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I. Introduction

The evaluation and needs assessment study of Metropolitan Technical Community College included a survey of the professional staff at the College. A questionnaire was developed and delivered to the College administration for distribution to the faculty, administrators, and other professional staff. The administration was responsible for the distribution and collection of the survey instruments. Responses were received from 78 faculty, 44 administrators, and 14 other professional staff. This represents response rates of 75% for faculty and administrators and 93% for other professional staff. The remainder of this report will delineate a) the respondents’ evaluations of Metro Tech’s success in achieving its missions and goals; b) their ratings of 14 services and activities; c) their perceptions of unmet educational needs which Metro Tech should be attempting to satisfy and of the problem of expanded program offerings, and, finally, d) their perceptions of the strengths of Metropolitan Technical Community College and e) areas which they said needed improvement. An Appendix reproduces the questionnaire and all comments in response to open-ended questions.

II. Achievement of Missions and Goals

Respondents were asked to assess the success Metro Tech has had in achieving its missions and goals and in communicating these to the public. A majority of the respondents said Metro was mostly or very successful in achieving each of its missions, but Metro was judged least successful in communicating its missions to the public. Less than half (48%) of all respondents said it was mostly or very successful in this area. See Table 1.

The professional staff rated the success of Metro greatest for "providing comprehensive occupational and technical career education programs." Almost one-fourth (24%) said it was very successful, and only 9% thought it was mostly or very unsuccessful. On a four-point scale ranging from 1 for very successful to 4 for very unsuccessful, this mission was rated most favorably at 1.86.*

Similarly favorable ratings were given to the mission of "providing high-quality education." The average score was 2.05 with 84% rating Metro as very

*Lower scores are more favorable.
## TABLE 1

**EVALUATION OF MISSIONS AND GOALS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mission Description</th>
<th>Mostly or Very Successful</th>
<th>Mostly or Very Unsuccessful</th>
<th>Average Score**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Providing high quality education</td>
<td>Total* 84% 12% 2.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty 88% 12% 2.01</td>
<td>Administration 88% 12% 2.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Providing comprehensive occupational and technical career education programs</td>
<td>Total 89% 8% 2.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty 96% 4% 1.71</td>
<td>Administration 88% 12% 2.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Providing useful general studies courses and continuing education programs</td>
<td>Total 64% 32% 2.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty 77% 23% 2.13</td>
<td>Administration 54% 46% 2.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Providing a comprehensive program of student services</td>
<td>Total 74% 17% 2.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty 87% 13% 2.06</td>
<td>Administration 74% 26% 1.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Providing individualized instructional support</td>
<td>Total 53% 38% 2.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty 64% 36% 2.29</td>
<td>Administration 45% 55% 2.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Promoting an institutional climate which enhances trust, confidence, and cooperation</td>
<td>Total 53% 43% 2.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty 55% 45% 2.49</td>
<td>Administration 55% 45% 2.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Providing an environment for staff to achieve their professional and personal goals</td>
<td>Total 57% 39% 2.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty 51% 49% 2.59</td>
<td>Administration 76% 24% 2.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Communicating college missions to the public</td>
<td>Total 48% 47% 2.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty 49% 51% 2.58</td>
<td>Administration 55% 45% 2.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Overall achievement of missions and goals</td>
<td>Total 78% 18% 2.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty 81% 19% 2.15</td>
<td>Administration 86% 14% 2.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentage based on all respondents (including 14 other staff and those not answering the questions). All other percentages and the average scores for each group are based on respondents answering the specific question.

**Average score based on 1 for very successful to 4 for very unsuccessful. Lower score, therefore, is a more favorable perception.
or mostly successful.

"Providing a comprehensive program of student services" was also rated favorably, 74% rating it very or mostly successful with an average score of 2.02.

Metro was judged less successful in facilitating the delivery of educational services by creating a favorable environment or climate for its staff. Only 53% of the staff rated the College as very or mostly successful in "promoting an institutional climate which enhances trust, confidence, and cooperation" or "providing an environment for staff to achieve their professional and personal goals." Average scores were 2.48 and 2.47, respectively.

