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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The impact of advancing technology on society generally is increasingly difficult to assess or to predict. The technological innovations of today may be obsolete in a few short years as medical, scientific, and technical advances continue at an accelerating rate.

As technological advances increase there is a commensurate increase in the need to plan for the kind of future that the technology makes possible. It is the position of this author that technological advances will continue to have a pervasive and accelerating influence on the life styles of the majority of Americans. Further, the potential impact of technological change must be anticipated and planned for if adjustments are to be relatively painless.

We are now part of an affluent society which provides goods and services at a highly sophisticated level. Long gone are the 10 and 12 hour work days that were once considered the norm. The 40 hour work week has been shortened to 35 hours in many institutions. This reduction of the work week, as well as increased vacation time and early retirement have redefined the meaning of leisure time for many Americans. Because of the school's traditional role as an educational delivery system, coupled with the increasing necessity for people to be trained or entertained, it is no coincidence that community education began a major growth period in the 1940's, at a time when social improvements benefitted the workplace. The return of soldiers after
World War II normalized the nuclear family and educational as well as recreational pursuits were being encouraged by the government (i.e., G.I. bill) and the schools.

Community education continues to flourish and provide broadening experiences for its participants as stated by Decker (1976):

Community education is destined to have an important role in the future. As the work day shortens, adults have the advantage of increased leisure time for themselves and their families. This time can provide an opportunity for people to work together to achieve community and self-improvement.

In the confines of this study, community education is defined as a program which uses a myriad of institutional forces in providing educational opportunity for all the people of a community. The specific emphasis on this research encompasses school based programs including: high school completion, adult basic education, leisure (enrichment) classes, recreational activities, senior citizen programs, and adult vocational training.

It must be noted that individuals often live years beyond retirement, so that the cultivation of new interests becomes a retraining for a different lifestyle, often a way of life that will last many years. Community education programs can be instrumental in the development of new interests and the reorganization of one's day and eventually one's life.

Community education programs offer lifelong learning and enrichment opportunities in education, recreation, social, and related cultural services with the programs and activities developed and structured for citizens of all ages, ethnic backgrounds, and socio-economic groups. The services provided by community education, if fostered,
could greatly enhance the lives of many people in the decades ahead (Decker, 1976).

The scientific advances in industry make re-education a necessity for the learning of new techniques and skills. The obsolescence of various jobs makes updating a necessity and not merely a luxury. Community education can be the sponsor of the retraining programs.

It is logical that the school should become a primary source in the area of re-education. At present, through community education programs new trades and skills are taught for occupations where old skills have become obsolete. The day worker need not quit his/her existing job while learning new skills in the evening. In addition, at a time when declining enrollments, delayed or rejected funding for new or remodeling of buildings, and soaring inflation are escalating, the use of existing school buildings for community education purposes becomes a sensible use of public property. Buildings can be used 18 hours a day, as opposed to the 7 hours when the traditional day classes are in session. Often new community centers need not be built, as the school buildings can house a variety of local activities. The number of individuals with access to school buildings increases as adult or community education sponsored recreational leagues, assorted classes, and civic meetings share in the usage of the school facilities.

School boards, while aiming to meet the needs of the public, must also face the problem of a devalued dollar. It is increasingly difficult to pass millages when the taxpayer finds his/her paycheck so quickly consumed. However, taxpayers are more inclined to approve
millage increases if their individual needs have been met at a local level. If community education has brought the local citizen into the school for a positive educational experience, this may be remembered at the yearly election when a yes vote is crucial.

In order to maximize the positive results of community education, we must plan today for the programs of the future. Effective planning is dependent on knowledge of community needs, costs, and citizen interest. In this respect, community education programming can be a great asset in the planning and administration of local activities, as it is able to accommodate or serve the interests of many age groups. Community education is a viable vehicle for meeting the expanding needs of our population, and the very planning of its future is a subject worthy of detailed investigation.

Problem

Simply stated the problem addressed in this study is as follows: What is the future of community education in Michigan during the next 10 years with regard to organizational structure, programs, and funding?

Purpose

The purpose of this research was to identify possible futures for community education so that community educators can plan for the years to come with new insights and direction. Using the Delphi technique, this study attempted to predict appropriate change, influence, and impact in the field of community education. To achieve the
purposes of the study, the following kinds of information were collected:

1. The most important influences which a panel of experts foresee as shaping the programs, structure, and funding of community education for the next ten years.

2. The probability of changes for various events within a specific time frame using a consensus of expert opinion.

3. The impact that selected events would have on community education's future.

Delimitations

The study was limited to the public sector. Further it was assumed that federal and state funding would continue to be the reference point for the financing of community education programs. Because of time and resource restrictions, the data sources were limited to public schools, state universities, and the legislature in the state of Michigan. As stated earlier, the Delphi technique was utilized in this study. The Delphi panelists worked and resided in Michigan and represented the public sector with vocational commitments either in public schools or in the legislature.

For the purpose of this study, community education was limited to school based programs encompassing high school completion, adult basic education, leisure (enrichment) courses, recreational activities, senior citizen programs, and adult vocational training.
Rationale

The increase of leisure time has accelerated an interest in the community education movement. Community education offers the participant an opportunity to foster his/her interests in academic, vocational, or enrichment areas. Community education is growing at a time when inflation and a devalued dollar are plaguing the United States economy. The taxpayers' revolt was clearly present in the 1977 California election where Proposition 13 passed overwhelmingly. This measure cut property taxes in half, returning taxes to the level that taxpayers had paid 10 years earlier. While they were willing to pay for various services via taxation, there came a time when the continuous tax escalation precipitated citizen rebellion.

Michigan's 1978 November election ballot presented a number of proposals which were assumed to represent citizens' unhappiness with tax levels and spending allocations. One of the proposals was approved by the taxpayers; the Headlee Tax Limitation Proposal limited state taxation and expenditures to a fixed proportion of Michigan personal income. The revenue ceiling was set at approximately 9.2% to 9.4% of personal income earned in the prior year (or the income average of the last 3 consecutive calendar years). Thus, as personal income increased, tax revenues would increase (Gast, 1978).

In addition, the Headlee amendment limited the growth in property tax assessments within any taxing unit (i.e., schools or county roads) to the rate of growth in the consumer price index. This kind of legislation forces the government to operate within a fixed budget.
Tax limitation made it imperative for the legislature to prioritize. The passage of the Headlee amendment reinforced the taxpayer's desire to voice his/her control in matters related to additional funding for schools and other social agencies.

A real conflict arises when citizens are provided with educational/recreational activities for filling leisure time on one hand and demand cutbacks in taxation on the other hand. Programs need a financial commitment for administration and implementation. It is this potential conflict that interests the author. These very concepts must be dealt with in assessing the possible futures of community education.

**Significance of the Study**

The state of Michigan has demonstrated leadership in the area of community education programming. In the early 1940's, the W. K. Kellogg Foundation was instrumental in encouraging interest in community education programs by establishing eight demonstration centers in small Michigan communities (Michigan Department of Education, 1975).

In 1935, the Flint Board of Education granted permission for the opening of public schools in the after class hours for various activities, and monies were made available for this purpose (CSSE Needs Assessment for Berrien Springs and Eau Claire, 1978). The chief motivator in the community education movement was Frank Manley. He felt that evening school activities would keep youngsters off the street, cut down on vandalism, and reduce juvenile delinquency. Charles Mott, another giant in the Michigan community education movement, believed
that boys' clubs would also accomplish a lowering of the juvenile delinquency rate. Both Manley and Mott believed that youngsters involved in organized recreational activities would be less likely to become troublemakers, thus effecting a reduction in vandalism and juvenile crime.

The Flint schools allowed Manley to institute a plan which involved the public school's recreational facilities. The after school activities included volleyball, baseball, basketball, tumbling, etc. In time, roller skating, square dancing, as well as adult and continuing education classes, were added.

In the early 1970's, 1,300 different classes were offered to an enrollment of 90,000 students. The Flint community education program has become a national model. Visitors from outside the United States have visited Flint since 1967 to study the programming.

The future of community education, specifically in Michigan, is a timely subject. Michigan has been a leader in community education from its inception. The Mott and Manley models have been copied and adapted by dozens of states since the 1940's. Since Michigan, as a state, has been at the cutting edge of program development, growth, and expansion for over 40 years, it seems reasonable that the changes in Michigan's program over the next decade portend changes for the nation at large in the next two decades.

It is the author's belief that expert consensus regarding community education trends will not only benefit Michigan communities, but also the nation at large.
Definition of Terms

The following definitions are presented for clarity and understanding pertinent to the thesis text:

1. Adult basic education: remedial programs in education for adults 16 years of age and older who wish to overcome English language difficulties and attain reading, writing, and computational skills through the eighth grade level of instruction.

2. Community: a grouping of residents by village, subdivision, neighborhood, school attendance area, etc., of a size which allows for interaction, involvement, and two-way communication.

3. Community education: a process that achieves a balance and a use of institutional forces in the education of all the people of a community. This particular study has been limited to programs encompassing high school completion, adult basic education, leisure (enrichment) classes, recreational activities, senior citizen programs, and adult vocational training.

4. Community education director: the individual, hired by the school district, responsible for coordinating the activities offered to the community.

5. Community school: a school serving a grouping of residents in a community that makes its facilities available for citizen use, that organizes the participation of citizens in assessing local conditions, setting of priorities, and program planning.

6. Delphi technique: an intuitive approach to predicting the future; a panel of experts are used to make probability forecasts;
three or four rounds of questions are generally used in order to reach consensus on various items.

7. Demography: the study of population concerned with three main tasks: ascertaining the numbers, the characteristics, and the distribution of people in a given area; determining changes in numbers, characteristics, and distribution over time; and explaining the major factors accounting for these changes.

8. Future: a time that will come.

9. General educational development test (GED): a national testing program for adults to demonstrate a high school equivalency ability; the test has five parts: Reading Interpretation in Social Studies, Natural Sciences and Literature, Correctness and Effectiveness of Expression, and General Mathematical Ability.

10. High school completion: a prescribed course of study including assigned units of English, mathematics, science, history, government, and electives, which when completed, culminates in the earning of a high school diploma.

11. Impact: the potential effect an event or trend will have on future programming.

12. Leisure time/enrichment classes: classes that are taken for personal interest or fun; credit is not earned toward a degree.

13. Programs for the health impaired: educational or recreational activities for persons living in nursing homes or extended health care hospitals. Classes may be part of an adult basic education or high school completion program.
14. **Programs for the mentally impaired:** educational and/or recreational activities for individuals who have been classified as mentally retarded or emotionally disturbed. Classes deal with basic survival and personal adjustment (i.e., basic computation, cooking, physical exercise, etc.).

15. **Programs for the physically handicapped:** educational and/or recreational activities for individuals with some physical impairment or incapacitation; classes include physical therapy as well as academic offerings which aid the individual in his/her day to day functioning.

16. **Round:** each trial that the questionnaire is used in the Delphi process.

17. **Senior citizen programs:** educational and/or recreational activities for adults 60 years and older; offerings may include participation in health seminars, fine arts, field trips, and various study groups.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

To adequately address the future of community education in Michigan, an exhaustive review of related literature was undertaken. Although there have been published books and articles relating to the history of community education and community education development, as well as community education concepts and theories in general, there was a noticeable void in research relating to future trends in the community education movement, particularly as it related to potential financial restraints imposed by the recessionary 1970's. In light of this under-researched area, the author believed further exploration in this field would benefit future planning and programming of the community education movement, as it continued into the decades ahead.

The literature review resulted in the emergence of four major categories of information. The categories established are as follows: (a) a definition of community education structure and programming; this information was included in order to provide the reader with a general understanding of the Michigan community education movement and its many program facets, as well as to provide an explanation of general terminology used in the field; (b) an historical background of both state and national funding for community education programs; the researcher believed this background was crucial for understanding the financial origins of the community education movement in Michigan.
as well as on the national scene; (c) the rationale for using the Delphi technique as a means of predicting the future; this technique has been highly successful in eliciting expert responses within given fields and thus was assumed to be a methodology which would motivate leaders to evaluate future directions of community education; and (d) a demographic profile of the United States population in general and of Michigan specifically in the decade ahead; this was considered to be very important for community education programming/planning as the median age of the United States population changes, and as programming is directed to serve a larger group of older Americans.

**Community Education**

The term, community education, has been defined by the Michigan Department of Education as a philosophical concept that recognizes life experiences as being part of one's education. The concept is not limited to formal instruction, certain age classification, or attainment of diplomas. Community education further acknowledges that a process of involving citizens in identifying the conditions, resources, and priorities of the community is the central means of improving one's opportunity in life.

Community education gives every individual an opportunity to further develop his/her interests and potential. If an interest or need surfaces, it can be met through community education programming. The process may manifest itself in the organization of a local senior citizen program, or the teaching of youngsters to play hockey, or the training of adults in computer technology. It is a case of discovering...
needs, meeting them, and altering programs to suit the population at hand. This process focuses upon every institution, agency, and organization of the community to deliver identified and prioritized services and programs (Michigan Department of Education, 1975).

Community education is a process that achieves a balance and a use of institutional forces in the education of all the people of a community. The process is integral to the programs. Although this study focuses on identified and delineated programs, it is assumed that the appropriate process was attendant. Specifically, this study has been limited to community education sponsored programs including: high school completion, adult basic education, leisure (enrichment) classes, recreational activities, senior citizen programs, and adult vocational training.

Implicit in the community education term is the leadership role that public schools play in implementing the process and the programs. Federal regulations for funding community education programs require "systematic procedures for providing for the direct and substantial involvement of a public elementary or secondary school in the administration and operation of the program" (U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1976).

Community education is built upon interrelated programs through which people help themselves and their communities. The philosophy advocates processes and programs to utilize the total community environment and human resources so that the community becomes a dynamic interchange of living-learning experiences for all people. Community education focuses upon the total population of a community--from
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infants to senior citizens—and is concerned with activities as diverse as upholstery and income tax preparation.

Inherent within the philosophy is the belief that each community education program should reflect the educational, leisure, and recreational needs and desires of a particular community. Community education should include a process based on citizen involvement and participation which produces essential modifications in programming as times and problems change (Decker, 1976).

A number of significant ideas have been incorporated into the community education movement during its growth from the 1930's until the present. Seay and Associates (1974) list six such ideas as follows:

1. Community education recognizes in its programming that education is a continuous process.

2. Its educational objectives are stated in terms of desired changes in behavior.

3. Its educational activities are based upon the problems, needs, and interests of those for whom they are planned.

4. The school serves the community and the community serves the school.

5. The local community provides a focal point for understanding other, larger communities of people.

6. Community education challenges both school and community leaders. (p. 28)

At the time of this study, one of the most enthusiastic proponents of community education is W. Fred Totten. Totten (1975) regards community education as the wave of the future which is "trending toward becoming the universal plan of learning," and he feels that it
may prove to be the best educational hope for society. The following ideas came from an address that he presented to the Indiana Association of Secondary School Principals:

1. [Community education] involves people in finding solutions to their own problems.

2. [Its driving philosophy is service to others.]

3. It concentrates on serving the grass roots needs of people; food, shelter, clothing, employment, recreation, health care, family life, cultural experiences, helping others, fulfilling the need to be needed.

4. It involves people of different backgrounds, races, educational experiences, abilities—on an equal basis in the solution of common problems.

5. It breaks through the walls between home, school, and community, and among groups in the community.

6. Through involvement, sharing, meeting basic needs, understanding, working together on an equal basis, giving service to others, people are building and re-building within themselves the fundamental ideas of love, justice, truth, compassion, freedom, equality . . . . (p. 63)

The last statement focuses upon what is perhaps the most important component in a community education philosophy—that community education offers each individual in the community an opportunity to improve his/her quality of life. This "helping" aspect has been summarized very well by Totten and Manley (1969). One chapter of their book answers the question, "How Does the Community School Attempt to Help People?" Other chapter headings are indicative of answers to that question, as the following reproduction demonstrates:

1. "Helps People Realize and Use Their Own Great Reservoir of Strength"

2. "Unifies Influence of Home, School, and Community"

3. "Overcomes Some of the Barriers to Social Progress"
4. "Serves People on a 'Cradle-to-the-Grave' Basis"
5. "Serves Infants and Preschool Children"
6. "Enriches the Program for Children and Youth"
7. "Reestablishes the Place of the Teenager in American Society"
8. "Stimulates Healthful Living"
9. "Provides for Leisure-Time Activity"
10. "Provides Culturally Enriching Experiences"
11. "Raises Literacy Level of Adults"
12. "Provides Retraining Experiences" (pp. 22-24)

Funding

State Funding in Michigan

Community education's viability was greatly strengthened in Michigan when state supplied funding was made available. According to Elliot (1944), it was in January 1944 that the Michigan legislature in an extra session appropriated a sum of $250,000 for the purposes of providing an experimental program in adult education. The ensuing legislative act was a significant commitment on the part of the state legislature to adult education and was to provide the main impetus of the advances to come in this field. It should be noted that adult education was a forerunner of the present community education concept; initial programs were devised for adults 16 years and older, as contrasted to the present preschool to senior citizen age range.

At its inception the purposes of the legislation was to create comprehensive programs designed to: (a) encourage and extend in
communities, programs of adult education through local boards of education; (b) develop lay leadership for community service; and (c) analyze the methods used and evaluate the results obtained for the derivation of guides for future program development (Elliot, 1944).

The programs resulting from the legislation were intended to serve youth and adults who were not enrolled in full-time regular day classes of public, private, or parochial schools. As Elliot (1944) stated, "the general areas to be included in the programs were: social-civic education, home and family living education, avocational and cultural education, vocational and occupational education, and foundational education" (p. 7).

The state plan for the execution of this program also required that there be a director for each adult education program. The director's responsibility would be to work cooperatively with the many organizations, groups, and agencies in a community whose needs must be served. The qualifications for the director were enumerated in the policy statement of Elliot (1944), who was at that time the State Superintendent of Public Instruction:

The director should hold a bachelor's degree or equivalent from an approved institution with post graduate study in selecting and preparing instructional materials for adults, methods of working with adults, curriculum development, school administration, community organization, surveying and presenting community needs or equivalent courses. He should have a minimum of five years of experience as a school administrator or as a teacher with some administrative and community responsibilities. His personality and training should fit him to work well with adults, enlist and hold their confidence and interest, and conduct meetings and discussion groups. Resourcefulness in adapting services to varying community situations and needs is another desirable quality (p. 7).
State Funding for Michigan Community Education Director Salaries

Reimbursement for the salary of the director, the supervisor, or assistant director as well as the teachers or leaders of programs was to be affected according to the specifications of the state plan (Elliot, 1944). The program was continued and funded by the state legislature in its 1945 session for another 2 years and proved to be a significant base from which community school programs in adult education began to develop throughout the state. The enactment of Section 1019-1021, Act 18 of the General School Laws in 1946 permitted county boards of supervisors to conduct adult education programs through the office of the county Superintendent of Schools, subject to the approval of the Superintendent of Public Instruction (Columbus, 1978).

