without being directly asked by volunteering comments about learning materials and meeting facilities. CII noted he had a supply of printed materials which helped establish the pattern of a new course jointly planned by him and an attorney. He made additional comments about resources as he described the process of program planning.

Well, as I say, I have put together a package of course materials over the years which I sort of chop and change depending on what kind of group it is I'm talking to.

Meeting facilities were assigned by the college. CII seemed to have little influence on which rooms were assigned and complained of not being able to locate facilities that had been assigned to him. He reported trying to do something about facilities but not always being successful.
Securing resources seemed to be less involved for this instructor than it was for instructor one. CI2 completed tasks associated only with learning materials, while CI1 reported being involved with the selection of learning materials, instructors, and facilities.

The Secretary offered many comments about how he performed and his views about how programmers completed this operation. When asked to describe tasks he completed as part of his job at the college, CS reported tasks that were in the operation of securing resources. CS described a set of routine tasks in which he was involved. After he had checked and signed budget sheets developed by various programmers, he gave them to another office worker who assigned the programs to rooms on a campus. From information on these sheets, control cards were typed and sent to the college admissions office for information purposes.

CS noted when some elements in the process were handled differently or required additional effort, he was reluctant to become involved. For example, when CS was asked to "program" a para-psychology course, he recalled a problem with the course when it was initially offered.

... we did put para-psychology on before. It always went. But to the best of my memory ... I said, "I think we had a little bit of a problem with the Psychology Department on it. So I think we should run it through them before we go out on our own hook and do it."

CS noted the Psychology Department felt as though it should know the person and his credentials and even though academic departments have some influence in securing or approving instructors, they could be ignored by the division. CS described his perceptions of how one programmer selected instructors.

She liaises [sic] with the English Department to see if they have someone who will teach it or if they have no one who will teach it ... does this go along with their philosophy in the English Department? ... If it didn't go along with it, they'd have to discuss it and see. And if H felt strongly enough that it should be
given, then he'd come to our Dean... and tell him this problem. He may very well say, "Put it on, I'll back you." But we try to keep peace in the ranks.

Facilities were described by CS as poor and scarce on the college's campus. College facilities were assigned on a mass basis by sending a list of courses to each campus where the courses were proposed to be held. There, someone assigned programs to specific rooms noting special facilities and equipment requested.

When a course was held off campus, CS first contacted school district personnel with whom he maintained a good rapport. This rapport was fostered by CS's policy of not scheduling competing programs from the college in school facilities. When requests came from programmers for nonschool facilities, he asked programmers to secure the facility themselves. CS was sensitive to some facility problems, especially between College A and School District A as noted earlier when CW reported that college programs were often placed in out of the way school facilities where little evening activity took place.

Another task CS commented upon was establishing budgets. When asked about funds for programs CS replied "There aren't any." He indicated that programs were held on a self-sustaining basis. His only involvement is to check those budgets developed by programmers.

CS viewed this operation as sometimes mechanical, at other times complex, and at still other times as both. He has planned programs when many of the facilities were not secured but when budgets and instructors were. He had a great deal of responsibility in locating and scheduling meeting places in college buildings and school district facilities.

The Dean mentioned three important resources: instructors, facilities and finances. Two of these were secured in a manner that can be described as routine. Financial resources were obtained on a recovery basis with
programmers responsible for setting fees and levels of payment. He used the term "mechanics" as he described the process of filling out budget sheets and setting payment levels. These sheets were sent to the division office where information for the calendar was typed, dates checked, and rooms assigned. The dean acknowledged the lack of space at the college and noted that "we are constantly begging, borrowing, or stealing." He explained that the college has guaranteed a number of rooms for adult education programs. However, this was not enough, so the division overbooked.

We have a guaranteed minimum level of space, particularly evening space during the week. In addition to that we put a lot of things on the airlines booking system. In other words, we know a lot of our things are going to be cancelled and a number of credit things are going to be canceled. We just hope... that when we go for broke we get enough cancellations. So far, I think we've never been caught. We've always been able to juggle it.

The dean supposed that when the new campus was completed most courses would be held in the new building.

When asked how instructors were identified, CUH described the least routine task as he mentioned several ways:

... [The] advisory committee might be asked, "Hey does anybody know-?-?" They may come up with a list of candidates. I suspect in the family area it would mostly be by word of mouth. If the advisory committee didn't know itself and faculty within the college didn't know, we might go to other educational institutions. "Do you know?" or other service agencies, "Hey there is a need for-?-? We would like to do this course--instructor?" We usually come up with a person. We usually don't advertise. At least we've never had to so far... that I'm aware of.

The securing of instructors seemed to be the most varied task described by the dean while facilities and money seemed to be routine tasks. Although he did not discuss the use of nonschool facilities explicitly, some of his comments about college facilities indicated that programs held off campus were a result of lack of space at the college rather than a positive choice about other facilities.
Summation. Securing resources involved community contacts for all informants. Sometimes these contacts were the result of positive choices, and at others they were the result of no choices. For example, inadequate college facilities seemed to force some programmers to use other community facilities. The fact remains, however, the community networks and contacts played a large part in the securing of resources. Considering the operation totally, community involvement is evidenced by the kinds of instructors used, the kinds of facilities used, and the community orientation of informants. Tasks within this operation seem to range from routine to nonroutine and from community based to college based.

Evaluating

This operation supplied programmers with information that affected the nature of future programs and it also helped programmers assess instructors. It seemed to be performed either by routine methods such as handing out forms to participants or by not so routine methods such as talking with people.

Programmer One felt evaluation was an area in which college personnel could improve, however, he reported evaluating most, if not all, of his programs. He also reported changing evaluation forms from program to program noting these forms were usually given to participants and collected by the instructors.

CP1 noted the forms were designed to gather some demographic data such as place of residence, age, gender, student status, and place of employment. Learners were also asked how they found out about the course, if the advertising was clear, if they registered easily, if they had difficulty finding the location, and if the fees were acceptable. Instructional quality was also evaluated by asking questions about the
instructor's apparent knowledge level, presentation capabilities, and group involvement. CP1 also attempted to obtain some information about learning gain by asking participants to give a self-assessment about their own learning. The results of the evaluation were sometimes discussed with the instructors and other times when a discussion was not possible, CP1 sent the results of the evaluation to the instructor.

This programmer seemed to evaluate courses from a learner's perspective only. Other perspectives that could have been taken were the instructor's and the division's. The absence of concern about numbers attending and dropping out presented an interesting contrast to the concern expressed by informants interviewed in the school district.

Programmer Two tended to evaluate programs through a joint effort with instructors as evidenced by some data which indicated he included instructors' perceptions about programs conducted. Results of evaluations are used by CP2 and instructors who seemed to have major responsibility for evaluating. Most of CP2 evaluation efforts were oral interviews with the instructors.

In talking with the instructors, I get a sense of how the courses are going. As I say, I try to encourage them to do a formal evaluation and give me a copy of those. [sic] And I take a look at those. Usually fresh after the course, if there has been any kind of a problem, I'll usually sit down with the instructor and talk about what went wrong, what she might do to change things if she is up and I'm up for trying her again.

There seemed to be an absence of standardized evaluations as no standardized form was reported. CP2 estimated that about a third of his instructors evaluated in a formal manner. His comments were brief but they indicated that CP2 had a different idea about evaluating from the idea CP1 had.

Programmer Three's comments about evaluation were not as extensive as his comments on some other operations. His most detailed account of
evaluating was a response to a question of the interviewer when he provided a description of how he and a colleague evaluated the conference.

Evaluation forms were produced for the group leaders, participants and members of the advisory committee. Evaluation data for this conference were collected about content, organization, publicity and perceived attainment of conference goals. Results of the evaluation were published as part of the conference proceedings and also discussed with the advisory committee.

We had a follow-up meeting with the advisory committee afterwards, where we went over the questionnaire. We really talked about what things could have been done in ways that may have been more effective. In other words, just trying to be as objective as possible about what the strengths and weaknesses were that had significance not only for the problem, dealing with the problem in the future, but also for organizing that type of event. . . what kinds of problems can these kinds of events address and what they can't address.

Several uses of evaluation were mentioned in this description. One was sharing with participants their feelings as a group about the conference. Another was to help the division improve its ability to plan and carry out future conferences. Still another was helping other groups who may want to deal with the subject of the conference.

The kind of evaluation referred to by CP3 in conjunction with the conference seemed to be one of two kinds: the conference evaluation was formal and objective. He also reported using another evaluation that was less formal and consisted of the programmer's reflecting on a course and deciding what problems are associated with it. CP3 described this process but not in terms of evaluating. "I tried, first time through a Japanese . . . reading and writing . . . course--for Japanese speakers. . . . It went, but not with that much of an enthusiastic response." CP3 then described factors he felt contributed to the unenthusiastic response. A similar community school program in Japanese was one reason and another
was "misdesign"--the content had limited interest among people in the area. Based upon this information, CP3 decided to offer the course to English speakers and so by redesigning the course, CP3 increased attendance substantially.

The second time the course was held a formal evaluation was performed by the instructors. Evaluating in this case consisted of generating and administering a questionnaire, the results of which were used by the programmer and instructors to change the content of the program.

After the evaluation we had done some definite assessment of what went on. And in the culture course, for example, we redesigned it for the following term with less historical, academic content and much more on kind of current issues and social customs and family--a little bit more accessible cultural content.

This programmer stated a belief that evaluation should be an integral part of program planning. He provided two examples of programs; one where he was involved in developing the evaluation and using its results; the other in which he used the results of an evaluation designed and performed by someone else. Results in both cases were used with the intention of improving future programs.

Programmer Four mentioned evaluation in a few brief comments which demonstrated that this was one of those routine tasks which he disliked. He designed a standard evaluation form which he described as "not good." Evaluation data were stored in CP4's files while he contemplated them. When asked who uses the information obtained from evaluating CP4 noted, "I wish I could give you a very positive answer and say that we meet together ... what happens is that it's sitting in my file and I'm looking at it and thinking about it." He reported using the results to guide him in future programming efforts. For example, from one particular evaluation he discovered that social policy was not an area of interest among the
clientele for which he programmed and as a result, his programming efforts changed to reflect that preference.

This programmer provided a few general comments about evaluating voluntarily with details resulting from probes by the investigator. This operation was routinely performed with the results reportedly used in a limited manner. In contrast, the instructors used evaluation data to a larger degree than did programmer four.

Instructor One evaluated his course without direction from college personnel. It was his idea to evaluate the course by sending questionnaires to participants following a program to ask what they thought about it and what they thought could be improved. When asked if the college provided any assistance or guidance in doing this, CI1 replied "No not really, except it just seemed to me from my own experience that after a course of that nature probably something like that should be done."

The second time the course was held the college provided assistance by typing and mailing evaluation forms. The results of the evaluation of the second course were shared with the programmer and both used the results. CI1 reported the programmer saw, "that we could carry that workshop on again. And, probably expand it. We'll definitely expand it because just about every person to a man said more time was needed."

This instructor used the results of the evaluations to change the course content and design in succeeding courses. He evaluated because it seemed to him an appropriate thing to do. The information obtained was initially secured without help of college personnel.

Instructor Two seemed more involved in evaluation than instructor one perhaps because of a different approach to evaluating. CI2 used evaluation for a number of purposes such as gaining ideas for other programs and
understanding learner motivation. These two ideas were expressed by CI2 as he described an informal evaluation session between him and some learners.

Every time I do a workshop, I'm not just interested in telling the students what I think concerning the material. I am equally interested in... why they came, what attracted them in the first place which is what I always start off asking them. And I always finish a workshop by saying "Right, what did you get out of this? What was useful to you? Do you think similar workshops would be useful to other people? Was it what you expected when you came, useful or not? What would be more useful to you?" So every time I do a workshop no matter what it is on, I always end up in this way.

He attempted to understand why people participate and if a workshop had met their expectations. CI2 exhibited a different approach to evaluation because he was the only informant to report combining questions at a workshop's beginning with questions at its conclusion. The questions written on a chalkboard changed from workshop to workshop depending upon CI2, the students, and the subject matter. CI2 reported that answers to these questions were examined, and notes made and retained until the next workshop was planned.

Evaluation results were used by CI2 in considering new programs. This process was viewed by CI2 as "... a continuous growth thing." Evaluating seemed to be an integral part of planning programs for CI2. "You're consistently evaluating what you're doing and looking for some new aspect that might be more relevant, more interesting, or draw a group of people that wouldn't be drawn to a similar but different aspect of the same problem." The results of evaluating were used by CI2 only. He noted that the college programmer has sent out evaluation forms only once. Evaluating for this instructor is a formative assessment because results from one program were used to modify future programs. According to CI2 consideration of evaluation results was the first step in planning programs.
The Secretary viewed evaluating as an activity that was largely programmer centered and his comments were observations about what programmers do in this operation and how they viewed evaluating.

Some programmers want feedback on it. But not too many of them. But some will come up with a form asking... what the people thought of the course and the instructor. But I would say only one or two out of a hundred do that. The programmer decides what they [sic] want to know from the students, and we may type it in our office, but there is no set form for evaluating the course.

When asked about instructor initiated evaluation CS speculated that it took place but noted people in the division office have limited contact with instructors. The division office personnel do maintain a passive evaluation system. CS explained:

Once that course has started and we aren't hearing about problems—if we don't hear about problems we know everything's all right because all your chickens come home to roost in that office in there.

However, this system does not supply the kind of information needed for the purpose of evaluating outlined by CS. When asked about what an instructor or programmer did with the information CS responded

I think that... if they are the ones that want the feedback they analyze it and they take it from there, whether they'll give the course again. Or if they're definitely wanting to give the course again: what was wrong with this course, what they would change.

It should be emphasized that CS's comments were largely his opinion of what he thinks to be the activities in evaluating. He was removed from this operation more than his counterpart in the school district. The secretary there was able to review and follow up on some evaluation results. CS realized a boundary which defines a programmer's professional territory. Thus his views were largely that of an informed observer in this area.

The Dean's comments about evaluating were different from the comments made by the programmers from the college and more like those made by school
district personnel. The dean generally felt that evaluation was not well done.

Well, there's the whole evaluation end of it. That's one thing we don't do very well. . . . on a scale of zero to ten, we're probably a minus three. I don't think that's uncommon but I guess that's my opinion of how well we evaluate the specific courses that we give.

His comments on how well evaluation was carried out were about formal evaluation. Informal evaluation was described as a "feel" and CUH reported his programmers did well in this area. "I have a feeling that most of the programmers have a pretty good informal feel for how well an instructor is doing or how well a particular course is doing."

He also mentioned an "old stand-by in terms of evaluating": drop out rates were used by him to determine if there is anything wrong in programs. This criterion was not mentioned by any other college informants.

Another perspective on evaluating provided by the dean was his expressed preference for evaluating program areas rather than specific programs. He felt the proper questions to be answered are: "Is that a field we should be in?" And then if it is, 'How well are we doing it?' And going into some kind of depth in a program field, rather than a one shot area." CUH was concerned about evaluating programs, and evaluating instructors was a secondary issue for him.

Summation. Evaluating was accomplished in different ways by different individuals. Some programmers for example developed evaluation instruments for each program they conducted and others encouraged instructors to evaluate. Still others felt evaluating up to the discretion of the instructors. Some informants reported comprehensive efforts that involved participants' comments, instructors' observations, and planning committee members' opinions about programs.
The purposes of evaluation were also varied. Some informants used them in a limited way. For example CP4 reported thinking about the results as opposed to sharing them with his advisory committee. Other informants used them more extensively, for example, CP3 reported sharing information with many people who helped plan a conference. Originating ideas for future programs was mentioned by one instructor as a use of evaluation. The other instructor used evaluation results to justify and expand current programs. Evaluating was nonstandard and sometimes did not take place. It seemed best described as a personal preference.

Community Programs and Services Division Profiles

Data reported in discrete operations by informants are now viewed in a holistic manner to enable conclusions to be made about the nature of program planning in the community college. First, a synthesis of program planning is presented and then observations about the context are made.

Program planning

Perhaps the most obvious characteristics of the program planning process in the college were heavy reliance upon community involvement and the diversity of ways programs were planned. Perhaps the only consistent factor was community involvement. Originating and developing ideas were two operations that provided examples of diversity and community development. Of the nineteen idea sources mentioned, one of the most common was community contacts. Developing the idea was also a divergent activity with the most common method reported being use of an advisory committee.

If unanimity existed in any operation, it was in establishing objectives. Most informants, whether they were directly asked about
objectives or not, indicated objectives were established either by the instructor or programmer or both. For some programmers the process was an integral part of designing programs used to help learners understand the intent of programs and help programmers select and sequence learning activities. All but one programmer voluntarily commented upon this operation and the informant who did not volunteer information reacted with some criticism about the use of such terminology when it was mentioned by the interviewer. One instructor did not volunteer any information about objectives, the other did. The secretary did not bring up the subject of objectives but the dean did. The informants all seemed to be aware of this activity and viewed it as one of the operations they were involved in.

Selecting and sequencing learning activities was an operation which continued to reflect a collaborative effort between the programmer and instructor. Some data indicated that there were occasions when either the programmer or the instructor would perform this operation, however, these were minimal. Three informants reported using information and advice from the community through the use of advisory boards or committees. While the operation was usually accomplished by joint efforts of programmers and instructors, it was influenced by community involvement.

Ensuring participation was accomplished in two general ways. The first was through publicity, which included the divisional catalog, special brochures, and news releases. The second general area was through community involvement, which included using advisory committee members to "advertise" a program and cosponsoring with other organizations. For most programmers, these two areas encompass most of the activities performed. It is understandable that some informants would not recognize or mention community involvement. The secretary, for example, performed a role that is largely within the division, thus his community contacts in program
planning were minimal. The absence of comments about community involvement from the dean was a surprise. He seemed to be one of the more community oriented informants and yet failed to talk about community influence in this operation. However, most of the informants acknowledged community involvement as part of this operation.

Securing resources was an operation that involved securing a number of different items. Perhaps this is one reason the operation was performed in a number of ways. Instructors, learning materials, finances, and facilities were mentioned as resources for programs. Personal knowledge of instructors' abilities and capabilities and personal references from colleagues and advisory committee members were important in identifying potential instructors. Cosponsoring with community organizations was done in order to locate and secure meeting facilities. Some informants indicated a lack of facilities caused them to be community oriented.

Evaluating varied from informant to informant. Some programmers evaluated all programs they were involved with while others relied upon instructors to evaluate. Still others evaluated initial programs and then relied upon the instructors to evaluate succeeding programs. Results were used to improve programs and instructors. Only one occasion was reported where an instructor was discharged because of a poor evaluation. Instructors demonstrated an interest in evaluating and both reported being involved in obtaining data. Many accounts of evaluation described a formative process: results were used to change programs according to clientele wishes. Evaluating was also used to gain new ideas for additional programs, thus returning the planning cycle to the first operation considered in the study. This cycle is set in a unique organizational environment described in the following section.
Context

The Community Programs and Service Division was an evolving unit that moved through at least two phases of development and into a third phase. The phases were best defined by the relationships between the division and the college and were described in detail in Chapter Five. The effects of phase III are the focus of this section.

The dean's desire and goal were to help the college become a community centered organization. To do this he assigned programmers to academic divisions in the college. Those interviewed in this study realized the importance of including faculty in the planning process. However even though they acknowledge this importance, the programmers' reported behavior did not reflect it. Most informants were influenced by at least two factors to be community oriented rather than college oriented. One factor was the lack of facilities at the college and the other was more difficult to describe because of its complexity. The goal of integrating the division with the college was changed to integrating the college with the division. This may be another reason the informants had a community orientation. Informants had a tendency to neglect the faculty and seemed careful to involve community representatives.

Another contextual variable that influenced the division to be community oriented was the similarity between the areas of content and clientele of the college and nearby school districts. The college was a relatively young organization having entered into adult education programming fairly recently, and as a result it seemed to be sensitive to programs planned and sponsored by school districts. In an attempt to avoid duplication, the college sought community input which may have been an attempt to obtain community support in the event of duplication.
An organizational role played by the division seemed to be that of a boundary spanning unit. At least three ways in which this role was carried out were identified by informants. The first was that of innovation. Like the school district's Community Education Department, the division initially offered new and non-traditional programs which have been adopted by or at least viewed as part of the regular college program. An example offered was ABE. The second way was by providing alternate access route to the college for students. One of the more traditional access route to colleges is through high school graduation. For adults who have not graduated or had graduated a number of years ago, the division offered a way they could be involved in the college's activities. The third way was by acting as an organizational conscience. It reportedly gave personnel of the college a community serving program in which they could take some pride. At the same time, however, it may remind them of other community opportunities in which the college should become involved.

These roles affect the division's technology and may help explain why the community emphasis was pronounced in this organization. One way of becoming an effective boundary unit is to attend to community problems, pressures, and issues. The technology is community oriented and thus helps the division carry forward its organizational role.

Programmers might also be influenced by the values held by members of faculty. These values might minimize the division's community orientation. One informant noted programmers and other professionals tend to become like the rest of the organization. No evidence was found to support this belief. Evidence such as the dean's desire and goal to make the rest of the college community oriented seemed that the programmers are not influenced appreciably by faculty values.
Certain external and internal variables influenced the program planning process in the division. External variables such as competition from school districts, and mandatory legislation for provision of continuing education, and internal variables such as the college's commitment to community programs and self perception of programmers seem to be associated with the use of a highly community oriented technology. The tendency to become like the rest of the organization was not as evident as it was in the school district. The next chapter describes a program planning process used in a third adult education unit that seems to strive to be like the organization of which it is a part.

2Thompson, *Organizations in Action*, p. 70.
CHAPTER VIII

PROGRAM PLANNING IN A UNIVERSITY

The program planning process described in this chapter was used in a university located in the same community as School District A and College A. The data in this section were obtained from university records and from interviews with selected members of the university community. The program planning process was explored through interviews with three programmers, an administrative assistant, two instructors, and the dean. These interviews provided data, which were then analyzed by using the conceptual framework outlined in Chapter III.

Originating ideas

The process of originating ideas seemed more organizationally bound in the university than in either the school district or the college. If ideas were generated independent of an academic department, those ideas had to be "sold" to a department. The variety of idea sources was limited by the extension model employed by the university.

