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ABSTRACT
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Purpose

The purpose of the study was to determine the impact the self-study and accreditation process had on the administration and management of selected accredited Michigan public community colleges. The study investigated the following questions:

1. Does accreditation bring about educational improvements?
2. Does accreditation protect the various publics which educational institutions serve?

3. Is accreditation a catalyst for educational change?

4. Does accreditation provide the spark which results in educational services of superior quality?

Five categories of possible improvements and/or change which might result from an accreditation process were investigated: goals and objectives of the institution; curriculum, instruction and/or program services of the institution; organizational and administrative policies or practices of the institution; planning and decision-making practices of the institution; and personnel policies and faculty/staff relations of the institution.

The population for this study was all of the Michigan community colleges which were accredited or reaccredited in the years 1975-1979. Thirteen of the twenty-nine Michigan public community colleges were included within these parameters.

Data Collection and Analysis

The self-study and on-site examining team reports were analyzed to identify recommendations and concerns and sorted into five categories named above. On-site visits were made to each institution where personal interviews were conducted with each college
president, chief instructional officer, dean of continuing education, dean of students, and a faculty representative as well as student representatives. The opinions of the interviewees were recorded as to their perceptions concerning (a) the status of the implementation of each recommendation, and (b) the level of influence that the interviewees felt the self-study and accreditation process had on the implementation of the recommendations. A chi square test of significance was used to determine if the influence of the accreditation procedures on the implementation of recommendations was significant or did it occur by chance. A z test was performed to determine the direction of influence from maximum to no influence. School size, years of accreditation, and source of recommendations were compared with the degree of implementation. Again, a chi square was used to determine significance.

Of the 702 recommendations identified in the self-studies or visiting team reports, almost 80 percent were either partially or totally implemented as perceived by those interviewed. The institutional self-study appeared to be favored as a reasonable evaluation instrument by all educational leaders. Once problem areas were identified, commitment to problem resolution was very high. In relation to influence the accreditation process had on the implementation of recommendations, educational leaders felt an average of only
34 percent was a direct result of maximum or moderate influence. When coupled with the influence which was considered to be slight, the percentage increased to a range of 52 percent as evaluated by faculty to a high of 82 percent as perceived by deans of continuing education.

Institutional accreditation was perceived to be important to the students interviewed. Sixty-three percent indicated they would have chosen another institution if their colleges had not been accredited.

Conclusions

Educational leaders recognize that the self-study process is a valuable mechanism the results of which, if followed, would enhance the quality of instruction and services provided by educational institutions. Educators generally feel that the achievement of regional accreditation indicates an institution does provide credible services and, therefore, does protect the publics which they serve. However, it is not a guarantor of educational excellence. There is agreement that only a quality, well-trained, competent faculty with professional integrity supported by a strong administration can produce educational services of superior quality.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, institutions of higher education have been faced with a number of challenges which have required close examination. Along with monetary issues which have been affected by inflation, "tax revolts," and an economy in trouble, colleges and universities have had challenges to their programs, ethics, and virtually every aspect of their conduct. Areas of concern have included:

- A significant and apparently increasing amount of cheating by students on academic assignments.
- A substantial misuse by students of public financial aid.
- Theft and destruction by students of valuable property, most specifically library books and journals.
- Inflation of grades by faculty members.
- Competitive awarding of academic credits by some departments and by some institutions for insufficient and inadequate academic work.
- Inflated and misleading advertising by some institutions in search for students. (Bonham, 1979, p. 13)

Along with questionable practices regarding the awarding of credit to athletes, universities and
colleges have had to answer charges regarding:

- Off-campus programs, the admission of unqualified foreign students, inadequate support services...
- Plagiarism by both teachers and students...
- And the abject submission by institutions to groups that would deny open discourse on controversial subjects of interest to the campus community. (p. 13)

One of the devices which evolved to evaluate educational institutions was that of "voluntary accreditation." Voluntary accreditation is a direct result of the educational institutions' desire to improve the academic and program services provided to their constituents. According to Kells (1980), institutional accrediting agencies and to some extent specialized agencies as well were created by the institutions and are largely controlled by institutionally-based professionals.

This uniquely American form of self-policing is a technique not possessed by any other educational system in the world. Elsewhere, inflexible government control and uniformity hold sway (p. 20). Nevertheless, suspicion has arisen concerning this system of voluntary accreditation in the United States which was adopted to "assure the quality of post-secondary education,

A publication of the National Commission on Accrediting described it as 'the single most important indicator of educational quality...

Not other awards, or Alan Cartter-type ratings, or expenditure per student. Not faculty-student ratios, or the ratio of applicants to those admitted, or graduates' performance on licensing..."
exams. But accreditation, the bromo for all forms of academic dyspepsia.

These vain proclamations overlook the fact that only 64 of the 3,173 institutions in the 1978-79 Education Directory were unaccredited. Hence, whatever ails higher education today ails accredited institutions. (p. 33)

Against this background, institutions themselves have had to re-evaluate the costs of the accreditation process in terms of time, money, and effort versus the benefits received. "The motivations to seek accreditation for a given program or institution are varied and probably differ dramatically," (Kells, 1980, p. 20). Concerns such as these have stimulated a desire to inquire whether or not the aims of the accreditation system are being achieved.

**Statement of the Problem**

Accreditation has as its main focus educational excellence. The self-study process for accreditation is a demanding, time-consuming procedure; and to be effective, it takes effort and commitment on the part of the total staff of each member institution, or those institutions seeking membership.

This study investigated the following questions:

1. Does accreditation bring about educational improvements?

2. Does accreditation protect the various publics which educational institutions serve?
3. Is accreditation a catalyst for educational change?

4. Does accreditation provide the spark which results in educational services of superior quality?

The problem is that there do not seem to be any definitive answers to these questions.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to determine the impact the self-study and accreditation process had on the administration and management of selected accredited Michigan public community colleges. This research, although limited to a specific geographic area and a specialized category of educational institutions, should be generalizable over other public community colleges in the state of Michigan and elsewhere.

Five categories of possible improvements and/or changes which might result from an accreditation process were investigated: goals and objectives of the institution; curriculum, instruction and/or program services of the institution; organizational and administrative policies (which includes financial practices) of the institution; planning and decision-making practices of the institution; and personnel policies and faculty-staff relations of the institution. Questions were directed to interviewees only in regard to those areas for which they were responsible or had a direct
relationship. In particular this study focused on determining:

1. The percentage of implementation of recommendations by the five categories given above
2. The percentage of influence on implementation of recommendations as a result of the accreditation procedure as perceived by the interviewees
3. The perceptions of faculty and administrators as to the worthwhileness of the accreditation process
4. The perception of selected students as to the value to them of accreditation
5. Whether institutional size or length of time accreditation was held was a factor of change resulting from the self-study and accreditation process

Significance of the Study

It would be helpful to educational leaders to affirm or deny the widely-held beliefs concerning the benefits of voluntary accreditation at a time when cost-cutting is foremost in consideration and when the specter of governmental control is real and growing in educational matters. The results of this study are seen as providing a helpful perspective on whether or not accreditation is deemed to be an effective and sensitive management tool used to facilitate and enhance the administration of Michigan community colleges.
Historical Overview

Prior to the evolution of educational accreditation, educational practices were dictated by and dependent on a papal or royal order. Until the fifteenth century medieval universities "both prepared the students and certified their standard of accomplishment" (Selden, 1960, pp. 8-9). However, church domination diminished as a result of a combination of external forces such as the growing nationalism, the Reformation, widespread wars, and political confusion (p. 10). In addition:

Men's ideas were enlarged as trade increased with the East and eventually with all parts of the world, and as the invention of the printing press increased literacy, and as the growing power of city states and nations changed and eventually replaced the feudal structure of society and challenged the political influence of the Church. (p. 9)

By the sixteenth century, sanction by the state was recognized in many countries as the legal basis for universities to operate. In the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, the state came to control education and educational standards in France and other European countries (pp. 9-10).

This form of control for institutions of higher learning—whereby ministries of education are assigned broad powers of policy and administration, and the admission and right to practice a profession is restricted to those who pass state examinations—is found with varying modifications in the countries of continental Europe, in the Arab countries of the near East, and in fact in almost all countries throughout the world except those where British influence has been predominant.
Such a form of control provides both an effective means of rapidly altering academic standards and an administrative organization that can be described relatively easily.

. . . This method of administration can readily be adapted to the desires of a state which wishes to convert the universities into instruments of extreme nationalism. (pp. 12-13)

Great Britain has been stronger in emphasizing academic freedom than other nations. British control of standards in higher education has been maintained by requiring institutions to serve an "affiliation" under degree-granting institutions such as Oxford and Cambridge until such time as they are considered sufficiently "mature" to warrant a charter as a university with accompanying powers of examining and granting degrees (pp. 13-15).

The system of higher education that developed in colonial America operated and granted degrees without official recognition from England.

With no practical legal restriction, it was possible for colleges to be created by lay boards of trustees spurred by the influence of religious sectarianism, geographic separation, and local pride, without regard to actual educational needs. (Selden, 1960, p. 19)

Inasmuch as education was not mentioned in the Constitution of the United States, it was considered a state and local responsibility. Charters granted by the state confirmed the existence of a college and "it is these charters which have provided the institutions with
considerable protection from political interference and government dictation" (p. 20). In 1819 the United States Supreme Court ruled in the famous Dartmouth College case that the state cannot take over a college without its permission and that the charter of a college is a contract between the state and the college the inviolability of which is guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States (p. 21).

Colleges and universities began to compete with each other for students, and in the process, concern developed over the lack of common admission standards and the diverse quality of different institutions (Larson, 1974, p. 1). As a result, in 1787, the New York State Board of Regents was required "to visit every College in this State once a year" and report annually to the Legislature (Horner, 1954, p. 5).

In 1871 the University of Michigan began an inspection system of Michigan high schools to pass judgment on their ability to prepare students for the university. Recommendations would then be made as to whether or not the schools would be certified or accredited, and their graduates would be admitted without formal evaluation (Geiger, 1970, p. ix).

Before accrediting standards were adopted, there might be a difference of several years in the amount of time a student had to prepare for admission
to a university or college. This difference led to the adoption of the "Carnegie Unit," a year's study in any subject in secondary school, as a measure of comparability of preparatory or high school course work (Selden, 1960, p. 35). Definitions of college work in quantitative standards such as four-year programs, or 120-semester hours, also tended to improve the quality of one's education (Blauch, 1959, p. 10).

Most regional accrediting associations were established to improve admission standards and relations between secondary schools and institutions of higher learning. The emphasis of accrediting associations has shifted through the years and it is no longer on college admissions requirements or quantitative measures alone. Today the focus is on quality:

The accreditation movement of today is an effort at quality control of programs (or institutions) based on peer evaluation. In this system, basic institutional quality is assured through evaluation efforts of regional accrediting association. (Larson, 1974, p. 1)

The "six unequal subdivisions, which ultimately became areas or regions for the general accreditation of education covered a period from 1885 to 1924" (Mayor, 1965, p. 37). In 1885 the New England Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools was formed and was quickly followed by the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools (1887). The North Central Association and the Southern Association of
Colleges and Secondary Schools were organized in 1895. The Northwest Association of Secondary and Higher Schools in 1917 and the Western College Association in 1924 continued the trend (Blauch, 1959, p. 10).

The North Central Association, the accrediting organization primarily involved in this study, is the largest of the regional agencies. It covers a wide and varied geographical area represented by nineteen states in mid-America (Geiger, 1970, p. xxii). The North Central Association established the first standards for colleges in 1909 and published the first list of accredited colleges in 1916. It announced standards for junior colleges in 1917 and introduced specifications for teachers' colleges in 1918 (p. 10).

The North Central Association conducts its affairs under the auspices of three commissions; namely, the Commission on Schools; the Commission on Research and Services; and the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education which is responsible for the evaluation and accreditation of colleges and universities (Vaughn & Manning, 1978, pp. 395-402).

At the same time that regional accrediting activities for colleges and universities were being initiated, other organizations were operating to evaluate professional schools and programs such as medical, dental, nursing, law, engineering, teacher...
education and social work. State agencies also undertook the responsibility of judging the quality of various programs through their licensing procedures (Sanders, 1959, pp. 11-14). In fact, Kells declared:

There appear to be too many accrediting agencies. . . . Not only should no new agencies be created, but the number of existing agencies must be reduced via merger or elimination. (Kells, 1980, p. 21)

An effort to try to control the proliferation of accrediting agencies and to stem the involvement of the federal government in the whole process of accreditation resulted in the formation of the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation (COPA). The two national bodies that had merged in 1975 to form COPA were: The Federation of Regional Accrediting Commissions of Higher Education (FRACHE) which had been composed of the commissions on postsecondary education for the six regional accrediting associations; and the National Commission on Accrediting which was the agent of degree-granting institutions charged with reviewing, recognizing by listing, and continually monitoring the activities of specialized or programmatic bodies (Young, 1978, p. 359).

Unfortunately, there are those who view COPA as ineffective in curbing the number of accrediting agencies.

Ironically, both the federal government and COPA have encouraged the proliferation of voluntary
professional or specialized accrediting agencies, 
and therefore the fractionation of higher insti­
tutions and the higher education community. In a 
relatively short period, then, the accrediting 
field became crowded and complex and replete with 
ambiguities and unsolved problems.

. . . As higher education has expanded and 
proliferated, the need and the demand of society 
for consumer protection and accountability have 
become more urgent.

. . . The federal government and COPA have 
become judges of what voluntary accrediting 
agencies do, and it is not hard to get blessed 
by either organization. (Nyquist, 1981, pp. 343- 
344)

The history of evaluation in education, then, 
has evolved and progressed from medieval papal or 
royal control to sanction by state authority. Initially, 
in the United States education was controlled through 
state charter, and it then progressed to include a 
voluntary system of participation in monitoring educa­
tional standards. "Accreditation is a vote of confidence 
in the future of an institution and must, therefore, 
take that future into account (Dressel, 1971, p. 278). 
The challenge and direction for this decade "will be 
the maintenance of quality and integrity" (Nyquist, 

Higher education is too complex to yield to simple 
numerical description, and accreditation which 
rests upon how much of this and how many of that 
is at best arbitrary.

. . . Eventually you learn to generalize, to 
recognize characteristics which predispose to 
institutional effectiveness, and to trust the 
judgment of thoughtful and experienced observers.
In fact, the more sophisticated institutional evaluation becomes, the more deliberately it leans upon subjective judgment. One can no longer pretend that the accreditation process is one of scientific objectivity. It is not. . . . Any good evaluation depends upon the probing and weighing of intangibles as well as of concrete facts by one or more practicing teachers and administrators . . . who have been successful enough in their own fields to know quality intimately. (pp. 346-347)

Accreditation Procedures

The unique process of voluntary institution accreditation in the United States evolved from the need for an external agency to attest to the quality of an educational institution. Generally there are two types of accreditation: one is institutional accreditation conducted by one of the six regional accrediting commissions; and the other is specialized accreditation that evaluates the quality of a specific academic program. The latter is carried out by a professional accrediting organization (Handbook on Accreditation, 1975, p. 7).