In May of 1948, the Michigan legislature enacted new legislation concerning adult education. This legislation was known as the State Aid Act into which two features were incorporated: (a) a rate of reimbursement based on full-time equated membership for those pupils over 21 years of age and (b) elimination of restrictions on the subject areas (Ninety-ninth Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction for the Biennium 1946-48). Funds were appropriated for a period of 4 years to assist public schools in maintaining adult education classes. In the school year 1948-49, 105 school districts received funds; in 1949-50, 135; 148 in 1950-51; and 167 during the school year 1951-52 (Columbus, 1978).
During the decades of the 40's and 50's, growth of adult education programs in the state represented a budding interest and commitment to the community education concept. The program successes in several districts soon interested other school systems, who followed suit and incorporated the adult education philosophy into their school programs.

Thurston (1952) quoted Section 9 of the State Aid Act for the final year of funding:

From the amount appropriated in Section 1, there is hereby appropriated to school districts for the reimbursement for the cost of maintaining adult education classes the sum of $300,000 to be distributed by June 1, 1952, to school districts approved for this purpose by the Superintendent of Public Instruction. The rate for reimbursement shall be on the basis of equated full-time membership for pupils who have not reached their twenty-first birthday by September 1, 1952. Reimbursement for those over 21 years of age prior to September 1, 1952, shall be on the basis of half-equated full-time membership provided that any tuition collected from resident pupils under 21 years of age prior to said date will be deducted from the state aid allowance. (p. 16)

During the 1950's, the post World War II economy set the stage for a new lifestyle. The State Superintendent of Public Instruction, in his report for the biennium (1952-54), stressed the changes in social, economic, occupational, and international influences on life. He further stated that "new scientific discoveries and obsolescence of knowledge lead to a greater need for education by adults" (p. 26).

In the biennium report of 1954-56, the State Superintendent commented on the number of individuals over 65 years old and the doubling of that group during the preceding 50 years. The combination of increased longevity brought about by modern medicine and the
increasing number of retirees created a need for education directed at the aged, so that these citizens could develop coping skills in their new lifestyles. As early as 1950, there were indications that this portion of our population would continue to grow and that they were in need of additional services (One Hundred and Third Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1957).

The late 50's reflected a reduction of financial assistance from $300,000 to $200,000 annually. This assistance was completely eliminated in 1959-1960. Demonstrating a commitment to the value of community education, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction encouraged local boards of education to support adult education in order to compensate for the decline of state revenue (One Hundred and Fifth Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction for the Biennium, 1958-1960, pp. 61, 50-51).

During 1958-1959, the total expenditure for adult education in Michigan was $2.3 million (only 8% was contributed by state aid). Almost 50% of the total came from student fees and over 50% was contributed by local taxes and grants. At its inception in 1954 state aid had accounted for 36.8% of the total expenditure for adult education. Obviously state financial support had declined slowly since 1954 as local school district contributions in the funding process grew (State Journal, 1960). There is no evidence to suggest that the decline in state aid support represented a legislative decline in interest or commitment. Rather it was a recessionary period in the state and financial resources for all purposes were limited.
The 60's became the solidifying years for adult education legislation. In 1963, the responsibility for the leadership and supervision of adult education was given to the State Board of Education by legislation through Public Act number 285; the effective date of this action was January 1, 1964. At this time the age guidelines for counting individuals for purposes of state aid reimbursement were eliminated. Adults working for a high school diploma were counted for state aid in the same way as day school youngsters (Public and Local Acts of the Legislature of the State of Michigan, 1964).

Financial assistance was crucial to the success of the adult education program development. The programs would have been unable to operate without financial assistance in addition to that available locally. The state aid permitted districts to offer quality education for their adults.

The Superintendent of Public Instruction noted that in the years 1962-64, the larger school districts were enlarging their adult education programs with financing from local taxes and student fees in approximately equal measure. However, small districts attempted to operate on student fees alone, and their programs began to deteriorate (One Hundred and Sixth Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction for the Biennium, 1960-1962, 1963). It was nearly impossible to operate a quality program without local tax support; a cooperative effort of funding had to be implemented for program continuity.

State funding for community education directors began in 1966. In that year a bill was introduced to the legislature providing for the reimbursement of salaries of community school directors. This
bill did not pass during the 1966 or 1967 legislative sessions. In 1968, bills to provide for the partial reimbursement of salaries of community school directors were introduced in the legislature and again the finances were vetoed. The community education movement was not organized sufficiently at this time to develop the political support necessary to receive funding.

It was not until 1969 that the Michigan legislature appropriated $1,000,000 for grants to school districts for community school programs. The Department of Education distributed the monies in the form of grants in conformance with policies adopted by the State Board of Education (Columbus, 1978). This served as a vote of approval for local districts interested in implementing programs.

Approximately $1,000,000 was distributed in 1969 and 1970 as partial reimbursement for salaries of 204 community education directors. In the 1970-71 school year over 200 directors received a partial salary reimbursement at a cost to the state of $1,000,000. In 1971-72 there were no reimbursements because the grants to community school programs were vetoed by the Governor. For the 1972-73 school year, partial reimbursement for 261 community education directors was allocated at the 1970-71 funding level. In the 1973-74 school year, almost 300 directors and coordinators shared in the $1,000,000 reimbursement from the state (Columbus, 1978).

During the 1974-75 school year, $1,400,000 was distributed among 300 directors. In the following school year, 1975-76, 342 directors and coordinators received $1,300,000 in reimbursement funds, and in 1976-77, 347 community school directors received partial salary...
reimbursements at a cost to the state of $1,300,000 (Columbus, 1978).

It should be noted that state support to community education has been maintained over the last decade; however, as more and more school districts participate, commensurate funding has not followed suit. The local school districts are individually receiving less money as more school systems share in the relatively unchanging pie.

Throughout this time period the reimbursement for a director's salary was contingent on fulfilling various program components. These included a local needs assessment, a community advisory council, a trained paid community educator, and a local commitment to carry out a formal community education program.

Federal Funding to Community Education

Federal aid to community education has been a new phenomenon in comparison to the history of funding for community education by the state of Michigan. It was on August 21, 1974, that congressional Public Law 93-380 took effect, 30 years after the state of Michigan began funding. The law provided authorization for the "... Federal share of the cost of planning, establishing, expanding and operating community education programs" (U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1974).

As stated in the Federal legislative enactment, the purpose of providing grants to local educational agencies (L.E.A.), state educational agencies (S.E.A.), and institutions of higher education (I.H.E.) was to encourage and stimulate public school involvement in community education programs. Additional purposes included the promotion of
more efficient uses of public facilities, community education programs with and for community groups, and utilization of community resources (Sullenger, 1976).

Community education programs in the above context were eligible for grants if they included the elements of: community school involvement, a community to be served, a public facility(ies) as a community center, a scope of activities, services, community needs, community resources and inter-agency cooperative arrangements, program clients, and community participation. The activities and services were to include educational, cultural, recreational, and other related community services in the form of formal classes or courses. In addition, the school was to make available its facilities and equipment to local residents. Some 30 years earlier, when Michigan was the first to extol the value of community education, these same components (listed above) were proven to be necessary for successful community education programming (Sullenger, 1976).

Under the federal grant program, local district projects were funded on a 1 year basis. To be eligible for funding the local educational agency submitted proposals which had to be approved by the state educational agency before the U. S. Office of Education reviewed the application. The financial stipend for local projects was not specifically limited; each individual project was analyzed for merit. However, the costs of facility rental, major purchases, and repairs were to be assumed by the local district's funds (The Federal Register, 1975).
It should be noted that there were critics of the entire community education expansion. Dr. Leroy Watt (1974), Executive Secretary to the National Community Education Association, voiced a concern in his appraisal of federal aid to community education programs; he was concerned about the availability of adequately trained professionals to fill community education positions generated by the hundreds of new programs which the funds made possible. A lack of professional training preceding the passage of the federal funding act could possibly leave programs improperly staffed and ill-prepared for necessary programming. Simply stated: "There is the possibility that the concept will be diluted, perverted, and bastardized as school systems across the nation attempt to jump on the bandwagon with the only intent being to gain new funds" (Watt, 1974, p. 25).

In October 1978, Congress appropriated $5,200,000 for community schools for fiscal year 1979; the Office of Education had determined that $3,190,500 would be earmarked for the Community School Act of 1974. This figure represented a decrease of $410,500 from the 1978 level. At this writing, the Carter administration has not proposed that federal funding to community education be increased. This could burden the state programs, financially, if the present level of programming is continued and if they accept the burden for unassumed federal support (Community Education Update, 1979, p. 2).

In order to nurture the growth of the community education concept, a concerted lobbying effort must be made on the national scene so that federal financing continues to grow at a rate that outpaces inflation. It is impossible to maintain a high quality of services...
if funding is decreased or kept at its present level.

**Delphi Method**

In order to predict the future we must assess the present in light of past events in history. Chapter II began with an historical background of the Michigan community education movement as it evolved to the present state. As a community educator, the researcher was deeply concerned with the future of community education structure, programming and funding in Michigan. The interest lies specifically in Michigan but is focused on the national level as well. Since Michigan has been a trend setter in the community education movement for almost 40 years, it is reasonable to believe that the future of community education in Michigan may be the future of community education nationally during the next several decades. Community education programs share a commitment to serve all the people in a community so that individual lives are enriched and interests are encouraged.

In order to plan for our constituency, we need to be aware of forces that will be affecting the future. These forces may be monetary, as programs need a financial base; they may be structural, as various agencies vie for the managerial role in organizing programs. In addition, demographics play an important role in assessing the future; we need to know the age groups we are serving and how the numbers in these groups will change.

After reviewing literature for projecting the future, the Delphi method seemed to hold the most promise. The Delphi method was introduced in the early 1950's after an Air Force sponsored RAND study was...
assigned to predict the probable effects of a large scale atomic bombing attack on the United States. Subsequent applications of the Delphi method in the mid 1960's have been directed toward technological forecasting.

Delphi may be characterized as a method for structuring a group communication process in such a way that the process is effective in allowing individuals as a group as well as individually to deal with a complex problem. It is a potential intuitive approach in that it relies on experts' perceptions of the occurrence of various events in the future. A panel of experts are used in formulating probability forecasts; however, these individuals do not meet on a face to face basis, but share predictions through paper and pencil responses that are compiled by the researcher.

As stated by Linstone (1975), in order to accomplish this "structured communication," several factors are provided: some feedback of individual contributions of information and knowledge, some assessment of the group judgment or view, some opportunity for individuals to revise views, and some degree of anonymity for the individual responses. In addition, the anonymity provided by the Delphi process allows for independent panelist thought as opposed to the possible group dynamic inhibitions that often result from a large group meeting. Participants are selected on the basis of their acknowledged expertise and are encouraged to elaborate on the rationale for the occurrence of various events. The individual participants are not revealed to one another until the entire process is completed. Generally four rounds of questionnaire statements are used in an attempt
to reach consensus on various items relating to the future.

A detailed description of Delphi was formulated by Weaver (1971) in a *Phi Delta Kappan* article:

Typically the procedure includes a questionnaire, mailed to respondents who remain anonymous to one another. Respondents first generate several rather concise statements of events, and in the second round give estimates as to the probability of each event occurring at a given date in the future. Once the respondents have given their answers, the responses are collated and returned to each respondent who then is invited to revise his estimates. The third-round responses are made with the knowledge of how others felt regarding the occurrence of each event. Again the responses are assembled and reported back to the participants. If a respondent's estimate does not fall within the interquartile range of all conjectures, he is asked to justify his position, whether or not he wished to change his position. More recently the technique has been extended to include questions about how familiar the participants are with the events.

Dalkey (1975) states the following general Delphi characteristics:

(a) "the exercise involves a group"; (b) "the goal of the exercise is information"; (c) "the information being sought is uncertain in the minds of the group"; and (d) "some preformulated systematic procedure is followed in obtaining the group output" (p. 236).

In order to substantiate the legitimacy of the Delphi method, Masters (1975) communicated with several experts in the futures field. Using the Delphi method, Masters in his dissertation asked various experts to respond regarding the validity and reliability of Delphi. Colonel Joseph Martino, United States Air Force, stated that if Delphi produced better information for a decision maker than alternative forecasting methods, validation of the process was unnecessary. Theodore Gordon of the Futures Group (an organization formalized to predict future trends in the sciences) believed that Delphi is a means
of collecting expert opinion from a particular, carefully selected panel and that, consequently, statistical validation is an inappropriate test. In addition, Dr. Michael Marien of the World Institute (another futures research group) stated that Delphi was no better than the questions asked and the respondents to whom they are posed. Marien stated that the quest for validation may serve to inhibit creative thinking about alternative possibilities.

As enumerated by Linstone and Turoff (1975), one or more of the following properties in research leads to the need for employing the Delphi technique:

1. The problem does not lend itself to precise analytical techniques but can benefit from subjective judgments on a collective basis.

2. The individuals needed to contribute to the examination of a broad or complex problem have no history of adequate communication and may represent diverse backgrounds with respect to experience or expertise.

3. More individuals are needed than can effectively interact in a face-to-face exchange.

4. Time and cost make frequent group meetings infeasible.

5. The efficiency of face-to-face meetings can be increased by a supplemental group communication process.

6. Disagreements among individuals are so severe or politically unpalatable that the communication process must be refereed and/or anonymity assured.

7. The heterogeneity of the participants must be preserved to assure validity of the results, i.e., avoidance of domination by quantity or by strength of personality ("bandwagon effect").

In summation, the Delphi process is an intuitive approach to predicting the future. In order to adequately assess the future of
community education, the past and present must be taken into account.

The Delphi method relies on expert opinion in determining consensus or agreement on various trends or events. Delphi was first introduced in the 1950's in order to predict probable effects of a large scale atomic bombing attack on the United States. It has since been adapted to a dozen other fields.

Delphi is considered to be reliable and valid according to experts Martino, Marien, and Gordon, who relied heavily on the technique in their research on the future.

The Delphi process is characterized by four rounds of a questionnaire, aiming at group input and eventually consensus on events or trends. The participants are anonymous until the completion of the process. When lack of time, high cost, and inability for face-to-face exchange become areas of concern, Delphi becomes a viable alternative for problem solving. It is a means of reaching subjective judgments on a collective basis. The heterogeneity of the participants when preserved helps to assure validity of results.

Demography

In order to plan effectively for future community education programs, it is imperative that we describe the audience to be served.

As stated by Bryant Robey (1979), editor of "American Demographics":

Congress has taken a new found interest in demographics that is certain to grow as politicians become aware of what population figures can tell them about the impact of the programs they create and the characteristics of the people they represent. (p. 2)
Therefore, in the decade ahead we must identify characteristics of the most appropriate population to serve through community education programming, so that we can plan accordingly for their specific needs.

National Population Trends

On a national level the average age of the population is rising. Families are becoming smaller, and the number of households is increasing at a more rapid rate than the population. The 1940's through the 1960's reflected a mood of expansion in that the economy was growing and soldiers returned from two foreign wars. The baby boom created a child-centered society—which is becoming an adult-centered society as the boom generation grows up (Tacuber, 1979).

By the turn of the century one person in eight will be at least 65 years old. There will be 40% more people in this age bracket than at present. In addition, this signifies a growth rate twice as rapid for the over 65's as for the population as a whole. The number of people between the ages of 75 and 85 will increase by 60%, and the number of people at least 85 years old will double; society will be pressed to devise better home care arrangements and to build new facilities for the aged.

More importantly, this sizeable population shift will mean a new demand for programming that reaches the elderly. More and more people in the 65 and over age bracket will have leisure time that could be directed toward social, educational, or recreational pursuits. In addition, the senior citizen population may view this time in their
lives as a first chance to enjoy social, educational, vocational, or recreational pursuits of their choice.

Those individuals born in the post 1964 "baby bust" will be in a favored job competition position, as the rivalry for jobs will be narrowed with fewer numbers of individuals available for work. Many job markets that are glutted today may be considered wide open in a period of 10 or 15 years. It will also allow the high school and college graduate an opportunity to choose the fields he/she truly desires, as opposed to one of several options that promise employment. Much of the programming outlined for the "baby boom" generation (now adults aged 15-33 or one third of our population) will be directed to a group that is adult as opposed to child oriented. The median age of the United States population was 28 in 1975. It continues to rise and will be at 30 in 1980, 32 in 1985, and 33 in 1990, if present trends continue. By the year 2000, the median age will be over 35. Therefore, we need to begin programming for an older population, a population that will be predominately middle aged at the turn of the century. Services will continue to be available for the young and old, but the major focus will be on the middle aged group (Michigan Statistical Abstract, 1974).

Michigan Population Trends

In Michigan, the population of individuals from birth to age 19 increased by 11% between 1975 and 1980; however, there has been a decline in the number of youngsters in the 5-14 age bracket (as noted by declining enrollments in the elementary and middle schools around
the state). Therefore, new schools will be built in rare instances; many buildings will have to close as the baby boom is officially laid to rest. The projections of population between 1980 and 1985 reflect a stabilization in actual numbers; however, a 3% growth in the under 19 year old group is expected to occur between 1985 and 1990.

The 20-39 age group has grown by 14% in the 1975-1980 time frame and is projected to increase by an additional 8% from 1980 to 1985 and a further gain between 1985 and 1990. These adults are the post World War II baby boom generation.

Conversely, in the 40-59 age group a 1% drop in population has been noted in the 1975-1980 years. This is expected to be reversed with a 3% growth between 1980 and 1985 and an 8% increase between 1985 and 1990 as some of the baby boom generation moves into this age category. The middle aged segment of our population will continue to grow throughout this century.

The 60-70 age group has grown by 6% during the period 1975-1980 and is projected to grow 6% between 1980 and 1985 and 3% from 1985 to 1990 in this senior citizen grouping. Medical and nutritional advances have made longevity a reality for more and more individuals 60 years old.

A marked increase in the 80 and older age group is apparent in 1975-1980, where a 10% growth rate has taken place. Between 1980 and 1985 and between 1985 and 1990 a 4% growth is projected in each of these 5 year spans. This 18% growth over a decade and a half is attributable to improved health care and technology for the aged (Michigan Statistical Abstract, 1974).
The shift in demography over the next 20 years could greatly influence the emphasis of programs in the community education domain. With a population increase in the over 60 group, additional programs could be needed for the senior citizen segment of our society. As stated by Seay (1975) in the *Community Education Journal*:

Older people have leisure because they are increasingly unemployed. Many are limited in education but able and eager to learn. They have a long view because they will be older a long time. The older people of almost any community now include two generations; frequently the group spans three generations. This means that for more and more people the longest single stage in life is old age. (p. 61)

In addition, leisure and educational offerings could be needed to accommodate the middle age grouping (40-59) of our population which also will be increasing.
CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES AND METHODOLOGY

This chapter describes the procedures used in collecting, compiling, and analyzing the data. Included in this chapter is a description of the Delphi panel selection and discussion of the procedures employed.

