EVALUATION of Occupational Programs

COPIES

Jan. 9, 10, 11, 1973 Final Report

Santa Barbara City College
MEMO TO: All Staff who participated in the COPES evaluation study.

FROM: Melvin J. Elkins, Assistant Dean, Vocational Education

First, let me express my sincere thanks to each of you for the time and effort you have contributed to making this evaluation possible.

In this report you will find:

1. The COPES team procedures and activities.
2. The COPES team written report.
3. The summary rating by the team.
4. The comparison rating by the staff and team.
5. Averages of various participant's ratings and conclusions.
6. Student summaries.
7. Advisory Committee summaries.
8. Item analysis with planning implications.
9. Summary and planning implications.

The entire study was based essentially on "perceptions".

"Whether considered to be right or wrong, whether based on evidence or not, a 'perception' is the realistic element one must deal with in effecting change."

The following participated:

1. Occupational faculty, counselors, division chairmen = 39
2. General administrators and counselors = 19
3. Students in occupational classes = 240
4. Advisory Committee members = 52
5. COPES team = 6

The perceptions of 1 through 4 above, when tallied and averaged, approximated those of the COPES team. As an overview, this is significant. In essence, the team validated our perceptions. This gives us strong starting points of consensus from which to begin our program of improvement.

My hope is that all those involved, or all those assigned to specific tasks, will, in the near future, start determining courses of action necessary for improvement in specific areas.

I will be available and happy to discuss details of this study at any time, and to review any ideas for improvement that you may have.

Sincerely yours,

Melvin J. Elkins
Asst. Dean, Voc/Tech

MJE/hal
Appendix B

SANTA BARBARA CITY COLLEGE VISITATION:  
"COPES" TEAM MEMBERS AND ACTIVITIES

Members

Jack Snyder (Chairman), Dean of Instructional Services, Cabrillo College; Rolf Bruckner, Associate Dean of Instruction, Gavilan College; Francis J. Conners, Director, Education Department, California State Chamber of Commerce; Virginia A. Gries, Director, Home Economics, Pacific Gas & Electric Company; John M. Hubbard, Assistant to the Chancellor for Community Relations, San Mateo Community College District; Dr. Warren W. Sorenson, Assistant Superintendent-Education, West Valley Joint Community College District.


Activities

The COPES team was requested to conduct an on-site evaluation of all occupational programs and services of the college, to validate a college self-appraisal (COPES Form 1) and to verify response tabulations from COPES perceptions instruments completed by other college personnel, students and members of the college's occupational education advisory committees.

Preceding the visitation, members of the COPES team analyzed the college self-appraisal, as well as computer tabulations from the perceptions instruments, and reviewed such college materials as the catalog, class schedule, occupational division budgets and district plan for vocational education.

The visitation was conducted on January 9, 10 and 11, 1973, and included these types of activities:

1. General tour of the campus and inspection of occupational education facilities.

2. Individual and group interviews with more than 50 members of the college faculty and administration. Among those interviewed were the Superintendent-President, Dean of Instruction, Assistant Dean-Vocational Education, Academic Senate President, occupational education instructors and counselors, and work-experience personnel.
3. Interviews with a few persons in the community.
(Note: This area of interviewing was purposely limited, since perceptions of advisory committee members had been secured on COPES instruments prior to the visitation.)

4. Analysis of college-developed instructional materials, budget and course outlines, among others.

5. Meetings of the COPES team to report on and validate observations, and to arrive at the consensus evaluations summarized in Appendix A.
January 11, 1973

TO:        Dr. Glenn G. Gooder, Superintendent-President
Santa Barbara City College
Santa Barbara, California

FROM:      Jack Snyder, Chairman
COPES Visitation Team

SUBJECT:   Summary of Conference Between College Personnel
and Visitation Team

Members of the COPES team met with Superintendent-President Gooder
and other Santa Barbara City College personnel in the college Board
Room at 10:00 a.m. on January 11, 1973, to report on and discuss
findings from a three-day COPES visit on the campus.

Purpose of the visit was to assist the college in identifying its
occupational education strengths and needs for improvement as a basis
for future planning and allocation of resources.

Following are the highlights of the oral report. (The COPES team
consensus assessment of the occupational education profile of the
college is shown as Appendix A. Visitation details such as team
membership, data gathering activities and schedule are included as
Appendices B and C. Also attached are a summary of occupational
education perceptions submitted by college personnel as Appendix D;
summary of student perceptions, Appendix E; and summary of advisory
committee member perceptions, Appendix F.)

