

STARS

Journal of Health Occupations
Education

Volume 10 | Number 1

Article 5

1995

Institutional Goal Priorities in Texas: A Look at an Associate Degree Nursing Program

John E. De Leon Ph.D.
Southwest Texas State University

Find similar works at: <https://stars.library.ucf.edu/jhoe>
University of Central Florida Libraries <http://library.ucf.edu>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by STARS. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Health Occupations Education by an authorized editor of STARS. For more information, please contact STARS@ucf.edu.

Recommended Citation

De Leon, John E. Ph.D. (1995) "Institutional Goal Priorities in Texas: A Look at an Associate Degree Nursing Program," *Journal of Health Occupations Education*: Vol. 10 : No. 1 , Article 5.
Available at: <https://stars.library.ucf.edu/jhoe/vol10/iss1/5>

Journal of Health Occupations Education
Spring 1995, Volume 10, Number 1

Institutional Goal Priorities in Texas:

A Look at an Associate Degree Nursing Program

John E. De Leon¹

Abstract: Trends indicate that Texans will enter community colleges seeking the skills and competencies needed to survive in today's highly technical work environments.

Nursing and allied health occupations are expected to account for 54,500 of the projected 10.3 million jobs available in the Texas workforce in the year 2000. The educational trend prompted by the need for a quality workforce in Texas mandates that community colleges establish institutional goal priorities among major constituent groups to maintain program effectiveness. This study examined the current and preferred importance of institutional goals among four community college associate degree nursing constituent groups: advisory board members, college administrators, faculty, and final semester students.

¹John E. De Leon, Ph.D. Assistant Professor, Department of Technology, Southwest Texas State University, San Marcos, TX

Business, industry, and education are grappling with the effects brought about by exponential advances in technology. Reports document the frustrations and disillusionment of business and industry with the present educational system (Carnevale, Gainer, & Meltzer, 1988; U.S. Department of Labor, 1988). Progressive employers expect more than the traditional technical and basic skills from their employees: they want them to possess cognitive, social and transferable skills (Secretary's Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills, 1991). Technological advancements have also created occupational opportunities in vocational-technical fields that require comprehensive, technical training compatible with associate degree level preparation (Johnson, Evans, Galloway, & Foster, 1990). Brand (1990) noted that community colleges and technical institutes "have the opportunity to be key players in creating a coherent training system" that can reduce the gap existing in the vocational-technical education system (p. 296). Community colleges and technical institutes frequently establish partnerships with business and industry for the preparation of employees to meet contemporary performance standards (Baker & Roe, 1990). Consequently, community colleges and technical institutes are in a unique position to respond to the needs of progressive employers for a skilled and competent workforce (Brand, 1990).

Review of Literature

After a review of studies regarding corporate managers' perceptions of general education competencies needed by the future workforce, Johnson, Foster, and Stachwell (1989) compiled a list of 15 categories of competencies. Johnson, et al. (1990) grouped the 15 categories into six broad competencies. Table 1 reproduces the framework developed by Johnson et al. (1990).

Table 1

Competencies Needed by the Workforce of the Future

Broad Competencies	Specific Skills
Affective Skills	Positive Attitude Motivation & Self Direction Career & Personal Development
Basic Academic Skills	Written Communication Skills Reading & Comprehensive Skills Computation Skills Oral Communication Skills
Cognitive Skills	Problem-Solving Skills Decision-Making Skills Creative & Critical Thinking Skills
Social Skills	Teamwork & Interpersonal Skills Multicultural Skills
Technical Knowledge & Skills	Technical Skills Scientific Knowledge Computer Skills
Transferable Skills	Ability to Learn Flexibility /Adaptability

Note. From Current practices in preparing the future workforce: An analysis of advanced technology programs in Illinois community colleges (p. 5) by S. D. Johnson, J. A. Evans, J. Galloway and T. Foster, 1990, Springfield, IL: Illinois State Board of Education.