The problem addressed in this study was to determine community education's future in Michigan during the next 10 years. A Delphi study was conducted in order to gain expert consensus in the areas of structure, programs, and funding for community education.

Hypotheses formulated to direct the focus of the study are as follows:

$H_1$: Between 1980 and 1990 programming in community education will reflect a lessening of program emphasis on high school completion and adult basic education, and a heightened program emphasis on leisure (enrichment) activities.

$H_2$: Between 1980 and 1990 the structure of community education will reflect greater social agency interaction, so that several agencies will develop community education activities (in lieu of majority involvement by the local school districts).

$H_3$: During 1980-1990 funding for community education programs will reflect decreasing financial support from the Michigan Department of Education.
Delphi Panelist Selection

In devising the list of panelists for a Delphi study, great care was taken to assure that panel members have expertise in the area in which they are responding. The group represented various information levels related to the topic at hand. With the aid of a committee composed of eight members from the Department of Education Leadership and Mott Fellows at Western Michigan University, a list of experts in Michigan's community education movement was compiled.

The names generated with repeated frequency by the Mott Interns and Educational Leadership faculty were included as potential panelists. Other names were added by the author through reputational analysis substantiated by a thorough review of the literature on Michigan community education. The author's job experience in the field was helpful in selecting several names of state organization leaders in the community education field.

The selected panelists had experience in funding and/or development of programming related to community education. They held the following kinds of positions: community education directors, university professors, community college officials, community education center directors, Michigan legislators, assistants to the governor, presidents or executive directors of state community/adult education or school board organizations, fiscal analysts, or Michigan State Department of Education specialists. Many of the panelists were authors of books and/or articles.
All of the selected panelists were familiar with programs serving various age groups, such as: adult education, senior citizen programming, and youth programming. A total of 23 experts had been accumulated and their background profiles are found in Appendix J of this research.

All panel members were employed by public institutions in the state of Michigan. The individuals selected were contacted via telephone and asked to be participants in the Delphi study. The purpose and background of the study was explained at that time. In addition, the amount of time involved in participating in the Delphi process was discussed. In addition, each participant was coded by number rather than name, so that responses to questionnaires were kept confidential. The questionnaires were to be stored by Western Michigan University for 1 year following the completion of the research.

A minimum of 15 experts must agree to participate in the study for validity purposes. The panelists determined the validity of the questionnaire by altering wording and rephrasing, as well as by adding and eliminating questions.

The phone conversations with panelists were followed up with a cover letter acknowledging their willingness to participate in the Delphi study. The panelists were asked to submit names of two colleagues in the field who were also regarded as Community Education experts. Additional names were added to the panel when support for a particular expert was mentioned repeatedly.

Each panelist was advised that the questionnaire would be used for a maximum of four rounds. Each round was aimed at reaching

Questionnaire Preparation

Permission to survey human subjects had been granted by Western Michigan University. Three major categories of information were studied for determining possible futures of community education: programs, structure, and funding.

With the aid of the Mott Fellows, Educational Leadership Professors, the literature reviewed by the author, and pertinent legislative issues, a list of sample forecast statements was prepared. These statements were designed to stimulate ideas in the minds of the panelists who would eventually consider the future of community education programming in Michigan.

A pilot run of the questionnaire was undertaken with the aid of the Mott Fellows at Western Michigan University. The Fellows answered the various sections of the preliminary questionnaire, redesigned the written language, and simplified the basic instrument form.

The addition of an impact section for the final phase of the questionnaire was recommended. Impact referred to the potential effect particular events or happenings would have on the present structure of community education by the year 1990. Panelist answers were collated in terms of their potential effect on the future of community education. In addition, the impact of change was addressed by the experts.
A series of instructions and sample questions were prepared for the panelists and accompanied the questionnaire items that each panelist received. The packets were mailed to each panel member (see Appendices A, B, and C). A return envelope was included for each participant with a 10 day response deadline agreed upon.

A total of 32 statements were provided for the panelists. In the program and structure sections of the questionnaire, statements were provided regarding possible future events related to community education. The participants were asked to check the appropriate boxes for the high probability of an event increasing, decreasing, or remaining stable during three distinct time periods commencing with: 1980, 1985, 1990.

In section III B of the questionnaire, funding statements were handled differently. Panelists were asked to predict the percentage of funding (0%-100%) provided by particular agencies mentioned during the three time spans: 1980, 1985, 1990. The funds allocated for each year was to total 100%.

The various sections of the questionnaire provided space for additional questions written by the individual panelists. Penned statements were related to program, structure, or finance of community education in the state of Michigan. In addition, rewording of statements was encouraged if sentences were considered to be vague or misleading; a comment (rationale) section was included so that elaboration for answers was possible.

The information from Round 1 was collated and the frequency percentages for each statement determined. New statements provided by
the panelists were used on the successive rounds of the questionnaire. This information, when collated, formed the materials for Rounds 2, 3, and 4. Each panelist received a composite showing his/her responses to each statement and the responses of the entire group so that direct comparisons could be made.

**Determining Consensus**

In order to categorize the group response, the following determinations were made:

- **High consensus**: Probability of occurrence—70% agreement by panelists (event will increase, decrease, or remain stable during a 10 year time frame: 1980, 1985, 1990).

- **Moderate consensus**: Probability of occurrence—60% agreement by panelists (event will increase, decrease, or remain stable during a 10 year time frame: 1980, 1985, 1990).

If the group consensus for any statement was outside (below) the moderate consensus margin (60% agreement) the statement was then repeated on the next questionnaire round. For statements where consensus was not reached during Round 1, panelists were encouraged to comment on the rationale for retaining or changing their answers on Round 2. Individual comments (without the panelist's name revealed) became part of the feedback to all participants in the following round. Those panelists not in agreement with the group position were not asked to define or change their positions once consensus was reached.
In cases where moderate consensus was reached (60% agreement or higher) the statement was withdrawn from subsequent rounds. There were certain cases reflecting moderate consensus on several statements in one time frame but nonagreement for the identical statements in a different time frame (i.e., 1980, 60%; 1985, 68%; 1990, 52%). In that case the statement was repeated on the next Delphi round since a minimum of 60% agreement had to be reached in all three time periods.

An impact statement was used following the tally of the Round 3 questionnaire. The impact statement was used only for the questions where consensus was reached and a future direction was agreed upon. The designations on the impact statement were as follows: UF (highly unfavorable), MUF (moderately unfavorable), MF (moderately favorable), HF (highly favorable), and NC (no change).
CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND RESULTS

The purpose of this chapter is to present the results of the research. The objective of the research was to identify possible futures for community education utilizing the Delphi technique. In this study a group of 23 panelists with expertise in community education structure, programming, and funding considered a series of questions regarding the future of community education in Michigan. As each person was in a position to influence policy, their responses were considered helpful for planning in the years ahead.

Panelist Demographics

The researcher collected biographical information on each of the participants. This was collected in order to develop a sketch of the group as to their average age, educational level, number of years in community education, number of publications relative to community education during the last 5 years, and memberships in community education professional organizations.

The 23 panelists participating in the study represented 248 years of involvement with community education in the following positions: local community education director, college dean, state department of education specialist, university center director, legislator, fiscal analyst, chairperson of a higher education department, assistant to the state governor, or presidents or executive directors of state
adult/community education or school board organizations. In the last 5 years, the panelists have published a total of 70 articles in professional journals pertaining to community education and the participants held a total of 116 memberships in community education professional organizations.

In terms of highest degree earned, 12 of the panelists had completed their doctorates, three finished specialist degrees, seven had earned masters degrees, and one panelist had a bachelors degree with some masters course work. In addition, the average age of the Delphi panelists was 45.7 years.

As part of the research project, the researcher interviewed all of the panelists by telephone or in person. The participants were interested in the study and agreed to the questionnaire time demands. The administrators agreed that community education has and will continue to have a great effect on society. One panelist dropped out of the Delphi process before completing Round 1 due to job demands. A second panelist completed Round 1, but was unable to follow through after than point. Two other panelists were unable to complete Round 4, but had completed all other questionnaire rounds.

Delphi Round 1 Results

After each Delphi questionnaire had been received from the panelists, the responses were tabulated. The group response was distributed in percentages for each statement choice (decrease, remain stable, increase) for each year (1980, 1985, 1990). The breakdown of their answers for each time frame summed 100%; consensus of the panel...
on various questions represented the direction in which they would likely be working in the immediate as well as the more distant future. This is extremely crucial for effective planning in the decade(s) ahead. Panelists were encouraged to comment on their particular responses, so that their individual reasoning might be influential or explanatory to the other panelists. Comments were listed anonymously, and are located in Appendix D. In cases where particular answers were omitted by the panelists, the researcher considered this to be missing data, and the group responses were tallied accordingly.

On Round 1 of the questionnaire, consensus was reached on questions 1, 5, 12, 16, 17, 19, 20, and 24. Two questions for which consensus was reached were in the area of community education programming, four were in community education structure, and only one was in the funding category (see Table 1). Consensus was indicated when a 60% agreement among the panelists was achieved in each of the time periods covered (1980, 1985, 1990) for a particular question. If a particular question reflected consensus for 2 years, but not for the third year, the question was repeated on Round 2. Consensus was declared only when a minimum 60% agreement was reached for all three time frames (1980, 1985, 1990).

However, consensus in all three time frames (1980, 1985, 1990) might individually reflect either consistent or inconsistent trends. For instance, on Table 1 questionnaire item 5 reflected consensus for 1980: 67%, 1985: 76%, and 1990: 62%, and all three answers acknowledged agreement in the area of increasing on-site classes at industrial locations. Question 12 (Table 1) also reflected group consensus,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1980</th>
<th>1985</th>
<th>1990</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Community education programming for the senior citizen population (60 and over).</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>86%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Community education emphasis on adult job retraining skills for occupational change.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Community education emphasis on adult job retraining skills culminating in a high school diploma.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Programming for leisure-time enrichment activities (includes leagues and various sports).</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Classes held at on-site business/industrial locations to accommodate worker schedule.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>67%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Involvement of community education in programs for the handicapped adult (physically, mentally, or emotionally).</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. High school completion course work for individuals 17 years and over.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Consensus reached.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1980</th>
<th>1985</th>
<th>1990</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Adult basic education classes for individuals 17 and over.</td>
<td>10 57 33%</td>
<td>10 57 33%</td>
<td>20 57 23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Usage of G.E.D. testing for high school equivalency diplomas.</td>
<td>4 67 29%</td>
<td>24 52 24%</td>
<td>43 43 14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Programming for the health-impaired adults living in hospitals or nursing homes.</td>
<td>20 40 40%</td>
<td>13 63 24%</td>
<td>24 55 21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Usage of school classrooms, gymnasiums, cafeterias, etc. for activities (i.e. civic meetings, weddings, banquets, etc.).</td>
<td>4 48 48%</td>
<td>2 43 55%</td>
<td>2 43 55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Emphasis on community awareness/public relations seminars: luncheons, coffees (provided by the school).</td>
<td>5 33 62%*</td>
<td>5 33 62%*</td>
<td>9 62 29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Availability of child care services for adults attending classes.</td>
<td>0 38 62%</td>
<td>5 33 62%</td>
<td>9 48 43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Marketing/advertising expenditures for public awareness of community education.</td>
<td>0 48 52%</td>
<td>0 62 38%</td>
<td>4 67 29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. COMMUNITY EDUCATION STRUCTURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1980</th>
<th>1985</th>
<th>1990</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15. Community education functions to be taken over by the community college in lieu of the local school district.</td>
<td>5 71 24%</td>
<td>14 48 38%</td>
<td>14 62 24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Community education functions to be taken over by the four-year college or university in lieu of the local school district.</td>
<td>20 75* 5%</td>
<td>30 65* 5%</td>
<td>30 65* 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Consortium agreement between educational and governmental agencies for developing programs (i.e., local school district and Social Services Department).</td>
<td>0 29 71%*</td>
<td>0 24 76%*</td>
<td>4 29 67%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Consortium agreements encompassing two or more school districts for adult high school completion and adult basic education programs.</td>
<td>9 43 48%</td>
<td>14 48 39%</td>
<td>24 57 19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Adult student full-time equivalency raised from 480 (present hours) to 700 hours per year for high school completion work.</td>
<td>0 81* 19%</td>
<td>5 71* 24%</td>
<td>4 82* 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Adult basic education course work changed from a minimum of 30 weeks (present number) to 35 or more weeks per year.</td>
<td>0 70* 30%</td>
<td>0 80* 20%</td>
<td>5 85* 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Volunteers used in the administration of recreational, senior citizen and enrichment activities.</td>
<td>4 48 48%</td>
<td>5 43 52%</td>
<td>10 38 52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Citizen involvement in the schools.</td>
<td>0 43 57%</td>
<td>0 48 52%</td>
<td>19 43 38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Daytime programming for adult education courses.</td>
<td>0 43 57%</td>
<td>0 29 71%</td>
<td>0 57 43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. COMMUNITY EDUCATION FUNDING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Scholarships given by local districts to lower income individuals (school district pays the bill) as incentive to return to school.</td>
<td>6 80* 14%</td>
<td>15 65* 20%</td>
<td>15 65* 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Community education directors' salaries to be reimbursed through cooperative agreement (state and local district)</td>
<td>0 52 48%</td>
<td>14 43 43%</td>
<td>28 44 28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Community education directors' salaries to be solely paid for by local school districts.</td>
<td>33 62 5%</td>
<td>38 43 19%</td>
<td>33 38 29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Community education directors' salaries to be subsidized with federal monies.</td>
<td>14 62 24%</td>
<td>14 57 29%</td>
<td>33 38 29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Social Service participation in the total financing of education programs for the handicapped adult (mentally or physically).</td>
<td>0 67 33%</td>
<td>9 48 43%</td>
<td>10 38 52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
but agreement was as follows: 1980: 62%, 1985: 62%, and 1990: 62%. This latter question related to public relations seminars, and consensus referred to program increases for 1980 and 1985, but a stability (remain stable) in program offerings for 1990.

Funding--Round 1

In the Funding section (III. B.) of the Round 1 questionnaire, the Delphi panelists were asked to determine statewide funding allocations for 1980, 1985, and 1990, in comparison to the 1978-79 allocation levels. The mean of the panelist totals was determined.

Analysis of Table 2 demonstrates the panelists' belief that financial support to community education programs through fees or tuition would gradually increase from the present funding level through to 1990 (15% to 20.8%). This portion of the questionnaire was not repeated on Rounds 2 and 3, as the intent of this section was group direction, rather than consensus. Financial support of community education programs through the state aid formula (state and local money) was predicted to decrease consistently from the present level through the 1980's and into 1990 (81% to 61.3%). In addition, the respondents cited financial support of community education programs through federal grants or appropriations as an area of increase during the next 10 years (2% to 6.3%).

The last area covered was financial support of community education through local funds (over and above the state aid formula). This allocation level was also projected to continually increase between 1980 and 1990 (1% to 8.9%). General direction of the panelists
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indicates a lessening of state aid monies for community education programming with the responsibility for funding growing through fees, philanthropies, and local support.

Table 2

Group Consensus Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29. Financial support of community education program through fees or tuition.</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Financial support of community education program through state aid formula (state and local money).</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>76.6%</td>
<td>69.5%</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Financial support of community education program through federal grants or appropriations.</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Financial support of community education program through private businesses, foundations, or philanthropies.</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Financial support of community education program through local funds (over and above state aid formula).</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Delphi Round 2 Results

On Round 2 of the questionnaire all of the original statements were repeated. However, for the eight statements where consensus had been reached on Round 1, a response was not required.

The Round 2 questionnaire showed the distribution of answers for each individual year calculated in percentages for the Round 1 answers. The percentages for each answer was noted on the questionnaires. A red arrow was used to signify the individual response of each respective panelist for every answer. In this way the panelist could compare his/her particular answer with the group tally.

Panelists were then asked to reconsider the questions in light of the group answers and the comments (rationale) provided in their packet. If panelists wished to maintain their responses, their reasoning was encouraged via the written word on Round 2. In addition, a panelist altering his/her response was asked to comment on the reason for the change (see Appendix F).

Upon receipt by the researcher, the completed Round 2 questionnaires were tabulated, and consensus was reached on an additional three questions as shown on Table 3. For the three questions where consensus was reached on Round 2, one was from the community education programming section, one from community education structure, and the last consensus question was from the area of community education funding. As in Round 1, community education trends were not necessarily the same for any three time periods (Table 3). Although question 1 reflected consensus in the area of increases for senior citizen
Table 3
Delphi Questionnaire 2 Group Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1980</th>
<th></th>
<th>1985</th>
<th></th>
<th>1990</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. COMMUNITY EDUCATION PROGRAM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Community education programming for the senior citizen population (60 and over).</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>86%*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>76%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Community education emphasis on adult job retraining skills for occupational change.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Community education emphasis on adult job retraining skills culminating in a high school diploma.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Programming for leisure-time enrichment activities (includes leagues and various sports).</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Classes held at on-site business/industrial locations to accommodate worker schedule.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>67%*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>76%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Involvement of community education in programs for the handicapped adult (physically, mentally, or emotionally).</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. High school completion course work for individuals 17 years and over.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Consensus reached.
Table 3—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1980</th>
<th>1985</th>
<th>1990</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Adult basic education classes for individuals 17 and over.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Usage of G.E.D. testing for high school equivalency diplomas.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Programming for the health-impaired adults living in hospitals or nursing homes.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Usage of school classrooms, gymnasiums, cafeterias, etc., for activities (i.e., civic meetings, weddings, banquets, etc.).</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Emphasis on community awareness/public relations seminars: luncheons, coffees (provided by the school).</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Availability of child care services for adult attending classes.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Marketing/advertising expenditures for public awareness of community education.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. COMMUNITY EDUCATION STRUCTURE

15. Community education functions to be taken over by the community college in lieu of the local school district. | 10 | 76 | 14% | 14 | 57 | 29% | 14 | 67 | 29% |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>16. Community education functions to be taken over by the four-year college or university in lieu of the local district.</th>
<th>1980</th>
<th>1985</th>
<th>1990</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Consortium agreement between educational and governmental agencies for developing programs (i.e., local school district and Social Services Department).</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Consortium agreements encompassing two or more school districts for adult high school completion and adult basic education programs.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Adult student full-time equivalency raised from 480 (present hours) to 700 hours per year for high school completion work.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Adult basic education course work changed from a minimum of 30 weeks (present number) to 35 or more weeks per year.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Volunteers used in the administration of recreational, senior citizen and enrichment activities.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Citizen involvement in the schools.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Daytime programming for adult education courses.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. COMMUNITY EDUCATION FUNDING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Scholarships given by local districts to lower income individuals (school district pays the bill) as incentive to return to school.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>80*</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Community education directors' salaries to be reimbursed through cooperative agreement (state and local district).</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Community education directors' salaries to be solely paid for by local school districts.</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Community education directors' salaries to be subsidized with federal monies.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>76*</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Social Service participation in the total financing of education programs for the handicapped adult (mentally or physically).</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Panelists were once again asked to consider their answers in light of the comments provided by the other participants. The researcher marked each individual panelist response for Round 2 answers on the Round 3 questionnaire; in this way each panelist could compare his/her former response with the desired response for Round 3. If answers were not changed by the panelists, they were asked to justify their responses. The comments of all panelists (listed anonymously) were sent to all the panelists after Round 2 (see Appendix F). In this way a panelist might influence the thinking of the other participants through his/her written rationale. The identical format was used for the questionnaire on Rounds 2 and 3.