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

For many years Santa Barbara City College has been a leader in meeting
the educational needs of its community, not only through programs
offered on the campus but also through off-campus offerings throughout
the district.

Whereas once the college's emphasis was almost completely devoted to
preparing students in the academic areas, there has been a dramatic
change during roughly the past decade to include a wide variety of
occupational programs. This change, effected particularly in the
most recent past, has been brought about by a greater mobility of
students, a growing community that is undergoing significant
character transformation, and an awareness of an expanding and
diversifying job market for students.
In continuing its occupational education evolution, Santa Barbara City College, like many other colleges, is encountering difficult financial and planning challenges. One major challenge has already been surmounted through acquisition of funding for sorely needed construction of additional facilities. In facing other challenges that still remain, the college exhibits full capability to accomplish the same sort of resolution that is being achieved in the matter of facilities.

MAJOR AREAS OF DEMONSTRATED STRENGTH

Santa Barbara City College enjoys an excellent reputation within its community, as evidenced by the highly favorable written and oral comments COPES received from advisory committee members and by the equally positive responses elicited in personal interviews during the visitation. The COPES team discovered many strengths in keeping with the college's reputation. These are reflected in the appended summary profile representing the consensus assessments of the team. In some areas, the team ratings were appreciably higher than those contained in the college self-appraisal. While a realistically self-critical posture is certainly to be commended, it is suggested by the team that the college has every reason to be proud of what has been accomplished.

Notable among the strengths are the following:

1. The excellent quality of occupational instruction. This excellence, as rated by the COPES team from a synthesis of observations and perceptions of students, college personnel and persons in the community, is a direct reflection of the fine qualifications of the instructional staff and their motivation, dedication and personal commitment.

2. The adult and continuing education programs. These programs, by their variety of offerings, flexibility, easy entrance and exit, availability, sensitivity to the needs of all people and non-threatening nature, have produced a major bloc of community support for the college.

3. The wealth of community resources which immeasurably augment and enrich programs and services of the college. These resources range from an enlightened, supportive Board of Trustees to widespread utilization of community facilities, cooperation of a vast number of community organizations (civic, labor, etc.) and availability of talented community residents to provide outstandingly effective programs to meet community needs.
4. The willingness of the instructional staff to modify and update curricula in response to demonstrated community needs.

5. The individual efforts of instructors to place their students in meaningful jobs.

6. The access to, and intended use of, an industry/occupation matrix developed by General Research Corporation. This matrix, designed to forecast future job opportunities in Santa Barbara County, provides a tool that, if used properly by the college's occupational and planning staff, can be a vital source of information for development, upgrading and establishment of career programs.

AREAS MERITING PRIORITY CONSIDERATION FOR IMPROVEMENT

Obviously, the financial limitations of Santa Barbara City College preclude the immediate undertaking of costly steps toward meeting occupational education needs perceived both by the college and the COPES team. There are certain areas, however, in which action might be initiated more through a reordering of institutional priorities than through any significant additional overall expenditures, or through reappraisal of the effective organization and utilization of resources already largely existent. It is to these areas that the suggestions which follow are principally addressed.

1. Analysis of the justification for doubts expressed by many of the occupational faculty concerning the extent of the administration's real commitment to occupational education. Genuine concern was encountered that commitment, although firmly expressed, is not being translated into sufficient action in certain areas, including provision for support personnel (e.g., teacher aides and technicians), priorities for facility construction and utilization, and operational budget allocations.

2. Re-examination of the administrative organizational structure. At present, effective coordination and direction of occupational education appear to be deterred by fragmentation and by lack of adequate provision for an administrative focal point to deal with real concerns.

3. Further incorporation in the work-experience programs of systematic follow-up and evaluation procedures to determine the quality of work-experience provided. These are deemed necessary to maintain a quality of experience commensurate with classroom instruction and to achieve a level of performance compatible with the goals and standards of the college.
4. Evaluation of the availability of, and emphasis placed upon, occupational education counseling and guidance. The COPES team concurred with the college self-appraisal regarding the inadequacy of existing services.