The staff's ratings of "overall achievement of missions and goals" were very high. More than three-fourths (78%) rated Metro as very or mostly successful; only 18% thought Metro was mostly or very unsuccessful. The average score for this statement was 2.16.

Perceptions of Metro Tech's success in achieving its missions and goals were not shared by all equally. Table 1 indicates that for some missions and goals perceptions by faculty were more favorable, for some the views were almost identical, and for some a more favorable rating was given by administration. Faculty had more favorable perceptions about Metro Tech's success in a) providing comprehensive occupational and technical programs (average score of 1.71 compared to 2.10 for administrators, with 34% of the faculty believing MTCC was very successful compared to only 5% of the administrators); b) providing useful general studies and continuing education programs (average score of 2.13 for faculty and 2.49 for administrators, with 23% of faculty saying Metro Tech was mostly or very unsuccessful compared to twice as many or 46% of the administrators); c) providing individualized instructional support (average score of 2.29 for faculty and 2.58 for administrators, with 36% of the faculty but 55% of the administrators seeing it as usually unsuccessful).

One of the largest differences between faculty and administrator perceptions concerned the provision of an environment for staff to achieve their professional and personal goals. Administrators had much more favorable perceptions, with only 24% of the administrators viewing Metro Tech's performance as unsuccessful compared to almost half (49%) of the faculty; average scores were 2.26 for administrators and 2.59 for faculty.

Differences among the faculties at each of the three campuses were usually greater than differences between all faculty and administrators. Table 2 indicates, for example, that the differences between the faculties at South Omaha and the other two campuses were .50 of a point on the assessment of success in providing
TABLE 2

EVALUATION OF MISSIONS AND GOALS BY FACULTY AT EACH CAMPUS  
(average score)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mission/Goal</th>
<th>Campus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Providing high quality education</td>
<td>Fort Omaha   2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Providing comprehensive occupational and technical career education programs</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Providing useful general studies courses and continuing education programs</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Providing a comprehensive program of student services</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Providing individualized instructional support</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Promoting an institutional climate which enhances trust, confidence, and cooperation</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Providing an environment for staff to achieve their professional and personal goals</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Communicating college missions to the public</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Overall achievement of missions and goals</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Average score based on 1 for very successful to 4 for very unsuccessful. Lower score, therefore, is a more favorable perception.
useful general studies and continuing education programs (average score of 2.50 at South Omaha and 2.00 at each of the other two campuses). Generally, the faculty were most critical at the South Omaha campus and least critical at the Fort Omaha campus. The faculty on the campuses shared the greatest consensus on the major missions of providing high quality education and providing comprehensive occupational and technical programs and in their overall assessments of achieving the College's missions and goals.

No consistent pattern was observed when years of service at Metro Tech was analyzed as an independent variable.

III. Services and Activities

The professional staff at Metro Tech were asked to rate a series of 14 services and activities as excellent, very good, good, fair, or poor. In addition, the respondents were given an opportunity to add comments about each of their ratings. These comments are reproduced in the Appendix.

The most favorable rating (based on the average score) was given to the availability of teaching aids such as supplies and materials. See Table 3. The score was 2.29 with 15% of the respondents considering it as excellent and none calling it poor. The handful of comments about this service suggested requests were always given consideration, but some need for more resources was noted. Considerable variation existed among the faculties at the different campuses, with Southwest most critical (average of 2.56) and South Omaha most favorable (1.85). See Table 4 for campus comparisons.

The second most favorable rating was given to the Instructional Resource Centers, with a score of 2.37. This area received the highest proportion of excellent to very good ratings (57%); only 1% considered them as poor. Nevertheless, 10 respondents suggested more books and other resources were needed.

The third most favorable rating was given to the quality of the instruction. The overall rating was 2.60, but considerable variation occurred between the ratings of faculty and administrators. Administrators were much more critical than faculty, with average scores of 2.93 and 2.40, respectively. While 63% of the faculty rated the quality of teaching as excellent or very good, only 34% of the administrators did. Comments made by the respondents indicated a wide variation in quality. Several blamed the 24 contact-hour workload, and a need for coordination across the three campuses was noted by several of the respondents.