An institution wishing to apply for accreditation must meet the eligibility requirements that it be chartered as an educational organization and that it must include in its curriculum, or as a prerequisite for entrance or graduation, a sequence of general education (Manning, 1979, pp. 51-52). Such an institution may then proceed through the following three steps:
(a) Program for Candidate for Accreditation
(Seeking and Maintaining Affiliate Status)

(b) Program for Initial Accreditation
(Seeking Membership Status)

(c) Program for Member Institutions
(Reaffirmation of Accreditation). (Handbook on Accreditation, 1975, p. 9)

Colleges and universities holding "Candidate for Accreditation" status are evaluated biennially for a period not to exceed six years. During this period, an institution must prepare and apply for full accreditation (p. 20). This first step indicates that an institution has "provided evidence of sound planning, has available the resources to implement its plans, and appears to have the potential for attaining its goals within a reasonable time" (p. 10).

An institution which has received "Initial Accreditation" status is required to submit an annual report to the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education. It must also have an on-site evaluation for full accreditation within a five-year period unless approved otherwise by the Commission (pp. 16-17).

"Member Institutions" are required to submit an annual report and to have an on-site evaluation for reaffirmation of accreditation at least once each ten years. Upon the recommendation of the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education, the on-site evaluation of an institution may occur more frequently than

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
every ten years (p. 17). "Membership" indicates that the institution is providing educational opportunities in harmony with its objectives and at a satisfactory quality-level (p. 10).

In preparation for accreditation or reaffirmation for accreditation, an institution is obliged to undertake an extensive self-study. According to Dressel (1971), a successful comprehensive institutional self-study is a major effort of data collection, assessment of strengths and weaknesses, re-examination of goals, and detailed analysis of present and needed resources. Dressel offers a brief outline of points to be studied by each institution:

1. Definition and clarification of institutional purposes and goals;
2. Examination of the adequacy of physical and financial institutional resources;
3. Study of the effectiveness of the institutional governance and decision-making process, including roles of various groups within;
4. Appraisal of the quality, morale and activities of faculty;
5. Review of the strengths and weaknesses of current curriculum organization and instructional methods of the institution;
6. Consideration of the campus climate and environment, the role of students, their level of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with programs and services of the institution; and
7. Collection of evidence on the effectiveness of the educational programs and educational processes in fostering student development within the institution. (p. 280)

Semrow (1974) asserts that the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education has abandoned the past notion of a prescribed set of fixed standards or norms for all institutions; and in its place, current practice of institutional evaluation and accreditation employs the following:

1. Institutional self-study
2. Evaluation in the light of a particular institution's goals and objectives
3. On-site peer evaluation
4. Consideration of a combination of quantitative qualitative factors in the institution's operations leading to judgments of quality and final accrediting decisions. (p. 285)

Semrow further states that the self-evaluation and on-site evaluation results in judgments which can be made about the quality of the educational enterprise in terms of major strengths and major weaknesses (p. 285).

An institutional self-study is a time consuming, demanding task involving all levels of an institution. Its primary purpose is the improvement of an institution and its educational services. Carlson (1965) maintains that an in-depth study can bring the past, present, and the future of an institution into perceptive balance. A self-study can, and should, contribute to an institution's own improvement.
According to Dressel (1971), a self-study cannot be considered effective if it does not produce change. The self-study process, therefore, becomes a unique administrative tool within an institution, to clarify its purpose, to effect institution-wide improvement, to strive for educational excellence (p. 287).

At the conclusion of the entire process, the Manual for Chairing a North Central Accreditation Team (1979-80) indicates that the evaluating team must certify that the institution has fully met the following five criteria which are referred to as the "Certification Statements of the North Central Association Accreditation":

Certification Statements for Accreditation: The process of accreditation involves an evaluative procedure at the successful conclusion of which the Commission publicly certifies that in its judgment an educational institution:

1. Has clear and publicly stated purposes appropriate to a postsecondary educational institution;

2. Has established conditions and procedures under which these purposes can be realized;

3. Appears after evaluation by the Commission to be accomplishing its purposes substantially;

4. Is organized, staffed and supported so that it can be expected to continue to accomplish its purposes;

5. Fully meets the criteria of eligibility for consideration for accreditation and fulfills the obligations of membership in the Association through the Commission. (p. 1)
Theoretical Framework

Accreditation has progressed from its initial purposes of establishing minimum educational standards for the protection of the public, the institution, and the graduates to stimulation for self-improvement and protection of institutions from improper internal or external pressures. Selden and Porter (1977) have identified twelve uses in four categories to which accreditation has been of primary importance:

1. Internal Uses of Accreditation
   a. Identifying an institution or program of study as having met established standards.
   b. Assisting institutions in the determination of acceptability of transfer credit.
   c. Encouraging the involvement of faculty and staff in institutional evaluation and planning.
   d. Creating goals for self-improvement and stimulating a general raising of standards among educational institutions.

2. External Uses of Accreditation
   a. Assisting prospective students in identifying acceptable institutions.
   b. Helping in identification of institutions and programs of study for investment of private funds.
   c. Providing one basis for determination of policies established by civil government.
   d. Serving as an instrument for enforcement of policies established by civil government.
3. **Professional Uses of Accreditation**

   a. Establishing criteria for professional certification and licensure.

   b. Serving as a means for specialized groups to gain increased support for their programs of study.

4. **Societal Uses of Accreditation**

   a. Protecting institutions against harmful external and internal pressures.

   b. Serving as an integral part of the balance of forces exerting control over postsecondary education. (Selden & Porter, 1977, pp. 5-15)

The Commission on Institutions of Higher Education of the North Central Association has stated its purposes of accreditation as:

Fostering excellence in postsecondary education through the development of criteria and guidelines for assessing educational effectiveness;

Encouraging institutional improvement of educational endeavors through continuous self-study and evaluation;

Assuring the educational community, the general public and other agencies or organizations that an institution has clearly defined and appropriate educational objectives, has established conditions under which their achievement can reasonably be expected, appears in fact to be accomplishing them substantially, and is so organized, staffed, and supported that it can be expected to continue to do so;

Providing counsel and assistance to established and developing institutions;

Protecting institutions against encroachments which might jeopardize their educational effectiveness or academic freedom. (Handbook on Accreditation, 1975, p. 7)
Assumptions Relating to Accreditation

The self-study and accreditation process should have four positive effects on the institutions of the study:

1. It should foster educational improvements in the services provided by the institutions.
2. It should be an integral part of the planning and decision-making process of the institutions.
3. It should be a management tool for the continuous evaluation of the educational programs of the institutions.
4. It should also serve as an effective communications link, interpreting the educational services of each institution of the study. This improvement in communication should be both among the members of the educational institution and between the educational institution and the community.

Delimitations

Although applications and generalizations may be made to other community colleges, this study was limited to:

1. An investigation of the effects of the self-study and accreditation process on thirteen accredited Michigan public community colleges which have been accredited or reaccredited in the years 1975 through
1979 and are not scheduled for reaccreditation before the 1980-81 academic year. The time frame 1975-1979 was selected so that the information obtained in the investigation would be reasonably current and yet would have allowed the institutions in the study sufficient time to have planned for or implemented the recommendations they felt to be beneficial. It was also felt that the staff within the institutions would most likely have been involved in the self-study and accreditation processes thereby adding to the quality of the study.

2. Although the intent of the self-study and accreditation process is to bring about positive educational improvements, it was not the purpose of this study to evaluate the goals and philosophy, the departmental organizational structure, or the quality of programs and services provided by the accredited Michigan public community colleges. Each institution was licensed to operate under the statutes of the state of Michigan and therefore met minimum educational requirements as established by the Michigan Department of Education.

Definition of Terms

The following definitions of terms are presented as used in the conduct of the present study:
Accreditation: The recognition accorded to an educational institution in the United States through inclusion on a list of accredited or approved institutions issued by some agency or organization which sets up standards or requirements that must be complied with in order to secure approval. Membership is voluntary and extralegal (Good, 1975, p. 6). Accreditation is a nongovernmental, voluntary means of attesting to the quality of educational institutions (Manning, 1979, p. 51).

Accrediting Agency: An organization that sets up criteria for judging the quality of educational institutions and programs, determines the extent to which institutions and programs meet these criteria, and issues a public announcement concerning the institutions and programs found to be of acceptable quality. It may be a governmental bureau, i.e., State Department of Education, or a voluntary organization such as a regional accrediting agency (Good, 1975, p. 6).

Change: The modification that occurs within an institution in educational programs, services, or practices, either large or small, because of the self-study and accreditation process.

Management: A distinct process consisting of planning, organizing, actuating, and controlling the work of others, performed to determine and accomplish objectives (p. 348).

Process: A course or method of operation. It includes a systematic series of actions to accomplish a specific activity.

Recommendation: A course of action suggested to improve or otherwise alter an existing program or service for the betterment of an institution.

Self-Study: A process of institutional investigation and evaluation terminated in a written report submitted to an accrediting agency for the purpose of receiving accreditation or reaffirmation of accreditation.

Summary and Organization of the Study

Chapter I includes an introduction, a statement of the problem, and the purpose of the study. An historical overview of accreditation is given, accreditation procedures are outlined, and the theoretical framework is presented. Basic assumptions are stated, delimitations are expressed, and terms are defined.

Chapter II presents a review of the literature.
and related research on the topic of accreditation, specifically in community colleges.

Chapter III presents the design and methodology of the study, and chapter IV describes the analysis of the data. In chapter V conclusions are drawn from the data presented and recommendations are made for further study.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

An ERIC and DATRIX search was conducted to obtain information pertaining to the general subject of accreditation and specifically to community college self-studies and accreditation. The first section of chapter II presents an overview of the community college movement. Secondly, issues in accreditation are presented. Thirdly, research in the area of community college accreditation is examined, and lastly, various methods used to study accreditation are outlined.

Overview of the Community College

Although the community college is primarily viewed as a twentieth-century phenomenon, the foundations for this type of educational institution were laid during the nineteenth century. William Rainey Harper, an American educator and first president of the University of Chicago in 1891, is generally considered to be the father of the junior college because he "advocated the division of the undergraduate college into two levels--the 'junior college' and the 'senior college'" (Landrith, 1971, pp. 16-17). In 1915
Harper wrote of this arrangement:

The division of the college work into the Junior and Senior Colleges has been an unqualified success, striking the natural line of division between preparatory work and professional work. The trend of events indicates that in time this line of division will become an actual line of cleavage in the best universities of the country. (Goodspeed, 1916, p. 155)

Harper introduced many innovations into the organization of higher education that have been generally adopted. Among them are correspondence and extension-lecture courses; the four-quarter system; the university press; and the concept that students should be graduated every quarter when their work was finished and not just in June (pp. 130-157).

Colvert states that only eight junior colleges existed in 1900, with approximately one hundred students among them (Colvert, 1947, p. 244). The growth in the number of junior colleges since then has been impressive:

In 1960, the American Junior College Association reported that 677 junior colleges were in operation in the United States. Of these, 390 were publicly supported and had an enrollment of 804,814 students. The remaining 276 were privately controlled and had 97,700 students. About one out of every four students starting a college program began in a two-year college. (Landrith, 1971, p. 32)

By 1979, community and junior colleges numbered 1,230 with some 4,487,872 students of which 62 percent of the students were part-time (Community, Junior and Technical College Directory, 1980, p. 61).

The evolution of the junior college/community
college movement has been greatly influenced by at least three major currents in American education identified by Hillway (1958):

(1) The nineteenth-century efforts to reform American university education:

(2) the extraordinary growth in the United States of the various types of adult and vocational education as our economy became increasingly industrialized; and

(3) the continuing democratic tendency toward the extension and equalization of educational opportunity for all Americans. (p. 33)

A fourth factor may be identified as the tremendous influx of World War II veterans which suggested a need for additional educational opportunities. Thus, a large growth period occurred at the community college level immediately after World War II when community colleges rose to 621 in number with a combined enrollment of over half a million students (Colvert, 1947, pp. 244-247).

The nature of the community college is an institution whose program is closely related to the life of the community it serves. Most students live at home while attending college and the programs are usually one or two years in length rather than four years as found in the university. The programs are often geared closely to the vocational needs of the students. Typical programs might include training for business careers (accountants, junior executives,
retail management), health careers, or technologies. Sexson and Harbeson listed four major objectives of the two-year institution:

1. To provide all students with an adequate general education.
2. To provide qualified students for junior standing in four-year colleges.
3. To provide vocational training for those desiring immediate and effective entry into the business world.
4. To develop a comprehensive program of community education and culture. (Sexson and Harbeson, 1946, p. 49)

The student attending a community college is typically one of two types of individual: (1) The recent high school graduate who elects to attend a local institution for a variety of reasons. Some of these reasons might be economics, indecision on educational objectives, or the institution providing the specific educational training desired by the individual. (2) The mature adult who is seeking training or retraining to enter an occupational area or to upgrade present employment opportunities.

Two-year colleges with 'open door' policies admit students with varied backgrounds and abilities. Included in the student body are recent honor graduates who have the qualifications for admission to numbers of institutions and recent graduates whose academic records are so poor they are considered high academic risks. Junior colleges enroll adults who are high school graduates and those who are high school drop-outs.
More than 50 percent of the students in many two-year colleges are part-time students who take courses while holding a full-time job. In general, urban community colleges such as Chicago City College have large numbers of students in late afternoon and evening courses. (Landrith, 1971, p. 84)

Issues in Accreditation

Accreditation, the unique self-regulating, self-policing system of educational management that exists in the United States is not without adversaries. Five of the current issues which appear to present challenges to the accreditation process are examined in this section. These issues are not ranked in any order of importance. These challenges concern proliferation of accrediting agencies; cost of the accrediting process; specialized accreditation; involvement of the federal government in accreditation; and the threat of defamation judgments against team members.

Due to the proliferation of accrediting agencies, many institutions are inundated with self-study requirements that result in duplication of effort, time, reports, and costs. "One northeastern university was recently visited 40 times in three year" (Kells, 1980, p. 22). This increase in numbers of accrediting agencies has resulted partly from the growth of specialized agencies for program evaluation. For example, in the health occupations area there are separate specialized accrediting agencies for nursing, dental, and
radiology programs, to name a few. Institutions wishing to offer these health occupation programs might perceive it necessary to acquire this specialized accreditation with the accompanying increase in accrediting agencies with whom they must deal.

The primary distinction between specialized and institutional accrediting is that specialized accrediting is concerned primarily with educational content, with the structure of the curriculum, and perhaps with educational procedures. Institutional accrediting is more concerned with providing an institutional context in which sound education can occur. (Warren, 1980, p. 12)

Kells (1980) points out that when staff members are overwhelmed by reporting requirements, they cannot be expected to study and develop their programs well and prepare effective materials. He further suggests that proliferation and duplication in accrediting could be controlled by the adoption of an Institutional Bill of Rights which would in part provide:

1. The right to expect that the number of accrediting agencies will not be excessive, that the agencies will not be competitive or in conflict, that the disciplinary coverage in the agencies will not be duplicated, and that the number of agencies will be small enough so that each can be at a size and support level to enable adequate service to institutions. . . .

2. The right to a simple, well coordinated relationship with more than one accrediting agency, including, if desired, the designation of one agency as the coordinating agency for a given institution. . . . (p. 25)

Another result of accountability to an increased
number of accrediting agencies is an accompanying increase in costs. Questions have arisen about the benefits of the accrediting process itself.