5. Development of a single, organized system for follow-up of students who enter the job market. Here, too, there was team concurrence with the college self-appraisal regarding the inadequacy of existing services. Although many instructors are aware of the success of former students, such individual efforts cannot provide sufficiently comprehensive findings for proper program evaluation and planning.

6. Utilization of advisory committees. In some cases, while these committees rendered valuable service in the original shaping of occupational programs, the college has not continued subsequently to obtain optimum benefit of their counsel in regard to program evaluation and possible needs for modification.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In recent years Santa Barbara City College has accomplished much toward meeting dramatically increased needs in the realm of occupational education. Notably, this progress has been achieved within the limits of relatively tight financial constraints.

Considering the prospect that these constraints are not likely to loosen appreciably in the near future, it is suggested that further desirable progress might best be maximized through actions based upon re-examination of institutional priorities and of administrative organization effectiveness.

Thus internally assured of its most appropriate and most efficient directions, and given its excellent Board of Trustees, strong community support and dedicated staff, the college should be in the most advantageous attainable position to retain and enhance its traditional stature as a leader in serving the needs of its community.

The COPES team sincerely believes the general perceptions contained herein, when viewed together with other perceptions obtained from college personnel and persons in the community, will be of help toward that end.
### SUMMARY PROFILE BY SITE VISIT TEAM

#### PERCEPTIONS OF OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION

#### GOALS AND MEASURABLE PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

1.1 Goal(s) (broad purpose) for occupational programs.

1.2 Development of measurable learner performance objectives in organizing occupational programs.

1.3 Use of measurable learner objectives in evaluating student performance.

1.4 Relation of stated learner objectives to job performance requirements.

1.5 Planned enrollments in relation to community needs (e.g., population needs, labor market needs).

1.6 Actual program enrollments in relation to planned enrollments.

1.7 Student completions in relation to enrollments, including jobouts (i.e., students leaving school for employment in field of preparation prior to completing program of studies).

1.8 Student placements (employment or related advanced education) in relation to completions.

1.9 Information on job success of former students in field of preparation.

#### PROCESSES: INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

2.1 Concurrence of programs with district vocational education plan submitted to state annually.

2.2 Quality of occupational instruction, in general.

2.3 Provision of educational opportunities consistent with community needs (e.g., population needs, labor market needs) for training, retraining, and upgrading personnel.

2.3.1 Continuing Education

2.4 Growth and/or modification of offerings during past five years in response to community needs.

2.5 Articulation with other educational organizations in your area (e.g., high schools, other community colleges, regional occupational centers) in providing for community occupational needs.
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SUMMARY PROFILE BY SITE VISIT TEAM

PROCESSES: INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS (continued)

2.6 Relating of the college's general education courses (e.g., English, math) to occupational education.

2.7 Provision for vocational work experience in occupational education programs.

2.8 Quality of work experience programs.

2.9 Special provisions for the disadvantaged (i.e., academic, socioeconomic, cultural, and related handicaps).

2.10 Special provisions for the handicapped (i.e., physical, mental, emotional, and other health-impairing handicaps).

PROCESSES: SUPPORT PROCESSES

3.1 Administration's commitment to occupational education.

3.2 Organization for effective coordination and direction of occupational education.

3.3 Status of occupational education dean or director position on the college "administration team".

3.4 Awareness of college's occupational education goals by all faculty and staff.

3.5 Balance between academic and occupational education interests on college curriculum committee.

Emphasis upon occupational education counseling and guidance:

3.6 To full-time college students
3.7 To adult and evening students
3.8 To high school students

3.9 College-wide coordination of placement services with occupational education curriculums.

3.10 Effectiveness in placement of occupational education students completing programs.

3.11 Recruitment into occupational education programs.
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SUMMARY PROFILE BY SITE VISIT TEAM

PROCESSES: SUPPORT PROCESSES (continued)

Systematic follow-up of students:
3.12 Who have completed occupational programs
3.13 Who have dropped out
3.14 Who have completed college transfer programs

3.15 Use of job success and failure information of occupational education graduates in program evaluation and planning.

3.16 Promotion of occupational education's strengths, merits, and opportunities to the public and its decision-making representatives.

3.17 Participation in development of one-year and five-year district vocational education plan submitted to state.

3.18 Systematic collection and translation of information on community occupational education needs (population needs, labor market needs and opportunities).

3.19 Coordination of college's community occupational education needs analysis with those of other planning agencies in the area.