Consistent with these six categories are the findings of studies to determine the general education competencies that graduates of the Associate of Applied Science (AAS) degree programs should possess to become employable and adaptable to the technological changes in

the work environment (Armistead, Armistead, & Perkins, 1989; Armistead & Vogler, 1987; Meyer, 1983). Students (Armistead & Vogler, 1987), employers (Armistead, et. al., 1989; Meyer, 1983), and faculty (Perkins, 1985) consistently found affective skills, basic academic skills and cognitive skills to be the most valued competencies acquired during study for the AAS degree. Particularly, studies in Associate Degree Nursing (ADN) curriculum models and competencies (Germann Community College, 1989; Hardee & Worthington, 1983; Seminole Community College, 1985) and employers' perceptions of ADN graduates (Adams & Stoyanoff, 1982; Wright & Yungho, 1989) are parallel with the aforementioned competencies and skills needed for successful employment.

Institutional Goals Studies

Koltai (1984), in a series of recommendations directed towards “strengthening the quality of the associate degree in order to improve its relevance and value to the student, the employer, and to the four-year institution to which the degree holder may wish to transfer,” recommended that all groups involved in the community college (i.e. students, faculty, administrators, employers, community) should be pursuing the same institutional goals (p. 18). Heath (1981) concluded the following, after conducting a study of the attributes colleges would need to possess to “adapt healthily and effectively to the demands of the future” (p. 93):

Future effectiveness as well as survival may well depend in part upon how perceptive are our questions about our own institution's ethos. As vague as the idea of “ethos” may be to some, it refers to the subjective reality to which faculty and students adapt. Hopefully organizing our understanding

De Leon: Institutional Goal Priorities in Texas

about ethos in terms of adaptive potentials will empower us to create more effective schools in the future. (p. 11 O)

Developed by the Educational Testing Service, the Community College Goals Inventory (CCGI) was drafted for the specific purpose of helping community colleges examine institutional goal priorities among constituent groups (Educational Testing Service, 199 1a). Findt and Sullins (1990) utilized the CCGI to form their conclusions. After examining state legislators, presidents, academic administrators, and trustees at 22 North Carolina community colleges they determined that a general consensus existed among the groups supporting the traditional goals of vocational/technical education preparation, general education, and remedial preparation.

Hardin and Martin (1988) applied the CCGI to determine whether institutional goals had changed among key constituent groups at the State Technical Institute of Knoxville (STIK) after the institution's name was changed to the Pellissippi State Technical Community College (PSTCC). After the name change, administrators, faculty, and staff were surveyed for their perceptions concerning the goals as they currently existed and how they would prefer them to exist under the new institution's name. The researchers ascertained that the goals of vocational/technical preparation, general education and remedial/developmental education should remain the institution's areas of emphasis despite the name change.

Scope

Members of the community college constituency evaluated ADN programs to resolve inconsistencies and disparities among students, faculty, administrators, and employers. Through funds partially allocated by the Kellogg Foundation and the Midwest Alliance in

Nursing (MAIN), a three-year project that involved 595 ADN programs comprising over 40 states sought to find means of strengthening ADN programs. The study helped determine disparities among key groups of constituents and uncover other undetectable concerns (Minckley & Walters, 1983).

A number of studies have been pursued in hopes of refurbishing the strength and success of ADN programs (Germana Community College, 1989; Hardee & Worthington, 1983; Seminole Community College, 1985). After conducting a follow-up study of faculty and students to help improve the quality of the ADN program and its graduates, Scott (1982) especially detected disparities in the students' perceptions of the program. While the data concluded that 93.8 % of the graduates would recommend the program to a friend, some weaknesses did surface, one of which involved graduates who felt that the time allotted between classes was inadequate. In addition, the students noted that the staff did not address their needs as students when they were enrolled in the program. Williams (1988) studied the perceptions of faculty, students, and administrators to determine the effectiveness of an ADN program and found that students, faculty, and administrators were at odds regarding the direction and mission of the institution. The study findings enabled the researcher to design a solution that implemented better communications between faculty, students, and administrators to establish institutional goal priorities.