The next highest rating by the staff was given to placement service with a score of 2.64. This service was one of the few that administrators rated more
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 3</th>
<th>RATING OF SERVICES AND ACTIVITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total*</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Teaching aids</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Instructional Resource Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Quality of the instruction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Vocational and career counseling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Academic counseling and advising</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Placement Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Other support services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Coordination of programs/courses offered on more than one campus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) Recruitment of staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k) Flexibility in class scheduling to permit multiple entry points and early completion by students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l) College's efforts to assure program quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m) Planning and implementing new programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n) Reviewing and revising existing programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentage based on all respondents (including 14 other staff and those not answering the question). All other percentages and the average scores for each group based on respondents answering the specific question.
TABLE 4
RATING OF SERVICES AND ACTIVITIES BY FACULTY AT EACH CAMPUS
(average scores)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service/Activity</th>
<th>Fort Omaha</th>
<th>South Omaha</th>
<th>Southwest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Facilities</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Teaching aids</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Instructional Resource Center</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Quality of the instruction</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Vocational and career counseling</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Academic counseling and advising</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Placement Service</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Other support services</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Coordination of programs/courses offered on more than one campus</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) Recruitment of staff</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k) Flexibility in class scheduling to permit multiple entry points and early completion by students</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l) College’s efforts to assure program quality</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m) Planning and implementing new programs</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n) Reviewing and revising existing programs</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
favorably than faculty (e.g., 57% of the administrators rated it excellent or very good compared to 39% of the faculty). This service was also one with large variations across campuses; faculty at the Southwest campus gave it an average score of 2.60, but those at the South Omaha campus gave it a score of 3.13.

The fifth highest rating among the 14 was given to the facilities (classrooms, laboratories, equipment). This area in the series received the highest proportion of excellent ratings (18%), but it also had the greatest variation among faculties at the different campuses. While the score for all faculty was 2.75, this was boosted by the very favorable rating from the newest campus in service, South Omaha. On this campus 55% of the faculty considered the facilities excellent, 30% very good, and 15% rated them as good—the lowest rating given at that campus since no one rated the facilities as fair or poor. This resulted in a score of 1.60, considerably better than the scores of 3.22 at Southwest and 3.43 at Fort Omaha. Only 19% at Southwest rated facilities as excellent or very good, and at Fort Omaha this proportion was only 17%; no more than 4% at these campuses rated facilities as excellent. At least 8 respondents indicated ratings would improve once the new Elkhorn Valley campus replaced the current Southwest facility.

"Other support services" was ranked sixth of the 14 services and activities with an average score of 2.97. This area apparently was given varying definitions as comments referred to such diverse support services as financial aid, business office, curriculum specialists, and committees. Administrators rated this area higher than faculty (2.80 and 3.10, respectively).

Both vocational/career counseling and academic counseling/advising were rated in the middle of the series of 14 at seventh and eighth, respectively. Some respondents did not differentiate between the two types as seen by similar ratings and comments repeated for both. Faculty viewed counseling more favorably than did administrators. The faculty at South Omaha, however, were most critical. Several respondents suggested counselors needed more exposure to industry, and several were critical of the organization of the service while others claimed the service was uneven. One respondent accused the system of "racism, sexism, economic prejudice."

"Flexibility in class scheduling to permit multiple entry points and early completion by students" was ranked in ninth place, with an average score of 3.17. The biggest difference in ratings between faculty and administrators occurred on this service/activity; faculty gave it an average score of 2.88 (the fifth highest rating) while administrators were more critical, giving it a score of
3.57 (their third worst rating—eleventh). While 43% of the faculty considered it excellent or very good, only 15% of the administrators did; similarly, 28% of the faculty rated it fair or poor compared to 50% of the administrators. The most frequent comment made was that flexibility was limited to only a few areas; its success also was seen as varied.

