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Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

The concept of Community Education has been steadily filtering onto the American educational scene. This concept recognizes the fact that community education is not only limited to educational opportunity, but is one which attempts to have a significant impact upon a person's life opportunities in relation to his social, recreational, and cultural enrichment, as well as his academic endeavors. In this sense, Community Education can be the vehicle whereby many of the services of a community are generated and coordinated.

Since Community Education has earned financial backing and assistance from federal, state, and local appropriations in many states, it can indeed be considered the education of the future. Even though recent attention and recognition has focused upon this concept, there is still a definite concern that has surfaced. Most sources tend to agree that Community Education has not stabilized to the point where Community Education advocates, educators, and lay citizens are in total agreement as to the definition, process, and conceptual framework of the Community Education philosophy.

It was the purpose of this study to not only define this elusive concept, but to determine the status of Community Education in the metropolitan area of Clark County, Nevada, during the 1976-77 academic year. If the state of Nevada is striving to improve the
utilization of all resources with broad opportunities for local residents to identify and meet their needs and wants, as well as work toward solving pertinent community problems, then a cooperative and communicating effort needs to be established between organizations to stimulate both personal and group community improvement.

This study was intended to assist the people in the metropolitan area of Clark County, Nevada, by examining the current status of Community Education, preparing a summary, drawing conclusions, and making recommendations needed to formulate an effective community effort. Even though some personal interpretations have been inserted, each reader is encouraged to critically analyze the data collected and form his/her own opinion of the information presented.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to investigate and survey the status of Community Education in the metropolitan area of Clark County, Nevada during the 1976-77 academic year. It was limited to programs, and/or courses offered, a cost analysis, personnel involved, the use of a needs assessment, and the people actively enrolled in the programs.

Rationale for the Study

In our society, it is apparent that the public schools have been called upon to solve many of our social problems, as well as offer an academic curriculum. Since schools cannot meet all of society's expectations pertaining to recreational, cultural, academic,
and social wants and needs, extensive involvement of other groups, institutions, etc., is needed to meet these expressed expectations.

Through the Community Education process, opportunities for all citizens to be involved in helping coordinate the community's educational efforts are possible or can exist. The coordination can help all people to more nearly achieve their full potential.

The citizens of Nevada own millions of dollars worth of public facilities and equipment. The Community Education process can make definite expansion of these facilities and equipment, especially in Clark County where most of the population is located.

A Community Education process within Clark County, Nevada, can provide a variety of educational, recreational, cultural, and social learning experiences for all children, youth, and adults. This process can have a positive affect on the lives of all persons of all ages within the community. This can be accomplished through the support and promotion of the following:

1. The expansion of continuing adult and vocational education programs.

2. The improvement of cultural and recreational opportunities for all members of the community.

3. The improvement of environmental conditions in the home, school, and community.

4. The expansion of cooperative efforts between institutions of the community through maximum utilization of programs, courses, and facilities.

Within the metropolitan area of Clark County, Nevada, many
public agencies maintain educational, cultural, recreational, and social programs in isolation. Through proper dissemination of information and cooperation among these agencies, duplication of programs and services can be reduced. This, in turn, will offer the expansion of new areas or programs.

This rationale and supportive statements for Community Education are not only applicable to this study, but are endorsed by the Nevada Department of Education and its Community Education Service Team.¹

Significance of the Study

This study represented a cooperative venture between the investigator, the Nevada Department of Education, the Clark County Community College, the Continuing Education Department of the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, and the Baker Park Community School Recreation Center. As the initial study conducted in the area of Community Education within the metropolitan area of Clark County, Nevada, this study should serve as a stimulus for future research.

This study should prove successful in procuring information by which valuable insight might be gained into the initial steps toward determining the status of and need for Community Education within Clark County. It might then provide an opportunity for citizens to democratically be involved in helping determine the function and destiny of the community's education.

¹Nevada Department of Education Service Team, "Rationale and Supportive Statements for Community Education," August, 1976. (Handout at Advisory Council meeting.)
Definition of Terms

Definitions of terms utilized within this study were as follows:

Community Education . . . A cooperative community involvement process, including but not limited to the identification, development, and utilization of all applicable human, financial, and physical resources to meet people's identified academic, recreational, cultural, and social needs.

Cooperating Center . . . An agency or institution that works in concert with Regional Centers to disseminate information and provide direct assistance regarding Community Education. These may be located within state departments of education, universities, or colleges.

Model . . . A worthy example; pattern; or standard.

Needs . . . A discrepancy between conditions as they actually exist in a community at a given point in time and the desired conditions the community expects.

Process . . . An activity or course of action that attempts to organize and activate each community so that it more nearly reaches its potential for democratic involvement and development.

Regional Center . . . One of fifteen (15) Community Education centers that provide training and technical assistance relative to Community Education development. The fifteen Regional Centers are all located on university or college campuses.

Resource . . . Physical buildings, money, and human talent which might be utilized to meet a community need.2

Assumptions and Limitations

The following assumptions were made in designing this study:

1. There are distinct factors which are related to the success of community involvement and a Community Education program.

2. These factors can be recorded, and the results as to the success of a program and/or courses can be tabulated with conclusions drawn from these results.

These limitations were deemed restrictive by the writer in generalizing the findings of this study to a nationwide population:

1. The study was dependent upon information received and programs offered during the 1976-77 academic year from the Clark County Community College, the Continuing Education Department of the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, Baker Park Community School Recreation Center, and information supplied by the Nevada Department of Education.

2. There was no attempt to design a study that could be applied to an area other than the metropolitan area of Clark County, Nevada. Though it is possible that the results of this study may have promise for other areas or populations, the results, conclusions, and recommendations apply only to this area.

Organization of the Study

The introduction, statement of the problem, rationale for the study, significance of the study, definitions of terms, and assumptions and limitations of the study were presented in this chapter. The related literature pertaining to the topic of Community Education is presented in Chapter 2. Chapter 3 contains the methods and procedures utilized while collecting data for the study. (Appendices showing the data collected from participating organizations appear in Chapter 4.)
Analysis of the study, conclusions, and recommendations drawn from the data collected are discussed in Chapter 4.

Summary

The main purpose of this study was to investigate and survey the status of Community Education in the metropolitan area of Clark County, Nevada, limited to programs or courses offered, funding, personnel, use of needs assessment, and people enrolled in the programs. The organizations involved with the study were the Nevada State Department of Education, Clark County Community College, the Continuing Education Department of the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, and Baker Park Community School Recreation Center.

Rationale for the study included the identification of various factors that could possibly relate to the success of a Community Education program involving citizens within the metropolitan area. These factors were utilized as a means to meet the educational, recreational, cultural, and social needs of people in a community.

Significance of the study lay in the fact that such a study would provide new and useful information for the institutions involved, the community as a whole, and any others who have an interest in the concept of Community Education.

Definitions of terms used in the study were provided to clarify some of the relevant concepts, as well as to add continuity to the understanding and structure of the research involved.

Analysis of the study, the conclusions drawn, and recommendations made, were limited to the precise conditions and locale described, since the investigation was of a descriptive, rather than a statistical nature.
Chapter 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The literature reviewed for this study was divided into the following categories: (1) early development and history of the Community Education concept, (2) current strategies in Community Education, (3) leadership role in Community Education, and (4) Community Education in Nevada.

**Early Development and History of the Community Education Concept**

The current concept of Community Education has developed over years of experience with school and nonschool agencies that have performed various educational functions for the people of communities. Originally, the American school grew because of the desire of communities to formalize the teachings of home and church by providing opportunities for teachers to guide and stimulate the instruction of their children.

However, as the communities grew, the demands upon parents, teachers, and community leaders grew in proportion, thus creating a more complex situation. Not only did the community have to offer an increase of programs within its public school system, but community leaders felt that they should meet the educational needs of all people in their social and vocational relationships, and at all possible ages of their lives.
As a whole, the American people throughout history have believed in education. As leaders, citizens, and voters, they have called upon our schools to guarantee a way of life that is the best for everyone. In return, the educational leaders have responded with a variety of programs and reform movements that were intended to provide a better life for all.

From 1914 to 1917, the nation was involved in a war that was to make the world "safe for democracy." It was during the post-World War I period that educator Joseph S. Hart wrote in his Discovery of Intelligence: "Education is not apart from life. . . . The democratic problem in education is not primarily a problem of training children; it is a problem of making a community [1924, p. 382]."^3

With the stock market collapse in 1929 and the Great Depression of the 1930's, educators, supervisors, and superintendents became well acquainted with the concepts of twentieth-century educational reform. At this time, the public was rewarded with journalistic attention focusing upon experimental programs and innovative ideas which were considered evidence of professional competence. The country was partially paralyzed by the economic disaster; thus, out of economic necessity, educators and all citizens were forced into a situation of resourcefulness and inventiveness which they could apply to their immediate vicinities. During this historic era, the community became a setting for a human struggle to survive.

During this time, many of our nation's communities began to

look to the schools for leadership. The education system had the buildings and equipment conveniently located for family usage and a staff of teachers and administrators somewhat acquainted with innovation. Therefore, educators and the public began planning and utilizing their combined resources to solve arising community problems.

The residents of cities began to view school-community cooperation not only as a helping hand, but as an educational necessity. Paul J. Misner, one of the early proponents of Community Education, described his Community Education center of the mid-1930's, in Glencoe, Illinois, as including in its membership all the persons living within the community. This Community Education center provided the means by which "the needs and responsibilities of the community may be formulated in relation to the demands of a changing civilization for the continuous growth and enrichment of children and adults in the Glencoe community [Samuel Everett, 1938, The Community School, p. 80]."^4

In Everett's 1938 report of community school programs he discussed the significance of the growing community school concept when he stated,

An analysis of the programs presented in this book indicates that an acceptance of the community approach to education involved the acceptance of fundamental positions in both educational and social theory. . . . All life is educative. . . . Education requires participation. . . . Adults and children have fundamental common purposes in both work and play. . . . Public-school systems should be primarily concerned with the improvement of community living and the improvement of the social order [pp. 435-42].^5

^4Ibid., p. 22.

^5Ibid., p. 29.
It was also during this time that Frank J. Manley, nationally recognized as the originator of the Community School concept, had joined the Flint, Michigan public school system as a physical education instructor. It was not unusual for him to see youngsters playing in the city streets while the playgrounds were not only empty, but were closed and considered forbidden territory. Manley had an idea which one day he expressed to Charles Stewart Mott, millionaire philanthropist, auto pioneer, and large stockholder in the General Motors Corporation. During the now-legendary tennis match in which Manley and Mott were engaged on the court behind Mott's English-styled home in the center of Flint, Michigan, Mott first became interested in the concept of Community Education. Thus, Manley's role in securing financial assistance from Mott and in planting the seed nurturing the early developments in the Flint community schools has become well known.6

While these leaders, whose names have become synonymous with the early concept of Community Education, were beginning their work, there were countless others working in classrooms and administrative positions implementing an idea which was based upon economic emergency as well as educational and philosophical idealism. This American ingenuity in regards to a "new" educational concept characterized the period of the 1930's.