Statement of Problem

The literature reviewed reveals that a community college's longevity, prosperity, and mission authenticity hinge on key constituencies embracing congruent goals. Researchers endorse the notion that if community colleges are to be receptive to the needs of their

groups. Finally, institutional goal priorities can be determined by performing a systematic analysis of the perceptions of key community college constituencies regarding the importance of institutional goals.

If post-secondary institutions that offer ADN programs are to maintain and improve program effectiveness, the perceptions of major constituent groups should be studied to construct the foundation for decisions leading to program effectiveness and institutional longevity. A study was undertaken to determine the degree of similarities and differences between major constituent groups at one post-secondary institution regarding their perceptions of existing and desired institutional goal priorities.

Statement of Purpose

In Texas, community colleges provide education to approximately 50% of all students enrolled in higher education. Of the projected 10.3 million Texas jobs available in the year 2000, over 1.8 million will require at least one year of post-secondary education. Specifically, nursing/allied health occupations (i.e., dental assistant, medical assistant, nursing) are expected to experience the largest annual growth until the year 2000 (Texas Employment Commission, 199 1). The purpose of this study was to examine the perceptions of students, faculty, administrators, and program advisory board members regarding institutional goal priorities at a Texas post-secondary institution that offered an ADN program.

Methodology

Houston Community College System (HCCS), one of 38 Texas post-secondary institutions offering Associate Degree Nursing programs, was selected as the institution investigated for the study. HCCS is a multi-campus community college system consisting of six regional colleges, one of which is the Southeast College that manages the ADN program for HCCS. During the period 1989-1991, HCCS awarded 358 Associate Degree Nursing degrees; the second highest in the state. In addition, when compared to other public Associate Degree Nursing programs in the state, HCCS' Associate Degree Nursing program has experienced the largest growth in student enrollment during the past two years.

Sample

The study examined the perceptions of four key constituent groups from the Southeast College ADN program regarding institutional goal priorities. Twenty-three ADN faculty, 13 college administrators, 128 ADN students, and 5 ADN advisory board members were involved. Cluster sampling identified the student subjects for the study. The elements (students in their final semester of study) were found in 1 of 16 clusters (classes). Nine classes of students were randomly selected utilizing a random digits table (Borg & Gall, 1983). All 128 students enrolled in the randomly selected classes were surveyed.

Data Collection and Analysis

The surveys were distributed to the subjects selected during the second week of March 1993. Each subject received a packet containing a copy of the CCGI survey instrument, a letter of transmittal from the dean of instructional services, and a self-addressed, stamped

envelope. Four weeks after initial distribution, a letter of reminder was mailed to each subject, excluding the students, to encourage responses. Final collection of instruments was made eight weeks after initial distribution.

Participants were asked to rate 90 goal statements found in the CCGI in terms of how important is the statement perceived to exist currently versus its preferred (should be) importance. The goal area statements were reduced and reflected in 20 goal area categories; each goal comprised four statements. Ten of the 90 statements were miscellaneous and were not tabulated. The respondents rated the statements on a five-point scale, where 1 indicated of no importance. or not applicable, and 5 indicated of extremely high importance. Means were determined for each goal area. A goal mean had a value ranging from a low of 1.00 to a high of 5.00. The higher the mean, the higher the importance of the goal area. The following research question was explored: Do differences exist between the current and preferred importance of goal areas within each constituent group and, if so, are these differences significant?

A data base of the survey responses was created for the purpose of statistical manipulation procedures. The data were entered into the Texas A&M MVS (Wylbur) system at College Station and analyzed using the SAS system. Statistical comparisons were based in terms of the 20 goal area means. A repeated measures t-test was performed by group to determine if differences between the current (is) and preferred (should be) goal rankings were significant; alpha was set at 0.05.

Results

The study obtained a 62% response rate. The advisory group achieved the highest response rate at 100% and the faculty group the lowest at 52%. The student and administrator groups both achieved 60% response rates.