3.20 Use of community occupational education needs information in modifying programs.

3.21 Up-dating of instructional content and method in relation to current occupational practices and trends.

RESOURCES

4.1 Provision for coordination and/or direction.

4.2 Qualifications of coordinator(s) and/or director(s).

4.3 Number of instructors necessary for program effectiveness.

4.4 Qualifications of instructional staff.

4.5 Occupational experience of instructors.
SUMMARY PROFILE BY SITE VISIT TEAM

RESOURCES (continued)

4.6 In-service education opportunities for faculty, including conference attendance, curriculum development, work experience.

4.7 Provisions for systematic evaluation of instructional personnel.

4.8 Use of paraprofessionals (e.g., aides, teacher assistants).

4.9 Salary schedule provisions in relation to other professional staff within the college.

4.10 Adequacy of instructional facilities, excluding equipment.

4.11 Adequacy and availability of instructional equipment.

4.12 Utilization of instructional facilities and equipment.

4.13 Adequacy and availability of instructional materials (e.g., textbooks, reference books, visual aids, mock-ups).

4.14 Use of individualized instruction (e.g., programmed learning, self-paced instruction, tutoring).

4.15 Use of advisory committees.

4.16 Participation of advisory committees in shaping programs.

4.17 Use of community resources in class instruction (e.g., field trips, outside speakers, borrowed equipment).

4.18 Contributions of equipment and/or funds from labor, business, industry, and the professions.

Provisions in current operating budget for:

4.20 Occupational education in general

Provisions in capital outlay budget for:

4.22 Occupational education in general
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SUMMARY PROFILE BY SITE VISIT TEAM

PERCEPTIONS OF OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION

GOALS AND MEASURABLE PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

1.1 Goal(s)(broad purpose) for occupational programs.

1.2 Development of measurable learner performance objectives in organizing occupational programs.

1.3 Use of measurable learner objectives in evaluating student performance.

1.4 Relation of stated learner objectives to job performance requirements.

1.5 Planned enrollments in relation to community needs (e.g., population needs, labor market needs).

1.6 Actual program enrollments in relation to planned enrollments.

1.7 Student completions in relation to enrollments, including jobouts (i.e., students leaving school for employment in field of preparation prior to completing program of studies).

1.8 Student placements (employment or related advanced education) in relation to completions.

1.9 Information on job success of former students in field of preparation.

PROCESSES: INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

2.1 Concurrence of programs with district vocational education plan submitted to state annually.

2.2 Quality of occupational instruction, in general.

2.3 Provision of educational opportunities consistent with community needs (e.g., population needs, labor market needs) for training, retraining, and upgrading personnel.

2.3/ Continuing Education

2.4 Growth and/or modification of offerings during past five years in response to community needs.

2.5 Articulation with other educational organizations in your area (e.g., high schools, other community colleges, regional occupational centers) in providing for community occupational needs.

T = TEAM
P = OFFICIAL
O = OCCUPATIONAL
AC = GENERALISTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Below Expectations</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Date: January 11, 1973
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SUMMARY PROFILE BY SITE VISIT TEAM

PROCESSES: INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS (continued)

2.6 Relating of the college's general education courses (e.g., English, math) to occupational education.

2.7 Provision for vocational work experience in occupational education programs.

2.8 Quality of work experience programs.

2.9 Special provisions for the disadvantaged (i.e., academic, socioeconomic, cultural, and related handicaps).

2.10 Special provisions for the handicapped (i.e., physical, mental, emotional, and other health-imparing handicaps).

PROCESSES: SUPPORT PROCESSES

3.1 Administration's commitment to occupational education.

3.2 Organization for effective coordination and direction of occupational education.

3.3 Status of occupational education dean or director position on the college "administration team".

3.4 Awareness of college's occupational education goals by all faculty and staff.

3.5 Balance between academic and occupational education interests on college curriculum committee.

Emphasis upon occupational education counseling and guidance:

3.6 To full-time college students

3.7 To adult and evening students

3.8 To high school students

3.9 College-wide coordination of placement services with occupational education curriculums.

3.10 Effectiveness in placement of occupational education students completing programs.

3.11 Recruitment into occupational education programs.
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PROCESSES: SUPPORT PROCESSES (continued)

Systematic follow-up of students:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.12 Who have completed occupational programs</td>
<td>Poor (P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.13 Who have dropped out</td>
<td>Acceptable (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.14 Who have completed college transfer programs</td>
<td>Good (G)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.15 Use of job success and failure information of occupational education graduates in program evaluation and planning.