During the national emergency of World War II, a large number of communities in the United States responded with school-community cooperation and unity. Citizens discovered that school personnel

could effectively handle the rationing of food and gasoline. Under direct persuasion from the people, schools began to stay open for adult evening classes and volunteer war service projects. School libraries began to serve all members of the community, regardless of their age.

Once again, the community school and education concept began to move forward in a time of national emergency. As a result of the cooperative effort and educational possibilities displayed by these communities, social leaders and philanthropists directly assisted the effort by enlisting the help of governmental units, national educational associations, and other social and educational agencies, in promoting the community school idea.

It was also at this time that an article, written by Howard Y. McClusky of the University of Michigan, held special interest because of the light it threw upon the budding nature of the Community Education concept. The article, entitled "The School in the Community," was written just before World War II, but its significance was not fully realized by educators until the 1940's. In it, McClusky wrote:

To fasten the whole burden of education on the school is to delegate to a part of society that which only society as a whole can achieve. . . . This . . . does not propose that the functions which society is trying to pass on to the school are not legitimate objects of education, nor does it mean that the school should not share some responsibility for them. It merely illuminates the nature of the relationship which the school should maintain. To elaborate: The school may well be the most important single agency in society to improve the community, but the primary function of the school should be that of helping the community to help itself. The community school then becomes the instrument whereby the superior resources of the community are mobilized for self-improvement. It becomes a catalytic agent and coordinator. It would help the community discover, funnel its power into extra-school
agencies. Thus, the school must work IN and WITH the community and only FOR the community when it can contribute some unique service which no other agency possesses [1953, pp. 150-151].

From this post-World War II era, there also emerged a new evaluation of adult learning. It was fully recognized that adults belong to a social organization, are tool-using, and belong to a family. Adults are definitely capable of learning a second language, forming a new social life, and procuring a new set of tools or traits that may be profoundly different in kind from the first learning as a child. In Community Education, it was then important to discover which parts of a person's life are concrete and unchangeable and which parts can be seen as interchangeable. The conclusion can be drawn that the immediate postwar years of the late 1940's saw an expanding development of interest in the community school which justified reference to a nationwide community school movement.

During the late 1940's and early 1950's, enrollment reports from local schools concerning adult education were often astounding. Doubled and tripled enrollments within a one-year period were a common story, and boards of education suddenly began to increase funds, facilities, and leadership. Because of inadequate provisions for gathering data pertaining to enrollment and other pertinent data on a nationwide basis, exact statistics were unknown at the time. However, the most comprehensive study of public-school adult education ever conducted reported an increase in enrollment of 51 percent from

---

7Seay, p. 25.

1947 to 1951, with the total enrollment in 1951 in public school adult-education activities estimated to be approximately 4,750,000

The rapid growth in adult education during the early 1950's resulted more from public demand than from external promotion. Adult programs within the community grew because of pressure from the people, not because big money for new programs was available.

This sudden hunger for learning among adults arose primarily from four major causes:

1. **Rise in Educational Level.** As the general educational level rose decade after decade, more adults began to realize the value of a further or higher education. Many adults who dropped out of school returned to finish their education. Often, this return was caused by the commercial advantages of having a diploma, although other considerations also must be taken into account. Evidence was clear at this time that the more education adults have, the more they want; for those with education will usually recognize its intrinsic value. Thus, as more people become familiar with educational processes, more will have the desire to continue their education throughout life, hopefully producing a nation with a growing interest in lifelong learning.

2. **Demands of the Changing Culture.** Adults were becoming more aware of the accelerating tempo of modern life and of the value

---

of education in helping them to adjust to the cultural changes taking place. Within their generation, many adults lived through two world wars, an economic depression, European unrest, the struggle of people in underdeveloped areas, the Korean conflict, and other postwar events, all of which had an effect on a change in lifestyle.

As expected, more people began to recognize that they did have some control over events, and by thinking, studying, and learning, they could make the world a better place in which to live. With new problems to solve, they found that they could no longer depend upon the past knowledge built up in youth, but had to create new solutions to old and new problems by continuing to learn throughout life.

3. The Influence of War. During World War II, more adults engaged in the learning process than at any previous time in history. Millions of men and women found that they, as adults, could learn, adjust, and adapt to new situations. They gained a new appreciation of the benefits which they could reap through adult education. Millions more had to engage in new learning incidents because of occupational shifts accompanying the reconversion to a peacetime economy, with the industrial and economic mobilization following the Korean outbreak calling for still further education.

4. The Need for Human Association. Industrialization, urbanization, increased mobility, reduction of family size, fragmentation of family life, and other related social and economic circumstances increase loneliness among adults. In a world that is constantly changing, educational programs are helping many people of all ages to maintain contact with the culture of their times and avoid psychological and social isolation. Because of this, people are finding personal
satisfaction and mental health through participating in educational
groups and programs which will provide commendable reasons for
companionship.  \(^{10}\)

Even though the early 1950's produced a dramatic upswing in adults furthering their education, the later 1950's began to show an increasing polarization of viewpoints. Russia's launching of Sputnik produced fear reactions in the United States, and pressure began to mount from the citizens who thought that the schools should be more accountable. At this time, financial incentives were also used to increase the number of scientists and mathematicians to be prepared in the schools. Minority groups were beginning to be recognized, with the self-conscious understanding of the fact that male and female were equally human and the elderly being depicted in a newly humanitarian way. The social upheaval of the 1960's demonstrated the fact that the political and economic views of the American people were beginning to pull away from the center and group toward extreme opposite ends.

The polarization of educational viewpoints became recognizable by the fact that one influential group of leaders in government, business, and industry was demanding that education serve the national needs in areas of better defense, bigger technology, and an increase in the gross national product. Another group of influential leaders represented humanitarian interests, such as civil rights and ecology, while trying to persuade the public to take a stand toward a more

\(^{10}\) Ibid., pp. 9-10.
humanistic point of view. These leaders attempted to transmit to educational circles that humane values in American society were just as important as technological skills.

Humanitarian issues and humane values were a definite concern of the community school. Community and educational leaders turned to the community school as an answer to the mounting and increasingly complex problems that were arising within society. By the period of the 1960's, many communities had become urbanized, and their members were expecting much more in the line of educational services for all people throughout their life cycle. Many community agencies, at this time, aimed their educational programs toward the diverse needs within the community.

The community-school concept has always claimed to recognize programs of other educational agencies within the community, but in the 1960's educators began to view the school as only one educational agency among many. Community and educational leaders began to look upon education as a comprehensive social institution. The leaders now saw that the time had come for the school-centered concept to grow into a true community-education concept. 11

Current Strategies in Community Education

From past experience, we have come to realize that the development of Community Education is an evolutionary process which must begin and grow through the involvement of all the people to be affected by it. Educational and community leaders have come to realize

that common problems can be identified and resolved through members of the community, and that worthwhile programs will develop from community needs. It is imperative to know exactly what the community is and any variables within it that will directly affect a program's progress and growth. The acquisition of this knowledge will require a sophisticated assessment of the community, as well as a basic understanding of community structure and organization. A common problem of the 1970's is that the assessment stage is often ignored, or, at best, done poorly and thus given rather limited attention and consideration.

The importance of this assessment in community development and organization is essential if we are to believe the comments of Nelson, Ramsey, and Verner in their book, *Community Structure and Change*:

> Social change is not introduced in a vacuum but in a structure of human relationships, a veritable network of subtle and yet undeniable forces operating to maintain the status quo. Without a thorough assessment of these dimensions and elements, the success of a community development program is left to chance and probably doomed to failure.\(^\text{12}\)

Most community assessments done in the past were a summation of a variety of data gathered through some type of survey. Information, for example, is collected on economic levels of community members, educational levels, age, race, sex, population growth, etc. Even though there is no question that information of this type may prove to be very valuable in understanding the community to be served, a competent community assessment must also recognize that the community

shares certain beliefs, values, and needs that ultimately will affect the community goals.

There is no doubt that the period of the 1970's has produced more leisure time in our society than ever before. For some people, however, this has created a problem, for they do not know how to profitably fill this free time. Many educational administrators have felt that they have found an adequate solution to this problem by establishing a wide variety of programs. The market for such programs and what they have to offer the public has become saturated. Community Education in the future may offer a solution to this predicament by eliminating overlapping programs, coordinating existing programs, and getting more and better usage out of community facilities and state and federal funds.

If Community Education is to be a success now and in the future, some definitive, basic, prime goals need to be formulated.

Donald F. Staffo, in an article entitled, "Examining the Merits for Community Education," states that the prime goals of Community Education are:

1. To eliminate the repetition, duplication, and overlapping of programs. Efforts should be made to see that various groups, clubs, and organizations are not performing or fulfilling similar functions and thus competing for the same people. When you have only one program of its kind offered, you will reach, attract, and meet the needs and interests of more people. When you have several organizations offering similar experiences, each group is in competition with each other. Each organization will reach only a few people comparatively and yet presume itself to be effective.

The key to solving this dilemma is cooperation and coordination. Everyone must work together for the good of the community. One thought might be to create a coordinating agency which would establish roles and functions for groups,
organizations, and clubs. One thrust of community education then is the coordination of existing programs, elimination of overlapping programs, and the establishment of needed programs where none now exist.

2. To get the maximum use out of community facilities. Schools obviously offer the best overall facilities. However, in many cases these buildings are closed to the public in the evenings. Realistically, it can get quite expensive to use a school after hours on a regular basis when you must pay union custodians overtime merely to unlock the door for your group to enter and then lock up after you leave. This is one obstacle which has to be overcome. Arrangements could possibly be made for the group to use the school free of charge or for a nominal fee with the group supervisor being held accountable and totally responsible for the entire situation. It is quite obvious that each time a building is used after hours there will be additional expenses (lights, heating, etc.). To eliminate these problems the community as a whole must unite behind a common purpose to combine and shore its money, facilities and workstaff. Then you will begin to really meet the needs and interests of people--and you will save money too! This leads directly to another aim of community education.

3. To get your full share of whatever state or federal funds are available to you. One large program or agency would qualify for substantial amounts of money from the local, state, and national level under such classifications as delinquency prevention, youth services, education, recreation, and drug rehabilitation. However, when organizations apply for money separately, each group qualifies for relatively little funding. If and when this money is used to sponsor an activity which is already being carried on by another club, it is not put to its best use.

4. To create activity programs for all age groups. Quality programs can and should be offered to adults just as they are offered to children. In most cases the adults are much more appreciative of this opportunity to participate in planned programming since the youngsters already have many of these things available to them in school.