Faculty constituency. As shown in Table 2, the faculty constituency did not perceive a single goal as currently being of high importance. They did, however, indicate that the goals of intellectual orientation, general education, faculty/staff development, and developmental/remedial preparation should be of high importance as institutional goal priorities. Particularly, the goal of college community was perceived as being of low importance (mean of 2.56) and ranked last under the current importance of goals, but attained a ranking of fifth (mean of 3.97) among the preferred importance of institutional goals. Two goals, general education and intellectual orientation, escalated from of medium importance under the is category to of high importance under the should be category. Furthermore, all 11 changes were both positive (an increase in is to should be mean value) and significant.

Student constituency. As reflected in Table 3, students, like their faculty counterparts, indicated that none of the 20 goals provided were currently being viewed as of high importance. The students were in agreement with the current and preferred importance of general education, ranking it the most important goal under both is and should be categories. In addition, the data analysis showed that the student constituency perceived that more emphasis should be placed on the goals of counseling and advising, personal development, and college community. This is manifested in the significantly different positive changes

Table 2

Faculty^a Constituency Current and Preferred Importance of Goal Areas

Current “Is”	Mean	Preferred “Should Be”	Mean
		“Of High Importance”	
		Intellect Orientation	4.39
		General Education	4.12
		Faculty/Staff Dev	4.12
		Dev/Remedial Prep	4.04
“Of Medium Importance”			
Voc/Technical Prep	3.77	College Community	3.97
*General Education	3.56	Personal Dev	3.95
Dev/Remedial Prep	3.50	Lifelong Learning	3.89
Counseling & Advising	3.42	Voc/Technical Prep	3.83
*Lifelong Learning	3.31	Effective Management	3.81
“Intellect Orientation	3.29	Accountability	3.72
Accessibility	3.25	Humanism/Altruism	3.70
Student Services	3.23	Counseling&Advising	3.68
*Personal Dev	3.17	Innovation	3.62
*Accountability	3.13	Intellect Environment	3.56
“Intellect Environment	3.02	Social Criticism	3.39
“Effective Management	3.00	Accessibility	3.39
		Student Services	3.37
		Cult/Aesthetic Awar	3.25
		Community Services	3.20
		Freedom	3.14
“Of Low Importance”			
Community Services	2.98		
*Humanism/Altruism	2.98		
*Faculty/Staff Dev	2.96		
Cult/Aesthetic Aware	2.92		
Freedom	2.90		
“Innovation	2.88		
Social Criticism	2.75		
*College Community	2.56		

Note. Scale: 1 = of no importance, or not applicable; 2 = of low importance; 3 = of medium importance; 4 = of high importance; 5 = of extremely high importance. ^an = 12. * = Difference between “Is” and “Should Be” mean values significant, Alpha (Prob> t) =0.05.

in mean values for each goal. All three goals achieved an of low importance ranking under the is category, but attained an of high importance ranking under the should be category.

As depicted in Table 3, all changes in ranking were both positive and significantly different. Five goals had positive changes from of medium importance status to importance, and 10 goals advanced from of low importance to of medium importance. Despite advancing from an of low importance to an of medium importance, cultural/aesthetic awareness remained the least important goal in both the is and should be categories.

Administrator constituency. As shown in Table 4, vocational/technical preparation was considered of high importance among the administrators, achieving the highest scale rating as the most important current goal (mean of 4.14) and preferred goal (mean of 4.52) of the community college.

Notably, the three goals of college community, humanism/altruism and intellectual environment constituted is means that ranked them of low importance, but achieved an of high importance ranking under the should be category. Cultural/aesthetic awareness received is and should be means that ranked it the least important current and preferred goal. Of the 18 significantly different positive changes in mean rankings, two goals changed from low to medium importance status and 12 changed from medium to high importance status.

Advisory constituency. Table 5 reveals that the advisory constituency perceived general education to be the most important current goal (mean of 3.90) of the institution, but attested that faculty/staff development should be the most important goal (mean of 4.75).