Administrators discussing accrediting agencies more and more frequently express displeasure with cost, frequency of visits, overlapping of agencies, pressure tactics, and finally, the lack of demonstrable value of the process. Lack of accreditation is negative. Yet, presence of accreditation rarely adds to an institution's status. (Uehling, 1980, p. 14)

Warren (1980) believes that the most useful demonstration of the value that accrediting can offer is to show actual improvement in education as a result of the accrediting process (p. 13).

An additional concern is that "government agencies are ready and willing to attempt to replace the self-regulation process" (Kells, 1980, p. 24).

At issue is whether accreditation by nationally recognized agencies should continue to be the main criterion by which colleges and universities--and many of their programs--qualify for government assistance.

... The Carter Administration surprised and angered many higher-education leaders by proposing in effect that licensing by the states replace non-governmental accreditation as the basic requirement.

The controversy has come up at a time when accreditation is under growing attack from both inside and outside the academic community on grounds that it is too costly and too time-consuming for the institutions, and largely ineffective as a gauge of academic quality. (Jacobson, 1980, p. 11)

In July, 1980, a coalition of national organizations requested the federal government to stop
evaluating accrediting agencies as a basis for determining which colleges are eligible for federal funds. Academic leaders, and some government officials cited "excessive federal involvement in accreditation" as justification for this request (Jacobson, July 7, 1980, p. 13). In addition, the coalition declared that:

Accreditation of an entire institution—as opposed to specialized accreditation of its individual programs—should be enough to establish its eligibility for government funds under the Higher Education Act. (p. 13)

Dr. William L. Ramsey, present Chairman of the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education recently argued that:

Major considerations which speak strongly against government involvement in the accreditation process are (1) the Constitution states that education is a responsibility of the States; (2) educational standards could become subject to political pressures, and (3) government involvement might pose a threat to academic freedom. (Today, Fall 1980, p. 1)

The preservation of nongovernmental accreditation is seen as necessary to protect education from rigid, "legally imposed constraints and regulations at both state and federal levels" (p. 4).

Finally, a legal challenge arose in the case of Avins v. White (1979) where an administrator requested an accreditation review of his institution, and as a result ended up suing one of the accreditation team members for defamation. A federal district court awarded a $50,000 judgment, and the case is now on
appeal to the U. S. Court of Appeals, Second Circuit. The implications of such action suggest:

If competent and conscientious individuals are unwilling to serve on voluntary accreditation teams for fear of jeopardizing their personal assets in a defamation suit, then the present means of conducting accreditation reviews will come to an end. (Flygare, 1980, pp. 706-707)

Flygare believes that the federal government might be pushed into the vacuum resulting from the demise of accrediting agencies. While he supports judicial review of accrediting activities between an educational institution and the voluntary organization in such matters as whether or not accrediting organizations are applying their standards uniformly to various institutions, nevertheless, good-faith immunity from defamation lawsuits is necessary to preserve the voluntary, self-policing process (p. 707).

Community College Accreditation Research

The available research in the area of accreditation of community colleges is somewhat limited. It is interesting to note that the studies that have been undertaken seem to focus on several major themes which include the perception of educational leaders and the evaluation of the processes used in accreditation.

For example, in 1973 Young attempted to analyze and compare the perceptions of 230 faculty members, administrators, and accreditation team members who
represented schools in the North Central Association. His goal was to test four hypotheses concerning the perceptions of educational leaders involved in the study; their membership or nonmembership in a state community college system; institutional size, and the professional background of each individual participating in the study. Young tested each of his hypotheses against five factors and found that there were no significant differences which could be attributed to perceptions, membership, or nonmembership in a community college system, institutional size, or professional background (Young, 1973, pp. 42-44).

In a study conducted by Keyser (1975) an evaluation was made of the relationship of specialized regional, and state accrediting activities in community colleges in the North Central Region as perceived by 313 college presidents. The findings indicate that regional accreditation was judged to have attained significantly greater success than specialized accreditation and state accreditation in meeting the objectives of accreditation. Presidents perceived that regional accreditation served their institutions adequately and more effectively than specialized or state accreditation. Also, presidents did not approve of an expanded role of the federal or state government in the accreditation process.
Collins (1965) conducted a study of the accreditation of seven newly established public junior colleges in California. The purpose of the study was to determine how staff and board members perceived the accreditation process and to compare these perceptions with the claims of accreditation that were derived from the literature. Eighteen claims of accreditation were identified and became the basis for a guide that was used to interview seventy-two staff and board members in these seven California institutions. The conclusions of Collins' study showed that accreditation was regarded as a favorable goal by those interviewed and was perceived to be a guarantor of minimum standards to which institutions should be able to subscribe without fear of conformity. Further, the accreditation process did not directly cause major internal improvements of the educational institution. These improvements came from the efforts of the professional staff involved in continual self-evaluation rather than from the accreditation process only. Collins' results also indicated that the accreditation process was considered to be subjective in nature, consequently the competence of the evaluator is of paramount importance.

The purpose of the investigation conducted by Farrow (1975) was to determine how presidents and
staff members at ten Alabama junior colleges perceived the accreditation process. Ten college presidents and 124 staff members participated in the ratings of seventeen claims of accreditation. Results of the study suggest that junior college personnel were committed to the policy of evaluation by peers and preferred this process to be conducted by a voluntary agency that represented higher education in preference to governmental evaluation. Faculty did not view accreditation as a negative force toward conformity that would weaken the avowed purpose of meeting the specific educational needs of particular communities. Faculty regarded the status of being accredited to be of major importance and the maintenance of this coveted position of being "on the list" as imperative. Like Collins, Farrow found that the accreditation process was viewed as subjective in nature; therefore, the competence of the evaluators was felt to be of significant consequence.

In the final analysis, Farrow found that although the evaluation report was considered to be an important element in the accreditation process, junior college administrators rarely used these reports as levers to obtain needed funds or materials.

Moore (1974) studied the results of accreditation on ten nonsectarian two-year colleges in the middle
states region. His conclusions indicate a predominantly positive attitude toward the accreditation process on the part of the institutional personnel in regard to expectations, faculty involvement, reaffirmation, thoroughness of the team's evaluation, measurement of outcomes, and relationships of issues to outcomes.

Walters (1970) addressed himself to the identification of indicators of quality for public junior colleges through an analysis of peer opinions expressed in evaluations of selected institutions. A total of 191 Southern Association of Colleges and Schools visiting committee reports concerning accreditation visits to 126 public junior colleges during the period of 1960-69 were reviewed. The 4,599 formal recommendations and suggestions of those committees were collected, organized, and analyzed. The characteristics appearing in twenty or more of the recommendations were identified as indicators of quality for public junior colleges. Fifty-eight specific characteristics were identified. The indicators taken collectively describe an effective or "quality" public junior college and this description is based on the combined opinions of administrators and faculty members.

Goldhagen (1971) sought to identify decisions common to the self-study process; to determine which of them were critical; to explore some of the reasons they
were critical; and to explore the time and sequence involved and their effect on whether or not a decision is critical. He conducted interviews with presidents and self-study directors of ten selected community colleges in Florida using a structured interview guide. Results indicated that five decisions were critical; two involved the choice of personnel; one dealt with the involvement of faculty in the study, and the remaining two pertained to the openness of the study and the availability of college records. Time and sequence seemed to have no effect on whether or not a decision was critical. Again, the perception of the educational leaders was the tool utilized in this study.

Cavallaro (1972) conducted a study of the accreditation processes used to accredit community colleges. The purpose of the investigation was to ascertain whether improvements in these processes were needed. The hypothesis tested in this research was that traditional standards used to accredit community colleges were inadequate, did not reflect the unique characteristics of community colleges, and were in need of revision. An analysis of the standards used by the six regional accrediting agencies to accredit community colleges was made with particular emphasis on the evaluation technique used to measure occupational programs. The findings of Cavallaro's study confirmed
the hypothesis and indicated that there is a need to develop evaluative criteria that more appropriately accredit the diverse programs and services found in a comprehensive community college.

In a study conducted by Rossi (1979) of twenty California community colleges, an effort was made to determine whether change processes as reflected in self-study reports related in predictable ways to organizational climates of adaptability. Rossi's study assumed that when relationships between report measures and adaptability measures occurred in predicted directions, it could be inferred that self-study reports were representational or accurately reflected self-study change processes; when relationships were absent, it was inferred that the reports were instrumental.

The results of Rossi's study suggest that the value of the self-study report is questionable. While the purpose of accreditation is said to be institutional improvement, the colleges devoted much more space to describing present practices than to either identifying problems or formulating specific plans for improvement. Overall, the findings suggest that the self-study report technique, as it is presently used, does not yield the information by which colleges can improve and by which an accrediting agency can determine effectively whether colleges have the capacity to improve
when improvement is determined to be necessary.

In research conducted by Day (1976) of community and junior colleges in states of the Southern Association, an attempt was made to determine whether institutional problem areas which were identified through the self-study process were consistent with the problem areas as perceived by state directors for community and junior colleges. One hundred and ten community and junior college self-studies were examined during the period between 1970 through 1973. A frequency distribution of problem areas was developed for the community/junior colleges in each of the ten southern states. The Standards for Colleges of the Southern Association served as a basis for a survey instrument which was sent to state directors of community and junior colleges. An analysis both within states and among states was made. Conclusions of the study suggest that state directors tend to be aware of the general distribution of problem areas within the institutions in their states. In addition, there appeared to be a general agreement of the existence and types of problem areas between the state directors and the institutional accrediting team. Where perceptions of problem areas were different, it appeared that there was some question as to the roles and responsibilities between the state directors and that of the institutions. The relation-
ship between institutional perceptions and state directors' perceptions did not differ substantially when comparing one state with another in the southern region. Lastly, little relationship existed between the degree of agreement of problem area perceptions and the type of state-level control exhibited by the state agency for community and junior colleges.

Methodology in Accreditation Research

Most of the research in accreditation cited heretofore has utilized the subjective perceptions of educational leaders. As stated by Nyquist (1981), "One can no longer pretend that the accreditation process is one of scientific objectivity" (p. 346). Data collection in accreditation research is based to a large extent on the perceptions of those individuals most closely associated with the factor under study. Data may then be analyzed and subjected to various statistical tests; but in the final analysis:

The objectivity has to be in the minds of the men and women who evaluate the facts. Any good evaluation depends upon the probing and weighing of intangibles as well as of concrete facts by one or more practicing teachers and administrators. (Nyquist, 1981, pp. 346-347)

Summary

The community college movement in the United States has had tremendous growth in the past eight decades. In 1900 there were eight junior colleges with
100 students; by 1979 the number of institutions had increased to 1,230 with more than four-and-three-quarter million students. Currently more than 50 percent of all community college students are part-time students who often have full-time employment responsibilities or family requirements. The community college of today designs its programs, curriculum, and services to meet the needs of the community it serves. In most cases, community colleges are fluid, ever-changing organizations, locally controlled, with a major objective of providing sound educational programs for a diversified society.

Sexson and Harbeson identified four major objectives of the two-year institution which were to provide all students with an adequate general education; to provide qualified students for junior standing in four-year colleges; to provide vocational training for those desiring immediate entry into the business world; and to develop a comprehensive program of community education and culture.

Five current issues in accreditation were briefly discussed. These issues were the proliferation of accrediting agencies; the cost of the accrediting process; specialized accreditation; federal government involvement in accreditation; and the threat of defamation judgments against team members.
The available research in accreditation of community colleges is limited. What is available appears to focus on the perceptions of educational leaders and the evaluation of the processes used in accreditation.

Studies showed that accreditation status was generally regarded as a favorable goal to be achieved and was perceived to be a guarantor of minimum standards to which institutions could subscribe without fear of conformity. Further, community college personnel were committed to the process of evaluation by peers and preferred this process to be conducted by a voluntary agency that represented higher education in preference to governmental evaluation.

Studies also showed that presidents generally perceived that regional accreditation served their institutions adequately and more effectively than specialized or state accreditation. In addition, presidents did not approve of the expanded role of the federal or state government in the accreditation process.

There was concern expressed in studies by Cavallaro and Rossi that the evaluative criteria presently used in the accreditation procedures do not yield the necessary information by which colleges can improve their quality of service. According to
these studies there is a need to develop criteria that can improve their quality of service. These authors indicate that there is a need to develop criteria that more appropriately accredits the diverse programs of a comprehensive community college. In addition, these authors suggest that there is a need to develop a plan for institutional self-improvement as a part of the self-study process.
CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Chapter III outlines the type of research undertaken, the population of the study, and the procedures used in collecting the data. The eight analyses are detailed and an explanation is given of the method used in evaluating the data.

Type of Research

This research was an evaluative investigation. It is based on the personal knowledge, judgment, and appraisal of those individuals interviewed. The information thus obtained was used to investigate the effect of the self-study and accreditation processes in selected Michigan public community colleges.

Population

The population for this study was all of the Michigan community colleges which were accredited or reaccredited in the years 1975 through 1979 and which were not scheduled for re-evaluation prior to the 1980-81 academic year. The colleges were deliberately selected under the delimitations previously outlined;
namely, the currentness of the data; an adequate time frame to allow for the implementation of recommendations by the institutions; and the opportunity to interview institutional personnel who were themselves involved in the self-study process. The complete population, as described, was studied.

Thirteen of the twenty-nine Michigan public community colleges fell within these parameters. (See mini-profiles, Appendix F, p. 147). These institutions were located in all parts of the state: three colleges were located in small communities; six were located in rural areas, one of which serves a metropolitan community; and four were in urban communities.

If the state were divided into three sections as follows, (1) upper peninsula, (2) eastern lower peninsula, and (3) western lower peninsula, two colleges would be located in the first division; four institutions would be identified in the second division; and seven institutions would be represented in the third division. (A map identifying the location of each institution can be found in Appendix B, p. 129).

Institutions were categorized as to size according to the following limitations: Small-size institutions, 1,499 students or less; medium-size institutions, 1,500 to 3,999 students; large-size institutions, 4,000 or more students.
The institution, size, and location are shown in table 1.

**TABLE 1**

SELECTED MICHIGAN COMMUNITY COLLEGES BY SIZE AND LOCATION AS OF FALL, 1980

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay de Noc Community College</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen Oaks Community College</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gogebic Community College</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Shore Community College</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpena Community College</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Michigan College</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid Michigan Community College</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montcalm Community College</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Clair County Community College</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson Community College</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalamazoo Community College</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muskegon Community College</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washtenaw Community College</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Collection

The self-study report prepared by each institution in the study was examined and analyzed to identify recommendations and concerns. Further, the report of the North Central Association on-site examining team for each institution was reviewed. The
recommendations from both the report of the examining team and the self-study report were investigated by institution in each of the following five categories:

1. Improvements and/or changes in the goals and objectives of the institution

2. Improvements and/or changes in curriculum, instruction, or program services of the institution

3. Improvements and/or changes in the organizational and administrative policies or practices of the institution

4. Improvements and/or changes in the planning and decision-making practices of the institution

5. Improvements and/or changes in personnel policies and faculty-staff relations of the institution

Based on these five categories, an interview instrument was developed for each of the thirteen institutions in the study (appendix D). These individualized interview forms included the specific recommendations by both the institutional self-study and the examining team's report. This instrument was used to record the findings of the partially structured interviews and is the data-base for this study.