The College's efforts to assure program quality was given the tenth highest overall rating with a score of 3.20. Administrators were much more critical than faculty (scores of 3.56 and 3.00, respectively); a majority (51%) of administrators gave it a fair or poor rating and none rated it excellent; in contrast, only 29% of the faculty considered the efforts as only fair or poor. Several respondents (faculty and administrators) said it was difficult to assure program quality, given the heavy teaching workload.

The eleventh highest (or fourth lowest) rating was given to "planning and implementing new programs." The average score was 3.35. Half (50%) of the administrators, who were more critical than the faculty, rated the College as fair or poor on this factor. Most comments (6) referred to the process as too slow while several noted it was cumbersome with many barriers and levels of authority, and a few thought the entire idea of program expansion needed further study.

The third lowest rating was given to recruitment of staff, with an average score of 3.36. Almost half (49%) of the faculty gave it the mid-point rating of good, but 51% of the administrators rated it lower (as fair or poor). Six (6) of the respondents pointed to low salaries as the main factor for the College's inability to attract high quality staff; 3 cited the heavy workload. Three (3) also cited a need for more minorities, while 1 charged a "good-old-boy system thrives."

The review and revision of existing programs was given the second lowest score, 3.41. Again, administrators were more critical than faculty (scores of 3.79 and 3.15, respectively); only 5% of the administrators gave this area one of the two highest ratings compared to 26% of the faculty. Again, comments blaming the faculty's heavy workload were made more often than any other, but some suggested a formalized system or overall plan was lacking and that the process was slow. A few felt programs were retained, perhaps, out of habit.

The most critical problem facing the College—based on the ratings of 14 services and activities—was the coordination of programs and courses offered on more than one campus. More than half (57%) of the respondents gave the
College a fair or poor grade in this area. Three-fourths (75%) of the administrators rated the College in these two categories; no one said the College was doing an excellent job in this area, and only 12% said it deserved a "very good" rating. Although both faculty and administrators gave this area their lowest scores, and although an apparent high consensus occurred in respondents' ratings, volunteered comments ranged widely. While most saw a need for less competition and greater cooperation and consistency, several cited a need for greater campus flexibility or indicated differences were due to varying campus populations. While a few blamed administrators, at least 1 felt faculty were not committed to coordination, and 1 blamed the distances between campuses.

In summary, the ratings of services and activities by Metro Tech's professional staff indicated some strengths but also pointed to some areas needing improvement. The latter included planning and implementing new programs, reviewing and revising existing programs, and coordinating programs and courses offered on more than one campus.

The next section will focus on two questions which probed these areas--one asking about unmet educational needs and another focusing on program expansion.

IV. Unmet Needs and Program Expansion

The professional staff were asked, "Are there any educational needs that you feel Metro Tech should be attempting to meet but is not meeting now?" More than half (58% or 79 respondents) said there were unmet needs, and almost all of them suggested some area. The need mentioned most frequently was for a general studies program; this was mentioned specifically by 16 respondents with 4 more suggesting the need for a transfer program or greater transferability of credits. A number of respondents listed specific programs or courses which they felt should be taught at Metro; Diesel Mechanics and Machining were the only programs listed by more than one respondent.

Other needs listed by 2 or 3 respondents each were: better relations with business and industry, career education, greater concern for the needs of Dodge and Washington Counties, and better testing and preparation of students who need remedial assistance. The complete list of responses is included in the Appendix.

Another question was intended to explore the general policy options available to the College concerning new and current programs. The options offered the respondents were: a) expand program offerings for new occupations, b) keep current program offerings, c) drop a program before adding a new program.
offering, and d) reduce the number of program offerings. Although the question was thought to offer mutually exclusive options, the 124 respondents who answered the question (12 or 9% did not) indicated 155 preferences. Approximately 70% favored expanded program offerings for new occupations. Approximately 29% preferred to maintain the status quo. Ten percent (10%) favored keeping the number of programs constant, and therefore one program had to be dropped before another could be added. Five percent (5%) favored the reduction of the number of programs offered. See Table 5.

