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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

Educational articulation has existed in American education in some form since the early 1900's. Initially, in 1910, articulation was seen as a method to ease the transition of students from the elementary to the secondary level, and consequently the junior high school was developed. The term was used to refer to the desirable relationship among subject areas at the same grade level and among grade levels in public elementary and secondary schools. More recently, however, the term "articulation" has been used in higher education to describe the desirable relationships that should exist among all sectors of the educational system.

Without question there is a need for educational articulation in today's educational system. First, the current educational system shows fragmentation. Articulation advocates attention to individual, rather than collective, student needs, and emphasizes a continuum for lifelong learning. Second, there are attitudes of superiority that exist among educators at different levels. These attitudes can (and do) result in a lack of cooperation among educational groups or sectors. Articulation could be a means to develop better professional relationships. Finally, the cooperation among various educational sectors is complicated by a bureaucratic maze. This maze stems from the separation of bureaucracies. For example, if a high school student completes a three credit course at a community college with a desire for high school credit, the 150 clock hours (the time required by most public school systems for credit) are not necessarily met; therefore, the administrations at the community college and public school system have to agree on an acceptable number of hours. In other words, there must be a willingness to cooperate among the
different educational bureaucracies. As a vehicle for such cooperation, articulation could be a means to break through the maze.

Despite this seemingly necessary need for articulation, articulation still has not become a part of the educational system in many states. The question then is, why? More specifically, why have states been slow to promote the case for articulation? Why have they, in the majority of instances, failed to formulate and implement policies for educational articulation? Using the Commonwealth of Virginia as a case study, the purpose of this research is to conduct an historical analysis of the policies governing educational articulation and its formation, and in so doing, to come to terms with the problems that have been retarding the development of state policy for educational articulation.

The Case Study

The Commonwealth of Virginia serves as an excellent example of articulation policy development. First, the educational system within the Commonwealth has grown significantly in the last few years. Because of economic development in certain sections of the state, the populations in those regions have increased tremendously. Therefore, public school systems that twenty years ago boasted of only twenty thousand students now have enrollments three times that number. With enormous growth has come increased staff with new ideas to meet the varied needs of the students. Special programs (e.g., English as a Second Language) have been implemented to accommodate the needs of various types of non-traditional students.

Second, higher education within the Commonwealth has experienced similar growth in numbers of students. With the beginning of the community college in the Commonwealth in 1966, higher education has seen increasing numbers of students. Today, the total community college enrollment within the Commonwealth nearly exceeds that of other institutions of higher education within the state (SCHEV, 1987).
Third, Virginia education leaders have been talking about articulation for more than twenty years. The opening of the first community college in the state caused leaders to assess ways to prevent duplication of efforts. The community college's major purpose was not to copy the four-year institution but rather to serve a different population and thus meet the higher education needs of the public not met by existing colleges and universities. Clearly, educational leaders have been toying with the concept of articulation for some time.

Finally, the Commonwealth has recently (summer and fall 1988, respectively) developed and implemented a statewide vocational educational articulation program and a statewide dual enrollment plan. Both of these initiatives have involved the public schools and community colleges. Plans are currently in progress for additional upward articulation between the community colleges and senior institutions.

Thus, Virginia serves as an excellent case study for an historical policy analysis of educational articulation. It possesses healthy vital signs. It has a rather long history of seemingly well-intentioned lip service to, and gracious acknowledgement of, the concept of educational articulation. And it is showing tangible proof of budding and thoughtful policy for statewide educational articulation.
The Research Questions

The major research foci for this case study of educational articulation are delineated below:

1. What factors have influenced the development of educational articulation in Virginia public education from 1966, with the opening of the first community college in the state, until December 1990?

2. What has been the Commonwealth of Virginia's policy toward educational articulation?
   a. What roles have public schools played in the development of articulation policy?
   b. What roles have community colleges played in the development of articulation policy?
   c. What roles have four-year colleges and universities played in the development of articulation policy?

3. What significant events within the Commonwealth have influenced the development and implementation of educational articulation policy?
   a. What was the influence of the opening of the community colleges in 1966?
   b. What was the influence of specific organizations (e.g., SCHEV, VCCS, VDE)?
   c. What influence was shown by statewide committees and task forces (e.g., 1977 Articulation Committee)?

4. What specific documents written between 1966 and 1988 have influenced the development and implementation of articulation policy and what has been the nature of their impact?
   a. SCHEV reports
   b. Standards of Quality (VDE)
   c. Dual Enrollment Plan (VCCS & VDE)
   d. Virginia General Assembly Documents
   e. Vocational Education Reports (Virginia Department of Vocational Education)
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

This review is intended to give a philosophical background for conducting an historical policy analysis of educational articulation in Virginia from 1966 until 1990. Particular emphasis is placed on those studies which provide an historical perspective on the articulation process and general articulation practices. The types of articulation found in recent literature are also presented, with their importance briefly summarized, to clarify further the concept of articulation.

Since articulation has two major components, the final two segments of this review present each in detail: first, the literature relevant to current high school and community college articulation practices, and second, the literature relevant to community college and four-year college and the university articulation practices, also called "Two-Plus-Two."

Historical Overview of Articulation

Even though the term "articulation" is newly coined, the problems of articulation have been recurring for many years. Articulation is a new term for an old process, and therefore this section will review the early literature that related to articulation among the segments of education.

The roots of the American educational system are found in Europe. In Europe at the time of American colonization, there was a clear distinction in the social classes; not surprising, this distinction was reflected in the educational system. The "higher" class pupils were taught Latin and Greek while the "average" class children were taught the fundamentals: reading, writing, and preparation for an occupation.

The strong presence of religion in the founding of America was present also in America's early educational system. One writer asserts
that this close relationship of church and state in colonial Massachusetts led to the establishment of town-supported Latin grammar schools. He adds that those Latin schools existed in most of the other colonies under local government, private or church sponsorship (Brown, 1907). Another writer argues that the development of the academy was an alternative to the Latin school (Mulhern, 1933). He believes that some colonial leaders saw the need for a more practical education. Benjamin Franklin was an early supporter of the academy, and he prepared in 1749 a practical curriculum taught in English, including English, writing, history, mathematics, science, modern languages, gardening, agriculture, commerce, bookkeeping, geography, and drawing, as well as the traditional Latin and Greek (Mulhern, 1933). Early proponents of a broad, practical education sought to tie the different aspects of the curriculum together and yet expand the curriculum.

The idea of replacing the academies with a new institution, the public high school, surfaced in 1821 and continued to spread during the next several decades. One writer asserts that now only institutions financed by the community or state and directly controlled by its offices merited the title of public (Brown, 1907). The pressures of technological innovations, population growth, and ethnic diversity highlighted the inadequacies of the loose system of secondary education provided by networks of incorporated academies and private schools throughout the country. The secondary high school seemed to be an attempt to overcome these inadequacies through standardization. Thus, the organization of the high school was a very early attempt at articulation. The first public high school was established in Boston in a town meeting in 1821 (Carroll, 1975). The curriculum was similar to that of an academy (Saylor, 1960).

The idea of articulation became evident in 1892 with the establishment of the "Committee of Ten" with Charles Eliot as chairman. The committee's purpose was to investigate the limits of instruction, the methods of instruction, and a time sequence for subjects. Its results
were in the form of suggestions, which included the teaching of foreign languages, algebra, geometry, and natural science in the elementary school, thus freeing the high school to teach more advanced courses and ultimately to shorten the period of time necessary to complete an education program (NEA, 1894). Another suggestion from the committee was to reduce the elementary school course from eight years to six years, and thus begin secondary school education two years earlier.

The idea of articulation again surfaced with the report of the "Committee of Fifteen" in 1895. It recommended closer alignment between elementary and secondary schools (NEA, 1895). Other writers see the idea of articulation surface with the start of the junior high school (Lounsbury, 1956). Lounsbury asserts that the primary reason for the junior high was to improve the movement of students from elementary schools to senior high schools. Other writers claim the junior high school was not fulfilled in its purpose (Sunderland and Drake, 1956). The literature reveals that articulation practices have been active for some time; nevertheless, the masses of children have not received an uninterrupted and continuously adjusted education.

The Committee of Ten's report brought about new developments in the high school. For example, it is credited with the establishment of the Carnegie Unit, which is the standard of academic measurement for describing the secondary schools' subject matter pattern that constitutes the entrance requirements for college. Menacker (1975) asserts that the establishment of this Carnegie Unit was the "most significant outcome for improved articulation" between high schools and colleges. Some writers indicate that the establishment of the "Committee of Ten" occurred because of decreased college enrollments, underprepared students, and the lack of uniformity in college admissions (Wilbur, 1975; Tyack, 1983). Certainly the "Committee of Ten's" report sparked interest in the student's education.
Early in the twentieth century other committees were formed, including the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching in 1906 and the College Entrance Examination Board in 1900 (Rudolph, 1962). Colleges saw the need to connect levels of education as well as to have some uniformity among them. Another committee established by the National Education Association in 1910 was the "Committee of Nine" whose task it was to seek an alternative to stringent subject requirements for college admission (Raubinger, 1969). In keeping with this purpose, the "Committee of College Entrance Requirements" was formed in 1911.

Tyack (1983) points out that in a 1918 publication called the *Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education* the high school curriculum was considered terminal rather than a preparation for higher education. In 1920 the Progressive Education Association appointed the Commission of the Relations of School to College to examine the subject admission requirements demanded before high school students could be admitted to most colleges. This project came to be known as the "Eight-Year Study," and it reported that college admissions standards should not determine the curricula of high schools (Aiken, 1942). This period showed the beginning of the tension between high schools and colleges in curricula and admissions.

Of course, the 1940's saw a change in higher education with the end of World War II and the G.I. Bill. Large numbers of veterans were able to attend college because of the bill and expanded course offerings (Carnegie, 1973). Changes occurred after the G.I. Bill until Sputnik, at which time high schools and college began to perform again their self-analysis (Rudolph, 1962). Again their program offerings changed to meet the demands of society.

The President's Commission on Higher Education in 1947 saw the need to coordinate efforts between high schools and colleges (Opachinch and Linksz, 1974). The introduction of the G.I. Bill resulted in increased numbers of veterans in high schools and colleges, causing colleges to
relax their admission policies. In addition to the G.I. Bill, the high school equivalency test, the test of the General Education Department (GED) was introduced. It allowed those students who successfully completed the GED to enter college directly without completing high school (Menacker, 1975). However, the Sputnik era forced schools and colleges to take another look at themselves. In response to Sputnik, technical education programs developed in America. In response to new technological programs, Bowles (1967) writes:

The changing condition in our field—steadily increasing numbers of candidates, growing memberships, the tremendous developments in financial aid for students—put a whole set of operational demands on us. The need for direct communication with schools and colleges . . . had to be met. (212)

While acknowledging the cooperation of various levels of education in the past, clearly the host of committee reports and studies point to the need for more active cooperation.

Two recent publications have sought to respond to the need for more partnerships between high schools and colleges: Action for Excellence: A Comprehensive Plan to Improve Our Nation's Schools (1983) and A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform (1983). The first volume recommended stronger partnerships in education as vital to the nation's future. A Nation at Risk sought to draw attention to the national educational system and society's superficial attitude toward its excellence. It also stressed the idea that the future of the nation is limited if changes are not made.

Again in 1983, a publication entitled Academic Preparation for College (by the College Board) presented the results of a ten-year undertaking to improve secondary and postsecondary education. This report concluded that in order to have quality in higher education there must be a coordination of students' knowledge and skills at both levels—high school and college.

In summary, the literature shows that articulation is not a new process; however, the name given to the process may be newly coined. It
is therefore imperative to examine some of the specific types of articulation efforts which have evolved, in addition to demonstrating the importance of articulation within the educational system.

Types of Articulation

There are several types of articulation. Carr (1974) sees two of these groups as formal and informal articulation. He describes formal articulation as the coordination between a community college and its environmental partners (i.e., high schools, senior institutions, industry and the community). Informal articulation consists of subtle but powerful influences such as individual and institutional attitudes and unofficial attempts at solving small problems of coordination. Menacker (1975) suggests that this informal category of articulation can support or undermine the formal activities to such an extent that, even in officially sanctioned articulation efforts, its effects must not be overlooked.

Another classification system according to Carr separates articulation into vertical and horizontal components (1974). Vertical articulation consists of conventional processes—coordinating the transfer upward from high school to college (two-year or four-year institutions) and from two-year institutions to four-year institutions. He believes that horizontal articulation is often ignored. He suggests students move laterally instead of vertically. More explicitly, horizontal articulation involves the student's lateral movement within an educational level such as transferring from one public school to another. He describes the movement of students at this level even further—from community college to business and industry. He therefore suggests that students move laterally into or out of the community college from either industry or the community. The latter feature, he asserts, results in improved relations between the community college and both industry and the community.

Menacker (1975) takes the complex issue of articulation and organizes it into four categories: (1) educational specialty articulation, (2) administrative articulation, (3) subject-or curricula-
articulation, and (4) guidance-centered articulation. Educational specialty articulation consists of all coordinating efforts within an educational field or area, such as mathematics, science, or health. Administrative articulation occurs when administrators at the community college and other levels make a personal and institutional commitment to a cooperative endeavor. Curriculum articulation consists of those efforts made to ease the transition in subjects spanning the different levels. It involves, for example, the development of skills at one level which are prerequisite for success at the next sequential level. Guidance-centered articulation occurs when program selection, admission, transferability, academic and social adjustment, and other important activities occur.

Several writers (Cross, 1971; Cox, 1966; Burnett, Bigham and Carr, 1977) argue that curriculum articulation is needed by institutions to insure maximum credit transfer for students. Community colleges and four-year college and university personnel must work to insure the best coordination for the student, these writers assert.

In addition to general articulation efforts, some community colleges have entered into special articulation agreements with several senior institutions. Under one such agreement, known as a Two-Plus-Two program, a student who completes the requirements for an associate's degree in a program at a community college transfers directly to the senior institution to complete the bachelor's degree, with no loss of credit. For instance, a student who earns an Associate in Science Degree with a major in Science and a specialization in Computer Science at a community college can transfer directly to a senior institution with junior standing and without loss of credit.

The varied types of articulation show that articulation is thought to be worthwhile. Educators have devoted time and thought to the articulation process. Consequently, more research on articulation is needed.
Two-Plus-Two or Four-Year College/Community Articulation Programs

Two-Plus-Two as a form of articulation is relatively new. Most of the literature uses "two-plus-two," "2 plus 2," and "2 + 2" to denote the cooperation and/or agreements existing between the high school and the community college. However, the phrase is also used to describe the cooperation in programs between the community college and four-year institution.

Ernst (1978) alluded to the idea of cooperation in his article defining the articulation process. He asserts that the institution's mission and goals to a large extent determine the nature and effectiveness of articulation. Of the many factors that determine the goals and objectives of a community college, a major concern is its location in relation to the four-year college or university. Ernst asserts that each institution should understand its respective service to the area, and each should work cooperatively to achieve those goals.

Several two-plus-two programs already exist between high schools and community colleges. Scott (1985) describes, for example, a four-year (11th through 14th grade-level) agricultural curriculum involving Bakersfield College, the Kern High School District, and representatives of forty-eight agriculture businesses. This study was based on enrollment during the fall of the 1980-81 academic year and showed the financial advantages of the articulation efforts. One purpose of this program was to provide agricultural employers with better prepared employees. This two-plus-two program permits four-year agricultural training by connecting two years in the high school with two years at Bakersfield College. The result was to promote graduates to a master technician title with advanced skills. This program represents unusual sharing, leadership, and commitment.

Brauder (1986) describes the successful development and operation of several two-plus-two technical preparation programs at Williamsport Area Community College. Here the last two years of a high school student's
education are joined to the first two years of his/her college study in a well-organized, uninterrupted track of study.

Yet another two-plus-two program is found in Newport News, Virginia. This program consists of the Peninsula Public Schools (Secondary) and the Peninsula Vocational-Technical Center, and it is designed to prepare technicians for new advanced-technology occupations such as electronic and telecommunication technicians. Spanning grades eleven through fourteen, the aim of this program is to develop master technicians who are broadly educated.

Finally, another two-plus-two high school and community college articulation program exists between the Dallas County Community College District in Dallas, Texas, and the Dallas high schools. This program coordinates the community college vocational education program with feeder high school programs. Some of the program areas are auto mechanics, child development, drafting, design technology, and office careers.

When one reviews the history of the American educational system, the ideas of cooperation and coordination are evident. Articulation between high schools and community colleges will continue. Parnell (1985) states this clearly:

> Clear signals must be given high school faculty, students, and their parents about the role of preparatory requirements for succeeding in a technical or junior college . . . . Much greater attention must be given to coherence in the curriculum, calling for closer program articulation between high schools and colleges. (96)

When one examines articulation between community colleges and four-year colleges, he or she really thinks of transfer and wonders if there is a difference. However, there is a difference. Transfer refers to a student's leaving one college and continuing his or her education at another college with the goal of earning a bachelor's degree. He or she may lose some credit for some of his or her previous courses, if the four-year college refuses to accept some credits. Articulation, especially in
community colleges and four-year institutions, is somewhat different. Some of these programs have used the name "two-plus-two" to refer to the special agreement these schools have made. For example, in a two-plus-two program, a student's curriculum at the community college is closely coordinated with his or her curriculum at the four-year college because representatives of each institution have an agreement whereby the curricula in specific areas (e.g., education, accounting) are coordinated, and the student is assured acceptance of courses without having to retake courses.

Brawer (1985) discusses several issues related to articulation which concern community college and four-year college practices that emerged from visits to several colleges. One issue, she explains, relates to the idea of universities being dictatorial in what courses they will accept. These universities wonder why their curriculum should be dictated to them. She further notes that universities challenge the contents of courses and deny factoring GPA's earned at the community college. These same universities may require that the student take additional courses. However, she believes that if enrollment at universities declines, the competition for students, especially freshmen, will become keener.

Probably the most notable of all current articulation programs is the Ford Foundation's Urban Community College Transfer Program (UCCTP), Brawer explains. This program involves twenty-four urban colleges with high percentages of minority enrollment; the purpose of this project is to increase the movement of minority students from two-year institutions to four-year institutions.

Florida is one state that has a state-mandated program of articulation between colleges and universities. It is a statewide numbering system developed to better coordinate courses. Articulation in Florida seems effective. In one example, students who successfully complete one semester at Miami-Dade Community College will be upper
division/level freshmen at Florida International University after transferring.

Maricopa County Community College District (MCCCD) in Arizona has an articulation program also. Its administration and teachers involved in the program curriculum meet regularly to discuss courses.

A similar program also exists with the University of Texas and area two-year colleges. California has several articulation programs already in progress. One such program involves the University of California at Berkeley and another California State University of Sacramento and Stanislaus. The Chancellor of the California Community College System has initiated directives for these programs.

One can conclude from the literature on two-plus-two programs and community college and four-year college transfer programs that these programs occur all over the country. Though they may differ in methods, they continue to increase in size and occur in more and more institutions. With increased cooperation and communication between program faculty and administrators, these programs will continue to develop; and there will be an elimination of duplication of programs with area colleges.

High School/Community College Articulation

The high school has long sought to educate young people, and a part of that education is to prepare students for success in higher education. Pattillo and Stout (1951) prepared a report to show how high school educators view their relations with colleges. They summarize their report as follows:

1. College admissions requirements in their present form are adversely influencing the curriculum offerings of secondary schools.

2. Colleges have not adopted their curricula, teaching methods, guidance services, and admissions practices to serve the needs of their students and to accord with the findings of modern research in education.

3. Colleges do not provide high schools with adequate information about college programs, admission requirements and procedures, and the level of ability of
students in particular higher education institutions.

4. The visitations of college representatives and the publications of colleges are often of a purely promotional nature and do not help the student select the best college.

5. Parents and college personnel too frequently place sole responsibility on the high school for the failure of students in college.

6. Colleges make heavy demands on high school authorities for detailed information about applicants, and must be needed or properly used for admission purposes. (126)

In contrast with Pattillo and Stout's (1951) report on how high school educators view their relations with colleges, college educators often express their willingness to cooperate with high school educators in college admissions requirements for students. Therefore, articulation is not always explicitly stated. Commenting on the value of college admission requirements, Gerrita notes:

Colleges and universities generally are becoming more liberal in the admissions of pupils with respect to the course of study which they have followed in high school. Practically all studies have been made to show good performance in high school is much more important for prediction purposes than exposure to particular types of subject matter. Thus the pupil with good college aptitude may now proceed in many different college courses without difficulty regardless of the subject preparation he has lost in high school. (117)

Several studies show how high school articulation efforts have varied. For example, Woelfer (1975) reported the success of articulation efforts between North Carolina's Sprint Institute and the Duplin County high schools in reference to goal setting and occupational programs. Those involved in the project concluded that the schools needed to standardize skill requirements of students and that the instructors needed to be aware of the curricula of the other institutions and the requirements of the business world.

Friedlander (1982) recommends increasing cooperative efforts to avoid duplication of effort. He shows how to increase high school and college program efforts by heightening high school student interest in
liberal arts education and by increasing the number of academically gifted students attending colleges.

Several colleges have devised programs which aid in the articulation process of students from high school to college. One such program is found at Miami-Dade Community College (MDCC), often considered a community college leader. Among this college's articulation efforts with local high schools is the annual six-week summer program for approximately two hundred gifted and talented high school students. This program provides college-level instruction with hands-on experience using state of the art equipment and facilities. Miami-Dade Community College also offers scholarships to outstanding Dade County high school seniors who graduate in the top ten percent of their class. In addition, MDCC has a dual enrollment system which has operated for a number of years as a part of its articulation agreement with the high schools. Florida law now permits both the high school and the community college to collect state funds for a currently enrolled student.

Queens College (New York) instituted an articulation project for junior and senior high school students in English. This program permits students to take college-level English classes. One prime component of this project was the development of a task force consisting of public school and college faculty who together formed a cohesive group which met regularly to schedule monthly meetings, describe teaching techniques, formulate goals, and discuss student motivation, successes, and failures. The results of this group were design and implementation of an articulated English curriculum for the eleventh grade through the freshmen year (Parnell, 1985).

In 1981 LaGuardia Community College's (LGCC) Center for high school and college articulation was established by Janet Lieberman and Arthur Greenbay as an informational system to exchange data about high school/college programs (Parnell, 1985).
The Alamo Community College District and San Antonio College have developed a high technology high school. Although it is located on the campus, it enrolls junior and senior high school students in science, math, and computer courses taught by college faculty. These students receive college credit and credit toward high school diplomas. According to Parnell (1985) the school opened in the fall of 1983 with phase one, a baccalaureate degree track that prepares students for college-level work through advanced courses.

Williamsport Area Community College in Pennsylvania has developed a program that allows eleventh and twelfth graders to enroll in vocational technical-education programs, according to Parnell (1985). Approximately 800 high school students are enrolled in fifteen socially designed programs.

The Community College of Rhode Island has developed a guide aimed at high school freshmen, indicating the kind of high school preparation required to succeed in community college programs (Parnell, 1985).

Hagerstown Junior College in Maryland has begun cooperative agreements with Washington County high schools. College credit is offered for advanced work in biology, English, foreign languages, and secretarial science (Parnell, 1985).

An examination of high school and community college articulation literature reveals considerable interest on the part of educators at both levels. Thompson (1978) asserts that the increase in students who go directly from high school to college has advanced interest in high school and community college articulation efforts. Similarly, the literature is replete with a variety of articulation practices involving high schools and community colleges. Clearly the variety of articulation programs, as well as the numbers of programs currently in operation, points to the need for more research on these programs.
Conclusion

The first part of this review presented an historical perspective of the articulation process. And one can thus conclude that articulation has been a part of education for decades. The second part presented the various types of articulation present in education today. There are many forms, and the connections continue to broaden. The final two sections noted literature on two specific forms of articulation—community college/four-year college, or two-plus-two articulation, and high school and community college articulation practices, with specific examples of the existing programs.

If all these programs have one common feature, it is that they are primarily concerned with the student's cohesiveness in secondary and post-secondary, as well as, career education. The abundance of current literature leads one to consider the vast popularity articulation has achieved and still possesses today. Researchers cite the importance of articulation in aiding student educational goal attainment.

This literature review gives an historical background on educational articulation. It reveals the different types of programs available today. It also explains current articulation practices and some of the problems associated with articulation. High school and community college articulation practices and community college and four-year college practices clearly assert the need and worth of educational articulation. However, the literature neglected to reveal any statewide policies for articulation. It also failed to trace the development and implementation of articulation policy within states. The case study of articulation in the Commonwealth of Virginia holds much promise for beginning to fill this research void.
CHAPTER 3
METHODOLOGY

Introduction

An examination of the research literature suggests methodology pertinent to this study. In order to answer the research questions, two distinct methods are used. The first section of the methodology chapter presents a theoretical rationale for policy analysis as a means of analyzing the development and implementation of policy. The second section of this chapter lists specific documents to be analyzed in this research, the reason for their selection, and the information they reveal about the success and failure of articulation policy.

Theoretical Rationale for Policy Analysis

This research project is concerned with analyzing specific documents which relate to the development and implementation of articulation policy in the Commonwealth. Therefore, this section presents an appropriate theoretical rationale for policy development and implementation.

Pressman and Wildavsky (1973) have noted that in developing policy, a goal or an "end" result is a paramount feature that provides direction and meaning to policy. Implementation of the policy then can only be measured as successful or not when measured against this stated goal (Pressman and Wildavsky, 1973). Finally, to measure the success or failure of policy, the goal must be stated in measurable terms. The analysis of policy in this research was based on Pressman and Wildavsky's (1973) theory of policy analysis. Their theory of policy development states:

Policies imply theories whether stated explicitly or not. Policies point to a chain of causation between initial conditions and future consequences. (If X then Y.) Policies become programs when, by authoritative action, the initial conditions are created. X now exists. Programs make theories operational by forging
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the first link in the causal chain connecting actions to objections. Given X, we can act to obtain Y. Implementation, then, is the ability to forge subsequent links in the causal chain so as to obtain the desired results. (XV)

Pressman and Wildavsky (1973) conclude their rationale for the causal link between policy and implementation by stating that:

The study of implementation requires understanding that apparently simple sequences of events depend on complex chains of reciprocal interactions. Hence, each part of the chain must be built with the others in view. The separation of policy design from implementation is fatal. It is no better than mindless implementation without a sense of direction. (XVII)

This rationale gives key phrases that are important to analyzing policy: 1) policies imply theories, 2) policies represent a chain of causation, 3) policies indicate forged links, 4) policies indicate a reciprocal interaction, 5) policies suggest a hierarchical order that is implied in the chain of events, and 6) separation of policy design from implementation is fatal.

Pressman and Wildavsky's (1973) idea of policy development can be summarized in the following way. (1) Identify a goal or result. This goal or result must be stated in measurable terms. (2) Identify theories. Policies imply theories. (3) Policies point to a chain of causation between initial and future consequences, so to identify a chain of causation is the next aspect of policy development. (4) Show how policies become programs. By authoritative action initial conditions are created. (5) Make theories operational by forging the first link in the causal chain connection to objectives. (6) Show implementation (to forge other links in the chain to obtain desired results). There must be hierarchical order implied in the chain of events. The separation of policy design from implementation is fatal.