**Delphi Round 3 Results**

The greatest panelist movement in terms of answer changing occurred in Round 3. An additional six questions reached consensus in the community education programming section (see Table 4: questions 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, and 13). In the area of community education structure, consensus was achieved for three of the statements (see Table 4: questions 15, 21, and 23).

The funding section of the questionnaire revealed consensus for questions 25 and 26 (see Table 4). Panelist comments from Round 2 were included in the packets delivered to each participant. The
Table 4
Delphi Questionnaire 3 Group Response

| I. COMMUNITY EDUCATION PROGRAM                                                                 |
|                                                                                               |
| 1. Community education programming for the senior citizen population (60 and over).              |
|                                                                                               |
| 2. Community education emphasis on adult job retraining skills for occupational change.         |
|                                                                                               |
| 3. Community education emphasis on adult job retraining skills culminating in a high school diploma. |
|                                                                                               |
| 4. Programming for leisure-time enrichment activities (includes leagues and various sports).    |
|                                                                                               |
| 5. Classes held at on-site business/industrial locations to accommodate worker schedule.         |
|                                                                                               |
| 6. Involvement of community education in programs for the handicapped adult (physically,         |
|    mentally, or emotionally).                                                                  |
|                                                                                               |
| 7. High school completion course work for individuals 17 years and over.                        |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1980</th>
<th>1985</th>
<th>1990</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Community education programming for the senior citizen population (60 and over).</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>86*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Community education emphasis on adult job retraining skills for occupational change.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Community education emphasis on adult job retraining skills culminating in a high school diploma.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Programming for leisure-time enrichment activities (includes leagues and various sports).</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Classes held at on-site business/industrial locations to accommodate worker schedule.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Involvement of community education in programs for the handicapped adult (physically,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mentally, or emotionally).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. High school completion course work for individuals 17 years and over.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Consensus reached.
Table 4—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1980</th>
<th>1985</th>
<th>1990</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Adult basic education classes for individuals 17 and over.</td>
<td>4 72* 24%</td>
<td>15 70* 15%</td>
<td>24 67* 9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Usage of G.E.D. testing for high school equivalency diplomas.</td>
<td>5 81 14%</td>
<td>19 76 5%</td>
<td>43 52 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Programming for the health-impaired adults living in hospitals or nursing homes.</td>
<td>9 62* 29%</td>
<td>4 67* 29%</td>
<td>10 71* 19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Usage of school classrooms, gymnasiums, cafeterias, etc., for activities (i.e., civic meetings, weddings, banquets, etc.).</td>
<td>0 24 76*</td>
<td>5 14 81*</td>
<td>5 19 76*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Emphasis on community awareness/public relations seminars: luncheons, coffees (provided by the school).</td>
<td>5 33 62*</td>
<td>5 33 62*</td>
<td>9 62* 29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Availability of child care services for adults attending classes.</td>
<td>0 19 81*</td>
<td>0 19 81*</td>
<td>5 33 62*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Marketing/advertising expenditures for public awareness of community education.</td>
<td>0 38 62*</td>
<td>0 71* 29%</td>
<td>0 71* 29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Community education functions to be taken over by the four-year college or university in lieu of the local school district.</td>
<td>20 75* 5%</td>
<td>30 65* 5%</td>
<td>30 65* 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Consortium agreement between educational and governmental agencies for developing programs (i.e., local school district and Social Services Department).</td>
<td>0 29 71*</td>
<td>0 24 76*</td>
<td>4 29 67*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Consortium agreements encompassing 2 or more school districts for adult high school completion and adult basic education programs.</td>
<td>0 38 62*</td>
<td>10 67 23*</td>
<td>14 67 19*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Adult student full-time equivalency raised from 480 (present hours) to 700 hours per year for high school completion work.</td>
<td>0 81 19*</td>
<td>5 71 24*</td>
<td>4 82 4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Adult basic education course work changed from a minimum of 30 weeks (present number) to 35 or more weeks per year.</td>
<td>0 70 30*</td>
<td>0 80 20*</td>
<td>5 85 10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Volunteers used in the administration of recreational, senior citizen, and enrichment activities.</td>
<td>0 29 71*</td>
<td>0 29 71*</td>
<td>5 24 71*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Citizen involvement in the schools.</td>
<td>0 21 79%</td>
<td>0 30 70%</td>
<td>0 53 47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1980</th>
<th>1985</th>
<th>1990</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Daytime programming for adult education courses.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>81*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>III. COMMUNITY EDUCATION FUNDING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Scholarships given by local districts to lower income individuals (school district pays the bill) as incentive to return to school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Community education directors' salaries to be reimbursed through cooperative agreement (state and local district).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Community education directors' salaries to be solely paid for by local school districts.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Community education directors' salaries to be subsidized with federal monies.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Social Service participation in the total financing of education programs for the handicapped adult (mentally or physically).</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
additional commentary was believed to be instrumental in the changes provided by the Delphi participants (Appendix F).

For the 28 questions provided at the beginning of Round 1, consensus had been reached on 22 questions by the end of Round 3. Of the 22 questions for which consensus was achieved, 9 statements reflected high consensus; high consensus refers to a 70% panelist agreement in all three time frames (1980, 1985, 1990). Of the 13 remaining statements, consensus was moderate (determined by a minimum of 60% agreement) in all three time frames (1980, 1985, 1990).

An additional five statements (beyond the 28 mentioned above) in the funding section of Round 1 were not answered in a consensus type manner. Panelists predicted the percentage of financial support contributed to community education through fees, state aid, grants, philanthropies, and local funds. The mean of these estimates provided the data for a portion of the funding section in the questionnaire (Table 2).

For the five questions where consensus was not reached, agreement was proximate (Table 4). On question 2, two time frames achieved consensus: 1980: 60%, 1985: 70%; but the percentage for 1990 was 57%, nearly enough for moderate agreement. This was true also for questions 3 and 4; consensus had been reached in two time frames, but a 57% agreement appeared in one time frame for each of these statements.

Question 9 reflected a high consensus for the stability of G.E.D. testing in 1980 and 1985, but the future of G.E.D. testing 10 years from now reflected a mix of predictions, and consensus was not reached.
The questionnaire reflected a high consensus for increasing citizen involvement in the schools in 1980 and 1985; however, the vote was split for 1990 (53% believed involvement would remain stable; 47% believed involvement would increase).

The greatest disagreement occurred with question 28. The panelists agreed that social service programs would retain their support for handicapped adults by 1980. However, the group response was split as to the stability or increase of financial assistance for 1985 and 1990.

**Delphi Round 4 Results**

Round 4 of the Delphi process was an impact statement. Impact referred to the effect potential events or trends could have on Michigan's community education programming, structure, and funding by the year 1990. The panelists were provided with all the statements for which consensus had been reached on previous Rounds 1, 2, and 3.

The panelists were asked to circle the possible effect of an event or trend. Notations were arranged as follows: UF (highly unfavorable), MUF (moderately unfavorable), NC (no change), MF (moderately favorable), and HF (highly favorable). Panelist comments were once again encouraged via the written word so that potential impact of trends or events could be explained or defended. Following each statement on the Round 4 questionnaire, the consensus results were listed in parentheses; i.e., community education programming for the senior citizen population 60 and over (group responded increase}
for 1980, 1985, and 1990). In this way the panelists could decide the potential impact of an event in light of the group response from the previous rounds. In the community education programming section of the questionnaire, the respondents predicted that the increase in senior citizen programming would have a favorable effect on community education's future in the decade ahead (Table 5). The increase in on-site educational opportunities for workers was also viewed as a favorable trend for the future.

The stability of programs for handicapped adults, and adults living in hospitals or nursing homes was viewed as a neutral or favorable trend. The majority of Delphi panelists viewed the leveling of high school completion and adult basic education programming as a neutral or favorable occurrence.

Four areas of predicted increase were school usage for activities (weddings, banquets); advertising or marketing expenditures; local public relations seminars; and child care services. All these areas were viewed as predominately favorable occurrences in the future of Michigan community education.

In the area of community education structure, community college and university involvement in local programs was viewed as remaining stable; most of the Delphi respondents predicted no change in its effect on the future of the program. The predicted increase for consortium arrangements between schools or school and governmental agencies was viewed primarily as a favorable trend.

Adult basic education time requirements were predicted as not increasing during the next 10 years, and this was viewed as having
Table 5
Delphi Questionnaire 4 Group Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOTE:</th>
<th>UF</th>
<th>MUF</th>
<th>NC</th>
<th>MF</th>
<th>HF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UF = highly unfavorable impact</td>
<td>MUF = moderately unfavorable impact</td>
<td>NC = no change</td>
<td>MF = moderately favorable impact</td>
<td>HF = highly favorable impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. COMMUNITY EDUCATION PROGRAM

1. Community education programming for the senior citizen population (60 and over) (Group responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990). 0% 0% 11% 31% 58%

5. Classes held at on-site business/industrial locations to accommodate worker schedule (Group responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990). 0% 0% 6% 47% 47%

6. Involvement of community education in programs for the handicapped adult (physically, mentally, or emotionally) (Group responded remain stable for 1980, increase for 1985, and remain stable for 1990). 0% 6% 37% 31% 26%

7. High school completion course work for individuals 17 years and over (Group responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, and 1990). 6% 0% 47% 29% 18%

8. Adult basic education classes for individuals 17 years and over (Group responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, and 1990). 6% 0% 55% 33% 6%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UF</th>
<th>MUF</th>
<th>NC</th>
<th>MF</th>
<th>HF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. Programming for the health-impaired adults living in hospitals or nursing homes (Group responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, and 1990).</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Usage of school classrooms, gymnasiums, cafeteriums, etc., for activities (i.e., civic meetings, weddings, banquets, etc.) (Group responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990).</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Emphasis on community awareness/public relations seminars: luncheons, coffees (provided by the school) (Group responded increase for 1980, 1985, and remain stable for 1990).</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Availability of child care services for adults attending classes (Group responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990).</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Marketing/advertising expenditures for public awareness of community education (Group responded increase for 1980, remain stable for 1985 and 1990).</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**II. COMMUNITY EDUCATION STRUCTURE**

15. Community education functions to be taken over by the community college in lieu of the local school district (Group responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, and 1990). | 16% | 10% | 58% | 10% | 6% |
### Table 5—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UF</th>
<th>MUF</th>
<th>NC</th>
<th>MF</th>
<th>HF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16. Community education functions to be taken over by the four-year college or university in lieu of the local district (Group responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, and 1990).</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Consortium agreement between educational and governmental agencies for developing programs (i.e., local school district and Social Services Department) (Group responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990).</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Consortium agreements encompassing two or more school districts for adult high school completion and adult basic education programs (Group responded increase for 1980, remain stable for 1985 and 1990).</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Adult student full-time equivalency raised from 480 (present hours) to 700 hours per year for high school completion work (Group responded increase for 1980, remain stable for 1985 and 1990).</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Adult basic education course work changed from a minimum of 30 weeks (present number) to 35 or more weeks per year (Group responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, and 1990).</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Volunteers used in the administration of recreational, senior citizen and enrichment activities (Group responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990).</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### III. COMMUNITY EDUCATION FUNDING


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UF</th>
<th>MUF</th>
<th>NC</th>
<th>MF</th>
<th>HF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. Scholarships given by local districts to lower income individuals (school district pays the bill) as incentive to return to school (Group responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, and 1990).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UF</th>
<th>MUF</th>
<th>NC</th>
<th>MF</th>
<th>HF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. Community education directors' salaries to be reimbursed through cooperative agreement (state and local district) (Group responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, and 1990).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UF</th>
<th>MUF</th>
<th>NC</th>
<th>MF</th>
<th>HF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UF</th>
<th>MUF</th>
<th>NC</th>
<th>MF</th>
<th>HF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UF</th>
<th>MUF</th>
<th>NC</th>
<th>MF</th>
<th>HF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

32. Financial support of community education program through fees or tuition (Group predicted an increase from 15% to 20.8%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UF</th>
<th>MUF</th>
<th>NC</th>
<th>MF</th>
<th>HF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UF</td>
<td>MU</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>HF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Financial support of community education program through state aid formula (state and local money) (Group predicted a decrease from 81% to 61.3%).</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Financial support of community education program through federal grants or appropriations (Group predicted an increase from 2% to 6.3%).</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Financial support of community education program through private businesses, foundations, or philanthropies (Group predicted an increase from 1 to 2.7%).</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Financial support of community education program through local funds (over and above state aid formula) (Group predicted an increase from 1 to 8.9%).</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
little or no change in programming. Lastly, the increases in both volunteerism and daytime class programming were predicted as being favorable changes by the panelists.

The financial section of the Delphi questionnaire reflected a stability in local school district funding for community education directors' salaries and scholarships. It does not appear that increases or decreases in federal subsidies will affect the present structure; this was recorded as having no change on future programming.

The panelists believed fees and tuitions would increase for community education financial support. However, the respondents' beliefs were divided in terms of potential effect or impact. The group also believed that state aid would decrease during the next 10 years, and this was perceived as an unfavorable trend. Increases in federal grants, philanthropies, contributions and local support were all viewed as favorable trends for community education by the end of this century.

Findings of the Study

Based on the findings as developed through questionnaire Rounds 1 through 4, conclusions are made by the researcher regarding the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1

Between 1980 and 1990 programming in community education will reflect a lessening of program emphasis on high school completion and
adult basic education, and a heightened program emphasis on leisure (enrichment) activities.

Hypothesis 1 was rejected. Delphi panelists stated that high school completion and adult basic education programming would remain stable during the next 10 years, even though leisure time activities would increase.

**Hypothesis 2**

Between 1980 and 1990, the structure of community education will reflect greater social agency interaction, so that several agencies will develop community education activities (in lieu of majority involvement by the local school district).

Hypothesis 2 was not rejected.

**Hypothesis 3**

During 1980-1990, funding for community education programs will reflect decreasing financial support from the Michigan Department of Education.

Hypothesis 3 was not rejected.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

This chapter presents a summary of the study, a discussion of the findings, conclusions, implications, and recommendations generated from the analysis of the data. Suggestions for further research conclude the study.

Summary

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this research was to identify possible futures for community education so that community educators could plan for the years to come with new insights and direction. Using the Delphi technique, this study attempted to predict appropriate change, influence and impact in the field of community education. The following kinds of information were gathered in the study:

1. The most important influences which a panel of experts foresaw as shaping the programs, structure, and funding of community education for the next 10 years.

2. The probability of changes for various events within a specific time frame using a consensus of expert opinion.

3. The impact that selected events would have on community education's future.
The study was limited to the public sector because it was assumed that federal and state funding would continue to be the reference point for the financing of community education programs. The data sources were limited to public schools, state universities, professional organizations, and the legislature in the state of Michigan. The Delphi panelists worked and resided in Michigan at their respective positions with vocational commitments either in public schools or in the legislature.

**Review of the Literature**

Although there have been published books and articles relating to the history of community education, community education development, as well as community education concepts and theories in general, there was a noticeable void in research relating to future trends in the community education movement, particularly as it related to potential financial restraints imposed by the recessionary 1970's. In light of this underresearched area, the author believed further exploration in this field would benefit future planning and programming of the community education movement, as it continued into the decades ahead.

The literature review resulted in the emergence of four major categories of information. The literature review chapter synthesized (a) a definition of community education structure and programming, (b) a historical background of both state and national funding for community education programs, (c) the rationale for using the Delphi technique as a means of predicting the future, and (d) a demographic
profile of the United States population in general and of Michigan specifically in the decade ahead.

**Methodology**

The problem addressed was a determination of community education's future in Michigan during the next 10 years. A Delphi study was conducted in order to determine expert consensus in the areas of structure, programs, and funding for community education.

The Delphi panel included a total of 23 experts who had experience in funding and/or development of programming related to community education. The individuals selected were either community education directors, university professors, community college officials, community education center directors, Michigan legislators, assistants to the governor, presidents or executive directors of community/adult education or school board organizations, fiscal analysts, or Michigan State Department of Education specialists.

The Delphi technique incorporated a four round questionnaire process, in which the respondents were asked to predict changes in various programming, structure, and funding aspects of community education during the 10 years spanning 1980 to 1990. On each round of the questionnaire, written panelist comments were encouraged and comment collation was included in the mailing of the next questionnaire round. Each panelist received a composite showing his/her responses to each statement as well as the responses of the entire group so that direct comparisons could be made.
In order to categorize the group response, the following determinations were made on Rounds 1, 2, and 3: high consensus (70% agreement by panelists on the probability of occurrence of a particular event during the time frame: 1980, 1985, 1990) and moderate consensus (60% agreement by the panelists on the probability of occurrence of a particular event during the time frame: 1980, 1985, 1990). For a question where moderate consensus was not reached, that question reappeared on the subsequent round(s).

Round 4 of the questionnaire was an impact statement. Impact referred to the potential effect particular events or happenings would have on the present structure of community education by the year 1990. Panelists were asked to select the favorability or unfavorability of effect their predicted trend would have on community education's future.

Findings of the Study

A summary of the findings of the study follows:

Hypothesis 1. Between 1980 and 1990 programming in community education will reflect a lessening of program emphasis on high school completion and adult basic education and a heightened program emphasis on leisure (enrichment) activities.

Hypothesis 1 was rejected.