The researcher made on-site visits to each of the thirteen institutions selected for this study. Personal interviews were conducted with each college president; vice-president or dean of instruction;
vice-president or dean of continuing education and community services; dean of students; and the president of the faculty senate or a representative of the faculty. In selecting the individuals to be interviewed, an effort was made to obtain a broad representation of school personnel who would most likely be imminently involved in the self-study and accreditation process. The opinions of the interviewees were recorded as to their perceptions concerning (a) the status of the implementation of each recommendation, and (b) the level of influence that the interviewees felt that the accrediting process had had on implementing the recommendations.

Interviews were conducted with student representatives in some of the institutions where arrangements were granted. In most cases, students were selected by the institutional administration. In one instance where the opportunity presented itself, the researcher interviewed three students in the student-lounge area. The interviews were conducted in group-settings, and items pertaining directly to student concerns were discussed.

**Data Analysis**

Eight analyses were conducted of the data collected as follows:

1. The data were analyzed and displayed in
tabular form showing the percentage of implementation of recommendations by the five categories: Goals and objectives; curriculum, instruction, and program services; organizational and administrative policies or practices; planning and decision-making practices; and personnel policies and faculty-staff relations of the institutions. This analysis was to determine how much was done as a result of the accreditation procedure.

2. The data were analyzed and displayed in tabular form showing the percentage of influence on implementation of recommendations as perceived by the interviewees to be a result of the accreditation procedure.

3. The subjective evaluations made by the faculty and administrators were analyzed as to their perceptions of the importance of the accreditation process.

4. The perceptions of students were analyzed as to the value to them of the accreditation process.

5. Institutional size as a factor of change was examined to determine if there was a relationship between the size of the institution and the changes that had occurred due to the self-study and accreditation process. This information was evaluated and reported in percentages of implementation. Size of
school was one dimension and the number of recommendations implemented, partially implemented, or not implemented was another dimension.

The chi square test of significance was used to determine if there was any relationship between institutional size and the level of implementation of recommendations.

The null hypothesis is that there is no relationship between the size of schools and the level of implementation of recommendations, that is \( p_1 = p_2 \).

6. An evaluation was made to determine whether the length of time an institution had held accreditation had any relationship to the change that had occurred due to the implementation of recommendations made as a result of the self-study and accreditation process. The number of years an institution had held regional accreditation was compared with the number of recommendations implemented, partially implemented, or not implemented.

The chi square test of significance was used to determine if there was any relationship between the length of time an institution had held accreditation and the level of implementation of recommendations.

The null hypothesis is that there is no relationship between the length of time an institution has held accreditation and the level of implementation
of recommendations, that is, \( p_1 = p_2 \).

7. The chi square test of significance was used to determine if the influence of the accreditation procedures on the implementation of recommendations was significant or did it occur by chance. That is, the observed frequency was compared to the theoretical frequency of 50/50 which is the result to be expected by chance.

Those observed frequencies which were statistically significant were divided into two groups; moderate to maximum influence versus little to no influence. Further, the data was subjected to a \( z \) test to determine the differences between proportions, moderate to maximum versus little to no influence, and the direction of the difference. The \( z \) test is the customary test of the significance of the difference between sample proportions. The null hypothesis is that there is no difference, that is, \( p_1 = p_2 \).

The null hypotheses given in enumerations 5, 6, and 7 above apply to the appropriate tables in chapter IV.

8. The school size, years of accreditation, and source of recommendations were compared with the degree of implementation. The chi square analysis for contingency tables was used to determine if there was a relationship between school size and degree of
implementation of recommendations. The number of years accreditation was held by institutions was compared to the degree of implementation of recommendations. Finally, the source of the recommendations, from the institutional self-study, from visiting team reports, or from both the institutional self-study and the visiting team reports, was compared to the degree of implementation of recommendations.

The chi square is one of the simplest and yet most useful of statistical tests (Kerlinger, 1964, p. 166). The function of this statistical test is to compare the obtained results with those to be expected on the basis of chance. In the chi square test of significance the frequencies obtained ($F_o$) are compared with the frequencies expected ($F_e$). The chi square is the measure of departure of the obtained frequency from the frequency expected by chance.

The values of chi square range from zero, which indicates no departure obtained from the expected frequencies, through a large number of increasing values. The larger the chi square is the greater the obtained frequencies deviate from the expected chance frequencies. The degree of freedom used in the chi square means the latitude of variations a statistical problem has.

The $z$ test was selected to accommodate the
large number of observations obtained in the research. A large number of observations can be expected to approximate a normal curve (Downie & Heath, 1959, pp. 64-77; 128-130). The 5 percent level of significance was selected in this study which means that there are five chances in one hundred that the null hypothesis might be rejected when it is actually true. "A z score of 1.96 taken at each end of the normal curve cuts off 5 percent of the total area" (p. 129). Therefore, a z score of larger than 1.96, positive or negative, would be considered significant at the .05 level and the hypothesis would be rejected.
CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Chapter IV presents the data collected for the study. Thirteen of the twenty-nine public community colleges within the state of Michigan were included.

Personal interviews were conducted with key educational administrators and selected faculty members to ascertain their perceptions relative to the value of regional accreditation at their institutions. In addition, group interviews were held with students at seven of the institutions where arrangements could be made without major interference with students' schedules and programs.

Seven-hundred and two recommendations for educational improvements resulted from the institutional self-studies and the visiting team reports for the thirteen colleges in the study. These suggestions were categorized into five areas:

1. Recommendations pertaining to goals and objectives
2. Recommendations pertaining to curriculum, instruction, and program services
3. Recommendations pertaining to organizational and administrative policies and practices
4. Recommendations pertaining to planning and decision-making practices
5. Recommendations pertaining to personnel policies and faculty-staff relations

The status of implementation of the recommendations was reported in percentage form. The perceptions of the educational leaders interviewed as to the influence the self-study and accreditation process had on the implementation of recommendations were also reported in percentages.

A chi square test of significance was used to determine if the influence of the accreditation procedure on the implementation of recommendations was significant. A z test was made to compare the direction of influence, from maximum to none, on those observed frequencies that were found to be statistically significant.

Analysis of Data Relating to Goals and Objectives

Of the 702 recommendations evaluated by the 65 interviewees, 46 recommendations pertained to institutional goals and objectives. Of these 46 recommendations, 31 were evaluated to have been implemented for 67.40 percent. Seven recommendations, or 15.21 percent, were not implemented, while eight recommendations, or
17.39 percent, were felt to be partially accomplished. Each of the 65 interviewees evaluated each of the self-study/team recommendations in terms of the degree of influence the accreditation process had on the level of implementation. As perceived by these interviewees, 18 recommendations, or 39.13 percent of the total 46 recommendations, were implemented because of maximum or moderate influence of the accreditation process. Nineteen recommendations, or 41.30 percent, were influenced little by the accreditation process. Another nine recommendations, or 19.57 percent, had not been influenced at all by the accreditation process in the opinion of the interviewees. Therefore, resolution of slightly more than 60 percent of all the recommendations for improving the institutions' efforts in the area of goals and objectives was affected very little or not at all by the accreditation process.

A chi square test of significance was performed to compare the degree of influence the accreditation process had on the level of implementation of the recommendations on goals and objectives as perceived by those interviewed. The chi square calculated value obtained was 2.173. At the .05 level of significance, the critical value was 3.841; therefore, the degree of influence the accreditation process had on the number of recommendations implemented regarding institutional
goals and objectives was not significantly different from that which would have been implemented by chance.

The primary reason given for lack of implementation of the recommendations was financial limitation. Michigan community colleges have all experienced a reduction in state aid during the past several years. That fact, coupled with high inflation, has caused severe financial constraints at most institutions.

There were also a number of interviewees that felt that recommendations made by the visiting team were not of primary importance for their institutions; therefore, such recommendations were not implemented.

Table 2 summarizes the data and shows the status of implementation and the degree of influence the accreditation process had on the implementation of the recommendations as perceived by the educators interviewed.

Analysis of Data Relating to Curriculum, Instruction, and Program Services

Two-hundred-ninety-eight recommendations were related to the area of curriculum, instruction, and program services. The educational leaders felt that 163, or 54.70 percent of the recommendations, were implemented, while another 76, or 25.20 percent, of the recommendations were partially accomplished. Fifty-nine
TABLE 2
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR GOALS AND OBJECTIVES BY STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION AND PERCEIVED DEGREE OF INFLUENCE AT SELECTED MICHIGAN PUBLIC COMMUNITY COLLEGES IN NOVEMBER 1980

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewees</th>
<th>Number of Recommendations</th>
<th>Status of Implementation</th>
<th>Degree of Influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>Partially Implemented</td>
<td>Not Implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Instructional Officer</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean/Director of Cont. Educ. and Community Serv.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean/Students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PERCENTAGES OF IMPLEMENTATION: 67.40, 17.39, 15.21

PERCENTAGES OF INFLUENCE: 23.91, 15.22, 41.30, 19.80

recommendations, or 19.80 percent, were perceived as not implemented.

It was felt by those interviewed that 103 recommendations, or almost 35 percent, of the suggestions for improvement in curriculum, instruction, and program services had been maximally or moderately influenced as a direct result of the accreditation process. An almost
equal number, 106 recommendations, or 35.57 percent, were seen as having had only a little influence from the accreditation process in their resolution, while 80 recommendations, or 26.35 percent were considered not to have been influenced at all by the accreditation process.

A chi square test of significance was performed to compare the degree of influence the accreditation process had on the level of implementation of the recommendations relating to curriculum, instruction, and program services as perceived by those interviewed.

The chi square calculated value of 23.837 was greater than the critical value of 3.841, and it was therefore statistically significant at the .05 level of significance. Thus, the degree of influence the accreditation process had on the number of recommendations implemented regarding curriculum, instruction, and program services was greater than expected by chance.

A z test was performed to determine if there was a significant difference between the percent of positive influence and little or no influence exerted by the accreditation process as perceived by those interviewed. The calculated z of -4.693 was less than -1.96, therefore, the hypothesis was rejected. This means there was a significant difference between the
positive influence and little or no influence exerted by the accreditation process. In the case of recommendations relating to curriculum, instruction, and programs, the larger percentage fell in the category of little or no influence being exerted by the accreditation process.

Financial limitation was again the major reason listed for recommendations not being implemented. Because of the financial constraint, colleges had to give priority ranking to the recommendations which would be of greatest value and put the institutional effort and emphasis into those areas.

Staffing restraints were also indicated as a limiting factor in the implementation of the recommendations. The financial strength of an institution would certainly dictate staffing flexibility.

Table 3 summarizes the data relating to the recommendations in curriculum, instruction, and program services.

Analysis of Data Relating to Organization and Administration

Recommendations on organization and administration policies and practices numbered 199. One-hundred-thirty-one, or 65.83 percent of the recommendations, were felt to have been implemented into the institutional administrative-management structure. Another
TABLE 3
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CURRICULUM, INSTRUCTION, AND PROGRAM SERVICES
BY STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION AND PERCEIVED DEGREE OF INFLUENCE AT
SELECTED MICHIGAN PUBLIC COMMUNITY COLLEGES IN NOVEMBER 1980

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewees</th>
<th>Number of Recommendations</th>
<th>Status of Implementation</th>
<th>Degree of Influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>Partially Implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Instructional Officer</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean/Director of Cont. Educ. and Community Serv.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean/Students</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>298</strong></td>
<td><strong>163</strong></td>
<td><strong>76</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PERCENTAGES OF IMPLEMENTATION**

- 54.70%
- 25.30%
- 19.30%

**PERCENTAGES OF INFLUENCE**

- 14.43%
- 20.13%
- 35.57%
- 26.35%
- 1.02%

29 recommendations, or 14.57 percent, were felt to have been partially implemented, while 39, or almost 20 percent, of the recommendations were not accomplished.

As to the perceived degree of influence the accreditation process had on the implementation of organizational and administrative recommendations, 67, or 33.67 percent, were accomplished as a result of
maximum or moderate impact of the accreditation process. Another 82 recommendations, or 41.21 percent, were resolved but the accreditation process was felt to have had only little influence in their solution. Forty-nine, or almost 25 percent, of the recommendations were resolved but without influence of the accreditation process as reported by the interviewees.

A chi square test of significance was performed to compare the degree of influence the accreditation process had on the level of implementation of the recommendations relating to institutional organization and administration as perceived by those interviewed. The chi square calculated value of 20.687 was greater than the critical value of 3.841, which is statistically significant at the .05 level of significance. Thus, the degree of influence the accreditation process had on the number of recommendations implemented regarding institutional organization and administration was greater than expected by chance.

A z test was performed to determine if there was a significant difference between the percent of positive influence and little or no influence exerted by the accreditation process as perceived by those interviewed. The calculated z of -4.327 is less than -1.96, therefore, the hypothesis was rejected. This means there was a significant difference between the
positive influence and little or no influence exerted by the accreditation process. In the case of recommendations relating to organization and administration, the larger percentage fell in the category of little or no influence being exerted by the accreditation process.

Economic factors, again, were the major reasons given for the inability of the institutions to implement all the suggested recommendations. There also appeared to be some indications of philosophical differences emerging between some educational leaders and members of the visiting teams as to the appropriateness of some of the recommendations. These philosophical differences suggested a lower priority on the part of the educational leaders with the resulting lack of implementation.

A summary of the data as to percentage of implementation and the degree of influence resulting from the accreditation process can be found in table 4.

### Analysis of Data Relating to Planning and Decision Making

Fifty-four recommendations were identified as relating to planning and decision-making practices. Interviewees felt that 34, or 62.96 percent, of the recommendations were implemented while 9, or 16.67 percent, had been only partially implemented. Eleven, or slightly more than 20 percent, were not accomplished.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewees</th>
<th>Number of Recommendations</th>
<th>Status of Implementation</th>
<th>Degree of Influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>Partially Implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Instructional Officer</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean/Director of Cont. Educ. and Community Serv.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean/Students</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>199</strong></td>
<td><strong>131</strong></td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PERCENTAGES OF IMPLEMENTATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>65.83</strong></td>
<td><strong>14.47</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PERCENTAGE OF INFLUENCE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In relation to the degree of influence the interviewees felt the accreditation process had on the level of implementation of planning and decision making, 23 recommendations, or 42.59 percent, were felt to have resulted from maximum or moderate influence. This percentage was the highest recorded for all five categories. The accreditation process was felt to be of little influence for 20 recommendations, or 37 percent, while
10 recommendations, or 18.52 percent, were felt not to be influenced by the accrediting process. With respect to one recommendation, or 1.85 percent, it was felt that there was no basis for judgment as to whether or not the accrediting process affected its implementation.

A chi square test of significance was performed to compare the degree of influence the accreditation process had on the level of implementation of recommendations relating to institutional planning and decision making as perceived by those interviewed. The chi square calculated value obtained was 0.924. The critical value was 3.841 at the .05 level of significance, therefore, the degree of influence the accreditation process had on the number of recommendations implemented regarding institutional planning and decision making was not significantly different from that which would be implemented by chance.

Financial limitations were again noted to be the major constraints prohibiting full implementation of the recommendations. Again, some differences of opinions surfaced between institutional leaders and visiting team members as to the appropriateness of some recommendations. This would indicate some bias and perhaps less inclination toward implementing the recommendations in question and certainly is reflected
in the 20 percent figure not implemented.

Table 5 summarizes the data relating to planning and decision-making practices.