Additional literature on policy formation and implementation shows why the process is lengthy and tedious. Peterson (1971) believes policy decision making can occur on a variety of levels. Within the level of authority, he draws a distinction between "policy" decisions, "managerial"
decisions, and "operating" decisions. "Policy" decisions establish the organization's (long-range) goals and objectives. "Managerial" decisions refer to fiscal, facility, program, and personnel decisions relating to the organization's goals and objectives. "Managerial" decisions also refer to conflict resolutions and coordination of efforts among the various segments of an organization toward achievement of organizational goals. "Operating" decisions refer to actual tasks centered toward organizational goals. These may be delegated and/or performed by the leader. Bogue and Riggs (1974) create similar categories of distinction between organizational decisions, but they suggest that all categories are policy decisions.

Authority is basically a stable element in decision-making. Management can delegate responsibility but does not transfer authority (Letterer, 1965). An organization's structure assigns authority.

Another level of policy decision-making is that of influence. Peterson (1971) asserts that "whereas authority is largely a zero-sum concept, influence is largely dependent upon personal initiative" (533). He continues by adding:

While the concept of authority is essentially one which resides in positions and formal groups in a university, the notion of influence by definition resides primarily in the individual. While a person can use his authorized sanction to influence others, he also can utilize information, beliefs and values, personality, and other social rewards and pressures in a more personal interaction. (533)

The final level of policy formation and decision-making is that of information (Porter, 1971). Influence on a policy decision is difficult to achieve outside authority positions if one is ignorant of the facts. The control of information is an important variable in maintaining authority. Consequently, the leader's ability to influence others' actions plays a significant role in policy making.

The goals of an organization, according to Nebrandhi and Reiman (1973), act as guides to policy decisions. Goals of colleges and universities are influenced by a concern for students and a concern for
the organization—its mission, standards, norms, values, and well-being of its members. Therefore, the degree to which organizational goals can be achieved depends on the extent of coordination of efforts.

In summary, the literature on policy formulation and implementation can be applied specifically to educational articulation. First of all, Peterson's (1971) levels of decision making assert that the organization's goals and objectives are projected in its policies. Articulation efforts should be directed through policy in order to enhance institutional goals and objectives. Managerial decisions are necessary to enhance articulation because they provide a mechanism for actual production. Any problems are resolved at this level. Operating decisions, on the other hand, are actual implementation tactics which require time and skill. Again, the separation of policy design from implementation is fatal (Pressman and Wildavsky 1973), producing at best mindless action without a sense of direction.

Documents to be Analyzed

This last section reviews the specific documents to be analyzed as a part of this study, concentrating on why they were selected and what they should and should not reveal about articulation policy development and implementation. The first documents included in the analysis are reports or publications developed by the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia (SCHEV). These include "Guidelines for Promoting Articulation Between the State Controlled Community Colleges and Four-Year Colleges and Universities":

- Document I Approved - April 3, 1967
- Document II Updated - December 11, 1969
- Document III Updated - June 8, 1972.

These documents were chosen because they contain information directly referencing educational articulation within the Commonwealth. These guidelines list specific ways community colleges and four-year colleges and universities do or do not provide smooth articulation. Since there are updates of the original guidelines, the implementation of
community college and four-year college articulation efforts are or are not revealed along with the specific changes in the updated versions of the document. These guidelines do not provide the detailed roles that the community colleges or four-year colleges played in their development but concentrate on the process.

There are documents published by SCHEV (every two years since 1974) which show the state of public higher education within the Commonwealth. These documents are called The Virginia Plan for Higher Education. These plans were chosen because the purpose of the publication(s) is to inform the citizens of the Commonwealth of the health of higher education within the state. These documents reveal the health of the articulation process. This analysis will examine the 1974, 1977, 1981, and 1983 editions.

The plans reveal the goals of higher education in Virginia for each two-year period indicated, present general recommendations to colleges and specific recommendations for college boards, and measure how the Commonwealth's system of higher education expects to compete and rate with other systems throughout the country. The literature reveals that other states have been actively pursuing goals in this direction. These documents give the organization's broad goals of articulation.

SCHEV also presents reports to the Virginia General Assembly in the form of House documents. One such document which specifically references articulation and is analyzed in this research is "The Report on Articulation Agreements: A Progress Report to the Governor and The General Assembly of Virginia"—House Document No. 6, 1977.

House Document No. 6 gives the status of articulation in 1977 in the Commonwealth, with focus on specific institutions and leaders and what they are doing to enhance articulation between community colleges and four-year colleges and universities. This document should show the institutions' representatives who were instrumental in formulating articulation policy. Institutional positions are noted. Statewide committees are examined as well.
The Virginia State Superintendent of Public Instruction and the Chancellor of the Virginia Community College System, with the endorsement of the Commonwealth's Secretary of Education, in 1988 established the Committee on Dual Enrollment. Reports of this committee should reference articulation with state public secondary schools and colleges (community colleges and four-year colleges), with recommendations for present and future cooperative effort.

In addition to SCHEV documents and Dual Enrollment reports, the State Board of Education in Virginia publishes "Standards of Quality," which are reports on public elementary and secondary education within the Commonwealth. These reports should list goals and objectives of the Commonwealth's system of public instruction in these areas. The reports should indicate how the state intends to meet the educational needs of its students, and one of those should be coordinating all segments of the student's education, which, in turn, should reference articulation (especially high school/community college and university). Therefore, high school articulation policy development and implementation should be indicated in some way in these documents.

The final documents included in the analysis are Vocational Education Reports. These reports were produced by the Commonwealth's Joint Vocational-Technical Education Committee, and they represent agreements between the Virginia Department of Education and the Virginia Community College System. These documents include current articulation plans, objectives, programs, and models of articulation within the Commonwealth. Policy development and implementation methods should be a significant part of these documents.
CHAPTER 4
PRESENT ARTICULATION IN THE COMMONWEALTH—1990

Introduction

The Commonwealth's system of higher education continued to prosper in 1990. First, the enrollment of students in public institutions increased, especially in the Virginia Community College System, which served over 200,000 students in its twenty-three colleges (VCCS Annual Report 1988). Not only did enrollment increase, but new programs were added and old programs strengthened. There was an increase in articulation efforts during 1988 because of the priority given to articulation by mid- and upper-level educational leaders. The Chancellor of the Virginia Community College System and the Commonwealth's Secretary of Education blessed the idea of articulation, but it was mid-level leaders who worked toward the establishment of articulation policy. This step represents a major achievement for articulation because little attention had been given to this process, and formal statewide policy had not been formulated, prior to this time. This chapter describes current articulation efforts in the Commonwealth by secondary schools, community colleges, and senior colleges with a focus on the key players participating in articulation efforts, the influence of each sector on articulation in the Commonwealth, and any articulation policy which resulted from these sectors.

Secondary Schools and Community Colleges

The major efforts of the secondary schools and community colleges in the Commonwealth toward articulation will be presented in this section. During 1988 important strides were made in articulation between secondary schools and community colleges in Virginia. In order to provide a systematic method of presentation, the contribution to articulation of key
participants in the secondary schools and community colleges is presented first, with their influence carefully noted. Next, the specific influences of secondary education on articulation in the Commonwealth are explained. Finally, since the focus of this study centers on the development of articulation policy, the last section discusses the formation of articulation policy.

Secondary school articulation efforts moved swiftly in 1988 largely because of the efforts of mid-level administrators. According to Dr. Edwin Barnes, then Assistant Vice Chancellor for Instructional Programs and Student Services for the Virginia Community College System, the idea of articulation between the VCCS and the state's public secondary schools originated when Dr. Dewey Oakley, Administrative Director of the State's Department of Vocational Education, and Dr. Ned Swartz, Supervisor for State Planning and Data Management in the Virginia Department of Vocational and Adult Education, and he met in 1987 to discuss the possibilities of such a plan. Dr. Barnes also asserts that the individuals at the helm in both the Virginia Department of Education and the VCCS (Dr. Jeff Hockaday, Chancellor of the VCCS, and Dr. John Davis, State Superintendent of Public Instruction) readily endorsed the idea of articulation (Barnes, 1989).

Drs. Barnes, Swartz, and Oakley worked together to initiate positive responses toward articulation. The literature reinforces the importance of this spirit. Wilbur (1981) concurs with Krash's (1980) idea of cooperation by stating:

The success of school-college partnerships depends on many factors, but probably the most important is the cooperative spirit. If persons in both institutions are not willing to work together drawing on a reservoir of mutual trust and respect, joint programming will not work. (44)

Nevertheless, articulation did not exist in many areas of the Commonwealth. According to Dr. Ned Swartz, the idea of articulation had been slow in coming because of "turf protection" (1989). For example, Dr.
Barnes asserts that some community college personnel felt the secondary schools' vocational education program was not equal to the VCCS's program (1989). Most personnel were eager to keep their programs and not to share the program funds or personnel with other agencies. However, Dr. Barnes and Dr. Swartz concur that they had no trouble working with each other or with many other personnel from the VCCS and the Commonwealth's Vocational Education staff (1989). Another example of turf protection was the schools' fear of losing control of some programs. Few, if any, educators were interested in any process or program which seemed to threaten their agency to any degree. Even though turf protection has historically been a problem, Dr. Barnes and Dr. Swartz transcended this problem of turf protection, no doubt a significant key to their success.

Articulation thus proceeded. Dr. Barnes and Dr. Swartz assert that several factors were important to the success of articulation. The first factor was the presence of an adequate forum to present ideas initially (1989). Once those educators (Drs. Barnes, Swartz, and Oakley) established goals and objectives for active articulation, having a forum for the presentation of ideas was extremely important. Dr. Barnes asserts that the importance of a forum for the presentation of ideas is that it ensures the presenter of the political support needed to enhance his idea (1989). Dr. Barnes and others were given the opportunity to present the idea of articulation to a task force called the Joint Vocational-Technical Education Committee (Barnes, 1989). This committee included two members of the State Board of Education. Also, an especially significant member of this group was Senator Adelard Brault, who had been interested in articulation for some time. Because of the presentation by Dr. Barnes, Senator Brault provided much needed political support (Barnes, 1989).

Another factor important to the success of articulation, according to Dr. Barnes, is the testing of every aspect of the proposed program—articulation—with philosophical precepts. These precepts include:

---Benefits to students will override benefits to agencies.
--Students will not be required to study what they already know.
--There should be no disincentives for articulation.
--New initiatives should not disrupt existing articulation agreements.
--Strong leadership should come from both state agencies.

(Barnes, 1989)

The basic goal of these precepts was to keep all players involved with the initial steps of articulation and focused on the goal without the possibility of turf protection or any aim that would prevent smooth operation of articulation.

Mid-level administrators in the community college, specifically Dr. Barnes, were largely responsible for movement in articulation; however, secondary school leaders such as Dr. Swartz participated in articulation efforts. Together they greatly influenced the Commonwealth's articulation policy development. In fact, discussions and activities within the secondary school system regarding standards and expectations during this period advanced the articulation process greatly. While perhaps not intentional, the adoption of seven "Standards of Quality" by the Commonwealth's Board of Education in 1988 was a positive step.

Standard One asserts that local public school boards have the responsibility for developing and implementing a coordinated program of instruction for grades K-12. It can be inferred that these programs are created to develop in students the knowledge and skills they need for further education and employment. Coordination in education provides a means of relating each segment of a student's education, from elementary school through college. Such coordination eliminates redundancy and gaps in a student's education.

Part D of Standard One asserts that local public school boards throughout the state should also implement the following:

Competency based vocational education programs, career guidance and job seeking skills for all secondary students including those considered handicapped.
Academic and vocational preparation for students who plan to continue their education beyond secondary school or who plan to enter employment. (2)

These two standards provide evidence of the Board of Education's interest in fostering a cooperative educational effort, such as articulation, in the Commonwealth's secondary education system. There is a desire to prepare public secondary students for education and careers beyond the secondary school. The realization of this desire is an effort toward articulation. Articulation seeks to coordinate a student's secondary education with a student's college or university education. Articulation can also involve coordinating a student's vocational education and employment with the student's public school education.

Vocational education and community college education were the areas initially considered for articulation by Drs. Barnes and Swartz. According to these gentlemen, they had no specific reason for choosing these two segments of the educational system; they simply began an informal discussion one afternoon and conceived this idea (1989). With one representing Virginia community colleges and the other representing the secondary schools, together they set goals and objectives, showing how articulation could be successful statewide. These mid-level administrators worked tirelessly to ensure that the wheels of articulation were in motion. In order to promote articulation efforts successfully, the articulation plan needed review, and plans for implementation needed review as well. Final plans and implementation required curriculum committees in specific program areas to construct models of cooperation, including coordination of course objectives, agreement on course competencies, and procedures for evaluation.

Another influence of public secondary education on articulation within the Commonwealth was the recognition and elimination of barriers to articulation. Dr. Swartz and Dr. Barnes assert that these barriers, such as time constraints (time to plan, organize and carry out the articulation with one program), may be difficult; some staff may wonder if financial
resources are available to meet existing demands as well as to plan for articulation. Resource concerns can be eliminated when they are acknowledged, and ways are sought to remove them (1989).

One significant document resulting from the cooperation of state-level, mid-range leaders, as well as those at the helm, was entitled "A Public Partnership for Vocational-Technical Education." This document was developed in 1988 under the direction of the Joint Vocational-Technical Education Committee, with mid-level administrators in both the community college and secondary schools guiding the efforts. The specific curriculum coordinators in both the secondary schools and community colleges recommended specific teachers to serve on special committees in the articulation effort, representing agreements between the Virginia Department of Education and the Virginia Community College System. The work was the result of the efforts of members of the Joint Vocational-Technical Education Committee, which consisted of some Virginia Board of Education members and some State Board for Community College members.

The two educational sectors wanted to expand their partnership to provide well-coordinated, vocational-technical education programs. These programs were designed to enable high school vocational students to make a smooth transition from the high school to the community college without loss of time and financial resources. The main intent of the committee was the expansion of the partnership into a comprehensive, statewide plan for program coordination, with three major goals. These goals are:

1. To identify all remaining programs within the two systems that can be coordinated and to initiate action leading to written cooperative agreements;

2. To implement a program of shared staff development to ensure increased cost effectiveness; and

3. To design and implement new, sophisticated strategies for coordination, such as the expansion of existing "2 + 2" programming designed to prepare technicians for new, advanced technology occupations. (1)
In addition to these three goals, the committee also developed philosophical precepts to stimulate cooperative efforts toward achievement of the goals. These include:

1. Benefits to students will override benefits of agencies.
2. Students will not be required to learn what they already know.
3. Any barriers to the continuation or establishment of coordinated programs will be eliminated.
4. New initiatives will not disrupt existing coordination agreements.
5. Strong leadership will come from both agencies—the Virginia Department of Education and the Virginia Community College System. (Barnes, 1989)

The Joint Vocational-Educational Committee established strategies to achieve its partnership goals. These strategies were in the areas of programming and staff development. This committee focused its efforts on existing vocational programs, future vocational programs, and an expansion of current vocational programs. Staff development plans focused on frequent conferences and workshops to promote a coordinated, well-developed relationship between the two educational sectors. These strategies were:

1. Annual conference on vocational education. An annual conference on vocational education was conducted for professional personnel from state secondary schools and community colleges. Each conference was designed to stimulate further cooperative efforts among secondary and postsecondary educators in the Commonwealth.

2. Regional in-service workshops. Four regional workshops were conducted to update technical faculty of secondary schools and community colleges. Continued updating of training is required to keep pace with new technology.

3. In-service education for vocational administrators. A seminar on economic development was held for vocational administrators from secondary schools and community colleges. Workshops for beginning vocational administrators from both systems were conducted.

4. Annual coordination workshops. Meetings organized by instructional program areas were conducted for personnel from secondary schools and community colleges for the purpose of developing new coordination agreements. Curriculum materials needed to coordinate programs at the two levels were reviewed at these meetings, which
The Vocational-Education Committee also identified five objectives for enhancing vocational-technical articulation between the Commonwealth's public secondary schools and community colleges. These objectives were:

Objective 1: To modify Virginia Community College System policies and procedures to facilitate articulation agreements and to insure consistent applications.

Objective 2: To plan and implement a joint program of professional development for vocational faculty and administrators from both systems.

Objective 3: To update the state of existing articulation initiatives between secondary schools and community colleges in the Commonwealth and to identify the potential for expanding these initiatives.

Objective 4: To expand the number of 2 + 2 programs between community colleges and secondary schools in the Commonwealth.

Objective 5: To develop and promote articulation models in program areas which are most common to community colleges and secondary schools in Virginia.

According to the Joint Vocational-Education Report these objectives were especially helpful because they aided the mid-level administrators in providing articulation exercises involving faculty and staff persons from the various educational institutions. The first objective was addressed in the 1988-89 working plan. This objective states:

To modify Virginia Community College System policies and procedures to facilitate articulation agreements and to insure consistent applications.

The second objective focused on planning and implementing a joint program for professional development for vocational faculty and
administrators in the public secondary schools and the community colleges in Virginia. Several strategies were developed to promote objective two. These include:

A. "The Annual Conference on Vocational Education";

B. "The New Horizons in Vocational and Technical Education Conference";

C. Nine regional drive-in workshops scheduled statewide to provide technology updating on computer networking for secondary schools and community college business teachers;

D. A provision in the 1989-90 Vocational Education State Plan to fund scholarships for secondary/postsecondary vocational administrators to participate in the Virginia Institute for Economic Development. (Joint Vocational Report Program, 1988)

These conferences and workshops involving teachers and administrators were an example of articulation in action in the Commonwealth.

The First Annual Vocational Education Conference program was designed to accomplish several tasks:

Improve vocational instruction by providing the opportunity for vocational educators to develop and update skills, knowledge, and attitudes directly related to the performance of their responsibilities. It is expected that this year's conference design will promote more cooperation among all vocational program services and will facilitate the articulation of vocational education efforts in local school divisions, community colleges, universities, Governor's Employment Training Department and other public and private agencies. (Joint Vocational Report, 1988).

In order to provide teachers with vivid examples of the workings of articulation in the area of business, one entire day of the conference was designated as the "Business Education Summer Conference." This time was used to offer workshops and clinics for business teachers to provide examples of articulation in business education. Business educators from community colleges and public schools went through articulation exercises together in fields such as Business Management, Data Processing, Accounting and Office Technology.
This "Business Education Summer Conference" included persons needed to enhance articulation from diverse sectors of the Commonwealth. Included were members of the Virginia Board of Education, Virginia Department of Education, State Board for Community Colleges and Virginia Community College System, Virginia Vocational-Technical Education Foundation, Inc., and the Public Relations Council for Vocational-Technical Education (Joint Vocational Education Report Program, 1988).

According to Dr. Barnes, the mid-level administrators who were interested in a well-planned articulation program attempted to cover every obstacle to ensure a clear and smooth flow of the planning and formulation of an articulation program between the community colleges and the secondary schools (1989). In keeping with this planning, this vocational conference was one of several strategies designed to prepare faculty and administrators for implementation of educational articulation policy. This vocational conference included representative members of the Public Relations Council for Vocational-Technical Education, the Virginia Board of Education, the Virginia Department of Education, the State Board for Community Colleges, the Virginia Community College System, and the Virginia Council on Vocational Education. All gave both leadership and direction to the Vocational Education Marketing Program that was started in 1987.

Another step taken to ensure that an articulation program could work in the Commonwealth was the inclusion of the Virginia Council on Vocational Education as a part of this conference. The Virginia Council on Vocational Education was created by the United States Congress through the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968, and its purposes were redirected and expanded under the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act of 1984. The activities of the Council were important because they supported the general purposes of the law "to assist the States to expand, improve, modernize, and develop quality vocational education programs to meet the needs of the Nation's existing and future work force for
marketable skills and to improve productivity and promote economic growth, " (Public Law 98-524). Dr. Swartz asserts that the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act has aided articulation in the state in that the purpose of articulation between the community college system and secondary schools and part of the purpose of this act were similar. An articulation program between these two agencies could help to expand and improve existing educational programs to help meet state and national needs in the area of vocational education, leading to better future employment skills for students (1989).

The Joint Vocational-Technical Education Committee did not itself institute all of these conferences and workshops. The mid-level administrators sought ways of sharing their ideas on how articulation could work in the Commonwealth; therefore, they endorsed these efforts by setting goals and ensuring that other educators (superintendents, deans, admissions officers) selected competent faculty and department chairs to work on these committees for planning conferences and workshops. Professional development was an important aspect of articulation planning. In order to implement a joint program of professional development for faculty and staff who would be working directly with the articulation efforts and ensure the continued success of these articulation efforts in the area of vocational-technical education, a series of drive-in workshops was planned.

The conference "New Horizons in Vocational and Technical Education," held in April of 1988, was an outgrowth of these workshops. "New Horizons" was jointly sponsored by the Virginia Community College System, the Virginia Council on Vocational Education, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, and the Virginia Center for Public and Private Initiatives. According to the Joint Vocational Educational Report Program, the conference's purpose was awareness of the future of instruction, curricula, and other articulation needs (1988). In addition to professional development activities already planned for faculty and
administrators, a series of nine regional drive-in workshops of two and one-half hours each was added to update secondary school and community college business teachers on computer networking.

In addition to the first two objectives (37) presented by the Joint Vocational-Technical Education Committee for enhancing articulation between the Commonwealth's public secondary schools and community colleges, three additional objectives were identified.

**Objective Three:** To update the state of existing articulation initiatives between secondary schools and community colleges in the Commonwealth and to identify the potential for expanding these initiatives (2).

Objective three was important to articulation because its purpose was to identify the current articulation efforts between secondary schools and community colleges in the Commonwealth and to examine the possibility of expanding these efforts. In response to Objective Three presented by the Joint Vocational-Technical Education Committee, all Virginia community colleges were surveyed by the committee to determine the status of articulated programs with secondary schools. A total of 322 formal articulation agreements was identified, and forty-two were under development by school division.

In order to achieve Objective Four, to expand the number of 2 + 2 programs between community colleges and secondary schools in the Commonwealth, a task force on Virginia Community College System/Virginia Department of Education 2 + 2 programs was formed early in 1988 to assess the feasibility of additional 2 + 2 programs, the funding for each program, and the possibility of adding a 2 + 2 + 2 program. Most 2 + 2 or 2 + 2 + 2 programs focused on teaching employable skills in technology. A program such as the 2 + 2 program mixes resources of two levels of instruction—the last two years of secondary education and the two years of community college education—resulting in employable skills for students. The 2 + 2 + 2 program would comprise three levels of cooperation, high school, community college, and senior college, resulting
in employable "high tech" skills. "High tech," as defined by Flexner, consists of any technology requiring the most sophisticated scientific equipment and advanced engineering techniques such as microelectronics, data processing, or telecommunications (16).

Since the state's three current 2 + 2 articulation programs (the Master Technician Program, located on the Virginia Peninsula and designed to prepare technicians for electronics/electromechanical technology; the Engineering Design Technology Program, located in the Lynchburg area and designed to prepare engineering design technicians; and the Winchester area program in Information Processing, established to prepare information processing specialists) have received statewide and national attention in recent years the Joint Vocational-Technical Education Committee saw the need to adopt effective 2 + 2 articulation models for a variety of areas (e.g., accounting, office systems). According to the proposal included in "A Public Partnership for Vocational-Technical Education," funding was anticipated for each project through vocational educational funds (state and national) as a result of the Carl D. Perkins Act (1988). The Virginia Department of Education and the Virginia Community College System assert that high tech training today requires the acquisition of more complex skills than required in previous years. Consequently, vocational secondary education and post secondary training could adjust to meet the specialized needs of training students for highly technical careers. Articulation could assist in coordinating the training (Virginia Department of Education, 1984).

The last objective concerns models of articulation programs.

**Objective Five:**
To develop and promote articulation models in program areas which are most common to community colleges and secondary schools in Virginia.

The purpose of this objective was to present models of articulation programs to conference participants to serve as guides for what could be done in articulated programs. Under this objective, eight program areas
were identified, which had great potential for articulation initiatives. Here, curriculum teams were formed for each of the program areas to design "models of cooperation" (sample articulation programs) which could be implemented at the local level. The teams consisted of two instructors from secondary schools and two from the community colleges. The teams met for three to five days and completed models for Accounting, Data Processing, Drafting and Design, Business Management, Marketing, Automotive Technology, Electronics, and Office Systems Technology. To further illustrate the effectiveness of articulation models, a copy of the complete 2 + 2 articulation program in Accounting is presented in Appendix A of this document.

One important plan created during this period was entitled the "Virginia Plan for Dual Enrollment," implemented in 1988. Prior to this plan no formal cooperative relations or formal agreement between secondary schools and community colleges had been produced. This plan provides a solid framework for statewide enrollment arrangements between public schools and community colleges in the Commonwealth, and it is one of the latest developments that point to statewide coordination.

The overall intent of this plan, according to the Joint Vocational Education Report, was to provide a well-coordinated vocational education program (Joint Vocational Education Report, 1988). The Dual Enrollment Task Force consisted of educators from around the state, specifically public school superintendents, community college presidents and provosts appointed by Drs. Hockaday and Davis. According to the chairman of the Dual Enrollment Task Force, Dr. Deborah DiCroce, the Joint Vocational Educational Education Committee was not the major facilitator behind the development of the Dual Enrollment Plan (1990). According to Drs. Swartz, Finley, and Davis, the major force behind this plan was Dr. Barnes. He was the person with the idea initially, so he took steps toward the development and implementation of the Dual Enrollment Plan (1989, 1990). Governor Baliles stated in a letter explaining the dual enrollment
agreement, "Dual enrollment allows high school students to meet their graduation requirements while simultaneously earning college credit. Once implemented, the plan for dual enrollment will both provide Virginia high school students with a wider range of course options and prevent unnecessary duplication of programs" (1988).

The Dual Enrollment Plan states:

The arrangements, according to the plan, may be made between local public school systems and community colleges, and the plan identifies the three main ways the arrangements may be formed. The first aspect of the plan identifies the way high school students may be enrolled in regularly scheduled college credit courses with other college students taught at the community college. The second connection permits high school students to be enrolled in specially scheduled college credit courses exclusively for high school students taught at the community college. The particular courses to be taught are to be determined by the public secondary system and community college. Students who are at least sixteen years or older and high school juniors or seniors can participate in a logically developed dual enrollment arrangement. (Virginia Plan for Dual Enrollment, 1988)

There are specific conditions for this plan.

First, the high school student must be recommended by the public school and must meet the admissions requirements established by the community college. Second, courses for this program must be in the fine arts, academic (math, science, or English), or vocational subject areas. Upon successful completion of a course, college credit and/or high school credit will be awarded. Third, selected faculty must meet state requirements. (Virginia Plan for Dual Enrollment, 1988)

According to Section Seven of Standard C of the 1988-89 "Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia," the public school shall receive average daily membership credit for its students who participate in the dual enrollment arrangement, and the community college shall receive FTES (Full-time Equivalent Student) credit for the participating high school students. This particular action shows how each agency (high school and community college) benefits from the plan by receiving credit for the student. It also shows how turf protection can be eliminated; however, the chair of the Dual Enrollment Task Force asserts that turf
protection still exists in some secondary schools as some educators see dual enrollment as a threat to their advanced placement programs. A formal mechanism for evaluation of the Dual Enrollment Plan was included as a part of the plan (Dual Enrollment Plan, 1988).