Programmer One, UP1, held the title Director, Extension Credit Programs, Evening and Summer Session. The title of director, however, did not reflect the programmer's broad responsibilities, which included: "assist and/or initiate and facilitate the planning, development, and offering (loosely, administration) of the face to face extension credit courses and programs of . . . [University A] Departments and Faculties." UP1 had a Ph.D. in Psychology and was an assistant professor of Psychology.
before assuming his present position in 1975. He was active in two professional adult education associations.

UP1 listed three sources of ideas for developing programs, two of which seemed to be associated with the university. Using university sources, ideas may have been a function of the nature of the planned programs which were limited to credit activities. The use of the extension model described earlier may also have been a limiting factor. Interviews with other programmers seemed to validate the second explanation.

When UP1 first came to the university, he noted that few evening courses were offered that led to a degree.

One of the things we began to work on after I got here was to make them [credit courses] more sequential to promote the fact that you could sign on at the beginning and over some large number of semesters, indeed, get the right courses to complete the minor or the major. And we also increased the number . . . so then the question becomes one of in a limited resources situation which departments do you go after to develop.

Students and community needs were used to determine which departments would be extended. Surveys, comments, or "just sensing what's happening in the community" helped define what was needed. UP1 noted that mathematics courses were needed, and then for example, briefly reviewed a process that establish applied math courses in the evening program.

That has turned out to be very successful. So we in part did a needs analysis recognizing that the department if you just torque it around a little bit to thinking in a more applied way; a highly theoretical department, that there was indeed a market. . . . So that's taking basically what exists and putting a little twist to it and meeting what we saw as a program need.

UP1 believed that the Extended Studies Diploma Program was a more innovative program than the one just described. It was designed to allow individuals the opportunity to obtain a certificate in specific areas. This program recognized a person's need to demonstrate he was engaged in
learning additional or different subjects and was based upon the idea that people change careers and must document study in a new subject area.

UP1 also provided an example of originating an idea in toxicology that led to an Extended Studies Diploma. "A number of years ago we became interested in the whole area of toxicology probably by talking to some faculty member who had some ideas on it as well as being generally aware in the literature that people are getting very concerned about toxic substances..." This general awareness seemed to be a typical way UP1 gained ideas.

To me that's a very important part of my job, is sort of having what you might call a general awareness of what people do, you know, what their interests are, what seems to be of interest in the general community, through the newspapers, what are issues that might relate to the kinds of resources that the University has that might speak to those issues.

Faculty research interests and public needs all provided ideas for programs. These elements depended upon university resources. UP1's idea sources were limited when compared to programmers in the other two organizations because unlike the others he was bounded by the extension model. Programmer two at the University seemed less constrained than programmer one, but was still affected by the extension model.

Programmer Two, UP2, held an M.S. in Communications and had been employed as a Director of Community Education at University A since 1974; and prior to that he had been employed at University B for ten years in Continuing Education with experience in marketing research.

UP2's sources of ideas were broader than UP1's sources. He described himself as working intuitively but being somewhat restricted by the availability of university resources.
Like programmer one, he also noted community needs. He did not do formalized need assessments, but rather acted upon needs as he saw them. He reported that other sources of ideas were articles in popular magazines, individuals, societal trends, and personal interests. Although these sources were broader in scope and more numerous than those used by UP1, they were still bounded by university resources. Programmer three seemed to use even more sources than UP2 or UP1.

**Programmer Three**, UP3, served as Program Director of Conferences. He had had previous experience in television production, possessed a M.S. and had done some doctoral work.

He acknowledged that program ideas came from several sources. "The source can be someone in the community, a friend, a professional colleague, your colleagues in your own department, and faculty members. It's just such a range of sources of program idea."

Another element UP3 described as critical in originating ideas was timing. UP3 reported that faculty interests, organizational needs, and community needs converged to produce a proper time and appropriate climate for program.

When asked about a specific program, UP3 responded that "Family Choice in Education" grew from the research interest of a faculty member, who approached Continuing Studies. This situation, where ownership of an idea was in the faculty, seemed to be a desired state of affairs in terms of the extension model described by university informants. The faculty member UP3 referred to is one of the two instructors interviewed. Results of his interview are presented next.

**Instructor One**, UI1, was a professor of Education at University A and was active in research and the practice of adult education. He described three programs that were generated by research interests. A program on
family choices in education resulted from his research interest and from a subsequent presentation of a paper at an American Education Research Association Annual Meeting. He explained that the idea for a conference occurred around the time of the meeting.

It must have been around that time that the idea occurred to me of holding a major conference in British Columbia on family choice in education in schools. But I can't remember exactly the date. It was at that time we talked about it. O. and I met frequently, we talked on the telephone frequently and I thought about holding this conference which I think I approached Continuing Studies . . .

UIL prepared a three-page document, which outlined conference objectives, potential topics, and suggested some resource people. This proposal was first presented to the dean of Education in order to gain his support. UIL then approached the dean of Continuing Studies, who referred him to UP3.

A second program idea developed from the research interests in the Faculty of Education. The faculty of Education designated the faculty member responsible for a conference on Education and the Federal Government. A third idea, still in a conceptual stage, was a result of UIL's personal and professional interests in Education and television. UIL noted that before this idea could be taken to Continuing Studies, it had to be presented to either the dean or to the executive committee of the Faculty.

Now in that case, what I've done is to secure the approval of the Faculty of Education, the executive committee, that this be a Faculty of Education sponsored conference for next year. That legitimates the conference and it means that I can now go to UP3 and Continuing Studies and draw on the resources of Continuing Studies to help me organize it.

SUH viewed approval and sponsorship as the key to gaining access to Continuing Studies. Academic sponsorship was crucial to the faculty member if he wanted support from Continuing Studies. UIL described a process of
conceiving ideas from research interests and then proposing them to Continuing Studies. This process differed from the one outlined by the second instructor.

Instructor Two, UI2, was employed by University A in accounting. He taught for Continuing Studies in a non-credit management program for women, and his involvement in originating ideas was minimal. "I'm usually not the one who initiates the idea. UP2 as the administrator in Continuing Education has come to me on a couple of occasions and said, 'We have a need in a certain area.'" UI2 performed the function of developing and refining initial ideas presented by others.

They had sensed there were a lot of women in middle management positions who wanted to go on to higher management positions but they lacked a lot of financial skills in comparison with men at the same middle management level... that would give me the idea we're talking about women in middle management who don't have financial skills, who want to go on to higher positions to better themselves and they need some kind of basics in accounting. So he would leave me with like a kernel like that. So that goes a long way towards defining some parameters to me.

UI2 provided a second example where a representative from Continuing Studies again supplied the program idea.

UP2 again has come to me and said, "O.K., we have a lot of demand for anything in the whole nonprofit area." Not just accounting, [but also] program administration, [and] how to get funding. There is just a lot of need in terms of nonprofit organization. So he said "O.K., we would like to develop a course on accounting. An introduction to accounting for nonprofit organizations."

These two examples of ideas flowing from Continuing Studies to a faculty member were the reverse direction Instructor One described. In actual fact then, the movement of ideas was bidirectional; moving from either the academic area to Continuing Studies, or from Continuing Studies to the academic area. The support of academic units was crucial especially in terms of ideas coming from the adult education unit.
The Administrative Assistant, US, performed some planning tasks; however, his role was limited, and he simply described what program planners did. Many of his tasks were quite similar to the tasks performed by the secretaries in the other two organizations.

When asked about sources of ideas, he listed four: program planners; faculty; community groups; and programs that might generate follow-up programs. When asked if he could select a major source, US chose program planners in conjunction with faculty members. He further explained that "very rarely [is programming] done just within Continuing Studies." Faculty and departmental approval and input were always necessary.

He also noted that programs were usually activities within a larger area of programming efforts. For example, a programmer might plan a number of events as part of an effort to help a participant obtain a certificate. It seemed to be almost a deductive planning process where a person began with a programmatic effort and then moved to individual parts.

US noted that ideas came from faculty members and Continuing Studies programmers equally, and he perceptively defined the direction of ideas bidirectionally.

I would say [the origin of ideas are] even. A lot of it depends on the area you are working in, public policy which is mainly UP3's area here . . . would come not only from him but definitely from the department. And one program because it is programmatic, will lead to another program . . . UP2's area which is professional development and management, most programs are probably generated from him . . . although some of them come from the School of Business Administration and a lot from the community needs.

US viewed programs ideas as originating from several sources similar to those described by other interviewees, but usually from programmers or faculty members. The dean offered comments which provided a different view of how ideas originated.
The Dean, UUH, held a doctorate in education evaluation; and before being appointed dean of Continuing Studies, held the position of assistant director of Continuing Education at a nearby university. He was recently given the title of Vice President for University Development, while retaining his title of dean.

When asked about how he originated ideas, he answered: reading and requests from community residents. However, UUH noted that he did not often think of specific programs but rather conceptualized on a program area level. He further reported ideas were filtered through at least two screens. The first was what faculty members were doing at University A and the second was the perceived mission of Continuing Studies. A third filter not specifically noted as such by UUH was rational structure for program ideas. "We focus our energies on things which tend to . . . have a very clear rationale or structure rather than doing ad hoc things. So we don't go off and do individual courses. Almost everything we do must have a clear rationale."

Although ideas for UUH seemed to come from limited sources, it did not mean the ideas were limited in scope. The scope was limited only by the extent of his reading and his contact with people.

**Summation.** The range of idea sources was smaller than the ranges in the other two organizations studied. Although ten categories of sources were mentioned by informants, the predominant two were community and faculty interests. One source of ideas unique to the university was the faculty. Another unique feature of this operation within the university was the notion of programmatic efforts, which refers to planning a series of courses rather than a single event. Only one other programmer in either of the other two organizations mentioned programmatic efforts. Originating ideas usually took place within the organization. However, when ideas did
have their genesis outside the university, ideas were affected by university resources and faculty interests, which in turn had affects on other program planning operations.

Developing the idea

Activities in this operation emphasized the extension of the university into its community. Departmental and faculty support was emphasized by most informants, which indicated that without the support of academic units, Continuing Studies would not offer programs. This operation was often complex as exemplified by programmer one's comments.

Programmer One described a sophisticated operation in developing ideas that may have been related either to the academic credit nature of his programming efforts or to the nature of the total program planning process shared by most programmers in the university. A comparison of UPL's performance in this operation with other informant's performance will assist in determining whether credit is a factor in complexity or if complexity is shared by people who plan programs in credit-free areas.

One of the first steps in developing the idea was trying the idea out on an office colleague. As UPL explained after getting the idea, he

[came] back to this office and ... [said] to somebody, "Listen, I was just talking to this guy from Biological Sciences and, .. there's this whole area of toxicology that we do nothing about. Do you know anything about it?" ... he said, "No, but I just read an article in the paper about [toxicology]". And so we're saying, "Should we look at it further?" ... we've said, "Why not?"

A decision to proceed was made at this time of initial development. UPL then did a limited literature search and found that little was being done in adult education about the problem area.

UPL then asked the faculty member in Biological Sciences if he thought a course would attract people. In addition to his own positive feelings in developing the idea, UPL received two positive responses--from his office
colleague and from the faculty member, which he used as evidence that the idea had some potential. UP1 described the next step, which involved the academic chairman.

Clearly, at this point the chairman's response is going to be critical. If the chairman shows (A) some enthusiasm for the topic area and (B) some indication that yes it's administratively possible, I mean, then we're on the road to starting to talk about, at this point in time, a single course.

At this point, a request was made by UP1 for a formal course proposal form from the chairman's office that contained details about the course and approval from the chairman who forwarded it to the Dean of Science. After all necessary approvals, the course was implemented.

The course proved successful and generated a diploma program as well as a minor in environmental toxicology. The completion of the course seemed to be a trial for the larger programatic area of a diploma and academic minor emphasis.

UP1 noted that during this operation the ownership of program ideas was turned over to academic departments. He reported that this was personally difficult but that it followed the model used at the university. "Programs come from the departments and faculties. Like, program development turns over to them. I mean you have your general ideas, you put them into the system somehow. You in part relinquish your autonomy, or your right to have a lot of say in this model." UP1 explained that because program development was turned over to the department, a programmer must be willing to inquire how the idea was progressing.

When proposals were formalized, UP1 noted that they were reviewed by the Senate Committee on Continuing Studies. The committee's reaction to proposals had no binding effect but UP1 felt these reactions were critical.

The proposal at a certain point would go to this committee for information. ... if this committee was against it, we would sort of say, "Hey, wait a minute, maybe we missed something here,"...
Since all things ultimately have to be supported at senate if you can thereby pick up five or six votes in your senate committee, you're just that much more likely to get it through senate. In part, the senate committee here is used as another form of evaluation of the idea before you then maybe spend another two thousand dollars in terms of further development of a proposal.

This process involved approval and support from a number of academic areas. As previously indicated, however, individual courses did not require senate approval.

In an effort to determine how often, if ever, the model was violated, UP1 was asked if an idea had support from external groups, Continuing Studies, and a faculty member, and what would happen if a department head did not support the idea.

Our model says if it [an idea] doesn't have the support of the academic unit then forget it. I mean, we lose a few that way. But we think that for our institution this is the best way to go. That capitalizes on the strengths we have in this institution and we can serve the public best with that model, as well as ... insuring our own credibility stance within the institution.

The model referred to by UP1 and others seemed to be based upon building academic support for programs as they developed. Development and support came initially from within Continuing Studies and then moved to departments. Here program development was almost turned over to academic units: the programmer's role at this point was follow-up. The senate and its committees became involved in approving major program efforts, such as diploma and other academic programs. This model was evidenced in comments by other programmers. It may not be as clearly manifest with them as with programmer one, but their support for it was evident.

Programmer Two provided an example of developing the idea for a noncredit program called the Foundation Program in Management for Women. According to UP2, it was a result of the emphasis placed on management program by the dean and his interest in women's programs.
UP2 approached the Business Administration Department about management programs in general. He quoted the department head: "Look, we're not sponsoring anything..." Although he did not receive support, UP2 continued to think about specific programs and again approached the department, but this time he offered a specific program idea. He described this second interaction:

So I went back to the people in Business Administration and said, "Look, I think there's a need for this, what if I just mobilize the field." They said, "Fine, do it but we won't sponsor it. You just do it under Continuing Studies." I said, "Fine, Okay." But with their tacit approval.

This tacit approval seemed to be similar to the explicit approval UP1 described. Once approval was gained, UP2 reported holding ad hoc seminars in areas he thought had potential. He reported that the response was good to the idea of management programs for women. These preliminary seminars constituted the basis for a program planning seminar that involved potential clientele, both participants and financial contributors. Based on reported need, literature searches, other programs, and UP2's experience, he invited women from various organizations who were in management to a seminar. This seminar produced an idea "of a sequential program at the end of which you receive something," and it also provided background material and information used to write a proposal for a management program for women. After these seminars were completed, UP2 described a process of once again working with the academic department.

[I] worked with the faculty, got them involved, and this is the first program that the Department of Business Administration, and then, at that point in time, the School of Economics and Business Administration agreed to sponsor. [I] worked with faculty in the development of each of the courses.

Working with the faculty entailed approaching them with his idea of the program's content and then modifying it slightly. UP2 believed that
"this strengthened [his program] and got faculty involved." He felt this step was a crucial one in the development of programs.

The program concept involved people in the department in the planning of it. I got people that were respected there to ... contribute to the program ideas. I worked on it, I went to them for feedback, I got some of those people involved to say they would teach in it and at that point in time its credibility was established.

Development of the program idea involved two categories of people: the faculty member who gave credibility by teaching in programs; and potential participants who provided ideas about content areas and potential support for the program.

For UP2, university support and external support in developing ideas was important. The planning seminars he mentioned seemed to serve a double function of securing the assistance of outside groups in developing ideas and of producing a document that represented some effort and results of planning. This also seemed important in securing the sponsorship of a department. Although sponsorship by a department was important for programmer three, it seemed to be overshadowed by other considerations in developing ideas.

Programmer Three described a process in developing ideas that was less definite than those described by either of the other two programmers. Both UP3 and the faculty member assumed roles in program development. UP3 described the process.

... we complemented each other very nicely. ... I should say the role evolved as it does in every program. It has to do with the faculty member and the programmer. And I think initially [UI1] wanted to have...almost exclusively senior people and researchers and such to talk about it. But he saw the kind of interest generated even by the general community. ... that he really expanded those range of people that he wanted to discuss that with.

After their roles had been defined, he and the faculty member developed a tentative program that helped them "really convince [others] that this was
a superb program." In addition to the interchange between the programmer and faculty member, informal telephone calls determined how people, known to either the faculty member or the programmer, felt about the general issue, what climate existed for a program, and how it might be received. The program's marketability, usefulness, and potential for achieving public interest were also discovered through this process.

After UP3 made these contacts, he "analyzed the situation in the field and the general community," which indicated that the issue might be an emotional one with perceived gains or losses. The identification of interest groups was useful in later securing resources and involving other organizations.

UP3 then outlined the program. "Now that means it can be changed, it can be added [to], sections can be deleted, you may change the format, you may end up with something totally different." According to UP3, this tentative program demonstrated that a program was actually being developed with a mixture of decisiveness and flexibility.

Flexibility was defined as responsiveness to groups who might supply funding and therefore affect program development.

In fact, you can't totally separate in your mind the manner in which you conduct all that preliminary stuff from the funding, because you can't do the program without funding. . . . if you can add a session over here that will make these people happy and doesn't really water down or it's still really high quality but is maybe not a direction you wanted to go, but the they'll give you ten thousand--you might consider it . . . those are interwoven, they're not separate, you don't do everything without any consideration for the funding.

Developing ideas for UP3 involved interaction with faculty members, sensitivity to interest groups, and consideration of funding sources. This three-tiered approach was promoted by using a tentative written outline of the program. The outline was flexible enough to accommodate some change especially if changes were associated with funding.
For UP3, obtaining academic approval for conferences was critical. He was asked what would have happened if a department had not sponsored the family choices conference.

We wouldn't have done it. We would not have done it. But that's a matter of organizational kind of thing because I am a part of a university department. I'm not an individual entrepreneur in this job. I don't mean it like that. . . . but we tend not to do things without departmental sponsorship and I think there is a good reason for it. It's a tremendous sense of support and security for a programmer to know that a department is behind that.

UP3 was aware of and supported the idea of departmental approval. This integrated model seemed assumed by UP3 and was mentioned only when asked about it. Approval came before or during the planning process and is automatically sought by UP3.

Instructor One did some work in developing the idea before he approached Continuing Studies. The approval process UI1 followed allowed him to prepare a paper containing the content areas, objectives, and suggested resource people for the conference. After approval for the conference had been secured from his academic unit, UI1 explained that

the next step is to take the idea statement and start to refine it. What we did . . . was to meet regularly about every week or ten days, we'd try to meet for an hour or two and try to have planning sessions. And the planning sessions involved . . . my acquainting him with the background of the proposed conference . . . he began to get a sense of that. What we then did after two or three meetings was to think about two kinds of issues . . . the first thing we had to do was to decide when to hold it, how long it would take to run and where to hold it and so we set the dates right then . . .

A second task identified by UI1 was to select the conference structure and daily schedules. UP3, according to UI1, made substantive contributions in these areas. UI1 also identified a third set of tasks, which included identifying which sessions should be preliminary and concurrent. "Those kinds of decisions began to emerge as needing to be made. But they are very tentative at this point . . ." The tentative nature of the program was useful in that it allowed some negotiation in the conference content.
Outside agencies were used to help develop the program ideas. UI1 reported that he "took the preliminary program to two meetings of the board of directors of BCCLEA [British Columbia Council for Leadership in Educational Administration] for their feedback and comments. So they played a role as well."

While funding and political support were being developed, the program was being refined. Schedules became more definite and key people who would make presentations were identified. These decisions were influenced by political concerns surrounding the content of the conference. For example, choosing persons who would be identified as sharing views sympathetic to both sides of family choice in education was important.

UI1's comments about developing ideas indicated that he viewed this operation as a shared one with UP3 because each had different perspectives and abilities. UI1's involvement in developing the idea occurred early in the program planning process, which contrasted with the involvement of instructor two.

Instructor Two became involved in this operation at a later time in the program planning process. This may have been due to the direction of idea flow. Continuing Studies brought its idea to UI2 and he indicated that the ideas had been conceptually established before they were presented to him. "He's given me who the target market is, a fairly specific audience, what their needs are and what their background... is and then at least related it to my area."

Using the parameters established by Continuing Studies as guidelines, UI2 then "would get my whole vision of what the accounting field is and say. 'If somebody in one of these positions wants to be informed in accounting and I have three days of eight hours a day in which to do that,' then I look at what broad areas need to be covered... ."
After UI2 determined the broad areas and allocated time to each one, he then considered which topics should be covered in light of participants' needs. UI2 reported reviewing resumes and applications of each participant and then reviewing his course outline to determine "whether or not I'm hitting way above the level that some of these people...can't even... [comprehend]. Do I need to get more basic? Do I need to become more sophisticated?" This process helped produce one part of the Foundations in Management for Women Program. Developing the idea, however, continued to occur even after the program had been taught. UI2 explained that

I talk with other...accounting faculty members here... and I'm trying to get their inputs in terms of actually participating in it as well as just their ideas on what kinds of content should be presented and how it should be presented.... And I talk quite a bit with [UP2] to see if there is any kind of informal feedback they get in terms of fine tuning the course.

This process was used only when UI2 had an idea of the employment background of the probable audience. He described a process used when advance information about participants was not available. It differed from the Foundation Program in at least one area. "I go through more or less the same process in developing it, except I develop all of it and then I develop a course outline which he [UP2] prints up in the form of a sheet which is sent out on a mailing list to people. And from that people decide to sign up."

This produced a broadly conceived program with few specifics. The detailed outline was formulated only after some registrations came in, which were used to help refine topics and learning activities.

In addition, UI2 located similar programs and sent for "their materials so I could see what are they trying to cover, how are they doing it, and what needs are they trying to meet." He used this information as a check on his program. Another developmental activity was surveying a
potential market for ideas and problems that could be addressed in a program.

UI2 described developing ideas within a specific conceptual area requested by a programmer from Continuing Studies. His role was more limited in developing ideas than instructor one's role but not as limited as the administrative assistant's role.