TABLE 5
RECOMMENDATIONS ON PLANNING AND DECISION-MAKING PRACTICES, ILLUSTRATING THE STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION AND PERCEIVED DEGREE OF INFLUENCE AT SELECTED MICHIGAN PUBLIC COMMUNITY COLLEGES IN NOVEMBER 1980

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewees</th>
<th>Number of Recommendations</th>
<th>Status of Implementation</th>
<th>Degree of Influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>Partially Implemented</td>
<td>Not Implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Instructional Officer</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean/Director of Cont. Educ. and Community Serv.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean/Students</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENTAGES OF IMPLEMENTATION</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>62.96</td>
<td>16.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENTAGE OF INFLUENCE</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>14.31</td>
<td>27.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Personnel Policies and Faculty/Staff Relations

One-hundred-and-five recommendations were defined to be in the area of personnel policies and faculty/staff relations. Fifty-nine recommendations, or 56 percent, were felt to have been implemented.
Another 17 recommendations, or 16.19 percent were partially accomplished, while 27 recommendations, or 25.71 percent, were not implemented according to those interviewed.

Little or no influence on the degree of resolution was perceived in the case of 70, or more than 66 percent, of the recommendations for personnel policies and faculty/staff relations. On the other hand, only 13, or 12.38 percent of the recommendations were felt to have been carried out as a result of maximum accreditation procedure influence. Another 17 recommendations, 16.19 percent, were felt to have been accomplished as a result of moderate influence from accreditation procedures. Five, or almost 5 percent, fell in the category where it was not possible to make a judgment as to whether or not the accrediting process had had an influence on its solution.

A chi square test of significance was performed to compare the degree of influence the accreditation process had on the level of implementation of recommendations relating to institutional personnel policies and faculty/staff relations. The chi square calculated value of 16.00 was greater than the critical value of 3.841, which is statistically significant at the .05 level of significance. Thus, the degree of influence the accreditation process had on the number of
recommendations implemented regarding institutional personnel policies and faculty/staff relations was greater than expected by chance.

A z test was performed to determine if there was a significant difference between the percent of positive influence, moderate to maximum, and little or no influence exerted by the accreditation process as perceived by the interviewees. The calculated z of -3.714 is less than -1.96, therefore, the hypothesis was rejected. This means there was a significant difference between the positive influence and little or no influence exerted by the accreditation process.

In the case of recommendations relating to institutional personnel policies and faculty/staff relations, the larger percentage fell in the category of little or no influence being exerted by the accreditation process.

Financial limitations were cited as the main reason that 27, or 25.71 percent, of the recommendations were not implemented. The years between 1978 and 1980 were a critical financial period for Michigan community colleges. The reduction in state aid during this period presented a difficult administrative dilemma because at the same time institutions were experiencing a growth in enrollment. It was difficult, with reduced revenues and the decreased buying power of the dollar due to inflation, to implement improve-
ments in educational programs without corresponding reductions in other areas. These reductions were generally felt in the support areas such as staffing for maintenance, clerical, administrative, or student personnel services. Table 6 summarizes the data pertaining to personnel policies and faculty/staff relations.

Summarizing all recommendations resulting from the self-study accreditation processes for the thirteen colleges in this study, the percentage of implementation of recommendations ranged from a low of 54.70 percent in the area of curriculum, instruction, and program services to a high of 67.40 percent for the recommendations relating to goals and objectives. Those recommendations partially implemented ranged from a low of 14.57 percent for the area of organizational and administrative policies and practices to a high of 25.50 percent for curriculum, instruction, and program services.

The recommendations not implemented ranged from a low of 15.21 percent for the area of goals and objectives to a high of 25.71 percent for the segment relating to personnel policies and faculty/staff relations.

In regard to perceived maximum influence, implementation of recommendations for goals and
TABLE 6

RECOMMENDATIONS ON PERSONNEL POLICIES AND FACULTY STAFF RELATIONS, ILLUSTRATING THE STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION AND PERCEIVED DEGREE OF INFLUENCE AT SELECTED MICHIGAN PUBLIC COMMUNITY COLLEGES IN NOVEMBER, 1980

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewees</th>
<th>Number of Recommendations</th>
<th>Status of Implementation</th>
<th>Degree of Influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>Partially Implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Instruc-</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tional Officer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean/Director of</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cont. Educ. and Community Serv.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean/Students</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PERCENTAGES OF IMPLEMENTATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Implemented</th>
<th>Partially Implemented</th>
<th>Not Implemented</th>
<th>Not Impossed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56.19</td>
<td>16.21</td>
<td>25.71</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PERCENTAGE OF INFLUENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Little</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.38</td>
<td>16.19</td>
<td>29.52</td>
<td>37.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Objectives was affected most, 23.91 percent, by the accreditation process, while implementation of recommendations for personnel practices was affected least, 12.38 percent.

The moderate influence range was from 15.22 percent for recommendations relating to goals and objectives to a high of 27.78 percent in the area of planning and decision-making practices.
The accreditation process was felt to have had little influence on 41.30 percent of the recommendations for goals and objectives while at the other extreme the accreditation process had little influence, 29.52 percent, on the recommendations for personnel practices and faculty/staff relations.

Perceptions that the accreditation process had no influence on recommendations implemented ranged from a high of 37.14 percent in the area of personnel practices and faculty/staff relations to a low of 19.57 percent in the area of goals and objectives.

Responses from College Presidents

Of the 169 recommendations made, college presidents interviewed felt that 118, or 69.82 percent, had been implemented while another 25 recommendations, 14.79 percent, were partially accomplished within their institutions. This evaluation of 84.61 percent implementation was the highest rate given by any of the sub-groups interviewed. Twenty-six recommendations were not implemented according to college presidents for a percentage rate of 15.38. The high level of implementation of the suggested recommendations indicates strong support for the accreditation process by the college presidents as a valuable tool to affect educational improvements.
College presidents felt that the accreditation process had a maximum or moderate effect on their decisions to implement 58, or slightly more than 34 percent, of the recommendations. Seventy-three, or 43.20 percent of the recommendations, were brought to a resolution because of a slight influence from the accreditation process while 38, or 22.49 percent, of the recommendations were concluded without a direct influence from the accreditation procedure as perceived by the thirteen chief administrative officers.

A chi square test of significance was performed to compare the degree of influence the accreditation process had on the implementation of recommendations as perceived by college presidents. The chi square calculated value of 16.621 was greater than the critical value of 3.841 which is statistically significant at the .05 level of significance. Thus, the degree of influence the accreditation process had on the number of recommendations implemented as evaluated by the college presidents was greater than could be expected by chance.

A z test was performed to determine if there was a significant difference between the percent of positive influence, that being moderate to maximum and little or no influence exerted by the accredita-
tion process as perceived by the college presidents. The calculated \( z \) of -3.890 is less than -1.96, therefore, the hypothesis was rejected. This means there was a significant difference between the positive influence and little or no influence exerted by the accreditation process. In the case of college presidents, the larger percentage fell in the category of little or no influence being exerted by the accreditation process.

This may suggest that although the accreditation process has some influence toward educational change, institutions may very well be able to carry out this function and obtain the same results without the need for an external examining agency.

The findings of the interviews conducted with selected college presidents are summarized in table 7.

**Responses from Chief Instructional Officers**

In their evaluation of the level of implementation of recommendations made during the accreditation process, the chief instructional officer indicated that more than one-half of the suggestions for educational improvements had been made at their institutions while another 22 percent had been partially achieved. Twenty-one percent were not implemented with the major reason being financial limitations.

Instructional officers perceived that the
TABLE 7
AN ANALYSIS OF ALL RECOMMENDATIONS AS PERCEIVED BY COLLEGE
PRESIDENTS AT SELECTED MICHIGAN PUBLIC COMMUNITY
COLLEGES IN NOVEMBER, 1980

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Recommendations</th>
<th>Status of Implementation</th>
<th>Degree of Influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>Partially Implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENT</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>69.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENT</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The accreditation process had maximum or moderate influence on their institutions' decisions to implement some 98 or slightly more than 40 percent of the recommendations. Another 79, or 32.91 percent, of the recommendations were considered to be resolved due to only a slight influence of the accreditation process. Twenty-three percent of the recommendations and their resolution were evaluated by the chief instructional officers as not having been influenced by the accreditation process. Like college presidents, the instructional officers value accreditation as worthwhile and helpful to their institutions.

A chi square test of significance was performed.
to compare the degree of influence the accreditation process had on the implementation of recommendations as perceived by the chief instructional officers. The chi square calculated value of 6.171 was greater than the critical value of 3.841, which is statistically significant at the .05 level of significance. Thus, the degree of influence the accreditation process had on the number of recommendations implemented as evaluated by the instructional officers was greater than could be expected by chance.

A z test was performed to determine if there was a significant difference between the percent of positive influence, that being moderate to maximum and little or no influence exerted by the accreditation process as perceived by the instructional officers. The calculated z of -2.452 is less than -1.96, therefore the hypothesis was rejected. This means there was a significant difference between the positive influence and the little or no influence exerted by the accreditation process. With instructional officers the larger percentage fell in the category of little or no influence being exerted by the accreditation process.

Again, this may suggest that once problem areas are identified in the form of recommendations through the self-study process, institutions may implement the suggestions for improvement without the influence
of an external examiner. These data are summarized in table 8.

### TABLE 8

AN ANALYSIS OF ALL RECOMMENDATIONS AS PERCEIVED BY THE CHIEF INSTRUCTIONAL OFFICERS AT SELECTED PUBLIC COMMUNITY COLLEGES IN NOVEMBER, 1980

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Recommendations</th>
<th>Status of Implementation</th>
<th>Degree of Influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>Partially Implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENT</td>
<td></td>
<td>55.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses from Continuing Education and Community Services Deans

Administrators of continuing education and community services, although having the lowest number of recommendations pertaining directly to their phase of education, felt that 32 recommendations, or 61 percent, were implemented. Another 19 percent, or 10 recommendations, were partially attained, while a similar percentage were not accomplished.

The accreditation process was perceived to have had a maximum or moderate influence on implementation of 38 percent of the recommendations as perceived by the
deans of continuing education. Forty-four percent of the recommendations were resolved as a result of only slight influence and 17 percent of the recommendations were not influenced by this process according to these educational leaders. Again, the high percentage of recommendations implemented as perceived by the interviewees indicates a positive support for the accreditation process for their institutions.

A chi square of significance was performed to compare the degree of influence the accreditation process had on the implementation of recommendations as perceived by the deans of continuing education and community services. The chi square calculated value obtained was 2.769 at the .05 level of significance. The critical value was 3.841, therefore, the degree of influence was not statistically significant from that which could occur by chance.

The findings as perceived by the deans of continuing education and community services are illustrated in table 9.

**Responses from Deans of Students**

Sixty-two percent of the recommendations evaluated by deans of students were felt to be implemented. Another 16.83 percent were partially completed. Almost 21 percent were estimated to be not carried out.
with the major cause being economic constraints.

The accreditation process was considered to have had at least some influence on institutional decisions in 73 percent of the recommendations as perceived by deans of students, but they felt the process had little influence in resolution of 26 percent of the recommendations.

A chi square test of significance was performed to compare the degree of influence the accreditation process had on the implementation of recommendations as perceived by deans of students. The chi square calculated value of 6.188 was greater than the critical value of 3.841, which is statistically significant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of Recommendations</th>
<th>Status of Implementation</th>
<th>Degree of Influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>Partially Implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENT</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>61.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENT</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
at the .05 level of significance. Thus, the degree of influence the accreditation process had on the number of recommendations implemented as evaluated by the deans of students was greater than could be expected by chance.

A z test was performed to determine if there was a significant difference between the percent of positive influence, that being moderate to maximum and little or no influence exerted by the accreditation process as perceived by the deans of students. The calculated z of -2.415 is less than -1.96, therefore the hypothesis was rejected. This means there was a significant difference between the positive influence and the little or no influence exerted by the accreditation process. As with presidents and instructional officers, the larger percentage for the deans of students fell in the category of little or no influence being exerted by the accreditation process.

The high level of implementation appears to suggest a solid, firm support for the accreditation process; however, the degree of influence was not as high as might be expected. These data are summarized in table 10.

**Responses by Faculty**

Thirteen faculty members were interviewed, and they apprised 51.43 percent of the recommendations to
TABLE 10
AN ANALYSIS OF ALL RECOMMENDATIONS AS PERCEIVED BY THE DEANS OF STUDENTS AT SELECTED MICHIGAN PUBLIC COMMUNITY COLLEGES IN NOVEMBER, 1980

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Recommendations</th>
<th>Status of Implementation</th>
<th>Degree of Influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>Partially Implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENT</td>
<td></td>
<td>62.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENT</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

have been implemented, while 16.83 percent were partially completed. Another 25 percent were evaluated as not being within reach of the institution.

Faculty generally supported the concept of accreditation to bring about educational improvements and change. However, the degree of influence the accreditation process had on the level of implementation was the lowest of all sub-groups.

In relation to 40 percent of the recommendations, faculty representatives felt the accreditation process had no influence on the decisions of their institutions regarding implementation. Nineteen
percent of the recommendations were identified by the faculty as having been resolved due to maximum or moderate influence of the accreditation procedure while 33.57 percent of the recommendations were brought to conclusion due to a slight influence only. Faculty were unable to determine the level of influence in 7 percent of the recommendations.

A chi square test of significance was performed to compare the degree of influence the accreditation process had on the implementation of recommendations as perceived by faculty members. The chi square calculated value of 44.431 was greater than the critical value of 3.841, which is statistically significant at the .05 level of significance. Thus, the degree of influence the accreditation process had on the number of recommendations implemented as evaluated by the faculty members was greater than could be expected by chance.

A z test was performed to determine if there was a significant difference between the percent of positive influence, that being moderate to maximum and little to no influence, exerted by the process of accreditation as perceived by the faculty representatives. The calculated z of -5.754 is less than -1.96, therefore the null hypothesis was rejected. This means there was a significant difference between the positive
influence and the little or no influence exerted by the accreditation process. The larger percentage fell in the category of little or no influence. Thus, the faculty joined other administrators in suggesting that an external examination may not be an absolute necessity in the accreditation process. The faculty perceptions are summarized in table 11.

**TABLE 11**

AN ANALYSIS OF ALL RECOMMENDATIONS AS PERCEIVED BY FACULTY MEMBERS AT SELECTED MICHIGAN PUBLIC COMMUNITY COLLEGES IN NOVEMBER, 1981

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Recommendations</th>
<th>Status of Implementation</th>
<th>Degree of Influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>Partially Implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENT</td>
<td></td>
<td>51.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 702 recommendations, 292 resulted directly from the institutional self-studies. The visiting teams suggested another 326 while 84 were implied by both the self-studies and the team reports.
The recommendations generated by the visiting team were carried out 60.43 percent of the time. Another 21.47 percent were partially accomplished, according to those interviewed, for a grand total of 81.90 percent. Eighteen percent were not implemented.

Of those recommendations suggested by the institutions themselves through the self-study, 57.88 percent were implemented while another 17.31 percent were said to be partially fulfilled. Slightly over 24 percent were not implemented which was the highest percentage of the subdivisions.

The recommendations which resulted from both the self-studies and the visiting team reports had an implementation rate of 55.95 percent. Slightly more than 21 percent were considered to be partially implemented, while 22.62 percent were not accomplished.