5. To get the citizens to identify and solve their own problems. The local citizen should be contacted, urged to enumerate on their problems. Later, they could be invited to take part in the evaluation, critique, and follow-up procedures.13

---

When reviewing the primary goals of Community Education, one has to remember that the guidelines can be applied to any situation, whether it be a small town or large city. Just a few years ago, there were only a few educators that knew and understood what the term "Community Education" meant. There were even fewer having the knowledge necessary to implement such a program. During the 1970's, the concept has begun to receive national visibility.

The development of the goals of Community Education essential to the survival of the concept have, for the most part, been established. One important question has been surfacing, however, and that is why the phenomenal rate of growth took place during the late 1960's and the 1970's.

Jack Minzey, in his article entitled, "Community Education: An Amalgam of Many Views," offers some possible answers to this question. The article points out that major demographic and sociological changes have drastically brought about public concern for various problems and attempts to provide solutions. At times, the success in dealing with the problems has been minimal.

Urbanization in the United States has meant that fewer citizens are able to make decisions and participate actively in their governance. There is a loss of a feeling of community as people lose their identity in the crowd. Problems such as crime, delinquency, drugs, poverty, and unemployment have increased at such an alarming rate that many cities are unable to cope with them.

Those educators and public leaders who have been exposed to Community Education, however, feel that the implementation of this
concept could make an important impact on solving the above-noted problems. They see the concept as a means of dividing large cities into smaller units that would foster an interaction among the people who live there. In these smaller areas, it would then be possible to involve the people in problem-solving techniques and create a positive atmosphere of community belonging. With this community base, the people should be better equipped to attack their social problems and establish a personal identity along with community spirit.

Another reason for interest in Community Education during the late 1960's through the mid-1970's was dissatisfaction with the public schools as they were operating. Public schools speak of community involvement, but to many this involvement seems superficial. The schools state that their goal is to educate students for life. Yet, according to Minzey, the curriculum may do little to prepare students for future employment, appreciation of, or living within a community. The schools may believe that education is a lifelong endeavor, yet they act as though the educational process is terminated with the public-school experience.\(^\text{14}\)

If one accepts the facts that these problems do exist and that Community Education is a possible solution, then the future must be established on the premise that people must be involved in community decisions that affect them. Many educators feel that if community education is committed to only providing program opportunities and not

\(^{14}\text{Jack Minzey, "Community Education: An Amalgam of Many Views," }\text{Phi Delta Kappan (November, 1972), 150-3.}\)
providing problem-solving and involvement opportunities, it will fail.

Many proponents of Community Education feel that education must become what former President Lyndon Johnson foresaw when he stated:

"Tomorrow's school will be a school without walls—a school built of doors which open to the entire community. Tomorrow's school will reach out to places that enrich the human spirit; to the museums, to the theaters, to the art galleries, to the parks and rivers, and mountains. . . . Tomorrow's school will be the center of community life for grownups as well as children, as shopping centers for human services. It might have a community health clinic or public library, a theater and recreation facilities for all citizens—and it will not close its doors anymore at 3 o'clock. It will employ its buildings around the clock, its teachers around the year. We just cannot afford to have an $85 billion plant in this country open less than 30 percent of the time."

Leadership Role in Community Education

If the community education concept is to prosper and flourish as intended, a leadership role needs to be defined before a program can be implemented. Whether the leader is identified as the director, coordinator, or administrator, traits need to be identified, policy formation established, and problems and practices outlined. Since the director of Community Education will be the key person in the future development of the program, and the success of the program may be dependent upon the characteristics of the individual involved, great care should be taken in the selection of the Community Education director.

Most educators agree that certain identifiable personal traits should be sought in the selection of a director. A competent director

\[15\] Minzey and LeTarte, pp. 273-4.
should be a highly motivated individual who has a reputation for achieving his goals. The individual should be task-oriented so that his goals will take precedence over his time. He should work well with all types of people, and be able to establish positive rapport in a short period of time. The individual should be a competent administrator who is able to organize, plan, execute, and delegate. He should be able to relate well to children, youth, and adults. Also, he should possess the type of leadership characteristics which will make it possible for him to play either an active or passive role, dependent upon what is needed to bring the various aspects of the community into successful interaction.

In 1970, Blue generated a doctoral study regarding the director's selected role in Community Education, possible areas of role conflict, and conflict resolution. As a result of his findings, Blue suggested that:

1. The different expectations which related others have of the community school director should be examined within the field of the goals and objectives of Community Education and prioritized with the appropriate administrative adjustments being made.

2. Areas of potential conflict should be considered by those in authority in order to reduce friction and further refine the role of the community school director. Also directors themselves should be aware of potential areas of conflict taking appropriate steps to reduce them.

3. Regardless of the demands made upon by related others, the superordinate referrent group should be streamlined so that the community school director will not be responsible to so many individual groups.

4. Once priorities have been established for the role of the community school director, they should be communicated speedily to all groups of related others.
5. Communication between the director and all groups at the building level needs improvement.

6. There must be an ongoing evaluation of the programs initiated by the director to determine if the goals of Community Education are being realized and to provide feedback to the director so that he may adjust his responsibilities in furthering these goals.

7. The content of the training programs for community school directors must be geared to the goals of Community Education and to the role expectations of the director and related others.16

Because leadership is vital to the success of the Community Education concept, one needs to be acquainted with basic leadership style and theory. The human relations movement of the late 1920's and early 1930's had a profound effect on leadership theory. From early experiments, three types of leadership style arose: (1) the authoritarian leader, who will remain aloof from the group and guide group activities by issuing direct orders, (2) the democratic leader, who will offer encouragement and suggestions as well as participate in group activities, and (3) the laissez-faire leader who will supply information to the group members but show little emotional involvement, and will not participate in group activities.17

Another early concept of leadership style was developed by the German sociologist, Max Weber (1864-1920).

According to this view, the three styles of leadership are traditional, charismatic, and rational. Traditional leadership is leadership that is given to someone because people


expect leadership from him, not because of the official organization structure. He will provide a very personal, paternalistic style of leadership. Instead of giving direct orders, the traditional leader often achieves his ends through the means of giving his "advice" which is frequently sought.

A charismatic leader is one who acquires leadership through his own personal qualities of popularity or personal magnetism. Accordingly, the leadership style is intensely personal, with the followers assuming the role of devoted disciples of the idealized person of the leader.

The rational leader is a leader only through his official position in an organization. The rational leader follows rules, regulations, and policies and expects others to do the same. To the rational leader, authority, responsibility, and standard operating procedures are very important. He "goes by the book" and requires his subordinates to do likewise.18

Three additional styles of leader behavior can be identified following the Getzels and Guba (1957) theory of administration. The nomothetic style emphasizes institutional or organizational expectations. The idiographic style of leadership stresses the individual and the personality, while the transactional style focuses attention on the institution and the individual, placing greater emphasis upon one or the other depending upon the situation.19

Even though one may be acquainted with the various styles of leadership previously noted, there is another way to view the leadership concept. It is possible to study leadership by observing what the leader does, instead of what he is. If one accepts this theory, various characteristics applicable to a specific position can be learned through training. By learning these new traits and adapting

18 Ibid., pp. 312-3.
them to the job, leadership may prove to be more productive because of the modification or change in people's behavior.

Leadership being a strong requisite for the implementation of any concept, Community Education has proven to be most successful where duties and positions have been defined and filled with trained and knowledgeable personnel. The title of the position may not be too important, as it varies from place to place; but the responsibilities should be consistent. Dependent upon the type of community in which the concept is implemented, the job description should be as close as possible to the following outline.

Duties of the Community Education Director are:

1. Accountability objective. Under the direction of the Community Education Council, the responsibility of the director is to administer, coordinate, and supervise the adult basic educational program, adult high school completion program, community service, recreational, and enrichment programs. He is under the direction of and responsible to the superintendent of schools on all school-related matters.

   The director will have the responsibility of the community calendar and be responsible for coordinating the use of school facilities with day and evening programs. The director shall evaluate and assess existing community education program activities to determine their effectiveness and to make recommendations to the Community Education Council for future programs.

2. Nature of position. The community education director shall be responsible for the supervision and coordination of all adult education programs. This includes employing, assigning and discharging instructors with the help of the administrative assistant.

   The director shall observe classes to assess the effectiveness of all programs, and it will be his responsibility to see that there is a quality instructional program.

   The community education director shall be responsible to prepare a budget and to submit the budget to the Community Education Council for its approval. After budget adoption, it is the responsibility of the director to see that the
expenditures stay within the budgeted amounts. The director will be responsible for all state and federal reports, financial and otherwise.

The community education director shall determine the needed supplies and materials and see that they are ordered by the administrative assistant. The equipment and other large expenditures needed for programs must have the approval of the superintendent and the Community Education Council before they are ordered.

The community education director shall work closely with the principals and coordinate the use of all school facilities with the day programs. The principals have the responsibility of scheduling the facilities for the day program and submitting their schedule of needs of evening programs to the community education director.

The community education director has the responsibility to notify the respective custodians of the use of school facilities after the regular school day. It shall be the responsibility of the director to keep the principals and superintendent informed of the ongoing programs and to make recommendations to the Community Education Council for the need of future programs.

The community education director shall have the responsibility for working with the recreation director and youth center director in implementing community recreational and youth center programs. The director of recreational programs and the youth center director will have the responsibility of the programs under the direction of the community education director.

The community education director shall assess the community as to the needs for programs. These programs will include social and community problems as well as enrichment and educational programs.

3. Principal activities. The community education director shall (a) be responsible for adult basic educational programs, adult high school completion program, enrichment programs, community recreational and service programs, and other programs needed in the community and approved by the Community Education Council; (b) be responsible for the counseling of adults as to their individual needs to complete their education; (c) be responsible for employing and supervising instructors needed for the approved programs; (d) be responsible to see that the facilities and equipment are properly taken care of when being used by the community education program; (e) be responsible for coordinating the
community education calendar between day programs as well as night programs; (f) be available to work with administrators of schools and other educational agencies in developing and coordinating total community education programs; (g) be knowledgeable about the trends in community education and be responsible to see that the school district takes advantage of any program that would be of value to the community; (h) be responsible for all reports and applications; (i) be responsible for the ordering of supplies and materials for the community education programs; (j) work closely with the superintendent of schools in developing and coordinating the community education programs and submitting to the Community Education Council all programs for approval; (k) be responsible for other assigned duties.20

The position of director should facilitate leadership in the initiation and continuing administration of the program in any type or size of community. The previously-mentioned job description or duties should also be consistent at any level.

Once a director is selected and a Community Education program is initiated, peculiar and unusual demands may be placed upon a district's administrative apparatus. Some assumptions discussed by Harold E. Moore concerning the characteristics and goals of an effective organization include:

- Reliance on democratically established goals, and a viable philosophy should be substituted, in the main, for the authority-oriented approach.