Dr. Judith Ball, Superintendent of York County Public Schools, served as member of the Dual Enrollment Task Force, and she cites its purpose as "to develop guidelines that the State Department of Education and the VCCS could endorse as a guide toward articulation" (1990). She believes that the Task Force was effective because it responded to its charge by providing a Dual Enrollment Plan (1990). She sees a real commitment to articulation from the secondary schools and community colleges; however, she envisions differences in approaches to and implementation of the Dual Enrollment Plan. Dr. Ball believes future articulation efforts between secondary schools and community colleges will occur in different ways (i.e., some specific secondary schools and community colleges or even community colleges and senior colleges will look at uncommon ways of providing articulation between educational institutions). According to Dr. Ball, as the state looks at the cost of public education and equity in programs, articulation will be examined more closely because state educational agencies will be looking for ways to save money and/or to use their reduced resources more wisely (1990).

The Dual Enrollment Plan between the Virginia Public Schools and the Virginia Community College System is articulation in action. Dr. Barnes and Dr. Swartz, two key players in producing this plan, assert that they had the blessings of top leaders in education within the Commonwealth (1989). Some of these leaders include the former VCCS Chancellor, Dr. Hockaday, the Commonwealth's then Secretary of Education, Donald J. Finley, and the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Dr. Jack Davis. Also, Governor Baliles showed his support of this plan by calling a news conference to acknowledge publicly his support (Barnes and Swartz, 1989).
To conclude, the major forces behind secondary schools and community college articulation were mid-level administrators. One mid-level administrator, Dr. Barnes, saw the need for articulation and devised a plan for successful articulation. With the support of Dr. Hockaday and Dr. Finley and the help of Dr. Davis, he was permitted to proceed with his articulation efforts. The next links in the chain as he worked toward articulation were other mid-level administrators in both the VCCS and Virginia Department of Education, with Dr. Swartz and Dr. Oakley playing two additional key mid-level roles. In addition to the mid-level leaders, political leadership was provided by Senator A. Brault. According to Dr. Barnes, all of these key players were delighted with his idea and readily agreed to assist him with the project (1989). The shared enthusiasm for the concept must have filtered down to other subordinates because after the initial idea of articulation was presented and planning began to take place, few hitches were found. Drs. Barnes and Swartz both agree that acknowledging flaws and finding ways of eliminating them was crucial to the success of articulation at this time (1989). One can thus conclude that articulation between secondary schools and community colleges at this point occurred because of these mid-level administrators.

The main influence of the secondary schools and community colleges on articulation efforts came from the mid-level administrators, Drs. Barnes, Oakley and Swartz, educators who had the foresight, patience, and ability to work with one another. The political leadership given by Senator A. Brault was also important to articulation between secondary schools and community colleges during this time. Had there been other individuals in mid-level administrative positions or even top administrative positions, articulation may not have advanced as it had during this period.

In Senior Colleges and Universities

The State Council of Higher Education for Virginia continues to direct senior colleges and universities in their articulation efforts.
Since the opening of the first community college in the state in 1966, the State Council has been interested in articulation with two-year colleges and universities to enhance students' education. SCHEV initiated guidelines to promote articulation between community colleges and four-year colleges in 1967. These guidelines have been updated twice since the original guidelines were established. Many Virginia community colleges have formal articulation agreements in place. However, few students are using the 2 + 2 programs, according to Dr. James McLean, a member of the SCHEV staff. In fact, he asserts that there is little evidence to date to prove that many students are enrolled in and transfer from Virginia community colleges to senior colleges in the 2 + 2 articulation programs. Dr. McLean anticipates changes for the positive with new SCHEV mandates (1990).

In this era of assessment SCHEV has developed a mandate which requires higher education institutions in the Commonwealth to submit data on community college students transferring to senior colleges. Tidewater Community College and Old Dominion University, for example, have begun in the last two years to seek data. (A list of some of the Virginia community colleges with articulation agreements is found in Appendix B of this document). A few formal articulation agreements now exist between two-and four-year institutions throughout the state; however, few are active and working. Tidewater Community College and Old Dominion University as well as Thomas Nelson Community College and Christopher Newport College are a few of the schools that currently have articulation agreements.

Some of the articulation agreements that exist between community colleges and four-year colleges do not work because a majority of community college students are unaware that they are available. Some students who are aware of the agreements are not sure how they work. Some community college staff—counselors Dorothy Little, Valarie Evans, and Carolyn Pulley; program head Nancy Guarnieri; division chairman Gregory
Frank and William DeWeese all of Tidewater Community College; president Arnold Oliver of Danville Community College—believe that generally faculty and staff at the community college are not kept informed of the changes that may occur regarding programs or classes (1990).

Ms. Little and Ms. Pulley believe that the lack of counseling personnel limits the amount of time a counselor can give to each student; therefore, students are not always informed of the benefits and availability of articulation programs, and articulation programs go unused. Ms. Little also asserts that staff at both the community college and senior college are not kept informed of changes in courses and/or curricula (1990).

There are four-year college personnel who see their relationship with the community differently. For example, Ms. Judy Bowman, articulation contact person at Old Dominion University, believes articulation is getting better between Old Dominion University and Tidewater Community College. She acts as a mediator between Old Dominion University and Tidewater Community College. In this capacity, she attempts to initiate meetings periodically between key personnel at both institutions, and she swiftly passes key course information from Old Dominion University to key Tidewater Community College personnel and from Tidewater Community College personnel to Old Dominion University department heads (1989).

Another reason that articulation does not work as well as it could is "turf protection." Each senior college is interested in protecting its institution's courses in content and in credit. According to Dr. Barnes and Dr. Oliver, few college and university personnel want the content of their courses, curricula, or credits established for them (1989, 1990). Also, some college and university personnel are not committed to articulation if they cannot see the benefit of articulation to their college and its program offerings, asserts Dr. Barnes (1989). Dr. Robert Grymes, Dean of Instruction and Student Services at Tidewater Community
College, and Dr. Oliver concur that turf protection is also a cause for the slow pace of articulation between community colleges and senior colleges in Virginia. Drs. Barnes and Oliver believe that many senior colleges do not want their colleges' curriculum dictated; consequently, they seek to protect their own institution's integrity and/or right to design its courses and curriculum by not informing the local community college of course and curriculum changes (1989, 1990). The poor flow of information, for whatever the reason, shows a lack of commitment to articulation among senior college educators. Ironically, as Dr. Oliver asserts, articulation has the power to create more trust and a better working relationship between agencies and schools (1990).

Another problem affecting articulation efforts is that schools do not always abide by the agreements they set up. For example, Tidewater Community College has written articulation agreements (in several areas) with Norfolk State University; however, these agreements are virtually useless because Norfolk State University has changed some of its program area requirements within the areas of the articulation agreements, according to Ms. Little (1990).

Perhaps one of the major reasons for the senior colleges' lack of interest in articulation at this time is that there were no key people in the senior colleges duplicating the efforts of Dr. Swartz or Dr. Barnes. An examination of SCHEV documents—minutes of SCHEV meetings, SCHEV Articulation Advisory Board Meetings, SCHEV notes, and SCHEV's University of the 21st Century—provides the evidence that no such individual in the senior college system was working toward articulation. Also, after interviews with Dr. Grymes; Dr. Oliver; Dr. Ann-Marie McCartan and Dr. McLean of SCHEV; and Dr. John Casteen, former Secretary of Education for the Commonwealth, there is simply no indication that there was any individual in the senior college who was strongly committed to articulation (1989, 1990).
It is possible for the senior colleges to develop articulation policy. However, policies and/or guidelines are of little use if they do not have key personnel to direct their implementation. There has been no evidence uncovered to suggest that an "Ed Barnes or Ned Swartz" who planned, organized, and directed articulation efforts between community colleges and four-year colleges existed in the senior colleges within the Commonwealth. Mid-level educators (like Ed Barnes and Ned Swartz) were vital to the formation and implementation of articulation policy between the secondary schools and community colleges within the Commonwealth. No doubt they will be critical to any successful articulation effort with the senior institutions and community colleges.

SCHEV has a tremendous ability to affect changes in higher education in Virginia, and it can therefore have an impact on articulation. The influence of SCHEV within the Commonwealth on articulation is evident in its capacity as a coordinating agency of the state's higher education institutions. With SCHEV's initiatives in the area of assessment, more steps can be taken toward articulation between senior colleges and community colleges. More specifically, SCHEV has advised colleges and universities within the Commonwealth to make articulation a part of their assessment initiative. These colleges will be reporting the progress of articulation at their institution directly to the State Council. The colleges and universities that have developed statewide articulation agreements will serve as models for other institutions to follow. In addition, SCHEV's direction in coordinating all higher education institutions and requiring each to submit transfer data will certainly enhance articulation in the Commonwealth.

Since SCHEV is a coordinating agency for institutions of higher education in the Commonwealth, its efforts toward articulation are important for higher education institutions in the state. The State Council is the key authority within the Commonwealth's postsecondary institution; it does have the power to influence mandates for these
institutions. One such directive recently issued by SCHEV concerned assessment. In an effort to address assessment, articulation has been examined because "senior colleges are now looking at their transfer students' grades," asserts Dr. McCartan (1990). SCHEV and a commission appointed by governor Baliles have also produced a document entitled "The University of the Twenty-First Century," which urges efforts in the direction of articulation. Each four-year college and the VCCS are to respond to this report. These directives show how the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia should be a vital link in senior college efforts to enhance articulation because the State Council's task is to coordinate all colleges in the Commonwealth.

The citizens of the Commonwealth have consistently been interested in the effectiveness and efficiency of the state's programs. For this reason the Joint Legislative Audit and Review Commission (JLARC) was established (1990). According to the annual report of the Secretary of the Commonwealth in 1984:

The Joint Legislative Audit and Review Commission (JLARC) was established to carry out continuous legislative review and evaluation of effectiveness and efficiency of state programs, make reports on findings, recommendations to the Governor, General Assembly concerning economical, efficient agency operations of the state agencies (JLARC Code Reference 30-56). JLARC members consists of seven members of the House of Delegates appointed by the Speaker; at least five members of the House Appropriations Committee; four members of the Senate and two members of the Finance Committee (JLARC, Code Ref. 30-56)

The Joint Legislative Audit and Review Commission (JLARC) submitted a series of recommendations to the VCCS, and several of these recommendations directly relate to articulation. The pertinent recommendations are:

RECOMMENDATION (29). The State Council of Higher Education for Virginia should increase its efforts as facilitator between the Virginia Community College System and Virginia Public senior institutions with the goal of establishing formal System wide articulation agreements with all public senior institutions in Virginia.
RECOMMENDATION (30). The State Council of Higher Education for Virginia, in cooperation with the Virginia Community College System and senior institutions, should: (1) establish a standard format for reporting student achievement data on former VCCS students and (2) establish a task force for the purpose of assessing the performance of former VCCS students in Virginia's senior institutions of higher education.

RECOMMENDATION (31). The Virginia Community College System and the Department of Education should conduct or facilitate an evaluation of the dual enrollment program. The evaluation should include a comprehensive assessment of program costs, as well as the extent of dual financing which occurs, as stipulated in the Virginia Plan for Dual Enrollment. (JLARC Recommendations to the VCCS, 1990)

However, since movement toward articulation with senior colleges is recently beginning to unfold with state mandates from SCHEV and recommendations from JLARC, one can assume that senior colleges need a mandate more than one or two mid-level administrators to enhance their articulation efforts.

Several statewide articulation agreements have recently been developed (and are in place) between some senior institutions and the VCCS. James Madison University, Virginia Commonwealth University, and Virginia State University are three such senior institutions. (The proposed articulation agreements of James Madison University and Virginia State University are found in Appendix C of this document.) Other senior institutions within the state are working toward this point. For example, Old Dominion University and Norfolk State University both have written articulation agreements with Tidewater Community College. Even though some senior colleges in the state have articulation agreements in place, more are needed.

Dr. Grymes believes that more specific agreements will indeed be forthcoming from other senior colleges and universities as word spreads about the articulation agreements that JMU and VSU have developed (1990). Dr. Arnold Oliver asserts that progress toward articulation is slow in the senior institutions. He continues by asserting that some senior institutions are more willing to work with community colleges when they are secure about the quality of their own programs (1990). More senior
institutions could work toward increased articulation efforts if they kept the community college informed of curricula changes. So a reason for the slow progress in senior institutions' articulation efforts could be attributed to elitism in the senior institutions. Also, political pressure on senior institutions from other educational agencies (community colleges, other senior institutions, the State Council) could inspire senior colleges to develop articulation plans. Perhaps most importantly, as the strides in articulation between the VCCS and secondary schools were made, through mid-level commitments, most of the evidence suggests the presence of key mid-level administrators as being vital to progress in articulation between VCCS and senior colleges. No doubt SCHEV and JLARC may provide the impetus even for this presence.

**Key Forces Shaping Articulation-1990**

The growth of educational articulation in the Commonwealth has been tremendous. Never before had the state's educators given such direct attention to this educational issue. The key forces shaping articulation during this time period were the commitments of the state's educational leaders who blessed the idea and mid-level administrators who provided a vision and passion for implementation.

The major educational segments began to work closely when their mid-level administrators showed a special interest in articulation. For example, the Chancellor of the Virginia Community College System and the Secretary of Education for the Commonwealth blessed the workings of the mid-level leaders (e.g., Dr. Ned Swartz and Dr. Edwin Barnes) toward the achievement of smooth articulation and, in the process, developed a statewide articulation policy. These gentlemen worked on articulation together, but the key figure behind educational articulation between the secondary schools and community colleges in the Commonwealth was Dr. Ed Barnes, according to Drs. Swartz, Ball, Finley, Davis, and Oliver (1989, 1990). Without his vision and leadership direction, articulation would not have moved so swiftly and smoothly.
These mid-level leaders worked together harmoniously, concentrating on educational articulation in the Commonwealth. With the idea of "turf protection" softened to some degree by eliminating all disincentives and barriers to articulation, these educators shared their favorable attitude and their insights on articulation policy with their subordinates, thereby inspiring cooperation among the Commonwealth's different educational sectors (secondary schools, community colleges, and some senior colleges). During the latter 1980's, Dr. Davis asserts he played a significant role in getting state educators to see a connection between kindergarten and post-graduate or professional school (1990). This cooperative spirit is consistent with Wilbur's (1981) idea. He believes that successful school-college partnerships are most dependent on a cooperative spirit (p 36).

Prior to this time educational leaders in the Commonwealth had given much "lip service" to educational articulation, but significant steps had not been taken. Put another way, the "cooperative spirit" was not there. Indeed it was the cooperation among the state's mid-level administrators during the late 1980's which played a prime role in contributing to articulation policy development in the Commonwealth. These relations then led to the formation of subcommittees and task forces, consisting of secondary school and community college personnel. These groups worked together planning and organizing conferences and workshops to develop articulation programs. They also assisted in statewide policy for articulation measures such as dual enrollment. It was, in short, their collective dedication and commitment to the concept of articulation which accounted for the immense progress made in articulation during this time period.

The cooperative spirit of system personnel was of prime importance in articulation during 1988; however, timing was extremely essential as well. Articulation was a buzz word in recent higher education literature as well as in secondary education literature. Therefore, the time was right to turn the Commonwealth's educational top and mid-level leaders'
attention to articulation. This is an age of accountability. Educational leaders are looking for ways to improve programs. They are also looking for ways of preventing duplication of efforts and waste of resources. Thus, the timing was also a critical factor to the success of the articulation effort at this time.

In summary, the attention of the Commonwealth's educational leaders (top-and mid-level) to articulation, the cooperative relationships developed among personnel through workshops which inspired the creation of articulation curricula and the right time period in the Commonwealth's education system were extremely important to the formation of educational articulation policy in the state. Dr. Barnes was the key person who toiled endlessly as a mid-level leader to enhance educational articulation. He worked with the state's secondary education leaders and those individuals under his employ in the community college to enhance and bring about an education articulation policy. There was no evidence of a "Dr. Barnes" or person like him in the senior college. Hence, the four-year colleges and universities did not advance articulation policy as rapidly as did the secondary schools and community colleges. Of prime importance to the articulation progress in the senior institutions was the mandate by SCHEV, recent recommendations by JLARC, and the political pressure presented to some senior colleges by other senior institutions developing statewide articulation agreements. Turf issues are still present in some of these institutions. However, some 2 + 2 + 2 programs now exist that include some senior institutions.

Since this section has provided insight on current articulation efforts, some questions still remain. How did articulation reach this point? What retarded the growth of articulation in the Commonwealth during the early years of the community college in the state? The next chapter and subsequent chapters should begin to answer these questions by showing where articulation was in 1966 and how it evolved from that point.
CHAPTER 5

Introduction

The Commonwealth entered into a new era in higher education with the birth of its community college system in 1966. State legislators and educators worked diligently to meet the higher education needs of all citizens within the Commonwealth. The community college, which was an outgrowth of the junior college in America, had existed in other states for years. Likewise, educational articulation, which had early roots in American education, enjoyed popularity elsewhere, but not in the Commonwealth.

In order to obtain a vivid picture of articulation in the Commonwealth, it is important to analyze pertinent documents produced from 1966 to 1970. These documents indicate the direction of articulation (or the lack of focus on articulation) during this time period. The documents to be analyzed during this period include the State Council's "Guidelines for Promoting Articulation Between State-Controlled Community Colleges and Four-Year Colleges and Universities," approved on April 3, 1967, and an update of the same document produced by the State Council on December 11, 1969. This section also includes an examination of the Virginia Plan for Higher Education, produced by SCHEV in 1967. In addition to the analysis of documents, each educational sector within the Commonwealth during this time period (secondary schools, community colleges, four-year colleges) will be considered according to its key players, influence, and policy implications (if any) found with articulation as the focus. While examining these agencies, attention will be given to the single most
important occurrence during this time—the opening of the first community college in the Commonwealth.

In Secondary Schools

The late sixties and early seventies in Virginia's public education system were a time of turmoil. Racial unrest was evident, especially in public elementary and secondary schools. Some Commonwealth public secondary schools, which had been closed for several years because some leaders wanted them to remain racially segregated, were climbing their way back to where they were before they closed. "Urban flight," a term describing urban residents moving to suburban areas to avoid school integration, continued. For example, public schools were closed in Prince Edward County, Virginia for more than two years (between 1957-59), according to the Virginian Pilot; large numbers of students left the state and/or moved to other areas within the Commonwealth where public schools remained open (1959). Some writers believe that racial unrest influenced the federal educational appropriations, popular during this time (Brodinsky, 1976). A major influence was the Elementary Secondary Education Act, which resulted in Title I grants and other types of assistance to poor children through the school systems, bringing them food (breakfast and lunch) as well as learning aids to help them improve in the classroom. (Brodinsky, 1976). Because educational leaders concentrated on improving secondary schools, articulation was not a major focus in the Commonwealth when the community college opened in the state in 1966; and, not surprisingly, an examination of the secondary schools in the Commonwealth showed no evidence of steps toward articulation during this time period. Because very little reference is made during this time period to public secondary education and its part in articulation in the documents analyzed, no key players in articulation were found. Likewise, there is little information to suggest that the opening of the community college had a significant influence or any policy implications on the Commonwealth's public secondary schools. Therefore, one can conclude that
the secondary schools in the Commonwealth made no significant strides in articulation during this period.

In Community Colleges and Senior Colleges

The need for "accessibility" to higher education within the Commonwealth led to legislation authorizing the development of the Commonwealth's system of community colleges. In fact, legislation was enacted by the General Assembly within weeks after the Higher Education Study Commission reported in December 1965 that:

The most significant gap in Virginia's present provision of higher education is the lack of any institution of the kind commonly known in other states as the comprehensive community college and the most urgent need in Virginia's program of higher education is the development of a system of comprehensive community colleges. The highest priority should be given to this development. (42)

The 1966 opening of the first community college within the Commonwealth was a time of joy for many citizens. Those who had been eager to expand their education, improve their job qualifications, and even attain job promotions were very excited about the establishment of the community college system. The community college did not seek to take students from the four-year institutions; rather, its objective was to serve a different population, those denied entrance to four-year colleges and even those Virginia citizens afraid to attempt higher education because of their lack of self-confidence.

One cannot discuss any aspect of the development of the Virginia community college without acknowledging and explaining the critical role Governor Mills E. Godwin played. He is today referred to by many citizens as the "father of the Virginia Community College System." In his first major address to the General Assembly of Virginia in 1966, Governor Godwin outlined his plan for expanding higher education within the state. His plan called for a state sales tax which could be used to move toward this goal of a system of community colleges in Virginia. He further believed that the Virginia community college would cover the higher education needs of most citizens in the Commonwealth (between high school and the four-
year college), thereby providing higher education within commuting distance for every citizen within the state (Address of Mills E. Godwin, Jr., Governor, 1966).

So the opening of the community college within the Commonwealth served to address the educational needs of many previously forgotten citizens. The community college created new challenges, however. One such challenge was a coordinated system of higher education that properly fit the community college and its students into Virginia's system of higher education.

In response to this need, SCHEV's General Professional Advisory Committee (at the time, a group of presidents of all four year public colleges and universities and the Director of the State Department of Community Colleges) recognized the need for a guide for student transfer from community colleges to four-year colleges or universities. In 1967 SCHEV developed and approved "Guidelines for Promoting Articulation Between State-Controlled Community Colleges and Four-Year Colleges and Universities." These guidelines promoted the smooth transfer of students completing college transfer programs in the state's community colleges to four-year institutions and outlined the working agreements whereby community colleges and four-year colleges and universities could work jointly to plan baccalaureate degree programs.

This guideline revealed SCHEV's early commitment to articulation between senior colleges and community colleges and, what is more, established a procedure for continual re-evaluation of articulation efforts. Item ten in the guidelines states that "advisory committee members should meet at least semi-annually to consider problems, suggest needed studies, and recommend to SCHEV additional guidelines for effective articulation" (SCHEV, 1967). Yet, although the need for guidelines was recognized, no formal statewide articulation policy was present at this time.
In 1969 the same guidelines were approved and accepted by SCHEV, with the addition of two other provisions. One of the two new guidelines encouraged community college students to complete their two-year degree (Associate in Arts or Associate in Science) before transferring to the four-year college or university. The other additional guideline considered unusual circumstances enabling community college students' applications to four-year colleges and universities to be considered by the senior institution at the end of one year of community college work, but requiring in some cases a secondary school transcript as well.

These updated guidelines were provided by SCHEV's Articulation Advisory Committee (SCHEV Report, 1967). The Articulation Advisory Committee was composed of a seventeen member group of faculty and administrative personnel representing the state-controlled four-year colleges and universities and the state system of comprehensive community colleges. This report also indicated that SCHEV brought together this group to give it responsibility for the development of a coordinated system of higher education (SCHEV, 1967). The literature did not indicate a change in the membership of SCHEV's original Articulation Advisory Committee, so one can assume that the membership remained the same. The Articulation Advisory Committee received the endorsement of the State Council's General Professional Advisory Committee. However, no evidence was found to indicate that any single individual or group of individuals was appointed to implement these guidelines, possibly explaining why the guidelines were not put into action.

The importance of these guidelines to higher education within the Commonwealth was that they provided the direction SCHEV intended the community college system and senior institutions to take with regard to articulation. Since SCHEV's goal of a coordinated system was paramount, it saw the need of "connecting" the two segments. The congenial workings of these agencies aided in helping SCHEV to attain its goal and provided systematic coordination in a student's education. Therefore, the role
these guidelines played in articulation was to begin the coordination of agencies within the Commonwealth.

In addition to guidelines, SCHEV also published The Virginia Plan for Higher Education in December 1967. Like the "Guidelines for Promoting Articulation Between State-Controlled Community Colleges and Four-Year Colleges and Universities," this document reflects SCHEV's commitment to "[promote] the orderly development of a sound, vigorous, progressive, and coordinated system of public higher education in Virginia" (5). The State Council also included five distinct goals in this Virginia Plan. They are:

1) To provide appropriate opportunities in higher education for all youth who can benefit therefrom.

2) To provide timely and relevant opportunities for the continuing education of adults.

3) To encourage the development of expanded social and economic opportunities for the individual and the Commonwealth through the cooperative mobilization of the research and public service resource so higher education, government, business, industry, and the community at large.

4) To seek excellence in all elements and aspects of higher education.

5) To promote the continuous support and environment necessary to develop and maintain maximum efficiency and productivity throughout the entire system of higher education. (13)

In order to implement its goals in The Virginia Plan, SCHEV presented four components. While articulation was not a major focus of the Plan, some of the components of the Plan had implication for articulation. These components are:

Component I  State Planning As a Joint Venture for All Higher Education

Component II  A Pattern for Orderly Growth in Enrollment

Component III  No Additional Four-Year Public Institutions
Component IV  Institutional Roles and Functions
Consistent with State and National Needs. (15)

The first component, "State Planning as a Joint Venture for All Higher Education," reveals the Council's emphasis on comprehensive joint planning between senior colleges and community colleges. It also sought to determine if shared facilities and shared selected staff resources might benefit both educational systems. This sharing should have led to greater articulation efforts since the articulation committee had already formed, and it had already developed guidelines.

The last component of the plan was Component IV, in which the State Council reinforced its responsibility. Specifically, with this task, the State Council was instructed "to assemble data, conduct studies, and recommend statewide policies in the field of higher education" (SCHEV, 1967).

Component IV of the 1967 Virginia Plan demanded that institutional roles and functions be consistent with state and national needs. This section asserted that four-year colleges and universities should accept qualified graduates from community colleges (SCHEV, 1967). The mere fact that four-year institutions were asked to accept qualified two-year college graduates indicates that SCHEV was indeed interested in the process of articulation.

Clearly the intent of articulation on the part of the State Council was present in these earlier years of the Virginia Community College System. However, studies of senior colleges and universities in the Commonwealth during this time period provide the strongest evidence that despite the SCHEV intent, no form of articulation policy was implemented. There was no evidence found in any document of an attempt by any senior college to implement SCHEV's 1967 or 1969 guidelines. One can thus conclude that these guidelines contributed little toward senior institution articulation in the state. Neither was evidence found to
indicate that there were key educators who were interested in articulation or policy implications during this time period.

The opening of the community college in the Commonwealth did not generate a strong interest in four-year colleges and universities in articulation. Many senior colleges in the Commonwealth had fears when the community colleges opened. Some senior college educators felt that a community college without a faculty with doctoral degrees, without numerous transfer courses, and without a vast amount of research would not enhance higher education in the Commonwealth (Franklin, 1966). Some even feared the community college movement would diminish the quality of Virginia higher education. Senior institutions also feared competition with community colleges for students. The fears in time proved to be unfounded. In these early years, however, they no doubt contributed to the lack of any real sign of practiced articulation between community colleges and senior institutions.