De Leon: Institutional Goal Priorities in Texas

Table 3
Student” Constituency Current and Preferred Importance of Goal Areas”

Current “Is”	Mean	Preferred “Should Be”	Mean
		“Of High Importance”	
		General Education	4.39
		Dev/Remedial Prep	4.18
		College Community	4.13
		Voc/Technical Prep	4.11
		Lifelong Learning	4.07
		Intellect Orientation	4.03
		Personal Dev	4.03
		Counseling & Advising	4.00
“Of Medium Importance”			
General Education	3.69	Humanism/Altruism	3.79
Lifelong Learning	3.36	Accessibility	3.78
Intellect Orientation	3.27	Faculty/Staff Dev	3.77
Voc/Technical Prep	3.24	Accountability	3.77
Dev/Remedial Prep	3.17	Student Services	3.76
Accessibility	3.03	Effective Management	3.75
Effective Management	3.02	Intellect Environment	3.65
		Innovation	3.62
		Community Services	3.58
		Social Criticism	3.56
		Freedom	3.50
“Of Low Importance”			
Freedom	2.88	Cult/Aesthetic Aware	2.98
Accountability	2.86		
Counseling & Advising	2.81		
Personal Development	2.81		
Faculty/Staff Dev	2.76		
Humanism/Altruism	2.70		
Social Criticism	2.67		
Community Services	2.60		
Student Services	2.60		
Innovation	2.59		
College Community	2.58		
Intellect Environment	2.47		
Cult/Aesthetic Aware	2.25		

Note. Scale: 1 = of no importance, or not applicable; 2 = of low importance; 3 = of medium importance; 4 = of high importance; 5 = of extremely high importance. ^an = 78. * = All differences between “Is” and “Should Be” mean values significant, Alpha (Prob>t) =0.05.

Table 4

Administrator Constituency Current and Preferred Importance of Goal Areas

Current	Mean	Preferred	Mean
“Of High Importance”			
Voc/Technical Prep	4.14	Voc/Technical Prep	4.52
		Dev/Remedial Prep	4.47
		General Education	4.38
		College Community	4.36
		Personal Dev	4.25
		Intellect Orientation	4.22
		Lifelong Learning	4.19
		Faculty/Staff Dev	4.19
		Effective Management	4.13
		Community Services	4.11
		Innovation	4.11
		Humanism/Altruism	4.08
		Student Services	4.05
		Accountability	4.05
		Counseling & Advisin	4.00
		Intellect Environment	4.00
“Of Medium Importance”			
*General Education	3.81	Accessibility	3.88
*Counseling & Advising	3.61	Social Criticism	3.86
Accessibility	3.50	Freedom	3.61
*Dev/Remedial Prep	3.47	Cult/Aesthetic Aware	3.58
*Community Services	3.39		
*Student Services	3.36		
*Faculty/Staff Dev	3.36		
*Accountability	3.31		
*Effective Management	3.2		
*Lifelong Learning	3.17		
*Intellect Orientation	3.11		
*Freedom	3.08		
*Personal Dev	3.03		
*Innovation	3.03		
“Of Low Importance”			
*Social Criticism	2.81		
*Humanism/Altruism	2.78		
*Intellect Environment	2.75		
*College Community	2.61		
*Cult/Aesthetic Aware	2.53		

Note. Scale: 1 = of no importance, or not applicable; 2 = of low importance; 3 = of medium importance; 4 = of high importance; 5 = of extremely high importance. ^an² 9.
* = Difference between “Is” and “Should Be” mean values significant, Alpha = 0.05.