- The administrative staff should be an "open" one, not fearing change or challenge.

- The administrative climate should reflect the philosophy of community education, using a problem-solving approach.

- A flat and flexible administrative organization, in contrast to a vertical one, offers the best promise.

20Seay, pp. 159-61.
- The individual school and community must be seen as an educational unit, with freedom to adapt to the needs of the local area and delegated authority commensurate with assigned responsibility.

- Administration should recognize that not all wisdom is found in the administrative staff but is liberally possessed by laymen and the teaching staff.

- Increasingly, decisions should be made by those possessing the competence to do so, not merely the rank or position.

- Leadership should bring people, ideas, and resources together to produce an optimum opportunity for all learners.

The principal problems involved in developing an administrative structure with such characteristics and goals are fear of and resistance to change and the nature of preparation programs of which most administrators are products.²¹

From the evidence presented, one can conclude that the director or coordinator is the key to the development of the Community Education project. If no one person is assigned the task, then it is likely that no one will assume the responsibility.

The responsibility assigned to the director may seem overwhelming and appear too large for one person. However, if the director fully understands and assumes his role, his task will be somewhat lightened.

The director is described by many as an encourager or initiator. These terms are appropriate, for his job is to encourage individuals, groups, agencies, and institutions to get involved. He is also the initiator of programs and projects by planning, organizing, marshaling, and implementing. He gets totally involved. He is the agent who gets people and organizations moving, thus providing the key to success.

The task of the director is basically to broaden involvement within the community. Each new task he faces must be analyzed as to the role he must play and the role of the individuals or groups involved. The relationship between a time element and an involvement element must be assessed, with the decision made that people will be directly involved in as short a time as possible.

As a director, he must assess and assemble all the available resources, and then develop each to its greatest potential in the Community Education project. A good example of broadening community involvement and utilizing resources is in the planning and conducting of a survey or needs assessment. This assessment would prove to be valuable in gathering data, but this value will be almost outweighed by the involvement element of the venture. The director or coordinator does not need to write the instrument; he can gather a group of volunteers with whom he works. They, as a group, can decide what needs to be known about the community, what types of questions need to be asked, what type of instrument is needed, and from this, what types of programs need to be developed.

The success of the director may depend upon his ability to initiate an idea and then join as a partner. He must be a doer, yet have the conceptual skills necessary to understand when to assume a task and when he should involve others.

There is likely to be an increasing need for Community Education leadership, with possible pressure placed upon colleges and universities to develop training programs at the master's- and doctoral-degree levels. Therefore, anyone interested in this type of position would be well advised to examine emerging models and to focus attention
on the necessary training components. It is also necessary to review current training strategies such as case studies, laboratory exercises, simulation, and internships which are applicable to the training of the Community Education leaders needed for the future.

Community Education in Nevada

Confusion in Nevada regarding the concept of Community Education has often led to fragmented efforts to implement a program. Various examples throughout Nevada have produced or increased conflicts and conceptual differences among school administrators, teachers, community colleges, adult educators, recreation and park personnel, social service staffs, and others. 22

For Community Education to gain widespread acceptance in the state, many conceptual disagreements between Community Education advocates, educators, and lay citizens need to be cleared. Many of these disagreements may be justifiable; therefore, it is necessary that these misunderstandings be discussed.

Many envision Community Education as a series of programs that simply keep the schools open at night. Of equal importance is the development of a process by which members of a community learn to work together to identify problems and seek out solutions to those problems. Others see Community Education as a post-secondary program or a community college. But Community Education addresses itself to the total community. Therefore, the process may be directed to the needs of the unborn, pre-school, youth, adults, senior citizens, minorities, and the disadvantaged. Cooperation with other educational institutions is sought and utilized in meeting the needs of the community. Still others say Community Education is a public relations gimmick. However, Community Education provides an

22 Many ideas set forth in this section are from the author's involvement as a member of the Community Education Advisory Council.
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opportunity for the community to share in the decision-making process. People do not need to be sold on educational activities, they need to be involved! As a final example, some say that Community Education in Nevada is a religious movement. This misconception stems from the fact that the Rocky Mountain Regional Center, located at Brigham Young University, is the coordinating institution for Community Education in Nevada. Community Education is concerned about people, not creeds. The Regional Center is aware of this misunderstanding and in all instances attempts to dispel this feeling.23

Because of these mounting fallacies concerning the Community Education concept, the Nevada Department of Education, through its Community Education Service Team, was to conduct an awareness program in each of the seventeen Nevada county school districts. Since the Nevada Department of Education received a grant under the Community School Act of 1974 (P.L. 93-380) to work in partnership with the public schools, the awareness program was to assess the status of and the need for Community Education on a statewide basis.

The Community Education Service Team extended invitations to all county superintendents to meet with them, beginning October 6, 1976 and concluding November 19, 1976. During this time, the Service Team visited fourteen of the seventeen county school districts. The remaining three districts were unable to meet during this time because of conflicts in scheduling or travel. During these meetings, Community Education was discussed with thirteen superintendents and thirty-one other members of the districts' administrative staffs. The Service Team developed a report of its findings (see Appendix A).

During this same period of time, the Nevada Department of Education appointed twelve people to serve on the Advisory Council

The Nevada Community Education Advisory Council was to serve in an advisory capacity to the Nevada Department of Education to provide advice and make recommendations affecting the total planning of Community Education activities within the State Department. The Council was also to be concerned with the broad range of individual needs within communities and the extent to which the needs were being met. In addition, the Advisory Council was to review, evaluate, and advise the Nevada Department of Education concerning:

1. Community Education needs in the State of Nevada.
2. Yearly objectives and activities of the Community Education Service Team.
4. Statewide evaluation of Community Education.
5. Reports of Community Education efforts.
6. Applications for grants in Community Education.
7. Resources available in Community Education.

Even though the meetings during the 1976-77 academic year proved to be successful, a letter from John R. Gamble, Superintendent of Public Instruction, stated the following:

"The Nevada Department of Education was informed by the United States Office of Education, late in September, that its FY 1977-1978 Community Education Grant proposal had been reconsidered for funding. Negotiations pursuant to that funding have made it necessary to make substantial reductions in in-state travel. Due to these budget constraints, we will be unable to support the activities of the Community Education Advisory Council of which you are a member." 25

24 Minutes of Board Meeting, October 21, 1976.

Mr. Gamble went on to say that the Community Education Advisory Council was disbanded at this time.

Realizing that it is not possible to resolve all the needs of a community simultaneously, the Community Education Task Force developed a *Community Education Needs Assessment and Evaluation Guidebook* in 1977. One of the main objectives for developing this guidebook was because the task force realized that it is advantageous to identify the most critical needs of a community and focus the necessary resources on them. Any needs assessment utilized will collect relevant information for use in decision-making. A comprehensive needs assessment which documents facts, figures, opinions, feelings, and trends will justify the decision-making action.

This assessment also gives strong assurance that a sustained effort will be made to thoroughly resolve the most important needs of a community. It helps to avoid the shifting and resource allocation from one problem to another without ever resolving any of them. Through efficient utilization of a needs assessment, more appropriate goals and objectives can be established for community education.

A successful needs assessment, regardless of the size of the community involved, requires the completion of nine major steps. Needs assessments, using either formal or informal methods, should follow this general sequence:

1. **Identifying People and Roles**
2. **Speaking the Same Language (Common Understanding of Key Terms)**
3. **Stating Concerns and Goals**
4. **Conducting the Assessment**
5. **Analyzing the Data**
6. **Stating the Need and Setting Priorities**
7. **Determining the Feasibility of Meeting the Needs**
8. **Planning the Program (Objectives and Procedures)**
9. **Evaluation**
If a group is thinking about doing a community assessment, it is important to realize that the group needs to:

1. Agree that an assessment is needed.
2. Have a commitment to do an assessment.

In making decisions on the above two issues, take some time to discuss the value an assessment has for your community. Agreement and commitment are both necessary; otherwise, you may get started but never complete the task.26

In 1977, the Nevada Department of Education Task Force on Community Education under the leadership of Richard L. Hornya, Community Education Specialist, developed another narrative entitled, A Process Model for Community Education Development (see Appendix B). This document was put together because of the feeling that the model development approach dictates that certain steps be followed to assure a solid and lasting base for operation. When the importance of all the components of Community Education described in the narrative are internalized and developed according to this model, then Community Education will reach its greatest potential.

This model described in the narrative was the result of a year-long assessment of Community Education development in the State of Nevada and represents input from school administrators, public and private agencies and organizations, citizens, the Nevada Community Education Advisory Council, and members of the Nevada State Department of Education Community Education Service Team.

The model developed was not intended to provide the reader with all of the solutions to problems encountered when implementing

Community Education. It was to be a guide that hopefully would generate ideas which would give some direction for any community in Nevada, or elsewhere, that was seeking to enhance community life.

**Summary**

Chapter 2 summarized literature pertinent to early development and history of the Community Education concept, as well as current strategies in Community Education. Chapter 2 also delved into the importance of the leadership role, establishing desirable personal traits, job description, and characteristics and goals of an effective organization. The section entitled Community Education in Nevada provided insight into the conclusions drawn from awareness meetings involving fourteen of the seventeen county school districts in the state. Recent narratives published by the State of Nevada Department of Education were also cited.

From the literature discussed, it can be concluded that even though Community Education has not yet achieved all of its goals, it is making an impact in communities across America. Currently, there is a need to give established processes and models special emphasis when implementing Community Education. One can determine that the ultimate value of Community Education is that it can provide the vehicle for a means of achieving individual and community goals. When the total community becomes involved in identifying problems, establishing priorities, and mobilizing available resources, then this ultimate value of Community Education becomes apparent.
Chapter 3

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Chapter 3 contains a detailed discussion of the development of the study, the utilization of an inventory instrument, the method of data collection, and the procedure used for data analysis.

Development of the Study

While serving on the Advisory Council for Community Education during 1976 and 1977, initial contact was made by this investigator with various individuals involved in the Community Education process. During this time, letters of cooperation and support for the study were obtained from: A. Leedy Campbell, Dean, Community Services, Clark County Community College; LaMar LeFevre, Executive Assistant, Nevada Department of Education; Dwight A. Marshall, Dean, University Extension, University of Nevada, Las Vegas; Bill Stabler, Director of Baker Park and Charleston Heights Community Schools in Las Vegas, Nevada; and Curtis Van Voorhees, Director, Office of Community Education Research, University of Michigan (see Appendix G).

Because of illness, A. Leedy Campbell of the Clark County Community College resigned his position during the course of this study and was replaced by Val Garner.

After the cooperation and support of the above-named individuals was obtained and with input from my doctoral committee members, an inventory instrument was developed. This inventory instrument was
designed to survey the status of Community Education in the metropolitan area of Clark County, Nevada, as it existed during the 1976-77 academic year. It was utilized for data-gathering purposes throughout the course of this study (see Appendix C).