3.16 Promotion of occupational education's strengths, merits, and opportunities to the public and its decision-making representatives.

3.17 Participation in development of one-year and five-year district vocational education plan submitted to state.

3.18 Systematic collection and translation of information on community occupational education needs (population needs, labor market needs and opportunities).

3.19 Coordination of college's community occupational education needs analysis with those of other planning agencies in the area.

3.20 Use of community occupational education needs information in modifying programs.

3.21 Up-dating of instructional content and method in relation to current occupational practices and trends.

RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Provision for coordination and/or direction.</td>
<td>Poor (P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Qualifications of coordinator(s) and/or director(s).</td>
<td>Acceptable (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Number of instructors necessary for program effectiveness.</td>
<td>Good (G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 Qualifications of instructional staff.</td>
<td>Excellent (E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 Occupational experience of instructors.</td>
<td>Poor (P)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**SUMMARY PROFILE BY SITE VISIT TEAM**

**RESOURCES (continued)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Below Expectations</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>In-service education opportunities for faculty, including conference attendance, curriculum development, work experience.</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>Provisions for systematic evaluation of instructional personnel.</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>Use of paraprofessionals (e.g., aides, teacher assistants).</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>Salary schedule provisions in relation to other professional staff within the college.</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>Adequacy of instructional facilities, excluding equipment.</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>Adequacy and availability of instructional equipment.</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>Utilization of instructional facilities and equipment.</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>Adequacy and availability of instructional materials (e.g., textbooks, reference books, visual aids, mock-ups).</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>Use of individualized instruction (e.g., programmed learning, self-paced instruction, tutoring).</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>Use of advisory committees.</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>Participation of advisory committees in shaping programs.</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>Use of community resources in class instruction (e.g., field trips, outside speakers, borrowed equipment).</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>Contributions of equipment and/or funds from labor, business, industry, and the professions.</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provisions in current operating budget for:

- Occupational education in general

Provisions in capital outlay budget for:

- Occupational education in general
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**C.O.T.E.S. EVALUATION - JANUARY - 1973**

**SUMMARY OF PARTICIPANTS' RATINGS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Responding</th>
<th>USER TEAM</th>
<th>2. OFFICIAL COLLEGE BY DEPT.</th>
<th>3. OCCUPATIONAL STAFF</th>
<th>4. GENERAL ADMIN. &amp; COUNSEL</th>
<th>AVERAGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Goals and Measurable Objectives</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Processes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Instructional Progress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Support Processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. Resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. District</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Community</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ITEMS</strong></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AVERAGES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OVERALL AVERAGE**

3.5

**ADDITIONAL**

240 STUDENTS ANSWERED AN 11 QUESTION INSTRUMENT.
32 ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS ANSWERED A 15 QUESTION INSTRUMENT

**Scale**

1.0 = Poor
2.0 = Below expectations
3.0 = Acceptable
4.0 = Good
5.0 = Excellent

**CONCLUSIONS**
# COPES
The California Community Colleges

**STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION**

**College** SANTA BARBARA CITY COLLEGE

**TOTAL OF ALL STUDENT RESPONDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Below Average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>N 1/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Overall reputation of the college within the community?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Your overall rating of your occupational program?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Quality of your occupational instruction, in general?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Quality of your courses outside of your occupational area (such as English, science, math)?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Adequacy of instructional facilities and equipment for your occupational program?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Adequacy and availability of instructional materials for your occupational program (such as textbooks, reference materials, visual aids)?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Arrangements by the college for work experience (or clinical experience) in your occupational program?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Quality of work experience (or clinical experience) in your program?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Counseling and guidance at your college as they pertain to you and your program?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. College's effectiveness in job placement of students completing your occupational program?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Job success of students completing your program?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1/ Number Responding in Time for Processing

□ = Median
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COMMUNITY PERCEPTIONS OF OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION

College  SANTA BARBARA CITY COLLEGE

TOTAL OF ALL ADVISORY RESPONDENTS

In what ways have you been asked to contribute to the college's vocational program in your field (e.g., serving as an outside speaker, arranging field trips)?

Please answer all questions based on your contact with the college in the capacity of an advisory committee member.