Table 5

Advisory³ Constituency Current and Preferred Importance of Goal Areas

Current	Mean	Preferred	Mean
"Of High Importance"			
Faculty/Staff Dev			4.75
College Community			4.70
Dev/Remedial Prep			4.60
Accountability			4.50
General Education			4.45
Voc/Technical Prep			4.45
Counseling & Advising			4.40
Effective Management			4.25
Lifelong Learning			4.20
Personal Dev			4.20
Community Services			4.15
Innovation			4.10
Humanism/Altruism			4.00
"Of Medium Importance"			
General Education	3.90	Intellect Orientation	3.90
Voc/Tech Prep	3.75	Intellect Environment	3.85
Lifelong Learning	3.35	Student Services	3.80
*Dev/Remed Prep	3.35	Accessibility	3.45
Community Serv	3.20	Freedom	3.25
Student Services	3.15	Social Criticism	3.20
Personal Devlpt	3.10	Cult/Aesthetic Aware	3.15
*Faculty/Staff Dev	3.00		
"Of Low Importance"			
*Innovation	2.95		
Accessibility	2.95		
Intellectual Orient	2.90		
Social Criticism	2.90		
Counseling & Ad	2.90		
*Accountability	2.90		
Effective Mangm	2.85		
*Humanism/Altr	2.70		
*Cult/Aesth Aware	2.65		
"Intellect Envirmt	2.65		
Freedom	2.60		
"College Commnty	2.50		

Note. Scale: 1 = of no importance, or not applicable; 2 = of low importance; 3 = of medium importance; 4 = of high importance; 5 = of extremely high importance. ^an = 5.

* = Difference between "Is" and "Should Be" mean values significant, Alpha (Prob > t) = 0.05.

They felt that none of the goals presented had current priority status comprising of high importance ranking.

College community had the lowest mean (2.50), a scale rating of low importance under the is category of goal importance. Nevertheless, it received an of high importance ranking with a mean value of 4.70. Furthermore, five additional goals (accountability, counseling and advising, effective management, innovation, humanism/altruism) had is mean value increases that escalated their of low importance status to of high importance.

All seven goals receiving is mean values reflecting of low importance ranking, with the exception of student services, had positive increases under the should be category ranking them of high importance. In addition, six goals increased from of low importance rank to medium importance in relation to the current and preferred importance of the goals, respectively. Only eight of the positive changes in mean values were significant.

Summary

Only the administrators perceived vocational/technical preparation to be of high importance. The faculty members perceived that 12 goal areas were of medium importance, the students perceived 7, the administrators 14, and the advisory members 8. The three goal areas of general education, developmental/remedial preparation, and lifelong learning were perceived of medium importance, and humanism/altruism, cultural/aesthetic awareness, social criticism, and college community were perceived to be of low importance by all four groups.

In preferred importance of goals, only the students rated a goal less than of medium importance on the scale. The faculty constituency preferred the importance of four goals to be of high importance. The students rated 8, the administrators 16, and the advisory board members rated 13 similarly. The students felt that general education should be the most important goal area. The administrators and advisory board members indicated that

vocational/technical preparation and faculty/staff development should be the most important goals, respectively. Two groups, faculty and student, affirmed that freedom should be the least preferred among the of medium importance goal areas. General education and developmental/remedial preparation were perceived of high importance as preferred goal areas by all four groups. Three goal areas were considered of medium importance as preferred by all constituencies: accessibility, social criticism, and freedom. In terms of means, vocational/technical preparation, general education, and developmental/remedial preparation were among the top 10 most important current and preferred goal areas by all four groups. Three goal areas were among the 10 least important current and preferred: intellectual environment, social criticism, and cultural/aesthetic awareness.

Conclusions

In general, the results of the study were consistent with previous research in the field of institutional goal studies. All groups felt that the goal areas should be more important than they are currently being perceived in order to exist. Data analysis found some discrepancies to be significantly different. The faculty members had 11 significantly different discrepancies, the students had 20, the administrators had 17, and the advisory members had 8 significantly different discrepancies. Only general education and developmental/remedial preparation were preferred to be of high importance as goals for the college; no one goal was preferred to be most important by all four groups.

Although the groups could not reach agreement on the goal that should be the most important for the college, there were similarities among the groups regarding the current importance of six goal areas. Four goal areas (developmental/remedial preparation, vocational/technical preparation, general education, and lifelong learning) were perceived to be of medium importance by the four constituencies. College community and cultural

perceive the traditional goals of the community college (a student's quality of education, commitment to non-traditional students, accommodation of adequate remedial programs, and the attainment of occupational competence) to be more important than formulating a climate in which there is faculty and staff communication.