The results may suggest that institutions place a high level of importance on the recommendations identified during the self-study process and those suggested by the visiting team; and within their financial constraints, the institutions work diligently to implement the proposals. Although the recommendations of the visiting teams were implemented more frequently, the percentage variation was only 4.48 which does not suggest a major difference.
A chi square test of significance was performed to compare whether the source of recommendations was statistically significant, namely, recommendations from the institutional self-study, from the visiting team, or from both the self-study and team report. The chi square calculated value obtained was 4.338. At the .05 level of significance, the critical value was 9.488. This implies that the source of recommendations is not of critical importance to implementation of recommendations. A summary of the data can be found in table 12.

### TABLE 12

**ANALYSIS OF THE LEVEL OF IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS DUE TO THE ACCREDITATION PROCESS IN SELECTED MICHIGAN PUBLIC COMMUNITY COLLEGES IN NOVEMBER 1980**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status of Implementation</th>
<th>Recommendations from Self Studies</th>
<th>Recommendations from Visiting Team Reports</th>
<th>Recommendations from Both Self Studies and Team Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>Number: 169, Percentage: 57.88</td>
<td>Number: 197, Percentage: 60.43</td>
<td>Number: 47, Percentage: 55.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially Implemented</td>
<td>Number: 52, Percentage: 17.81</td>
<td>Number: 70, Percentage: 21.47</td>
<td>Number: 18, Percentage: 21.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Implemented</td>
<td>Number: 71, Percentage: 24.31</td>
<td>Number: 59, Percentage: 18.10</td>
<td>Number: 19, Percentage: 27.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comparison of Implementation by Institution

In comparing the level of implementation by institutions that held accreditation for six years or less, with the exception of one college, all had an implementation rate well above the 50 percent level, with a range between 62.50 percent to a high of 77.27 percent. When combining the implemented category with the partially accomplished group, implementation levels rose to over 80 percent.

Bay de Noc Community College had conducted its self-study late in 1975 and was visited by the accreditation team in December of that year. Due to the fact that this research was conducted some five years later, interviewees were unable to recall exactly the complete status of each recommendations. In addition, some 56 percent of the institution's budget comes from state and federal resources. With the dismal State economic situation, the institution had had to set aside plans for building expansion and was, therefore, unable to meet some of the recommendations suggested in the self-study. This institution, however, has a strong financial plan and has been able through efficient administrative management to continue to serve an expanding enrollment with a broad curriculum.

With the exception of Bay de Noc, previously
discussed, the percentage of recommendations not implemented ranged from a low of 6.82 percent to a high of 19.05 percent with an average of 13.61 percent. This implies a very strong commitment to the accreditation process as a necessary and important function of an educational institution. A summary of the data can be found in table 13.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Years of Accreditation</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percent Implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay de Noc Community College</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen Oaks Community College</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>67.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid Michigan Community College</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>62.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montcalm Community College</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>64.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Shore Community College</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>77.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the institutions which held accreditation for a minimum of seven and a maximum of eighteen years, which included four colleges, the range of implemented
recommendations was 45.90 percent to 81.82 percent. Three of the four institutions were well above the 50-percent level. When combining the implemented with the partially fulfilled group, the implementation level rose to an average of over 80 percent.

The suggestions not implemented ranged from a low of 9.09 percent to a high of 37.79 percent. The latter percentage although somewhat high still reflects a positive position for the self-study and accreditation process as an effective means of institutional evaluation and accountability.

Lake Michigan College experienced a change in its presidential leadership some five months after the on-site evaluation occurred. A possible reason for the lower level of implementation experienced might be attributed to the need for a new executive to learn the complexities of a new assignment. A comparison of institutions holding accreditation between seven and eighteen years and their implementation records is given in table 14.

Four institutions held accreditation for over eighteen years: Gogebic, Jackson, Muskegon and St. Clair County community colleges.

The level of implementation of recommendations ranged from 45.61 percent to 64.10 percent. The range of this group was more narrow than in either of the
TABLE 14
A COMPARISON OF THE PERCENTAGE OF RECOMMENDATIONS IMPLEMENTED WITH INSTITUTIONS WHICH HAVE HELD ACCREDITATION FROM SEVEN THROUGH EIGHTEEN YEARS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Years of Accreditation</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alpena Community College</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>59.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalamazoo Valley Community College</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>81.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Michigan College</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>45.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washtenaw Community College</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>60.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25.76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

other sub-groups. By merging the implemented with the partially implemented recommendations, three of the four institutions had accomplished more than 80 percent of the suggestions, while one college had a rate of over 57 percent.

Three of the four institutions also had a very low level, under 20 percent, of recommendations not implemented. One institution had been unable to implement 42.11 percent of the recommendations as perceived by those interviewed. This may be due to the fact
that the institution experienced a very long and difficult negotiation period which actually delayed the self-study and on-site visit until a settlement was reached. Although there were no interruptions in the instructional process during this period, energies that would have been used to finalize the self-study process were required elsewhere. In addition, the institution experienced a millage defeat which limited its financial flexibility and which would have a direct bearing on the implementation level of those recommendations requiring financial commitments.

Again, the over-all percentage of implementation reflects a high regard by the institutions for the accreditation process. A summary of the data can be found in table 15.

In summary, with the exception of the three institutions identified previously, the range of implementation of recommendations when merging the partially implemented with the implemented was between 74.24 percent to 93.18 percent.

A chi square test of significance was performed to compare whether the length of time an institution held accreditation was statistically significant. The chi square calculated value obtained was 1.908. The critical value was 9.488, therefore, there was no relationship between the number of years an institution
A comparison of the percentage of recommendations implemented with institutions which have held accreditation over forty years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Years of Accreditation</th>
<th>Percent Implemented</th>
<th>Percent Partially Implemented</th>
<th>Not Implemented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gogebic Community College</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>64.10</td>
<td>25.64</td>
<td>10.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson Community College</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muskegon Community College</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>57.14</td>
<td>23.22</td>
<td>19.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Clair County Community College</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45.61</td>
<td>12.28</td>
<td>42.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This indicates that the length of time an institution held accreditation does not have a major impact on the institutional commitment to implement the recommendations received through the accreditation process. The ranges were relatively consistent in all three sub-groups: less than six years, seven to eighteen years, and over eighteen years.

Comparison of Implementation by Institutional Size

Size of institution, based on enrollment as of
the 1979 Fall semester, did not appear to have a major difference in the level of implementation of recommendations made during the accreditation process. Ten of the thirteen colleges accomplished well over 50 percent of the recommendations totally. The range of implementation was from a low of 57.14 percent to a high of 81.82 percent. Three institutions had an implementation rate which ranged from 35.71 percent to 45.91 percent. Suggested causes for this were previously described.

When combining the implemented with the partially implemented recommendations, all institutions were well above the 50-percent level. This suggests that institutions feel accreditation is of importance and they make every effort, within a milieu of constraints, to make the improvements suggested during the accreditation process. A chi square test of significance was performed to determine whether there was a relationship between size of institution and degree of implementation of recommendations. The chi square calculated value obtained was 4.299. At the .05 level of significance, the critical value was 9.488; therefore, there was no relationship between the size of the institution and the number of recommendations implemented. The percentage of implementation by size of institution is summarized in table 16.
### TABLE 16

A COMPARISON OF THE PERCENTAGES OF RECOMMENDATIONS IMPLEMENTED WITH THE SIZE OF THE INSTITUTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Percent Implemented</th>
<th>Percent Partially Implemented</th>
<th>Not Implemented</th>
<th>No Basis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enrollment of 1,499 or less:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay de Noc Community College</td>
<td>35.71</td>
<td>23.21</td>
<td>37.50</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen Oaks Community College</td>
<td>67.86</td>
<td>21.43</td>
<td>10.71</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gogebic Community College</td>
<td>64.10</td>
<td>25.64</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Shore Community College</td>
<td>77.27</td>
<td>15.91</td>
<td>6.82</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enrollment of 1,500 to 3,999:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpena Community College</td>
<td>59.26</td>
<td>31.48</td>
<td>9.26</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Michigan College</td>
<td>45.90</td>
<td>21.31</td>
<td>32.79</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid Michigan Community College</td>
<td>62.50</td>
<td>19.64</td>
<td>17.86</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montcalm Community College</td>
<td>64.29</td>
<td>16.66</td>
<td>19.06</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Clair County Community College</td>
<td>45.61</td>
<td>12.28</td>
<td>42.11</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enrollment above 4,000:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson Community College</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalamazoo Valley Community College</td>
<td>81.82</td>
<td>9.09</td>
<td>9.09</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muskegon Community College</td>
<td>57.14</td>
<td>23.22</td>
<td>19.64</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washtenaw Community College</td>
<td>60.61</td>
<td>13.63</td>
<td>25.76</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AVERAGE</strong></td>
<td>60.16</td>
<td>19.88</td>
<td>19.68</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Student Interviews**

Twenty-seven students were interviewed at
seven of the thirteen community colleges in the study where arrangements could be made and institutional approval was obtained. Of the twenty-seven students, ten were male and seventeen were female. The educational goals of the students were varied and their courses of study included different curriculums representative of the three major academic subdivisions, general academic, vocational and occupational studies, and health sciences found in most comprehensive community colleges.

Five general questions relating to accreditation were asked of each group of students for the purpose of identifying their feelings of the importance accreditation was perceived to have. A summary of the questions follows:

**Question 1**: As students, what does "accreditation" mean to you?

In response, four major themes were identified. Credit transferability was of most importance with seventeen of these students relating it as a direct benefit of accreditation. Recognition was also important to students who felt accreditation was a level of acknowledgment that their institutions had met an established standard and were, therefore, credible. These students generally felt there was a direct relationship between the quality of instruction and institutional
accreditation. The broad and varied curriculum offered by institutions was perceived to be at least partially a result of accreditation.

**Question 2:** What was your reason for attending a community college?

Reputation of the school appeared to be the primary reason given by these students, followed closely by the fact that the institutions offered the curriculum desired by the students. These students also felt the institutions were convenient to reach and affordable.

**Question 3:** Was it important for you to know that your community college was accredited?

Of the twenty-seven students interviewed, nineteen felt it was important to know the accreditation status of their institution. Only one suggested it was not, while four did not know their institutions were accredited. Three others elected not to answer the question. Based on this information, students appear to be well-informed about accreditation and feel it is important to attend an accredited institution.

**Question 4:** If your community college did not have accreditation, would it have influenced your decision to matriculate or would you have gone somewhere else?

Seventeen of these students indicated they would have chosen another institution if their community
college had not been accredited. Ten felt they would have enrolled for other reasons even though their institution did not have the accreditation status.

**Question 5:** How do you feel institutional accreditation will help you in the future?

These students felt it was important to be recognized as a graduate of an accredited institution. In seeking employment, these students felt that they would be able to compete more favorably for a position with the knowledge that they attended or were graduates of an accredited institution.

**Faculty/Administrators' Questionnaire**

In addition to the previous information described in this study, a partially structured questionnaire was designed to obtain data as to how educational leaders valued accreditation. The results follow:

**Question 1:** Do you feel that the self-study and accreditation process has improved the quality of services your institution provides?

The range of positive answers was a low of 53.85 percent by faculty to a high of 100 percent as perceived by the chief instructional officers. Of those interviewed, 77.61 percent answered the question affirmatively, while only 14.93 percent gave a negative response. Another 7.46 percent were unable to make a judgment.
The results suggest a positive value for the accreditation process is held by those educational leaders interviewed. The interviewees felt strongly that the self-study and on-site evaluation was helpful in improving the quality of institutional services.

Question 2: Do you feel that the self-study and accreditation process has been worth the time, effort, and expense which are involved?

Again there appeared to be strong support for accreditation with 79.10 percent of those interviewed responding positively to this question. However, the low range fell below the 50 percent level with only 46.15 percent of the deans or directors of continuing education and community services feeling the self-study and accreditation process was worth the time, effort, and expense their institutions spent on the process. The presidents, on the other hand, were strongly supportive with all thirteen rating affirmatively for a 100 percent response. Those answering the question negatively were again led by the deans/directors of continuing education and community services with a 30.77 percent rate followed closely by the faculty with 23.07 percent. The over-all negative response was an average of 15.38 percent, with 9.23 percent unable or unwilling to answer the question.

Question 3: In what area do you feel regional
accreditation is most beneficial to your institution?

The area of planning appeared to be the primary benefit as seen by those interviewed. The opportunities provided for maximum evaluation of academic and program services and a determination of whether institutional resources were used effectively where the need was greatest was a close second response. In addition, there was strong feeling that the self-study and accreditation process gave institutions the opportunity to identify and strengthen their philosophy, mission, and role statements. As one administrator indicated, it provides for the "fine tuning of our philosophy and mission statements."

Teaching faculty felt that the process provided an opportunity for their input into the planning and evaluation of their institutions. Others felt that accreditation indicates a level of credibility of an institution that could be used as a marketable public-relations tool. There was also strong support that the accreditation process allowed for increased communication between all segments of an institution as well as an effective means of sharing information between the community and the institution. It was generally felt that the process enhanced the public image of an institution.

Question 4: In your judgment is there too
much emphasis on accreditation, including specialized accreditation?

In regards to regional accreditation, 78.46 percent of those interviewed felt satisfied with the process and did not feel it was over-emphasized at their institutions. While 7.69 percent felt it was over-emphasized, another 13.85 percent was not able to answer the question or gave no opinion.

The range of support for regional accreditation was from 53.85 percent for the deans/directors of continuing education and community services to 100 percent by college presidents. Of the college faculty members interviewed, 61.54 percent was also supportive of regional accreditation. Faculty, particularly, felt it important to be "on the list" of accredited institutions. Other administrators fell within these ranges also.

In relation to specialized accreditation, eleven of the presidents interviewed were adamantly opposed while two remained neutral. There was concern expressed by the presidents that the proliferation of accrediting agencies would be detrimental to higher education. To quote one college president, "Specialized accreditation agencies are self-serving groups who wish to dictate management policies to institutions." The presidents felt strongly that there was a very real need to
co-ordinate specialized accreditation through the regional accreditation process.

Another fear expressed by several of the college presidents was the involvement of the federal government in institutional accreditation. According to Nyquist (1981), there are seventy-five agencies now approved by the Division of Eligibility and Agency Evaluation of the Department of Education with another six waiting to be recognized. This number certainly suggests as justifiable the fears of the college presidents "as too much government" (pp. 343-344).

Of the faculty interviewed, 61.54 percent were supportive of specialized accreditation. Specialized accreditation was particularly recognized by the technical and occupational studies faculty as an appropriate and adequate method to certify a curriculum as being a credible instructional program.

At the mid-management administrative level, specialized accreditation was not of major concern. Only 46.15 percent of the deans of students were supportive of specialized accreditation while the same percentage was opposed. Slightly more than 33 percent of the deans/directors of continuing education and community services were in opposition, while 30.77 percent were supportive of specialized accreditation.
Of these two groups, upwards of 30 percent either did not answer the question or had no opinion. This seems to suggest that unless administrators are intimately involved in a curriculum area, their position on the question of specialized accreditation remains relatively neutral.

Of the chief instructional officers, all who elected to answer the question, 70 percent, was opposed to specialized accreditation. Of all educators collectively, 56.92 percent was opposed while 27.69 percent was supportive of specialized accreditation programs. Another 15.39 percent did not answer the question.