At best, the early years saw "paper" articulation on the part of senior institutions. As a coordinating agency, SCHEV was perhaps the most important force influencing institutions to work together. Senior institutions were encouraged to work closely with community colleges because of SCHEV's guidelines for articulation. And most began articulation efforts "on paper" with community colleges. The State Council published "Programs Approved Since December 1, 1966 For Community Colleges" which listed the articulation programs of community colleges with four-year colleges (SCHEV 1966). These articulation programs were intended to promote smooth transfer of students completing appropriate college transfer programs in the state's community colleges to the state's four-year colleges and universities. Yet, there is evidence that some colleges, while accepting SCHEV's challenge to create articulation agreements, never actually committed themselves to implementing articulation.
For example, Old Dominion University catalogues for 1966-68 made no noticeable reference to either articulation with community colleges or to SCHEV's articulation guidelines. These catalogues addressed transfer students briefly, yet failed to mention articulation. One particularly significant section was entitled "Community College Division," which provided information regarding associate degree programs ODU offered (Included in Appendix D of this document ODU College Catalogue, 1966-68). ODU catalogues dated 1968 and 1969 made no visible reference to articulation or SCHEV's articulation guidelines. Indeed, these latter sources did not even contain the community college section of their predecessor. Also, the transfer section in these latter documents addressed transfer students' requirements for graduation from ODU, but they did not include or mention community college students specifically. If articulation were truly being implemented, then placing information in the college's catalogues would have insured that students at least had knowledge of its benefits.

Similarly, an examination of the catalogues and Annual Reports for Virginia Commonwealth University (Richmond Professional Institute) and The College of William and Mary for 1966-68 gave no evidence that these institutions took any steps to implement SCHEV's articulation guidelines.

To summarize, state educators recognized at least the theoretical importance of articulation between two- and four-year colleges in this era. The problem is that the theory was never realized in the formation of a formal statewide policy governing the implementation of articulation at the individual college level. One reason for the lack of statewide policy could have been the fact that SCHEV was a coordinating agency rather than an enforcement agency. Another explanation is that there were no key figures pushing for greater implementation of articulation. Finally the lack of a statewide policy could have been the result of four-year colleges' apprehension in accepting the community college within the family of higher education in the Commonwealth. Whatever the reason, the
result is that articulation, while introduced as a theoretical concept, did not progress rapidly in practice during the early years of the Virginia Community College System.

**Key Forces Shaping Articulation: 1966-70**

The birth of the community college in the Commonwealth began a new era in Virginia's system of higher education. Its growth was testimony to its meeting the educational needs of citizens. Educational leaders began, with the birth of the community college, to find ways that institutions could work together rather than compete with one another. Articulation was a logical step.

The key figures working toward articulation during this era were few and resided exclusively in the state's coordinating body for Virginia higher education, namely, SCHEV and also in the community colleges. (Specific names of SCHEV members are found in Appendix F of this document.) These educators instituted articulation guidelines almost immediately after the inception of the community college in the Commonwealth.

The State Council of Higher Education for Virginia published the *Virginia Plan* (emphasizing joint planning) in 1967. This joint planning shows some influence on articulation. At the time, SCHEV saw its general responsibility as "... promoting the orderly development of a sound, vigorous, progressive, and coordinated system of public higher education in Virginia" (5). Joint planning can be interpreted as cooperation between educational segments. SCHEV leaders sought ways to prevent duplication of efforts and to ease the transfer of students from one educational segment to another. SCHEV also noted in its 1967 *Virginia Plan* that it did not want the Virginia Community Colleges to move toward independent four-year institutions (42).

Another other important document produced during this time, called the "Guidelines for Promoting Articulation Between State Controlled Community Colleges and Four-Year Colleges and Universities," was approved
by the State Council in 1967, only after the establishment of the Virginia Community Colleges. These guidelines were the result of a SCHEV initiated committee, consisting of all presidents of four-year colleges and universities and the director of the Virginia community colleges. The "Guidelines for Promoting Articulation Between State Controlled Community Colleges and Four-Year Colleges and Universities" were designed to promote the smooth transfer to senior colleges of students completing college transfer programs in the state's community colleges. So, these guidelines were as close as the state came to articulation policy in the late sixties.

The reasons for slow implementation of articulation policy are many. Initially, senior colleges and universities within the Commonwealth were concerned about protecting the "integrity" of their own course offerings. Some institutions were extensions of senior colleges that were considered prestigious, and these colleges did not want to lose their association with institutions such as The University of Virginia or The College of William and Mary (Vaughan, 1987). Consequently, these two-year extension colleges were not immediately in favor of the introduction of the community college into the Commonwealth's system of higher education.

In addition, leaders had to see how the community college fit into the Commonwealth's system of higher education: Would funding be cut for existing colleges and universities to support community colleges? What kind of curriculum would it have? Would the community college's courses somehow have an influence, somehow change those at the senior colleges?

In reality, community college enrollment increased at an alarming rate, having a massive impact on the Commonwealth's system of higher education. Certainly with the rapid growth of the VCCS, more specific and detailed articulation plans in the form of articulation policy for community colleges and senior institutions should have surfaced. Yet, they did not.
Nor was there much visible evidence of articulation efforts between secondary schools and community colleges or between secondary schools and four-year colleges. There is little documentation of any kind addressing articulation in the public secondary school. Suffice it to say that Virginia's secondary schools were busy addressing an immense array of problems of their own. Articulation was simply not a part of the agenda.

At best, the period 1966-1970 saw the beginnings of the community college movement in Virginia which brought with it a kind of theoretical gesturing toward the need for articulation between the state's new community colleges and existing senior institutions. No seeds for articulation were actually planted, but they were considered for planting. It would rest with others in subsequent years of Virginia's history to pick up the shovel and commence the digging.
CHAPTER 6
ENROLLMENT GROWTH AND ARTICULATION IN THE COMMONWEALTH, 1971 - 1975

Introduction

An analysis of articulation from 1971 to 1975 requires a more in-depth look at education nationally. One trend across the country during this period was the existence of racial tension. Separate but equal educational facilities were outlawed, and many cities began to see increases in federal funding. By 1974 American education was receiving more than $100 billion a year (Marland, 1975). The increase in federal funding brought about other means of financing an education as well (e.g., student loans and student grants). Consequently, the number of students seeking an education increased, as people once denied the opportunity for post-secondary education took advantage of loan and grant opportunities.

One of the "new students" seeking education was the Vietnam veteran. As the Vietnam war ended, thousands of veterans took advantage of the G.I. Bill. The G.I. Bill of 1944 gave veterans the opportunity to enroll in technical institutes, colleges, and universities or to seek training through industry. Some veterans even sought training through correspondence courses. By the seventies—thirty years after the G.I. Bill was passed—federal officials assessed the results of these programs and found the G.I. Bill, according to former U.S. Commissioner of Education, Sidney Marland (1975), to be of great benefit to the country. He believed that a better educated public would result in economic and social benefits to the country.

Just as the nation saw an increase in the numbers of postsecondary students, especially in higher education, so did the Commonwealth of Virginia. Students across the state who were veterans or who qualified
for scholarships and grants took advantage of these monetary awards by enrolling in educational programs of all kinds. College and secondary educators devised programs to meet the needs of this "new" student. These students needed training for employment enhancement; articulation, which would ensure a coordinated system of higher education, could have provided a logical link for them. For example, with the money appropriated for student enrollment in higher education, the community college and four-year college could have joined forces in specific areas such as vocational training, which could have led to highly qualified technicians.

Articulation was already in place to some degree on paper in the Commonwealth—between community colleges and senior colleges—yet the state government did not appropriate specific funds for increased articulation efforts during this time period. Neither the documents searched nor the individuals interviewed gave any indication that the state or federal government made plans for or appropriated funding directly for articulation in the Commonwealth.

The federal government did not provide funds for articulation within the Commonwealth either. To explain carefully the status of articulation during this period, three major agencies of education will be examined—the secondary school, the community college, and the senior college. Also studied is the role or influence of educational leaders in the articulation process. The specific documents used to retrieve this data include an update of "Guidelines for Promoting Articulation Between Two-Year and Four-Year Colleges and Universities in Virginia" and *The Virginia Plan for Higher Education*. These documents were produced by the State Council in 1972 and 1974, respectively.

In Secondary Schools

The secondary schools within the Commonwealth were healthy during this time. An examination of the key players, influences, and policy implications during this time provides insights into the relationship between the secondary schools and higher education.
In the documents studied (notes of meetings of the Virginia State Board of Education, notes of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, and recordings in State Library Archives of Public Education Committee meetings) no reference was made to articulation in secondary schools between 1971 and 1975. Also, according to Dr. John Casteen, former Secretary of Education; Dr. Dana Hamel, former Chancellor of the Virginia Community College System; and Dr. Donald Puyear, current Vice-Chancellor for Policy Studies, few, if any, noticeable steps were made by the secondary schools toward articulation in the Commonwealth (1990). Therefore, no articulation policy was noted. In addition, there was no evidence found, from the documents studied or those interviewed, that any particular individual in the secondary school, including the State Superintendent of Public Instruction and the Secretary of Education, was involved in articulation during this time period. The conclusion that can be drawn from the lack of reference to secondary school articulation in the Commonwealth is that secondary schools showed little influence on educational articulation in the state between 1971 and 1975. This lack of interest of the secondary schools in articulation continued until the late seventies.

In Community College

The community colleges in the Commonwealth were progressing quickly during this period. More and more citizens were learning about the system and the benefits it offered them. Articulation was still a workable process because there were people in the Commonwealth interested in articulation. Documents produced by SCHEV, The Virginia Plan-1974 and the "Guidelines for Promoting Articulation Between Two-Year and Four-Year Colleges and Universities," as well as interviews with key people, shed light on the steps the community college took toward articulation at this time.

According to Drs. Hamel and Puyear (1991), the individuals within the Commonwealth's educational system who placed significance on
articulation were the members of the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia and the person at the helm of the community colleges, Dr. Hamel, himself. According to Dr. Don Puyear, community college president during this time, many community college presidents endorsed the idea of articulation and the guidelines (1991). However, SCHEV updated the original "Guidelines for Promoting Articulation Between Two-Year and Four-Year Colleges and Universities" in 1972. According to Dr. Dana Hamel, who was Chancellor of the Department of Community Colleges in Virginia (the name changed to Virginia Community College System in 1977) between 1966 and 1981, the make-up of SCHEV did not influence the focus of this organization on articulation by way of guidelines. However, Dr. Hamel was able to convince the SCHEV director and his staff of the importance of efforts in the direction of articulation with the production of "Guidelines for Promoting Articulation Between Two-Year and Four-Year Colleges and Universities" (1991). Since this document was the second update of these guidelines, one can conclude that these guidelines were important to the key developer, Dr. Hamel, and those SCHEV members he convinced of its importance (1991).

These guidelines were meant to be a means of assuring a coordinated system of higher education in the Commonwealth, specifically between community colleges and senior colleges and universities. Dr. Hamel's idea of a coordinated system of higher education was that both the community colleges and senior colleges and universities could work together so the student could receive similar adequate training in his other first two years at either the community college or senior college in the Commonwealth (1991). One can thus speculate that a coordinated system of higher education indicated that the community colleges and senior colleges and universities would work toward a similar general goal of providing higher education for all of the citizens of the Commonwealth. For example, students would be able to gain an associate's degree at a community college, transfer to senior colleges and universities in the
state, and complete requirements for the bachelor's degree in the same or similar area without a significant loss of credit. Yet, since no evidence of specific actions by four-year colleges and universities or community colleges in the Commonwealth to enhance articulation were found, these guidelines can be seen as an attempt at articulation.

In 1967, shortly after the birth of the community college within the Commonwealth, the State Council and community college system sought to promote articulation with the original guidelines ("Guidelines for Promoting . . .," 1967). The members of SCHEV were persuaded to assume the leadership role in continuing efforts toward educational articulation between community colleges and senior colleges and universities within the state. The documents examined listed no specific individuals within the State Council, department of community colleges, or specific community college, senior college, or university who worked toward enhancing educational articulation at the time; however, Dr. Hamel cited specific persons with interest in articulation—Dr. Donald Puyear, Dr. S. B. Burnette and Dr. Richard Ernst (both community college presidents) and other community college presidents, and himself (1990). Most importantly articulation was on the mind of the leader of the community colleges, Dr. Hamel, and he must have been able to interest some SCHEV members because they developed the "Guidelines for Promoting . . ." (1967). These questions remain, though: Did the leaders within the community college work to enhance articulation? How did the leaders within the community college attempt to enhance articulation? Assessing the influence of the community college on articulation should shed light on these questions.

Community college leaders and SCHEV members, seeing the need to continue articulation between community colleges and senior colleges and universities, updated their original guidelines and alluded to the importance of articulation in the Commonwealth's system of education. However, the assumption can be made that articulation between community colleges and senior colleges during this time period was on paper only,
that is, in the SCHEV "Guidelines." No evidence is found to indicate that any actions were taken by four-year colleges and universities or community colleges within the Commonwealth to reinforce articulation.

Dr. Hamel gave reasons which he believes were responsible for very little action toward articulation between the Commonwealth's community colleges and senior colleges and universities. He asserts, "The senior institutions within the Commonwealth projected the attitude that they did not want to accept credit from a two-year college. Community colleges in Virginia were young and had not yet achieved the confidence of the senior colleges" (1991).

The "Guidelines for Promoting Articulation Between Two-Year and Four-Year Colleges and Universities in Virginia" was the only document produced during the time that comes close to articulation policy. Even though articulation policy could have been more forceful (according to Wildavsky's (1973) definition of policy), these guidelines suggested ways institutions could enhance educational articulation within the Commonwealth.

The "Guidelines for Promoting Articulation Between Two-Year and Four-Year Colleges and Universities in Virginia" was an update of the guidelines produced in 1967 by SCHEV and endorsed by Dr. Hamel. The first guidelines were developed in response to the anticipated transfer of community college students to four-year public institutions. Rather than change any steps in the articulation process as stated in the guidelines, this update provided (as did previous guidelines) steps for achieving smooth transfer of students from the two-year college to the four-year public college or university. A few of the original guidelines were combined with others. The only guideline omitted from this list was guideline number XII, which stated:

Under unusual circumstances, applications of community college students will be considered by a senior college at the end of one year of community college study and in such cases, the secondary school transcript and College Entrance Examination
Board (CEEB) scores may be required of the transfer applicant by the senior college. (3)

The intended deletion of guideline XII indicates that SCHEV and the community college leaders were advising community college students to complete two-year degree programs before attempting to transfer to four-year colleges and universities. The guidelines provide recommendations for community college students who planned to transfer to four-year schools and for four-year institutions on accepting community college program graduates. In many ways, it is very logical for the articulation effort to have focused at this time on mere "acceptance" of transfer students. A major reason for the focus on transfer students could have been the newness of the community college system in the Commonwealth and, of course, the skepticism of most, if not all, senior college and university personnel of the value and place of the community college in Virginia higher education. This conclusion was confirmed by Dr. Hamel (1991).

The development and implementation of statewide articulation policy could have been a means of ensuring a community college student's acceptance into the public four-year college and university after receiving his or her Associate of Arts or Associate of Science degree. Perhaps the community college student who lacked the motivation for further educational pursuits would have been willing to expand his or her education if there had been a specific statewide articulation policy.

In short, a summary of the status of articulation in the community college during this era finds more community colleges opening, yet only some activity by the community college in the direction of articulation. SCHEV, with the encouragement of community college leaders during this time, continued to update the 1967 "Guidelines for Promoting Articulation Between Two-Year and Four-Year Colleges and Universities in Virginia," but the update seemed to serve as simply a written document as there is no visible evidence of specific action taking place. Nonetheless, given the
times, perhaps maintaining the written document was itself a most positive step.

In Senior Colleges and Universities

Senior colleges and universities within the Commonwealth during this period were experiencing growth in numbers of students. Like the community colleges, senior colleges and universities were guided in articulation by the State Council in its "Guidelines for Promoting Articulation Between Two-Year and Four-Year Colleges and Universities" and its updated 1974 Virginia Plan for Higher Education. An examination of the key players, influence, and policy implications of senior colleges and universities within the Commonwealth should reveal evidence of the senior colleges' role in articulation between 1971 and 1975.

The members of the State Council were either persuaded by the director of the community colleges, Dr. Hamel, of the importance of articulation between community colleges and senior colleges and universities because of their production of the guidelines for promoting articulation, or at least they were willing to give him support for this effort. However, other than the SCHEV members working toward promoting a coordinated system of higher education in the state with the production of the guidelines, the researched documents revealed few specific individuals at the senior college and university level playing key roles in articulation at this time.

Community college educators were probably interested in seeing that community colleges in the Commonwealth were successful, especially at this time of their infancy. The senior colleges and universities were instructed by SCHEV to continue the enhancement of articulation with the community colleges. However, the senior college and university catalogs (ODU, VCU, RPI, and NSU) did not reference articulation during this time to any degree, suggesting that senior colleges and universities were not receptive to the idea of articulation. In addition to an examination of the individual college catalogs not referencing articulation, interviews
with persons involved in higher education during this time (Dr. John Casteen, former Secretary of Education for the Commonwealth, and Dr. James McLean, SCHEV Associate) gave no indication that articulation was active in the Commonwealth's colleges and universities (1991). In addition, no evidence of individual institutional efforts toward implementation of SCHEV's guidelines was found in the documents studied. Each senior college and university knew of the guidelines but may not have known of any time constraints for action in the area of articulation. According to Dr. Hamel and Dr. Puyear, public senior colleges and universities may have been attempting to digest the new addition to the Commonwealth's system of higher education, the community college (1991). A closer look at policy implications could shed light on the senior colleges' and universities' role in articulation between 1971 and 1975.

The term policy as used in this study refers to specific directives that institutions were asked to implement. No specific articulation policy was found in the documents studied, nor was it indicated by those interviewed from this era. However, The Virginia Plan for Higher Education-1974, published by SCHEV, gives the Council's initial position on articulation at the time. SCHEV asserted that "plans must be constantly reviewed and reevaluated if they are to continue to serve effectively, especially during periods of great change" (2). SCHEV, with the persuading of Dr. Hamel, saw the need for updating its goals and objectives, in keeping abreast with the growth and changes in the Commonwealth's higher education system. For example, by 1974 the community college system enrolled over one-third of all students in Virginia's state-supported institutions of higher education (SCHEV, 1974). So the community colleges were a significant part of higher education in the Commonwealth, especially in light of their enrollment.

The Governor of Virginia at this time, Linwood Holton, made remarks pertinent to the goal of higher education for the Commonwealth. He asserted, "Our mission, the mission of Virginia higher education in the
1970's, is not to compete with one another, but to cooperate; not separatism but unity; not mediocrity but excellence" (SCHEV, 1974). This statement could have been the reason SCHEV emphasized "coordination" of educational segments. Yet, it says very little about a real commitment to articulation for the sake of the continuity of students' education. Articulation was clearly not the major focus. From the evidence acquired in examining the progress of articulation between secondary schools and community colleges, the key people who make articulation work are the mid-level administrator (such as Ed Barnes, an assistant vice-chancellor in the VCCs at the time) with the support of educational leaders. There seems to have been no key persons interested in articulation in the senior colleges and universities at this level and during this time period. Also, other concerns could have been more important than articulation.

Because of the growth and changes in the state's higher education system, SCHEV set forth several immediate goals for higher education for the Commonwealth:

1. To ensure the opportunity for full and equal access to higher education by all citizens of the Commonwealth.

2. To ensure that financial condition does not become a barrier to higher education.

3. To provide timely and relevant opportunities for the continuing education of each citizen.

4. To provide an educational system responsive to state and national manpower requirements.

5. To encourage an increased commitment on the part of the Commonwealth to provide quality higher education.

6. To protect and enhance institutional diversity within a coordinated system of higher education.

7. To encourage a continuing emphasis on instructional quality and to foster appropriate innovative modes of instruction.

8. To encourage research and public service activities that meet local, regional, and national needs.
9. To assure the most efficient and effective use of all resources provided to higher education.

10. To assure opportunities for both the intellectual and personal development of the individual student and to help prepare the individual for productive participation in society.

11. To ensure statewide and institutional accountability through coordination and cooperation among all elements of the state's total higher education community and between higher education and all other levels of education. (12)

Several of these goals were specifically pertinent to articulation in higher education in the Commonwealth. The first goal is pertinent because it implies that the "higher education community should make it possible for a student to transfer from one level of postsecondary education to other forms or levels, depending upon his interest and abilities" (SCHEV, 1974). The State Council attempted a coordinated system of higher education for the Commonwealth in accordance with the "Guidelines for Promoting Articulation Between Two-Year and Four-Year Colleges and Universities in Virginia" (SCHEV, 1972), which mirrored this concern.

Goals five and eight implied that higher education should be responsible to the educational needs of the community it serves. SCHEV saw the Commonwealth evolve from the rural body with an agricultural economy to a largely urban state with an economy supported by business, industry, and high technology. Articulation policy development and implementation could have served to enhance efficient and effective cooperative arrangements between two-year and four-year institutions as well as secondary schools and two-year colleges. It could also have ensured the sanctity of the missions of colleges and universities as perceived by the senior institutions.

Goal six was "to enhance institutional diversity within a coordinated system of higher education." Articulation policy development and implementation could have assured this goal because articulation between institutions demands a coordinated effort. Both institutions must
agree on curricula, policies, and rules. SCHEV asserted, "A coordinated system of higher education encouraging and ensuring that the system-wide needs of its students are satisfied is the most appropriate vehicle for maintaining the excellence of higher education in the Commonwealth" (4).

"To assure the most effective and efficient use of all resources provided to higher education" was another goal which could have enhanced articulation and prevented the duplication of resources. In an era of financial strain, articulation could have been a means to reduce educational costs and to prevent duplication of curriculum. However, there is no evidence in the documents studied of actions taken in this direction.

The final SCHEV goal was as follows:

To enhance statewide and institutional accountability through coordination and cooperation among all elements of the state's total higher education community and between higher education and all other levels of a community of postsecondary institutions and urge increased and more effective coordination and cooperation among all other diverse components in the structure. (SCHEV, 1974)

SCHEV noted several implications inherent to this goal:

-- The coordinating board remains the best mechanism in Virginia for ensuring accountability and simultaneously preserving essential institutional autonomy.

-- This goal is important if Virginia is to preserve strong institutions in both public and private sectors of higher education and at the same time preserve a diversity of choice for the state's students.

-- This goal implies increased cooperation between the post-secondary education community and the elementary and secondary levels. (20)

This goal asserted that articulation between all sectors of education ensures that each student receives academic opportunities to best prepare him or her for further education. As an implementation tactic, SCHEV recommended that "the use of contractual agreements to
satisfy degree program needs should be further promoted among public and private institutions within the state" (20).

Another implication of this last goal was that "greater coordination should also be achieved between secondary and higher education. The learning process continues as students move from secondary education to higher education" (SCHEV, 39). SCHEV recommended that an interagency task force be established between itself and the State Board of Education to improve coordination between secondary and postsecondary education. There is no indication (in the documents studied or people interviewed) that such a task force was formed between these two agencies for such a purpose.

Consistent with the same coordination efforts, SCHEV recommended a reduction in duplication of efforts and facilities in occupational-technical education. It recommended that the State Department of Education and the Department of Community Colleges develop an appropriate and accelerated plan to prevent duplication of efforts. However, there is no indication from relevant literature studied that either developed a plan to prevent duplication of efforts at this time period. Pressman and Wildavsky (1973) have indicated that there is a time order to the events in a policy which relates to the events. These writers assert that "Policies become programs when, by authoritative action, the initial conditions are created, x now exists ..." (xv). They assert that policy only becomes reality when the "right" chain of events occurs, a chain of causation between initial and future consequences. From the lack of written or oral evidence of activity toward articulation, one can conclude that educational leaders--the Chancellor of the VCCS, the Secretary of Education, and college presidents--made no steps toward articulation and that articulation was not a high priority for them. Pressman and Wildavsky believe that by the actions of leaders, conditions favorable to policy implementation are produced (1973). Additionally, these writers believe that the implementation of policy is dependent not
just on timing but on skill. SCHEV simply made recommendations without any evidence that its members had anticipated any present or future consequences of their recommendations. This fact could be due to SCHEV's being a "coordinating" rather than "governing" body.

Key Forces Shaping Articulation: 1971-1975

Few major steps in articulation were made during this time period, but goals and commitments were reaffirmed, as suggested earlier. Few educational players were advocating articulation, at least few names surfaced in the documents researched. SCHEV members, Dr. Hamel, and many community college presidents at the time continued their efforts to prevent duplication by producing documents that encouraged articulation between community colleges and senior colleges and universities in the Commonwealth. One such document was "Guidelines for Promoting Articulation Between Two-Year and Four-Year Colleges and Universities." However, no evidence was found to prove that it was more than mere words.

The influence of the secondary school was not significant; however, SCHEV influenced articulation at the higher education level by encouraging, but not mandating, the community colleges and senior colleges and universities to follow its guidelines. For example, these two educational segments were encouraged to provide campus leadership in the area of articulation by way of the SCHEV guidelines. A portion of one guideline stated:

Two-year college students should be encouraged to choose as early as possible the four-year institution and program into which they expect to transfer in order to plan programs which may include all lower division requirements of the four-year institution. . . . (SCHEV Guidelines, 2)

Although SCHEV, the coordinating body, made recommendations for greater articulation, the literature does not point to any implementation of them by senior colleges and universities or community colleges.

Next, SCHEV showed influence on articulation in the production of the 1974 Virginia Plan. This plan offered statewide higher education
goals, and some of these goals were pertinent to articulation. For example, the first goal was pertinent to articulation because it implied that the "higher education community should make it possible for a student to transfer from one form or level of postsecondary education to other forms, depending upon his interest and abilities" (SCHEV, 1974). Articulation is stressed here because it eases the transfer of students from one educational division to another.

Based on interviews and documents searched, the influence on articulation of the different branches of the Commonwealth's educational system varied from almost none on the part of the secondary schools to mere words on the part of the community and four-year colleges. The period between 1971 and 1975 with its growth in number of students did not show any policy developments toward articulation. Clearly the emphasis was on growth and development in Virginia higher education during this period of growth and development for both Virginia senior institutions and community colleges. Thus while SCHEV updated documents, no efforts were made by colleges to implement articulation.

Nonetheless, the SCHEV documents offered much hope for movement toward the development of articulation policy. It would fall to the next era, 1976-1981, to realize this potential and implement the written objectives of the State Council.
CHAPTER 7
REDUCED APPROPRIATIONS AND ARTICULATION
IN THE COMMONWEALTH, 1976-1981

Introduction

Almost every facet of education is dependent on adequate financial appropriations. Articulation is no different from other areas of education in needing funds to operate. However, between 1976 and 1981, financial resources for education were reduced considerably. The shortage of funds was a result of financial restraints in the national economy. Seemingly, every sector in the nation was affected. The Commonwealth, indeed, felt its share of this crisis, and the state's public education system was not immune.

State legislators sought ways of meeting critical needs with reduced funds and without disrupting needed services. Legislative cutbacks resulted in layoffs in personnel (including teachers and administrators), in discontinued service programs (e.g., the Teacher Corps), and in reduced services for students. Chancellor Dana Hamel summarized VCCS fiscal constraints in the VCCS Annual Report for 1976 as follows:

Fiscal prudence has always been a hallmark of the State Board for Community Colleges. We will continue to examine every practice and every program to assure maximum results are being received for each dollar invested. (1)

Despite these financial constraints, a review of this and other VCCS annual reports, minutes of VCCS board meetings, and interviews with faculty and staff at several community colleges--J. Sargent Reynolds Community College, Thomas Nelson Community College, Northern Virginia Community College, and Lord Fairfax Community College--show that these institutions continued some articulation efforts (1976, 1989). This chapter traces the development of educational articulation policy in the
Commonwealth between 1976 and 1981 by considering the following: a series of documents produced at the time, the key people involved in articulation, the influence of the different educational segments on articulation, and the policy implications of articulation.