The intent of the study was limited to programs or courses offered, funding, cost of instruction, fees, personnel, use of needs assessment and people actively involved in the programs. The survey instrument developed dealt directly with these areas.

It is also noted that the limitations of the study were dependent upon information received from the participating organizations and programs offered during the 1976-77 academic year.

When this study was started, it was thought that the Clark County Community College offered noncredit Community Service-type courses. Upon receiving the completed inventory instrument from Val Garner, it was learned that "all courses are credit courses"; thus, the information was not applicable to this study (see Appendix D).

Information received from Charleston Heights Community School was incomplete and did not provide sufficient data to make a thorough study.

**Methods and Procedures**

After completion of the inventory instrument and the establishment of a rapport with the individuals representing the participating organizations, additional interviews were conducted and the raw data collected.
The raw data collected supplied the following information: course or program title, number of students enrolled and/or completing the course, instructors' fee, fee charged the student, and location of the course. The inventory instrument completed and signed by the individual in charge of the program also supplied information concerning: reasons for cancelling courses, use of a needs assessment, personnel involved and financial information. Since all participating organizations did not supply the same information, certain adjustments had to be made when analyzing the data (see Appendixes E and F).

After the raw data were collected and compiled, all courses offered were categorized into seven divisions. These seven divisions were: academic, arts and crafts, business and related fields, homemaking, nursing, sports and athletics, and travel. Within each division, the raw data were compiled and broken down into the following categories: total number of courses offered, number of courses cancelled, number of courses completed, total number of students enrolled, average number of students enrolled, range of the students enrolled; total cost of instruction within each division, average cost of instruction, range of the cost of instruction, average student fee charged per class, and range of student fees.

These data and the analysis of them, as well as data concerning reasons for cancelling courses, the use of a needs assessment, personnel involved and financial information will appear in Chapter 4.
Chapter 4

ANALYSIS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The intent of this study was to review the status of Community Education in the metropolitan area of Clark County, Nevada, as it existed during the 1976-77 academic year. Chapter 4 contains a report of the results of this study, as well as conclusions drawn and recommendations made.

Analysis of Tables

Analysis of Table 1

During the 1976-77 academic year, the Continuing Education Department of the University of Nevada, Las Vegas offered a total of 300 noncredit courses. Of this total, 36 were cancelled and 264 were completed. The reason for cancellation of courses was insufficient enrollment.

The total enrollment for these 264 courses was 9,153 students, with an average enrollment of 34.7 and a range of 2 students to 637 students per course.

The total cost of instruction for these 264 courses was $142,904, with the average cost of instruction per course being $541.30 and the range of the cost of instruction per course being from $20 to $23,187. The range of student fees per course was from $4 to $1,100.
Table 1

Totals

<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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNLV</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>9,153</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>2-637</td>
<td>$142,904</td>
<td>$541.30</td>
<td>$20-$23,187</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$4-$1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker Park</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2,149</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>4-73</td>
<td>$9,620</td>
<td>$99.18</td>
<td>$0-$200</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$0-$20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston Heights</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2,646</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$0-$13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
During the 1976-77 academic year, the Baker Park Community School offered a total of 97 noncredit courses. Of this total, none were cancelled; thus, 97 were completed.

The total enrollment for these 97 courses was 2,149 students, with an average enrollment of 22.2 and a range of 4 students to 73 students per course.

The total cost of instruction for these 97 courses was $9,620, with the average cost of instruction per course being $99.18 and the range of the cost of instruction per course being from $0 to $200. The range of student fees per course was from $0 to $20.

Due to the lack of sufficient data obtained from the Charleston Heights Community School, the only applicable information was a total enrollment of 2,646 students and the range of student fees per course being from $0 to $13.

When the raw data were collected and compiled from the participating institutions, all courses offered were categorized into seven divisions, as follows: Academic, Arts and Crafts, Business and Related Fields, Homemaking, Nursing, Sports and Athletics and Travel.

Analysis of Table 2

During the 1976-77 academic year, within the Academic Division, the Continuing Education Department of the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, offered 79 courses. Of the 79 courses, 9 were cancelled and 70 were completed.

The total enrollment for these 70 courses was 2,434 students, with an average enrollment of 35 and a range of 2 students to 169 students per course.
<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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNLV</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>2,434</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2-169</td>
<td>$31,928</td>
<td>$456.11</td>
<td>$20-$6,726</td>
<td>$58.52</td>
<td>$4-$1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker Park</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7-72</td>
<td>$1,360</td>
<td>$113.00</td>
<td>$0-$200</td>
<td>$12.83</td>
<td>$0-$20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston Heights</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$7-$13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The total cost of instruction for these 70 courses was $31,928, with the average cost of instruction per course being $456.11, and the range of the cost of instruction per course being from $20 to $6,726.

The average student fee charged per course was $58.52, with the range of student fees per course being from $4 to $1,100.

During the 1976-77 academic year, within the Academic Division, the Baker Park Community School offered 12 courses, of which none were cancelled; thus, 12 were completed.

The total enrollment for these 12 courses was 223 students, with an average enrollment of 19 and a range of 7 students to 72 students per course.

The total cost of instruction for these 12 courses was $1,360, with the average cost of instruction per course being $113, and the range of the cost of instruction per course being from $0 to $200.

The average student fee charged per course was $12.83, with the range of student fees per course being from $0 to $20.

Charleston Heights Community School during the 1976-77 academic year within the Academic Division, had a total enrollment of 165 students, with the range of student fees per course being from $7 to $13.

Analysis of Table 3

During the 1976-77 academic year, within the Arts and Crafts Division, the Continuing Education Department of the University of Nevada, Las Vegas offered 71 courses. Of the 71 courses, 4 were cancelled and 67 were completed.

The total enrollment for these 67 courses was 2,590 students,
Table 3
Arts and Crafts

<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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNLV</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>2,590</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5-637</td>
<td>$54,764</td>
<td>$817.37</td>
<td>$120-$23,187</td>
<td>$30.22</td>
<td>$15-$50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker Park</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1,146</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4-60</td>
<td>$5,200</td>
<td>$92.85</td>
<td>$60-$200</td>
<td>$10.63</td>
<td>$7-$20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston Heights</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1,158</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$7-$13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
with an average enrollment of 39 and a range of 5 students to 637 students per course.

The total cost of instruction for these 67 courses was $54,764, with the average cost of instruction per course being $817.37, and the range of the cost of instruction per course being from $120 to $23,187.

The average student fee charged per course was $30.22, with the range of student fees per course being from $15 to $50.

During the 1976-77 academic year, within the Arts and Crafts Division, the Baker Park Community School offered 56 courses of which none were cancelled; thus 56 were completed.

The total enrollment of these 56 courses was 1,146 students, with an average enrollment of 20 and a range of 4 students to 60 students per course.

The total cost of instruction for these 56 courses was $5,200, with the average cost of instruction per course being $92.85, and the range of the cost of instruction per course being from $60 to $200.

The average student fee charged per course was $10.63, with the range of student fees per course being from $7 to $20.

Charleston Heights Community School, during the 1976-77 academic year, within the Arts and Crafts Division, had a total enrollment of 1,158 students, with the range of student fees per course being from $7 to $13.

Analysis of Table 4

During the 1976-77 academic year, within the Business and Related Fields Division, the Continuing Education Department of the
Table 4

Business and Related

<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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNLV</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1,515</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5-115</td>
<td>$22,285</td>
<td>$518.25</td>
<td>$44-$2,170</td>
<td>$92.35</td>
<td>$10-$395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker Park</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>Charleston Heights</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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University of Nevada, Las Vegas offered 52 courses. Of the 52 courses, 9 courses were cancelled and 43 were completed.

The total enrollment for these 43 courses was 1,515 students, with an average enrollment of 35 and a range of 5 students to 115 students per course.

The total cost of instruction for these 43 courses was $22,285 with the average cost of instruction per course being $518.25, and the range of the cost of instruction per course being from $44 to $2,170.

The average student fee charged per course was $92.35, with the range of student fees per course being from $10 to $395.

During the 1976-77 academic year, the Baker Park Community School and Charleston Heights Community School did not offer any courses within the Business and Related Fields.

**Analysis of Table 5**

During the 1976-77 academic year, within the Homemaking Division, the Continuing Education Department of the University of Nevada, Las Vegas offered 15 courses. Of the 15 courses, 2 were cancelled and 13 were completed.

The total enrollment for these 13 courses was 606 students, with an average enrollment of 47 and a range of 24 students to 152 students per course.

The total cost of instruction for these 13 courses was $4,550, with the average cost of instruction per course being $350, and the range of the cost of instruction per course being from $80 to $1,500.

The average student fee charged per course was $26.92, with
Table 5
Homemaking

<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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNLV</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>24-152</td>
<td>$4,550</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td>$80-$1,500</td>
<td>$26.92</td>
<td>$5-$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8-9</td>
<td>$240</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$80-$160</td>
<td>$13.50</td>
<td>$9-$18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston Heights</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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the range of student fees per course being from $5 to $150.

During the 1976-77 academic year, within the Homemaking Division, the Baker Park Community School offered 2 courses of which none were cancelled; thus, 2 were completed.

The total enrollment of these 2 courses was 17 students, with an average enrollment of 9 and a range of 8 students to 9 students per course.

The total cost of instruction for these 2 courses was $240, with the average cost of instruction per course being $120, and the range of the cost of instruction per course being from $80 to $160.

The average student fee charged per course was $13.50, with the range of student fees per course being from $9 to $18.

Charleston Heights Community School during the 1976-77 academic year, within the Homemaking Division, had a total enrollment of 202 students, with the range of student fees per course being from $9 to $13.

Analysis of Table 6

During the 1976-77 academic year, within the Nursing Division, the Continuing Education Department of the University of Nevada, Las Vegas offered 13 courses. Of the 13 courses, none were cancelled; thus, 13 were completed.

The total enrollment for these 13 courses was 415 students, with an average enrollment of 32 and a range of 11 students to 107 students per course.

The total cost of instruction for these 13 courses was $2,813, with the average cost of instruction per course being $216.38, and the
<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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNLV</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>11-107</td>
<td>$2,813</td>
<td>$216.38</td>
<td>$150-$888</td>
<td>$21.54</td>
<td>$5-$40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker Park</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>26-53</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston Heights</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
range of the cost of instruction per course being from $150 to $888.

The average student fee charged per course was $21.54, with the range of student fees per course being from $5 to $40.

During the 1976-77 academic year, within the Nursing Division, the Baker Park Community School offered 3 courses, of which none were cancelled; thus, 3 were completed.

The total enrollment of these 3 courses was 125 students, with an average enrollment of 42 and a range of 26 students to 53 students per course.

The cost of instruction and student fees charged were none.

Charleston Heights Community School, during the 1976-77 academic year, within the Nursing Division, had a total enrollment of 104 students.