The Administrative Assistant reported that he was not as involved in this operation as much as he was in others, however, US offered his opinion as to how he thought ideas were developed. He noted that after an idea for a program came into being, a programmer developed a proposal defining needs, marketing, and budgets in conjunction with an appropriate academic department. US noted the department's role in this operation.

For example, [UP2] is working on a middle management program. Content for that would mainly come from the department, in consultation with the department. What courses should be involved... what topics should be involved... and then the actual content of the courses that are going to be taught under that program would definitely come from the faculty.

US emphasized that even though UP2 wrote proposals that contained program content and format "it's never done in isolation. I mean there is always consulting going on back and forth between the faculty, between the community and UP2." The community's involvement was usually providing information about needs. US noted that proposals must be approved by academic departments. "We simply don't do programs in Continuing Studies here without an academic department's approval and sponsorship."

US's notion about developing ideas was based upon his observations of the process followed by UP2 as he developed ideas. US described three elements in this process. First and second were exchanges between UP2 and academic departments and between UP2 and the community. The third was departmental approval of proposals that grew from these exchanges. His
observations seemed to be similar to other accounts of developing ideas within the university.

The Dean's comments about program planning emphasized developing ideas. A substantial amount of time in the interview with the dean was devoted to this operation. His remarks were more philosophical and less anecdotal than the other subject's comments. He offered few specific examples about this operation but made a number of observations about how it was performed. "If I have this idea, I check it out with various people, like maybe some faculty or whatever. Kick it round for a while. And if it seems like worth doing, then I'll will try and find somebody in our place--a program director--to try and work on it."

UUH noted that sometimes an idea was of such programmatic significance that he would hire someone to work in an area. If the idea was a single event or an ad hoc idea then UUH's involvement ended; however, if it was a broader programmatic area, his involvement in developing the idea continued. UUH explained that

if it's a program idea, like creating downtown programs now, or a few other program areas where . . . which are now in embryonic stage, . . . I have weekly or biweekly, . . . meetings with all program directors [and] talk about it each time we have a meeting and it just evolves.

UUH's involvement seemed to be one of support for programmers after this operation. He noted that development continued with the programmer "securing university support for the idea, departmental or faculty support." He believed that gaining support required establishing a rationale for the program and identifying a clientele, both of which were political processes.

UUH used ethnic studies as an example of a program for which support of the university was secured without faculty or departmental support.
... one program we've got going now is Ethnic Studies, which is in the developmental stage and sometimes you have to create a structure which is not department or faculty. In Ethnic Studies, ... we then established a cross faculty committee which in fact then functions like a department. You get a committee of faculty, you get a chairman, you make sure the committee is constituted by the Vice-President of Academic, so that it has the authority, in a way, of a department.

After a committee was established, UUH continued discussions with the programmer either informally or in staff meetings. In addition to talking with colleagues, UUH reported that programmers also consulted other faculty members and community groups.

After this period of discussion, another step in developing a program idea usually occurred.

We have a custom in our place when we think we've got an idea for a new program area pretty carefully thought out, we put this on paper in a couple of pages and have ... a seminar, a full day seminar and invite about twenty people in for an intensive one day session examining the rationale, the direction, the objectives of the proposed program. Usually this group of people were employers of intended participants and faculty from the University. A final check or "test" was made with people who had been in the developmental seminar.

The dean stressed the importance of trying out program ideas. "I emphasize a lot in terms of talking in our staff meetings and my biweekly meetings [about] the importance of tryouts, trying out a program, a course or conference in advance ... whether that's in a committee session, or one to one situation or with a faculty member." These tryouts helped refine ideas and also helped secure participation in a subtle way. The dean emphasized this operation more than others in the planning process. He described interaction between and among programmers, faculty and potential participants.

Summation. In order for Continuing Studies to offer a program, university support must exist. This operation of developing the idea was
one of two operations where university support was evident, the other was in securing resources. Support for an idea was developed through discussion with faculty members and sometimes by official action on the part of an academic unit. One informant described establishing an interdisciplinary committee that substituted for an academic unit in supporting or approving an idea. Another informant believed that gaining tacit approval to develop an idea without direct involvement of a department would also work. However, later in the process the department became more involved. The operation seemed to be highly collegial, although, at times, people from the community participated.

Establishing objectives

This operation reflected a concern for two kinds of objectives: first, organizational or agency objectives; and second, individual or learner objectives. The former seemed to be of concern to most informants from the university. Most informants mentioned establishing objectives without probes from the investigator. Objectives were probed only with the administrative assistant and programmer one—the two individuals who seem to be the most removed from this operation.

Programmer One did not mention objectives freely. When first asked about objectives, he responded with information about divisional objectives dealing with meeting the needs of nontraditional students. A second time the issue was raised, UP1 responded in terms of learning outcomes. He noted:

I assume the department or faculty has that under control. If I start to get complaints from students... I then attempt to ascertain the level of complaint then communicate that to the chairman for resolution at that level.... In terms, of say, very negative kinds of things, I would hear about the outcomes. Otherwise I assume that the academic enterprise is going on as planned, the students have learned what they are supposed to learn.
UP1's involvement was limited in this operation. When he became involved, it was only after problems surfaced.

Programmer Two reported developing and using objectives for marketing his program. Tasks in this operation also helped ensure participation. UP2 provided these comments about the single purpose of these two operations.

I always think in marketing terms anyway, so from day one I was really thinking about how would I promote this and market this. The next thing was to decide what we would do in terms of marketing. And that was to really go the prestige route which related to kinds of things such as... the objectives for the employers as well as the people taking the program. ...

UP2 explained that he developed program objectives in order to ensure participation. As he discussed another program for which he had an idea, UP2 reported establishing objectives with an instructor. "He helped define the purpose of our program. What is our objective? I had my sort of objective and he helped clarify what that objective was, we were not far apart but he helped clarify that."

This operation was accomplished before selecting instructors. On the basis of these objectives, UP2 explained: "He identified those people he felt should take part." Objectives and purposes seemed to be conceptualized by UP2 on a programmatic rather than on a learner level; as he did not mention learning objectives but instead focused on program purposes.

Programmer Three discussed program objectives in terms of developing proposals for funding. Learning objectives for UP3 seemed to be secondary to at least one other operation that was similar to the way UP2 viewed objectives. Speaking about proposals and objectives, UP3 noted:

My funding proposals are usually a skeleton program outlining the major issue to be covered, the major format to be used, the objectives from the standpoint of the university as well as the standpoint of the community and to personalize each funding application.
Objectives were conceived in programmatic terms and were used to help secure resources. When UP3 was asked how objectives were established, he noted that two perspectives were involved. The first considered the "intrinsic value, timelines, need, and advisability" of the program itself. The second, he explained, weighed faculty objectives and institutional priorities, which were determined by faculty interests and resources. These two broad perspectives guided most programmers in establishing program objectives.

When asked about how objectives were used, UP3 replied in programmatic terms.

... it's really good to force yourself into sitting down and doing that [setting objectives] because it justifies [a program]... . . You might have a wild idea and it's wonderful and it's just all right and you feel it here--that "ain't" good enough. It's not good enough to justify to those people who are going to ask you to justify it, both out there and here. It's also important because of an approval process operating in a lot of faculties.

UP3's view about establishing objectives helped him to accomplish other operations, such as securing resources. These views and activities seemed to be shared by instructor one.

Instructor One noted that objectives could be used to obtain funding. Although he did not use the term "objectives," he did note that they were contained in a proposal. The proposal "outlined what the conference was going to do, who was going to come to it, why they should be invited" and was used to secure support from funding agencies as well as the university. The objectives also assisted in UII's evaluation of the conference. These objectives were written in specific terms and their achievement was subjectively assessed by UII.

This instructor's perspectives on objectives were similar to those of the programmers. Most informants within the university had similar perspectives about objectives. An exception was Instructor Two.
Instructor Two used "goals" to help him design the courses he taught. He developed learning materials and packages containing handouts, copies of overhead transparencies, quizzes, and goals. As he discussed the package, UI2 noted his objectives helped guide him in including some materials while excluding others from the package.

Goals were a starting point for development of the instructional material. As he reviewed a set of learning materials, UI2 briefly described his thought processes which began with a goal which was refined until his goals were stated in relatively specific terms when compared to instructor one's goals.

When asked how he determined goals, UI2 indicated that it was through a process of considering "what their personal goals were for taking the course and my combining that with what I feel accounting as a discipline is." UI2 was also asked if he had any help from Continuing Studies personnel in establishing goals. He indicated the only information he received was a broad overview of the foundation program from UP2.

UI2 discussed objectives in terms of the participants. By so doing, he was one of the few people in the university to discuss goals in other than a programmatic way. The administrative assistant was more like the majority of respondents than UI2 as he discussed objectives.

The Administrative Assistant did not mention objectives during phase one of the interview. When he was asked in phase two how objectives were set, he briefly responded that it was one of the most important parts of the program planning process and that they were set by those involved, such as program planners and departments.

US had minimal participation in this operation. All of his comments indicated he viewed establishing objectives as a shared activity between program planners and faculty members. During the discussion, US spoke
about division, university, and program goals. His concept of goals seemed to be in terms of the organization and unit rather than the participant in adult education activities.

The Dean, however, seemed to view objectives as important for the learner. He was somewhat atypical of most other informants. Although he noted that he was not involved at this level of programming, he offered his views about how he thought objectives were established.

The programmer's themselves get much more involved in terms of the construction of very specific courses. It all requires the identification of very specific kinds of objectives.... They get involved very technically in the design of things, in other words, I don't do that.

According to UUH, programmers established "almost behavioral objectives" which were then presented to faculty and advisory groups for comments and revision. In addition, they set objectives by talking with both the faculty and instructors about what they ought to do." He thought variety in establishing objectives was a function of personal style. The dean and instructor two presented a similar view but one different from the other informants because they both seemed concerned with learning objectives. It differs from other respondents' views because there was no mention of unit or organizational goals.

**Summation.** Objectives and goals were terms used in both a programmatic and an individual level. Programmatic goals or objectives were largely instrumental and were used most commonly to assist programmers in performing some other operation such as securing resources. Only instructor two and the dean spoke about objectives at the learner level. It is interesting that the dean who could be expected to have a broad organizational view did not mention program, unit, or organizational goals; but rather chose to talk about learning objectives, and it is equally
striking that instructor one spoke about organizational goals and did not mention learning goals.

Selecting and sequencing learning activities

Several levels of activity were represented in this operation. Three informants were specifically asked about the operation in phase two before they offered comments. One of the three, UP1, responded that he was not involved in selecting and sequencing activities. "By in [sic] large, I don't worry about that. That's a problem for the department, the faculty and whatever powers that are concerned about teaching the curriculum."

After disclaiming primary responsibility for this operation UP1 acknowledged the unit's interest in expanding university access to potential clients and the way this operation related to the effort. For example, correspondence and distance learning were two ways the university was trying to reach new students. To augment the unit's ability to provide quality learning activities UP1 reported that "we have an instructional design specialist now who works with all the faculty who are course authors. There is a theory developing. So we do get involved in the larger sense." This larger sense seemed to be limited to involvement in assisting authors of correspondence courses as they planned courses. UP1's involvement in this operation was replaced by an expert's involvement.

Programmer Two, on the other hand, described an operation in which he was highly involved. He reported initially researching "information on what other programs were going on" in order to gain a perspective on a management program for women. This activity provided him with a sequence, which he presented to faculty members and then he "worked with faculty in the development of each of the courses." This exchange and cooperative effort established a series of courses within the foundation program that
were subject to change as a result of information gathered during evaluation of the program. UP2 explained how evaluation had affected learning activities.

We haven't changed the content of the course in terms of . . . accounting, finance, the kind of content we haven't changed. We're modifying some of the approaches to it... For instance, a course in finance . . . these are supposed to be three-day modules. . . . The finance course is a lot of lecture. . . . I think the instructor is convinced now that it really needs to be split over two days. We split the quantitative analysis over two different [days] . . .

UP2's involvement in this activity occurred at two different points. He initially set the activities in consultation with faculty members and he was also aware of, if not involved in, changing sequences as a result of evaluation efforts. UP2 also perceived individual courses within a program as learning activities. This approach is somewhat different from the way programmer three viewed learning activities.

Programmer Three involved himself in selecting and sequencing learning activities at a sufficiently early stage of program development and this operation may have helped him develop the idea. Both of these operations were directed at a third—securing resources. When UP3 performed this operation, he realized that it might have tentative results.

I subscribe to the storm trooper approach . . . in the sense that you sit down and you do a program. Now that means it can be changed . . . sections can be added, sections may be deleted, you can change the format. . . . But the point is get a program, get it on paper so that at all times you can present yourself, outside the University as doing a program.

UP3 used this program outline as a funding proposal in which learning activities were specified. The outline was further refined by considering alternatives. UP3 explained: "The next part is really to try to dress the program. . . . A big challenge for me particularly in a program development from a university is to try to vary the media if you can. In other words are there some really good films that are good to include."
UP3 also noted that tours were sometimes used to help vary a program's learning experiences, but that the decision to use such devices depended on the audience. In addition, the program itself helped define appropriate learning activities. "You've got to maintain a certain level at all times. So certain activities might take away from that. At the same time [there] are other things that you might say are borderline and you sort of take a risk."

Sometimes learning activities were selected and developed spontaneously during a program. UP3 described a tour of a city by night to examine drug abuse. "It all happened quite casually. They were all standing in a big group, mixing ..." A former Royal Canadian Mounted Police investigator offered to lead the tour, and the program's two keynote speakers, professors of psychology and jurisprudence, as well as other conference participants went on the tour. In this case, UP3 felt that the spontaneous tour was a proper and useful addition to the conference.

UP3 was highly involved in selecting and sequencing learning activities. From his description of this operation, it seemed to be accomplished early and tentatively and was used for the accomplishment of other operations.

Instructor One, when asked how learning activities were selected and sequenced, noted that he conscientiously decided to not use discussion groups as a major learning activity because of his bias that "the sharing of ignorance ... often occurs in discussion groups [and is] a waste of my time." UI1 selected and sequenced a number of different activities to provide some variety with little external consultation. However, this sequencing was modified when suggestions were made.

It did become clear to me that you needed to sequence the activities and in fact, I learned this by talking with U on the telephone when I sent him my first proposal. He reacted by saying, "We think you've got a good conference here and we would like to
support it . . . the one thing I'd like you to think about is the way you've got your conference planned, the sequence of events. I think you may want to think about moving them around a little bit." . . . we followed his advice. . . . I refined it, made it more prominent.

A logical pattern to the program was provided by the sequence and enabled UI1 to conceptualize it as having "a beginning, a body, and an end." He indicated this pattern was used in a subsequent program in which he was involved and will be used in a future program.

UI1 used a variety of activities and sequenced them by following advice from a potential supporter of the program. He seemed to be unaware of sequencing until the above conversation. He later reported that this awareness provided help in sequencing activities in at least one subsequent program.

Instructor Two used the experience of program participants to determine appropriate learning activities. He indicated that he had a preference for group activities. "... We like to try and get people to work in groups for just the whole exchange of information aside from accounting. Just the whole socialization." UI2 found natural groupings and determined the levels of the participants experience. Based on this analysis, UI2 assembled "overhead transparencies, problems, group projects, quizzes, different types of feedback projects to fit the type of content" he taught.

Usually his materials came from available resources. While UI2 noted he rarely developed material such as cases and problems exclusively for this program, they were subject to revision based upon feedback from the participants.

UI2 reported future plans to secure examples of budgets from organizations that would be used in learning activities. "I'm going to ask . . . 'Could you send a copy of your local budget' . . . so that when we're
putting together a workshop on budgeting that we have... some really excellent real world examples to draw on."

UI2's comments demonstrated that he relied upon participants' experience, interests, and comments to select activities and refine his selection. In addition to these factors, UI2 also reported using content as a determinant of learning activities after he was asked how he selected and sequenced learning activities. He noted: "... I look at the different topical areas and I try and figure out which different type of an activity a group discussion, or monologue, a lecture from me, a problem, a quiz, would best put those people in the position of learning that information."

Numerous factors were reported by UI2 in considering how learning activities were selected. The most important seemed to be the individual learner and the content.

The Administrative Assistant responded to a question about this operation with brief comments that indicated that this operation was performed by someone other than himself. "... That's done by the director, the academic department involved... and by the instructor."

US felt the content was a major determinant of activities and also noted that activities were subject to change based upon program evaluation results. US reported his involvement as minimal in this operation as did the dean.

The Dean made few observations about selecting and sequencing learning activities and reported not being involved in this operation. When asked if there was anything else in the program planning process that should be noted, he replied: "Not at the level which I work. The programmers themselves, of course, are that much more involved in terms of, ... the
construction of very specific courses. . . . They get involved very technically in the design of things where I don't do that."

UUH's involvement was obvious in other operations such as developing ideas but he understood the importance of selecting and sequencing learning activities. For example, he felt activity sequence should be tested. "Well, the ideas are tested out, rationale, purpose, procedures, how the program might be organized in terms of, far beyond content, but in terms of how it might be offered whether it might be packaged, weekly or intensively or whatever."

The dean reported that after the procedures and format had been tested, programmers revised and expanded program proposals for further consideration. The dean's involvement seemed to be more pronounced in other operations than in this one. He referred to these activities as technical and occurring at a level at which he was not involved. UUH was more informative as he discussed the next operation, ensuring participation.

**Summation.** This operation was performed in a variety of ways by the informants. Some were not involved directly, others were highly involved. Informants who were highly involved presented an evolutionary approach. The first step in this approach was a careful consideration of participants' experience, programmers' or instructors' preference, and content constraints. A second step was usually a reconsideration of learning activities after some kind of trial which included written proposals, one-day seminars with potential participants, and initial offerings of programs. Learning activities also seemed to be subject to change depending on program evaluation results. This operation was performed by most informants in order to accomplish multiple purposes. Among those purposes was ensuring participation.
Ensuring participation

This operation provided examples of nonlinear program planning. Participation was considered by most informants as they established objectives, developed ideas, and selected learning experiences.

Programmer One commented that as ideas developed, they were checked "with external sources." He went on to explain: "We may look around and say, 'Anyone out there interested in... some upper division work in tourism?' Do you hear any voices?"

More formal efforts in this operation were described by UP1 as he mentioned general and specific advertising efforts. "We put out general information about programs but every semester there's two or three or four... courses that we sort of earmark and say, 'Hey, this is a new course, this is a new area.' In addition to our regular promotion we are going to generate a flyer."

UP1 reported that instructors developed the descriptions used in flyers and someone in Continuing Studies edited the material. The flyers were sent to targeted audiences. He reported few activities in this operation, perhaps due to the fact that Continuing Studies had a person who was involved in ensuring participation as a full time job and UP1 did not view his role as securing participation.

Programmer Two, much like programmer one, reported activities that helped insure participation as well as develop the ideas but in more detail. In addition to developing parts of the program with departmental faculty members, UP2 reported "enough sort of touching base with industry to see that the needs were there, the interests were there, that there would be support from the community."

Not only were needs and interests assessed, but also future community support was determined. UP2 used ad hoc seminars as a part of planning the
Foundations in Management Program, which allowed him to determine support for this program. He also reported the seminars built "within the organization... a certain amount of support so that the other kinds of things I do, I continue to get support from that organization." This kind of contact early in the program planning process helped UP2 secure support for his programs. For the Foundation Program, this support was demonstrated by companies sending employees and paying for their participation.

Credibility of the Foundations Program, which UP2 defined as "acceptancy by the business community" was achieved in two ways. First was by using faculty that had academic affiliation with University A. Second was establishing "application forms, and recommendation forms, and employer support forms... [for] the people to get in. They had an application process that's probably more complex than the MBA program." Credibility was thought to be important in marketing the program. Marketing was a term UP2 used often as he described this operation. UP2 explained that "I always think in marketing terms anyway. So from day one I was really thinking about how would I promote this and market this." UP2 reported the results of this deliberation as being prestigious looking and expensive brochures describing the Foundations Program.

UP2 described at least five steps or activities used in marketing this program: (1) establishing objectives as described in a previous operation; (2) mailing brochures accompanied by a letter written by UP2 and signed by the Chairman of the School of Economics and Business Administration which described the program, objectives, and kinds of participants who should attend; (3) obtaining media coverage; (4) selecting participants; and (5) involving employers in program evaluation. This was intended to insure participation for other programs as UP2 explained:
I'm looking to this program [the Foundations program] for doing other kinds of things. Other programs both with women and employers in management. So we said as part of this program we would, besides the regular courses that go on, ... would bring employers and the group together ...

This activity of bringing employers and the participants together helped market the Continuing Studies Division as well as the Foundations Program which seemed to be a general investment for future programs UP2 might plan. He used this particular program to assist in marketing future programs by establishing the division's credibility.

Another program UP2 described was developed because of a human resource within the University. An instructor who was well known for research about the human brain provided the impetus for developing a program dealing with brain hemispheres. "I got a hold of T [and] said, 'I think this is a neat idea for a program' and we talked about who would be interested."

After potential audiences had been identified, UP2 reported that the division developed a brochure, designed a media plan, and established a mailing list. The media plan included not only articles in newspapers but also the identification of "local associations who could help us market the program in terms of talking to people in those associations."

At least two differences are evident in the way ensuring participation occurred for the Foundation Program and the brain research program. The first is involvement of the instructor. This is likely due to a difference in the sequence of operations as each program was planned: in the brain research program a resource was first secured and a program planned; in the Foundations Program resources were secured after some initial development. The second difference is the complexity between the two operations. The Foundations Program was a highly complex affair, while the brain research program was comparatively simple. This difference may
have been due to anticipation of a sustained program on the one hand and an ad hoc or single event on the other hand.

UP2's descriptions provided a contrast of operations not only in the same unit but also used by the same individual. The second set of activities used by UP2 seemed similar to the activities described by UP1. The first set of activities were the most complex used by any informant with the exception of the account provided by programmer three.

Programmer Three presented data that detailed a complex operation. Ensuring participation was considered important and was recognized as needing to be thought about early in the planning process. UP3 explained: "It was very important that very early on, in fact immediately, we gained the support of those groups who would be able to make this thing fly or let it fall."