In Secondary Schools

During this era there is little evidence to prove that the secondary schools made many strides in the direction of educational articulation. The documents examined (The Virginia Plan for Higher Education: A Progress Report 1977; "The Report on Articulation Agreements: A Progress Report to the Governor and The General Assembly of Virginia," House Document No. 6; minutes of State Board of Education Meetings 1976-1981; and Annual Reports of the State Superintendents of Public Instruction between 1976 and 1981) and the people interviewed (Dr. John Casteen, Former Secretary of Education, and Dr. John Davis, Former Superintendent of Public Instruction) gave no evidence of any key players in articulation in the secondary schools during this time. Therefore, one can assume that even though educational articulation with secondary schools and community colleges continued in different regions of the country (especially in California), few efforts were made in this direction in Virginia between 1976 and 1981.

The influence of the secondary schools in the Commonwealth on educational articulation was negligible between 1976 and 1981, and no articulation policy resulted. One can conclude from the lack of evidence in the documents examined and the persons interviewed who were active in education during this period that there was no person or persons with a keen interest in promoting educational articulation within secondary schools between 1976 and 1981. Perhaps part of the reason was a preoccupation with fiscal matters, which moved articulation (and other agenda items) to the back burner.
From 1976-1981, the community college in the Commonwealth felt the pressure of reduced resources, as did other segments of education. In fact, Dr. Hamel, made the following statement in his address to the Governor in 1976:

The present fiscal situation clearly will have some long term effects. We cannot grow at the rate that we planned, nor, indeed, at the rate we feel necessary to meet the needs that are evident. We are exercising fiscal prudence but the cutbacks in budgets necessitated by the unfortunate revenue picture have caused us to fall further behind in the development of our Master Plan. . . . We continue to be funded at only eighty percent of our authorized average.

Secondly, we continue 1.8 million square feet short of our building needs based on the guidelines prescribed by the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia. . . . This shortage results in conditions that do not give us, in many instances, appropriate physical facilities to serve our students and has kept us from offering many occupational-technical programs which are sorely needed. (1)

Suffice it to say that budget constraints were considerable throughout this period.

Progress in articulation took primarily the form of agreements—i.e., an action which required no funding support. There were a few key players, together with some committees, working on articulation. Dr. Hamel, Dr. Davis, and some community college presidents in particular saw the need for articulation between community colleges and senior colleges and universities at this time (1991). As stated in Chapter 6, Dr. Hamel's concern for articulation and the support he gained from many community college presidents and SCHEV members resulted in the development of articulation guidelines (1991). The previous chapter in this study provided evidence of SCHEV's concern, inspired by Dr. Hamel, for community college articulation with four-year colleges and universities. This concern continued into the period from 1976 until 1981. The members of SCHEV were convinced by Dr. Hamel that articulation was important to the

The influence of the community college on educational articulation can be ascertained by looking at the workings of different groups such as SCHEV and its Articulation Advisory Committee and its production of documents between 1976 and 1981. Even though Dr. Hamel can be credited as the force behind one of these documents ("Guidelines for Promoting Articulation Between Two-Year Colleges and Universities"), Dr. Gordon Davies, SCHEV Director, asserts that he and other staff members such as Dr. J. C. Phillips, SCHEV Director of Continuing Education, supported Dr. Hamel in his articulation efforts (1991). The members of SCHEV between 1976 and 1981 were instrumental in the production of the first document—"The Report on Articulation Agreements: A Progress Report to the Governor and The General Assembly of Virginia," House Document No. 6. Even though Dr. Hamel is attributed as being the primary endorser of articulation between community colleges and four-year colleges and universities, he was able to convince SCHEV members also to endorse the idea of articulation, according to Dr. Puyear and Dr. Davies (1991). A summary of House Document No. 6 indicates that the Commonwealth made some articulation efforts with community colleges and four-year colleges and universities, specifically in the form of guidelines.

The consortia members were involved in articulation during this time-period. Each region of the state is divided into consortia consisting of groups of higher education institutions. (Specific consortia members are found in Appendix G of this document.) All of the public colleges and universities in the Commonwealth were members of at least one consortium. During the 1975-1976 academic year, each
institutional member of the consortia was asked by SCHEV to develop and to submit a plan for the long-range development of its particular consortium. (Appendix G has detailed information presented by institutions to the consortia.) Part of each institution's task was to develop articulation plans with other institutions in the consortium. For example, Tidewater Community College developed several articulation agreements with Old Dominion University and Norfolk State University. However, it is clear that articulation was not carried out effectively in the hands of the consortia, as few articulation agreements were made or carried out between other community colleges and senior colleges. This ineffectiveness could be attributed to two problems: (1) the consortia's inadequate knowledge of what articulation should be, and (2) the colleges' and universities' weak cooperative efforts with one another, including the community colleges' lack of cooperation with senior colleges and universities in the transfer area. The consortia remained in existence, but, as the documents searched and the persons interviewed reveal, the consortia were not significant in the development or implementation of articulation plans.

Another function of articulation during this time period was that of transfer. Many community college students sought transfer to senior colleges and universities. In this effort the community college students wanted to have the courses they had taken at the community college accepted by the senior college as credit leading to a bachelor's degree. SCHEV saw articulation as an enhancement to the transfer function for community college students. An indication of the State Council's concern with transfer is found in the 1977 Virginia Plan. According to the Virginia Plan, the State Council hoped that the individual community colleges in the Commonwealth would develop their own transfer arrangements with the senior colleges and universities (1977).

In keeping with SCHEV's directive to community colleges to make their own arrangements with senior colleges and universities, the Council produced a document entitled "The Report on Articulation Agreements: A
Progress Report to the Governor and The General Assembly of Virginia,"
House Document No. 6. This document was presented to the General Assembly
of Virginia in response to the House Joint Resolution No. 17, which
directed the State Council, in cooperation with public and private
colleges in the state, to develop articulation agreements between public
community colleges and senior colleges and universities and to assist
private colleges in Virginia in developing similar agreements. The
legislator who sponsored House Joint Resolution No. 17 was Delegate Edward
Lane. SCHEV hoped that the articulation agreements would permit the
orderly transfer of credits from the community college to four-year
colleges and universities funded by the Commonwealth and that these
agreements would lead to the development of necessary parallel course
information that would encourage private colleges in the state to adopt
similar agreements (SCHEV, 1977). The development of this document is
significant in that it showed SCHEV's attention to articulation at the
time and that it could have served as another step toward articulation
policy. According to Dr. Hamel and Dr. Davies, most senior colleges and
universities in the state were reluctant to accept community college
credit. They believe that the senior colleges were concerned about the
quality of community college courses (1991). SCHEV attributed the long
and tedious process toward articulation between community colleges and
senior colleges and universities to the diversity of institutions and also
lack of understanding on the part of senior institutions in the missions
and programs of institutions.

The last two sections of this document focused on the status of the
Commonwealth's efforts toward articulation and indicated that many state
officials throughout the nation had done much to foster transfer of credit
between two-year and four-year colleges and universities. SCHEV reported
in "Report on Articulation Agreements" that thirty-nine of the fifty
states and the District of Columbia had taken actions in this direction.
Most of these states created statewide guidelines for articulation rather
than explicit policies and procedures, and Virginia was one of these states. Many Virginia community colleges and senior colleges and universities were aware of the guidelines the Commonwealth had in place. Yet, no statewide policies were formulated.

The last section of the "Report on Articulation Agreements" concentrated on articulation in Virginia. In 1976 each of Virginia's public senior colleges and universities was asked to submit copies of policies, procedures, and any other materials related to the Commonwealth's community college transfer students. The resulting material indicated that eleven of the fifteen senior colleges and universities had available student handbooks and transfer guides for those community college students. The remaining institutions did not have written policies or procedures governing transfer (SCHEV, 1977). These handbooks and guides contained lists of credit courses available at community colleges and the comparable credit courses at four-year colleges and universities. The transfer of credit from a community college to a four-year college or university varied with the particular senior institution's mission or even the idea of elitism. Most of the senior institutions required a grade point average of "C." This requirement coincided with that of the Joint Committee on Junior and Senior Colleges (a committee established by the American Association of Community Junior Colleges and the Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers, 1976).

The State Council acknowledged that:

Only four of the senior institutions state in their policies that a student holding an Associate's degree in a university parallel program, and who meets the minimum grade point average requirements, will be granted admission in junior status. (SCHEV, 1977)

These institutions were Mary Washington College (liberal arts transfer programs only), Norfolk State College, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, and Virginia State College (SCHEV, 1977). The other senior colleges and universities accepted transfer of equivalent courses, those offered at the senior colleges and universities which had similar
descriptions to the community college courses, but did not transfer all community college credit courses to fulfill students' graduation requirements. The State Council asserted that the community college student who received the associate's degree before transferring would most likely be accepted at the senior institution as a transfer student. However, only a small number of community college transfer students who applied to these senior colleges, between the years of 1976 and 1981, were accepted because of limited spaces at the institutions (SCHEV, 1977).

In summary, SCHEV's "Report on Articulation Agreements: A Progress Report to the Governor, The General Assembly of Virginia," House Document No. 6 indicates that articulation between community colleges and four-year colleges and universities, in the form of guidelines, existed in the Commonwealth. Some community colleges and four-year colleges and universities had articulation agreements, which included community college courses that would transfer to (or be accepted by) senior colleges. Community colleges and senior colleges and universities directed their energies toward easing the transition of students from community colleges to senior colleges and universities. Thus, Virginia had articulation arrangements in progress. (Appendix I of this document gives data on students' applications from Virginia Community Colleges to public four-year institutions in this time period.)

The process of creating articulation agreements was hardly smooth, though. The SCHEV Articulation Task Force found problems occurring because of inadequate communication and understanding between institutions. For example, according to SCHEV's "The Report on Articulation Agreements: A Progress Report to the Governor and The General Assembly of Virginia," transferability of college transfer credits earned in a community college is not uniform throughout the state (1977). For example, if a Tidewater Community College student wished to transfer the Psychology 201 and 202 (3 credit hours each of an introductory sequence) courses he or she had taken at Tidewater Community College to
James Madison University, he or she will receive degree credit for six hours of psychology toward degree requirements. However, if the student wished to transfer these same psychology courses to Old Dominion University, he would have received degree credit for one course (Psychology 201) and elective credit for Psychology 202. The Articulation Task Force therefore directed:

that articulation agreements between public community colleges and senior colleges and universities in Virginia be developed and that the necessary information on parallel courses be developed to assist private colleges in developing agreements. (SCHEV Articulation Task Force, 12)

In its "Report on Articulation Agreements", the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia suggested that this same task force study articulation agreements which:

1. Assist institutions to formalize the existing transfer guides and establish them as articulation agreements. These should be made available to community college students on a wide basis. The task force should also work with those senior institutions not having transfer guides and assist them in developing articulation documents. This should be completed by June, 1977.

2. Examine the best manner possible to assist private colleges in Virginia to develop similar articulation agreements.

3. Examine the desirability of annotating the Community College Curriculum Guide and make recommendations to the Department of Community Colleges.

4. Examine the possibility of each senior institution developing an inexpensive brochure describing its transfer policy and procedure that can be made readily available to all community college students; and

5. Recommend to the Council of Higher Education matters related to articulation that require additional study. (12)

The State Council also recommended that the Articulation Advisory Committee:
1. Reevaluate the existing statewide guidelines on articulation and recommend any changes that are necessary.

2. Collect data on the transfer of credit.

3. Establish liaison with the regional consortia to facilitate regional articulation; and

4. Conduct such studies as are deemed necessary and make recommendations to the appropriate bodies. (12)

The Articulation Advisory Committee was created to seek information on the needs of students transferring from community colleges to senior colleges and universities. With the encouragement of the VCCS Chancellor, Dr. Hamel, and the SCHEV Director, Dr. Davies, the Articulation Advisory Committee led by SCHEV's Dr. McLean made some progress toward articulation by writing recommendations on articulation in the "Report on Articulation Agreements: A Progress Report to the Governor and The General Assembly of Virginia," House Document No. 6. Delegate Ed Lane promoted this legislation, and SCHEV readily endorsed the recommendations. This research failed to locate members of the Articulation Advisory Committee other than its chair, Dr. James McLean; but Dr. Puyear, in an interview, attributes articulation transfer efforts at this time to Dr. Hamel's inspiration and concern (1991). The assumption can be made that Dr. Hamel, Dr. McLean, and Dr. Davies were the significant forces behind articulation during this period.

In addition to the Articulation Advisory Committee, SCHEV also appointed an Articulation Task Force during this time. This task force was composed of SCHEV members and community college personnel. The major function of the Articulation Task Force was to find ways of enhancing articulation (e.g., acceptance of some community college courses by senior colleges and universities). SCHEV also wanted the task force to devise specific guidelines between community colleges and senior institutions. The next chapter of this research gives specific actions of this Articulation Task Force.
Finally, the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia asserted that the Commonwealth had made some progress in articulation and that it would continue to monitor articulation efforts and work with the public community colleges and public four-year colleges and universities throughout the Commonwealth (1977). SCHEV's "Report on Articulation Agreements" was designed to describe the state of articulation in the Commonwealth. Even though articulation was active, there were few signs of policy development or implementation. Articulation procedures in this "Report on Articulation Agreements" focused on the elimination of articulation problems. SCHEV's desire was to ease the transfer process for community college students. Thus, articulation during this time period was designed to ensure a smooth transition for community college students who completed an associate's degree at the community college and who desired to complete the bachelor's degree at a senior college and university.

An influence on transfer can be seen in another document produced by SCHEV, entitled The Virginia Plan for Higher Education: A Progress Report-1977. The purpose of this report was to inform the Commonwealth's citizens of the implementation of the goals established in the 1974 Virginia Plan for Higher Education. One of the Council's previous goals was that of accessibility, making higher education in Virginia available to all its citizens. This report asserted "that accessibility can take many forms including providing financial aid to students, changing curricula and administrative procedures, providing new facilities, or a host of other actions" (5).

The State Council noted transfer as a means for enhancing access to higher education. The attainment of this goal was largely achieved through the Virginia Community College System, growing urban universities, and a diverse set of independent institutions. Since that time, four-year colleges and universities expanded and community colleges were strengthened and enlarged. The result was twenty-three community colleges
located throughout the Commonwealth. SCHEV encouraged continued transfer agreements with four-year institutions, which were designed to promote successful transfer of students from the two-year colleges (1981).

The 1974 Virginia Plan for Higher Education emphasized the need to ensure Virginia community college students' smooth transfer to four-year colleges and universities. This recommendation was reinforced by the 1976 General Assembly, which directed the Council to develop, in cooperation with the State's institutions, agreements that would provide for the orderly transfer of credit from the community colleges to the senior colleges and universities. In accordance with this request twelve of the fifteen senior public colleges developed transfer guides for community college students (SCHEV, 1977).

Another transfer recommendation set forth in the 1974 Virginia Plan for Higher Education called for the development of a transfer policy for holders of the Associate in Applied Science degree. At the time of this report each senior institution determined the transferability of academic credit on a course by course basis. The State Council pledged to collect relevant data and to encourage the development of a comprehensive policy covering transfer credit awards (SCHEV, 1977). According to Dr. Hamel, policy and plans made by community college and senior college and university personnel were good yet inactive because changes in transfer committee members occurred frequently and transfer course decisions were made by faculty members of senior institutions (1991).

Another document produced by SCHEV, The Virginia Plan (1981), reveals more of the Council's attitude toward articulation. This document noted the "good" health of higher education within the Commonwealth (2). It reported that the state-supported colleges and universities are sound, progressive, and economically efficient. In looking toward the twenty-first century, the State Council identified several external factors which "impinge upon higher education and affect the continued development of Virginia's colleges and universities" (4). These factors are as follows:
1. Precipitous declines in the funding for student financial assistance programs supported by the federal government;

2. A return to the States of responsibility for various social programs which for many years have been funded by the federal government, and a concomitant increase in demands upon state revenues;

3. Persistent inflation and economic stagnation;

4. Continued pressure from every region of the Commonwealth for additional higher education programs without regard for the problems of duplication or the allocation of limited resources;

5. Severe energy shortages which affect both institutional operating costs and the costs of students' travel to school;

6. Changes in the general population and therefore in the number of characteristics of the men and women who enroll in higher education;

7. Sharply reduced federal support for both basic and applied research performed by colleges and universities. (4)

The State Council argued that these external factors were beyond the control of those responsible for higher education, but the responses to them were not. It indicated that Virginia's response to these factors would determine the health of higher education in the Commonwealth as the end of the century nears.

The State Council recommended that institutions of higher education continue to improve and maintain quality. In addition to quality, each college and university within the Commonwealth was asked to review its own mission and to remember that it cannot meet the needs of all students it may attempt to serve. According to the Council, fewer essential activities were to be curtailed, and resources were to be appropriated efficiently.

Wildavsky (1979) has asserted that policy analysis "seeks out error and promotes change" (36). SCHEV's 1981 Virginia Plan for Higher Education promoted the health of higher education within the Commonwealth.
SCHEV encouraged change, specifically improving the quality of higher education through the production of documents promoting articulation. However, SCHEV, in promoting new policies did not attempt to "seek out errors," which Wildavsky sees as a necessary step in policy analysis, to disclose where the weaknesses in articulation policy development were and to find reasons for its slow progress. The organization of the Articulation Advisory Committee to produce the "Report on Articulation Agreements: A Progress Report to the Governor and The General Assembly of Virginia," House Document No. 6 attests to this fact, as does broad reference to articulation in the 1977 Virginia Plan and the 1981 Virginia Plan. But, progress toward articulation during this period was primarily demonstrated on paper and was not actually implemented. SCHEV is a coordinating body, not a governing body, and so did not enforce articulation. Few, if any, of the senior institutions and community colleges provide documented evidence of a commitment to articulation during the time period under review. For example, "The Report on Articulation Agreements: A Progress Report to the Governor and The General Assembly of Virginia," indicates that guidelines for transferring credits from community colleges to senior institutions were in place; yet, examining documents such as the minutes of State Council meetings and VCCS board meetings and interviews with Dr. Davies, Dr. Hamel, and Dr. Puyear and others gave no clues. There is little evidence that these guidelines were implemented. Another articulation effort that was demonstrated on paper only was SCHEV's request that each senior college plan for the long-range development of the consortium and articulation plans with other members of the consortium; however, there is little evidence that articulation agreements were successful. In order to locate evidence, several persons at community colleges such as counselors, teachers, and administrators and persons in similar capacities in some senior colleges were interviewed. But these interviews reveal little result. Although a few individuals, such as Dr. Hamel and Dr. McLean, were instrumental in
keeping articulation in the minds of educators at this time, progress
toward articulation other than the documents they inspired was minimal.

Key Forces Shaping Articulation, 1976-1981

This section will attempt to analyze and summarize the occurrences
in articulation between 1976 and 1981. In order to present the material
clearly, the items will be organized so that the critical happenings to
articulation are presented first. Next the ways these critical
occurrences promoted articulation are discussed. Finally, the result of
all the efforts toward articulation during this period are given.

Few documents provided evidence to prove that articulation made any
progress during this time in secondary schools. The documents examined
were a direct outgrowths of the Virginia Department of Education, and they
should have contained information related to articulation had any recorded
steps been made in this sector. Key persons in public education, such as
the former Secretary of Education, Dr. Casteen, and former Superintendent
of Public Instruction, Dr. John Davis, were persons interviewed; however,
they gave no evidence of the movement of articulation in the direction of
secondary education, nor of many key persons showing an interest in
promoting articulation in secondary schools during this time.

In the community college and senior colleges and universities, there
were a few developments in articulation; however, these developments did
not mark significant progress towards articulation. First, SCHEV promoted
transfer credit agreements between community colleges and senior colleges
and universities and directed each consortium in the state to submit, as
part of a plan for its long-range development, articulation plans with
other institutions. The number of transfer agreements between community
colleges and senior colleges in the state did increase as the consortia
members encouraged senior colleges and universities to accept transfer
credits from community college students. The consortia's primary aim was
to get institutions to work closely and to agree on acceptable courses.
Yet, the actual implementation of these agreements was minimal, and the
degree to which college personnel and students were aware of these agreements is difficult to ascertain. Community college students continued having difficulty transferring to some senior colleges, as these institutions were reluctant to accept community college credit. Part of the reluctance of senior colleges and universities to accept transfer credits from colleges was due to their lack of knowledge concerning the quality of community college courses. Another problem was that senior college personnel did not keep community college personnel aware of changes in courses, credit, and/or numbers. The "Report on Articulation Agreements: A Progress Report to the Governor and The General Assembly of Virginia," House Document No. 6 contained articulation guidelines that schools should follow to enhance articulation between community colleges and senior colleges and universities. However, colleges were slow to implement these guidelines, even though they were endorsed by the Dr. Davies and Dr. Hamel. Furthermore, SCHEV could not enforce the guidelines with senior colleges because it is not a governing body. Therefore, community colleges could not have true articulation with senior colleges and universities themselves who were unwilling to pursue articulation actively.

Two documents, the 1974 and the 1977 Virginia Plan for Higher Education and the 1981 Virginia Plan for Higher Education, made broad references to the need for articulation in the Commonwealth. SCHEV worked to meet this need with the assistance of its Articulation Advisory Committee, which helped to solve problems related to community college students' transferring to senior colleges. This committee sought to work with institutional representatives (i.e., admissions persons, etc.) from the colleges. It also made recommendations on articulation in "Report on Articulation Agreements: A Progress Report to the Governor and The General Assembly of Virginia," House Document No. 6. Another committee, the Articulation Task Force, worked to enhance transfer also.
In addition to committees, there were key persons instrumental to what progress articulation did make between 1976 and 1981. For example, Dr. Davies' interest and support of articulation enabled Dr. McLean to continue his articulation efforts at the helm of the Articulation Advisory Committee and in his membership of the Articulation Task Force.

One can summarize the community colleges' and senior colleges' articulation efforts between 1976 and 1981 as making little progress toward articulation. There was support from those at the helm of the community college and the State Council, but no persons in the trenches to actively work toward successful articulation. Committees were formed, the consortia members were involved, and seemingly an articulation need established in several documents; yet articulation moved slowly.

To conclude, in the period between 1976 and 1981 one finds a few occurrences. First, in the secondary school there was very little interest in and progress toward articulation. Next, in the community colleges and senior colleges and universities, there were key persons who endorsed the idea of articulation, such as Dr. Hamel and Dr. Davies. There were formed an Articulation Advisory Committee and an Articulation Task Force, and there were documents written, such as the 1974 and the 1976 Virginia Plan for Higher Education, pointing to the need for articulation. Yet, movement in this direction was slow and the "Report on Articulation Agreements: A Progress Report to the Governor and The General Assembly of Virginia," House Document No. 6 consisted of articulation guidelines, providing the basis on which some articulation agreements were written, but few, if any, were implemented. This slow response could have occurred because some senior colleges and universities were concerned about the quality of community college courses. Another reason for this slow response could have been the poor communication between community colleges and senior colleges and universities about changing senior college requirements. Finally, part of the slow implementation of articulation guidelines, as suggested by Wildavsky, is the result of
SCHEV's failure to identify the reasons for senior colleges' and community colleges' reluctance to implement articulation and its inability, as a coordinating rather than a governing body, to enforce articulation guidelines.

Therefore, one can conclude that articulation did not move rapidly from 1976 to 1981. Yet, there were indicators of articulation during this era within the community college and in the senior college. The 1982-1987 years should show more changes toward articulation in the community colleges and in the senior colleges and universities.
CHAPTER 8
COMING OF AGE IN THE COMMONWEALTH, 1982-1987

Introduction

The period from 1982 to 1987 shows specific steps in the growth of the Virginia Community College System. Previous periods examined revealed the birth, maturity, and eventual decline in student enrollment. Yet, the system continued to maintain its health, experiencing notable triumphs. Education in general has a history of ups and downs, usually depending on the influences of external factors. The VCCS has been no different. Indeed, secondary schools, the community college, and the senior college and university within the Commonwealth mirror the community which surrounds them. Likewise, articulation's advancement within the segments of education was dependent on the community's leaders in education and their educational priorities. Between 1982 and 1987 the state's economy felt the blow of a national trend--inflation--and a new emphasis on "high tech," followed by a focus on specialized technical training (VCCS, 1987). The community college was available to offer the needed skills. However, increases in student population were not immediate but occurred later.

The public schools are likely the beginning of and senior colleges and universities the end of formal education for some citizens; however, the community college plays a unique role because it comes in the middle of the education track. It is the school that the drop-out, the intellectually shy, the academically deficient, and the adult in need of more job training will first approach. It is also a financial alternative for many. Because the community college was, as it is today, an important intermediate step for some, the years between 1982 and 1987 showed growth, especially in the area of articulation. The purpose of this section is to
present data clearly showing logical steps in the growth of articulation. The process for presenting these facts entails a discussion of the three major levels of education, beginning with the secondary schools and continuing through the community college and senior college, each time with an examination of the key players, influence of the various educational segments on articulation, and policy implications. This analysis includes interviews with noted Virginia educators active between 1982 and 1987, as well as the review of some relevant documents. The documents included in this analysis are the 1983 *Virginia Plan for Higher Education*, the 1979 *State Plan for Vocational Education in Virginia*, the SCHEV publication *Directions*, *Articulation in Virginia*, "Secondary/Postsecondary Education in Virginia," and the 1987 "Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia."

**In Secondary Schools and Community Colleges**

Articulation between the secondary schools and community colleges in the Commonwealth progressed slowly from 1966 until 1982. The pace picked up somewhat after that time. Most of the educators interviewed and the documents searched show some formal strides toward articulation in secondary schools and community colleges. An interview with the then Secretary of Education for the Commonwealth, from 1982 to 1985, Dr. John Casteen, revealed at least one step toward articulation in secondary schools during his tenure in office.

Dr. Casteen indicated that one secondary school articulation effort during this period was the publication of a set of books for parents to show how students could move from one segment of education to another (i.e., from secondary school to community college to senior college). This publication also showed how students could change their minds about career goals and still progress with minimum difficulty. This particular effort toward educational articulation focused on the secondary schools and community colleges (1990).
Others instrumental in educational articulation at this time, in addition to the Commonwealth's Secretary of Education, were those persons in the Department of Vocational Education and community colleges who shared a commitment to articulation. Although the few documents produced during this time and the interviews with educators in key administrative positions (such as the Chancellor, Presidents, the Secretary of Education) reveal few interested persons other than Dr. Casteen, it is probable, however, that others credited with making noted achievements later, such as Dr. Ned Swartz, a leader in vocational education, and Dr. Ed Barnes, whose job centered on the community college, had an interest in articulation. These men were instrumental in the development of statewide articulation policy later, so one can assume their interest in and awareness of articulation began before the policy was developed.