Analysis of Table 7

During the 1976-77 academic year, within the Sports and Athletics Division, the Continuing Education Department of the University of Nevada, Las Vegas offered 44 courses. Of the 44 courses, 4 were cancelled and 40 were completed.

The total enrollment for these 40 courses was 1,056 students, with an average enrollment of 26 and a range of 5 students to 153 students per course.

The total cost of instruction for these 40 courses was $23,909, with the average cost of instruction per course being $597.72, and the range of the cost of instruction per course being from $133 to $8,300.

The average student fee charged per course was $36.82, with the range of student fees per course being from $15 to $150.
<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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNLV</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1,056</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5-153</td>
<td>$23,909</td>
<td>$597.72</td>
<td>$133-$8,300</td>
<td>$36.82</td>
<td>$15-$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker Park</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7-73</td>
<td>$2,820</td>
<td>$117.50</td>
<td>$60-$200</td>
<td>$13.46</td>
<td>$7-$20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston Heights</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1,017</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$0-$13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
During the 1976-77 academic year, within the Sports and Athletics Division, the Baker Park Community school offered 24 courses, of which none were cancelled; thus, 24 were completed.

The total enrollment of these 24 courses was 638 students, with an average enrollment of 27 and a range of 7 students to 73 students per course.

The total cost of instruction for these 24 courses was $2,820, with the average cost of instruction per course being $117.50, and the range of the cost of instruction per course being from $60 to $200.

The average student fee charged per course was $13.46, with the range of student fees per course being from $7 to $20.

Charleston Heights Community School during the 1976-77 academic year, within the Sports and Athletics Division, had a total enrollment of 1,017 students with the range of student fees per course being from $0 to $13.

Analysis of Table 8

During the 1976-77 academic year, within the Travel Division, the Continuing Education Department of the University of Nevada, Las Vegas offered 26 courses. Of the 26 courses, 8 were cancelled and 18 were completed.

The total enrollment for these 18 courses was 537 students, with an average enrollment of 30 and a range of 6 students to 82 students per course.

The total cost of instruction for these 18 courses was $2,655 with the average cost of instruction per course being $147.50, and the range of the cost of instruction per course being from $50 to $333.
<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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNLV</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6-82</td>
<td>$2,655</td>
<td>$147.50</td>
<td>$50-$333</td>
<td>$100.67</td>
<td>$10-$752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker Park</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>Charleston Heights</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The average student fee charged per course was $100.67, with
the range of student fees per course being from $10 to $752.

During the 1976-77 academic year, the Baker Park Community
School and Charleston Heights Community School did not offer any
courses within the Travel Division.

Conclusions

In Chapter 1, it was stated that the purpose of this study was
to investigate and survey the status of Community Education in the
metropolitan area of Clark County, Nevada during the 1976-77 academic
year. The study was limited to programs and/or courses offered,
a cost analysis, personnel involved, the use of a needs assessment
and the people actively enrolled in the programs.

From the related research studied and the data gathered, the
conclusions reached, as related to the statement of the problem, are
as follows:

1. During the 1976-77 academic year, the Continuing Education
Department of the University of Nevada, Las Vegas offered to the
public the largest number of courses.

2. The Continuing Education Department of the University of
Nevada, Las Vegas had the largest total enrollment of students during
the 1976-77 academic year.

3. The Continuing Education Department of the University of
Nevada, Las Vegas had the largest enrollment for any single course
offered during the 1976-77 academic year.

4. During the 1976-77 academic year, the Continuing Education
Department of the University of Nevada, Las Vegas had the highest total cost of instruction, the highest average cost of instruction per division and the widest range of the cost of instruction.

5. The range of student fees charged per course was the greatest through the Continuing Education Department of the University of Nevada, Las Vegas.

6. None of the participating organizations utilized a needs assessment before offering courses or programs.

Recommendations

Based upon the related research studied and an analysis of the data gathered, the following recommendations are made. These recommendations are not necessarily in order of priority:

1. Utilization of a needs assessment by all participating agencies.

2. Cooperative efforts by participating agencies be initiated to prevent undue duplication of courses offered.

3. Utilization of a scientific method to assure that all groups within the community are included in the needs assessment.

4. Selection of a coordinator to manage programs and/or courses from all participating agencies.

5. Establishment of a Community Education program under the auspices of the Clark County School District.

6. Obtainment of state financial support for a Community Education program.

7. Establishment of additional Community Education centers to serve more people within the metropolitan area of Clark County, Nevada.
8. Establishment of a local Community Education advisory council.


10. Announcement of programs and/or courses offered be made in a second language, such as Spanish.

11. Dissemination of course announcements in places other than newspapers, schools or by mail, i.e., in such locations as stores, churches, bars, etc.

12. Utilization of individuals from within the local community to make initial contact with prospective students.
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APPENDIX A

FINDINGS
FINDINGS

From our meetings in fourteen (14) counties with thirteen (13) county superintendents and thirty-one (31) members of their staffs, the Service Team has developed the following conclusions:

1. The philosophical appeal of community education is acceptable to school administrators in the State of Nevada. There is little argument that education is truly a life-long process; that people of all ages have unmet needs; that there are resources in the community which could be utilized to meet those needs; and that the school, in many instances, is providing opportunities for the people of the community to fulfill their needs in school facilities.

However, the leadership role, which was suggested by the Team and by the proposed legislation, seems to be a hindrance to further development of community education. It appears that the majority of educational leaders support a strong community effort in developing a process that would identify and utilize community resources to best meet the needs of the community. Rather than assuming the leadership role, the schools envision themselves as being a partner in a community-wide effort. It is encouraging to note the willingness of most school districts to explore the possibilities of joining in partnership with other local organizations and agencies to examine ways in which they could jointly provide the resources to meet the needs of the community they serve.

2. The legislation to pilot 20 community schools in the state of Nevada received minimal support. This was evidenced by the schools' response to our questionnaire indicating that most would apply for a grant to assist in the development of Community Education as a pilot program. However, strong commitment was not forthcoming in support of the legislation for the following reasons:

a. The exclusive leadership role of the school seemed to foreshadow the cooperative arrangements that would need to be fostered with existing agencies. The legislation seemed to imply that the schools would in fact "become all things to all people".

b. In light of the financial commitment that many school districts have already made, community education would in their opinion increase this burden. The monies that would be made available with such a grant would hardly negate the added expenses for salaries and programs.

c. There appears to be some concern over the role and function of the advisory councils. Would they in fact be "advisory". Many, especially rural communities, did not see a need for advisory councils as specified by the proposed legislation.
d. Community Education legislation might take money which could be appropriated to "proven" programs.

3. While school administrators have varying opinions about community education, all have had some exposure to the concept. It was suggested that the Center make some effort to explain exactly what it is, rather than try to "sell" the concept. It was also suggested that efforts be made to include other education entities in the process as well as the non-educated public.

4. There is concern among education leaders that previous community education activities in the State have included few, if any, follow-up activities in those districts which have expressed an interest in developing a community education program.

5. While the national model seems to focus upon the school as being the leader in initiating the processes involved in community education, it is quite possible that in Nevada, the community approach may be the most viable course of action. The Service Team began with the assumption that the end result of our activities should "reflect the genuine uniqueness of the State". This can be achieved as a result of the cooperation and willingness to explore alternatives as expressed by many local school districts.

6. As a result of those meetings, the Service Team believes that it would be safe to conclude that all districts have community education to some degree. This assumption can be made on the basis of studies which have been conducted nationwide and in Nevada to ascertain the common components of community education in a school based model.

A. The components of community education most developed in Nevada are:

1. Educational programs for school age children (K-12);
2. Maximum use of school facilities;
3. Additional programs for children and youth; and
4. Programs for adults.

B. The components of community education least developed in Nevada are:

1. The delivery and coordination of community services; and
2. Community Involvement. (Involves the school aiding in the development of community councils and provides the leadership necessary to help those councils become viable organizations on their own.)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
In light of developments across the nation, the latter two components are the ones most likely to impede complete implementation of community education. It is of importance to note that the criteria to assess the status of community education did not involve whether or not a district employed a full/part-time director or had established programs. These items are simply components of the total concept. The consensus of opinion seems to indicate that the school districts are not presently in a position to devote time nor commit financially to the development of these two components.

The questionnaire, intended to assess the status of and the need for community education in Nevada, yielded the following conclusions based upon a 50% return.

1. School districts recognize a need to foster greater cooperation between the school district and the community. All of the districts have made efforts to cultivate and promote this cooperation. The single greatest existing need is to develop more effective lines of communication between those offering services and those who would benefit from those services.

2. A majority of the school districts now offer some type of community education program.

3. Some changes in attitude by administrators would be necessary to implement community education as perceived by the Service Team.

4. Some changes in attitude by the community would be necessary before community education could be implemented.

5. More information about community education would be beneficial for the:
   a. Administrative Staff
   b. Board of Education
   c. Certificated Personnel
   d. Classified Personnel
   e. Community Groups.

6. Training for the above groups should be developed and provided by the Department of Education. With a few reservations, most administrators indicated a willingness to participate in workshops to promote an understanding of community education.
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7. All of the districts contacted support the utilization of school facilities and resources for the community so long as they do not conflict with the required activities of the district.

8. There is a division of opinion regarding the employment of a coordinator for community efforts. Most do not see this as an exclusive function of the school. The concern centers around finding the resources to financially support such a person. The legislation does not provide 100% of such a person's salary.

9. A majority of the districts indicated that they would submit a proposal for funding should the legislation pass. As mentioned before, this appears to be good moral support. However, a strong commitment for advocacy of the legislation was not perceived by members of the Service Team.