The results of the data analysis indicated that high school completion and adult basic education classes would remain stable as opposed to decreasing in the decade ahead. However, the respondents did believe leisure class offerings and participation would generally
increase between 1980 and 1990 because of increasing availability of leisure time. Energy (gasoline primarily) problems will force individuals to recreate locally as opposed to traveling out of state, ultimately increasing usage of local district recreational programs (Appendix D). The impact of increasing leisure time activities was not addressed because panelist consensus was not reached on this particular statement.

The impact of stability for high school completion and adult basic education programming was viewed as being a neutral or favorable occurrence. It was believed that these needs are being met satisfactorily at their existing programming level.

Hypothesis 2. Between 1980 and 1990, the structure of community education will reflect greater social agency interaction, so that several agencies will develop community education activities (in lieu of majority involvement by the local school district).

Hypothesis 2 was not rejected.

The Delphi panelists predicted an increase in consortium arrangements between educational and governmental agencies for developing programs. The consortium will be a means of survival for various organizations as costs can be shared. However, there is some belief that the titled organization in the consortium is the one whose ideas are primarily supported. The impact of increased numbers of consortiums was perceived as favorable by the Delphi panelists. Private, educational, and governmental organizations can offer joint professional, financial, and facility resources.
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Hypothesis 3. During 1980-1990, funding for community education programs will reflect decreasing financial support from the Michigan Department of Education.

Hypothesis 3 was not rejected.

The respondents predicted a lessening of state aid funds from the current level (Table 2) throughout the 1980's and continually decreasing until 1990. The impact of declining state (financial) aid was considered to be unfavorable. The state funds available to community education programs were crucial to the maintenance of various educational programs. Without state support, many of the academic local school district programs would scale down or terminate. However, the financial support is predicted to increase from fees, tuitions, grants, philanthropies, and local funds. The impact of the latter statement was considered to be favorable by the respondents.

Panelist rationale included the belief that taxpayers would assume more and more of the cost responsibilities for programs. The tax limitation legislation of the 1970's will put many financial decisions on local individuals as far as their priorities are set (Appendix D).

Further Findings

In the area of community education programming, the following trends were predicted:

1. The population group receiving expansion of services would be the senior citizen group. Handicapped, health impaired adults were expected to receive the same level of programming or commitment (as they now receive) in the decade ahead.
2. There would be an increase in classes at industrial sites in order to accommodate workers. School facilities will be used more and more by local residents for weddings, meetings, and classes.

3. Marketing and public relations were viewed as growth areas in community education by the panelists, mainly because a great deal of "selling" was needed for continuation of local programs.

4. The working/mobile parent would be accommodated by availability of child care services at the instructional site.

Community education structural predictions included:

5. There would be a stability of community college and university roles in local school district community education.

6. The numbers of consortiums between educational and governmental agencies for community education programs as well as between several school districts would increase.

7. Hour/week requirement for adult basic education and high school completion courses would stabilize.

8. Volunteerism in community/school activities would increase.

9. There would be an increase in daytime classes for adult education students.

Future predictions in community education funding included:

10. Scholarships to local individuals as an incentive to return to school would stabilize.

11. There would be a funding percentage stabilization for community education director salaries on local, consortium, and federal levels.

12. Increasing support would be provided for community education programs from fees, tuitions, grants, philanthropies, and local monies.
13. Financial support from state aid would decrease.

Conclusions

The following conclusions appear to be justified on the basis of the findings in this study:

1. Community education in Michigan will continue to accommodate the growing senior citizen segment of the population through program expansion. Demography shows a continued growth in this particular population throughout the century. Planning should begin now in order to prepare for the projected growth.

2. Special interest groups such as the handicapped and health impaired will retain services, but will not receive greater funding allocations. Although this group is growing, they have not been vocal enough in demanding greater financial or program assistance.

3. Businesses will want to retrain or further educate their workers, but this classwork will be accomplished at the business site as opposed to the school site. In this way workers need not change clothing or return home before class; it is an ideal program for swing shift workers who have free hours within their work day.

4. School facilities will be continually used for weddings, meetings, service groups, etc. The school will be able to justify many of its expenses as it opens its doors to more people.

5. Volunteerism will increase in community education programs. The growing senior citizen population will provide a potentially large volunteer working force; many of these individuals are healthy and willing to work.
6. Marketing and advertising will increase in order to educate the public about the community education concept. The job of selling the schools is crucial for the successful continuation of community education programming.

7. Child care services will be offered at instructional sites so that parents may return to school without the worry and expense of obtaining a babysitter. The school in general has picked up many of the responsibilities once thought of as parental charges (i.e., breakfast programs, hot lunch provisions).

8. Day classes for adults will accommodate those individuals that work an evening shift. This will also be a positive use for empty classrooms due to the declining K-12 school enrollment.

9. At present the community college and university are minimally involved in local school district community education programs. This will likely increase as the consortium concept grows, since pooling resources will be financially prudent.

10. The number of consortiums will increase between educational and governmental agencies because of economics. Increasing demands on social services make the joint effort a necessity. Financial, professional, and organizational resources can be shared with the benefit of offering greater services.

11. Scholarships will not increase on a local basis due to inflationary times. This is reflected in stability of support from local, state, and federal levels; each level is feeling the money pressures of the 1970's. The panelists support the notion that tuition will need to be charged in greater instances, and local monies
will be requested. Taxpayers will be taking a greater personal responsibility for the cost of programming.

12. Grants and philanthropies may turn their attention to education in the decade ahead as state support begins to decline.

Implications and Recommendations

The findings have significant implications for several groups of individuals and organizations in Michigan. The groups would include local boards of education, the Michigan Association of School Boards (MASB), local school districts in Michigan, the Michigan legislature, state supported universities and community colleges, state community education organizations such as Michigan Association of Public Adult Community Educators (MAPACE) and Michigan Community School Education Association (MCSEA).

The following implications and recommendations were derived from the findings of the study:

1. Community education should creatively plan for the growing over-60 population. Increased facilities, teachers, and leisure training need to be developed to accommodate this group.

2. Handicapped or health impaired individuals should develop a stronger lobbying effort for their interests if a growth in services is desired; a greater team effort between social service and educational agencies could greatly enhance the programs for these groups. This group is growing in numbers, but their voices must be heard in the legislature of Michigan before governmental action will be taken.
3. The local community school director and area industry representatives should work together to plan courses of study for workers desirous of continued education. In this way the commitment is a three way process.

4. The increasing use of school facilities would be possible because of the declining enrollments of students in Michigan. There also would be room available for adult daytime programming. In addition, positive associations developed through school usage might attract more volunteers to school related programs. Furthermore, this greatly increases favorable associations with the community school concept by local residents.

5. Child care services for adults returning to school will be an area of exploration between educational and governmental agencies; here a consortium effort would divide the financial burden of expenses.

6. Community education consortiums will continue to grow as local school districts find it too costly to operate independent programs. Exploration of larger consortiums, encompassing three or more school districts should be explored.

7. Local school districts should be exploring various philanthropic agencies for financial support; in addition, more school districts should avail themselves of federal grant money available for various community education programs.

Suggestions for Further Study

The findings of this research have provided insight into additional subject areas worthy of investigation. Suggestions for
continued research might include:

1. Replicating this study in 5 years to determine whether priorities have changed in the prediction of possible futures for community education in Michigan.

2. Duplicating this study in a state other than Michigan in order to determine the similarities and differences between Michigan's programming changes in the decade ahead as opposed to possible futures in another region. This duplication would determine whether Michigan's community education situation is unique or whether it is, in fact, the model for future changes in other states.

3. Conducting a study that analyzes historical data for the various program areas, and then project these trends into the future. These trends should be compared to the Delphi respondents' projections of possible futures. A study of this type would provide community education planners with additional information for the development of strategies that would cause some of these futures to become realities.

4. Administering Delphi studies to explore other aspects of educational programming in Michigan (i.e., special education, vocational education).
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APPENDICES
Appendix A

Initial Letter

89
I am a practicing community education director in Berrien Springs, Michigan, and a doctoral candidate at Western Michigan University. Because of my professional interest in the community education movement, I have selected the dissertation topic entitled: "A Delphi Study to Identify Possible Futures of Community Education in Michigan." Your name has been selected for participation in this study because of your interest and involvement in the educational domain.

The Delphi Technique is an approach used to determine consensus on statements about the future. A panel of experts is used, and their names are not revealed to one another during the course of the technique. The Delphi technique involves four rounds of questionnaires that are sent to the panelists with feedback after each round.

This study will utilize the Delphi Technique and the results of the study will be available to community educators throughout Michigan for the purpose of future planning. Each round will require approximately one hour of your time.

In the confines of this study, community education is defined as a process that achieves a balance and a use of institutional forces in the education of all the people of a community. The specific emphasis in this study encompasses high school completion, adult basic education, leisure (enrichment) courses, recreation activities, senior citizen program and adult vocational training. The study is limited to public institutions in the state of Michigan and the activities are primarily school based.

The data generated in this study can be used in determining possible futures for community education. In addition, the study will identify the probability that certain events will occur within a ten year time frame (1980, 1985, 1990).

As you respond to the questionnaire, the statements about the future must be applicable to all public community education programs in Michigan. It would be of help if you could provide the names of two colleagues in Michigan who you regard as experts in community education financing or programming. A stamped, self-addressed envelope is enclosed in order for you to return the information to me upon completion.

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this research. Please feel free to call me collect at (616) 471-2891 for questionnaire clarification.

Sincerely,

Ilene Sheffer

enclosure
Please fill in the personal data listed below and return in the enclosed envelope. This information will be kept confidential and will be used for analyzing background characteristics of the panelists. The data will be destroyed at the completion of this study.

NAME _________________________________________________________________

AGE _________________________________________________________________

EDUCATIONAL DEGREES __________________________________________________

PRESENT POSITION AND TITLE ___________________________________________

NUMBER OF YEARS IN COMMUNITY EDUCATION (if applicable) ______________

NUMBER OF PUBLICATIONS IN THE PAST FIVE YEARS _______________________

MEMBERSHIP IN PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS _____________________________

HOW MANY? ______________ LIST _______________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________
CONSENT STATEMENT

I agree (sign only if consent is given) to be part of the Delphi study. I hereby consent to being identified at the end of the study and in any publications resulting from the study, as a participant of the Delphi study to identify possible futures for Community Education.

______________________________    ______________________
SIGNATURE                      DATE

Please name two colleagues in the state of Michigan whom you consider experts in Community Education financing or programs.
1. _______________________________________
2. _______________________________________

Return address: Ilene Sheffer
150 West Rocky Weed Road
Stevensville, MI 49127
Appendix B

Instructions to Participants
INSTRUCTIONS TO PARTICIPANTS

1. The attached questionnaire contains a list of events that could occur in the future of community education.

2. You are encouraged to add statements to the questionnaire in the three major areas covered: program, structure, and funding.

3. On this first questionnaire, you are asked to check the appropriate column for the future occurrence of a particular event during three time frames: 1980--1985--1990.

   I = high probability that the particular program will increase during this time frame

   D = high probability that the particular program will decrease during this time frame

   RS = item will remain stable during the particular time frame mentioned

4. If you care to elaborate, there is a space for comments (rationale) that will explain your reason for choosing a particular answer.

5. There will be a deviation in format in the Funding section (IIIB) of the questionnaire. Here you will be asked to indicate the percent of financial responsibility (0%-100%) to be contributed by a particular agency.

6. The results of the panelists' statements will be collated and returned to you after each round. If the group response for a statement does not fall into the moderate consensus range (60% agreement), the statement will reappear on the following round. Comments justifying your answer will be sent to the other panelists (without revealing your name).

7. Panelists will not be identified until the study is completed. If you find that a colleague is involved in this same study, please do not discuss the information. At the conclusion of the study, an information summary will be sent to each panelist. Panelists' names will be revealed at this time if consent is given.

8. Thank you for your time and assistance.

Please return your questionnaire and information in the attached stamped, self-addressed envelope no later than ______________.

Return address: Ilene Sheffer
150 West Rocky Weed Road
Stevensville, MI 49127

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Appendix C

Community Education Questionnaire
## COMMUNITY EDUCATION QUESTIONNAIRE

**NOTE:**  
*I* = high probability that item will increase  
*D* = high probability that item will decrease  
*RS* = existing program will remain stable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAMPLE: Private grants appropriated to community education programming.</th>
<th>1980</th>
<th>1985</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>COMMENT/RATIONALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### I. COMMUNITY EDUCATION PROGRAM

1. Community education programming for the senior citizen population (60 and over).  
2. Community education emphasis on adult job retraining skills for occupational change.  
3. Community education emphasis on adult job retraining skills culminating in a high school diploma.  
4. Programming for leisure-time enrichment activities (includes leagues and various sports).  
5. Classes held at on-site business/industrial locations to accommodate worker schedule.  
6. Involvement of community education in programs for the handicapped adult (physically, mentally, or emotionally).  
7. High school completion course work for individuals 17 years and over.
## Community Education Questionnaire—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOTE:</th>
<th>I = high probability that item will increase</th>
<th>D = High probability that item will decrease</th>
<th>RS = existing program will remain stable</th>
<th>1980</th>
<th>1985</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>COMMENT/RATIONALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. COMMUNITY EDUCATION PROGRAM—Continued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Adult basic education classes for individuals 17 and over.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Programming for the health-impaired adults living in hospitals or nursing homes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Usage of school classrooms, gymnasiums, cafeterias, etc., for activities (i.e., civic meetings, weddings, banquets, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Emphasis on community awareness/public relations seminars: luncheons, coffees (provided by the school).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Availability of child care services for adults attending classes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II. COMMUNITY EDUCATION STRUCTURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOTE:</th>
<th>1 = high probability that item will increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D = high probability that item will decrease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RS = existing program will remain stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Community education functions to be taken over by the community college in lieu of the local school district.

17. Community education functions to be taken over by the four-year college or university in lieu of the local school district.

18. Consortium agreement between educational and governmental agencies for developing programs (i.e., local school district and Social Services Department).

19. Consortium agreements encompassing two or more school districts for adult high school completion and adult basic education programs.

20. Adult student full-time equivalency raised from 480 (present hours) to 700 hours per year for high school completion work.

21. Adult basic education course work changed from a minimum of 30 weeks (present number) to 35 or more weeks per year.
Community Education Questionnaire--Continued

**NOTE:**

- **I** = high probability that item will increase
- **D** = high probability that item will decrease
- **RS** = existing program will remain stable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1980</th>
<th>1985</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>COMMENT/RATIONALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>II. COMMUNITY EDUCATION STRUCTURE--Continued</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Volunteers used in the administration or recreational, senior citizen, and enrichment activities.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Citizen involvement in the schools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Daytime programming for adult education courses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>III. A. COMMUNITY EDUCATION FUNDING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Scholarships given by local districts to lower income individuals (school district pays the bill) as incentive to return to school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Community education directors' salaries to be reimbursed through cooperative agreement (state and local district).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Community education directors' salaries to be solely paid for by local school districts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Community Education Questionnaire—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOTE:</th>
<th>1980</th>
<th>1985</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>COMMENT/RATIONALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I = high probability that item will increase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D = high probability that item will decrease</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS = existing program will remain stable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>III. A. COMMUNITY EDUCATION FUNDING—Continued</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Community education directors' salaries to be subsidized with federal monies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Social Service participation in the total financing of education programs for the handicapped adult (mentally or physically).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Community Education Questionnaire—Continued

**NOTE:** Indicate percentage of funding to be contributed by each source mentioned below. Questions 34-38 should total 100% for each year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>III. B. COMMUNITY EDUCATION FUNDING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Financial support of community education program through fees and tuition.</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Financial support of community education program through state aid formula (state and local money).</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Financial support of community education program through federal grants or appropriations.</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Financial support of community education program through private businesses, foundations, or philanthropies.</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Financial support of community education programs through local funds (over and above state aid formula).</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** The numbering of the questions in the aforementioned tables differs from the numbering system in the appendices because of blanks for additional questions.
Appendix D

Delphi Questionnaire 1
Panelists' Comments
Delphi Questionnaire 1
Panelists' Comments

Statement 1

Responded an increase in 1980, 1985, 1990 due to increasing numbers of senior citizens who will create greater demand and greater pressure—general and through lobby groups.

Responded increase in 1980, 1985, 1990; population and political power of group will increase.

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, 1990 because of ever increasing numbers of persons in this age category.

Responded increase in 1980, 1985, 1990; population will continue to grow older, school population decline.

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, 1990 because this must happen due to population trends and "grey power."

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, 1990 because senior citizens will demand it.

Statement 2

Responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, 1990; it is currently low and will remain so. Facilities and equipment are seldom available—where they are, vocational education will direct.

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, 1990; as unemployment rises, inflation increases and unskilled people exist; more emphasis has to be placed on jobs.

Statement 3

Responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, 1990; not much is done now. When money is made available, other organizations will garner the bulk of it.

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, 1990; as unemployment rises, inflation increase and unskilled people exist, more emphasis has to be placed on jobs.

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, 1990; currently serving only a fraction of those with need.

Responded remain stable for 1980 and 1985, decrease for 1990 because we should have caught up on some of the backlog on nongraduates.
Statement 4

Responded increase in 1980, remain stable in 1985 and decrease in 1990 because greater pressure by recreational organizations will result in categorical aid to other than community education organizations.

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, 1990; slight increases; probably primarily for special populations.

Responded decrease for 1980, increase for 1985 and 1990 because of an increased fertility rate again and larger population of child rearing age.

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, 1990 because of ever increasing leisure time available.

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990 as more leisure time will be available, energy problems will force more community activities.

Responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, 1990, because the adult education market has been targeted for over a decade and research indicates that this market may be reaching a peak enrollment. Review Dr. Moore's study from CMU for most recent data.

Statement 5

Responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, 1990 as there will be an increase but on a contract basis by industry and not as a part of community education.

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, 1990 to keep up with technology.

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, 1990 because we must move outside schools!

Statement 6

Responded remain stable for 1980, increase in 1985, remain stable in 1990; slight increase in recreational programs--e.g., handicapped olympics--then plateau as community educators realize the other options are already spoken for.

Responded increase for 1980 and 1985, remain stable for 1990 because a new awareness and demand is upon us.

Responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, 1990 because I see little of such services now. I doubt they will increase unless community educators are "sensitized."
Statement 7

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, 1990; this may be one of community education's greatest gains. Community education may become an "alternative" program for high school completion.

Responded remain stable for 1980, 1985 and decrease for 1990; probably primarily for special populations.

Responded remain stable for 1980, increase for 1985, and remain stable for 1990 because graduation/promotion requirements may lead to more dropouts again.

Responded increase for 1980, remain stable for 1985, decrease for 1990 because the population served will decline due to birth rate change.

Statement 8

Responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, and 1990 as I perceive community education will still benefit from adult basic education. Gradually it will become its own discipline if money is available. Otherwise decreasing numbers will reduce it.