The involvement of secondary schools in articulation efforts again surfaced with the implementation of the 1979 State Plan for Vocational Education in Virginia. This project was jointly sponsored by the Department of Education and the Virginia Community College System with Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University (VPI & SU) being awarded the research project to develop a model for formal articulation that could be used throughout the state. In this project four smaller plans were established in three community college service regions — Central Virginia Community College, Thomas Nelson Community College, and Southwest Virginia Community College—and at James Madison University (to serve the Blue Ridge, Lord Fairfax, and Dabney S. Lancaster Community College service regions). This project was funded for a three-year period (VDE, 1986). However, the project at VPI & SU was continued until June 30, 1985, and according to the Department of Vocational Education, major progress in securing articulation agreements was made throughout the Commonwealth (1986). The project's specific effort was described as follows:

Articulation agreements were obtained in eleven programs, 37 others were involved in the
development of some form of articulation, and 14 additional programs were reviewed and studied for possible articulation efforts. Beginning in 1983-84 mini grants of approximately $1,500.00 were made available again during September, 1986. Approximately ninety percent of the state's community colleges and public schools were involved in the development of articulation agreements in one or more occupational programs. In order to determine the extent to which these efforts have occurred, a survey was taken during August, 1986 by the Department of Education with the assistance of the Virginia Community College System. (Virginia Department of Vocational Education, 1986, 2)

The members of the State Board of Education were instrumental in devising the "Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia," which was the document adopted in 1987. Some of these standards were directly relevant to articulation. These standards were state-mandated, but the duty of implementing them was left to local superintendents and their staffs.

An examination of the "Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia" reveals some degree of influence of the secondary schools on articulation in 1987. The purpose of these standards was to provide a foundation for quality education in the Commonwealth. Additionally, the Board of Education created them to provide guidance and direction for elementary and secondary schools in their continuing efforts to offer educational programs to meet the needs, interests, and aspirations of all students.

The document is divided into several sections, giving the requirements, the procedures, and the specific standards for accreditation of public schools in Virginia. The standard pertinent to articulation is:

Standard C Each school shall provide a planned and balanced program of instruction that is in keeping with the abilities, interests, and educational needs of students and that promotes individual student achievement. (State Board of Education, 1987, 19)

A specific criterion for secondary schools included in Standard C
pertinent to this study of articulation policy development follows: "Each secondary school shall offer options to pursue a program of study in several academic and vocational areas" (19). The State Board asserts that these options shall include:

a. Vocational educational choices that prepare the student with marketable skill in one of three or more occupational areas;

b. Academic choices that prepare the student for technical or preprofessional programs of higher education;

c. Liberal arts choices that prepare the student for college-level studies in the arts and sciences;

d. Access to at least two Advanced Placement courses or two college-level courses for credit. (20)

The State Board of Education (1987) continued its directives to public schools by asserting:

Beginning in the middle-school years, students shall be counseled as to opportunities for beginning postsecondary education prior to high school graduation. Whenever possible students shall be encouraged and afforded opportunities to take college courses simultaneously for high school graduation and college degree credit, under the following conditions:

(a) prior written approval of the high school principal for the cross-registration must be obtained;

(b) the college must accept the student for admission to the course(s); and

(c) the course must be given by the college for degree credit. (21)

The criteria presented here reinforce the need for articulation in Virginia public education. Directives (particularly those in reference to vocational education) encourage students to pursue education beyond high school or to establish career goals. These directives provide the incentives and procedures necessary for students' smooth transition to other educational institutions or for their job placement. In addition, the directives give the Commonwealth's educational leaders the basis for
the development of articulation policy.

In order to get a full picture of articulation during this period, one must realize that there were variations on articulation, especially during the latter part of this period. The Virginia Department of Vocational Education listed several articulation arrangements. These included:

- Fully coordinated programs and courses;
- "2 + 2" programs in Master Technician, Engineering Design Technician, and Information Processing Specialists and development of nine additional "2 + 2" programs;
- "2 + 2 + 2" models to include a third instructional level of vocational training;
- Agreements to share facilities and equipment;
- Agreements for advanced placement credit;
- Provisions for dual enrollments;
- Exploration of secondary/postsecondary teaching exchanges;
- Exploration of granting secondary credit for postsecondary work for students who did not complete high school. (Articulation in Virginia: Coordination of Secondary/Postsecondary Education, 1982.) (2)

These different articulation arrangements simply show how articulation matured and developed during this time. Most of these different arrangements were made between the secondary schools and community colleges within the Commonwealth. A 1988 publication by the Commonwealth's Department of Vocational and Adult Education entitled Articulation in Virginia: Coordination of Secondary/Postsecondary Education lists specific articulation arrangements between community colleges and public schools in the Commonwealth.

In summary, between 1982 and 1987 strides were made in secondary school articulation, as numerous programs and agreements between secondary schools and community colleges were developed. With the inspiration and help of the Secretary of Education, Dr. Casteen, interested persons in the secondary schools, such as Dr. Swartz, as well as persons in the community college system, such as Dr. Barnes, steps toward articulation were taken in most areas of the state. One can thus conclude that the steps taken
during this time were the important preliminary steps leading to the statewide policy formulated later.

In Senior Colleges and Community Colleges

According to the 1983 Virginia Plan for Higher Education the institutions of higher education in the Commonwealth were healthy. The entire system of higher education had experienced tremendous growth over the last decade—from 134,000 to 252,000 students served (SCHEV, 4). In addition to student population growth, the community college system's presence in every major geographical region of the state made a significant impact on higher education in the Commonwealth. Yet, there is no evidence that increased articulation efforts resulted from the increase in the numbers of students in higher education in the state and an increase in the numbers of students in the state's community colleges. Instead, senior colleges' and universities' articulation efforts were a response to an Office of Civil Rights (OCR) mandate encouraging equality for minority students transferring to senior colleges and SCHEV's goals of "access," "excellence," and "accountability" as stated in the 1983 Virginia Plan. To meet these goals, senior colleges and universities worked primarily on their transfer policies; thus, their contributions to the articulation effort during this time period was to develop transfer agreements.

Between 1982 and 1988 many senior colleges and universities began to look at their transfer policies, student demographics, and other transfer data. SCHEV members (their specific names are found in Appendix F of this document) indicated their attention to articulation with the reaffirmation of their commitment to the goals stated in the 1983 Virginia Plan for Higher Education.

Also, in keeping with SCHEV's allegiance to transfer was the SCHEV sponsored meeting of the directors of admissions from the senior colleges and universities in the Commonwealth and Dr. James McLean. With Dr. McLean as head, this group sought to follow federal mandates from the
Office of Civil Rights to provide equal accessibility for minority students to higher education, (McLean, 1989). These meetings had the purpose of finding ways to ease the accessibility to senior colleges and universities for underprivileged young people, especially minorities. According to Dr. McLean, most of the state's senior colleges and universities re-evaluated their admissions policies to include minority students (1989).

One major achievement during this time was a transfer guide entitled Directions, which was a joint production of the VCCS and SCHEV (1988). This document was endorsed by the leaders of the VCCS and State Council. This document was not a product of the senior colleges and universities, but it did include information on the senior colleges and universities. In addition to listing transfer information for each public senior college and university and community college, this transfer guide identifies the types of statewide articulation agreements between senior colleges and universities and Virginia community colleges. Those senior colleges and universities with articulation agreements with the VCCS listed in Directions are Virginia State University, Christopher Newport College, George Mason University, and Old Dominion University. Many other senior colleges and universities in the Commonwealth were involved in some type of articulation arrangements, as well. (Some specific examples are found in Appendix D.)

Key players in community colleges and senior colleges this time were Dr. Davies; Dr. Hinson, Virginia Community College System Chancellor, 1980-1983; Dr. McLean; Dr. Hockaday, Chancellor of the Virginia Community College System, 1983-1990; Dr. Casteen; and Dr. Finley, former Secretary of Education for the Commonwealth. Many of the community college presidents blessed the efforts of their articulation staff members who helped in forming articulation agreements with other educational institutions, according to Dr. Puyear (1991). Yet, less than one-third of the member institutions of the VCCS were actively involved in articulation

Dr. Robert Grymes, Dean-Instructional and Student Services at Tidewater Community College, believes the key players in community college and senior college and university articulation are the deans, division chairpersons, department heads, and some faculty at the particular institutions. These persons, he said, are the persons who really do the work to enhance or hinder articulation between institutions (1989).

Faculty are extremely important and influential at higher education institutions. They often determine the success or failure of many programs. They are the individuals who work closely with students in teaching, advising, and mentoring. Therefore, a major portion of a student's time at the college is spent with faculty. Since faculty contact with students occurs at different times in the student's educational cycle, he or she (the student) often follows the direction or recommendation of faculty members. Also faculty play a central role in deciding which courses transfer; thus articulation can rest in their hands.

Dr. John Casteen believes the actual success of articulation with senior colleges and universities lies with the faculty. He asserts that if the faculty want articulation to work, it will (1990). One can conclude from these comments that articulation involving the community college and senior college and university can be successful, if those who work at its success decide it to be so (1989, 1990).

In summarizing community college and senior college articulation efforts during this time, one finds the senior colleges and universities responding to mandates from the Office of Civil Rights in the form of increased transfer policies to increase "access," "excellence," and accountability. In turn, community college students were given more options for earning the bachelor's degree in the Commonwealth. Certainly key educators within SCHEV, the VCCS, as well as the Secretary of
Education, and community college presidents were vital to articulation at this time.

**Key Forces Shaping Articulation, 1982-1987**

An examination of documents relating to articulation during this time period reveals factors important to this historical analysis. For the most part, education within the Commonwealth between 1982 and 1987 was considered by most educators to be stable. Community colleges within the state were enrolling a significant number of students in new and varied programs. A closer analysis of the three educational segments reveals their role in articulation during the time.

To begin, the secondary schools showed some interest in articulation in three major ways. First, their interest in articulation was seen with the formulation and implementation of the "Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia." This standard encourages students to pursue education beyond high school and to establish career goals. It also provides the incentives and procedures necessary for students' smooth transition to other educational institutions or for their preparation for the job market.

Another contribution of the secondary schools to articulation during this time period was the development of articulation guides, which Secretary of Education, Dr. John Casteen, inspired. These books showed students and parents how students moved from each level of education to another.

Also, the Virginia Department of Vocational Education and the VCCS worked hand in hand in articulation efforts during this time as exemplified in the 1979 *State Plan for Vocational Education*. This plan resulted in articulation agreements between secondary schools and community colleges in the Commonwealth, such as the number of 2 + 2 and similar programs.

Likewise the senior colleges and universities and community colleges made strides in articulation. In response to an Office of Civil Rights
mandate encouraging equality for minority students and SCHEV's goal of "access," senior colleges and universities worked on developing better transfer policies. Essential to the progress of articulation at this time were the support and attention of key educators such as Dr. Casteen, Dr. Davies, Dr. Hockaday, and Dr. McLean. Publications such as SCHEV's Directions and the 1983 Virginia Plan for Higher Education reflected the incoming attention to statewide articulation. Also important for the success of articulation were faculty at community and senior colleges and universities. Both Dr. Grymes and Dr. Casteen, gave special emphasis to the role the faculty play in successful articulation (1990) or, simply, one faculty informing other faculty and students about the importance and workings of articulation. Faculty advise students in course selection and often decide which courses transfer from one college to another. Without question, faculty, are important facilitators for articulation.

Suffice it to say that 1982-87 saw important strides in the statewide articulation effort. And, perhaps in ways which matter most, the accomplishments of these years positioned the state quite well for the articulation advancements which materialized in the late 1980's.
The purpose of this study is to present an historical policy analysis of educational articulation in the Commonwealth of Virginia, covering the years from 1968 to 1990. The research involves an examination of the Commonwealth's secondary schools, community colleges, and senior colleges and universities to determine the contribution of key individuals involved in articulation policy development between 1968 and 1990, the influence of each section of the state's educational system, and the articulation policy which resulted.

Summary

Articulation has long been a part of education in America. It was once seen as a method of easing the transition of students from primary to secondary education. However, more recently it is a term applied specifically to cooperative relationships among educational segments. Articulation today has been cited as a cure for the fragmentation in our current American educational system. It has been dubbed simultaneously, as well, a deterrent to the hierarchical attitudes of superiority that exist among some educators and a relief from the bureaucratic maze that stems from separate bureaucracies at different educational levels.

The Commonwealth serves as a good case study showing the steps taken in articulation over the last twenty-two years. The study focuses on the development of educational articulation in the Commonwealth from 1966, with the beginning of the Virginia community colleges, until 1990. More specifically, the concern is with the historical development of educational articulation policy. In the later part of the 1980's, two segments of the Commonwealth's educational system--the secondary schools...
and community colleges—formulated statewide articulation policy. Senior colleges and universities became involved in articulation development in the eighties as well. This study analyzes the involvement of the Commonwealth's secondary schools, community colleges, and senior colleges and universities in articulation policy development, by focusing on the key players involved, the influence each of the educational segments had, and the policy, if any, which resulted.

The 1966-1970 Era

Between 1966 and 1970 there was a significant event in the Commonwealth, which was the birth of the community college. Enrollment in community colleges accelerated at an alarming rate. The community college, therefore, established its importance in the Commonwealth's system of higher education. Despite this important introduction, no articulation policy resulted. However, some initial steps toward articulation were taken.

There is no evidence suggesting that in the period between 1966 and 1970 secondary schools were involved in articulation efforts with community colleges. Because there is little documentation of any kind addressing articulation in public secondary schools, one can assume that secondary schools had other more important agenda items.

On the other hand, the founding Chancellor of the VCCS, Dr. Dana Hamel, was thinking differently. He convinced the State Council of the importance of articulation between community colleges and senior colleges and universities, and he therefore initiated the document entitled "Guidelines for Promoting Articulation Between State Controlled Community Colleges and Four-Year Colleges and Universities," approved by SCHEV in 1967. This document was intended to promote the smooth transfer of students from community colleges to senior colleges and universities in the Commonwealth and was as close as the state came to statewide articulation policy in the late sixties.

Also, SCHEV published the 1967 Virginia Plan, emphasizing joint
planning among the educational segments which can be interpreted as a move toward articulation. SCHEV hoped that the community colleges and senior colleges and universities would plan programs and curricula together in an effort to enhance articulation. "The Virginia Higher Education Report," produced by SCHEV in 1966, clearly notes the formation of several advisory committees which were designed as an effective mechanism for promoting and developing higher education in Virginia. One of these committees was the Articulation Advisory Committee; another was the Articulation Task Force.

The senior colleges, however, did little to promote or encourage articulation. At least there is very little evidence or documentation to show the growth of articulation between the two-year colleges and the senior institutions between 1966 and 1970.

To summarize the period between 1966 and 1970, neither the secondary schools nor the senior colleges and universities participated in articulation policy development at this time. The interest of the community college Chancellor, Dr. Hamel, and SCHEV members suggests at least a theoretical interest to move the three segments of the state's education system toward articulation. Of course, without the involvement of the senior institutions, the community college was powerless to move actively toward articulation.

The 1971–1975 Era

The next time period, 1971 to 1975, shows few major steps made in articulation. First, the influence of the secondary schools was not significant. Few names of people interested in articulation during this time surfaced in the documents searched and from the educators interviewed.

A look at higher education found that an update of SCHEV's original "Guidelines for Promoting Articulation Between Two-Year and Four-Year Colleges and Universities" influenced articulation by encouraging, but not mandating, coordination between the community colleges and senior colleges. SCHEV recommended that community college students be able to
transfer to senior colleges and universities without loss of credit to senior colleges. Yet, the literature does not point to any implementation of this recommendation by senior colleges and universities or community colleges. There is little evidence to show any steps taken by the Articulation Advisory Committee to enhance articulation in the Commonwealth. Therefore, articulation during this time was not yet a priority for each educational segment. There was almost no articulation effort in the secondary schools and merely articulation on paper between the community colleges and senior institutions.

The 1976-1981 Era

During the years between 1976-1981, again the secondary schools provided no visible leadership in educational articulation. The community college, on the other hand, continued some focus on articulation with its leader, Dr. Hamel, pulling for its place in the state's education system. However, he was not alone; Dr. James McLean, a SCHEV member, was also instrumental in articulation, especially with the Articulation Task Force and Articulation Advisory Committee. These groups consisted of SCHEV members and VCCS members. The Articulation Task Force was advised by SCHEV to study existing articulation agreements within the state. They found some articulation agreements on paper but little documentation that they were working.

Again, in 1976-81, community college and senior college showed little progress in articulation. Leaders at these educational entities supported articulation but seemed to lack the support of persons in the necessary trenches to make articulation work. Even with the establishment of articulation committees, task forces, and documents pointing to the need for articulation, there was little progress in articulation.

The 1982-1987 Era

Moving into the next period, 1982-1987, the state moved closer to articulation. First of all, the secondary school showed more interest in articulation with its formulation and implementation of the "Standards for
Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia." These standards encouraged students to pursue education beyond high school and to establish career goals. It also provided the incentives and procedures necessary for students' smooth transition to other educational institutions or for their preparation for the job market.

Another step toward articulation at this time was the articulation guides which the Secretary of Education, Dr. John Casteen, inspired. These books showed students and parents how students moved from one level of education to another. An additional document produced via the secondary schools with an articulation focus was "Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia." This era marks significant steps in articulation in part because of the activities of the Virginia Department of Vocational Education. According to the Virginia Plan for Vocational Education, different types of articulation were formulated and instituted in the Commonwealth involving secondary schools and community colleges. For example, 2 + 2 programs were begun in several technological areas, and 2 + 2 + 2 programs that included another instructional level were also started during the same time. Other models were developed in addition to those listed. A publication entitled Articulation in Virginia: Coordination of Secondary/Post-secondary Education lists specific articulation arrangements between community colleges and public schools in the Commonwealth.

The senior colleges and universities exhibited efforts toward articulation with their look into transfer policies. Senior colleges' and universities' efforts toward articulation at this time were a response to an Office of Civil Rights mandate encouraging equality for minority students transferring to senior colleges and SCHEV's goals of "access," "excellence," and "accountability" as stated in the 1983 Virginia Plan. To meet their goals, senior colleges and universities worked primarily on their transfer policies; thus, their contribution to the articulation effort during this time period was to develop transfer agreements.
The publications produced between 1982 and 1987 and the workings of noted leaders were important to the effort to move the state toward better articulation. Also important to this effort, some educators believe were faculty. Faculty, who are well informed about articulation and upon whom decisions rest regarding transfer of credits, are vital to the articulation process. Often, informed faculty keep students informed of the changes in transfer credits, thus enhancing articulation.

Suffice it to say that 1982-87 saw some strides in articulation in the Commonwealth, especially within the secondary schools, even though few specific names surfaced in the secondary schools other than Dr. John Casteen, who was the Secretary of Education for the Commonwealth. It was during this era that the Virginia Department of Vocational Education made an effort to enhance articulation through 2 + 2 programs and 2 + 2 + 2 programs which involved the secondary schools and community colleges; in some cases articulation involved the secondary schools, community colleges, and senior colleges and universities. Finally, senior colleges worked on transfer policies. This period of the Commonwealth's articulation history involved some articulation efforts at each educational level (secondary school, community college and senior college).

Present Articulation - 1990

The final period of this research covers articulation from 1988 through 1990. Never before have educators within the state given so much attention to the articulation issue. The significant contributions during this period were the commitments of the state's educational leaders who supported the idea of articulation and the mid-level administrators who provided a vision and passion for implementation.

Those at the helm of the three educational segments, such as the then Chancellor of the Virginia Community College System and the then Secretary of Education blessed the workings of mid-level leaders, particularly, Dr. Ned Swartz and Dr. Edwin Barnes. Yet, Dr. Barnes is
credited by many as the key force behind articulation between secondary school and community colleges at this time.

It was indeed the cooperation among the state's mid-level administrators during the later 1980's which played a primary role in contributing to articulation policy development in the state. These relationships led to the formation of subcommittees and task forces, consisting of secondary school and community college personnel. They assisted and helped to ensure statewide policy for articulation, such as the Virginia Public Schools/Virginia Community College System Dual Enrollment Plan. Their dedication and commitment to the concept of articulation accounted for the significant progress made in articulation during this period.

Timing was extremely important to the steps taken toward articulation. The time was right, in the late eighties, for the Commonwealth's educational top-and mid-level educational leaders to turn attention to articulation. This timing, coupled with the passionate commitment of Dr. Barnes, was clearly one of the critical forces during this three year period. The remaining critical forces behind the progress of articulation in the senior colleges were the mandate by SCHEV, recommendations by JLARC, and the political pressure presented by some senior colleges who were developing statewide articulation agreements.

While turf issues are still present in some senior colleges and universities, there are now in place some statewide articulation agreements between senior colleges and universities and community colleges. The models are there. One can only hope that they will be used to advance the articulation effort in the Commonwealth for all Virginians.

Conclusions

The analysis of documents in this research leads to several conclusions about articulation in the Commonwealth. These are as follows:

1. Policies do not spontaneously appear. Timing and the right people those who are interested in the process, are very important to policy development.
2. Articulation policy development can be influenced by the political demands of the time.

3. Contrary to Pressman and Wildavsky's (1973) theory of policy development, top administrators are not always the key educators responsible for policy development. Mid-level administrators and agency workers are important to policy development, as well.

4. Turf issues need to be settled between and among agencies before articulation policy can be fully developed.

This policy analysis overall illustrates that articulation policy development can occur between community colleges and secondary schools. However, it requires close work with all the players involved. It requires as well a commitment to its success on the parts of all players.

Implementation and maintenance of articulation policy depends on how well articulation is presented and marketed within each educational institution or agency. Unless the attitudes of institutional and agency employees—administrators (top-and mid-range), faculty, and students—are made aware of articulation and its merits and the barriers that inhibit the workings of articulation are removed, articulation simply cannot operate effectively.

Implications for Further Study

This study sought to discover the historical development of educational articulation in the Commonwealth of Virginia from 1966 until 1990. It specifically focused on secondary schools, community colleges, and senior colleges and universities. However, many more local, state and/or regional institutions across the country must be involved in research efforts to give a thorough picture of how articulation can work and why articulation is important for educational planning. Even though this research is a case study focused on one state, many similar studies involving several states would provide data pertinent to planning and developing future articulation strategies. Studies should be done to show how senior colleges and universities benefit from articulation, since senior colleges and universities do not always show the progress in articulation of the secondary schools and community colleges. Also,
current studies should be done to show how institutions, students, and communities benefit from educational articulation.

Continued research in articulation should influence articulation policy; however, the aim as educators should be toward excellence in education, seeking the best education for all students. Dale Parnell's work The Neglected Majority summarizes the major task of articulation in the form of recommendations for the future. These recommendations are:

1. All students need a student-centered curriculum. We must identify and remove the barriers to achieving excellence in education for all students.

2. All students must experience greater structure and substance in their educational programs. Unfocused learning will not produce excellence.

3. Students must see coherence in their educational programs. Much greater attention must also be given to coherence in the curriculum, calling for closer program articulation between high schools and colleges.

4. Students must see connectedness between what they do and the larger whole—between education and the rest of the real world. The walls must come down between vocational education and the liberal arts.

5. Students must experience continuity in learning. Loss of continuity in learning may be one of the significant barriers to achieving excellence in education.

6. Students must be offered a larger range of choices, so that their lives and work are not unnecessarily degrading or boring, or limiting.

7. Students must see the necessity to continue to learn throughout a lifetime to avoid obsolescence and to develop the competencies to become life-long learners. It is time to recognize colleges as institutions of excellence and to value the role they play in meeting the life-long learning needs of an adult American. (172-75)

Parnell's recommendations are especially relevant to this study because this study emphasizes coherence in a student's education from his secondary studies to his post-secondary studies. This particular idea of coherence is noted in Dr. John Casteen's guide indicating a connection in a student's public education from grade school through his secondary education. Again, Parnell's recommendations are evident in connecting a student's early public education to his real life experiences in the
working world by focusing on the latest Virginia Department of Vocational Education Report with its emphasis in this same direction and even though today with the Tech-Prep focus.

In addition to Parnell's recommendations, which are fitting in this research, the findings of this study indicate that educators at all levels need to reexamine their attitudes towards other educators at different levels. Every effort should be made to develop positive feelings toward one another as a way of achieving immediate as well as long range educational goals. Now that some statewide articulation policy has been established in Virginia, educators within the secondary schools, community colleges, and senior colleges should capitalize on this new process to increase articulation efforts among educational agencies within the Commonwealth and to enhance the educational opportunities available to Virginia citizens.
APPENDIX A

Articulation of Secondary/Post-Secondary Programs in Accounting

"A Partnership for Vocational-Technical Education"
July 1988

*This appendix is comprised of only selected portions from the original document.
Articulation of Secondary/Postsecondary Programs

in

Accounting
II. COMMITTEE OBJECTIVES/STRATEGIES/RESOURCES

A. Objectives

1. To identify the basic courses in accounting and bookkeeping for articulation between secondary and postsecondary levels

2. To present a summary of basic procedures for accounting/bookkeeping articulation in a formal articulation agreement

3. To formulate general guidelines for successful implementation of an accounting/bookkeeping articulation agreement between secondary and postsecondary institutions

4. To plan a presentation of the model for the summer vocational conference to be held in Richmond, August 2-4, 1988

B. Strategies

1. Review of existing articulation agreements

2. Group discussion

3. Review of secondary and postsecondary accounting curriculum

C. References


III. ARTICULATION PROPOSAL

A. Discussion of the Proposal

Successful secondary/postsecondary articulation of accounting/book-keeping programs will provide two major benefits:

- Articulation will provide a smooth transition for students moving from one educational level to another, allowing them to avoid unnecessary gaps and overlapping in their program of study.

- Articulation will provide for maximum use of personnel, facilities, equipment, and funds in all participating institutions.

The separation by which pioneer educators established the identity and strength of vocational education has reached the point of diminishing returns. Both professional educators and the larger society have come to realize—and often demand—that each unit in the educational system be in its place and interconnected with other units to form a continuum. Interconnection with other educational units does not lead to the loss of purpose or identity of any educational level; it does indicate, however, that vocational education cannot have a delivery system composed of individual components going in opposite or independent directions.

Articulation, then, is a means of establishing and maintaining a desired continuum of learning. It is not a means of eliminating courses or creating an advanced placement service. Articulation can be incorporated into planning for new programs or into established programs.

Like any creative enterprise, the process of articulation is never completely finished. Agreements, course content, and procedures need periodic review and revision. Moreover, it should be obvious that an articulation plan designed and used by one locality may not be completely applicable to the needs of other localities. Basic to any plan, however, is the need for all educators to foster the proper attitudes toward the concept. The following conditions must be met if articulation is to succeed.

- Both secondary and postsecondary administrators and faculty must be committed to the concept.

- Both educational levels must recognize and respect the educational contributions of each other.

- Faculties from high schools and community colleges must identify and subscribe to a common goal.

- Communication must be strong and continuous among all educators and institutions involved in the articulation process.

If these preliminary conditions are met, articulation will succeed and greatly enhance the educational progression of Virginia's students.
B. Major Objectives

Articulation is an extremely complex activity requiring much coordination and cooperation. The Accounting/Bookkeeping Articulation Committee, however, believes a workable plan may be presented adequately in three broad objectives and their corresponding strategies, which may serve as a guide for local articulation planners.

1. Objective 01: Identify the basic courses in accounting and bookkeeping for articulation between the secondary and post-secondary educational levels.