Differences concerning current importance of three goals (community services, vocational/technical preparation, and counseling and advising) proved significant among the students and administrators. The students did not perceive their occupational training to be the most important goal. The administrators, on the other hand, perceived that vocational/technical preparation was the most important current goal.

The findings reveal that all four constituent groups perceived that more could be done in all the 20 goal areas. This came as no surprise to the researcher, since people naturally tend to expect better services. What is most revealing and significant to the study is that disparities exist in the current perceptions of goal areas. This occurrence demonstrates that the groups are not perceiving the direction and purpose of the college in the same way. All groups perceived the current importance of college community, a goal area that purports "open and candid communication, open and amicable airing of differences, and mutual trust and respect among faculty, students, and administrators" to be of low importance (Educational Testing Service, 1991b). All groups, however, preferred that college community should be ranked among the most important goals of the institution. Consequently, the great number of disparities could perhaps be attributed to the fact that the groups do not hold communication and openness to be among the most important goal of the college.

Another group disparity that merits commentary concerns the goal area of community services, which is defined as being “concerned with the college’s relationship with the community: encouraging community use of college resources (meeting rooms, computer facilities, faculty skills), conducting community forums on topical issues, promoting cooperation among diverse community organizations to improve availability y of services, and working with local government agencies, industry, unions, and other groups on community problems” (Educational Testing Service, 199 lb). The faculty group rated community services of low importance as both a current and preferred goal. On the other hand, the students rated it of low importance as a current goal, but preferred that it should be of medium importance. The administrators and advisory members felt that it was of medium importance currently, but would prefer to see it be of high importance. The disparity among the faculty members and the rest of the groups regarding the scale value of this goal reiterates the perception held constant by the ADN faculty members: the primary mission of the ADN program should be preparing students for workplace responsibilities. In addition, low response rate by faculty to the survey supports sentiment that ADN faculty are pursuing only the traditional community college goals of vocational/technical preparation and general education. The faculty should broaden their perspective on the mission of the college to include not only the interests of the individual learners, but also the interests of the various constituencies they serve.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are made in reference to the conclusions reached from the study involving ADN faculty, ADN students, college administrators, and ADN advisory board members of the Southeast College:

1. Discussion on the results of the study among the constituent groups involved may be useful in resolving areas of disagreement regarding the importance of institutional goals. This can be realized by fortifying established institutional linkages and by augmenting the current mediums of communication among the groups. The lifeline of an institution is its ability to communicate both internally and externally. Specifically, the administrators could demonstrate to the faculty members (who perceived that faculty/staff development was “of low importance” currently) that their stability and interests as faculty members are of concern. This could perhaps be accomplished by providing educational opportunities that are aimed at strengthening awareness and understanding of their role as one of many constituencies that comprise the community college. In addition, with the influx of computer technology and sophisticated communications in almost every facet of community college activity, there is no excuse why staff, faculty, and administrators could not exchange ideas, concerns and strategies. A strategy to reduce the communication gap among the faculty and administrators would be for the college to provide incentives for faculty/administrator collaborative initiatives with public and private organizations.

2. The most significant of the internal variables of an institution is, perhaps, leadership. In striving to achieve program excellence, college administrators and their board of trustees should subject the mission of the college to the consistent changes driving the internal climate of the college. The leadership of the Southeast College should, therefore, consider training and retraining initiatives needed to insure harmony, allegiance, and cohesion to shared goals critical to the institution’s effectiveness.

References

Adams, F. G., & Stoyanoff, K. (1982). A study of Illinois employer reactions to training credentials. Springfield, IL: Illinois State Department of Commerce and Community Affairs, Lake County College.