How would you rate the following:

1. Overall reputation of the college within the community?
2. Reputation of the college's occupational education program in your field(s)?
3. Quality of occupational instruction in your field(s)?
4. Promotion of available occupational education programs within the community?
5. Community support of occupational education?
6. The administration's commitment to occupational education?
7. The administration's responsiveness to manpower and employment training needs of the community?
8. General success of occupational graduates when employed in your business or industrial field(s)?
9. Educational opportunities for retraining and upgrading employed personnel in your occupational field(s)?
10. Counseling and guidance into vocational programs in your field(s)?
11. Systematic follow-up of occupational graduates employed in your field(s)?
12. Adequacy of instructional facilities and equipment in your field(s)?
13. Use of community resources in class instruction (e.g., field trips, outside speakers, borrowed equipment)?
14. Provision for vocationally-related work experience in your occupational field(s)?
15. Growth and/or modification of the occupational program in your field(s) in response to recommendations of your advisory committee?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Below Expectations</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = Number Responding in Time for Processing

☐ = Median Interval, excluding Don't Know responses
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COPES Evaluation, January 1973 - ITEM ANALYSIS AND PLANNING IMPLICATIONS

The following analysis considers the ratings by the following four groups:

1. COPES team
2. College Official
3. Occupational Staff
4. General Administrators and Counselors

Scale used:

1 = Poor
2 = Below Expectation
3 = Acceptable
4 = Good
5 = Excellent

Component A - Goals and Measurable Objectives

1. Ratings by the team were acceptable or good, with the exception of a systematic follow-up system on students' job success. This score was below expectation.

2. Counselors and Advisory Committee members indicated a significant number of "don't know" answers.

Planning Implications:

A. Time and effort should be given to the establishment of a systematic follow-up system to evaluate students' job success after leaving S.B.C.C.

B. Procedures need to be developed and time allotted to involve counselors with the occupational staff and lay Advisory Committees.

Component B - Processes

1. Instructional programs.
   a. Most ratings were acceptable or good, with the exception of provisions for the handicapped which was rated below expectation by the occupational staff.
   b. Quality of the Work Experience program was rated below expectation by the team.

Planning Implications:

A. More provision should be provided for the handicapped in the areas of facilities, parking, and scheduling.

B. Budget provisions will need to be considered in order to provide for staffing (classified and certificated) in our Work Experience Program. More quality and accountability are desirable.

(Continued)
COPES - Item Analysis etc. (Continued)

2. Support processes.
   a. This appears to be the area in which the College is weakest.
   b. The COPES team saw the areas of administrative commitment, Occupational administrative organization, Occupational counseling, and coordination of Placement services as below expectations.
   c. The team, college official, and generalists all agreed that systematic follow-up studies of students were below expectation.

Planning Implications:

A. The weak rating in this component indicates that serious consideration is needed with particular emphasis on administrative realignment so that occupational education is not fragmented and is represented at the policy making level of the College. Also, special consideration should be given to the performance of the following functions:
   a. Occupational student placement services.
   b. Occupational counseling, i.e. greater familiarity with the programs.
   c. Follow-up of students.

Component C - Resources

1. District Resources.
   a. The COPES team and the occupational staff rated the "use of paraprofessionals" and "adequacy of instructional facilities" below expectation. "Provisions for Occupational education" was also rated below expectation.

Planning Implications:

A. Funds, by priority, are needed for paraprofessional staff in the Occupational program.

B. Priorities for long range facility planning should be considered whereby Occupational education can experience the same level of sophistication as other divisions

2. Community Resources.
   a. With the exception of the use of Advisory Committees, and provisions in current operating budget for equipment and funds, the COPES team rated this category as acceptable, good or excellent. However, with regard to Advisory Committees and current operating budget, the team rated us below expectation.

(Continued)
Planning Implications

A. Use of and follow through on recommendations of Advisory Committees representing the various areas of Occupational education.

B. Whereas much of the money for Vocational-Technical education has come from VEA or NSF funding, much of the long range operational expense for these programs must be sought through District funding.

SUMMARY

It is my hope that an informal presentation concerning this report can be given to the President's Council and that a written report be submitted to the Board of Trustees.

Also, hopefully appropriate administrative staff will be assigned to areas where our evaluation rating was below expectation and specific ways and means will be spelled out to improve same.

Your cooperation is appreciated.

MJE/hal