For the purposes of the articulation workshop, the Accounting/Bookkeeping Articulation Committee identified the following courses as ones that could be articulated easily.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community College Courses</th>
<th>High School Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACC 105—Secretarial Accounting</td>
<td>BE 6320—Accounting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC 111—Accounting I</td>
<td>BE 6613—Accounting Computer Applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC 112—Accounting II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC 211—Principles of Accounting I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC 212—Principles of Accounting II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once courses are identified for articulation, community colleges have several alternatives for awarding credit to students for satisfactory completion of secondary work in accounting/bookkeeping courses.

a. Credit for dual enrollment

Students may enroll for credit in the following postsecondary accounting/bookkeeping courses if they have the prerequisites to do so.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community College Course</th>
<th>Prerequisite</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACC 105</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC 111</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC 112</td>
<td>&quot;C&quot; in ACC 111; or &quot;B&quot; in BE 6320/6613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC 211</td>
<td>&quot;B&quot; in BE 6320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC 212</td>
<td>&quot;C&quot; in ACC 211; or &quot;B&quot; in BE 6320/6613</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b. Credit for advanced standing

Students who receive a final grade of "B" or better in high school BE 6320 will be exempt from community college ACC 105. Students who receive a final grade of "B" or better in high school BE 6320 and BE 6613 will be exempt from community college ACC 111 or ACC 211. In order to be eligible for these exemptions, students must enroll and be accepted in a community college program of study within two years of high school graduation.

c. Credit by examination

Community colleges may grant credit to students who pass a standardized examination given and graded by the community college for ACC 105, ACC 111, or ACC 211. This option is most appropriate under the following circumstances:

(1) Students have a passing grade of less than "B" in BE 6320 and want credit for ACC 105 by examination.

(2) Students have a passing grade of less than "B" in BE 6320/6613 and want credit for ACC 111 or ACC 211 by examination.

(3) Students fail to enroll and be accepted in a community college program of study within two years of high school graduation.

2. Objective 82: Establish the basic procedures and necessary relationships for secondary/postsecondary articulation in accounting/bookkeeping into a formal articulation agreement.

The primary purpose of an articulation plan is to decide what to do, who will do it, and when it will be completed. An articulation agreement is a formal contract between two educational levels. The purpose of the agreement is to establish policies and procedures that enable students to obtain college credit for specific competencies they have mastered in previous courses. The Accounting/Bookkeeping Articulation Committee recommends that localities examine the Articulation Agreement (Exhibit A) and the Correlation of Courses form (Exhibit B) for the basic elements necessary for a successful articulation agreement. A joint committee of high school and community college personnel should be appointed to formulate the articles of the articulation agreement.

After the articulation agreement has been established, a contact person from each educational level should be selected to provide liaison when questions or problems arise. All faculty and administrators directly involved in the articulation agreement should receive a complete orientation to the process and in-service training in competency-based education (CBE).

The articulation agreement should be reviewed annually by the articulation committee. Following the review, secondary and postsecondary course revisions should be made, if they are necessary. All changes in the articulation agreement or in secondary or postsecondary courses should be sent to all affected personnel.
3. **Objective 03:** Formulate general guidelines for successful implementation of the Accounting/Bookkeeping Articulation Agreement.

Implementation of the articulation agreement should begin with state-level commitment and support from the Virginia Department of Education and the Virginia Community College System. This support must be matched at the local level. The local community college has the responsibility of initiating articulation negotiations with the school districts in its service region. Articulation should be limited to competency-based education (CBE) programs and courses. Local negotiations will culminate in the signing of an articulation agreement.

Negotiations at the local level will be governed by local circumstances. Attitudes, approaches to problems, methods of resolving differences, and specific details of the articulation agreement will—and should—vary. Strong commitment and adequate guidelines, however, will foster general agreement.

A variety of activities have been used successfully to enhance articulation efforts and should continue to be used when appropriate. Supporting activities include state-level staff development workshops, issues, forums, and other agency involvement; local development of sequential curriculum and competency examinations; exploration of shared staff, facilities, and advisory committees; development of individualized instructions; and formulation of articulation philosophies. (The Accounting/Bookkeeping Articulation Committee particularly recommends the approaches and activities presented in *Articulation: A Public Partnership for Vocational-Technical Education*, listed in the resources section of this report.)

Finally, successful articulation depends in large part on aggressive marketing. Students, faculty, counselors, administrators, and employers must all recognize the policies, procedures, and benefits of articulation if they are to support the concept and contribute to its success.
IV. RECOMMENDATIONS TO LOCAL ARTICULATION PLANNERS

The Accounting/Bookkeeping Articulation Committee recommends that . . .

A. The community college initiate the local articulation process.

B. High schools designate BE 6320 and BE 6613 as courses to be articulated.

C. Community colleges designate ACC 105, ACC 111, ACC 112, ACC 211, and ACC 212 as courses to be articulated.

D. Representatives from the community college and the high schools in the service region agree upon and formulate the formal articulation agreement. At least one instructor from each educational level should be appointed to this committee.

E. Periodic meetings of secondary and postsecondary faculty be held after the articulation agreement is in effect for the purpose of discussing course outlines, competency records, and philosophies.

F. All faculty and administrators involved in the articulation agreement receive in-service training in CBE and orientation to the articulation process.

G. A mailing roster be compiled, listing all articulating faculty in both the community college and the high schools in the service area, and be made available to the Virginia Department of Education and others upon request.

H. A comprehensive marketing strategy be developed and implemented to advertise the availability and benefits or articulated programs.
LIST OF EXHIBITS

Exhibit A — Articulation Agreement

Exhibit B — Correlation of Courses
ARTICULATION AGREEMENT

Between

______________________ College

And

______________________ Public Schools

Statement of Intent

The purpose of this agreement is to provide a mechanism that will enable selected vocational education programs of Community College and the Public Schools to be articulated in a manner that builds on past learning experiences and eliminates unnecessary duplication of instruction so that students' academic and career planning may be facilitated.

Articles of Agreement

1. All articulation students shall meet and maintain the prerequisites and academic standards of Community College and the intended program of study.

2. Each participating vocational teacher at the secondary level will maintain for each vocational student a competency record that identifies areas and levels of task achievement. This record will serve as proof of competency and will be forwarded to the college upon request by the student.

3. Community College will grant credits for articulated coursework provided the student has enrolled at the college within two academic years after graduation from the Public Schools. If the time limit has expired, the student may, when appropriate, opt for a competency examination given by the college.

4. Students will receive college credits for the designated vocational courses in which they have demonstrated competencies and earned a final grade of at least a "B". These credits will be part of the total credits required for program completion, unless otherwise specified, and will appear on the Community College transcript by course title(s) and credit hour(s).

5. No tuition fee will be charged for courses articulated, and grades will not be assigned for credits granted. These credits will not be articulated in determining student grade point average.

6. a. The program areas included under the terms of this agreement are specified on the Correlation of Courses form. Modification to this agreement, including the addition or deletion of these and other program areas, may become part of the agreement upon mutual review and approval by the appropriate secondary and postsecondary faculty and administrative staff.
6. b. Both institutions will work together to facilitate student progress through the full range of learning experiences in all mutually agreed upon program areas, whether or not articulated credit is granted. Responsibility will be shared for communicating this information to students, parents, and the community for effective academic/career planning.

7. A review of the Articulation Agreement and process will be initiated by Community College and conducted annually at the end of the academic year. Meetings will be scheduled for each vocational program area to review and amend, as necessary, the course competencies at both the secondary and college level. The appropriate faculty and administrators of both institutions are expected to participate in this evaluation and revision process.

8. The articulation agreement shall take effect on ________________, and remain in effect until it is revised or terminated. Either party may, upon a minimum of one year's written notice, terminate the agreement.

CERTIFICATION

________________________________________  ______________________________________
President                            Superintendent

_______________________________  _________________________________
Community College                   Public Schools

________________________________________  ______________________________________
Provost                              Contact Person

_______________________________  _________________________________
Community College                   Public Schools

Date: ______________________________
EXHIBIT B
CORRELATION OF COURSES*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High School</th>
<th>Community College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BE 6320—Accounting</td>
<td>ACC 105—Secretarial Accounting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE 6320/6613—Accounting Computer Applications</td>
<td>ACC 111—Accounting I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE 6320/6613—Accounting Computer Applications</td>
<td>ACC 211—Principles of Accounting I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* In addition to the credit of advanced standing, the option for credit by dual enrollment and credit by examination should exist as proposed by the Accounting/Bookkeeping Articulation Committee.
APPENDIX B

Funded Articulation Projects
Established Programs

Virginia Department of Vocational Education and
Virginia Community College System
FUNDED ARTICULATION PROJECTS

"2 + 2" Programs

Established Programs

1. Engineering Design Technology
   Technology Education, Trade and Industrial Education
   Central Virginia Community College, Lynchburg

   Area School Divisions: Lynchburg City, Amherst County,
   Appomattox County, Bedford County, Campbell County

   Project Director: Roger Beeker
   Project Coordinator: Robert Merchant
   Central Virginia Community College
   3506 Wards Road
   Lynchburg, VA 24502  703-386-4667

2. Information Processing Specialist
   Business Education
   Lord Fairfax Community College, Middletown/Winchester

   Area School Divisions: Clarke County, Frederick County,
   Winchester City, D. J. Howard Tech Center

   Project Director: Dorothy Brewer
   P. O. Box 351
   Berryville, VA 22611  703-667-9744

3. Master Technician—Electronics/Electromechanical Technology
   Technology Education, Trade and Industrial Education
   Thomas Nelson Community College, Hampton

   Area School Divisions: Hampton, Newport News, Poquoson,
   Williamsburg/James City County, York County, New Horizons
   Technical Center

   Project Director: Cecil Phillips
   Thomas Nelson Community College
   P. O. Box 9407
   Hampton, VA 23670  804-825-2700
New Programs

4. Automated Manufacturing Technology
Technology Education, Trade and Industrial Education
Roanoke County Public Schools, Roanoke

Area School Divisions: Botetourt County, Roanoke City,
Roanoke County, Salem City

Project Director: Ben Helmandollar
Arnold R. Burton Technology Center
1760 Boulevard
Salem, VA 24153 703-344-4643

5. Automotive Technology
Trade and Industrial Education
John Tyler Community College, Chester

Area School Divisions: Colonial Heights, Hopewell,
Petersburg, Richmond City, Amelia County, Charles City
County, Chesterfield County, Dinwiddie County, Prince George
County, Surry County, Sussex County

Project Director: Dale Jaenke
John Tyler Community College
13101 Jefferson Davis Highway
Chester, VA 23821-5399 804-796-4000

6. Food Service
Home Economics
Paul D. Camp Community College, Franklin

Area School Divisions: Isle of Wight County, Southampton
County, Suffolk City

Project Director: Martha Conley-Williams
Paul D. Camp Community College
P. O. Box 737
Franklin, VA 23851 804-562-2171
7. Health Technologies
Health Occupations
Southwest Virginia Community College

Area School Divisions: Buchanan County, Dickenson County, Russell County, Tazewell County

Project Director: Harold VanHook
Southwest Virginia Community College
P. O. Box SVCC
Richlands, VA 24641 703-964-2555

8. Industrial Electricity/Electronics Technology
Technology Education, Trade and Industrial Education
Central Virginia Community College, Lynchburg

Area School Divisions: Lynchburg City, Appomattox County, Bedford County, Campbell County

Project Director: Roger Beeker
Project Coordinator: Robert Merchant
Central Virginia Community College
3506 Wards Road
Lynchburg, VA 24502 703-386-4667

9. Practical Nursing
Health Occupations
Blue Ridge Community College, Weyers Cave

Area School Divisions: D. J. Howard Vo-Tech Center, Valley Vo-Tech Center, Massanutten Tech Center

Project Director: Joann Lowdon
Blue Ridge Community College
P. O. Box 80
Weyers Cave, VA 24486 703-234-9261

10. Health Occupations
Centra Health, Inc., Lynchburg

Area School Divisions: Amherst County, Appomattox County, Campbell County

Project Director: Eleanor Garrett
Centra Health, Inc.
3300 Rivermont Avenue
Lynchburg, VA 24503-2053 804-552-4561
11. Nursing
Health Occupations
Norfolk Public Schools, Norfolk

Area School Divisions: Norfolk City, Newport News City, Suffolk City, Chesapeake City

Other Participants: Norfolk State University, Old Dominion University, Thomas Nelson Community College, Lafayette High School, Peninsula School of Practical Nursing at New Horizons Technical Center, Hampton University, Riverside Hospital at Newport News

Project Director: Glenda Feldt
Norfolk Public Schools
800 E. City Hall Avenue
Norfolk, VA 23510 804-441-2957

12. Printing Technology
Technology Education, Trade and Industrial Education
Lord Fairfax Community College, Middletown

Area School Divisions: Clarke County, Frederick County, Winchester City

Project Director: Dorothy Brewer
P. O. Box 351
Berryville, VA 22611 703-667-9744

"2 + 2 + 2" Program

13. Law Enforcement
Trade and Industrial Education
York County Public Schools, Grafton

Area School Divisions: Hampton, Newport News, Poquoson, Williamsburg/James City County, York County

Project Director: Neils Brooks
York County Schools
302 Dare Road
Grafton, VA 23692 804-898-0300
APPENDIX C

Proposed Articulation Agreements
James Madison University with the Virginia Community College System
and
Virginia State University with the Virginia Community College System

Material furnished by Dr. Anne Marie McCarten of SCHEV
PROPOSED ARTICULATION AGREEMENT

VIRGINIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM AND
JAMES MADISON UNIVERSITY

James Madison University will initiate a program of Liberal Studies to be required for all new students beginning Fall, 1989. It seems appropriate at this same time to reexamine the current policy of accepting community college credits on a course-by-course basis and to recognize the common goals of liberal studies and the Associate in Arts, Associate in Sciences, and Associate in Arts and Sciences degrees. Further, JMU feels that it should ease community college student transfer.

James Madison University proposes to:

1) Waive Liberal Studies requirements for transfer students who have been awarded an Associate in Arts, Associate in Sciences, and Associate in Arts and Sciences degrees by a member of the Virginia Community College System. While the transfer student's program may not be equivalent to JMU's, JMU agrees to accept it in lieu of theirs to facilitate easy transfer of students and also to facilitate community college curriculum planning.

2) Evaluate credits of students who transfer from a VCCS institution to JMU without earning an associate degree on a course-by-course basis as specified in the appropriate edition of the Virginia Community College Transfer Guide published by James Madison University.

3) Waive the Liberal Studies Freshman Seminar requirement (LS 101) for VCCS students who transfer with twenty or more semester hours.

4) Initiate a required seminar for transfer students based on the educational philosophy of the Freshman Seminar but more advanced.

A number of majors require course prerequisites which the transfer student must meet regardless of where they completed their Liberal Studies requirement.

Acceptance of community college students to JMU is not automatic but competitive. Refer to JMU's catalog for a description of admission standards.

FJR/deb
This articulation agreement between Virginia State University (VSU) and the Virginia Community College System (VCCS) will facilitate access for students attending community colleges in Virginia who are desirous of transferring to Virginia State University.

1. Students completing an Associate of Arts, Associate of Science, or Associate in Arts and Sciences degree will be admitted by the University and be granted junior status; however, students will be required to satisfy major program requirements as stipulated in the college catalog.

2. Students not completing an associate degree at a VCCS institution will have their transcripts evaluated on a course by course basis using the current edition of the VCCS/VSU Transfer Guide.

3. Students who have associate degrees and who have used credits earned at accredited institutions to satisfy their Virginia Community College degree will have those credits treated on an equal basis as credits earned at the community college.

4. Students who transfer twenty or more semester hours will have the course ED 100 - Freshman Orientation waived.

Effective Date: Fall Term 1990
APPENDIX D

Old Dominion College Catalogue
1966-1968

*This appendix is only comprised of selected portions from the original document.
BULLETIN

of

OLD DOMINION COLLEGE

CATALOGUE ISSUE

1964-1966

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1966-1968
THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE DIVISION

The Community College Division comprises the following programs: Dental Hygiene, Engineering Technology, Law Enforcement, and Merchandising. In addition, it coordinates the Associate degree programs in Business Education and General Education.

*Edgar A. Kovner, Dean of the Community College Division*

THE DIVISION OF CONTINUING EDUCATION

This division organizes, schedules, and supervises the Evening College Program on the campus, the Extension Program, and the Summer Session Program.

*Stanley R. Pliska, Dean of the Division of Continuing Education*
The Community College Division

The Board of Visitors of Old Dominion College voted in 1964 to create the Community College Division, which has the function of administering and coordinating all non-baccalaureate programs, so as to meet more fully the needs of students who have neither the resources nor the desire for a four-year degree or whose career requirements do not require a baccalaureate program.

The curricula in the Community College Division are grouped into two broad areas, namely, the Technical Institute and the Semi-Professional Section.

TECHNICAL INSTITUTE

The Technical Institute was established in 1945 as an outgrowth of the War Training Program operated by the College during World War II. It was the first Technical Institute to be accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. Its curricula in Civil Engineering Technology and Engineering Design Technology were the first in the South to be certified by the American Institute for Design and Drafting. The Technical Institute is also an affiliate member of the American Society for Engineering Education.

The Technical Institute of the Community College Division offers the following three-year curricula leading to the Associate in Applied Science degree:

- Chemical Engineering Technology
- Civil Engineering Technology
- Electronic Engineering Technology
  - Automation Option
  - Design and Development Option
  - Nuclear Option
- Engineering Design Technology
  - Architectural Option
  - Marine Option
  - Product Option
- Mechanical Engineering Technology
  - Air Conditioning Option
  - Machinery Option
The Community College Division

CORE CURRICULUM

in

ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY

All students in Engineering Technology are required to complete the following subjects, totaling 43 semester hours (in addition to the specific courses required in each concentration):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester Hours</th>
<th>Subjects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English 101-102, 103 ............................................... 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fine Arts Elective* .............................................................. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>History 111 ......................................   3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematics 112-113 ............................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physical Education 101-102 ................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physics 101-102 .................................................................... 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Studies Elective** .................................................... 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technology 100 .................................................................... 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technology 105 .................................................................... 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technology 202 .................................................................... 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Semester Hours in Core Curriculum. ............ 43
Total Semester Hours in each Concentration .......... 49

Total Semester Hours Required for the
Associate in Applied Science degree ................. 92

*The Fine Arts Elective should be selected from among the following courses: Art: 121, 122, 221, 222.
Literature: Any literature course for which the student has the prerequisites.
Music: 121, 122, 201, 202, 211, 212.

**The Social Studies Elective should be in Economics, Geography, Philosophy, Political Science, Psychology, or Sociology.
The Community College Division
Concentration Requirements
in
ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY
(each totaling 49 semester hours)


Electronic Engineering Technology:
  Automation Option: Tech. 151, 164, 184, 201, 203, 251, 252, 253, 256, 257, 284, 288, 352, 353.

Engineering Design Technology:

Mechanical Engineering Technology:

*One of the following: Tech. 184, 281, 284, 288, 352, 382.
The Community College Division

SEMI-PROFESSIONAL SECTION

CURRICULUM IN BUSINESS EDUCATION

**First Year**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business Education 101-102, Shorthand</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Education 104-105, Typewriting</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English 101-102</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory Science</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education 101-102</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Second Year**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounting 201-202</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Education 201-202, Shorthand Transcription</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Education 204, Production Typewriting</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Education 214, Office Machines</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Education 225, Secretarial Procedures</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics 201-202</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Fine Arts Elective</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education 201-202</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Curriculum in Business Education (Cooperative Program)**

**First Year**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business Education 101-102, Shorthand</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Education 104-105, Typewriting</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Education 111-112, Cooperative Training in Office Occupations</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English 101-102</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory Science</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Second Year**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounting 201</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Education 201-202, Shorthand Transcription</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Education 204, Production Typewriting</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Education 214, Office Machines</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Education 225, Secretarial Procedures or Business Ed. 310,</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Organization and Supervision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Education 221-222, Cooperative Training in Office Occupations</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics 201-202</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Fine Arts Elective</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See footnote on page 107.*
This new program, scheduled to begin during the 1966-1968 biennium, is being developed under the supervision of the Dental Advisory Committee, consisting of the following members: Dr. A. L. Martone, Norfolk (Chairman), Member, Virginia State Board of Dental Examiners; Dr. R. B. Barrick, Portsmouth, President, Virginia State Dental Association; Dr. P. B. Drez, Norfolk, Chief Dental Officer, U. S. Public Health Hospital; Dr. E. H. Eskey, Norfolk, President, Tidewater Virginia Dental Association; Dr. T. R. Jarrett, Virginia Beach; Dr. J. C. Kanter, Norfolk; and Dr. A. C. Vipond, Norfolk.

An interview will be required of each applicant for this program.

### FIRST YEAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biology 102 (Human Anatomy and Physiology)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology 103 (Basic Bacteriology)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chem. 107 (Elementary Chemistry)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Hyg. 101 (Dental Anatomy)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Hyg. 102 (Introduction to Dental Hygiene)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Hyg. 103 (Oral Histopathology)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engl. 101-102 (Composition and Literature)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math. 100 (Beginning Algebra for College Students)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math. 130 (Statistical Methods)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>34</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SECOND YEAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D. Hyg. 201 (Oral Hygiene and Nutrition)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Hyg. 202 (Dental Pharmacology)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Hyg. 203 (Dental Radiology)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Hyg. 205-206 (Clinical Dental Hygiene)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Hyg. 212 (Dental Health Education)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Hyg. 213 (Dental Office Admin. and Ethics)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Fine Arts Elective</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Ed. 100 (Personal and Community Health)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psych. 201 (General Psychology)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology 201 (Introduction to Sociology)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech 101 (Public Speaking)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>34</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See footnote on page 107.
The Community College Division

CURRICULUM IN GENERAL EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Year</th>
<th>Semester Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English 101-102</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History 101-102 (History of Europe) or 201-202 (History of the U.S.)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory Science</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electives</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education 101-102</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Second Year</th>
<th>Semester Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English 201-202 (Introduction to English Literature)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy 301-302 (History of Western Philosophy)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science 101 (American Government) and Political Science 222 (Comparative Government), or Economics 201-202 (Principles of Economics)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electives</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education 201-202</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CURRICULUM IN LAW ENFORCEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Year</th>
<th>Semester Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English 101-102 (Composition and Literature)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory Science</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Enforcement 101 (Introduction to Law Enforcement)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math. 100 (Beginning Algebra for College Students)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math. 130 (Statistical Methods)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pol. Science 206 (Virginia Government)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology 201 (Introduction to Sociology)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Second Year</th>
<th>Semester Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bus. Mgt. 353 (Business Communications) or English 103 (Technical Writing)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Fine Arts Elective</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Enforcement 201-202 (Criminal Investigation)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Enforcement 205 (Procedures in Criminal Law)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pol. Science 352 (Local Government and Administration)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology 201 (General Psychology)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology 303 (Juvenile Delinquency)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology 315 (Criminology)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech 101 (Public Speaking)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education 101-102</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See footnote on page 107.
The Merchandising Department offers a two-year program to students who wish to prepare themselves for careers in the field of distribution. Distribution is defined by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States as the "term used in American business to embrace all the activities employed in finding customers for goods and services and in moving goods, geographically and through the channels of trade." The program is designed to prepare students for middle-management, supervisory, and specialized careers in retailing, wholesaling, and service businesses. The program is a cooperative one, combining classroom study of the principles of modern merchandising with directed occupational training in selected businesses in the Tidewater area. Students not wishing to take the cooperative courses (Mdse. 103-104, 203-204) may substitute Accounting 201-202 plus Phys. Ed. 101-102.

First Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Semester Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bus. Mgt. 105-106 (Mathematics of Finance)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English 101-102 (Composition and Literature)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory Science</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mdse. 101 (Principles of Salesmanship)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mdse. 102 (Principles of Advertising)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Mdse. 103-104 (Directed Occupational Training)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech 101 (Public Speaking)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology 201 (Introduction to Sociology)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

36

Second Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Semester Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bus. Mgt. 311 (Marketing Principles and Problems)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus. Mgt. 331 (Commercial Law)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Econ. 201-202 (Principles of Economics)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Fine Arts Elective</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mdse. 201 (Store Organization and Operation)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mdse. 202 (Personnel Management in Distribution)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Mdse. 203-204 (Directed Occupational Training)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mdse. 205 (Merchandise Information—Textile)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mdse. 206 (Retail Buying Procedures)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology 201 (General Psychology)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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*See footnote on page 107.
**Merchandising 103, 104, 203, and 204 each require a minimum of 250 hours in selected distributive businesses.
MEMO TO: Dr. Beverly B. Bryant 
Mr. W. W. Patterson, Jr. 
Dr. Dennis C. Rittenmeyer 
Dr. Kenneth H. Murray 
Mrs. Elizabeth Guy 
Dr. Stanley R. Pliska

MEMO TO: Mrs. Helen C. Stair 
Mr. Walter Earl 
Dr. James Vaillancourt 
Mr. Albert Godden 
Mrs. Peggy Hull 
Dr. Allen K. Clark

FROM: Charles O. Burgess
Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost

DATE: October 8, 1975

SUBJECT: Advising and Articulation Committee

May I ask that you serve as a member of the Advising and Articulation Committee for the academic year 1975-76. As you know this committee has been active for almost two years in dealing with matters of communication with the community colleges. As transfer of students from community colleges to Old Dominion continues to be an important matter, continued activity in this area is required.

As this committee has also been active in the advising and registration process, it is felt by the Council of Academic Deans that a number of matters dealing with registration might appropriately be taken up by this committee.

I understand from Dean Pliska that he has already organized a meeting schedule for the committee this fall. I hope that you will make every effort to be present at these meetings and lend your support to the important work of this committee.

Thank you for your continued cooperation in this work. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have questions or recommendations concerning this committee.

se
APPENDIX E

State Council of Higher Education for Virginia
(Members from 1967-1990)

Admissions and Articulation Advisory Committee
(1977, 1982, 1990-91)
MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

Joseph E. Blackburn, Richmond, Chairman
J. Hoge Tyler, Ill, Norfolk, Vice-Chairman
C. Wesley Peebles, Sr., Lawrenceville
John D. Richmond, Martinsville
Dr. Paul D. Sanders, Richmond
Edward P. Simpkins, Jr., Mechanicsville
William H. Trapnell, Sabot
Dr. Woodrow W. Wilkerson, Richmond, ex officio

ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

Dr. Prince B. Woodard, Director
Dr. Robert R. Ramsey, Jr., Assistant Director
Dr. Charles R. Walker, Assistant Director
Dr. Robert C. Jones, Resources and Development Administrator
Chase M. Adkins, Jr., Fiscal Analyst
James C. Phillips, Planning and Facilities Analyst
The meeting was called to order by the Vice Chairman (acting for the Chairman who was suffering from laryngitis) at 9:30 a.m., Thursday, January 9, 1969, in the State Council Conference Room, Richmond, Virginia.

PRESENT
Members
Joseph E. Blackburn, Chairman; William H. Trapnell, Vice Chairman; C. Wesley Peebles, Sr.; John D. Richmond; John F. Rixey; Paul D. Sanders

Staff
Prince B. Woodard, Director; Robert P. Ramsey, Jr., Associate Director; J.C. Phillips, Administrative Assistant; Robert O. Graham, Jr., Institution Review and Approval Administrator; Whitney L. Johnson, Automated Data Processing Systems Administrator; Robert L. Masden, Resources and Development Administrator; Mrs. Ann N. Rice, Secretary.