Support of groups was obtained by letting groups know the program planners were familiar with a group's perspectives and that the purpose of the program was to create a forum where groups could exchange information about perspectives. Interests groups were also asked to refer names of potential program participants and potential issues for the program. UP3 described a "broad input process" that was related to developing ideas but effectively provided a basis for ensuring participation. UP3 described the use of this basis:

Now that we have asked those people to participate and now that they have had so much input into our program, we ask them to promote it throughout their organizations. In other words, they give the stamp of approval. . . . if they feel that the program is really going to be good for their people, I find people tremendously helpful. They will publicize it in their newsletters, they will promote it through their departments, they will initiate and organize funding.

Coopting external agencies was one of several activities used to perform this operation. UP3 also described others: direct mail, newspaper
advertisements, and brochures. These activities were based upon "choosing the right look, and feel and description for A) the topic and B) the people that you're trying to reach."

UP3 considered this operation early in the planning process. He performed other operations such as developing the idea, with ensuring participation as a possible result. This approach combined operations and provided evidence that program planning might not always be an activity which was sequential and comprised of discrete steps or operations. For example, ensuring participation was also a part of securing resources in terms of meeting facilities because accessibility of potential audience was considered by UP3 as a factor in selecting meeting facilities. Even though UP3 and instructor one described the same program, their conceptualizations of this operation were significantly different.

Instructor One noted that UP3 and other Continuing Studies staff handled the activities in this operation. U11's description included a preliminary announcement which he wrote and UP3 designed. A brochure, newspaper ads, notifications in professional journals, as well as radio and television were also involved. He mentioned a publicity officer from Continuing Studies being involved.

U11's comments were limited and described a fairly rigid process of insuring participation. His brief description was of a discrete activity similiar to the observation of instructor two.

Instructor Two, when asked about this operation, offered comments that demonstrated he was not involved on a broad programmatic level. U12's concerns about participation were concentrated upon individual learners after they had registered in the program. He discussed participation in instructional terms:
I guess participation is the thing that really relates to me not necessarily whether they attend 'cause I leave that up to Continuing Ed. In terms of participating at the beginning I structure certain things like these group activities or I really make a point at every class of saying that what you get out of it is going to have a lot to do with your ability or your willingness to speak up and say things because I only can learn from openness.

UI2 also noted he individually approached people who he felt were not participating in learning activities and asked about his instruction in terms of meeting their needs.

These comments placed UI2's activities outside the operation of program planning and within the sphere of providing instruction. His comments were similar to the other instructor's comments about this operation. His comments offered a contrast to those of the administrative assistant.

The Administrative Assistant, noted several times that he was involved in providing logistics and marketing programs. He explained marketing the foundations program as producing "a brochure, an extensive, quality brochure. We use direct mail. Mainly government, larger businesses.... It's directed to the senior executive of the businesses and we use advertising." US noted that the advertisements appeared in newspapers and professional journals. He also noted the program was being talked about because it was known in the business community. This provided a new dimension of marketing which US was not involved in.

Even though US described marketing or ensuring participation as a discrete activity or set of activities, he viewed this operation as involved in others. He explained:

... the marketing is an integral component of program development ... I mean it's based on needs, it's based on clientele, ... and that's all part of program planning. ... I mean when I'm talking about marketing, I'm not talking about just the direct mail, or just the newspaper advertising, or media relations. Its image, it's identifying your client well ... it's just right from the very beginning. Starting to plan for a program your marketing has to be involved in that.
He explained further: "Marketing is involved in identifying the clientele, who would be interested [in] the needs, the program. Marketing is involved in the format... what kind of a program is it going to be? Is it going to be a workshop? Is it going to be a conference?"

This concept of marketing was consistent with the concept of marketing as held by the university programmers as they noted the importance of marketing considerations as the program developed. US seemed to view ensuring participation not as a discrete operation but as one that was part of other activities. The dean also recognized early consideration of marketing as important.

The Dean's responses were a result of direct probing about insuring participation. His comments were similar to instructor one's in that they described a discrete set of activities. These activities according to UUH were performed by a "marketing person." He noted:

We have a full-time person who works in marketing... and not always but generally speaking that person is brought in very early in an event... so that person can get an idea of what the program's about, what kind of clientele, and at that point working with a programmer and they are supposed to, whether they do or don't, but they are are supposed to start working in mailing lists--things of that sort.

The dean explained that mailing lists were developed for every program, whether it was a single event or a programmatic effort. He noted that the marketing specialist developed an idea of what the program was about and what kind of clientele would likely attend.

This description was not as detailed nor was it as complex as those provided by most of the informants from Continuing Studies. This difference was due, in part, to the dean's isolation from the details of program planning. His report of the process was not as rich as the reports provided by the people involved.
Summation. Ensuring participation occurred at several levels of complexity. Activities in this operation varied among programmers. However, generally programmers tended to describe a complex operation, while instructors and the dean described a fairly rigid sequential set of discrete activities, or they were unable to comment about the operations. This operation is one that seemed to be present throughout the process of program planning.

Securing resources

This operation has usually referred to securing instructors, funds and facilities. A new element of resources was introduced in the context of University A: academic support. UP1 described this set of activities.

Programmer One mentioned several kinds of resources necessary for programs: instructors; funds; facilities; and support from university academic units. UP1 noted that instructors for his programs were selected by departmental chairman and faculty deans. He explained this in terms of a model. "One of the models we work on here is that all of the academic appointments are academic appointments. Continuing Studies doesn't make appointments to teach credit courses."

UP1 noted that Continuing Studies made suggestions about individuals but the appointment came from the university's academic units. If an instructor came from outside the University, UP1 noted that "it would be the department's responsibility to find the person."

UP1 also mentioned funding as a resource and noted that he had some ability to make decisions about funding trial programs. After the toxicology program demonstrated its viability, increased funding became a problem. To obtain additional funds, UP1 reported to his dean and the dean of Science that this was a successful program and should be funded at
increased levels. UP1 noted he had enough funds from his budget that he could try experimental programs. When the programs demonstrated some viability and were expanded further, funds were obtained from other sources.

When asked about facilities, UP1 reported that programs he planned were often scheduled at University A through a central scheduling office. Sometimes programs were held off campus because special facilities were needed. At other times programs were held off campus to increase accessibility.

Most of the activities in this operation described by UP1 seemed to be common to other programmers. Programmer Two, for example, also reported being concerned with securing support for his program.

Programmer Two reported activities that were designed to obtain support from two areas. The first was support from academic units. As previously noted, UP2 was initially turned down by the Business Administration Department when he approached them with the idea for the foundations program.

With the department's tacit approval, UP2 then cultivated support from the second area: business and industry. This was done in order to obtain conceptual support as well as financial support for the program.

When UP2 felt conceptual and financial support was evident, he returned to the academic department. This time he involved faculty members in determining program content. Support from the university was important in obtaining faculty members.

I would have never gotten the resources that I wanted from the university unless they felt the program was of the highest calibre . . . I had to make that program good or the people would have never taken part in it, because they were refusing to take part in programs. . . .
To identify individual instructors, UP2 "went to the chairman of the Business Administration Department and said: "Who's really good in this area and who's likely to be able to take part in this and who can I even talk to for advice?"

Because of high fees, UP2 could and chose to pay instructors well to increase the quality of the program. He commented about the instructors and their fees:

I wanted them to be credible in terms of their colleagues . . . and I also pay them very well. And resources, I've no problem because with this kind of program you can charge a lot of money. This program was financed through fees charged to individual participants which were usually paid by their company. UP2 noted the fees were high where business valued things according to their costs.

UP2 felt that the program was held in expensive hotels downtown because "that's where men hold their meetings. Again it was establishing the credibility. . . . It was establishing the image of the program." Facilities were considered in terms of what they contributed to the programs. Facilities, funds, and instructors seemed to be based upon support from the University and business. Support was a crucial resource for UP2 and programmer three.

Programmer Three, as noted in the preceding operation, commented that support of certain groups was crucial to the success of the Family Choices in Education Conference. Support was defined as either cooperation or cosponsorship. UP3 explained the difference.

We secured cooperation, not cosponsorship but cooperation with the Federation of Independent Schools, with the Ministry of Education. . . . The difference is highly significant for me, and from what I gather after three and a half years I've worked with the faculty, it becomes significant to them too in working very actively with outside organizations. Cooperation implies that there is input from an outside organization, that there is perhaps even financial support in terms of a grant, there is input. Those people, representatives of an organization, may sit on an advisory committee
for example. But the editorial responsibility... lies with the university. "In cooperation with these other people" means that they have been - you've consulted them and it is a team effort with the community. However, cosponsorship implies there's a sharing of editorial responsibility.

Support was obtained by directly contacting organizations that were perceived to have an interest in the conference topic. Organizational representatives were asked for their comments and views about issues. From these efforts a program outline was developed that was used to help secure funding for the conference from many of the organizations.

Funding was viewed by UP3 as a consideration made early in the program development process. He explained:

Well the funding is already pretty clear in your mind from the beginning. I mean you should know already in advance. In fact, you can't totally separate the manner in which you conduct all that preliminary stuff from the funding. Because you can't do the program without funding. That doesn't ever mean you sell out and say, "Oh well, let's do this because we can get money." That's never a criteria [sic], unless it's a kind of a thing that's minor or incidental to the program.

Funds as a resource were based upon support for the conference that was generated during another operation: developing the idea.

Finding and securing instructors were related to support for the conference by the faculty. UP3 noted that he and a faculty member contributed some information and skill to the process of selecting instructors. UP3 described this process as: a phone call placed by UP3 to the potential instructor; a joint evaluation of the potential instructor by UP3 and a faculty member; and a follow-up letter written by UP3 extending an invitation to participate with specific details about date, time, travel, honorarium, and format. Selection of instructors was based upon UP3's impression from telephone conversations, the faculty member's assessment of the potential instructor's professional reputation and a joint evaluation between UP3 and the faculty member.
Another factor UP3 reported in securing resources was selecting a meeting place. The nature of a program helped establish criteria for selecting a meeting place. UP3 noted that a program should be accessible, and for this reason some programs were held at downtown locations. If a program was designed with the intent that participants stay for the whole event, then UP3 reported considering "a retreat if you want to insure that people will focus on each other rather than get together with their groups and take off." He noted other aspects of a program causing a programmer to select a retreat location, would be a desire to have instructors be frank, and a desire to limit accessibility of the press. When a program was designed to have an academic atmosphere it was on the university campus. Selection of meeting facilities was a crucial part of program design for UP3 because facilities were viewed as enhancing certain parts of conferences.

Securing resources was broadly conceived by UP3. He was aware of university support, funding, instructors, and meeting locations and seemed to understand how each of these resources affected a program. Instructor one was aware of resources in a narrower conceptualization than programmers.

Instructor One was aware of university support as a resource. This support was agreement from the academic unit that a program idea should be tried as a University program. U11 explained the process of gaining support and what support meant to an idea.

Now . . . what I've done is to secure the approval of the Faculty of Education, the executive committee, that this be a Faculty of Education sponsored conference next year. That legitimates the conference and it means that I can go to [UP3] in Continuing Studies to help me organize it.
UI1 perceived that Continuing Studies was responsive to faculty ideas. He explained:

Continuing Studies does not sponsor any programs of their own. They only work to support individual faculties, departments, or persons within faculties who wish to put on programs. As long as that person in my case can obtain the authority though the Faculty to do the conference, they will do what they can to help.

In this framework, Continuing Studies was a university resource for running programs. UI1 also noted other resources that needed to be secured, but he emphasized that funding was the most important.

UI1 noted that he and the programmer wrote a proposal which included a budget which was customized and submitted to identified funding sources. UI1 explained the steps involved:

[UP3] suggested in each case that what we should do would be make an appointment to have lunch with the person representing the source that we need the money from. We went to meet with the individual at a place and had lunch with him. At the time we explored in general terms what kinds of interests he thought his organization might have in helping us with the conference. And we raised the question about financial assistance and we got a sense from the conversation of what was possible from their point of view.

Then in the covering letter I would pick up some of the language that had come out during that particular lunch and reflect it in the letter and then ask for whatever seemed a reasonable amount based upon the conversation.

The preliminary meeting tested the likelihood of agency funding and at what level. This process also affected development of the program idea. In talking with agencies the faculty member and programmer found some areas they added to the programs. As noted above, he asked for comments from agency representatives. Sometimes funding was obtained with explicit conditions. UI1 explained:

The Ministry contract stipulated that we had to have a member of their staff on the program advisory committee. So we created a program advisory committee consisting of [UP3] and myself, the representative of the Ministry and the Executive Director of the Federation of Independent Schools. The four of us constituted the program advisory committee.
The Secretary of State of Canada also supported the program financially. To obtain funding from this source, a multicultural emphasis was included in the program because of federal desires, thus affecting the program idea. Two program planning operations seemed to take place concurrently: developing the idea and securing resources.

The last resource mentioned by U11 was instructors. He described identifying key people:

We started ... identifying key people who we thought could be that keynote speaker and I knew some of these people. I would phone some of these people ... and say, "What do you know of this person, does he speak well, is he a real bore? ... Because of my general interests in the area, I already knew some of these people well enough to be able to say they speak well. So we began to assemble resource people for the program.

U11 played an important role in selecting instructors. This action was shared by the programmer and the faculty member. This shared responsibility had some similarities with the actions reported by both instructors in the school district unit. They also located potential instructors, but in a much more independent manner than did the instructors in the university.

U11 also noted that support for the program had to be obtained from two divergent groups: those who supported independent schools; and those who supported public schools. Divergent groups resulted in limiting the amount of financial support from some groups. For example, $2000.00 were accepted from the Federation for Independent Schools. As a result $2000.00 were accepted from the Ministry of Education and the same from the British Columbia Teachers' Federation.

U11 was highly active in this operation and seemed to behave more like a programmer than an instructor. This perception may have been a function of the program planning model used by Continuing Studies. Instructor two, however, provided no evidence to help establish this conclusion.
Instructor Two responded with information only after being asked about securing resources. His comments indicated that the program as interpreted by the instructor dictated the kinds of facilities needed. UI2 explained:

Continuing Ed asks me what type of facilities that I need in terms of equipment, and the ambience, and, ... I guess just that whole surrounding. And then I just give them my general idea for each different type of group of things that I need and then they go out in the market place and find the best ones that fit those kinds of requirements within their budget.

These comments, which were UI2's only observations about securing resources, indicate that the program sets criteria for the kinds of meeting facilities needed. These same criteria were mentioned by the administrative assistant.

The Administrative Assistant commented about two criteria used in locating facilities. One was easy access for program participants. The other was high quality facilities because the program's image was considered important.

Budgeting or funding for programs was also mentioned by US. He noted that he was involved in noncredit programs and that they must generate revenue. He explained:

Most of the noncredit ... is revenue based. They have to generate enough revenue to carry their operating costs anyway. ... I do the actual budgeting for the programs And ... so much depends on the marketing and clientele that you think you will be able to get to the program. You set your fees on that budget and decide according to the budget whether its a go or a no go.

Programs in which US and UP2 were involved were designed to develop their own financial resources.

When asked about instructor selection, US noted they were selected after content areas had been established by Continuing Studies. He explained that instructors from the university were selected by both UP2 and various department heads. He also mentioned that people approached UP2 as potential instructors.
... and people approach him as well. One very good example was that psychology had a visiting professor this past semester in Florida. She had all sorts of experience in teaching management programs for women, and also working with nonprofit groups. And she came to UP2, and said... "I'm interested in doing this sort of thing, I have a background in it," and she fit.

Usually this activity of securing instructors was a joint effort by UP2 and the relevant department chairman.

Even though US had certain responsibilities for securing resources, he did not perform tasks independently.

I'm responsible for certain areas... like logistics... But I would never do anything without consulting with UP2 and it's just a constant back and forth. "What do you think of this? Will this work? Can you really afford to put it in a hotel or does it have to be held on campus because of budget costs? It's two way always almost in all aspects.

US seemed highly involved in most aspects of securing resources and perhaps in other operations also. Compared to his counterparts in the school district and college, he was involved on a broader basis. However, US did not seem to have the latitude that the secretary in the school district had in terms of hiring instructors. The dean offered a contrast to the level of involvement reported by US.

The Dean gave a broad description of securing resources. One of the first areas of resources mentioned by UUH was university support. For him it was a conscientious effort: The Dean was active in "securing university support for the idea, departmental or faculty support, and that requires establishing a rationale for the program and thinking about intended clientele." He categorized this as a continuing political process. UUH noted that after a program had been planned and was running, the programmer would check back with the faculty or department to make sure the program was consistent with original understandings.

According to UUH, establishing a budget was done for two reasons. First was a consideration of finances, the greater part of which were
obtained through fees paid by participants, in addition to grants from outside agencies like foundations and companies. The second purpose was providing a "dry run" for a program.

Instructors were usually obtained from the university faculty with suggestions from a programmer. If an instructor was from outside the university, the division attempted to find out about potential instructors through telephone calls.

Like instructors, facilities could come from either the university or community. Facilities were determined by: "the nature of the program. Depending on whether that program is most appropriately at [University A] or downtown. It depends upon availability. Quite often we want it at . . . [University A] of course it can't be there because all of the rooms are being used."

UUH went on to note that the campus lacked resident facilities and as a result residential programs were held downtown. The dean's comments were more general in nature but were essentially concerned with four items mentioned by other informants: organizational support; funds; instructors; and facilities.

**Summation.** Support of the organization was critical for Continuing Studies' programs and was obtained by several methods. The most predominant was the model of program planning used by the informants, which required academic support for programs planned. Another method of gaining support was by involving faculty members in the development of ideas. Selecting instructors was also influenced by gaining support from the university. Other sources of support for some programmers were usually sought from the community. For example, funding for programs came from participant fees, and might be a reason community support was obtained. Facilities were largely determined by access of the target population and
by the nature of program requirements. It seemed programmers did not have preconceived notions about where programs were to be held. They let the requirements of programs indicate the most appropriate meeting facilities.

**Evaluating**

Activities described in conjunction with this operation were varied: evaluating was reportedly done formally and informally; sometimes it was standardized and other times it was not. The purposes of evaluating also varied: some informants used it to determine success of learners; others used it to find out how well programs met community needs. At times evaluation was used to generate new programs. Programmer One provided an example of the last two purposes.

**Programmer One** described a joint activity between himself and an instructor. He explained to the instructor what Continuing Studies wanted from an evaluation and the instructor produced a questionnaire. UP1 explained:

> In this particular case I had worked with the instructor. I'd indicated the kind of information that we wanted from it. He also had his own idea about the kind of information he wanted. So he produced a questionnaire which I looked at and agreed "... this will serve our purposes jointly." He administered it and collected the data.

Results from the questionnaire provided ideas for other programs. UP1 explained that offering a course and evaluating it enabled them to offer several programs which soon evolved into an Extended Studies Diploma proposal. This activity provided another example of two operations being performed in one action. Evaluating and generating ideas seemed to happen at the same time. Generating ideas in this instance seemed serendipitous when compared to the deliberate nature of evaluating.

UP1 noted that evaluating was done to answer the following questions: first, were needs of working students being met? Second, were needs of
professionals being met? Unless these questions were answered positively, UP1 felt the course could have been properly offered as part of the regular curriculum of the University. Associated with evaluating was an extension unit's role as an experimental agent for a university. UP1 explained that even if no needs mentioned above were judged to be met he still would have considered the offerings successful because "you need a little nudge, a little experimental fund shall we say to try something. That's one of the things an extension unit does is to be an experimental vehicle for the departments and faculties to try something." This experimentation was evaluated by using data from students. Part-time students offered information that was used to help determine content of future courses. This information provided "ideas about what your next course ought to be or what a program might be."

UP1 mentioned that instructors wanted some information from evaluations. Instructors were interested in gaining ideas for research projects and in determining how well the course was received. In addition to these instructor purposes, three program purposes might be achieved by evaluations. First, they helped generate the next stage in thinking for the diploma courses. Second, they provided ideas for future courses. Third, they provided the rationale for releasing the instructor from teaching and other assignments to develop a formal proposal for the diploma program.

Programmer Two, in addition to other purposes, evaluated the Foundations in Management Program as building support for future programs. UP2 reported bringing together participants and their sponsors soon after the first program was concluded. UP2 noted that they discussed what should be changed in the program as a formative evaluation and provided him with
contacts to discuss future programming. "We now have established relationships with these companies, so that we have contacts with them for all sorts of other things."

Other purposes of evaluation included evaluation of learners, instructors, and program content sequence. UP2 reported that learners were assessed in terms of individual feedback based upon projects and group work. He also noted instructors who did an inadequate job and received poor evaluations were subject to removal. "I have an unwritten agreement with instructors. If anyone is unsatisfactory then we'll get rid of them."

UP2 reported evaluating every course within the program and using the results to improve subsequent courses. Involvement of sponsors in evaluation seemed to be designed to insure participation in other offerings of the management program as well as unrelated programming efforts. This purposeful evaluating appeared to be different from evaluating performed by programmer three.

Programmer Three considered evaluation important for all programs. He did not think that evaluation had to be done immediately after a program's conclusion, sometimes evaluation instruments were mailed to participants after a program concluded. UP3 felt that a structured evaluation was important for one-time events such as conferences. However, he also noted that these were usually modified.

... I think a program evaluation has to be structured for say a conference or a one-time get together ... based on questions that are going to emerge as a result of the conference. ... You ... [have] sort of a standard one or maybe something in your mind ahead of time or on paper. But then you might want to adapt.

UP3 made no mention of how the results were used. This may be understandable because UP3 dealt primarily with single event programs where evaluation results probably had minimal utility. This view was articulated by instructor one.
When Instructor one was asked by the investigator to comment on evaluation, he offered the following comments:

At the outset of the program, when [UP3] and I first met, [UP3] asked, "Do you want to have an evaluation questionnaire put in the package of materials?" I said, "No, frankly I don't." I think they are largely a waste of time. They don't tell me a lot. I can tell at the time of the conference whether it's successful or not successful.

UI1 went on to note that he personally evaluated the conference as it met the five objectives during the planning process. The objectives were: (1) to hold an international symposium examining dimensions of family choice in education; (2) to achieve visibility for University A; (3) to hold the symposium in conjunction with the BC Council for Leadership in Educational Administration; (4) to generate some revenue above cost; and (5) to publish an original set of papers based upon the conference. Using these criteria, UI1 noted that "all five of the statements were achieved and that for me was sufficient in terms of evaluation. I didn't need any more than that."