10. Results of administrators prioritizing needed service for varying age groups indicate that they see a need for services outside the realm of normal school operation. If, in fact, the needs do exist, efforts need be undertaken which will meet those needs. (See following page.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PEOPLE SERVED</th>
<th>RANKING OF NEEDED SERVICES:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Being the most important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. The least.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1. Pre-School

- **1. COMMUNITY**
  - beautification
  - traffic
  - day care
  - health
  - lighting
  - security
- **2. RECREATION**
  - sports
  - aquatic
  - parks
  - playgrounds
  - outdoor
  - hobbies
- **3. SOCIAL**
  - games
  - dances
  - suppers
  - picnics
  - movies
  - parties
- **4. ACADEMIC**
  - language arts
  - social studies
  - science
  - math
  - economics
  - adult basic
- **5. CULTURAL**
  - concerts
  - films
  - exhibits
  - lectures
  - theater
  - literary
- **6. SKILL**
  - vocational
  - social living
  - typing
  - woodworking
  - automotive
  - sewing

### 2. Grades K-8

- **1. RECREATION**
  - sports
  - aquatic
  - parks
  - playgrounds
  - outdoor
  - hobbies
- **2. SOCIAL**
  - games
  - dances
  - suppers
  - picnics
  - movies
  - parties
- **3. ACADEMIC**
  - language arts
  - social studies
  - science
  - math
  - economics
  - adult basic
- **4. CULTURAL**
  - concerts
  - films
  - exhibits
  - lectures
  - theater
  - literary
- **5. COMMUNITY**
  - beautification
  - traffic
  - day care
  - health
  - lighting
  - security
- **6. SKILL**
  - vocational
  - social living
  - typing
  - woodworking
  - automotive
  - sewing

### 3. Grades 9-12

- **1. SKILL**
  - vocational
  - social living
  - typing
  - woodworking
  - automotive
  - sewing
- **2. RECREATION**
  - sports
  - aquatic
  - parks
  - playgrounds
  - outdoor
  - hobbies
- **3. SOCIAL**
  - games
  - dances
  - suppers
  - picnics
  - movies
  - parties
- **4. CULTURAL**
  - concerts
  - films
  - exhibits
  - lectures
  - theater
  - literary
- **5. ACADEMIC**
  - language arts
  - social studies
  - science
  - math
  - economics
  - adult basic
- **6. COMMUNITY**
  - beautification
  - traffic
  - day care
  - health
  - lighting
  - security

### 4. Adults

- **1. RECREATION**
  - sports
  - aquatic
  - parks
  - playgrounds
  - outdoor
  - hobbies
- **2. SKILL**
  - vocational
  - social living
  - typing
  - woodworking
  - automotive
  - sewing
- **3. CULTURAL**
  - concerts
  - films
  - exhibits
  - lectures
  - theater
  - literary
- **4. SOCIAL**
  - games
  - dances
  - suppers
  - picnics
  - movies
  - parties
- **5. ACADEMIC**
  - language arts
  - social studies
  - science
  - math
  - economics
  - adult basic
- **6. COMMUNITY**
  - beautification
  - traffic
  - day care
  - health
  - lighting
  - security

### 5. Senior Citizens

- **1. CULTURAL**
  - concerts
  - films
  - exhibits
  - lectures
  - theater
  - literary
- **2. SOCIAL**
  - games
  - dances
  - suppers
  - picnics
  - movies
  - parties
- **3. RECREATION**
  - sports
  - aquatic
  - parks
  - playgrounds
  - outdoor
  - hobbies
- **4. COMMUNITY**
  - beautification
  - traffic
  - day care
  - health
  - lighting
  - security
- **5. SKILL**
  - vocational
  - social living
  - typing
  - woodworking
  - automotive
  - sewing
- **6. ACADEMIC**
  - language arts
  - social studies
  - science
  - math
  - economics
  - adult basic
COMMUNITY EDUCATION

DEFINITION

ORIENTATION

LEADERSHIP

Community Education
A cooperative community involvement process, including but not limited to the identification, development and utilization of all applicable human, financial, and physical resources to meet people’s identified academic, recreational, cultural, and social needs.

Awareness
To explain the concept of community education to community residents and interested agencies and organizations.

- Conceptual clarification
- Rationale clarified
- Motivation
- Internalization
- Commitment

Leadership
An individual or group takes the initiative to help the community use available resources to solve problems held in common.
FORMATION PROCESS MODEL

PROCESS ACTIVITY & ORGANIZATION

PROCESS PRODUCTS

COMMUNITY PRODUCTS

CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT
To provide a mechanism wherein the greatest possible citizen involvement in the decision making process is realized.

- Community Council
- Steering Committee
- 'Super' Council
- Citizen input in decision making
- Block Councils

TRAINING
To provide technical assistance which assists the community develop its greatest potential.

- Conflict resolution
- Group processes
- Needs/resource identification

ASSESSMENT
To determine the needs/interests/concerns of community residents and to inventory available community resources.

- Demographic study
- All people's needs identified
- Available resources identified

COORDINATION
To avoid costly duplication of services and develop interagency cooperation in identified areas.

- Facility use maximized
- Cooperative agreements
- Combined budgeting
- Clearinghouse

PROGRAMMING
To assist in the development of programs to meet identified community needs.

- Programs developed to meet identified needs utilizing existing resources
- Resources developed
- Academic, recreational, cultural and social offerings

- Evaluation processes which insures renewal in the face of changing situations.
- Coordination, planning, involvement, and comprehensive educational and service activities for all people of a community.
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Inventory Instrument Pertaining to the Status of Community Education in the Metropolitan Area of Clark County, Nevada, as it Existed During the 1976-77 Academic Year

The following definition, as stated in the pamphlet Community Education in Nevada, published by the Nevada Department of Education, will be utilized for this instrument:

Community Education is the process of bringing the total applicable human, economic, and physical resources of a community together to help people meet their educational, cultural, recreational, and social wants and needs.

Name of Organization: ________________________________

1. **Courses or Programs (ONLY NONCREDIT COURSES):**

   A. How many courses did your organization offer during the 1976-77 academic year?

      I. Spring Semester ______________

      II. Fall Semester ______________

      III. Other (please specify) ________________________________  

   

   B. What was the total number of courses cancelled by your organization during the 1976-77 academic year?

      I. Spring Semester ______________

      II. Fall Semester ______________

      III. Other (please specify) ________________________________

      IV. Reason or reasons for cancellation: ________________

   

   C. Location of courses if different from published catalog or schedule:

      I. Was your facility available for after school usage during the 1976-77 academic year? ______ If so, explain: ________________________________

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
D. Was a needs assessment taken before offering courses or program? Yes _____ No _____ If yes, please attach.

E. Additional comments concerning courses or program: Attach additional sheet if necessary. _________________________

2. Enrollment of Students:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>FALL SEMESTER</th>
<th>SPRING SEMESTER</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enrolled</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Enrolled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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3. Personnel Involved:
   A. Number of instructors utilized __________
   B. Administration needed _________________
   C. Clerical assistance ______________________
   D. Other (please specify) _________________
   E. Additional comments _______________________

4. Financial Information:
   A. Course or program fees charged to students __________
   B. Federal assistance if applicable ______________
   C. State assistance if applicable ________________
   D. Local assistance if applicable ______________
   E. Additional financial assistance (please specify) __________

   F. Cost analysis of implementing programs or courses:
      I. Cost of instructors __________________________
      II. Cost of administration __________________________
      III. Cost of clerical assistance _______________________
      IV. Cost of facilities __________________________
      V. Any additional cost (please list and explain) _________

   ________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________

Signature                  Title                  Date

Thank you very much for your cooperation on this project.

Robert L. Wondrash
APPENDIX D

INVENTORY INSTRUMENT
(Clark County Community College)
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Inventory Instrument Pertaining to the Status of Community Education in the Metropolitan Area of Clark County, Nevada, as it Existed During the 1976-77 Academic Year

The following definition, as stated in the pamphlet Community Education in Nevada, published by the Nevada Department of Education, will be utilized for this instrument:

Community Education is the process of bringing the total applicable human, economic, and physical resources of a community together to help people meet their educational, cultural, recreational, and social wants and needs.

Name of Organization: CLARK COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE

1. Courses or Programs (ONLY NONCREDIT COURSES):

A. How many courses did your organization offer during the 1976-77 academic year?

   I. Spring Semester 145

   II. Fall Semester 145

   III. Other (please specify) ________________________________

B. What was the total number of courses cancelled by your organization during the 1976-77 academic year?

   I. Spring Semester 53

   II. Fall Semester 48

   III. Other (please specify) ________________________________

IV. Reason or reasons for cancellation: 

C. Location of courses if different from published catalog or schedule:

   I. Was your facility available for after school usage during the 1976-77 academic year? Yes  If so, explain:
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D. Was a needs assessment taken before offering courses or program? Yes ____ No ____ If yes, please attach.

E. Additional comments concerning courses or program: Attach additional sheet if necessary.

2. Enrollment of Students:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>FALL SEMESTER</th>
<th>SPRING SEMESTER</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enrolled</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Enrolled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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3. Personnel Involved:
   A. Number of instructors utilized 145
   B. Administration needed
   C. Clerical assistance
   D. Other (please specify)
   E. Additional comments

4. Financial Information:
   A. Course or program fees charged to students
   B. Federal assistance if applicable
   C. State assistance if applicable
   D. Local assistance if applicable
   E. Additional financial assistance (please specify)
   F. Cost analysis of implementing programs or courses:
      I. Cost of instructors $92,000
      II. Cost of administration $13,000
      III. Cost of clerical assistance $6,000
      IV. Cost of facilities $8
      V. Any additional cost (please list and explain)

The costs involved are determined by the number of registrants in each class.

Signature: Val E. Barmer  Title: Assoc. Dean of CS.
Date: 

Thank you very much for your cooperation on this project.
APPENDIX E

INVENTORY INSTRUMENT AND ANALYSIS
(Charleston Heights and Baker Park Community Schools)
Inventory Instrument Pertaining to the Status of Community Education in the Metropolitan Area of Clark County, Nevada, as it Existed During the 1976-77 Academic Year

The following definition, as stated in the pamphlet Community Education in Nevada, published by the Nevada Department of Education, will be utilized for this instrument:

Community Education is the process of bringing the total applicable human, economic, and physical resources of a community together to help people meet their educational, cultural, recreational, and social wants and needs.

Name of Organization: Charleston Heights and Baker Park community schools

1. Courses or Programs (ONLY NONCREDIT COURSES):

A. How many courses did your organization offer during the 1976-77 academic year?

   I. Spring Semester ____________

   II. Fall Semester ____________

   III. Other (please specify) ________________________________

B. What was the total number of courses cancelled by your organization during the 1976-77 academic year?

   I. Spring Semester ____________

   II. Fall Semester ____________

   III. Other (please specify) ________________

IV. Reason or reasons for cancellation: insufficient

   number of persons registered

C. Location of courses if different from published catalog or schedule: N/A

   I. Was your facility available for after school usage during the 1976-77 academic year? YES  If so, explain:

       all programs offered after school hours, 3-10pm.
D. Was a needs assessment taken before offering courses or program? Yes ____ No ✓ If yes, please attach.

E. Additional comments concerning courses or program: Attach additional sheet if necessary. N/A

2. Enrollment of Students:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Enrollment (Fall)</th>
<th>Completed (Fall)</th>
<th>Enrollment (Spring)</th>
<th>Completed (Spring)</th>
<th>Enrollment (Other)</th>
<th>Completed (Other)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Personnel Involved:
   A. Number of instructors utilized: 118
   B. Administration needed: 5 (1 coordinator, 2 staff)
   C. Clerical assistance: Included above
   D. Other (please specify):
   E. Additional comments:

4. Financial Information:
   A. Course or program fees charged to students: $0-200
   B. Federal assistance if applicable: None
   C. State assistance if applicable: None
   D. Local assistance if applicable: City of Las Vegas
   E. Additional financial assistance (please specify): Dept. of Rec.
   recreation and leisure supplies administrative staff
   F. Cost analysis of implementing programs or courses:
      I. Cost of instructors: $5/hr, plus 1/2 hr preparation time
      II. Cost of administration: $40-45,000 annually (approx.)
      III. Cost of clerical assistance: Included above
      IV. Cost of facilities: No cost
      V. Any additional cost (please list and explain): office supplies
         classroom materials (approximately $5000 per year
         per school).