**Question 5:** Does your institution use the self-study and accreditation process as a planning and management tool?

The range of positive support of the question was from a low of 46.15 percent by faculty representatives to a high of 76.92 percent expressed by both the college presidents and chief instructional officers. The deans/directors of continuing education and community services and deans of students both indicated support but at a level only slightly above average at 53.85 percent.

Of all those interviewed, 29 percent felt that the self-study and accreditation process was not used as a planning and management tool. Another 9.23
percent did not answer the question or did not wish to express an opinion.

Question 6: In your judgment, does the self-study and accreditation process assure quality? If not, what does?

This question generated the most agreement among the educators interviewed. Eighty-seven percent of those questioned voted a resounding "No" on this item while only 4.61 percent indicated support. Another 9.23 percent did not answer the question or did not wish to express an opinion.

There appeared to be general agreement that only a quality faculty, well-trained, competent, and with professional integrity combined with a strong, supportive administration could produce the quality desired. There was general agreement, also, that the self-study and accreditation process if responded to with integrity helps an institution move toward achieving academic excellence. Administrators generally feel the self-study and accreditation process can be a tool for institutional accountability.

Question 7: Do you have any suggestions for improving the self-study and accreditation process?

It was generally agreed that the composition of the visiting team was of critical importance to meaningful accreditation. There was general support
for the team membership to be more representative, particularly as it relates to having knowledgeable educators in the field of technical and occupational education and student-personnel services as members.

There was also expressed a need that team members should be more knowledgeable about the needs, problems, and concerns of the small, rural community college. Since Michigan is a state where collective bargaining is present and flourishing, team members should have an intimate knowledge of this dimension and be able to bring this expertise to the institutions.

There was a general feeling among faculty representatives that more opportunities should be provided for team members to be engaged with faculty during the on-site visit. Others felt the on-site visit of two and one-half days was too short for total staff involvement.

It was also felt that more consultative services should be made available to institutions during the development of their self-study by the regional accrediting agency. Consultative services can be readily obtained from the regional office of the North Central Association, however, the requests must be made by the individual institution. This may suggest that colleges should investigate this consultative service more thoroughly and, within their financial planning, set
funds aside where it would be found to be beneficial.
It was further suggested that follow-up services should also be made available to assist an institution in correcting the problems identified in the self-study and the on-site visit. Several representatives suggested an institutional annual report be required to identify the progress to date in problem resolution and a plan of action for future activities that move an institution toward educational excellence. This would however, require a larger investigative staff for the regional accrediting agency to effectively review such a report and counsel an institution toward problem resolution. This, of course, would increase the cost of accreditation for all institutions.

If through the process of the self-study or team visit an institution is determined to have a specific problem area, the North Central Association may require a focus report during the interim period between accreditation visits. The main objective of this focus report is to review and analyze the institution's progress toward resolution of the problem area.

There was also a strong feeling, particularly by faculty representatives, that more information needs to be disseminated to faculty on the purpose and value of accreditation prior to the self-study process. In addition, it was generally felt that the self-study process should involve all levels of the institution
and be a critical analysis of the institution's strengths and problem areas. The self-study should also include an institutional plan of action as to the resolution of the identified problem areas.

One chief instructional officer felt that accrediting teams were not willing to make the hard decisions required of them and that in some instances they approved accreditation or reaccreditation without positive indication of academic excellence or institutional stability.

Question 8: In your judgment, was the self-study or team visit more beneficial to your institution?

Forty-one of the persons interviewed, or a total of 61.19 percent, felt the self-study was more beneficial to their institutions. Only 6.15 percent felt the team visit was most helpful, while another 12.31 percent indicated that both were necessary for maximum benefit. Still another 20.90 percent did not answer the question or chose not to express an opinion.

The faculty were most supportive of the self-study as being most beneficial with 76.92 percent, followed by 61.54 percent of the presidents and chief instructional officers indicating a self-study preference.

Of the mid-management administrators, namely, the deans of continuing education and community
services and deans of students, almost 38 percent either did not answer the question or did not wish to express an opinion. This may indicate less of a direct involvement at the mid-management level in the self-study or accreditation process within the institutions involved in this study.

Several educators felt that the on-site visit provided the impetus for institutional action to resolve the identified problem areas. As one administrator indicated, the team visit is "the clout." Another said, "It is the cap that ties it all together."

**Interpretations**

The accreditation process can be a very effective and efficient evaluation and management technique, however, this research suggests that it is not used to its optimal level at all the community colleges which were included in the study. Although educational leaders value the attainment of accreditation status, the self-study does not appear to be used by institutions as a strategy plan for educational improvement as effectively as it might be.

The self-study reports critiqued included a descriptive analysis of present institutional practices. It was found that specific plans for educational improvement as a result of the problem areas identified were
limited or not included in the reports. This would suggest that more emphasis needs to be placed on developing an institutional "plan of action" as part of the institutional self-study process. It further suggests that institutions should use the self-study process as an on-going evaluative method to effect institutional change. Too often the institutional self-study is completed and "shelved" and the learning which could result is minimized.

In addition, the faculties might be more adequately prepared to undertake a comprehensive self-study program. Although several institutions did an exemplary piece of work in this area, it appeared that faculties could have been better prepared to undertake the many facets of the self-study program. College presidents need to be more involved in the self-study process and provide leadership throughout the investigation and the development of the report. College presidents then need to use the self-study report and the resulting team report as a guide or model for institutional educational improvement. Educational leaders generally felt the self-study and accreditation was cost effective for their institutions. It would thus follow that to use the report as a guide would improve the cost-benefit ratio.

Specialized accreditation was supported by
faculty, particularly faculties in occupational and technical educational programs, as a viable method of certifying the quality of a specific curriculum. This enthusiasm was not shared, however, by educational administrators, particularly college presidents and instructional officers. This implies that there is a very definite need for regional and specialized accrediting agencies to foster a cooperative relationship so that the duplication which results with multi-accreditation is held to a minimum.

It is imperative that the governmental involvement in attesting to the value of educational institutions should be kept to a minimum. The Council on Post Secondary Education must assume a leadership role in this endeavor.

Generally, accreditation was received by institutions for a minimum of five years, sometimes seven, and rarely ten years. Seven years appears to be an effective time-frame as it allows an institution adequate time to implement the suggested improvements and also time to evaluate the results of their efforts. It also allows faculty time to focus on their main responsibility, that being the instructional program.

Summary

Chapter IV presented the data collected from educational leaders in thirteen Michigan public
community colleges pertaining to their perceptions as to the value of regional accreditation.

Recommendations for educational improvement and/or change identified as a result of the institutional self-studies and the visiting team reports were categorized into five sub-groupings. These were:

1. Recommendations pertaining to institutional goals and objectives
2. Recommendations pertaining to curriculum, instruction and program services
3. Recommendations pertaining to organization and administrative policies and practices
4. Recommendations pertaining to institutional planning and decision-making practices
5. Recommendations pertaining to personnel policies and faculty staff relations

Interviews were conducted with sixty-five educational leaders to determine the level of implementation of 702 recommendations identified through the self-study process and accrediting teams' evaluations. In addition, the interviewees were asked to determine their perception of influence the accrediting process had on the implementation of the recommendations.

In addition, twenty-seven students were interviewed to determine whether accreditation was
perceived to be important and of benefit to them.

Of the 702 recommendations, almost 80 percent were either partially or totally implemented as perceived by those interviewed indicating that educational leaders recognized the accreditation process as a viable and valuable evaluation technique and an instrument to bring about educational excellence if appropriately organized and administered.

Both educational administrators and faculty members felt the accreditation process had some effect on the decisions to implement the recommendations. However, the level of influence was not as high as expected. An average of only 34.13 percent felt the accrediting process was of maximum or moderate influence. When coupled with the degree of influence which was considered to be slight, the percentage increased to a range of 52.91 as evaluated by faculty members to a high of 82.69 percent as perceived by deans/directors of continuing education and community services with an average of 72.14 percent.

Students acknowledged that accreditation was valued and important, particularly as it pertained to the transferability of credits from institution to institution. In addition, these students felt it beneficial to them personally to be recognized as attending an accredited institution.
In chapter V conclusions are drawn from the data presented. Recommendations are outlined and suggestions for further study are made.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Chapter V presents a summary of the study. Conclusions are made, and recommendations for further study are suggested.

Summary

The purpose of the study was to determine the impact the self-study and accreditation process had on the administration and management of selected accredited Michigan public community colleges. Five categories of possible improvements and/or changes which might result from an accreditation process were investigated: goals and objectives of the institution; curriculum, instructional and/or program services of the institution; organizational and administrative policies and practices of the institution; personnel policies and faculty/staff relations of the institution. In addition, the impact of institutional size and length of time institutions had held accreditation was analyzed to determine if either had an effect on the level of institutional change.

On-site visits were made at thirteen of the
twenty-nine Michigan public community colleges which had been accredited or reaccredited between 1975 and 1979. Personal interviews were conducted with each college president; chief instructional officer; dean or director of continuing education and community services; dean of students; and the president of the faculty senate or a representative of the faculty. The opinions of the interviewees were summarized as to their perceptions concerning the status of the implementation of each recommendation and the level of influence that the interviewees felt the accrediting process had on implementing the recommendations. Interviews were also conducted with student representatives in seven of the thirteen institutions where arrangements were granted.

Based on the interviews, almost 60 percent of the recommendations identified in the self-study or in the visiting-team report were considered to be implemented. Another 20 percent were felt to have been partially accomplished. This high level of implementation of the recommendations suggests that the accreditation process is valued by educational leaders as an effective evaluation technique and is felt to be a means by which institutions can effect educational change and move toward educational quality.

The interviewees felt that the accreditation
process had either a maximum or moderate influence on the implementation of slightly more than 34 percent of the recommendations. The accreditation process was considered to have only a slight impact on the level of implementation in 38.01 percent of the recommendations as perceived by the interviewees. Slightly more than 26 percent of the recommendations was classified by those interviewed as not having been influenced by the accreditation process. The category of no opinion was 1.93 percent.

Although educational leaders feel the accreditation process is an efficient evaluation instrument, the level of perceived influence the accreditation process has on the implementation of recommendations is relatively low. Once institutions identify problem areas through the self-study process, their commitment to problem resolution is very high. This suggests that the examination of institutions by an external visiting team may be helpful but not of major consequence when institutions deal with educational improvements. It also implies that the self-study phase of the accreditation procedures is the most important facet for educational institutions. One must acknowledge, however, that without the process of voluntary accreditation, the self-study may not be undertaken by educational institutions with the same degree of dedication and
commitment as with the process. In other words, it takes the accreditation process to get things started but after that the institutions do things on their own.

Almost 82 percent of the recommendations suggested by the on-site evaluating team was considered to be at least partially implemented. Seventy-seven percent of the recommendations generated in both the self-studies and in the evaluating team reports was felt to be fulfilled, while 75.69 percent of the recommendations based on the self-studies was identified as being at least partially accomplished.

Institutional accreditation was perceived to be important to the students interviewed. Seventeen of the twenty-seven students indicated they would have chosen other institutions if their colleges had not been accredited. These students felt that institutional accreditation enhanced the transferability of their credits to a senior institution, and this was considered to be of major importance.

Institutional size did not appear to have a disproportionate effect on the level of implementation of the recommendations, except as noted. The institutions classified as medium-size implemented, on the average, 75.79 percent of the suggested recommendations, while the institutions identified as being small accomplished 82.78 percent and the large institutions
implemented 82.63 percent of the recommendations. Further, the chi square test of significance indicated there was no relationship between the size of the institution and the number of recommendations implemented.

The length of time an institution held accreditation did not have an impact on the commitment of the institutions to seek educational improvements through the implementation of the recommendations identified through the accrediting process.

Colleges accredited for more than eighteen years were felt to have accomplished 78.25 percent of the recommendations. Institutions accredited less than eighteen years implemented at least partially slightly more than 80 percent of the suggestions made through the accrediting process. The percentage of implementation, therefore, is comparable regardless of the time the institution had held accreditation. Also, the chi square test of significance indicated there was no relationship between the number of years an institution held accreditation and the number of recommendations implemented.

Conclusions

As indicated in chapter I, several questions were outlined to be answered through this investigation of accreditation practices. The results follow:
1. Does accreditation bring about educational improvement?

There appears to be strong support that the accreditation process does provide the vehicle, namely, the self-study procedure, which identifies institutional problem areas which need resolution. More than 75 percent of those recommendations identified in the self-studies were at least partially implemented. This high level of implementation suggests that educational leaders recognize the self-study process as a valuable evaluative mechanism, the results of which, if appropriately followed, would enhance the quality of instruction and services provided by educational institutions.

Of the sixty-five educators interviewed, 77.61 percent indicated that the self-study and team evaluation did improve the quality of services provided by their particular institutions.

2. Does accreditation protect the various publics which educational institutions serve?

The study results indicate that once problem areas are identified and methods of improvement are suggested, there is a high level of commitment upon the part of the institution to improve their services. This suggests that accreditation does protect the publics which educational institutions serve.
Educators generally feel that the achievement of regional accreditation status indicates that an institution does provide credible services. In addition, most educators feel that having accreditation does enhance the public image of their institution. Further, educators felt the accreditation process improved the level of communication within their institution, and the process is an effective means of sharing information between the institution and the community it serves. Generally, educators felt the accreditation process was an effective method of institutional accountability.

3. Is accreditation a catalyst for educational change?

It appears from the results of this study that the accreditation process is a catalyst for educational change. Almost 60 percent of the recommendations identified through the self-study and/or the team evaluation were implemented while another 20 percent were considered to be partially implemented. This high percentage of implementation by educational institutions suggests a positive support for the accreditation process as a vehicle for institutional change and enhancement.

Educational leaders, at all levels, felt the accreditation procedure was worth the time involved.
The more closely educators were involved in the study, the more positive their support.

4. Does accreditation provide the spark which results in educational services of superior quality?

In contrast to studies by Collins and Farrow, this study indicates that although accreditation does provide the instrument to heighten the quality of services educational institutions provide, it is not a guarantor of educational excellence. Among educational leaders interviewed there was general agreement that only a quality, well-trained, competent faculty with professional integrity, supported by strong administrative personnel could produce educational services of superior caliber. Educational leaders felt that the accreditation process, if responded to with integrity, would help an institution move toward achieving academic excellence.

**Recommendations**

Since voluntary accreditation is an accepted function on the American educational scene, it seems appropriate to suggest that the process needs continuous evaluation by competent educational leaders; therefore, the following recommendations are made:

1. That college administrators, particularly college presidents, exercise more leadership in preparing
their institutions for accreditation by actively involving faculty and all levels of staff in the process.

2. That college administrators, particularly college presidents or their designee, provide leadership in preparing the institutional personnel to undertake the institutional self-study. This training should include a thorough understanding of the purpose of accreditation and what outcomes are desired by the individual institution.

3. The institutional self-study should be a critical analysis of the programs and services of the institution. It should describe more than present practices. It should identify problem areas and formulate a strategy plan for resolution of the problem areas.

4. It is important for educational leaders, particularly college presidents, to examine carefully the recommendations for team membership made by the regional accrediting association. It is imperative that accreditation team members be experienced and competent evaluators. Team membership should also be representative of the institution to which they are assigned, particularly as it relates to community college experience.

5. Educational leaders, especially college presidents, should encourage participation in the
process of voluntary accreditation by becoming active as evaluators or by encouraging their faculty or staff members to become involved.