ABSENT
Ramsey D. Potts, Edward P. Simpkins, Jr., Woodrow W. Wilkerson

The minutes of the December meeting were approved as written.

Dr. Woodard introduced to the Council two new members of the staff; Mr. Robert O. Graham, Jr., retired Colonel and Deputy Commandant of the U.S. Army Quartermaster School of Fort Lee, Virginia, who joined the staff on December 16, 1968 as Higher Education Institutional Review and Approval Administrator; and Mr. Whitney L. Johnson, former faculty member in statistics and head of the computing center at Virginia Polytechnic Institute, who joined the Council on January 1, 1969, as Higher Education Automated Data Processing Systems Administrator.

Mr. Graham and Mr. Johnson each made a brief statement outlining their activities since joining the staff.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Appointed/Reappointed</th>
<th>Term Start/End</th>
<th>Term Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sanders, Paul D.</td>
<td>Appointed</td>
<td>April 14, 1966</td>
<td>Four year term to 6/30/69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reappointed</td>
<td>June 18, 1969</td>
<td>Four year term to 6/30/73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reappointed</td>
<td>June, 1965</td>
<td>Four year term to 6/30/69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reappointed</td>
<td>June 18, 1969</td>
<td>Four year term to 6/30/73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilkerson, Woodrow W.</td>
<td>Ex Officio as Superintendent of Public Instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td>Three year term to 6/30/73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appointed in own right</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowling, Dr. Dorothy N.</td>
<td>Appointed</td>
<td>July 10, 1970</td>
<td>Four year term to 6/30/74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller, A. Melvin</td>
<td>Appointed</td>
<td>July 10, 1970</td>
<td>Four year term to 6/30/74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teeter, Robert L.</td>
<td>Appointed</td>
<td>July 10, 1970</td>
<td>Four year term to 6/30/74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dotson, Bobby Joe</td>
<td>Appointed</td>
<td>July 15, 1971</td>
<td>Four year term to 6/30/75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stegman, Mrs. Earl R.</td>
<td>Appointed</td>
<td>July 15, 1971</td>
<td>Four year term to 6/30/75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthington, William C.</td>
<td>Appointed</td>
<td>July 16, 1971</td>
<td>Unexpired term to 6/30/72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reappointed</td>
<td>July 21, 1972</td>
<td>Four year term to 6/30/76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibbons, Miss Dorothy L.</td>
<td>Appointed</td>
<td>July 21, 1972</td>
<td>Four year term to 6/30/76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilkinson, J. Harvie, Jr.</td>
<td>Appointed</td>
<td>July 21, 1972</td>
<td>Four year term to 6/30/76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(S 23-9.4 of the Code of Virginia reads as follows:

"(a) No person having served on the council for two terms of four years shall be eligible for reappointment to the Council for two years thereafter."
LIST OF FORMER AND PRESENT COUNCIL MEMBERS
FROM 1977

Mr. Frank Batten 1977 - 1979
150 West Brambleton Ave.
Norfolk, Virginia 23510

Dr. Marian P. Capps 1978 - present
968 Anna Street
Norfolk, Virginia 23502

Dr. Dorothy N. Cowling ? - 1977
3402 Moss Side Avenue
Richmond, Virginia 23222

Mr. Horace G. Fralin 1981 - present
P. O. Box 4175
Roanoke, Virginia 24015

Mr. Robert E. Glenn 1980 - present
P. O. Box 2887
Roanoke, Virginia 24014

Mr. Bernard J. Haggertu 1983 - present
P. O. Box 1328
Charlottesville, Virginia 22902

Mrs. Elizabeth G. Helm 1980 - present
311 Fairmont Ave.
Winchester, Virginia 22601

Mrs. Joan S. Jones 1983 - present
2209 Falcon Hill Place
Lynchburg, Virginia 24503

Mr. John D. Marsh 1981 - present
6305 Catharpin Road
Gainesville, Virginia 22065

Mr. Lewis A. McMurran, Jr. 1978 - present
P. O. Box 85
Newport News, Virginia 23607

Mr. A. Melvin Miller ? - 1977
3928 Colonel Ellis Avenue
Alexandria, Virginia 22304

Mr. Lutrelle F. Parker, Sr. 1978 - 1981
2016 South Fillmore St.
Arlington, Virginia 22204
List of former and present Council members continued:

Mr. H. Merrill Pasco 1977 - 1981
Hunton & Williams
P. O. Box 1535
Richmond, Virginia 23212

Mr. W. Roy Smith 1977 - 1977
P. O. Box 1270
Petersburg, Virginia 23803

Mrs. Earl R. Stegman 1977 - 1981
3910 Oak Hill Drive
Annandale, Virginia 22003

Mr. George M. Warren, Jr. 1977 - 1981
P. O. Box 1078
Bristol, Virginia 24201

Mr. J. Harvie Wilkinson, Jr. 1977 - 1979
United Virginia Bankshares
900 E. Main Street
Richmond, Virginia 23219

Mr. Gordon C. Willis 1978 - present
P. O. Box 8425
Roanoke, Virginia 24014

Mr. John C. Wood 1979 - 1983
P. O. Box 369
Fairfax, Virginia 22030

Dr. Stephen J. Wright 1982 - present
1620 West Queen Street
Hampton, Virginia 23666

Mr. William L. Zimmer, III 1980 - present
Williams, Mullen & Christian
P. O. Box 1320
Richmond, Virginia 23210

Mr. Robert L. Teeter

Mr. Bobby J. Dotson

Mr. Woodrow W. Wilkerson
The November meeting of the Council of Higher Education was called to order by the Chairman at 10:00 a.m., Wednesday, November 3, 1982, in the Council conference room in Richmond, Virginia.

PRESENT: William L. Zimmer, III, Chairman; Elizabeth G. Helm, Vice Chairman; Marian P. Capps; Horace G. Fralin; Robert E. Glenn; Lewis A. McMurran, Jr.; Gordon C. Willis; John C. Wood; Stephen J. Wright

Gordon K. Davies; James M. Alessio; David M. Berlin; David J. Carr; Martha A. Crunkleton; Larrie J. Dean; Eric M. Engler; David A. Goodwin; Mary D. Herndon; J. Michael Mullen; David L. Potter; Jonathan A. Yoder

The minutes of the October meeting were approved as presented.

The Council reviewed a final draft of the report of the Financial Aid Task Force requested by the 1982 Virginia General Assembly in Senate Joint Resolution 81. The Council had reviewed an earlier draft of the report in October. The study recommends a number of improvements in certain State Student Financial Aid Programs and proposes several new programs designed to meet the changing needs of Virginia's students.

On motion by Dr. Capps, seconded by Dr. Wright, the Council unanimously approved the Financial Aid Task Force report, "Student Aid in Virginia: Proposals for Ensuring Continued Access to Higher Education." The Council requested Dr. Davies to convey its gratitude to members of the Task Force for their work. The Council further directed that the report be transmitted to the Governor and the General Assembly. An executive summary of the Financial Aid report is attached to and made a part of these Minutes.

Dr. Davies discussed preliminary headcount enrollments at state-supported and private institutions of higher education for Fall 1982. The reports indicate that headcount enrollment for state-supported institutions has declined 1.7 percent since Fall 1981. Headcount enrollment at the private institutions has increased 3.1 percent. The institutions will submit final Fall 1982 enrollment numbers later in November.

*This page has been retyped from the original to obtain a clean copy.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College Name</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHRISTOPHER NEWPORT COLLEGE</td>
<td>Mr. Keith McLoughland</td>
<td>Dean of Admissions</td>
<td>Newport News, VA 23606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLINCH VALLEY COLLEGE</td>
<td>Mr. Brent Kennedy</td>
<td>Admissions Counselor</td>
<td>Wise, VA 24293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>Mr. Clinton Blount</td>
<td>Director of Admissions</td>
<td>Fairfax, VA 22030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LONGWOOD COLLEGE</td>
<td>Dr. James C. Gussett</td>
<td>Assistant Dean of the College</td>
<td>Farmville, VA 23901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MADISON COLLEGE</td>
<td>Dr. Fay J. Reubush</td>
<td>Dean of Admissions &amp; Records</td>
<td>Harrisonburg, VA 22801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARY WASHINGTON COLLEGE</td>
<td>Dr. H. Conrad Warlick</td>
<td>Director of Admissions</td>
<td>Fredericksburg, VA 22401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORFOLK STATE COLLEGE</td>
<td>Mr. James S. Burton</td>
<td>Director of Admissions</td>
<td>Norfolk, VA 23504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLD DOMINION UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>Dr. James R. Vaillancourt</td>
<td>Dean of Admissions, Records</td>
<td>Norfolk, VA 23508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RADFORD COLLEGE</td>
<td>Mr. Drumont Bowman</td>
<td>Director of Admissions</td>
<td>Radford, VA 24142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA</td>
<td>Dr. John T. Casteen, III</td>
<td>Dean of Admissions</td>
<td>Charlottesville, VA 22903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIRGINIA COMMONWEALTH UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>Dr. Wayne C. Hall</td>
<td>Vice President for Academic Affairs</td>
<td>Richmond, VA 23284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIRGINIA MILITARY INSTITUTE</td>
<td>Col. Arthur L. Lipscomb</td>
<td>Director of Admissions</td>
<td>Lexington, VA 24450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>Dr. M. P. Lacy</td>
<td>Dean of Admissions &amp; Records</td>
<td>Blacksburg, VA 24061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIRGINIA STATE COLLEGE</td>
<td>Mr. Edward L. Smith</td>
<td>Director of Admissions</td>
<td>Petersburg, VA 23803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE COLLEGE OF WILLIAM &amp; MARY</td>
<td>Mr. Robert P. Hunt</td>
<td>Dean of Admissions</td>
<td>Williamsburg, VA 23185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD BLAND COLLEGE</td>
<td>Mr. John Thios</td>
<td></td>
<td>Petersburg, VA 23803</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VIRGINIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM
Dr. Samuel L. Creighton
Deputy Chancellor for
Academic and Student Affairs
Richmond, Virginia 23219

THOMAS NELSON
Dr. Gerald Cannon
President
Hampton, VA 23366

EASTERN SHORE
Dr. John C. Fiege
President
Melfa, VA 23410

NORTHERN VIRGINIA
Dr. Jean Netherton
Provost, Alexandria Campus
3001 North Beauregard St.
Alexandria, VA 22311

PRIVATE COLLEGES:

ROANOKE COLLEGE
Dr. Norman D. Fintel
President
Salem, VA

VIRGINIA WESLEYAN COLLEGE
Dr. Lambeth Clark
President
Norfolk, VA

UNIVERSITY OF RICHMOND
Mr. Thomas Pollard
Director of Admissions
Richmond, VA

COUNCIL OF HIGHER EDUCATION
Dr. Sharon H. Bob, Coordinator of Financial Aid
Mr. James A. McLean, Enrollment Coordinator
Richmond, VA 23219
Mr. Keith McLoughland  
Dean of Admissions  
50 Shoe Lane  
Christopher Newport College  
Newport News, VA 23606  
PH: (804) 599-7015

Dr. Bonnie Elosser  
Dean of Students  
Clinch Valley College  
Wise, VA 24293  
PH: (703) 328-2431

Ms. Pat Riordan  
Director of Admissions  
George Mason University  
Fairfax, VA 22030  
PH: (703) 323-2002

Dr. Fay J. Reubush  
Dean of Admissions & Records  
James Madison University  
Harrisonburg, VA 22801  
PH: (703) 433-6569

Mr. Gary Groneweg  
Director of Admissions  
Longwood College  
Farmville, VA 23901  
PH: (804) 592-9251

Dr. H. Conrad Warlick  
Director of Admissions  
Mary Washington College  
Fredericksburg, VA 22401  
PH: (703) 899-4681

Mr. Frank Cool  
Director of Admissions  
Norfolk State University  
Norfolk, VA 23504  
PH: (804) 623-8391/8396

Dr. James R. Vaillancourt  
Dean of Adm., Records & Regist.  
Old Dominion University  
Norfolk, VA 23508  
PH: (804) 440-3115

Mr. Drumont Bowman  
Director of Admissions  
Radford University  
Radford, VA 24142  
PH: (703) 731-5000

Ms. Jean Rayburn  
Acting Dean of Admissions  
University of Virginia  
Charlottesville, VA 22903  
PH: (804) 924-7751

Col. William J. Buchanan  
Director of Admissions  
Virginia Military Institute  
Lexington, VA 24450  
PH: (703) 463-6211

Dr. Archie G. Phlegar  
Director of Admissions  
VPI&SU  
Blacksburg, VA 24061  
PH: (703) 961-6267

Mr. Edward L. Smith  
Director of Admissions  
Virginia State University  
Petersburg, VA 23803  
PH: (804) 520-6542/6521

Mr. Gary Ripple  
Dean of Admissions  
The College of William & Mary  
Williamsburg, VA 23185  
PH: (804) 253-4223

Mrs. Sylvia McIvor  
Director of Admissions  
Richard Bland College  
Petersburg, VA 23803  
PH: (804) 732-0111, Ext. 238

Dr. Paul T. Pullen  
Dean of Instruction  
Virginia Western Community College  
Roanoke, VA 24015  
PH: (703) 982-7313
Dr. Howard Tayloe  
Coordinator of Counseling  
Thomas Nelson Community College  
Hampton, VA  23670  
PH: (804) 825-2827

Mr. Richard E. Jenkins  
Dean of Student Services  
Eastern Shore Community College  
P. O. Box C  
Melfa, VA  23410  
PH: (804) 787-3972

Dr. Johnnie E. Merritt, President  
Paul D. Camp Community College  
P. O. Box 737  
Franklin, VA  23851  
PH: (804) 562-2171

Mr. G. Richard Cox  
Assistant Director of Admissions  
Roanoke College  
Salem, VA  24153  
PH: (703) 389-2351

Mrs. Linda Glover  
Director of Admissions  
Bridgewater College  
Bridgewater, VA  22812  
PH: (703) 828-2501

Dr. Jerrie Johnson  
Director of Admissions  
Virginia Commonwealth University  
Richmond, VA  23284  
PH: (804) 257-1222

Dr. James A. Russell, Jr.  
Director of Instructional Programs and Student Services  
Virginia Community College System  
James Monroe Bldg.  
15th Floor  
Richmond, VA  23219  
PH: (804) 225-2124
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Mr. William C. Battle
P. O. Box 1
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**Mr. Robert L. Burrus, Jr.
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One James Center
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Office: 804-775-4306
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Mr. Douglas Cruickshanks
Executive Vice President
Sovran Bank, N.A.
Commercial Banking, 14th Floor
P. O. Box 27025
Richmond, VA 23261-7025
Office: 804-788-3257
Home: 804-740-1099

Mr. Bernard J. Haggerty
21 Ashlawn Boulevard
Palmyra, VA 22963
Home: 804-589-3682

Mr. Stanley E. Harrison
President
The Potomac Foundation
3211 Jermantown Road, Suite 480
Fairfax, VA 22030
Office: 703-385-6130
Home: 703-759-5834

*Mrs. Joan S. Jones
2209 Falcon Hill Place
Lynchburg, VA 24503
Home: 804-384-5728

Mr. Charles C. Lacy
Hodges and Campbell
P.O. Box 640
Wytheville, VA 24382
Office: 703-228-5566
Home: 703-228-5353

Mrs. Ruby G. Martin
715 Spottswood Road
Richmond, VA 23220
Office: 804-788-1283
Home: 804-359-4541

Mr. Hugh L. Patterson
Willcox & Savage, P.C.
1800 Sovran Center
Norfolk, VA 23510
Office: 804-628-5557
Home: 804-422-1345

Mr. Abe J. Spero
Suite 310
7700 Leesburg Pike
Falls Church, VA 22043
Office: 703-790-1677
Home: 703-560-3442

Dr. Stephen J. Wright
1620 West Queen Street
Hampton, VA 23666
Home: 804-826-8909

Director:
Dr. Gordon K. Davies
Exec. Secretary:
Ms. Mary D. Herndon
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**Vice Chairman
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Dr. Patricia M. Riordan
Dean of Admissions
George Mason University
4400 University Drive
Fairfax, VA 22030
PH: (804) 764-2107

Mr. Alan L. Cerveny
Director, Admissions
James Madison University
Admissions Office
Harrisonburg, VA 22807
PH: (703) 568-6147

Mr. Robert J. Chonko
Director of Admissions and Enrollment Management
Longwood College
Farmville, VA 23901
PH: (804) 395-2060

Dr. Martin A. Wilder
Vice President for Admissions and Financial Aid
Mary Washington College
Fredericksburg, VA 22401-5358
PH: (804) 899-4681

Dr. Frank W. Cool
Director of Admissions
Norfolk State University
Admissions Office
Norfolk, VA 23504
PH: (804) 683-8396

Dr. Richard Parent
Director of Admissions
Old Dominion University
Hampton Boulevard
Norfolk, VA 23529-0050
PH: (804) 683-3637

Mr. Vernon L. Beitzel
Director of Admissions
Radford University
Radford, VA 24141
PH: (703) 831-5371

Dr. John A. Blackburn
Dean of Admissions
University of Virginia
Miller Hall, P.O. Box 9017
Charlottesville, VA 22906
PH: (804) 924-7731

Mr. Horace W. Wooldridge
Director of Admissions
Virginia Commonwealth University
821 W. Franklin Street, Box 2526
Richmond, VA 23284-2526
PH: (804) 367-6124

Col. Mark S. Sandy
Director of Admissions
Virginia Military Institute
Office of Admissions
Lexington, VA 24450
PH: (703) 464-7211

Mr. David R. Bouguet
Director of Admissions
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
104 Burruss Hall
Blacksburg, VA 24061
PH: (703) 231-6267

Ms. Hope N. Walton
Director of Admissions
Virginia State University
Post Office Box 18
Petersburg, VA 23803
PH: (804) 524-5901

Dr. Jean Scott, Dean
Undergraduate Admissions
College of William & Mary
Williamsburg, VA 23185
PH: (804) 253-4223

Mr. Roger L. Gill
Director of Admissions
Richard Bland College
Petersburg, VA 23805
PH: (804) 862-6225

Mr. Scott Langhorst
Educational Programs Coordinator
Virginia Community College System
101 North 14th Street
Richmond, VA 23219
PH: (804) 225-2124

Ms. Deborah Rose
Coordinator, Admissions and Records
John Tyler Community College
Chester, VA 23831
PH: (804) 796-4150

Dr. Max L. Bassett, Dean
Academic and Student Services
Northern Virginia Community College
4001 Wakefield Chapel Road
Annandale, VA 22003
PH: (703) 323-3195

Mr. John F. Lawrence, Chairman
Engineering/Technologies Division
Thomas Nelson Community College
Post Office Box 9407
Hampton, VA 23670
PH: (804) 825-2899

Dr. James A. McLean
Coordinator of Affirmative Action and Student Research
Council of Higher Education
101 North Fourteenth Street
Richmond, VA 23219
PH: (804) 225-2637

Dr. John D. Sykes, Jr.
Southside Virginia Community College
Route 1, Box 60
Alberta, VA 23821
PH: (804) 333-4024

Dr. Grady Tuck
Coordinator of Records & Adms.
Danville Community College
1008 South Main Street
Danville, Virginia 24541
PH: (804) 797-3553
Ms. Peggy Chrisley
Coordinator of Records & Adms.
New River Community College
P.O. Drawer 1127
Dublin, Virginia 24084
PFI: (703) 674-3600
APPENDIX F

Listing of Virginia Consortia

The State Council of Higher Education for Virginia
1976

*This appendix is comprised of only selected portions from the original document.
CONSORTIA FOR CONTINUING HIGHER EDUCATION

1. WESTERN REGIONAL CONSORTIUM FOR CONTINUING HIGHER EDUCATION

- Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University (focal institution)
- Clinch Valley College
- Radford College
- University of Virginia - Roanoke Center
- Dabney S. Lancaster Community College
- Danville Community College
- Mountain Empire Community College
- New River Community College
- Patrick Henry Community College
- Southwest Virginia Community College
- Virginia Highlands Community College
- Virginia Western Community College
- Wytheville Community College
- Emory and Henry College
- Roanoke College
- Averett College

2. VALLEY OF VIRGINIA CONSORTIUM FOR CONTINUING HIGHER EDUCATION

- Madison College (focal institution)
- Virginia Military Institute
- Blue Ridge Community College
- Germanna Community College
- Lord Fairfax Community College
- University of Virginia - Madison Center
- Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
- Eastern Mennonite College

3. CENTRAL VIRGINIA CONSORTIUM FOR CONTINUING HIGHER EDUCATION

- University of Virginia (focal institution)
- Central Virginia Community College
- Longwood College
- Mary Washington College
- Piedmont Virginia Community College
- Rappahannock Community College
- Southside Virginia Community College
- Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
CONSORTIA FOR CONTINUING HIGHER EDUCATION (Continued)

4. CAPITOL CONSORTIUM FOR CONTINUING HIGHER EDUCATION

   Virginia Commonwealth University (focal institution)
   Virginia State College
   J. Sargeant Reynolds Community College
   John Tyler Community College
   Richard Bland College

5. VIRGINIA TIDEWATER CONSORTIUM FOR CONTINUING HIGHER EDUCATION

   Old Dominion University (focal institution)
   University of Virginia - Hampton Center
   Christopher Newport College
   Norfolk State College
   The College of William and Mary
   Eastern Shore Community College
   Paul D. Camp Community College
   Thomas Nelson Community College
   Tidewater Community College
   Eastern Virginia Medical School
   Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

6. CONSORTIUM FOR CONTINUING HIGHER EDUCATION IN NORTHERN VIRGINIA

   George Mason University (focal Institution)
   Northern Virginia Community College
   University of Virginia - Northern Center
   Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
   Marymount College of Virginia
In the Spring of 1976, each of the six regional consortia submitted plans for cooperative efforts to the Council of Higher Education. Four of the six consortia made specific mention of articulation. The following material on articulation and related matters is excerpted from those plans:

**Capital Consortium for Continuing Higher Education**

The Capital Consortium plan notes that each member institution has a policy regarding transferability of credits. Mention is made of agreements between several institutions concerning transferability of credit in certain fields. In addition to the Virginia Commonwealth University transfer guide for community college students, John Tyler Community College and Virginia State College have initiated steps to establish transfer agreements between the two institutions.

The last of the six consortia to be established, the Capital Consortium has established an Academic Programs Committee which will work to implement the Consortium's commitment to assuring greater transferability of credit.

**Virginia Tidewater Consortium for Continuing Higher Education**

The Tidewater Consortium's Articulation Committee developed a policy on the transfer of credits from community colleges which has been accepted by each senior college member of the Consortium with the exception of the University of Virginia and The College of William and Mary. The policy states that each senior college member with the exceptions noted above, recognize the A.A. and A.S. degrees from accredited Virginia community colleges or junior colleges as fulfilling the lower-division general instruction requirements of meeting the requirements for junior standing.

The Consortium views the adoption of policies leading to greater flexibility in credit transfer as one of its primary functions.

**Valley of Virginia Consortium for Continuing Higher Education**

In its charter statement, the Board of Directors of the Valley Consortium pledged to work for complete transferability of credit among member institutions. Complete transferability of programs among institutions has been provided for.
Several interinstitutional arrangements have been approved including arrangement between Lord Fairfax Community College and University of Virginia, Madison, Virginia Commonwealth University, and the community colleges, and Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University and Blue Ridge Community College.

Western Regional Consortium for Continuing Higher Education

Graduate students may transfer up to one-half of the credits in their master's program among member institutions. A priority item for the Western Regional Consortium is the transfer of credit and articulation of programs between community colleges and senior institutions. Some member institutions provide for the full transfer of an associate degree from a community college carrying with it junior class ranking.
APPENDIX G

APPLICATIONS FROM VIRGINIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES TO VIRGINIA STATE SUPPORTED INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION FALL 1975

SCHEV Form B-8, Applications for Fall Undergraduate Admissions, Fall 1975.
Applications from Virginia Community Colleges to Virginia Senior State-Supported Institutions of Higher Education Fall 1975

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutions</th>
<th>Applications</th>
<th></th>
<th>Applications</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>With A.A or A.S.</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>With A.A or A.S.</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Newport</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinch Valley</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Mason</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longwood</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Washington</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk State</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Dominion University</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radford</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Virginia</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Commonwealth U.</td>
<td>NA¹</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>NA¹</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Military Institute</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPI &amp; SU</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia State</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William and Mary</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Senior Colleges</th>
<th>916¹</th>
<th>2,888</th>
<th>830¹</th>
<th>2,285</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(91%)</td>
<td>(79%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Data for Virginia Commonwealth University concerning applications with associate degree not available.

*This page has been retyped from the original to obtain a clean copy.
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ABSTRACT


Maxine Branch Singleton
The College of William and Mary in Virginia
Chairman: Dr. Roger G. Baldwin

The purpose of this research was to conduct an historical analysis of the policies governing educational articulation and its formation, and to discover reasons for the slow development of statewide policy for educational articulation in the Commonwealth.

The Commonwealth served as an excellent case study because both its public schools and colleges experienced tremendous growth over the past twenty-two years. The Commonwealth's first community college opened in 1966 and since that time, its enrollment nearly exceeds other institutions of higher education within the state.

Next, articulation was the topic of some educational leaders within Virginia over twenty years ago. So articulation was an idea in the minds of a few Virginia educators for quite some time. More recently, however, the Commonwealth developed statewide articulation.

The process which led to the current articulation policy covered many years, and, at times, was even a slow process. The procedure used in this research to present the findings of this study involved an examination of various documents. Some of these documents were produced by the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia, the State Board of Education, Minutes of State Council meetings, as well as Minutes of Board of Education meetings. Interviews were another source of data. Interviews were obtained from persons involved in educational articulation in the Commonwealth. A few of the persons interviewed included a former Chancellor of the Virginia Community College System, a former Secretary of Education for Virginia, a former State Superintendent for Public Instruction, college presidents and many other individuals involved in educational articulation between 1966 and 1990.

In order to conduct this research in a scholarly way, the years covered, 1966 through 1990, were examined in a systematic way. The entire span of years was broken down into five time periods. Then each period was examined by searching the three educational segments--the secondary school, the community college and the senior college. Within each agency, the key persons involved in articulation, if any, were noted together with any significant influence of the agency. If articulation policy was developed, it was noted also. At the end of each period under discussion, the key forces which were found to influence educational articulation during that time were summarize. However, the period between 1988 and 1990 was discussed first to give insight as to where articulation is now in the Commonwealth.

The findings of this research showed that the Commonwealth made tremendous strides between 1988 to 1990. During this time,
statewide articulation policy was developed in the form of Dual Enrollment Agreement.

Many of the public secondary schools have developed articulation agreements with community colleges, and some four-year institutions have articulation agreements with community colleges. Many factors can influence the development of articulation policy. Yet, articulation policy can be developed between educational agencies; however, it requires the support of educational leaders and the actual work of faculty.

Future research on articulation is needed to show how different educational agencies, communities, and most of all students can benefit from educational articulation.