- Armistead, J. S., Armistead, L. P., & Perkins, D. R. (1989). The amount and importance of general education in the two-year occupational curriculum according to corporate employers. Community/Junior College Quarterly, 13, 91-99.
- Armistead, L. P., & Vogler, D. E. (1987). The importance of general education courses and competencies as viewed by community college occupational students. Journal of Studies in Technical Careers, 9 (3), 191-200.
- Baker, G., & Roe, M. (1990). The development of community college leaders: A challenge for our future. Community College Review, 16 (4), 5-16.
- Borg, W. R., & Gall, M. D. (1983). Educational research: An introduction. New York, NY: Longman.
- Brand, B. (Fall, 1990). The U. S. department of education's perspective of postsecondary technical training needs. Journal of Studies in Technical Careers, 7 (4), 295-300.
- Carnevale, A. P., Gainer, L. J., & Meltzer, A. S. (1988). Workforce basics: The skills employers want. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Labor & The American Society for Training and Development.
- Educational Testing Service. (199 1a). Community college goals inventory: Processing and reporting services. (Form No. 57208-02312). Princeton, NJ: ETS Higher Education Assessment.
- Educational Testing Service. (1991 b). Community college goals inventory: Processing and reporting services. (Form No. 57208 -Y44P. 1-24 1841). Princeton, NJ: ETS Higher Education Assessment.
- Findt, W. C., & Sullins, W. R. (1990). North Carolina community college goals for the future. Community College Review, 17 (4), 44-45.
- Germanna Community College. (1989). Germanna community college assessment report. Locust Grove, VA: Germanna Community College.
- Hardee, V. M., & Worthington, R. G. (1983). Curriculum models and competencies. Associate degree nursing and nursing education options: Associate degree with practical nursing. Raleigh, NC: North Carolina Department of Community Colleges.
- Hardin, J. W., & Martin, F. H. (1988). A study of staff perceptions of institutional goals before and after a major institutional mission. Knoxville, TN: Pellissippi State Technical Community College.
- Heath, D. H. (1981). A college's ethos: A neglected key to effectiveness and survival. Liberal Education, 37,(2), 89-111.

- Johnson, S. D., Evans, J. A., Galloway, J., and Foster, T. (1990). Current practices in preparing the future workforce: An analysis of advanced technology programs in Illinois community colleges. Springfield, IL: Illinois State Board of Education, Department of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education.
- Johnson, S. D., Foster, W. T., & Satchwell, R. (1989). Sophisticated technology, the workforce, and vocational education. Springfield, IL: Department of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education.
- Koltai, L. (1984). Redefining the associate degree (Report No. ISBN-0-871 17-131-7). Washington, DC: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges.
- Meyer, R. B. (1983). Desired general education competencies: A corporate perspective. Dissertation Abstracts International, 44, 07A, p. 2023. (On Disc Jul1980-Dec 1984).
- Minckley, B. B., Walters, M. D. (1983). Defining competencies for associate degree nursing education and practice. Proceedings of the midwest regional conference on "The associate degree nursing--facilitating competency development" project (Report No. ISBN-0-942 146-06-9). Indianapolis, IN: Midwest Alliance in Nursing, Inc.
- Perkins, D. R. (1985). General education competencies as outcomes of two-year occupational programs: A comparison of corporate and academic views. Dissertation Abstracts International, 47, 02A, p. 394. (On Disc Jan 1985-Dec 1988).
- Scott, D. C. (1982). Nursing education follow-up study--1982 R.N. 's. Bakersfield, CA: Bakersfield College, Office of Institutional Research.
- Secretary's Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills. (1991). What work requires of school. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Labor.
- Seminole Community College. (1985). Associate degree nursing program guide. Final report from February 19, 1985 to August 31, 1985. Tallahassee, FL: Florida State Department of Education, Division of Vocational Education.
- Texas Employment Commission. (199 1). Texas work force 2000. Austin, TX: The Economic Research and Analysis Department.
- Williams, J. (1988). Student development services program evaluation. Martinsville, VA: Patrick Henry Community College.
- Wright, C. E., & Yungho, K. (1989). A study of general education requirements in vocational education programs. Menlo Park, CA: California Community Colleges, Office of the Chancellor.