Setting objectives and then personally deciding about their achievement was the major way UI1 evaluated. He did not require feedback from participants and when questionnaires were used he viewed them only as confirming his personal judgment. UI1 explained:

Now in the case of the second conference ... [UP3] was concerned that we didn't have an evaluation instrument. He developed one, I reacted to it and modified it. It was sent out. We got evaluations back. But although the evaluations came back, they in no way changed our original estimate or judgment of the success of the conference that we made at the time it was held. It simply provided some written statements confirming our perceptions.

Using his judgment about how well criteria were met, UI1 seemed to rely upon his own expert opinion rather than on the results of a questionnaire. Instructor one believed that standardized evaluations served no purpose other than to provide written evidence supporting expert opinion.
In contrast to this approach, Instructor Two used evaluations to modify his courses. UI2 performed evaluation by talking informally with participants and by using a standard evaluation form prepared by Continuing Studies. UI2 also checked with UP2 to obtain any informal feedback he had. UI2 explained how he used results of evaluations. "I get copies [of the instruments] after the course is over, of all that feedback. And so I look at that in terms of... next year..."

Because the course was held a second time, UI2 used results to modify the next program. For him, evaluating seemed to be rather simplistic in terms of its use. He relied upon both formal and informal results. The administrative assistant provided a broader view of evaluating than did UI2.

The Administrative Assistant described an operation that dealt with evaluating participants, courses, results, and program administration. US explained that participants were sometimes contacted to see if they were using skills learned in the program. Courses were changed based upon results of evaluation. He noted: "Courses are changed, evaluating the women as they go through each course--some of those procedures have changed. What we started out with wasn't quite working." Administering the program was also evaluated. This included hospitality, organization, and marketing.

US also mentioned that evaluating occurred constantly: "It's constantly being evaluated both with the participants, with the employers who are sponsoring the women who are going through it, with the instructors. Each course is evaluated as it happens and the program is evaluated."

US briefly described a comprehensive and involved operation; comprehensive because it involved many facets of the program such as
participants, instructor, and sponsors; involved, because it dealt with courses specifically, the program generally, and the results operationally.

This comprehensive view of evaluating was also shared by the Dean. UUH did not use a specific example to illustrate his comments, but they were similar to those made by other informants in Continuing Studies. He noted that questionnaires were mailed after the event had taken place. He also noted that a "good programmer" would "not only talk to a lot of people during the event itself and after the event they'll visit some of them and bring small groups of two or three people together. That's a far richer source of getting data than a questionnaire is."

This creative method of evaluating was not described by other informants except when UI2 reported talking with people during a program. UUH moved evaluation to another level as he described evaluating the Foundations Program.

From time to time, we bring together all the participants and their employers . . . and look at it. OK we've been doing this for a year so what do you think about it. And we'll stage an event where we have a couple of great presentations . . . we want to make them feel like this is an important program, which it is. And then we'll discuss it in terms of various criteria or purposes.

This method of evaluating was described by some other informants. The dean used criteria and purposes as the terms for discussing the program. US, UP2, and UI2 all described evaluating the Foundations program. This program was subject to one of the most comprehensive evaluation exercises described by informants in this study. The dean's brief comments reflected a broad view of this operation.

Summation. Evaluating in Continuing Studies was reported as occurring on several levels and with formality and informality. Complex evaluation methods involved formal meetings with former participants and their employers. Simple evaluations were done by some people noting how well
objectives were achieved. Informal evaluations involve talking with participants about how they felt about a program. Evaluation results were used to change program content, to help in identifying unacceptable instructors, to generate other program ideas, as well as to substantiate need for additional program development of experimental ideas. Evaluating at University A involved more than one program planning operation.

Continuing Studies Division Profiles

The program planning process is next considered within the context of Continuing Studies. The discussions of this unit's technology is a synthesis of the information, which has been presented analytically.

Program ideas were highly influenced by university faculty and staff: ideas seemed to come from faculty research efforts or desires to do research. However, staff within Continuing Studies did originate ideas but involved faculty numbers to the point where faculties claimed some ownership of the idea. Programmatic ideas, that is ideas which deal with a number of adult education events, were given higher status and more emphasis than ideas for one event. Informants seemed to be concerned with those ideas that moved programming efforts into a rational sequence of events. Most of the ideas mentioned by informants came from Continuing Studies staff or university faculty members. When ideas originated exogenously they had to be approved by an academic unit.

Developing the idea was a further expression of moving an idea into either the university or an academic unit within the university. If an idea had its origin outside of the university, then this operation was one of bringing it to an examination by Continuing Studies staff. If the idea originated in an academic unit, then the operation involved making a programmer aware of some of the idea implications. If the idea originated
in Continuing Studies, then this operation was one of gaining support for the concept from academic units. This operation usually took place within the university. Sometimes it involved community groups, but usually after the adult education unit and an academic unit initially developed the idea.

Establishing objectives was seen as one of two kinds of activities. The first was setting the purpose of a program. This level of activity seemed to be highly instrumental for some informants. For example, they reported using this activity to help secure resources and insure participation. Other informants reported using objectives to help learners perform. This operation was usually viewed as a help to performing other operations on a programmatic level.

Selecting and establishing learning activities was an operation that was accomplished with varying amounts of involvement. Some informants were only indirectly involved, leaving this operation to instructional staff while others were highly involved with instructional staff. Those people who selected learning activities did so while considering participants, instructors, and content. Some people also described this as an evolutionary activity where learning activities were reported being subject to change depending upon evaluation results or feedback received because of trial efforts such as one day seminars used to develop and test program ideas.

Ensuring participation was the operation which intensively involved groups and people from outside the university. In some ways this operation was related to at least two other operations. Developing the idea was often reported as a way to ensure participation. Instructors were relied upon by programmers for help in this operation. Usually, informants recognized the instructors as people having some kind of expertise in a content area and thus having the ability to identify the best experts to
obtain for the program or audiences to which a program should be directed. Programmers also helped instructors view programs in a wider perspective. In one example, UP3 helped UI1 understand the interest that practitioners had in family choices in education. As in the other two organizations studied, instructors were not as involved in insuring participation as they were in other operations. Most informants viewed this operation as one that occurred throughout the planning process. Only instructor one and the dean reported it as a discrete operation.

Securing resources was an operation affected by other operations. University support was reported as a resource needed for each program conducted by Continuing Studies. Other operations, especially developing ideas affected Continuing Studies' ability to gain this resource as well as financial resources from outside agencies. Potential funding organizations were brought into developing ideas by programmers sensitive to the need for outside support. Facilities were secured based upon the needs of a program. This approach contrasted with the school district's almost automatic use of district property and the college's lament of inadequate facilities. Programmers at University A gave serious attention to audience access and program image.

Evaluating was done in a number of ways for a number of purposes. Standard evaluation forms were available. However, they were reportedly modified when used. The usual method of evaluating was a combination of customized instruments and informal discussion with participants. Some programmers mentioned using evaluations for the purpose of identifying weak instructors. Some mentioned using it as feedback for participants and some mentioned it as helping determine if unit goals were being met. These various purposes reflect different levels on which evaluation took place:
individual; program; and unit. Evaluation seemed to be informal and designed specifically for each program.

Context

These operations in this unit's technology were highly influenced by the historical development of this unit. Each operation was closely tied to the university. This tie may have been the result of established committee in the faculty senate which had the primary responsibility to oversee noncredit programming. The dean moved the committee away from close supervision to a position of overseeing program efforts. However, he realized the importance of a supportive committee and used cooperation and persuasion to accomplish his goals.

A demonstrated attention for credit programs over noncredit programs was found from reviewing university documents. It may have been this concern for credit that influenced the staff of Continuing Studies to gain the cooperation of academic units in noncredit programs. Perhaps as noncredit programs increase in numbers and gain some historical foundation the emphasis upon academic support for continuing education will decrease in importance.

The change in reporting format from terms "community education" and "students, faculty and staff" to "courses, lectures, conferences, and symposia" suggests movement from extension to a community to extension of the university. Using terms familiar to faculty members may make them more willing to participate in extension activities.

There existed in University A some feeling that Continuing Studies should extend only credit programs and courses to the community. Gaining support of academic departments was one way of assuring that the unit's involvement in noncredit activities would not be viewed negatively by the
university in general. In a sense, Continuing Studies was taking the university with it into noncredit program areas.

The movement of University A into new and different areas was aided by its relative youth. The university was young and had usually looked upon the newness of an organization as an opportunity to experiment and try new programs. People in the adult education unit viewed it as an experimental unit. This may not be its primary role as acknowledged by the dean, but it is a role nonetheless. The historical development of both the organization and the unit has helped evolve the extension model of University A. Both the organization and the unit valued experimentation in programs. The dominance of credit programs in the early years of the unit's existence may have provided a tradition of academic cooperation. These two factors have combined to produce an integrated and dependent model of program planning.

Chapter IX presents each of the three unique models in contrast and attempts to describe them in terms of Thompson's technologies.
CHAPTER IX

COMPARISON OF PROGRAM PLANNING PROFILES

AND THE FRAMEWORK OF TECHNOLOGIES

This chapter examines all three adult education units in an attempt to classify their technology as long-linked, mediating, or intensive technology, or some combination of these. To accomplish this classification three distinct approaches to each unit are taken. First, each unit's organizational relationships are explored. Second, each unit is examined for characteristics of the three technologies. Third, a report of the number of program planning tasks classified by technology is presented. Finally all three units are juxtaposed in an attempt to type their program processes in relation to one another.

Community Education Department

This unit differed from its organization in a number of ways which had an effect upon its organizational relationships. Unit clientele were significantly older than the school age clientele of the organization. Traditional school district programs were not used by the unit as basis for adult education programs to any significant degree; the unit used programs not usually found in other parts of the organization. However, some organizational duties that were not necessarily related to adult education were performed by the unit. Examples of these included: assisting in making personnel assignments; performing district public relations; and administering kindergarten through grade twelve summer school. These duties were performed in an attempt to make the unit more central to its
organization than it would have been otherwise, and they and the related organizational structure were the results of considered efforts by the superintendent and director to integrate the unit with its organization. These efforts have assisted in helping SUH be recognized as a colleague with the senior management staff of the district and in helping make district personnel aware of the unit, thus increasing the probability of the organization using the unit for adult education activities rather than using a local college or institute. The unit was also viewed as a vehicle for experimentation for the district. Examples were provided of programs started in the unit and then transferred to and maintained by the organization.

The relationship between the unit and its organization seemed to be of two types. One was a weak programmatic relationship in which unit programs were planned independently of any influence from district programs. The other type was a strong structural relationship where some organizational maintenance is part of the unit's responsibilities. These relationships provided a context for technology in the unit. The process exhibited the following characteristics of one of Thompson's technology types.

Serial dependence, unitary products, repetition, constancy of rate and concern for the process are all hallmarks of long-linked technology. Serial dependency was evidenced by reliance upon the district brochure for more than ensuring participation. This publication was a control mechanism for accounting and payroll activities. Additionally, planning tasks such as selection of instructors, meeting facilities, and learning activities occurred prior to ensuring participation. Program development was queued to such a degree that the brochure contained most of the unit's programs. Even though program planning was considered as a nonlinear set of
activities, this was the clearest example of serial dependency in any of the three units.

Programs produced by the district tended to be like one another especially when compared to college unit programs. Two comparative measures were the fees charged for programs and the number and kind of subheadings found in the two units' general brochures. Table 16 in Chapter V demonstrated that there was less variation in fees charged for district unit programs than in fees charged for college unit programs. This can be accounted for by less variability in program length, cost, and perceived worth in district programs than in the College programs. The other relative measure was presented in Table 17 of Chapter V. Subheadings which represent groupings of programs were more numerous in the college brochure than in the district brochure. These measures indicated that when compared to programs from the college unit, district programs are unitary with relatively little variance in fees and content.

Repetition was evident from interviewees' testimony and statistical description of the programs sponsored by the department. Programmers, for example, mentioned repeating programs each semester or repeating programs periodically. The statistical description in Chapter V of the kinds of programs held demonstrated that the majority were repeated at least once during a year.

Constancy of rate as noted in Chapter II had two aspects. One was the number of programs held each year. If a unit uses a long-linked technology, then the number of programs produced would not vary significantly from previous years. Table 8 of Chapter V provided some indication that programs were produced at a relatively constant rate unless some external condition disrupted the production process.
The second aspect of constancy of rate was control of the planning process. Most of the control seemed to be centered within the Community Education Department thus facilitating the rapid planning process that SP2 and SUH described. The desire to maintain a constancy of rate also helped explain why some programmers reported an antipathy toward using advisory committees and others failed to mention use of such groups. Some planning tasks were delegated to, assigned to, or expected from other people in the planning process. This distribution of responsibility did not lessen control over the process, rather it helped speed the process so that a maximum of programs could be produced. Tasks were given to others only after some level of trust had been established between the programmer and the person to whom the tasks were given. When little or no trust existed, then programmers performed the tasks or checked the tasks rather carefully. SP1, for example, reported spending hours with potential instructors making sure certain tasks had been performed adequately. Control of the planning process allowed the unit to produce rather large numbers of programs with relatively small numbers of staff members.

The use of a relatively small number of people to produce a large number of programs indicated this unit was approaching the last characteristic outlined by Thompson: instrumental perfection. Large numbers of programs produced by a few people required all of the above characteristics to be present in the planning operation. Rapid planning as described by informants would take place only if control, a constant rate, repetition, and concern for the process were present to some degree. Long-linked technology seemed to be the major type present in the Community Education Department.

However, some characteristics of mediating technology were present in the tasks performed by respondents in the school district. Tasks
classified as mediating technology were usually reported by one interviewee. SP3 accounted for one third of the 27 responses that were classified as mediating tasks. He seemed atypical compared to the other respondents from this unit.

Thompson described mediating technology as having interdependence, client participation, and extensive operations. Interdependence referred to the dependency of the adult education unit, the teacher, and the learner upon one another. The adult education unit in the school district did not exhibit a strong tendency to be dependent upon clients. Some use was made of teachers to perform some operations such as selecting and sequencing learning activities and establishing objectives; however, teachers were not involved in other operations. For example, no instructor activity was reported in ensuring participation. Learners were not involved to a large degree in any kind of an interdependent situation. Client participation is usually limited to instructors and seldom involved learners. The minimal use of advisory committees underscored the absence of client participation. Instructor participation was confined to certain operations and was not evident in the performance of other tasks in the process.

There is little evidence of standardization in program planning in the Community Education Department. The standardization that Thompson referred to seemed unlikely to occur in most adult education situations where the learner and teacher are usually brought together.

The distinguishing characteristics which Thompson listed for intensive technology included: feedback; a variety of techniques; and change. Feedback, other than summative evaluation was found in only one case: two informants reported securing instructors based upon program needs. The use of a variety of techniques was relatively small in relation to the other two units. The evaluating operation had perhaps the greatest variety of
tasks within the unit. However, the major tasks still remained consideration of dropout rates and of client opinion. Because there was a relatively small variation in tasks, the process rarely changed. The three characteristics of intensive technology were not as evident as characteristics of the other two kinds of technology.

The respondents in the school district reported a total of 51 different tasks used in planning programs with some respondents reporting the same or similar tasks. A total of 93 of these kinds of responses were recorded. These tasks and responses were classified by technology and operation and then counted, offering a measure of program planning as one technology or some combination of technologies. The nature of the task and how well it conformed to Thompson's definitions and characteristics of the technologies were the criteria used to classify the tasks. For example Task 1 listed in Appendix B is "Review past programs." This task was reported as one used to originate ideas for programs and by nature it was rapid, efficient, and tended to produce unitary programs. It most closely fit the defined characteristics of long-linked technology and was so classified.

The numbers of tasks were evenly divided between long-linked and mediating technology with 20 tasks being classified in each one. Eleven tasks were classified as intensive technology. Considering only the tasks reported, a conclusion that this unit was evenly divided between the use of long-linked and mediating technologies could be reached. However the number of responses demonstrates a preference for long-linked technology. Of the 93 responses 45 were in long-linked, 30 were in mediating and 18 were in intensive technology.
Conclusion

The Community Education Department was structurally integrated with its organization by some organizational maintenance roles. Technology as conducted in the Department was rapid, efficient, and routinized. The planning operations were uniform, and effective. The products of the process appeared to be relatively uniform. Repetition of programs was evident both within the unit and elsewhere in the organization. Some data exist to support the conclusion that there was only a minimal involvement of the clients, a condition not uncommon in a public school system. Most client involvement was due largely to one informant who was consistently client oriented in his description of program planning tasks.

The majority of responses were long-linked in nature. The next most common kind of tasks and responses were mediating in nature and the least common were intensive. The department used a technology which is closer to long-linked technology than to either of the other two technologies. Results from consideration of the nature of planning tasks indicated a clear preference of long-linked technology in the school district. Such is not the case when the college's adult education unit is considered.

Community Programs and Services Division

This unit had a tradition of being "other directed." Reports from a former director, a programmer and the college principal indicated that other community organizations have historically and to some extent currently influenced the kinds of programs offered by the college unit. If a program was offered in the college region by another organization, then it was unlikely that the college would offer a similar one.

Being "other directed" also referred to internal organization influences upon the unit. This influence was at one time manifest when
program planners were faculty members of academic departments and thus accountable to department heads rather than to the adult education unit head. This structure had changed so that program planners were accountable to the unit head instead of being members of traditional departments.

Another change of significance was the elevation of the unit head to a senior management position in the organization. While it may appear to be similar to the position of the director in the school district, one major difference existed. In the district the unit and its head performed non-adult education duties to achieve some degree of integration. In the college the unit personnel assisted the organization in performing adult education functions.

Like the school district's, the relationships between the college and its unit were expressed in terms of program and structure. Programmatic relationships were weak but were being strengthened through a changing organizational structure. The dean expressed hope that the unit could help the rest of the organization become community development oriented. His hope was being pursued through two changes. One was the promotion of the unit head to a position in senior management for the organization. The other was the assignment of unit personnel to academic college units in order to assist them in carrying out adult education functions. These relationships affected and were affected by the technologies in the college unit.

Technology in the college was oriented toward involvement of community groups and organizations. This involvement was evident in six of the seven program planning operations. For example, contacts with community organizations were used to originate ideas, and discussion with community advisory groups were used to develop ideas. Establishing objectives involved program planners and instructors but did not extend to community
groups. Selecting and sequencing learning activities was done at a community level through the use of advisory committees for specific programs as well as for programmatic areas such as Family Studies. Ensuring participation was accomplished through coopting organizations for meeting locations that increased the probability of high attendance as well as cosponsoring programs with organizations that had some influence with community members who were potential participants. Securing resources was also accomplished by cosponsoring programs. Instructors were located and selected through discussions with advisory committees. At times evaluating was done through discussion of completed programs with advisory groups.

This intended community involvement in program planning was one characteristic that helps identify this unit's technology as mediating. Another was the number of reports about sharing operations between a programmer and some other person. A third characteristic which facilitated this classification was a consideration of each of the technologies' characteristics and how well they described the process of program planning in the college unit.

Serial dependence, unitary products, repetition, constancy of rate and concern for the process were evident in varying degrees. Serial dependence could be assumed because of the use of a general brochure. However, some evidence was offered that indicated programs could be advertised before their details had been completely worked out. Even though the college used a general vehicle to help ensure participation, it did not seem to limit or queue the planning process to the degree the school district brochure did where it served additional functions. Unitary products were not as evident in the college as they were in the Community Education Department. When repeated programs were mentioned by informants, it was
usually to illustrate the changes that had taken place in the content or planning of the program.

Other measures could be used to ascertain the relative unity of products between college programs and school district programs. The fees charged to individuals for participation were a reflection of a number of variables: number of sessions; cost of instruction; amount of materials; and relative worth of content. It may be argued that relative status of the organization was also a function of the fees charged, however this was irrelevant to the use of fees as an index of dispersion from a mean fee. All programs offered by both the school district and college in the fall of 1980 were used to calculate a mean and standard deviation. The full listing of course fees by title are listed in Appendix A. The means and standard deviation were presented in Table 16. The means provide little useful data about relative degree of product unity. The standard deviations on the other hand provide a measure which indicated that a greater amount of variation existed in the fees charged by the college than those charged by the school district. This variance can be accounted for by more variety in the number of sessions; varying costs of instruction and variation in the worth of content.

Constancy of rate appeared to be less important in the division than in the school district unit. Data were given which indicate programs were not subject to queuing as are programs planned by the school district unit. Programmers noted that minimal requirements for announcements were a date and topic for a program. Reviewing the college catalog provided evidence that some courses were at different stages of development at the time the catalog was published. The characteristics of long-linked technology are fewer in number in the college unit than in the school district unit. The reverse seems true for characteristics of mediating technology.
Interdependence of clients, client participation and extensive operations were all present in the division's program planning process. Interdependence was evident by reliance of programmers upon instructors and advisory groups to develop programs. Programmers at times relied upon instructors and at other times advisory committees for program ideas and development. One programmer reported a major change of program direction as a result of a committee's advice. Instructors relied heavily upon participants' ideas for designing learning activities.

Client participation was the most pronounced characteristic of this technology. Clients were active in originating ideas as evidenced by advisory committees' work with programmers and requests from groups. In the school district programmers relied upon instructors for establishing objectives and selecting and establishing learning activities: the process was delegated by programmers to instructors. In the college, however, these operations were performed collaboratively by programmers and instructors. Extensive operations or the involvement of multiple customers was evidenced by the variance as presented in Table 16 and by the differing kinds of programs illustrated in Table 17.

The final characteristic of mediating technology was the use of standard methods of operations. No examples of such standardization were found in the college. Those characteristics of mediating technology that were present accurately described the process used in the college. This description however is not complete unless consideration is given to intensive technology.

Thompson listed feedback, variety of techniques and change as important characteristics of intensive technology. Each of these characteristics was present in the college unit's process. Feedback and change were usually found together. For example, CP4 reported taking
advice of an advisory committee and changing his proposed approach to a
program about the family. A variety of techniques was also present in the
process used by the college unit.