   William B. Steller, Community
   Signature Date 4/3/78

   Thank you very much for your cooperation on this project.

   Robert L. Wondrash
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Information gathered on the inventory instrument pertaining to the status of Community Education in the metropolitan area of Clark County, Nevada, as it existed during the 1976-77 academic year and supplied by Bill Stabler of the Charleston Heights and Baker Park Community Schools is as follows:

Number 1, A. "How many courses did your organization offer during the 1976-77 academic year?" has already been discussed.

Number 1, B. "What was the total number of courses cancelled by your organization during the 1976-77 academic year?" has already been discussed. The reason given for the cancellation of courses was "insufficient number of persons registered."

Letter C asking for location of courses if different from published catalog or schedule was marked "not applicable."

Number C-I asking if the facility was available for after-school usage during the 1976-77 academic year was marked "yes" by Mr. Stabler. He then went on to explain that all programs were offered after school hours from 3 to 10 P.M., on Monday through Friday, and some additional courses offered on Saturday and Sunday.

Letter D asking if a needs assessment was taken before offering courses or programs was checked "no."

Number 2 pertaining to the enrollment of students has been discussed.

Number 3 pertaining to personnel involved stated that 115 instructors were utilized at the two schools. One coordinator to
supervise the entire program as well as two staff members for each school were utilized. Clerical assistance is included in the above-mentioned numbers.

Number 4 asking for financial information stated that course fees charged to students ran from $0 to $20 per course. No federal or state assistance was granted, but the City of Las Vegas did provide some local assistance. The Department of Recreation and Leisure supplied the administrative staff necessary to carry out the program.

Number 4, letter F asking for a cost analysis of implementing programs or courses provided the following information: The cost of instructors was listed at $5.00 per class hour, plus $2.50 for one-half hour of preparation time. The cost of administration is approximately $40-45,000 annually, with clerical assistance included in this figure. There was no cost of facilities listed. Any additional cost pertains to office supplies and classroom materials which is approximately $500 per year, per school (see attached Inventory Instrument).
Inventory Instrument Pertaining to the Status of Community Education in the Metropolitan Area of Clark County, Nevada, as it Existed During the 1976-77 Academic Year

The following definition, as stated in the pamphlet Community Education in Nevada, published by the Nevada Department of Education, will be utilized for this instrument:

Community Education is the process of bringing the total applicable human, economic, and physical resources of a community together to help people meet their educational, cultural, recreational, and social wants and needs.

Name of Organization: Division of Continuing Education-UNLV

1. Courses or Programs (ONLY NONCREDIT COURSES):

A. How many courses did your organization offer during the 1976-77 academic year?
   
   I. Spring Semester 300 total for Spring and Fall semesters
   
   II. Fall Semester ________________
   
   III. Other (please specify) ________________

B. What was the total number of courses cancelled by your organization during the 1976-77 academic year?
   
   I. Spring Semester ________________
   
   II. Fall Semester ________________
   
   III. Other (please specify) Total of 36

IV. Reason or reasons for cancellation: Lack of enrollment

C. Location of courses if different from published catalog or schedule:
   
   N/A
   
   I. Was your facility available for after school usage during the 1976-77 academic year? no If so, explain:
D. Was a needs assessment taken before offering courses or program? Yes _____ No X If yes, please attach.

E. Additional comments concerning courses or program: Attach additional sheet if necessary. ______________________________________

2. Enrollment of Students:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>FALL SEMESTER</th>
<th>SPRING SEMESTER</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enrolled</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Enrolled</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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3. Personnel Involved:
   A. Number of instructors utilized see E below
   B. Administration needed 5
   C. Clerical assistance 5
   D. Other (please specify) 
   E. Additional comments Number of instructors varies from 1 to as many as 10 per class. Information regarding instructors is filed by course and unavailable for a total count of instructors.

4. Financial Information:
   A. Course or program fees charged to students variable
   B. Federal assistance if applicable none
   C. State assistance if applicable State appropriated funds through legislative action
   D. Local assistance if applicable none
   E. Additional financial assistance (please specify)

F. Cost analysis of implementing programs or courses:
   I. Cost of instructors variable depending on expenses incurred in each class
   II. Cost of administration N/A
   III. Cost of clerical assistance N/A
   IV. Cost of facilities Generally courses are scheduled in facilities where there is no charge.
   V. Any additional cost (please list and explain)

Understand that you should not use this form.

Dwight A. Marshall  Dean, Continuing Education  9-6-78
Signature Title Date

Thank you very much for your cooperation on this project.

Robert L. Wondrash
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Continuing Education, University of Nevada, Las Vegas

ANALYSIS OF INVENTORY INSTRUMENT

Information gathered on the inventory instrument pertaining to the status of Community Education in the metropolitan area of Clark County, Nevada, as it existed during the 1976-77 academic year and supplied by Dwight A. Marshall, Dean of Continuing Education, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, is as follows:

Number 1, A. "How many courses did your organization offer during the 1976-77 academic year?" has already been discussed.

Number 1, B. "What was the total number of courses cancelled by your organization during the 1976-77 academic year?" has already been discussed. The reason given for the cancellation of courses was "lack of enrollment."

Letter C asking for location of courses if different from published catalog or schedule was marked "not applicable."

Number C-I asking if the facility was available for after-school usage during the 1976-77 academic year was marked "no" by Mr. Marshall.

Letter D asking if a needs assessment was taken before offering courses or programs was checked "no."

Number 2 pertaining to the enrollment of students has been discussed.

Number 3 pertaining to personnel involved stated that the "number of instructors varies from 1 to as many as 10 per class." Information regarding instructors is filed by course and unavailable for a total count of instructors. Five administrators were needed as well as five individuals for clerical assistance.
Number 4 asking for financial information stated that course fees charged to students were variable. No federal assistance was available, but "state appropriated funds through legislative action" was granted. Local assistance was listed as "none."

Number 4, letter F asking for a cost analysis of implementing programs or courses provided the following information: The cost of instructors was listed as "variable depending on expenses incurred in each class." The cost of administration and clerical assistance was listed as "not applicable." Cost of facilities stated that "generally courses are scheduled in facilities where there is no charge."
APPENDIX G

LETTERS OF COOPERATION AND SUPPORT
January 10, 1977

To Whom It May Concern:

I have had a conference with Mr. Robert Wondrash and he has explained to me the title of his doctoral dissertation.

I think it is a very worthwhile project and I have assured him that the Dean of Community Services of Clark County Community College will support his study and give him 100% cooperation.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

A. Leedy Campbell, Dean
Community Services
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To Whom It May Concern:

Mr. Robert L. Wondrash has asked me to review his dissertation proposal and submit comments.

As an advocate of Community Education, I feel there is a definite need to have this study conducted. This research project will be a huge undertaking when one considers the objectives to be accomplished by interviews and a survey instrument.

When one deals with the primary organizations listed in the prospectus and develops an instrument to collect data on programs, individuals involved in programs, and costs, you are dealing with thousands of people and a large portion of state and community budget resources.

Above all, Community Education is a process in the identification, development and utilization of resources to meet the educational, recreational, cultural and social needs of people. This study is a vital step in getting that process started.

Again, I feel the study would benefit not only the Nevada State Department of Education, but all agencies serving people's needs.

Sincerely,

LaMar LeFevre
Executive Assistant
Robert Wondrash  
565 Royal Crest Circle, Apt. 11  
Las Vegas, NV  

Dear Mr. Wondrash,

I would like to indicate my willingness to assist you in your doctoral project at the University in any way feasible. I understand that you need access to certain records of our Division of Continuing Education which will provide raw data relative to our involvement in Community Education. It may be necessary for you to work with raw data in some instances, but dependent upon your requirements, I hope to be able to furnish you with categorical information as needed from time to time. I understand that this will include such things as needs assessment, enrollments, direct and indirect financing of our Community Education program and the like.

Please keep me posted on your progress.

Sincerely,

Dwight A. Marshall, Dean  
University Extension

DAM:kg
January 6, 1977

Pat Diskin Elementary School  
4220 Ravenwood Drive  
Las Vegas, Nevada

To Whom It May Concern:

This is to acknowledge the fact that I feel the survey which Mr. Robert L. Wondrash is desirous of doing on Community Schools will be very worthwhile. We will support Mr. Wondrash with this project.

Sincerely yours,

Bill Stabler  
Director

BS/cb
Robert L. Wondrash  
Pat A. Diskin Elementary School  
4220 S. Ravenwood Drive  
Las Vegas, Nevada  89103

Dear Mr. Wondrash:

Your research topic concerning Community Education in the Metropolitan Area of Clark County, Las Vegas, Nevada, is a worthwhile undertaking. I am willing to support your effort and will be pleased to render assistance in any way possible as you progress to completion of this worthwhile endeavor.

Please keep in touch and informed of your progress.

Yours sincerely,

Curtis Van Voorhees, Director  
Office of Community Education Research

CVV/hmc
ABSTRACT

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to investigate the status of Community Education in the metropolitan area of Clark County, Nevada, as it existed during the 1976-77 academic year. The study was limited to programs or courses offered, funding, cost of instruction, student fees, personnel, use of a needs assessment, and people actively involved in the programs.

Subjects

Participating organizations contributing data for the study were the Nevada Department of Education, the Continuing Education Department, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, Baker Park Community School, and Charleston Heights Community School.

Methods and Procedures

After the raw data were collected and compiled from the participating organizations, all courses offered were categorized into seven divisions. These seven divisions were: academic, arts and crafts, business and related fields, homemaking, nursing, sports and athletics, and travel. Within each division, the raw data were compiled and broken down into the following categories: total number of courses offered, number of courses cancelled, number of courses completed, total number of students enrolled, average number of students enrolled, range of numbers of students
enrolled, total cost of instruction within each division, average cost of instruction, range of the cost of instruction, average student fee charged per class, and the range of student fees.

Results

Within the metropolitan area of Clark County, Nevada, during the 1976-77 academic year, the Continuing Education Department of the University of Nevada, Las Vegas offered to the public the largest number of courses, had the largest total enrollment of students, had the largest enrollment for any single course, had the highest total cost of instruction, the highest average cost of instruction per division, the widest range of the cost of instruction, and the greatest range of student fees charged per course.

None of the participating organizations utilized a needs assessment before offering courses or programs.

Conclusions

The study was summarized, including a review of the literature and recommendations suggested for further research to determine the ongoing status of the Community Education concept.