6. Educational leaders, particularly college presidents, should make certain that faculty members have ample opportunity to engage in discussion with members of the on-site accreditation team.

7. Educational leaders, particularly college presidents, should evaluate continuously the progress made toward the educational improvements identified in the accrediting process and outline a management plan to effect these improvements.

8. The self study should be a technique used by educational leaders, particularly college presidents, to conduct a continuous, on-going evaluation of their institutions the results of which would provide a sense of perspective and give direction where needed.

Recommendations for Further Study

Further studies should be made:

1. To include perceptions of members of boards of trustees and alumni as to the value of regional accreditation for their institutions.

2. To replicate this study in a more advantageous economic climate. At the time of this study the economic climate in the state of Michigan was
extremely unfavorable. Tax proposals were soon to be voted upon which would have drastically affected the educational funding formulae and were of paramount concern to administrative leaders. Spending was being scrutinized, and only major institutional needs were being met. While institutional commitment for educational improvements was ever present, financial constraints dictated what could or could not be done.

3. To include all of the accredited Michigan public community colleges.

4. To include higher educational institutions that span the auspices of more than one regional accrediting agency.

5. To include the perceptions on accreditation of educators at both the public community colleges and major public universities in the state of Michigan.
APPENDIX A

PERSONS INTERVIEWED
PERSONS INTERVIEWED BY COLLEGE

Alpena Community College
President          Dr. Charles Donnelly
Dean of Liberal Arts Dr. Margaret Lee
Faculty Representative Mr. David Dierking
Dean of Students    Mr. John McCormick
Director of Continuing Mr. Charles Wiesen
          Education

Bay de Noc Community College
President          Mr. Edwin Wuehle
Acting Coordinating Dean Mr. Michael Burns
Faculty Representative Mr. Milton Brinkman
Dean of Students    Dr. James K. Peterson
Dean of Continuing  Mr. James Barr
          Education

Glen Oaks Community College
President          Dr. Phillip Ward
Vice President for Academic Affairs Dr. Roger Eckhardt
Faculty Representative Mr. David Gosling
Director of Student Development Ms. Lynn Wonnacott
Director of Community Service Mr. Dennis McCarthy

Gogebic Community College
President          Dr. Ernest Dear
Dean of Academic Affairs Mr. Andrew Angwin*
Faculty Representative Mr. Kenneth Larson
Dean of Students    Mr. David Linquest
*Coordinates Community Services

Jackson Community College
President          Mr. Harold V. Sheffer
Dean of Arts and Science Dr. Russell G. Hanson
Faculty Representative Mr. Richard Dodge
Vice President for Student Affairs Mr. Douglas McWry
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Community Service</td>
<td>Mr. Robert Dubois</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Kalamazoo Valley Community College**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>Dr. Dale B. Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Instruction</td>
<td>Dr. Marilyn Schlack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Representative</td>
<td>Dr. Maureen Taylor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Students</td>
<td>Dr. Bruce Kocker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Dean of Instruction</td>
<td>Mr. Charlie Dee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Opportunities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Lake Michigan College**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>Dr. Walter Browe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President for Instruction</td>
<td>Dr. John F. Walter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Representative</td>
<td>Ms. Betts Rittmeyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Students</td>
<td>Dr. Tony Swerbinsky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Continuing Education and Community Service</td>
<td>Mr. Arthur M. Crump</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past Dean of Continuing Education and Community Service</td>
<td>Dr. Charlie K. Fields</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mid Michigan Community College**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>Dr. Eugene Gillaspy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President for Institutional Affairs</td>
<td>Mr. Thomas Nyquist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Instruction</td>
<td>Mr. Ronald Verch*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Representative</td>
<td>Mr. Willis Diller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Students</td>
<td>Mr. Allen Nichols</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Coordinates Community Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Montcalm Community College**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>Dr. Herbert N. Stoutenberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Instruction</td>
<td>Dr. Donald Burns*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Representative</td>
<td>Ms. Maron Stewart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Student Services</td>
<td>Mr. Robert Minnick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Coordinates Community Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Muskegon Community College**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>Dr. Jack Thompson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Instruction</td>
<td>Mr. Frank Marczak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Dean of Learning</td>
<td>Dr. Gregory Franklin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Representative</td>
<td>Mr. Paul Wistrom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Students</td>
<td>Dr. Preston Pulliam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dean of Continuing Education Dr. Dennis Wilson

St. Clair County Community College

President Dr. Richard L. Norris
Dean of Instruction Mr. A. E. Metz
Faculty Representative Mr. Robert Collins
Dean of Students Dr. Frederick B. Hauenstein
Director of Adult and Continuing Education Mr. J. E. Lynch

Washtenaw Community College

President Dr. Gunder A. Myran
Dean of Occupational and General Education Dr. Norman Lederer
Faculty Representative Mr. Dennis Bila
Dean of Students Dr. Calvin Williams
Dean of Community Services Dr. Larry H. Hackney

West Shore Community College

President Dr. John Eaton
Academic Dean Dr. Robert Harrison*
Occupational Dean Mr. Terry Luxford*
Faculty Representative Mr. David Soles
Dean of Students Dr. Sam Mazman
*Coordinates Community Services
MICHIGAN PUBLIC COMMUNITY
AND
JUNIOR COLLEGES
1979–80

* Schools Visited, October & November, 1980

*1 Alpena Community College
*2 Bay de Noc Community College
*3 Calhoun Community College
*4 Delta College
*5 Delta College University Center
*6 Gogebic Community College
*7 Grand Rapids Junior College
*8 Henry Ford Community College
*9 Highland Park College
*10 Jackson Community College
*11 Kalamazoo Valley Community College
*12 Kellogg Community College
*13 Kent Community College
*14 Lake Michigan College
*15 Lansing Community College
*16 Macomb County Community College
    District Offices: Warren Center Campus, Mt. Clemens
    South Campus, Warren
*17 Manistee Community College
*18 Monroe County Community College
*19 Muskegon Community College
*20 Muskegon Community College
*21 North Central Michigan College
*22 Northwestern Michigan College
*23 Oakland Community College
*24 St. Clair County Community College
*25 Schoolcraft College
*26 Southwestern Michigan College
*27 St. Clair County Community College
*28 Northern Michigan College
*29 West Shore Community College
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APPENDIX C

PARTICIPATION REQUESTS
Mr. President

Community College
Address
City and State

As a member of the North Central Association and as a consultant-evaluator for accreditation on the college and university level, I am very interested in the dissertation topic of one of our doctoral students.

Margaret Crishal plans to study the effects of regional accreditation on the organization, administration, and programs of selected Michigan public community colleges as perceived by the president and other key educational leaders.

To undertake this study, Ms. Crishal, who serves as Director of Admissions at Lake Michigan College, will need your cooperation and support. May I ask you as college president to become involved in this important and pertinent study.

Thank you for your consideration of this worthwhile project.

Very sincerely yours,

Joseph D. Smith
President
Dear:

Ms. Margaret Crishal, registrar at Lake Michigan College, is requesting your assistance in her doctoral studies. Her dissertation, which she is doing for Andrews University, will deal with the effects of regional accreditation on the organization, administration, and programs of each institution, as perceived by the chief administrative officer and other educational leaders at the college. Her interest in regional accreditation began when she very ably handled the details of the NCA visit to Lake Michigan College in 1978.

She would be most appreciative if you can find some time in your busy schedule to assist her. She will be contacting you soon with further details.

Thank you, I hope.

Sincerely,

Dr. Walter Browe
President

ac/3/1
June 30, 1980

Dear j:

As a college president, I am seeking your assistance in carrying out my doctoral dissertation study.

The purpose of the study is to determine the impact of regional accreditation on the organization, administration, and programs of each institution as perceived by the chief executive officer and other key educational leaders.

Thirteen community colleges have been selected for this study which were reaccredited during the 1975-1979 academic years and which are not scheduled for re-evaluation prior to the 1980-81 year.

The study can only be carried out with your cooperation and support. It will require a copy of both your institutional self-study and the visiting team report. In addition, I will visit your campus for the purpose of conducting interviews with yourself, the vice president or dean of instruction, the vice president or dean of continuing education, the vice president or dean of student services, and a faculty representative. It would also be helpful if I were able to talk with a group of student leaders. These interviews will be conducted sometime during October or November at the convenience of the community college.

To prepare appropriately for the interviews it would be helpful if I could receive your self-study and visiting team report at your earliest convenience.

I would hope you would consider this proposed study important and become involved. I assure you that the material will be handled confidentially. Thank you for your consideration of this request. I eagerly await your reply.

Sincerely,

Margaret A. Crishal
Lake Michigan College
2735 S. Napier
Stevens Harbor MI 49022
mp/3/1
June 25, 1980

j

Dear j:

May we request you to kindly help us in conducting a very important study to determine the effects of regional accreditation on the organization, administration, and programs of selected Michigan Public Community Colleges as perceived by the chief administrative officer and other key educational leaders.

Voluntary accreditation has served an important educational function in the United States since its inception in the last part of the nineteenth century. However, there is a need to determine its present viability when compared to the time, effort, and cost to each institution to carry out this procedure. Your help is essential in determining the answers to these important questions. Ms. Crishal will be contacting you with specific needs in the near future.

A summary report of the findings of the study will be sent to you when the dissertation is completed.

Thank you for your assistance in this very important study.

Sincerely,

Bernard M. Lall
Professor of Educational Administration

Margaret A. Crishal
Doctoral Candidate

mg/3/1
INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. Do you feel that the self-study and accreditation process has improved the quality of services your institution provides?

2. Do you feel that the self-study and accreditation process has been worth the time, effort, and expense which is involved?

3. In what area do you feel regional accreditation is most beneficial to your institution?

4. In your judgment, is there too much emphasis on accreditation, including specialized accreditation?

5. Does your institution use the self-study and accreditation process as a planning and management tool?

6. In your judgment does the self-study and accreditation process assure quality? In what way? If not, why not?

7. Do you have any other suggestions for improving the self-study and accreditation process?

8. In your judgment, was the self-study or the team visit more beneficial to your institution?
Interview Sheet - 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of College</th>
<th>Interviewee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headsum:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Recommendations on GOALS AND OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>B. Implementation</th>
<th>C. If not implemented, why not?</th>
<th>D. Degree of Influence the accreditation process had on the implementation of each recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Recommendations on Curriculum and Program Offerings</td>
<td>B. Implementation</td>
<td>C. If not implemented, why not?</td>
<td>D. Degree of Influence the Accreditation Process had on the Implementation of Each Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of College</td>
<td>Interviewee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Bureaut</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Recommendations on Administrative and Organizational Policies</th>
<th>B. Implementation</th>
<th>C. If not implemented, why not?</th>
<th>D. Degree of Influence the accreditation process had on the implementation of each recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Recommendations on Planning and Decision Making</td>
<td>B. Implementation</td>
<td>C. If not implemented, why not?</td>
<td>D. Degree of Influence the accreditation process had on the implementation of each recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of College</td>
<td>Interviewee</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Recommendations on Personnel and Policies</th>
<th>B. Implementation</th>
<th>C. If not implemented, why not?</th>
<th>D. Degree of influence the accreditation process had on the implementation of each recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Interview Sheet - 6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of College: __________________________</th>
<th>Interviewee: __________________________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address: ___________________________</td>
<td>Position: ____________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headcount: ________________________________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| A. Recommendations on                      | B. Implementation                      | C. If not implemented, why not?       | D. Degree of Influence the accreditation process had on the implementation of each recommendation |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDENTS AND STUDENT SERVICES</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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SAMPLE OF STATISTICAL TEST

The following is an example of the chi square test of significance on table 3 pertaining to curriculum, instruction, and program services that was found to be significant:

**TABLE 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive Influence</th>
<th>Little or No Influence</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximum or Moderate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>144.5</td>
<td>144.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = \sum \frac{(O - E)^2}{E} \]

\[ X^2 = \frac{(103 - 144.5)^2}{144.5} + \frac{(186 - 144.5)^2}{144.5} = \]

\[ = 11.919 \]

\[ = 11.919 \]

\[ = 23.837 \]

\[ x^2_{.05 (1)} = 3.841 \]
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The following is an example of the z test to compare the direction of influence the accreditation process had on the level of implementation:

\[ n_1 = 103 \]
\[ \hat{p}_1 = .3564 \]
\[ n_2 = 186 \]
\[ \hat{p}_2 = .6436 \]

**H₀:** \( p_1 = p_2 \)

\[
z = \frac{\hat{p}_1 - \hat{p}_2}{\sqrt{\frac{\hat{p}(1 - \hat{p})}{n_1} + \frac{\hat{p}(1 - \hat{p})}{n_2}}}\]

where \( \hat{p} = \frac{n_1 \hat{p}_1 + n_2 \hat{p}_2}{n_1 + n_2} \)

\[
\hat{p} = \frac{(103)(.3564) + (186)(.6436)}{103 + 186} = .5412
\]

Note: \( \hat{p} + \hat{q} = 1 \)
\[ \hat{q} = .4588 \]

\[
z = \frac{.3564 - .6436}{\sqrt{\frac{(.5412)(.4588)}{103} + \frac{(.5412)(.4588)}{186}}} = -4.693
\]

Reject \( H₀ \) if \( z \leq -1.96 \) or if \( z \geq 1.96 \)

Reject \( H₀ \)
APPENDIX F

MINI-PROFILES OF PARTICIPATING COLLEGES
MINI-PROFILES OF PARTICIPATING COLLEGES

Information for these mini-profiles of participating community colleges was found in the 1979-80 Fact Book on Higher Education in Michigan published in 1980 by the Michigan Department of Education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Community College</th>
<th>Year Organized</th>
<th>Year Reorganized</th>
<th>1979 Fall Enrollment</th>
<th>F.Y.E.S.*</th>
<th>Full-Time Faculty</th>
<th>Fiscal 1979 Expenditure in Dollars</th>
<th>Library Volumes</th>
<th>Library Periodicals</th>
<th>1979 Degrees/Certificates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alpena</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>1,695</td>
<td>996</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3,480,736</td>
<td>29,053</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay de Noc</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>1,480</td>
<td>1,057</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2,548,729</td>
<td>24,814</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen Oaks</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>1,224</td>
<td>814</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1,909,779</td>
<td>31,615</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>1,188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gogebic</td>
<td>1930 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,308</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2,802,048</td>
<td>21,833</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>1928 1962</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,554</td>
<td>3,755</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>9,537,395</td>
<td>39,197</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalamazoo Valley</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>6,663</td>
<td>3,085</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>7,462,910</td>
<td>60,352</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Michigan</td>
<td>1946 1963</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,301</td>
<td>1,650</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>4,115,500</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid Michigan</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>1,660</td>
<td>943</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2,867,486</td>
<td>18,283</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montcalm</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>1,650</td>
<td>892</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1,956,966</td>
<td>20,669</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muskegon</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>5,353</td>
<td>2,641</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>7,719,380</td>
<td>52,980</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Clair County</td>
<td>1923 1967</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,350</td>
<td>2,320</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>7,445,094</td>
<td>41,871</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washtenaw</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>7,622</td>
<td>3,310</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>11,230,123</td>
<td>48,219</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Shore</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>927</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2,354,999</td>
<td>11,349</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Fiscal Year Equated Students: Student credit hours generated divided by 31 student semester credit hours
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