The classification of tasks by technology provided support for the
college unit's program planning process to be labeled as mediating
technology. Of the 78 different tasks reported, 19 were classified as
long-linked, 33 were classified as mediating, and 28 were classified as
intensive technology. Responses totaled 132 and followed much the same
pattern as the reported tasks: long-linked, 29; mediating, 63; and
intensive, 40. There were two tasks unclassified. One was considering
ideas from individuals as mentioned by CP3. He did not offer enough
information to allow proper classification of this task. The other
unclassified task was routinely using facilities from outside agencies. CS
noted this as one of the ways he secured resources. However, there were
not enough data to provide reasons for using the extra agency facilities
and as a result, this task was not classified. This numeric indicator of
technology preference further helped classify the college unit's technology
as mediating.

Conclusion

The Community Programs and Services Division sought integration with
its organization by assignment of division personnel to academic units and
elevation of the unit head to senior management in the college. Program
planning in the college unit stressed the involvement of its community.
Performance of operations often involved external groups and organizations
and the term "community development" was used numerous times as
respondents referred to the planning process. Development took place as
the clients of the unit became involved in the process creating an inter-
dependence between the clients and the college unit. In addition to the presence of mediating technology characteristics, a classification of tasks into one of the three technologies further supported the conclusion that this planning process is mediating in nature. The presence of long-linked or intensive technology tasks are not as prevalent as mediating technology tasks.

The Continuing Studies Division

This unit, as well as the other two units, was striving through its organizational relationships to achieve integration. However, it differed from the other units in that it had some historical traditions of administering programs originally planned by the organization. The division evolved from a unit offering only programs that were university credit classes to a unit offering credit and non-credit programs sanctioned by the organization. The unit's leadership status within the organization has changed over time. Originally the unit was led by a director; that position was changed to dean and eventually the dean was also made a vice president. These changing leadership relationships have not been as important to the program planning process as has the philosophy of the present dean.

Program planning as reported by interviewees from this unit was characterized by reliance upon other organizational units and faculty members from those units. Most of the operations performed were conditioned by reference to or involvement of the organization. For example, program ideas either came from a faculty member's interest or the program planner as he involved an appropriate university unit to develop and sponsor the program idea.
Characteristics of each of the technologies were present in the planning process used by the university unit. Characteristics of long-linked technology were present mostly because of the report from UP1 who was responsible for credit programs. The tasks he described were characteristic of a long-linked technology: serial dependence, unitary products, repetition, constancy of rate, and concern for the process appeared in his description of program planning. His concerns for sequential courses were used as evidence that serial dependency is a characteristic of programs he developed, but were not as characteristic of programs developed by other unit personnel. Credit courses which UP1 administered had a greater propensity to long-linked technology than noncredit programs. UP1's credit responsibilities may account for atypical programming behavior when compared to other programmers in this unit. Other interviewees described the planning process as "intuitive" and "organic".

Unitary products were not evident in large numbers. Because of the highly specific nature of each program developed in this unit, the appearance of unitary products seemed unlikely. The exceptions were those credit programs planned by UP1. Because they carry credit, the programs were of uniform length and cost making them the most unitary of the programs produced by this unit. Repetition was evident in few programs other than the credit programs. Constancy of rate existed to a limited degree. Tables 14 and 15 demonstrated a varying rate of production from year to year and little evidence existed for a constant rate of production. There were few comments about instrumental perfection except from UP1 who was concerned with getting proposed programs approved by several committees of the university senate. The dean provided evidence for establishment of customized procedures when he noted the creation of an interdisciplinary
committee to provide a program with academic legitimacy. The few examples of long-linked technology characteristics were provided by one interviewee, while other respondents provided reports containing characteristics of mediating technology.

Characteristics of mediating technology included interdependence, client participation and extensive operations. Interdependence and client participation were evident in the interviewee's descriptions of program planning. Examples of brokering between people who wanted to learn and people who wanted to teach were provided by UP2 who described a process of interaction between clientele outside the university and those inside the university. Performing the brokering function between businesses who had women managers and the Business Administration Department was one example. Another example was the visiting professor who wanted to teach and approached Continuing Studies for help in gaining an audience. Extensive operations were demonstrated by the numerous clients of the conferences described by UP3. Associations, governmental ministries, and concerned individuals all participated in the programs he described. While these characteristics were present in the descriptions of program planning, they are overshadowed by the characteristics of intensive technology.

Feedback, variety of techniques, and change seemed to be the set of characteristics that best described the planning process used in the Continuing Studies Division. Feedback was an integral part of the process described by UP1, UP2, and UP3. UP1 reported using the reactions of various faculty members, committees and colleagues as he helped the approval process move forward. Evidence of feedback was weakest in his descriptions probably because of the long-linked nature of the process he used. UP2, in contrast to UP1, used feedback extensively as he met with potential clients. Their reactions to proposed programs or questions about
what was needed helped him formulate program structures, formats and rationale of programs. This feedback was also used to involve a reluctant department in sponsoring a program. UP3 used feedback from interest groups as he planned programs dealing with controversial matters in education, and as he developed approaches to organizations for the support of these programs. UUH described a series of seminars with the resulting feedback being used to develop additional programs. These examples of feedback occurred before the program took place so that changes could be made in the planning process. UP3 provided an example of planning changes as he spoke of program alterations that were associated with obtaining program support. One of these changes involved establishing an advisory committee to a proposed program.

The Continuing Studies Division relied more upon the use of experts in its program planning process than did either of the other two units. This use of experts was congruent with employment of intensive technology. There was one confounding variable however that may have accounted in part for the heavy use of experts in the planning process. The division was striving to be like the rest of the university and as a result limited its programs to those approved by academic units. This factor could account for the predominance of expert use and may not be related to the kind of technology employed. However, the presence of intensive technology was indicated by other evidence.

The number of program planning tasks classified as intensive technology was larger than the number of tasks classified as long-linked or mediating technology: 28 were classified as intensive; 12 as long-linked; and 18 as mediating. Of the 12 tasks classified as long-linked, six were reported only by UP1. The number of responses in each classification followed a similar pattern to the number of tasks. Ninty-six responses
were recorded from reports by respondents in this unit: 15 were long-linked; 25 were mediating; and 57 were intensive. The classification of tasks and responses provides additional evidence that the university unit demonstrated a preference for intensive technology.

**Conclusion**

Historical and programmatic dependence upon the organization has helped this unit achieve and maintain an integrated position within the university. The program planning process used in the Continuing Studies Division relied upon experts in content matter and academic sponsorship of the programs it conducted. Once a program idea was acceptable to an organizational sponsor, the developing idea defined which planning tasks were performed in which order, and which resources were required. These factors were results of using planning tasks that are intensive in nature. A majority of tasks were classified as intensive, with mediating tasks being the next most prevalent and long-linked tasks being the least prevalent.

**Comparison of the Units' Tasks**

The tasks reported by each unit are next presented to provide a measure of the three units' relative program planning profiles. One hundred and twenty eight different tasks were identified and classified among the three units. In order to present the tasks and classifications, the qualitative data from Chapters VI, VII, and VIII were transformed into numeric data. These data are presented in a series of tables intended to simplify the complexity of narrative data and at the same time convey differences among program planning processes used by these three units.
Table 18 lists in descending order of frequency each task, the number of times it was reported, in which unit it was reported, and in which technology it was classified. The tasks were given a number in the table and can be cross referenced to Appendix B which lists tasks by number and description.

A count of tasks by technology provided a measure of relative use of a technology in each unit. Two items counted from the table were: number of different tasks reported; and number of times a task was reported or its frequency of mention by interviewees. The totals of different tasks reported demonstrated that respondents in each unit had a distinct preference for certain kinds of tasks. School district respondents reported an equal number of tasks classified as long-linked and mediating tasks, college respondents reported a plurality of tasks classified as mediating, and the university respondents reported a majority of tasks classified as intensive.

The frequency of mention was used as a measure of preference for kinds of tasks used in program planning by each unit. If a unit used tasks classified exclusively as one kind then it could be concluded that the unit used long-linked, mediating or intensive technology. As the data in the table indicated no unit used a single classification of tasks to the exclusion of others. It seemed reasonable to speak in terms of program planning profiles and preferences for certain kinds of tasks rather than the employment of one technology by a unit. The number of tasks reported and their frequency of mention are presented in graph form in Figure 3 which points out where these two totals are similar and where they differ.

Interpreting data in Figure 3 was accomplished by considering both responses and tasks. By so doing, a more certain profile of technology preference was obtained than by considering tasks only because responses
TABLE 18
FREQUENCY OF DISTRIBUTION OF TASKS BY
UNIT, TECHNOLOGY, AND OPERATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operations and Tasks</th>
<th>School District</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Originating ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing the idea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 18 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operations and Tasks</th>
<th>School District</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L  M  I  U</td>
<td>L  M  I  U</td>
<td>L  M  I  U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selecting and sequencing learning activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations and Tasks</td>
<td>School District</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Securing resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations and Tasks</td>
<td>School District</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total of different tasks</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total of tasks reported</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: L = long-linked; M = mediating; I = intensive; U = unclassified.
Figure 3. Histogram of total number of tasks and responses reported.
accounted for shared preferences among respondents within units. One problem in interpreting these figures as presented was that one or two individuals could skew the distribution of responses and thus be responsible for giving the impression that one kind of technology or another was characteristic of a unit when, in fact, the majority of responses in a unit were for a different technology or technologies. For example, an individual could report 18 long-linked tasks for an operation, while six other individuals in the unit could report 18 mediating tasks and four long-linked tasks. The distribution of those tasks would provide the following totals: long-linked, 22; mediating, 18; and intensive, 0. An erroneous conclusion that respondents in the unit demonstrated a preference for long-linked technology might be reached.

In order to provide some measure of assurance that such was not the case in any of the units, a percentage of homogeneity for each respondent was calculated providing an indication of which respondents may have distorted the technology preference of a unit. Two measures of homogeneity were provided. The first was an indication of intrapersonal homogeneity and was expressed as a percentage derived by dividing the number of tasks in the technology which a respondent scored highest among the three technologies, by the total number of tasks reported by that individual. This percentage provided an indication of the strength of individual preference for a technology. A measure of individual consistency was important because conceivably a unit's preference could be a total of unrelated preferences of individual respondents within a unit. The percentage of intrapersonal homogeneity provides a measure of consistency of response by individual interviewees.

The second measure was a percentage of interpersonal homogeneity which provides an indication of how completely an individual conformed to the
technological preference of the unit to which he belonged. This percentage was calculated by dividing the number of tasks reported by an individual and classified in the unit's predominant technology, by the total number of tasks reported. This percentage provided some indication of individual conformity to a unit's preferred technology.

The two measures are presented in Table 19. This table lists each respondent and the number of responses classified into one of the three technologies. The last two columns contain two measures of homogeneity. Data from the table support the conclusion that respondents were consistent with the technology used by most of the unit personnel. In the school district unit the average percentage of intrapersonal homogeneity was 64.0. The range was from a low of 41.6% for SP4 to a high of 84.6% for SP3 which represented the widest range of any in the three units. The interpersonal homogeneity average was 49.7% which was due to a skewed distribution of the percentages. SP3, who was the most personally consistent of all respondents, was also the least conforming of all respondents to a unit's preferred technology. The district unit sample was comprised of people who were similar in the way they planned programs except for two individuals who demonstrated other preferences. Six of the eight respondents reported planning programs in a manner consistent with the way programs were planned by the unit.

Data from the college unit personnel produced an average consistency percentage of 53.3 which came from a distribution that had less range than the district unit: the low is 42.9 percent, and high is 77.8 percent. More respondents in the college unit than in the district unit scored lower on internal consistency. These respondents were more likely to use tasks from other technologies than respondents in the school district unit. Most respondents conformed to the unit's preferred technology: only two
### TABLE 19
PERCENT INTRAPERSONAL AND INTERPERSONAL HOMOGENEITY

Number of Tasks Reported by Technology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School District</th>
<th>Technology</th>
<th>$%$ Intrapersonal Homogeneity</th>
<th>$%$ Interpersonal Homogeneity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUH</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| College         | L  | M  | I  |                |                            |
|-----------------| L  | M  | I  |                |                            |
| CP1             | 4  | 18 | 4  | 28            | 64.3                       |
| CP2             | 5  | 14 | 11 | 30            | 46.6                       |
| CP3             | 4  | 6  | 10 | 20            | 50.0                       |
| CP4             | 3  | 8  | 5  | 16            | 50.0                       |
| CI1             | 1  | 7  | 1  | 9             | 77.8                       |
| CI2             | 3  | 4  | 2  | 9             | 44.4                       |
| CS              | 3  | 4  | 1  | 8             | 50                         |
| CUH             | 6  | 2  | 6  | 14            | 42.9                       |
|                 | 29 | 63 | 40 | 134           | $X = 53.3$                 |
|                 |    |    |    |               | $X = 47.2$                 |

| University      | L  | M  | I  |                |                            |
|-----------------| L  | M  | I  |                |                            |
| UP1             | 6  | 2  | 8  | 16            | 50                         |
| UP2             | 0  | 7  | 11 | 18            | 61.1                       |
| UP3             | 2  | 2  | 11 | 15            | 73.3                       |
| UI1             | 0  | 1  | 5  | 6             | 83.3                       |
| UI2             | 3  | 4  | 6  | 10            | 60.0                       |
| US              | 3  | 5  | 8  | 16            | 50.0                       |
| UUH             | 0  | 3  | 7  | 10            | 70.0                       |
|                 | 14 | 25 | 57 | 91            | $X = 63.9$                 |

Note: L = long-linked; M = mediating; I = intensive; U = unclassified.
deviations were noted. CP3 and CUH reported more tasks that were classified in other technologies than the unit's preferred technology. Four of the eight respondents scored at or above 50 percent in terms of consistency and conformity.

Data supplied by university unit personnel indicated that respondents were consistent and conformed to the unit's preferred technology appreciably more than was the case for the other two units. The average percentage of intrapersonal homogeneity was 63.9 percent. The range was 33.3 percent from 50 percent to 83.3 percent which presented a range similar to the college unit range. The average percentage of interpersonal homogeneity was 63.9 percent and represented the highest degree of conformity to a technology among the three units.

The total number of tasks reported by kinds of respondents provided some interesting patterns. For example instructors in each of the units consistently reported the lowest number of tasks. One reason is that instructors were involved in a limited number of operations and seldom reported being involved in originating or developing ideas. The next lowest number of tasks was reported by the administrative group consisting of secretaries and unit heads. As expected the largest number of tasks were reported by program planners who are exposed to more operations than the other two groups.

The use of mixed technologies by each of the units while emphasizing one kind of technology gives cause for some discussion. Mixed technologies may be a result of units producing programs of an educational nature and performing various organizational roles at the same time. Also the use of mixed technologies allows a unit to modify program planning techniques according to the requirements of the nature of the program. For example, a program idea may require extensive community involvement for adequate
development. If a unit used only long-linked technology, community involvement would be unlikely in developing the idea. By employing mixed technologies a unit can utilize a wider range of tasks in developing programs, thus, providing flexibility in a unit’s technology. Some program ideas may require development in specific ways. The desire to have a wide variety of program ideas is one reason for mixing technologies. Even though the nature of program ideas may encourage the use of mixed technologies, there still exists a moderate degree of homogeneity within units. This can be explained in a number of ways.

Socialization of the interviewees is one way to explain homogeneity within units. Respondents usually reported similar tasks and displayed a similar philosophy toward program planning within each unit. For example, all programmers in the university unit commented upon the required academic support for programs.

Another explanation for homogeneity within a unit could be the result of deliberate staffing patterns of unit heads and chief executive officers. These people could influence the degree of homogeneity by hiring individuals who agree with a common philosophy or by hiring people who express differing philosophies. Evidence from interviews indicate that the unit heads have identified specific qualities they would look for in a potential employee. These qualities may be congruent with the program planning profile for the unit. Each unit head was asked which qualities he would look for if he were to hire a new staff member. SUH listed the following: dedication to community education; experience in the field; organizational ability; human relations skills; the ability to sense successful programs; interest in offering all kinds of programs that the public may want; and a willingness to take a few risks. Most of these qualities are general in nature and could be useful in an organization that
demonstrated any one of the three profiles described in this study. However, one exception is willingness to offer programs wanted by the public. This quality would be out of place in the college and university units. The college unit's programs are directed toward community involvement and the university unit's programs are directed toward providing public programs determined as appropriate by experts. Offering programs desired by the public as a quality is appropriate to an entrepreneurial unit. To an extent the kind of people found in the school district unit is a result of hiring patterns used by the unit head. Thus homogeneity may be related to hiring patterns.

CUH also provided qualities he would look for in hiring new people. Most are general: formal training; ability to learn; and an understanding of adult development. However, the first quality he mentioned was specific and fits his unit's profile: "a philosophy of adult learning as a means of development in terms of the broader community—the community development approach." CUH also provided comments about letting people who did not share this philosophy move out of the unit. He has purposely staffed his unit with individuals who share a common philosophy.

UUH enumerated the following qualities: energetic; collaborative; nonpossessive; generally educated; and organized. Collaboration and sharing are two qualities that seem essential to operate successfully within the extension model described for the university. This unit's homogeneity is also affected by the hiring practices of the unit head.

When the chief executive officer (CEO) of each organization responded to the same question they also provided qualities that would fit into the unit profiles. CEO1 noted he would look for a bureaucrat and liberal educator. CEO2 would not worry about a person's philosophy because he felt that the organization would socialize the person. CEO3 would look for an
acceptable academic. These responses provided evidence that unit heads as well as chief executive officers supply some of the influence for homogeneity within units.

A comparison of program planning profiles for three different groups of respondents can be used to illustrate differences in their approaches. Program planners and instructors form the first two groups, and the secretaries and unit heads form the third group. By plotting the number of tasks reported by each group and unit a total of nine frequency polygons was created and is displayed in Figure 4. This figure enabled a comparison by groups of respondents and by units thus allowed further interpretation of the total number of tasks reported.

These frequency polygons provided evidence that similar groups of interviewees responded with similar numbers of tasks. For example program planners in the college and university units produced similar profiles as did the instructors in these two units. Both of these groups' profiles in the school district unit differ from the groups in the other two units. The administrative group was the only group that showed some similarity in all three units. The greatest difference appeared between the school district unit and the other two units.

One possible explanation for the variation in the frequency of responses was the amount of experience a person had had in working for the unit or organization. To find out if there was any relationship between the number of years worked and frequency of responses a correlation coefficient was calculated using the number of years worked and number of tasks reported. A coefficient of .05 was produced and eliminated years of experience as a possible explanation of frequency variation. These two variables had no correlation of any significance. To ensure that there was no curvilinear relationship among these two variables a scatter gram was
Figure 4. Frequency polygons representing responses by interviewee group and unit.
constructed and is presented as Figure 5. The Y axis of the scattergram is the frequency of mention, the X axis is the years of experience. Each dot represents the reports of the interviewees on those variables. The pattern produced by the dots is random and confirms that there is little relationship between years of experience and frequency of response.

Respondents exhibited a high degree of idiosyncratic behavior in program planning by reporting a large number of program planning tasks that were not used by other respondents in the same unit. For example, Task 11 was reported by one respondent in each unit, making it a unique task to a respondent in a given unit. Table 20 provides the percentage of single task by operation and by unit. Percentages were calculated by dividing the number of tasks reported once in a unit by the number of different tasks reported in the same unit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operation</th>
<th>School District</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Originating ideas</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing ideas</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishing objectives</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selecting &amp; sequencing the learning tasks</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring participation</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Securing resources</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\bar{X} = 55.3\% \quad \bar{X} = 58.1\% \quad \bar{X} = 60.9\%
\]
Figure 5. Scattergram illustrating degree of correlation between years of experience and frequency of responses.
Idiosynocratic behavior was most common in the university unit. Average percentages of single tasks for each unit were: the school district unit, 55.3 percent; the college unit, 58.1 percent; and the university unit, 60.9 percent indicating that the amount of individual deviation among operations was greatest in the university unit. Data from Table 19 indicate the respondents in the university deviated less than other respondents from their unit's technology. Comparing those data with data from Table 20 a conclusion was made that variation within a technology occurred in all three units and was greatest in the university unit.

One final look at the data provides evidence that some operations were more consistently overlooked and not reported by respondents than other operations. This information may provide an indication that certain operations were more commonly performed by some respondents than others. Table 21 presents operations mentioned in phase II of the interviews by respondents which are grouped by unit.

Table 21 demonstrates that phase II of the interviews was random among units but grouped by operation. Establishing Objectives and Selecting and Sequencing Learning Activities are the two operations mentioned most often with direct questions in phase II of the interviews. Of the 17 times operations III and IV were mentioned by the interviewer, 7 were in interviews with program planners, 9 were in interviews with unit heads and secretaries, and one was with an instructor. The relative absence of these two operations from phase II in interviews with instructors is understandable because these respondents were concerned with instruction and concentrated upon these operations. It was also expected that the secretaries and unit heads were, of all interviewees, least concerned about these operations. Their concerns could be expected to be centered on administrative kinds of operations such as Securing Resources or Ensuring
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operation</th>
<th>SP SP SP SP SI SI SS SUH</th>
<th>CP CP CP CP CI CI CS CUH</th>
<th>UP UP UP UI UI US UUH</th>
<th>Σ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td></td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participation. Of the seven interviews with program planners where phase II of the interview was employed, five came from the school district unit. When the interviewer probed about these operations no consistent pattern of responses was observed. The high frequency of employing phase II to gather data about Establishing Objectives and Selecting and Sequencing Learning Activities may be an indication that these operations were not used by program planners as frequently as other operations in developing programs.

The operations most consistently mentioned in phase I of the interviews were Developing the Idea and Securing Resources. Each of these operations was mentioned by most of the respondents except for a school district instructor and the college unit head.

The presentation of data in a tabular form has allowed each of the units to be examined by operation and technology. Some data captured through in depth interviews have been transformed into numerical indicators which have been used in the comparison of the units studied. These data along with narrative data presented in Chapters V, VI, VII, and VIII provided the basis for the conclusions reported in the next section.

Conclusions and Summary

Certain conclusions about program planning can be made based upon the data presented in Tables 18, 19, 20, and 21. These are:

1) program planning was accomplished in similar ways by individuals within a given unit. The degree of conformity varied among units and program planning was not a completely standardized undertaking. Few individuals exhibited great deviation from a program planning pattern used by the unit by which they were employed.
2) Program planning was a consistent undertaking for an individual. Most of the respondents' reported tasks were classified within a person's dominant technology preference.