Responded remain stable for 1980, increase for 1985 and 1990 because a greater need would exist in the 1980's if schools continue to promote students who lack basic reading skills, etc.

Responded decrease for 1980, remain stable for 1985 and 1990 as groups outside of public schools will become involved due to change in federal funding.

Responded remain stable for 1980 and 1985, decrease for 1990 unless there is severe economic dislocation or major influx of non-English speaking people.

Statement 9

Responded remain stable for 1980, decrease in 1985 and 1990 since it seems unlikely without a major catastrophe (e.g., war) that G.E.D. will be a viable part of community education.


Responded increase for 1980, remain stable for 1985, decrease for 1990 because future alternative testing may become available competency testing.

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, 1990 because I see an increase although I feel that the viability of such degrees will apply mostly for those with jobs.
Statement 9—Continued

Responded remain stable for 1980, decrease for 1985 and 1990 as other forms of testing will come into play—"external diplomas" and other types of competency tests.

Statement 10

Responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because community educators are not trained for this work and won't be.

Responded increase for 1980 and 1985, remain stable for 1990 because other agencies besides education will hopefully realize their role here.

Responded increase for 1980 and 1985, remain stable for 1990 as a new awareness and demand is upon us.

Responded increase for 1980, remain stable for 1985 and 1990 as costs for specialized staff will remain too high to permit growth.

Responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, 1990 because they may be reduced due to poor programming in the past.

Statement 11

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because of greater awareness; pressure and logic will prevail. The day of the faculty owned school is over.


Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990; school usage whether under none of community education will increase as education philosophy changes with time.

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because declining enrollment will make more facilities more readily available.

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, 1990 because more facilities will be available due to declining enrollments.

Responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, 1990 because I believe increased usage will be prevented by financial constraint.

Statement 12

Responded increase for 1980 and 1985, decrease in 1990; increased pressure for local millage will increase the activities; but gradual assumption of funding by the state will decrease that in about 10 years.
Statement 12—Continued

Responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because of com­petition and new found vehicle.

Statement 13

Responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, and 1990; we don't know how to do this. Private business will maintain the major role.

Responded remain stable for 1980, increase for 1985 and remain stable for 1990 because of economy demanding many working mothers plus single parent.


Responded increase for 1980 and 1985, decrease for 1990 because child care will become more generally available either through employers or government.

Statement 14

Responded increase for 1980 and 1985, decrease for 1990; we will peak about 1987 and then our star will start to fall. Reason: our competitiveness with other agencies and insufficien training plus political pressure through lobbies.


Responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, and 1990; while there is and will be a desire and need to do more in this area, funds will be tight and hence limit this effort.

Responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, and 1990, but needs to be increased.

Statement 16

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990; community college personnel are much more competitive and aware of the benefits.

Responded increase for 1980 and 1985, remain stable for 1990; logical as move toward bigger government.

Responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, 1990; minor role changes unless functionary (significant) changes are made.
Statement 16—Continued

Responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, and 1990. The nature of the question makes it difficult to answer. If you mean the program aspect of community education, then I believe there may be a slight increase. I think it is more likely that it will be in addition to rather than in lieu of.

Responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, and 1990 and I hope this will remain stable, not increase!

Statement 17

Responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, and 1990; they don't perceive this function and will be unable to adjust because of their beliefs in tradition.

Responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, 1990; many are "above it all."

Responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, and 1990; minor role changes unless functionary (significant) changes are made.

Responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, 1990 as I believe both universities and community colleges will increase off campus programming but not "in lieu of" the school.


Responded decrease for 1980, 1985, 1990 because higher education is not interested in service to community unless it generates credit hour production.

Statement 18

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990; these will increase, for the purpose of survival. But community education will be mislead and will lose—the consortium always supports the titled organization.

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990; economics and competition demands.

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990; as unemployment rises, inflation increases and unskilled people exist, more emphasis has to be placed on jobs.

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because this will happen only if community educators encourage.
Statement 19

Responded decrease for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because greater recognition of the need for programs close to home and energy will prevail. Competitiveness wins again.


Responded increase for 1980, remain stable for 1985, decrease for 1990; related to funding, decrease probably will occur as concept and programming procedure become more widely recognized.

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990; this will be true as long as funding patterns give us "out of formulae" districts. However, it is not a good idea in terms of servicing the community.

Responded increase for 1980 and 1985, remain stable for 1990; more cost efficient.

Responded remain stable for 1980, decrease for 1985 and 1990; residents are going to demand their own school district to provide services.

Statement 20

Responded remain stable for 1980, increase for 1985, and remain stable for 1990; logic and pressure for higher standards wins again. However, "testing out" will help.


Responded remain stable for 1980, increase for 1985, remain stable for 1990; only chance for change is if a total new system and appropriation bill is devised.

Responded increase for 1980 and 1985, remain stable for 1990; this will continue to increase as long as districts are making a profit from adult education and until we can explain why adults can learn faster than traditional students.

Responded remain stable for all three years because this must not increase or we will lose our adults!

Statement 21

Responded remain stable for 1980, increase for 1985, and remain stable for 1990; logic and pressure for higher standards wins again. However, "testing out" will help.
Statement 21—Continued


Responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because this must not increase or we will lose our adults!

Statement 22

Responded increase for 1980, remain stable for 1985, and decrease for 1990; continued mentality regarding work as a "for-pay" activity. Federal funding promotes this.


Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990 depending on our willingness to use them.

Responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, and 1990 as resistance to "volunteering" will increase.

Statement 23

Responded increase for 1980 and 1985, decrease for 1990, a great outcry, peaking in the late 80's with state assumption of accountability standards.

Responded increase for 1980 and 1985, remain stable for 1990 as more community schooling implemented.

Responded increase for 1980, remain stable for 1985 and 1990 because specialized schools of all technical nature may forego this involvement.

Responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because I'm afraid most schools (superintendents) will not encourage such involvement!

Statement 24

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990; one of the bright spots. Extra space equals creative use. We may not call it community education, however.

Responded increase for 1980 and 1985, remain stable for 1990 due to availability of facilities.
Statement 26

Responded remain stable for 1980, decrease for 1985 and 1990 because welfare, as we know it, will decrease. Greater work incentive will win.

Statement 27


Responded increase for 1980, remain stable for 1985 and decrease for 1990 because of sunset legislation--different emphasis may bring about change.

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and decrease for 1990; this will only increase as long as community education is categorical. Once it is a legitimate expense, it will no longer be fine. My answer is also based on my expectation that MCSEA will stop its efforts to eliminate the reimbursement of directors' salaries.

Responded remain stable for 1980, decrease for 1985 and 1990 since state support of salary reimbursement likely to drop as all districts get involved with funds charged to programming.

Responded increase for 1980 and 1985, decrease for 1990; our star rises, then falls to competition, short money supply, failure to illustrate production.

Statement 28

Responded decrease for 1980, remain stable for 1985 and 1990; cannot answer this with your choices--anyway this will not happen.


Responded decrease for 1980, remain stable for 1985, increase for 1990 because of sunset legislation--different emphasis may bring about change.

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because this must happen.

Responded decrease in 1980 and 1985, remain stable for 1990 because a new title-job description must evolve. We don't yet know what this will be--but it won't be totally public schools.
Statement 29

Responded decrease for 1980, remain stable for 1985 and 1990; cannot answer this with your choices--anyway this will not happen.


Responded remain stable for 1980 and 1985, decrease for 1990; federal government's role is "seed money" and the current legislation (5 years) may be our last.

Responded increase for 1980 and 1985, decrease for 1990; failure to produce under current structures, plus pressure, will do away with direct community education federal aid.

Statement 30

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because pressure from the handicapped adult will force this.

Responded increase for 1980, remain stable for 1985 and 1990; sure as hell would help.

Responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, and 1990; laws will not promote this. PL 298 and 98-142 will enforce status quo.

Statement 32

Responded 15% for 1980 and 1985; 20% for 1990 because the cost will go up, but percentage will remain rather constant.

Responded 15% for 1980, 10% for 1985, and 5% for 1990 because I believe we will establish our programs as legitimate.

Responded 18% for 1980, 20% for 1985, and 30% for 1990 because people will be required to assume greater responsibility for the cost--directly. Tax problems.

Responded 16% for 1980, 18% for 1985, and 20% for 1990 because more will be post high school diploma and recreational.

Responded 15% for 1980; and 20% for 1985 and 1990 because reduction of state support will force local programs to increase tuition.

No response; this may (?) decrease.

Statement 33

Responded 81% for 1980, 75% for 1985, and 70% for 1990 because balance between demands for budget cuts and demands for classes will help keep balance.
Statement 33—Continued

Responded 75% for 1980, 70% for 1985, and 65% for 1990. This question is confusing. Local dollars aren't a part of state aid formula, but it looks like you want that included.

Responded 75% for 1980, 65% for 1985, and 50% for 1990 because state legislature is more social minded than education oriented. They seem to be more interested in treating the effect of social decay than in trying to treat the causes: one of which is lack of a broad based--innovative--education program for all citizens.

Responded 81% for 1980, 75% for 1985, and 70% for 1990 because expected impact of tax limitation legislation.

Responded 81% for 1980, 1985, and 1990; this may (?) increase.

Statement 34

Responded 2% for 1980, 5% for 1985 and 1990; it's building.

Responded 3% for 1980, 6% for 1985, and 1% for 1990 because federal support will increase then drop.

Statement 35

Responded 1% for 1980, 3% for 1985 and 1990 because community education will seek out these sources.

Responded 1% for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because little more help here.

Responded 1% for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because may change due to special population funding but economic indicators aren't that optimistic.

Statement 36

Responded 1% for 1980, 2% for 1985 and 1990 because more, but small, millages will be approved.

Responded 3% for 1980, 4% for 1985, and 3% for 1990. Local dollars aren't a part of state aid formula, but it looks like you want that included. Does this question equal local mills or not?
Appendix E

Community Education Questionnaire
Rounds 2 and 3
## COMMUNITY EDUCATION QUESTIONNAIRE—ROUNDS 2 AND 3

**NOTE:**

- **I** = high probability that item will increase
- **D** = high probability that item will decrease
- **RS** = existing program will remain stable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMENT/RATIONALE</th>
<th>1980</th>
<th>1985</th>
<th>1990</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SAMPLE:** Private grants appropriated to Round 1(2) community education programming. Round 2(3) X X X

### I. COMMUNITY EDUCATION PROGRAM

1. Community education programming for the senior citizen population (60 and over).

2. Community education emphasis on adult job retraining skills for occupational change.

3. Community education emphasis on adult job retraining skills culminating in a high school diploma.

4. Programming for leisure-time enrichment activities (includes leagues and various sports).

5. Classes held at on-site business/industrial locations to accommodate worker schedule.

6. Involvement of community education in programs for the handicapped adult (physically, mentally, or emotionally).

**Note.** Group results shown in percentages. Asterisk (*) indicates consensus reached on Round 1.
## Community Education Questionnaire—Rounds 2 and 3—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOTE:</th>
<th>1 = high probability that item will increase</th>
<th>D = high probability that item will decrease</th>
<th>RS = existing program will remain stable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>High school completion course work for individuals 17 years and over.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Adult basic education classes for individuals 17 and over.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Programming for the health-impaired adults living in hospitals or nursing homes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Usage of school classrooms, gymnasiums, cafeterias, etc., for activities (i.e., civic meetings, weddings, banquets, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Emphasis on community awareness/public relations seminars: luncheons, coffees (provided by the school).</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Availability of child care services for adults attending classes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**II. COMMUNITY EDUCATION STRUCTURE**

<p>| | | | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Community education functions to be taken over by the community college in lieu of the local school district.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Community education functions to be taken over by the four-year college or university in lieu of the local school district.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>CONSENSUS REACHED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Consortium agreement between educational and governmental agencies for developing programs (i.e., local school district and Social Services Department).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Consortium agreements encompassing 2 or more school districts for adult high school completion and adult basic education programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Adult student full-time equivalency raised from 480 (present hours) to 700 hours per year for high school completion work.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>CONSENSUS REACHED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Adult basic education coursework changed from a minimum of 30 weeks (present number) to 35 or more weeks per year.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>CONSENSUS REACHED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:**
- I = high probability that item will increase
- D = high probability that item will decrease
- RS = existing program will remain stable

**COMMENT/RATIONALE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1980</th>
<th>1985</th>
<th>1990</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Consensus Reached**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOTE:</th>
<th>I = high probability that item will increase</th>
<th>D = high probability that item will decrease</th>
<th>RS = existing program will remain stable</th>
<th>1980</th>
<th>1985</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>COMMENT/RATIONALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Volunteers used in the administration or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>recreational, senior citizen, and enrichment activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Citizen involvement in the schools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Daytime programming for adult education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>courses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. A.</td>
<td>COMMUNITY EDUCATION FUNDING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Scholarships given by local districts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>CONSENSUS REACHED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to lower income individuals (school district pays the bill) as incentive to return to school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Community education directors' salaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to be reimbursed through cooperative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>agreement (state and local district).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Community education directors' salaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to be solely paid for by local school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>districts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOTE:</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>COMMENT/RATIONALE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I = high probability that item will increase</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D = high probability that item will decrease</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS = existing program will remain stable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29. Community education directors' salaries to be subsidized with federal monies.

30. Social Service participation in the total financing of education programs for the handicapped adult (mentally or physically).

31. 

...
Appendix F

Delphi Questionnaire 2
Panelists' Comments
Delphi Questionnaire 2
Panelists' Comments

Statement 1—Consensus Reached

Statement 2

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990; re-thought my original interpretation of question, which causes me to change initial responses. Rapidly changing technology will create need for retraining at increasing rate.

More emphasis will be placed on jobs as illustrated with present federal and state monies, P.A. 609, Life Role Competencies, CETA, Vocational Act, etc.

Responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because we don't know how to do it and vocational education will control.

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because there will be a greater need; therefore more facilities will be made available.

Responded increase for 1980 and 1985, remain stable for 1990; with increase in 1980 and 1985, I believe it will stabilize on or before 1990.

Responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because I don't see community education increasing in the vocational education area. Skill centers will take over much of this along with community colleges.

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because retraining will become more needed.

Responded increase for 1980, remain stable for 1985 and decrease for 1990. Our success in retraining leaves much to be desired in the minds of business and industry. Some other vehicle will be used to train for complex technical jobs.

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990 with the people who have less than high school education.

Responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because the need will remain higher than the participation.

Responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because I believe stability remains here because of the renewed emphasis on vocational education in the K-12 system and CETA Federal programs. Greater emphasis there and the unique opportunities that community education provides in more recreational programs will provide the balance for programming for community education in the future.
Statement 2—Continued

Responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because job retraining is a lower priority on the Community Education scale. Will tend to remain so.

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because the rate of unemployment is high. Grads from high school have no or little salable skills for labor market.

Statement 3

Responded increase for 1980, remain stable for 1985 and 1990; no change; I believe credentials indicating job proficiency and skills will replace (partially at least) need for diplomas.

Responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because vocational retraining is a lower priority on the Community Education scale. Will tend to remain so.

Assuming this pertains to adults without high school diplomas, the adults are presently taking courses needed for a diploma--more emphasis will be spent on giving them employable skills in the future.

Responded increase for 1980 and 1985, remain stable for 1990; may remain stable in 1990 because high school diploma will be achieved by most students in regular school.

Responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, and 1990; same as before--job retraining is the key and relates to the not knowing how to do it and vocational education controlling.

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because faster technological changes create greater needs; community must respond.

Responded remain stable for 1980 and 1985, decrease for 1990; technological changes will, more and more as time goes on, make it necessary to obtain higher education.

Responded increase for 1980, remain stable for 1985 and 1990 because high school diplomas, though important, will lose some glamour.

Responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because high school diplomas will continue to have as its major emphasis academics.

Responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, and decrease for 1990 because this group of people is becoming smaller.

Responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, and 1990; there is a maximum level at which community education will emphasize this.
Statement 3—Continued

Responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, and 1990. I have changed my answer for 1985 and 1990, because I believe that the role competency skills will be stressed due to an increase of economic deprivation.

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990; I changed my responses based upon comments by other respondents.

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990; Department of Social Services may encourage certain subjects for ADC/ADCU persons if they become involved with education on a larger scale.

Statement 4

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990; no change.

Although there will be more leisure time in the future, the programming resources of the community education programs will still be in needed areas, not wanted areas.

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because the more I think about it the more I think we'll emphasize our physical education backgrounds and take advantage of the popularity of leisure time activities.

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because more leisure time will be available.

Responded remain stable for 1980, increase for 1985 and 1990 because more leisure time and more older persons.

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990; more leisure!

Responded remain stable for 1980; increased leisure time will continue and increase a need for ways to "live" with it.

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990 due to job pressures, stress, etc., there will be a need for these activities in 1985 and 1990.

Responded remain stable for 1980; increase for 1985 and 1990 if state support increases and other areas successfully cut job retraining then this area might increase in the future.

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990; 55 and 30 drop out—more leisure time results.

Statement 5—Consensus Reached
Statement 6

As in numbers 2 and 4, the emphasis will not be on minority areas (handicapped, senior citizens, leisure time, etc., there are special groups which will handle these areas), but will continue to be on uneducated, unemployed, and welfare.

Responded increase for 1980 and 1985, remain stable for 1990; I believe that the emphasis on handicapped is going to wane.

Responded remain stable for 1980, increase for 1985 and remain stable for 1990; again an upsurge because money is available, but eventual takeover by special education.

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because of greater awareness of need.

Responded increase for 1980, remain stable for 1985 and decrease for 1990; should increase but in time the emphasis and interest will wane.


Responded increase for 1980 and 1985; we've not done enough yet, however. This is an area which will increase until late 80's when the "average" people will slow down the expenditure for such activities.

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and remain stable for 1990; an awareness effort which will result in a program increase is underway. This will peak and programs will be "in place" by 1990.

Responded remain stable for 1980, increase for 1985, and remain stable for 1990. Changed 1990—should see other agencies providing same services.

Responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because with the federal rewrite of vocational rehabilitation legislation new dollars are designated for "independent living programs" for handicapped, however their dollars are targeted at vocational rehabilitation; if community education can work to get some of these dollars then maybe an increase.

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because the handicapped adults are demanding services like never before.

Statement 7

Responded remain stable for 1980 and 1985; decrease for 1990 because other alternatives will become available.
Statement 7--Continued

Responded increase for 1980, remain stable for 1985 and decrease for 1990; no change--demographics as indicated in statement 7 summary are, I believe, accurate.

More and more importance will be placed on a diploma and, also, their ability to read and write. But, the emphasis will be on employment skills, so there will be no major change here.