3) Program planning was an idiosyncratic undertaking within the limits of a technology preference. While respondents did not deviate from a preferred pattern of program planning to any large degree, they did exhibit personal preferences for tasks within a pattern.

These conclusions come as results of considering only the data presented in the three tables above. They are not intended to be answers to the research questions which were listed in Chapter I which are now discussed.

(1) Does the classification of technologies presented by Thompson describe the technologies employed by adult education units?

No pure type of technology was discovered in this investigation. Reliance upon Thompson's classification to describe program planning did not provide a complete perspective of the way programs were planned. All units used combinations of technologies with a demonstrated preference for one or another. The lack of pure or definite technology types made question 1A appropriate to this study.

(1A) Is there a discernible pattern of technology used by adult education units?

Data from Table 18 indicated that the process of program planning was basically similar for individuals within each unit studied. Narrative data reported in earlier chapters indicated that classifications of program planning tasks were possible using the definitions and characteristics of long-linked, mediating and intensive technologies provided by Thompson. Respondents identified tasks which were consistently classified as being one technology or another. Those respondents within a unit usually shared
preferences for the same kind of technology which provided discernible patterns of technology that were classified using Thompson's three technologies.

(2) Do adult education units in different public education organizations differ from one another in technology?

Table 18 and Figure 3 provided an indication that preferences for a technology were made by each of the units studied. Each of these preferred technologies emphasized different characteristics. For example, the school district unit used a process that was rapid and efficient, the college unit used a process which emphasized community involvement, and the university unit used a process that emphasized use of internal resources and expertise.

(3) What, if any, influence does an organization have upon the technology of its adult education unit?

Because a unit was part of an organization, it seemed reasonable to expect that it was influenced to some degree by the kind of organization to which it belonged. Data from contextual interviews and documentary research supported the conclusion that organizations influenced their units in varying degrees and in different ways. The school district influenced its unit the least and in a way that was qualitatively different from the other two organizations. The superintendent reported successful attempts to integrate the unit with the organization structurally. This integration, along with the fact that the unit's and organization's clienteles substantially differed, may have encouraged the unit to be entrepreneurial and competitive with other adult education units. Structural integration required that some unit personnel spend some time performing organizational maintenance duties which decreased the amount of program planning time and presumably the number of adult education programs
held. SP3 was the individual who performed the district-wide public relation functions and edited the district newsletter. He was also the respondent who used mediating technology consistently in planning programs. His commitment to community involvement made his selection to perform district public relations understandable. However, the effect of this arrangement was to remove a user of mediating technology from the unit's full time program planning staff, thus in effect strengthening the use of long-linked technology within the unit. The district's influence on the unit was indirect and not as evident as the influence of the other two organizations upon their units.

The college's influence on its adult education unit changed over time because the structural relationships between the organization and the unit have moved through three distinct phases. The first phase was one of high organizational influence because adult education programmers were members of academic departments. Program initiatives came from the organization to the unit. The second phase was one of diminished organizational influence because programmers were members of the adult education unit and were influenced by the community as well as the organization. The third phase is one of increased and reciprocal influence where programmers were members of the unit, directed by the unit head, and were also assigned to academic units within the college. Assigning programmers to a unit increased the likelihood of organizational influence and created the opportunity for the unit to influence the organization.

The university, among the three organization, had the highest degree of influence upon its unit. Organizational influence was encouraged by the unit as it attempted to be like its organization. The influence of the organization determined the kinds of program planned by its unit. A self imposed planning limitation on this unit allowed it to develop only program
ideas that had support from some academic unit. Ideas for programs originated not only in the unit but also in other parts of the organization. Faculty members approached the unit with ideas they wanted to develop into programs. When ideas were originated by unit employees they had to be supported by the organization in some way. One programmer explained that one of his ideas was turned over to an academic unit for future development. In effect, programs belonged to the organization and not the unit. The effect of this kind of influence was that the unit relied upon resident faculty members for instructional staff and assistance in planning programs. Of the three units studied this is the most completely integrated with its organization and that integration was accomplished through programmatic rather than structural relationships. Organizations did influence their units, but they did it in differing ways and to varying degrees. The matter of a unit's influence upon its organization is discussed in answering the final research question.

(4) What, if any, influence does the technology of an adult education unit have upon its organization?

The influence of a unit's technology upon its organization is not great and appears slight in all three organizations. The school district is influenced by its unit in at least one way. The unit was viewed by the superintendent as the organization's "most dynamic change mechanism." By that he referred to the unit's ability to produce programs which do not necessarily have as strong support from the board of trustees as have the regular elementary and secondary education programs in the district. He offered examples of these kind of programs being accepted as district programs after initially being developed and offered by the unit. The superintendent looked upon this unit as serving an experimental role for the district.
The same kind of role was also mentioned for the college unit. Its past director provided examples of programs originally started in the unit and then moved to other parts of the organization. An additional influence was anticipated by the dean. He hopes the unit will assist the college in becoming more community oriented than it presently is. This was one of the hoped for outcomes of the third structural phase noted earlier.

The university's unit was also described as helping the organization experiment with programs. UP1 reported this as one of the important roles for a unit. The president of the university noted that its adult education unit performed a bridging function through its programs to other organizations. He offered examples of representatives of the federal government as well as private business and other individuals being on campus to participate in unit developed programs. He also noted this influence had been formally recognized with the promotion of the dean to vice president for university relations.

Two common elements of influence existed in all three units. The first is the use of the unit in an experimental role for programs the organization may have wished to sponsor. This experimentation was a conscious effort on the part of the organization as demonstrated by comments from UP1 and CE01. The second area of influence was from the unit heads. Each unit head was part of his organization's senior management and as such had some influence upon the total organization. One less evident influence was the use of programs developed by the unit as alternative access routes to the organization.

Presentation of narrative data and numerical indicators from those data have provided conclusions that indicate program planning was a diverse and complex undertaking which varied within units to some degree and among units to a greater degree. Thompson's classification is not adequate for
describing the complexity of program planning, although useful as an heuristic in examining program planning for variation.

When conceived on a broad conceptual level planning operations, or steps, or decision points may be adequate. When teaching about program planning a conceptual approach may even be desirable. However, when describing program planning the conceptual approach rarifies the process so as to make it less useful than it might otherwise be. This implication among others is discussed in the next chapter.
1 Thompson, Organization in Action.

2 Ibid.
CHAPTER X

CONCLUSIONS AND SUMMARY

Adult education units like other organizations generate products. Two products identified with adult education units are planned educational programs and educated individuals. This study investigated how three adult education units produced educational programs to determine if different kinds of public educational institutions had distinctive and consistent program planning technologies.

Program planning has been the subject of a large number of publications most of which offer "how to" approaches. Few research projects about the nature of program planning as an organization's technology have been reported in the literature of adult education. None of the literature reviewed investigated program planning for variation, but rather attempted to synthesize the complex process of program planning into discrete phases of activity. This study attempted to identify differences among the tasks of program planning in three adult education units rather than to follow a tradition of describing program planning at a conceptual level where few differences might appear.

The concept of technology from the field of organization theory was employed to assist in describing program planning. Use of this concept in adult education was justified in at least two ways. First the subject of investigation was the adult education unit which, as an organization, employed technology in order to generate programs. Perrow's definition of technology, which was used in this study, stated that technology was
actions taken by humans with or without the aid of tools to change some object. He went on to note that an object may be animate, inanimate, symbolic, human, or nonhuman. Ideas in this present study were conceived of as objects that were changed into programs. The second way of justifying the use of this concept of technology was by considering the products of adult education units of which two were easily identified: people and programs. Instruction has been conceived of as a technology used to change people. Program planning in the present study was conceived of as technology employed to bring about educational products called adult education programs.

Employment of the concept of technology provided a way to deal with variation in program planning. Thompson's classification of technologies was used to construct a framework of program planning operations and kinds of technology. The framework employed seven program planning operations synthesized from four of the best-known studies of the process and three kinds of technology. The operations included (1) originating the idea; (2) developing the idea; (3) establishing objectives; (4) selecting and sequencing learning activities; (5) ensuring participation; (6) securing resources; and (7) evaluating. The kinds of technology employed were long-linked, mediating, and intensive. Each of these technologies had specific characteristics that distinguished it from the others. The activities performed by adult educators were classified by operation and kind of technology and then labeled tasks. Their classification constituted the basis for examining program planning for variation.

Methodology

Within this conceptual framework, a qualitative method of case study was employed for three reasons. First, contextual settings of the adult
education units and their organizations could be established. Second, a detailed account of program planning was determined to be more useful than a statistical study of population trends in order to describe variation in program planning. Third, it was desirable that respondents described what they did in planning programs rather than reacting orally to an instrument that might tend to suggest categories of processes. In addition to conducting interviews about program planning, other interviews were conducted and documentary research was undertaken to corroborate data.

Three adult education units were selected with consideration of four major factors. First, diversification among the subjects was achieved by locating units within three different educational organizations. Second, geographical differences were controlled as much as possible by selecting units that shared some portion of the same service areas. Third, cooperation of unit and organizational administrators was necessary for access to individuals. Fourth, practical considerations of cost and repeated accessibility were important to the completion of this study. In addition to these factors, each of the three units had a dynamic adult education program and dedicated professionals working in those organizations.

Data analysis

All interviews were recorded on audio tapes eliminating the need for note taking during the interviews and enabling the investigator to concentrate upon the topics mentioned by interviewees. The tapes were reviewed and indexed, which facilitated repeated access to interviewee comments, which were reported in Chapters V, VI, VII, and VIII in a narrative form.
Tasks reported were categorized by operation, classified by technology and then placed within the previously created framework. In order to present the narrative data in a comprehensible manner, a series of tables and figures was constructed and presented in Chapter IX. By analyzing these data conclusions were drawn.

Findings

Thompson's classification of technologies was inadequate to describe program planning in adult education. Thompson's classification assumed that pure types were evident in specific organizations and that technologies were not mixed. Data from this study indicated that technologies were mixed in adult education units.

The problem of mixed technologies or a "pure type" of technology deserves some discussion. Thompson in proposing the three technologies did not claim these were the only existing technologies. Nor did he claim that a given organization would use one or another of them. He strongly implied singular usage as he provided examples of pure types and ignored the possibility of mixed types except for one sentence. "One or more technologies constitute the core of all purposive organizations."5 This present study has demonstrated that mixed technologies exist in all organizations studied which may be due to a common public education setting. Perhaps adult education units in private business, religious, or military organizations would exhibit a stronger tendency toward some pure type.

The question is "Why are mixed technologies employed by the units studied in this investigation?" A number of explanations are proposed, some more comprehensive than others. One of the more intriguing explanations is related to the nature of the idea being developed into a program. Some ideas have more implications for program planning than others.
For example, an idea about teaching Cantonese as a second language has fewer potential implications than does an idea about teaching management. A program on Cantonese as a second language is offered to the general public. A management program, on the other hand, is likely to have a specific audience and implications for organizations which send participants. The nature of these two program ideas are different and may require some appropriate mix of technologies to be adequately developed.

Houle's use of eleven planning categories which profoundly influence operations is another example of why an idea and its context may require the use of mixed technologies. For example, three of his categories are: two or more groups design an activity which will enhance their combined programs of service (C-6); an institution designs an activity in a new format (C-8); and an institution designs a new activity in an established format (C-9). Houle notes that each of the categories is defined by the source of authority and direction of planning and control. He further notes that the categories or the source of authority and direction of planning strongly influence the process of planning. These elements may well be a reason for the existence of mixed technologies.

A second explanation for mixed technologies may be the relationship between an adult education unit and its organization. If a unit relies upon its own organizational ideas and resources in all aspects, then perhaps that unit could employ one technology. As data presented in this study indicate no unit had that as a possibility. Funding as well as program ideas often came from outside the unit. Perhaps outside resources had some effect on the technologies employed because of uncertainty of extra-organizational resources.

A third explanation is the nature of the clientele. All clients of adult education units participate for some reason and motivations are often
diverse and the selection of a specific technology may be affected by disposition of the client to participate. Programs generated by one unit may be planned in consideration of one or more of client motivations. Using the two previous examples helps illustrate this point. Cantonese language programs may have a diverse population as a marketing target. Many client motivations are involved and a diffuse method of ensuring participation may be appropriate. Management concepts, on the other hand, may have a well-defined client group and may require that methods of ensuring participation be specific as well as effective. Selection of specific tasks in these operations affect other operations and associated tasks. The nature of the client may help define an appropriate combination of technologies.

A fourth explanation may involve the model of program planning articulated by each unit. The school district's personnel described an entrepreneurial model, which emphasized meeting client wants. The college personnel described a community development model, which emphasized community involvement in the program planning process. The university personnel described an extension model, which emphasized the use of resident experts in defining programs and program areas. Each of these models involves different ways of performing operations. Some programs, clients, unit and organization relations, and available resources may necessitate making deviations from these models. These factors could account for mixed and differing technologies encountered in this study.

Mixed technologies provide flexibility in planning programs. Although there may be a preferred technology in each unit, there is not an exclusive technology employed. The nature of the adult education enterprise itself is characterized as diverse and may strongly influence the use of mixed
technologies. Consideration of use of only one technology could severely limit the ability of a unit to produce diverse programs for diverse clients.

Even though Thompson's classification did not adequately describe program planning, it was helpful in classifying tasks that produced patterns of technology for each unit. These patterns of technology may have been a reflection of the kind of programs usually produced by each unit. They may be the consequence of following a preferred program planning model described above.

Each of these technology patterns was substantially different from another. The school district unit preferred a technology pattern that was rapid, efficient, and able to meet clients' wants. Six of the eight interviewees in this unit were classified as showing a preference for long-linked technology. The college unit preferred a technology pattern that emphasized linking clients and resources in order to solve community problems with little or no reported concern for rapid planning. Six of the eight interviewees were classified as showing a preference for mediating technology. Both the school district and college units used external resources to a greater extent than did the university unit. The university unit used a technology pattern that tied its programs to the expert and other resources of the organization. All interviewees in this unit demonstrated a preference for intensive technology.

These three distinctive technology patterns have been labeled entrepreneurial, community development, and extension. The entrepreneurial pattern was characterized by planning operations performed expeditiously, historically, internally (within the unit), and efficiently. The community development pattern was characterized by community involvement, variety in
planning tasks, cooperation among planners, learners, and instructors; and a cooperation for resources and participation. The extension pattern was characterized by operations which involve internal organizational units and expertise.

These patterns of entrepreneurial, community development, and extension provided fundamental differences that were reflected in the way operations were performed among the units studied. These differences were greater than the differences within each of the units. Even though some individuals within each unit deviated from the technology pattern of their unit, there was a degree of overall planning agreement.

Just as there were explanations for use of mixed technologies, there are possible explanations for use of identified technology patterns. The matter of unit leadership is a factor in organizations. Each of the unit heads articulated a definite preference for some pattern of program planning. Following the notions of organization roles, norms and values, and inducements/contributions contracts, individuals tended to use the pattern valued and normally used in the organization. Most individuals interviewed in this study demonstrated a preference for a technology pattern depending on the prevalent pattern used within a given unit.

An alternative and interesting explanation of technology patterns involves organizational purpose and the nature of its clientele. These elements may influence each of the units to use a technology pattern familiar to the organization. In North American society, the nature of the primary clients in each of the organizations studied is essentially different from one another. The school district clients are usually children from ages five to eighteen. Community college clients are usually people from varied backgrounds with varied objectives in life. University
clients are usually people who have some interest in highly specialized areas of study or training.

The purposes of each organization differ also. School district purposes are mainly transmission of cultural heritage or slight adjustments of society. Community college purposes include university preparation, vocational training, community development, and personal enrichment. University purposes include advancement of knowledge and education in highly specialized areas.

The purposes of organizations and the nature of their clientele may influence the way each organization performs its work. The school district may use a technology which is basically reproductive in nature, efficient, and does not involve learners in planning. Some authors have compared public schooling to an assembly line factory process.\(^8\) The community college may use a technology which is community based and which relies upon linking resources and users. The university may use a technology which involves experts because of the specialized nature of its educational programs.

The fact that each of the units and organizations studied is attempting some degree of integration also had an effect upon the use of organizational technology. One way to integrate with a unit's organization is to act like the organization in as many ways as possible. One of those ways is using an organization's technology and modifying it where needed. This modification process may result in use of mixed technologies or a technology pattern detected in each organization.

Thompson's classification of technologies facilitated an analysis of data, which indicated there are technology patterns and variation among and within adult education units. It also allowed an analysis of program planning profiles among and within interviewee groups. The classification
system enabled differences in program planning to be described in a systematic manner. The conclusions about program planning and the usefulness of Thompson's classification system are limited by the boundaries of this study's methodology and its subjects.

Limitations

Some of this study's limitations were inherent in the research methodology used. These case studies do not support generalizations to other adult education units. Some conclusions about program planning have been made, however, generalizations about adult education units and organizations have not. Case studies produce many pieces of data and their analyses are often complex and subtle. However, they do not provide levels of statistical significance or probability.

Another limitation to this study comes from the framework employed in analyzing the data. Three technologies were defined, described, and then applied to the data. Perhaps a different kind of framework from the one employed which involved different or additional technologies would produce a more extensive or complete description of program planning.

Yet another limitation to the study may be the eclectic set of program examples used by interviewees to illustrate their program planning procedures. Even though each interviewee was asked to consider a program that he had planned, respondents used multiple programs to illustrate points about program planning. Some interviews contained information from three or four different programs. The limitation is that an aggregated description of program planning was produced rather than a description of the process used in one instance.

The findings of this study are obviously limited to three public educational organizations. Private organizations that provide adult
education to their clients may be an interesting population to study and are considered in the next section.

**Implications**

The conclusions that program planning is individualistic and follows a technology pattern or preference have conceptual and practical implications for researchers, practitioners, and teachers of program planning. These include the consideration of, teaching of, and the study of program planning.

**Consideration** of program planning as variable technology enables one to think about different ways to produce programs. The highly complex undertaking studied in this investigation presents a contrast to the simplistic and sometimes stark models of program planning found in the literature. Consideration of a unit's technologies also enables specific tasks to be thought about in relation to other tasks that are essentially different but often accomplish similar purposes.

Technology preferences exhibited by units may enable additional and perhaps useful classifications of adult education units to be made. Rather than using a typology such as the one Schroeder proposed which places such diverse organizations as the Berlitz School and Frontier College in the same classification, it may be useful to use preferred technology patterns as a basis for classifying organizations. Schroeder used the following relations of the adult education function to the unit as the criteria for classification: adult education as a central function; adult education as a secondary function; adult education as an allied function; and adult education as a subordinate function. Both Frontier College and the Berlitz School have adult education as a central function and are thus classified as Type I agencies using Schroeder's classification. Their similarities,
however, may be fewer and less significant than their differences. For example, the Berlitz School is proprietary, is usually found in large metropolitan centers, has a relatively well-educated clientele, and offers one kind of adult education program. Frontier College as a contrast is philanthropic, is usually found in remote and sparsely populated areas, has a relatively uneducated clientele, and offers several kinds of adult education programs. Using a unit's technology as a classification criterion may more appropriately place these two agencies among other units that share similar approaches to program planning and result in a more descriptive classification than using primacy of the adult education function as the criterion. They may also share other characteristics that have an impact on program planning such as the nature of clients, availability of resources, relationship of a unit to its organization, and articulated models of program planning.

Teaching program planning as technology has implications for graduate courses. Units' contextual settings, their technological preferences, and the philosophical approaches of their staff are important factors to consider in teaching about program planning because they influence the way the process is carried out. In some graduate courses models of program planning have been termed complete and others have been presented as sequential with the "correct" sequence specified. This study has described and documented references to a fluid approach to program planning where steps in the process come at unpredictable times and where some are repeated. Teaching program planning as a linear sequential undertaking is not an accurate reflection of what actually occurs in the practice of adult education. Considering differences between a model and the practice of program planning may be a useful exercise in that it would enable students to gain an understanding of differences between conceptualization and
practice. Conceptualizing seven operations, six clusters, or fourteen steps of program planning is a useful way to think about program planning because it enables a person to understand the scope of a comprehensive undertaking. However, the existence of nearly 130 tasks may emphasize the point that program planning is complex and individualized. Such an approach to teaching program planning might produce aware and insightful individuals who would be prepared to deal with the infinite variety of conditions and circumstances they will encounter in the professional practice of adult education.

Studying program planning has usually occurred at a macro level and much information about operations or their conceptual equivalents has been collected. The present study presents a different approach because a micro level of program planning was examined. This level of examination highlighted differences rather than similarities in program planning. What individuals do to produce programs at specific task levels might produce some propositions which could move the study of program planning in an organizational context from a descriptive to a predictive stage involving organizational structure and environment.

This study has raised more questions than it has answered: Do technology preferences exhibited by units covary with organizational relationships? Are similar technology preferences likely to be found in units belonging to similar organizations? What influences a unit to demonstrate a technology preference or no preference? Can generalizations about units and their technology preferences be made? Is technology preference a sum of individual program planner preferences, or is it a result of unit philosophy? Some of these questions have importance to the study of adult education organizations as well as program planning. Answers to these questions may provide some predictive capacity and
theories. For example, predictions about the kinds of technology preference may be based upon the kind of organization to which a unit belongs, the age of a unit, or the kind of people working in a unit. The implications and possibilities for research using program planning as a variable are extensive and possibly useful to at least teachers, students and researchers in adult education.

At least three studies using the concept of technology might be useful to further develop the discipline of adult education. One study should test the generalizability of technology patterns. Such a study should be concerned with a broad view representative of all adult education units. Operationalizing the concept of technology and then constructing an instrument to be used in capturing data from some sample of adult educators and using the kind of organization employing them as one independent variable would offer some test of generalizability. It would also help establish an additional method of organizational classification built upon a unique discipline concept--planning adult education programs. Measurement and correlation of technology patterns with organizational variables is a promising area of investigation.

Another study might be based upon the possibility that additional technology patterns exist. This study could be replicative in nature as far as the methodology used here is concerned. Intelligent variation of the subjects would provide new and useful insights to technology patterns. If additional patterns exist, they logically would appear in private sector organizations that offer adult education programs to the public and private sector organizations which offer adult education programs to their employees only. Such a study would serve two useful purposes. First, it would test for additional technology patterns; and second, such a study could offer a test for the findings of the present study.
Still another study should examine what factors influence a unit to use a given technology pattern. The present study has identified two factors: leadership and integration. Some future study should measure the influence of these and other variables upon adult education units. Correlation of an organization's technology and its adult education unit's technology would be an important part of such a study. Subjects should include public education organizations as well as private noneducational organizations in order to achieve a maximum variance in organization and unit technology.