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and remain stable for 1990; may remain stable in 1990 because high school diplomas will be achieved by more students in regular school.

Responded increase for 1980 and remain stable for 1985 and 1990. I'll bend to the probability that community education will lose this, in many cases.

Responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because drop-out rate in day schools is not decreasing.

Responded increase for 1980 and 1985, remain stable for 1990; strong emphasis til 90's.

Responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, and decrease for 1990; more and more students are completing high school today, leaving a smaller residual to complete high school in the 90's.

Responded decrease for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because increasing percentages of high school age group are completing high school, hence less need.

Responded remain stable for 1980; decrease for 1985 and 1990 because with declining enrollments and a lack of adequate "alternative education programs"--local districts will be agressive at developing some of their programs--neither community education nor LEP's have shown much success at meeting the needs of the "hardcore" drop-outs.

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because number of programs are growing in the United States--grads are increasing in number, too.

Statement 8


More and more importance will be placed on a diploma and, also, their ability to read and write. But, the emphasis will be on employment skills, so there will be no major change here.
Statement 8—Continued

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and remain stable for 1990. Market for these people will decrease due to older people with needs disappearing and younger people not having needs.

Responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because the basic educational needs will continue at the same rate throughout except in few places where new programs are initiated.

Responded remain stable for 1980, increase for 1985 and 1990; unless schools make a drastic change in their approach in teaching children how to read, the periods of 1985 and 1990 will see a far greater increase in this area.

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because number of programs are growing in the United States--grads are increasing in number, too.

Statement 9

Responded remain stable for 1980, decrease for 1985 and 1990. Assumed the same type GED administered; believe some other type test such as life role competency test will be used.

Responded remain stable for 1980, decrease for 1985 and 1990. Continue to feel other forms and tests will be available and in use by 1985 or 1990.

Responded remain stable for 1980 and 1985 and decrease for 1990. I'll allow it may take five + years, but without major calls for the young, (e.g., war) will sufficiently cut the numbers to the point that a drop must take place.

Responded increase for 1980, remain stable for 1985, and decrease for 1990 because most people will have high school diplomas and won't need GED.

If I were to change the answer, I'd write a decrease, but I am anticipating before 1990, the GED Testing Service to reevaluate their test and make it comparable for the times. Employers will not regard the GED the equivalent, and because of this, the school systems will not issue a diploma on it. There needs to be a break between a drop-out and graduate.

Responded decrease for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because unless something unforeseen occurs, there should be no need for GED--all students can be enrolled in credit programs.

Responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, and 1990; changed--in hope that the drop-out rate will decrease and more high school completion programs will be obtained.
Statement 9—Continued

Responded remain stable for 1980, decrease for 1985 and 1990 because persuasive reasoning by others on less demand for cheaper and more alternatives!

Responded remain stable for 1980, decrease for 1985 and 1990; will decrease as other alternative credentialing processes related to life role competencies become more accepted.

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because there will be more emphasis on GED testing as the state aid dollars will be cut back.

Statement 10


Because of lack of training, recent changes in Department of Education interpretation of the laws, and more specialty groups dealing with this issue, I see no change for 1985-90.

Responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because not much now or in the future; competition.


Responded increase for 1980; remain stable for 1985 and 1990. Gotta be!

Responded remain stable for 1980; increase for 1985, and remain stable for 1990 because the great movement is toward community health facilities; less emphasis on hospitals. Nursing homes should be the target of community education programs.

Responded decrease for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because will become a lower priority as additional demands are placed on government.

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because I do think adult foster care homes are becoming aware of school services for their people.

Statement 11

Responded remain stable for 1980, increase for 1985 and 1990 because taxpayers taking advantage on becoming more aware of public owned facilities and their usage to them as taxpayers.
Statement 11--Continued

Of low importance to most school personnel in charge of these functions.

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990; our big service.

Responded remain stable for 1980, increase for 1985 and 1990 because more facilities available because of declining enrollments. Inflation and energy costs prohibit rentals of privately owned buildings.

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because citizens (especially older ones) will demand use for their needs. There just will be more of them!

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990 due to declining enrollments.


Responded remain stable for 1980, decrease for 1985 and 1990 because fiscal constraints will reduce usage.

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because they are cheaper rates than motel dining areas.

Statement 12--Consensus Reached

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because doesn't make sense that they won't continue to grow in the 1990's.

Assuming that this is a community education questionnaire--emphasis will increase in community awareness but not through community education. The higher administrators will continue to spend a larger portion of their time and efforts here, but we will not.

Statement 13

Responded remain stable for 1980, increase for 1985, and remain stable for 1990 because money will not be available even though need is there.

Responded increase for 1980 and 1985, remain stable for 1990 because the economy will demand that both heads of households work, thus putting pressure on employers to assist in child care.

There will be a small increase in the next few years as new systems start this service, but it will level out, may even decrease, as those with children receive their diploma. Another factor is more emphasis on an education, birth control, lower population, alternative
Statement 13—Continued

education will mean there will be fewer parents needing to come back for a diploma.

Responded increase for 1980 and 1985, remain stable for 1990. I'll go with the growth for 5 years, but no longer. Private business will prevail.


Responded increase for 1980 and 1985; remain stable for 1990 because federal funds for this program will be increased.

Responded remain stable for 1980 and 1985, decrease for 1990; overall, adults with needs for this service is declining.

Responded remain stable for 1980 and increase for 1985 and 1990 because child care will increase as both parents become employed; heads of households need help; programs will try to assist students and awareness of this service will increase.

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because a great need for day care centers is felt in small communities. Grandmothers work.

Statement 14

Responded increase for 1980, remain stable for 1985 and 1990. There may be some increase for a few years. However, people's knowledge and understanding of the movement will be similar to their knowledge of the social services available.

Responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because there should be increases, but tradition, the academics, the conservative public will not permit it!

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because greater awareness of benefits in terms of number of people served as a result of advertising.

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990. I still believe these will show an increase because we do so little with them now.

There will be no change because this is not a priority from community education.

Responded increase for 1980, remain stable for 1985 and 1990 because decline in enrollment would warrant more dollars spent. More variety of programs and visibility might lend to it.
**Statement 14—Continued**

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because competition for dollars and clients will keep this on increase.

Responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because most community education programs are already doing a lot of advertising.

Responded increase for 1980, remain stable for 1985 and 1990; need will not be so great in five-ten years, as publicity for community education is big now.

**Statement 16**

Responded decrease for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because this group is not likely to provide for local needs.

Responded remain stable for 1980, decrease for 1985 and 1990 because community colleges are almost twice as expensive to perform a given service as K-12 programs due to decreased work loads and unionism taxpayers will again revolt.


Responded remain stable for 1980, increase for 1985 and 1990 because time will affect change and this will happen in the interest of economy locally and efficiency plus state support controls.

Responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because community education for community colleges is not as money making as college academic courses.

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because I still think community education organizational ability and strength will beat us at the programming level.

Some functions (accounting, teacher training, busing, etc.) will be handled by the Intermediate School District, community colleges, but the major and/or most important services will be controlled by the local school district. I don't see any difference between this and number 17, as far as anticipated changes.

Responded remain stable for 1980, increase for 1985 and 1990 based on local community college my opinion is formed.

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because as enrollment declines and dollars get more competitive, community colleges may take, especially the more academic functions, over from community education. The structure and qualification of community colleges staff will be in their favor. Headlee Sec. 30 will provide stable funding base for community colleges.
Statement 16--Continued

Responded increase for 1980, remain stable for 1985 and 1990 because it will be determined by whichever group is able to keep its financial base (state aid) intact. Public schools are not yet close enough in philosophy to keep from losing some ground in the next few years.

Statement 17--Consensus Reached
Statement 18--Consensus Reached
Statement 19

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because college people are out to lunch.

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and remain stable for 1990 because this must continue in growth to create efficiency. By 1990 should be completed for the most part.


Responded remain stable for 1980, decrease for 1985 and 1990 because energy is still the big factor. Only where mass transit is available can we expect this; given current problems with energy.

Responded increase for 1980, remain stable for 1985 and 1990 because my reason for expecting an increase has to do with out-of-formula districts. This may have disappeared by 1985, however.

Consortiums will remain the same for awhile, but when new federal and state monies start, when the schools want to run their own programs, when the services grow, and when the adults served want to stay with this school, you will see a decrease in consortiums.


Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990; ABE programs but not adult high school completion.

Statement 20--Consensus Reached
Statement 21--Consensus Reached
Statement 22

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because volunteer expertise is there for the "tapping." Tight money will add incentives.
Statement 22—Continued

Responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because feminism, etc., will continue to push away from volunteerism.

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because more people retiring earlier--plus more of this age group volunteering.

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because perhaps the missionary spirit will prevail. I'll try optimism on this--but . . .

Volunteers (not by large, but just 1%) are not reliable nor able to accept the responsibility nor have the needed training. Because of what happens when you have just one bad volunteer, the schools will not place this as an important issue.


Responded remain stable for 1980, increase for 1985 and 1990 as more seniors with more volunteer time.

Responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because volunteers are fewer now as many wait to be paid for their services.

Statement 23

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because this will continue until the population is older with fewer children in school but more interest in adult programs.

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990; better be!

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because people will more and more care about the future of youth plus their own as "senior citizens."

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because declining day time enrollment causes more space to be available.

Responded increase for 1980 and 1985; decrease for 1990; I think we'll remain in the current "high involvement" mode for 5 years or so, then will have a new "thing" to deal with.

The citizens that want to be involved will be, but there will be no decrease/increase from the percent of the total population.

Responded increase for 1980, 1985; remain stable for 1990; agree with summary students.
Statement 23—Continued

Responded increase for 1980, 1985; remain stable for 1990 because education and administration as well as parents are beginning to stress this due to specialized programming.

Responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because we greatly need more citizen involvement in our schools—but I am not optimistic on this score—greater demand by paraprofessionals for pay, discourages some schools from getting parents too active—greater responsibility if successful will also mitigate parent involvement.

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and remain stable for 1990; will increase in larger districts, possibly not in smaller ones.

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because taxes are high—want services.

Statement 24

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because more retirees proportionally in population makes need for more daytime programs for community.

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because with declining enrollments we'll have space!

Schools and communities that have the need/desire to do this are presently programming day classes; therefore, no change.

Responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because strongly feel economy will demand more working adults.

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because cuts babysitting costs.

Statement 26--Consensus Reached

Statement 27

Responded increase for 1980 and 1985; remain stable for 1990 because community education supply will stabilize, eventually.

Responded increase for 1980 and 1985; remain stable for 1990; OK!

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because as credibility of community education increases, legislators will see need and increased categorical will result.

Responded remain stable for 1980 and 1985; decrease for 1990 because without adequate definition of what is unique about us, we fade into an apathetic state—revise or gain parallel program groups.
Statement 27—Continued

There will be no major change in salary reimbursement, except for various requirements.

Responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because this will depend upon the direction of funding which is very difficult to predict.

Responded remain stable for 1980, increase for 1985 and remain stable for 1990 because 1985 and 1990 may see less if any outside funding sources for salaries.

Responded remain stable for 1980, increase for 1985 and 1990 because community education will continue to grow and this is the most logical form of funding.

Responded increase for 1980, remain stable for 1985 and 1990 because community education will continue to grow and this is the most logical form of funding.

Responded remain stable for 1980, 1985 and 1990 because community education will continue to grow and this is the most logical form of funding.

Responded remain stable for 1980; decrease for 1985 and 1990 because state support will continue to increase.

Responded remain stable for 1980 and 1985; decrease for 1990 because maybe the drop will come late.

There will be a decrease at first because of sunset legislation and as new systems get on the state plan in directors' salaries, but this will level out once the schools have an ongoing program.

Responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, and 1990; 1990 may remain stable until such time as cuts are to be made in overall budgets.

There will be a decrease at first because of sunset legislation and as new systems get on the state plan in directors' salaries, but this will level out once the schools have an ongoing program.

Responded remain stable for 1980 and 1985; decrease for 1990; maybe the drop will come later.

Responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because state support will continue to increase.

Responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because boards of education will in 10 years see the need (if not already) for good community education directors and will pay them.
Statement 29

Responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because men on the street concern for Federal government intervention in local affairs has diminished glamour of federal money.

Responded increase for 1980 and 1985; decrease for 1990 because the pattern seems to be there now; short government interest, a shift and the sundowners will take us out of the federal budget.

Responded remain stable for 1980 and 1985; decrease for 1990 because the current federal statement is to decrease this.

There will be a decrease at first because of sunset legislation and as new systems get on the state plan in directors' salaries, but this will level out once the schools have an ongoing program.

Responded remain stable for 1980; increase for 1985 and 1990. I still see increased federal aid to education.


Responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because uncertainties as far as priorities in funding of federal dollar warrant it remain stable.

Responded remain stable for 1980; increase for 1985 and 1990 because potential seminars are going to demand more programs and will have the potential clout to achieve them--thus need and support will be forthcoming.

Responded remain stable for 1980, increase for 1985 and 1990; with senior citizens' activities included in our responsibilities there may be money from Office On Aging.

Statement 30

Responded remain stable for 1980, decrease for 1985 and 1990 because I do not see social service getting this involved in these education programs.

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because social welfare contributions are being increased for all handicapped groups while contributions to education remain the same or are curtailed.

With Family Resource Centers being established, Title I, the wording of the new Adult Education Act, there is no doubt that there will be closer ties to all social service agencies.

Responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because laws won't permit it plus no reason to share on social service part.
Statement 30—Continued

Responded remain stable for 1980; increase for 1985 and 1990 because greater awareness—increased lobbying.

Responded remain stable for 1980, decrease for 1985 and 1990 because social service is transferring as many programs as possible presently to other agencies. Politically their basic service cost is expanding faster than revenue available.
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Delphi Questionnaire 3
Panelists' Comments

Statement 1—Consensus Reached

Statement 2

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and remain stable for 1990 because other kinds of delivery systems in place by then.

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990; more and more occupational change.

Responded remain stable for 1980, increase for 1985, and remain stable for 1990 because I still can't see community education taking over this area. A vocational education responsibility for the most part and will continue to be.

Responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because I continue to believe community education will not respond to their area to any great degree.

Responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because I do not see this increasing--as a matter of fact would predict a swing both toward liberal education if anything does change.

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because in 1990 the increase will be far greater due to the demands of the job industry in changing its line of equipment to a more highly technical and efficient line.

Statement 3—Consensus Reached

Responded increase for 1980, remain stable for 1985 and 1990; still believe them to be appropriate responses.

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because there may be less emphasis on this by 1985 although the drop out rate is still 35% and we are yearly creating our own pool. Also we currently have 50% of the adult population to catch up on.

Responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because I continue to believe community education will not respond to this area to any great degree.

Responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, and 1990 as I see no change . . . especially with emphasis noted in number 5.
Statement 3—Continued

Responded increase for 1980, remain stable for 1985 and 1990; I have changed my answer for 1980 based on comments from fellow respondents.

Statement 4

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990; still believe them to be appropriate responses.

Responded decrease for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because with the many crucial priorities of society, taxes will not be directed toward leisure time programs now or in the future.

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because energy problems will lend further emphasis to this area.

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because leisure time will be community education's "big thing."

Responded decrease for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because of budgets with increases later due to population shifts.

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990 due to job stress, pressures.

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990; more and more leisure.

Statement 5 - Consensus Reached

Statement 6

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because I believe that we are already seeing a reduction emphasis although it is a great need.

Responded remain stable for 1980, increase for 1985, and remain stable for 1990; this will increase in the 80's, remain stable later.

Responded remain stable for 1980, increase for 1985, and remain stable for 1990 because community education will of necessity pick up on special education for a brief time, to fill the gap until others start.

Responded increase for 1980 and 1985, remain stable for 1990; it's increasing only because of mandates and money and awareness.

Responded remain stable for 1980, increase for 1985, and remain stable for 1990; I have changed my answer for 1980 based on comments from fellow respondents.
Statement 7

Responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because drop out rate from "regular" day school programs not decreasing significantly.

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and remain stable for 1990 because we still have over a million such people to serve in Michigan alone.

Responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, and decrease for 1990 because we have already seen a decrease from 78 to 79.

Responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because we're heavy there and will continue.

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because GED will be encouraged by State Department of Education.

Responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because a strong interest coupled with vocational skill training will continue to exist.


Responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, and 1990; alternatives to high school programming will increase via proficiency testing, external diplomas, etc.

Statement 8

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and remain stable for 1990 because we have 670,000 in Michigan as we only dealt with 37,000 this year.

Responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, and decrease for 1990 because hopefully will not be needed as much.

Responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, and 1990; I have changed my answer based on the premise that basic education will always be a factor in all age groups.

Statement 9

Responded remain stable for 1980, decrease for 1985, and 1990 because other alternatives to the GED will emerge, e.g., grade proficiency exams, life role competing testing, etc.

Responded increase for 1980, remain stable for 1985, and decrease for 1990 because business and industry are beginning to use this only for people who are currently employed with them.
Statement 9—Continued

Responded remain stable for 1980 and 1985; decrease for 1990 because pressure for "excellence" will eventually cut this.

Responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, and 1990; hoping dropout rate of school age students will decrease and a high school diploma will be achieved.

Statement 10—Consensus Reached

Responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, and 1990; we can't and won't get into this for much.

Responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because it will probably be stable—however, increase in the older age groups may require an increase in the numbers.

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and remain stable for 1990; see this building slowly and then stabilizing.


Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990; more schools getting into community education and more space available.


Statement 11—Consensus Reached

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because student population decline will only enhance this service.

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990; our continuing "advertisement."

Statement 12—Consensus Reached

Statement 13

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990; if program figures go up, so will this need for this service.

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990; I have changed my answer for 1990 based on fellow respondents comments.

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because maybe we will continue to grow—"I'll go with the trend on this."
Statement 13—Continued

Responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, and decrease for 1990; less and less children; older population.

Statement 14--Consensus Reached

Statement 16--Consensus Reached

Responded remain stable for 1980, increase for 1985 and 1990 because unless community education alters its competitive behavior, the community college with legitimacy in many areas will take its due. I don't believe we'll change.

Responded remain stable for 1985 and 1990; I have changed my response to 1985 and 1990 due to a recent local emphasis of the community college in training skills programs only.


Statement 17--Consensus Reached

Statement 18--Consensus Reached

Statement 19--Consensus Reached

Statement 20--Consensus Reached

Statement 21--Consensus Reached

Statement 22--Consensus Reached

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because will continue to increase as bulge of population gets older.

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990; more volunteer use, after a period of disenchantment with volunteer work.

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because the increasing older population will do more volunteer work and get more involved for something to do and because they "care" and also have intellectual curiosity.

Responded remain stable for 1980, increase for 1985 and 1990 because not enough time between now and 1980 to make the difference.

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990; I have changed comments based on fellow respondents views.
Statement 23


Responded increase in 1980, 1985, and remain stable in 1990; I'll join the center, which suggests a slow down, though I think we will see apathy return.

Responded increase in 1980, 1985, and 1990 because the increasing older population will do more volunteer work and get more involved for something to do and because they "care" and also have intellectual curiosity.

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because money concerns plus a feeling of belonging.


Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990; can't change.

Statement 24

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because of space availability seems likely to me.

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because increasing older population will do more volunteer work and get more involved for something to do and because they "care" and also have intellectual curiosity.

Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990 because more and more time on their hands.


Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and remain stable for 1990; OK!

Statement 26—Consensus Reached

Statement 27—Consensus Reached

Responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, and 1990; OK

Responded remain stable for 1980, increase for 1985, and 1990 because it will increasingly be the way to fund.

Responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, and 1990; I have changed my answer for 1985 based on summary statements.
Statement 28—Consensus Reached

Responded remain stable for 1980, increase for 1985 and 1990 because even though both numbers 27 and 28 will increase, the legitimacy of directors' salaries is already moving them onto general fund money.

Responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, and decrease for 1990; I still feel we'll drop off the school role and become community oriented and paid.

Responded remain stable for 1980, decrease for 1985 and 1990 because it will increasingly be the way to fund.

Responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, and 1990 based on possible state increase in funding.

Statement 29—Consensus Reached

Statement 30


Responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990; there is too high of a percentage of people already included.

Responded remain stable for 1980, decrease for 1985 and 1990 because social service will not have the funds.

Responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, and increase for 1990; it appears to be the emphasis at this point in time.
COMMUNITY EDUCATION QUESTIONNAIRE  
Round 4 Impact Statement

INFORMATION: Consensus has been reached on all the statements listed below. In light of the group response designated after each question (i.e., increase for 1980; remain stable for 1985; increase for 1990), please react to the impact (effect) these events will have on the future of community education by the year 1990. PLEASE CIRCLE THE IMPACT (YOU BELIEVE) THE EVENT WILL HAVE, COMMENT IF YOU SO DESIRE.

NOTE:  
UF = highly unfavorable  
MUF = moderately unfavorable  
NC = no change  
MF = moderately favorable  
HF = highly favorable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAMPLE: Private grants appropriated to community education programming (Group responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990).</th>
<th>UF</th>
<th>MUF</th>
<th>NC</th>
<th>MF</th>
<th>HF</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This will increase private grant money; hopefully it ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. COMMUNITY EDUCATION PROGRAM

1. Community education programming for the senior citizen population (60 and over) (Group responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Community education programming for the senior citizen population (60 and over) (Group responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990).</th>
<th>UF</th>
<th>MUF</th>
<th>NC</th>
<th>MF</th>
<th>HF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Classes held at on-site business/industrial locations to accommodate worker schedule (Group responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Classes held at on-site business/industrial locations to accommodate worker schedule (Group responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990).</th>
<th>UF</th>
<th>MUF</th>
<th>ND</th>
<th>MF</th>
<th>HF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOTE:</td>
<td>UF = highly unfavorable</td>
<td>MUF = moderately unfavorable</td>
<td>NC = no change</td>
<td>MF = moderately favorable</td>
<td>HF = highly favorable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Involvement of community education in programs for the handicapped adult (physically, mentally, or emotionally) (Group responded remain stable for 1980; increase for 1985; remain stable for 1990).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UF</th>
<th>MUF</th>
<th>NC</th>
<th>MF</th>
<th>HF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UF</th>
<th>MUF</th>
<th>NC</th>
<th>MF</th>
<th>HF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

8. Adult basic education classes for individuals 17 years and over (Group responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, and 1990).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UF</th>
<th>MUF</th>
<th>NC</th>
<th>MF</th>
<th>HF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UF</th>
<th>MUF</th>
<th>NC</th>
<th>MF</th>
<th>HF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### COMMUNITY EDUCATION QUESTIONNAIRE
Round 4 Impact Statement—Continued

**NOTE:**
- **UF** = highly unfavorable
- **MUF** = moderately unfavorable
- **NC** = no change
- **MF** = moderately favorable
- **HF** = highly favorable

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>11. Usage of school classrooms, gymnasiums, cafeterias, etc., for activities (i.e., civic meetings, weddings, banquets, etc.)</strong> (Group responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990).</td>
<td>UF</td>
<td>MUF</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>HF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12. Emphasis on community awareness/public relations seminars: luncheons, coffee (provided by the school)</strong> (Group responded increase for 1980 and 1985, remain stable for 1990).</td>
<td>UF</td>
<td>MUF</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>HF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### COMMUNITY EDUCATION QUESTIONNAIRE
Round 4 Impact Statement—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOTE:</th>
<th>UF = highly unfavorable</th>
<th>MUF = moderately unfavorable</th>
<th>NC = no change</th>
<th>MF = moderately favorable</th>
<th>HF = highly favorable</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### II. COMMUNITY EDUCATION STRUCTURE

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16. Community education functions to be taken over by the community college in lieu of the local school district (Group responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, and 1990).</td>
<td>UF</td>
<td>MUF</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>HF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Community education functions to be taken over by the four-year college or university in lieu of the local district (Group responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, and 1990).</td>
<td>UF</td>
<td>MUF</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>HF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Consortium agreement between educational and governmental agencies for developing programs (i.e., local school district and Social Services Department) (Group responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990).</td>
<td>UF</td>
<td>MUF</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>HF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Consortium agreements encompassing two or more school districts for adult high school completion and adult basic education programs (Group responded increase for 1980, remain stable for 1985, 1990).</td>
<td>UF</td>
<td>MUF</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>HF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


| NOTE: UF = highly unfavorable  
| MUF = moderately unfavorable  
| NC = no change  
| MF = moderately favorable  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HF = highly favorable</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20. Adult student full-time equivalency raised from 480 (present hours) to 700 hours per year for high school completion work (Group responded increase for 1980, remain stable for 1985 and 1990).</td>
<td>UF MUF NC MF HF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Adult basic education course work changed from a minimum of 30 weeks (present number) to 35 or more weeks per year (Group responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, and 1990).</td>
<td>UF MUF NC MF HF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Volunteers used in the administration of recreational, senior citizen, and enrichment activities (Group responded increase for 1980, 1985, and 1990).</td>
<td>UF MUF NC MF HF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Daytime programming for adult education courses (Group responded increase for 1980 and 1985, remain stable for 1990).</td>
<td>UF MUF NC MF HF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### COMMUNITY EDUCATION QUESTIONNAIRE
#### Round 4 Impact Statement—Continued

**NOTE:**
- **UF** = highly unfavorable
- **MUF** = moderately unfavorable
- **NC** = no change
- **MF** = moderately favorable
- **HF** = highly favorable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III. COMMUNITY EDUCATION FUNDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26. Scholarships given by local districts to lower income individuals (school district pays the bill) as incentive to return to school (Group responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, and 1990).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Community education directors' salaries to be reimbursed through cooperative agreement (State and local district) (Group responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, and 1990).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Community education directors' salaries to be solely paid for by local school district (Group responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, and 1990).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Community education directors' salaries to be subsidized with federal monies (Group responded remain stable for 1980, 1985, and 1990).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMMUNITY EDUCATION QUESTIONNAIRE
Round 4 Impact Statement—Continued

NOTE: UF = highly unfavorable  
MUF = moderately unfavorable  
NC = no change  
MF = moderately favorable  
HF = highly favorable

INFORMATION: In light of the trends predicted below for community education funding, please react to the potential impact (effect) these funding changes will have on the future of community education by the year 1990. PLEASE CIRCLE THE IMPACT (YOU BELIEVE) THE TREND WILL HAVE, COMMENT IF YOU SO DESIRE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32. Financial support of community education program through fees or tuition (Group predicted an increase from 15% to 20.8%).</td>
<td>UF</td>
<td>MUF</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>MF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Financial support of community education program through state aid formula (state and local money) (Group predicted a decrease from 81% to 61.3%).</td>
<td>UF</td>
<td>MUF</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>MF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Financial support of community education program through federal grants or appropriations (Group predicted an increase from 2% to 6.3%).</td>
<td>UF</td>
<td>MUF</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>MF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Financial support of community education program through private business, foundations, or philanthropies (Group predicted an increase from 1% to 8.9%).</td>
<td>UF</td>
<td>MUF</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>MF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOTE:</td>
<td>UF = highly unfavorable</td>
<td>MUF = moderately unfavorable</td>
<td>NC = no change</td>
<td>MF = moderately favorable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Financial support of community education programs through local funds (over and above state aid formula) (Group predicted an increase from 1% to 8.9%).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| COMMENT | | | | |
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Delphi Questionnaire 4
Panelists' Comments
Delphi Questionnaire 4  
Panelists' Comments

Statement 1

Responded moderately favorable; effect will be an increased awareness of the senior population by communities, increased dollars to community education and greater use of unused facilities.

Responded highly favorable because number of persons involved (agewise) will increase along with increased programming.

Responded highly favorable because will have a large portion of our population in this age group.

Responded highly favorable; as a percentage of our total population, this segment is increasing. With more persons in this category, programs meeting their needs will be appreciated.

Statement 5

Responded highly favorable because makes more relevant, also brings industry into our circle.

Responded moderately favorable because effect will be an increased awareness of the senior population by communities, increased dollars to community education and greater use of unused facilities.

Responded highly favorable because on-site classes will increase as the quality of worklife programs begin.

Responded highly favorable; a long overdue relationship between business and education.

Statement 6

Responded highly favorable; it's only right!

Responded moderately unfavorable because here we will be in over our heads. This is a tough area requiring exceptional specialized skills. Will drop out—or back.

Responded highly favorable because community education will be reaching a more complete cross section of our country's population.

Responded moderately unfavorable because community educators need to give much more attention to these areas of need.
Statement 7

Responded highly unfavorable because as we face decreasing enrollments and empty buildings, this is an area of great potential, as well as need.

Responded moderately favorable; still our bread and butter. I think we'll lose out to adult education.

Responded no change; we still haven't found a better way to recruit and educate in this area.

Statement 8

Responded highly unfavorable because we cannot afford to ignore the increasing needs of the functional illiterates. I know it is difficult to service these needs.

Responded moderately favorable because this is seen as a real service and people will like us for it.

Responded no change; we still haven't found a better way to recruit and educate in this area.

Statement 10

Responded highly favorable; see more on the horizon.

Responded no change; stable—not much involvement. If we keep quiet about it, no increase. Will be ok.

Statement 11

Responded no change; by 1990 we should have maximized this usage.

Responded highly favorable because this is a point of high, positive visibility and will continue to be with declining enrollments.

Responded moderately favorable because it should increase local funding for community education.

Statement 12

Responded moderately favorable because I can't really believe that school superintendents and boards of education will encourage such!

Responded moderately favorable; if done well, we'll gain.

Responded moderately favorable because it should increase local funding for community education.
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Statement 13

Responded no change; do not agree with consensus.

Responded moderately unfavorable; same rationale as recreation and adult education—Day care will take it away and we'll have a brief struggle before being out-gunned.

Responded moderately favorable because it should increase local funding for community education.

Statement 14

Responded moderately unfavorable; question raised by taxpaying public: Is this an appropriate expenditure of funds?

Responded highly favorable as more non-parents must be involved and corresponded with; new techniques must be employed.

Responded no change; not much effect. We're not too good at it.

Statement 16

Responded moderately unfavorable because community colleges have the know how to make community education look bad if we invade their territory. If we don't let them "do their thing" we may get "cut."

Statement 17

Responded moderately unfavorable because I do not agree that this will happen. Most four year institutions do not want nor are they capable to deal with the daily, "nitty gritty" of "real" world.

Responded no change; not the same as community colleges. Their function is better defined and less oriented to us.

Statement 18

Responded highly favorable because better and more efficient utilization of tax dollars and/or facilities, etc.

Responded highly favorable because it will be the base for a new philosophy of education.

Responded highly favorable; exciting and a must!

Responded moderately unfavorable because we don't know how to do this well. Government involvement has meant initial success but long range problems in my experience. The idea is still good though.
Statement 19

Responded moderately unfavorable; these services need to increase steadily, whether in consortia, or not!

Responded moderately favorable; better and more efficient utilization of tax dollars and/or facilities, etc.

Responded no change; do not see this happening. Districts afraid to cooperate with certain districts—busing, race, etc.

Responded moderately favorable; states will like this so long as we don't use it to get more state support (by going through poorer district). If that happens, mark me UUUF! because we will lose face!

Responded moderately favorable because we need to help each other.

Statement 20

Responded highly unfavorable because these are unrealistic expectations/requirements for adults.

Responded no change; we won't get the hassle on this one--I hope.

Responded no change; would we still believe amount of time spent more crucial than quality of time.

Statement 21

Responded moderately unfavorable; jury out—community school directors will have to work harder to solicit and maintain.

Responded no change; no change in attitude.

Statement 22

Responded highly favorable because source of assistance cuts way of meeting people's needs.

Responded highly favorable; one of our few "big chances" to show our stuff.

Responded highly favorable because we'll capitalize on strengths of others.

Statement 24

Responded moderately favorable; a good thing for wrong reason—availability of space.
Statement 24—Continued

Responded highly favorable; another big chance to capitalize for declining enrollment.

Statement 26

Responded no change but if we could make it happen we'd get some plusses.

Responded highly favorable; much needed.

Statement 27

Responded moderately unfavorable because each group will tend to put burden on other and no one will want it.

Responded no change but if we could make it happen we'd get some plusses.

Statement 28

Responded no change; I disagreed with this!

Responded no change but if we could make it happen we'd get some plusses.

Responded no change; if the community educator is important to the local school district he/she should be paid from local funds.

Statement 29

Responded no change but if we could make it happen, we'd get some plusses.

Responded moderately favorable especially for beginning districts.

Responded no change; if the community educator is important to the local school district, he/she should be paid from local funds.

Statement 32

Responded moderately favorable because "no" voters will see others paying their way and will like it. Those paying don't mind.

Responded moderately unfavorable; another choice in use of "pinched budgets."
Statement 33

Responded moderately unfavorable because state aid supports much of what we do. Without it, community education will decrease.

Responded highly unfavorable; must sell our constitutional and moral obligation to give everyone access to a good, free education.

Responded moderately favorable because this will force local commitment or kill the program.

Statement 34

Responded moderately favorable because with federal money most are happy.

Responded highly favorable because it will motivate some to get into the community education business and others to stay in it.

Responded moderately favorable; I really doubt this increase.

Statement 35

Responded moderately favorable because without some kind of support, community education will decrease.

Responded highly favorable because this required collaboration and communication; thus a plus.

Responded moderately favorable; doubtful.

Statement 36

Responded moderately unfavorable because they don't want more taxes. It will take higher taxes to do it--and thus hurt us.

Responded highly favorable if successful--shows a job is being done and a commitment made.

Responded highly favorable; must be if community education is to survive.
Appendix J

Delphi Study Panelists
Delphi Study Panelists
(in alphabetical order)

Dr. Duane Brown, Director
National Community Education Center
1017 Avon Street
Flint, Michigan

Representative Mary Brown
State Capitol Building
House of Representatives
Lansing, Michigan 48909

Dr. Richard Burke
Dean of Continuing Education
Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan

Dr. William Carmody
Michigan Department of Education
Adult and Continuing Education Services
P. O. Box 30008
Lansing, Michigan

Mr. Ray Ferrier
Divisional Director of Adult Education
5057 Woodward, Room 1216
Detroit, Michigan

Dr. Charles Field
Dean of Community Services and Continuing Education
Lake Michigan College
2755 East Napier
Benton Harbor, Michigan

Mr. John B. Garber, Director
Northern Michigan University
Center of Community Education
Learning Resources
Marquette, Michigan

Mrs. Jane Goodreault
Olivet Community Education
251 First Street
Olivet, Michigan

Mr. Phil Hartman
President Michigan School Community Education Association
G-3475 West Court Street
Flint, Michigan
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Dr. Howard Hickey  
Michigan State University  
Department of Educational Administration and Higher Education  
East Lansing, Michigan

Mr. Henry Houseman  
President Michigan Association of Public Adult Community Educators  
Portage Public Schools  
8111 South Westnedge  
Portage, Michigan

Ms. Margaret Maccardini  
Community School Director  
Grand Rapids Public Schools  
143 Bostwick Avenue, N.E.  
Grand Rapids, Michigan

Dr. Jack Minzey  
Department Chairman Educational Leadership  
Eastern Michigan University  
Center for Community Education  
101 Boone Hall  
Ypsilanti, Michigan

Mr. Terry Redman  
Community School Director  
720 East Main Street  
Niles, Michigan

Dr. Maurice Seay  
Professor Emeritus  
Western Michigan University  
4500 South Minges Road  
Battle Creek, Michigan

Mr. Douglas Smith  
Special Assistant to the Governor  
State Capitol Building  
Room 1  
Lansing, Michigan

Dr. Gary Sullenger  
State Aid Analyst for Michigan Senate  
Senate Office Building  
P. O. Box 30036  
Lansing, Michigan
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Dr. Curt Van Voorhees, Director
Office of Community Education Research
University of Michigan
3112 School of Education Building
Ann Arbor, Michigan

Dr. Tom Wagamon
State Aid Analyst for Michigan House
State Capitol Building
Michigan House of Representatives
Lansing, Michigan

Mr. Ken Walsh
Michigan Department of Education
Adult Basic Education Specialist
P. O. Box 30008
Lansing, Michigan

Dr. Don Weaver
Western Michigan University
Department of Community Education
Sangren Hall
Kalamazoo, Michigan

Dr. Norman P. Weinheimer
Executive Director Michigan Association of School Boards
421 West Kalamazoo
Lansing, Michigan

Mr. Edward Woods
Adult Education Director
Benton Harbor Area Schools
711 East Britain
Benton Harbor, Michigan
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Appendix K

Vita
November 21, 1948 . . . . . . . . . . Born—Brooklyn, New York

1969 . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . B.A.—Hunter College
New York City, New York
major: sociology
minor: elementary education

1969-1970 . . . . . . . . . . Elementary school teacher
(grade 2) Brooklyn, New York

1970-1971 . . . . . . . . . . Elementary school teacher
(grade 3) Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

1971-1977 . . . . . . . . . . Elementary school teacher
(grade 5) Berrien Springs, Michigan

1973 . . . . . . . . . . . . . M.A.—Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan
major: teacher education

1977 . . . . . . . . . . . . . Community Education Director
Berrien Springs, Michigan

1979 . . . . . . . . . . . . . Ed.D.—Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan
major: educational leadership