Yet another study is possible based upon the findings of the present investigation. Unlike the suggestions made above, this last suggestion does not necessarily involve technology, but rather centers upon the concept of integration. This concept seems to be a major influence in a unit's structure, organizational relations, technology, and organizational role. Initial consideration seems to place this concept in relation to Clark's concept of marginality. Integration may well be a countervailing force or a reaction to marginality. A study that juxtaposed these two concepts may well demonstrate that marginality is not the only organizational factor influencing an adult education unit. These suggested studies may contribute to further understanding of adult education units.
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APPENDIX A

Program Titles and Fees From School District A and College A Fall 1980 Catalogs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Titles</th>
<th>Registration Fees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EDUCATIONAL UPGRADE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Skills Literacy</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing and Language Skills</td>
<td>26.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Writing and Language</td>
<td>26.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Improvement</td>
<td>26.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelling Improvement</td>
<td>26.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Mathematic Skills</td>
<td>26.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Skills</td>
<td>26.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronunciation Improvement</td>
<td>26.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 8 Equivalency</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Education Development</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BUSINESS MANAGEMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Forms Design and System</td>
<td>37.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Law</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Management &amp; Administration</td>
<td>46.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Communication</td>
<td>46.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit Management-Credit &amp; Collection</td>
<td>43.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Processing I</td>
<td>37.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Processing II</td>
<td>37.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Relations</td>
<td>47.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of Human Relations</td>
<td>49.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>46.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Selling Skills I</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Selling Skills II</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Supervision</td>
<td>46.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to Start A Small Business</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bookkeeping for Small Business</td>
<td>36.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising for Small Business</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding Your Market Potential</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to Manage Your Time</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selling for Small Business</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OFFICE SKILLS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Math and Machine Applications I</td>
<td>35.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Math and Machine Applications II</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Executive Secretary - Introduction</td>
<td>26.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretarial English</td>
<td>26.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Office Mgt &amp; Procedures I</td>
<td>26.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Office Mgt &amp; Procedures II</td>
<td>26.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machine Transcription</td>
<td>28.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typing I</td>
<td>42.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typing II</td>
<td>42.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typing III</td>
<td>29.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typing-Refresher, Dictaphone &amp; Speed Building</td>
<td>29.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shorthand I</td>
<td>42.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teeline Shorthand</td>
<td>26.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Stenography</td>
<td>28.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Stenography</td>
<td>28.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### BOOKKEEPING/ACCOUNTING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bookkeeping I</td>
<td>39.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bookkeeping II</td>
<td>39.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting I</td>
<td>60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-Write Accounting</td>
<td>23.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll</td>
<td>19.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Tax - Business and Personal</td>
<td>28.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Tax Training Program</td>
<td>75.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PERSONAL FINANCE MANAGEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prelude to Investment</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Avenues</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate As An Investment</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Shelter &amp; Tax Planning</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stocks, Bonds, &amp; Mutual Funds</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Real Estate</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art As An Investment</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CREATIVE LIVING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Moms</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living With an Explorer Parents and Toddlers</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Emerging &quot;I&quot;: Parents and Toddlers</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Why Years-Parents and Preschoolers</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents of Preschoolers</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Parents of a Single Person</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At the End of Your Rope-Parent Survival</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with Teens</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blended Step Families</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systematic Training for Effective Parenting:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Parents of Preschoolers</td>
<td>16.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Parents of Preschoolers and Elementary</td>
<td>16.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Parents of Elementary</td>
<td>16.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.T.E.P.ing Out</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage Preparation</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ENGLISH LANGUAGE TRAINING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginners to Intermediate</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginners to Advanced</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TECHNICAL VOCATIONAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Illustration</td>
<td>35.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blueprint Reading</td>
<td>35.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drafting</td>
<td>53.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Code</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronics I</td>
<td>39.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronics II</td>
<td>39.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewelry Making</td>
<td>39.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machine Shop I - Fundamentals</td>
<td>60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycle Mechanics - Basic</td>
<td>32.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycle Mechanics - Intermediate</td>
<td>42.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Professional Florist Training  29.00
Screen Painting  80.00
Welding  75.00
Woodwork & Cabinetmaking I  45.00
Woodwork & Cabinetmaking II  45.00

EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

Psychology of Early Childhood Development  70.00
Principles and Practices  70.00
Creative Art Experience  35.00
Science & Social Studies  35.00
Behavior Problems & the Preschool Child  20.00
Understanding Death & Dying  15.00
Enjoying your Preschoolers  15.00
Speech & Language Development in Children  10.00
Guidance, Display and Play  10.00
Health, Nutrition & Safety  10.00
Safety Oriented First Aid  25.00
My Child is in School: What Now?  

GENERAL EDUCATION

Art, Drawing and Painting  25.00
Art, Drawing and Sketching  27.00
Batik  35.00
Calligraphy I  28.00
Bookkeeping for Artists & Craftspeople  10.00
Marketing for Artists & Craftspeople  10.00
Tole & Decorative Painting I  25.00
Tole & Decorative Painting II  25.00
Watercolors  27.00
Brake Systems and Wheels  21.00
Car Owner's Mechanics I  31.00
Tune-up and Engine Diagnosis I  55.00
Women Only, Automechanics  29.00
Outboard Motors  29.00
Bread, Sweetdough & Pastries  35.00
Chocolate Making  19.00
An Introduction to Basic Cooking  35.00
Cake Decorating  29.00
Chinese Cooking  35.00
Chinese Din Sum  35.00
Christmas Buffet Parties  29.00
Cooking With a Food Processor  19.00
Desserts and Bridge  35.00
Eating for Health  19.00
Entertaining with Flair  35.00
French Cusine  35.00
Gingerbread Houses  10.00
Greek Cooking  35.00
Home Canning & Preserving  14.00
Japanese Cooking I  35.00
Microwave Cooking  20.00
Seafood Cooking in BC  19.00
Slim Cooking & Exercise 29.00
Ukrainian Cooking 14.00
Christmas Cooking 18.00
Crochet 20.00
Decoupage 22.00
Gift Wrapping 10.00
Knitting 20.00
Macrame 25.00
Making Wooden Toys & Giftware 15.00
Needlepoint 20.00
Outrageous Dolls & Other Soft Sculpture 27.00
Potpourri of Natural Crafts 27.00
Pottery 35.00
Quilting 28.00
Stained Glass Construction 35.00
Woodcarving 25.00
Ballet 19.00
Ballroom Dancing I 25.00
Ballroom Dancing III 25.00
Belly Dancing 19.00
Jive and Rock & Roll 29.00
Modern Jazz & Belly Dancing 25.00
Tap Dancing 25.00
Today's Dance 21.00
First Aid 30.00
Safety Oriented First Aid 25.00
CPR 20.00
Gardening for the Apartment Dweller 14.00
Home Gardening & Landscaping 25.00
Green House & Coldframe Construction & Culture 18.00
Vegetable Gardening 19.00
Antiques and Collectables 17.00
Astrology 25.00
Aviation Ground School 41.00
Bartender's Guide 25.00
Bridge I 25.00
Bridge II 25.00
Boating (Power & Sail) 40.00
Cutting Children's Hair 13.00
Defensive Driving 15.00
Dog Obedience 21.00
Driving An Automobile 31.00
Puppy Training 21.00
ESP 25.00
Floral Arranging at Home 29.00
Flycasting and Flytying 25.00
Freshwater Fishing 25.00
Goldpanning 20.00
Golf 25.00
Hairdressing at Home 28.00
Hunter Training 25.00
Interior Decorating 35.00
Makeup for Teens 6.00
Memory Dynamics 22.00
Operation Kick It 5.00
Amateur Radio 44.00
Shiatsu 21.00
Sign Language for the Deaf 25.00
Tai Chi 26.00
Indoor Tennis I 27.00
Indoor Tennis II 26.00
Transactional Analysis 29.00
Vitally Alive Holistically 21.00
Creative Writing, Writers Workshop 25.00
Yoga 25.00
Yoga Level II 20.00
Contract Your Own Home 31.00
Electrical Wiring for the Homeowner 35.00
Fireplace Finishing & General Masonry 31.00
Furniture Finishing and Refinishing 36.00
Home Plumbing 28.00
House Construction and Renovation 31.00
Ladies Only Home Repair 27.00
Loghouse Construction 90.00
Solar Greenhouse Design 30.00
Upholstery 35.00
Woodwork, Ladies Only 30.00
French I 25.00
French II 25.00
French III 25.00
Family French Conversation 17.00
Soiree Francais 17.00
Le Francais Vivant 25.00
German I 25.00
German II 25.00
Italian 25.00
Family Italian 17.00
Spanish I 25.00
Spanish II 25.00
Guitar I 25.00
Musical Sight Reading 20.00
Popular Piano Level I 25.00
Popular Piano Level II 25.00
Piano Teacher Training 42.00
Basic Photography 26.00
Basic Photo for Owners of Cannon Cameras 26.00
Basic Photo for Owners of Pentax Cameras 26.00
Photography - Advanced 26.00
Photography, Darkroom Techniques 65.00
Creative Sewing with Canvas 14.00
Drapes & Curtains 22.00
Dressmaking I 36.00
Dressmaking II 36.00
Fashion Design and Pattern Making I 36.00
Pattern Fitting Workshop 19.00
Sewing for Infants & Toddlers 14.00
Stretch Sewing Basic 23.00
WOMEN'S STUDIES

Professional Sales Training for Women 46.00
Self Protection for Women 20.00
Vocational Planning for Women 25.00
Women Do 25.00

LEGAL EDUCATION CLINICS

Buying and Selling a House
Family Law
Wills and Estates

College A

ART AND CRAFTS

Understanding Northwest Coast Indian Art 17.00
Painting from the Figure 50.00
Basic Graphics 45.00
Advanced Graphics 50.00
Painting with Water Colors 45.00
Introduction to Drawing 50.00
Basic Jazz Ballet 40.00
Stained Glass Designing 40.00
Wine Making Made Easy 25.00
Bottoms Only - Sewing Pants 35.00
Clothing Alterations 75.00
Basic Calligraphy 40.00
Intermediate Calligraphy 40.00

AUDIO VISUAL

The Home Entertainment Center 25.00
Home Video Systems 25.00
Exploring the Video Universe 25.00

AVIATION

Aviation Ground School Commercial Pilot 65.00
Aviation Meteorology I 50.00
Aviation Meteorology II 50.00

BUSINESS

How to Start Your Own Business 68.00
Internal Control for the Small Business 58.00
Advertizing Technique for Small Business Mgt. 25.00
Make Your Decor Do the Selling 75.00
Credit & Collections 58.00
Successful Selling 58.00
Selecting the Right Small Business Computer 35.00
Introduction to Microcomputers for Fun and Profit 30.00
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Designing Microcomputer Application for Your Business</td>
<td>60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bookkeeping for Artists &amp; Crafts People</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing for Artists &amp; Crafts People</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using Money to Make Money</td>
<td>35.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investing in Oil and Gas</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investing in Real Estate</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investing in Mining Stocks</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Development</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EQUINE STUDIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care of the Mare and Foal</td>
<td>14.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care of Mare</td>
<td>14.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care of Foal</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeding and Management of Horses</td>
<td>14.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Aid for Your Horse</td>
<td>16.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care &amp; Maintenance of Horses' Feet</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformation of the Horse</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lameness of the Horse</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention &amp; Control of Infectious Disease &amp; Parasites of Horses</td>
<td>14.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology of the Horse</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buying and Selling a Horse</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Blacksmithing Skills</td>
<td>120.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Your Horse for the Farrier</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horse Show Management</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditioning Horse &amp; Rider for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Day Eventing &amp; Cross Country</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jumper &amp; Hunter Class Course Design</td>
<td>14.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FAMILY STUDIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parenting for the Future</td>
<td>18.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation for Adoption</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parenting Skills for Adopting Parents of Older Children</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kramer vs Kramer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FISHING</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collision Regulations</td>
<td>17.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Control on Freezer Boats</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celestial Navigation</td>
<td>55.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celestial Navigation Practicum</td>
<td>22.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gillnet Training for Fisherman</td>
<td>45.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Navigation I for Fisherman</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Navigation II for Fisherman</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meteorology for Fisherman</td>
<td>45.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Purse Seine Know How</td>
<td>34.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troller Deck Land Training</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Cooks Training for Fisherman</td>
<td>75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-Off Fiberglass Boat Building Techniques</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scuba Diving Certification for Fisherman</td>
<td>265.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course</td>
<td>Price</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio Telephones Operator's Restricted Certificate (Marine)</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GARDENING AND NATURE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenhouse Propagation</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardening With Ven Mullins</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edible Wild Plant of B.C.</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mushroom Foray</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GENERAL INTEREST</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracing Your Family Tree</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science: What Are Your Questions</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explorations in Science Fiction</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre Experience</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Your Best Vacation Exercise</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storytelling and Folklore</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeology of the Lower Fraser River</td>
<td>17.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inherited Eye Condition of Dogs</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inherited Bone Diseases of Large Dogs</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral Problems in Contemporary Society</td>
<td>18.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GERONTOLOGY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be Prepared to Enjoy Your Retirement</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired but Inspired</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety in the 80's</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eat and be Healthy Without Being Wealthy</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking Pills for Your Ills</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beware - Be Aware</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Without Tears</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HEALTH AND NURSING</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Cardiac Care Program in BC</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPR Instructor's Certification</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPR Instructor's Recertification Seminar #1</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPR Instructor's Recertification Seminar #3</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating With Deaf Patients</td>
<td>51.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertive Health Care Workers Level I</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinician to Manager</td>
<td>35.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Aspect in Nursing</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Clinical Microbiology for Nurses</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The In and Outs of Respiratory Assist Ventilators</td>
<td>55.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying and Managing the Aggressive Patient</td>
<td>66.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LANGUAGES</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversational French</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday College in French</td>
<td>85.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French for Parents</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samedi Quebecois</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Conversation</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sabado En Espagnol 25.00
Sunday College in Spanish 85.00
Introduction to Italian 40.00
Dutch 40.00
Ukrainian Arts Workshop 40.00
Russian Level I 40.00
Introduction to Russian Literature 32.00
Sunday College in Germany 85.00
Basic Norwegian 40.00
Japanese for Beginners 40.00

LIBRARY

More Than Just Books 30.00
Children's Literature 30.00
The Upper Crust vs the Hard Boiled Detective 30.00
Community Video and What it Can Mean to the Library 15.00
Automation and Your Library 15.00

MUSIC

Grade I Rudiments 65.00
Grade II Rudiments 65.00
Grade III Harmony 65.00
Grade IV Harmony 65.00
Grade V Harmony 65.00
Grade III History 65.00

PERSONAL GROWTH

Stress Management 35.00
Single Again 30.00
Psychology 14.00
Holistic Health for Energy 40.00
From Grief to Growth 18.00
Overcoming Worry 40.00
Mind Control 25.00
Biofeedback for Body Awareness 27.00
Men's Focus Group 30.00
Self Hypnosis 30.00

PHOTOGRAPH

Buying a Camera 10.00
Photography - Basic 45.00
Photography Composition & Photo Workshop 20.00
Ins and Outs of Photographics Lighting 35.00
Photography for the Realtor 30.00
Restoration & Copy of Old Black & White Photographs and Portraits 32.00
Nature Through the Eye of a Camera 22.00
Photographying Weddings 24.00
**PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication Skills</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grantspersonship: The Art of Getting Money</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Art of Conducting a Meeting</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directors of Volunteer Training Programs</td>
<td>55.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Education Skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop I - Setting Course Objectives</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop II - Effective Use of Audio-Visual Aids</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop III - Effective Teaching Strategies</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop IV - Course Evaluation</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial First Aid</td>
<td>115.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Resource Centers</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pesticide Dispenser Certification</td>
<td>60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pesticide Applicator Certification</td>
<td>60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Appraisal</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blueprint Reading for Tradesmen</td>
<td>60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metric Standards for Construction Workers</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Drafting Techniques for Residential Construction</td>
<td>85.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WOMEN'S STUDIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career Profiles</td>
<td>16.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Job Search</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making Your Own Job</td>
<td>18.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Sales Training or Women</td>
<td>46.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women in Selling</td>
<td>17.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returning to Learning</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making the Most of Your Money</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money Matters for Women</td>
<td>33.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to Assertiveness</td>
<td>35.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertive Techniques Exchange</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertiveness Group I</td>
<td>35.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertiveness Group II</td>
<td>28.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertiveness Group III</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertiveness Group IV</td>
<td>28.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Assertiveness Skills</td>
<td>35.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving Your Self-Esteem</td>
<td>32.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Time to Meet Your Goals</td>
<td>27.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading Women's Groups</td>
<td>45.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Skills for Women</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress Conference</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress &amp; the Modern Woman</td>
<td>27.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Stress</td>
<td>16.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress-less</td>
<td>35.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Self Defense</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being in Relationship</td>
<td>32.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Juggling Act</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman: Balancing Feminine Socialization With Self</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hold Your Own in Public</td>
<td>17.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wen Do - Women's Self Defense</td>
<td>28.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Fitness</td>
<td>43.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women in Art History</td>
<td>35.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

Program Planning Tasks Reported by all Interviewees and Grouped by Operation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Originating Ideas</th>
<th>Number of Tasks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task #</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1- Review other programs</td>
<td>(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- Consider social trends or needs</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- Consider requests from instructors</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4- Consider faculty members' ideas</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5- Consider requests from groups</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6- Perform survey or needs assessment</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7- Consider telephone inquiries</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8- Consider personal interests</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9- Review past programs</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10- Consider suggestions from supervisor</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11- Value client ideas</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12- Talk with friends</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13- Use intuition</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14- Visit organizations</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15- Review literature</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16- Talk with colleagues</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17- Think about follow-up programs</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18- Consider research results</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19- Review organizational resources</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20- Consider community needs</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21- Comply with outside agency requests</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22- Comply with outside agency sponsored requests</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23- Establish network</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24- Consider gaps in programming</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25- Consider unserved clientele</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26- Balance program offerings</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27- Consider client program evaluations</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28- Consider requests from individuals</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Developing Ideas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29- Talk with office personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30- Check with community contacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31- Read about program idea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32- Talk with faculty member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33- Talk with client</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34- Talk with potential instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35- Work with programmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36- Gain approval of academic unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37- Use an instananeous process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38- Talk with community based program committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39- Review other program approaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40- Conduct developmental seminar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41- Respond to pressure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42- Talk with colleagues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43- Talk with potential participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44- Talk with experts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45- Develop philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46- Listen to comments from program participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47- Use program developed by sponsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48- Develop advisory board of experts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49- Consider research results</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
50- Review client opinion (1)
51- Assess & use expert (faculty) interests (1)
52- Consider nature of client (1)
53- Write proposal with faculty member (1)

Establishing Objectives

Task # 54- Allow faculty member to set objectives (6)
55- Use cooperation between programmer and instructor (5)
56- Use concerns of learners (4)
57- Recognize import of organizational goals (3)
58- Consider nature of subject matter (2)
59- Use predetermined objectives (1)
60- Use agency determined objectives (1)
61- Emphasize organizational and unit harmony in objectives (1)
62- Use objectives repeatedly (1)
63- Use objectives established by professionals (1)
64- Consider results of needs assessments (1)

Selecting and Sequencing Learning Activities

Task # 65- Use instructor selection and sequence (6)
66- Rely upon expert (5)
67- Consider content (4)
68- Use clients' wishes and desires (4)
69- Reproduce learning activities (3)
70- Consider learners (3)
71- Selected jointly by programmer and instructor (2)
72- Consider objectives (2)
73- Propose learning activities to advisory committee (2)
74- Rely upon comments from community contacts (1)

Ensuring Participation

Task # 75- Advertise through general brochure (9)
76- Use specific means of brochure distribution (7)
77- Advertise through specific brochure (6)
78- Co-sponsor with other organizations (5)
79- Develop support from other organizations (2)
80- Use varied media and approaches (1)
81- Locate program in high participation area (1)
82- Advertise through a topical brochure (1)
83- Give public interviews via TV and newspapers (1)
84- Use advisory Board (1)
85- Market through associations (1)
86- Use newspaper ads about specific program (1)
87- Use ads in professional journals (1)
88- Hire marketing expert (1)
Securing Resources

Task #39 - Develop funding
90 - Use organization controlled facilities (8)
91 - Use facilities based upon program requirements (7)
92 - Use instructors known to programmer or colleague (5)
93 - Select instructors based on program content (5)
94 - Select instructors from academic unit (3)
95 - Consider comments from advisory committee regarding instructors (3)
96 - Coopt for facilities (3)
97 - Obtain referral for instructors from network (2)
98 - Use instructors and commercially developed learning materials (1)
99 - Coopt for instructors (1)
100 - Secure public documents for learning materials (1)
101 - Resources (general) are coopted (1)
102 - Unit reproduces learning materials (1)
103 - Maintain pool of instructors (1)
104 - Consider client in selecting instructors (1)
105 - Use learners to help select learning materials (1)
106 - Use materials from previous courses (1)
107 - Use facilities routinely from outside agency (1)
108 - Rely on internal funding (1)
109 - Select instructors based upon professional reputation (1)
110 - Obtain funds by meeting sponsor requirements (1)
111 - Potential instructors approach unit (1)

Evaluating

Task #112 - Use standard instrument (6)
113 - Use evaluation results to improve program (6)
114 - Use perceived client criteria (6)
115 - Use dropout rates (5)
116 - Monitor client reaction (4)
117 - Obtain instructor opinion (2)
118 - Use customized instrument (2)
119 - Use results to improve teacher (2)
120 - Use unsolicited letters (1)
121 - Use committee of experts (1)
122 - Listen to comments from involved clients (1)
123 - Consider learner performance (1)
124 - Program visits by programmer (1)
125 - Done by instructor (1)
126 - Programmer and instructor jointly evaluate (1)
127 - Use criteria of expert (1)
128 - Bring clients together for oral evaluation (1)