Administrators were slightly more likely than faculty to favor expansion into new programs; 75% of the administrators chose this option compared to 65% of the faculty. The overall faculty proportion was reduced by the smaller support for this idea on the South Omaha campus (only 50% supported this option there compared to 70% and 73% at the Southwest and Fort Omaha campuses, respectively). The status quo was more likely to be favored by faculty (especially at the Fort Omaha and Southwest campuses) than by administrators; 31% of all faculty (33% at the Fort Omaha and Southwest campuses) but only 18% of the administrators indicated preferences for this option. Support for options involving dropping current programs was slightly more likely to be favored by administrators than faculty.

The volunteered comments made in conjunction with this question often modified or elaborated upon the checked responses which were used in the analysis above. For instance, some respondents suggested that current programs should be evaluated and dropped if found wanting but that this should be done independently of any decisions about program expansion. Similarly, a number of respondents indicated that a focus on or priority for assuring the quality of current programs should be established. These comments could be found in conjunction with any of the four policy options and among those who did not answer the question. Some suggested community need as a criterion for adding or eliminating a program, but others referred to costs and cost efficiency (the latter relating cost and enrollment).

V. Perceived Strengths of Metro Tech

The professional staff were asked to "list two of Metro Tech's major strengths in performing its mission." This section will discuss these strengths. The full list is included in the Appendix.

Metro Tech's greatest strength, according to its professional staff, was its professional staff. Half (61) of the respondents answering the question cited
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Notice</th>
<th>Total (N=136)</th>
<th>Faculty Fort Omaha (N=30)</th>
<th>Faculty South Omaha (N=20)</th>
<th>Faculty Southwest (N=27)</th>
<th>Administration Total (N=78)</th>
<th>Staff (N=44)</th>
<th>Administration Staff (N=14)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expand program offerings for new occupations</td>
<td>95 70%</td>
<td>22 73%</td>
<td>10 50%</td>
<td>19 70%</td>
<td>51 65%</td>
<td>33 75%</td>
<td>11 79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep current program offerings</td>
<td>40 29%</td>
<td>10 33%</td>
<td>5 25%</td>
<td>9 33%</td>
<td>24 31%</td>
<td>8 18%</td>
<td>8 57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drop a program offering before adding a new program offering</td>
<td>13 10%</td>
<td>3 10%</td>
<td>3 15%</td>
<td>1 4%</td>
<td>7 9%</td>
<td>5 11%</td>
<td>1 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce the number of program offerings</td>
<td>7 5%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 5%</td>
<td>1 4%</td>
<td>2 3%</td>
<td>3 7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentages are based on the number of respondents, and therefore exceed 100% as some respondents indicated more than one policy preference.*
the staff, and almost one-third of these referred to their dedication. Other adjectives used included committed, motivated, caring, and sincere. Some respondents focused on the faculty, some simply said Metro Tech's strength was its staff without specifying their roles, and others stressed they meant faculty, administration, secretaries, and other support staff. Occasionally they used the question on strengths as an opportunity to note a weakness—e.g., "dedication of faculty despite extremely high workload" or "a faculty with second incomes."

Almost as many respondents (53) referred to Metro Tech's occupational-technical programs as one of its strengths. Many stressed the quality of the programs, but many cited the number or variety of programs available. Approximately 15 staff members saw the College's program response to community needs and the needs of business and industry as one of its major strengths.

Eight (8) respondents stressed the College's flexibility, usually referring to new or revised programs or to other aspects of serving the students (e.g., scheduling). Some simply cited their openness to new ideas and change.

A number of respondents placed their emphasis on the staff's concern for students and the support programs instituted in response to this. Some of the 30 respondents who mentioned strengths in this category stressed the individualized instruction and small personalized courses and personalized counseling/advising services. Others noted a "pro-student orientation" and "student-centered" operations and services. A number of other respondents specified the role of such support services as vocational and career counseling, academic advising, and job placement. A few mentioned support courses at Metro as one of its strengths.

Related to this focus on students, perhaps, were references to the growth of enrollment (2) and factors which contributed to it—i.e., ease of physical access because of multiple locations (12), low tuition (10), the open admissions policy (6), and efforts to recruit minority and training minority and handicapped students (3).

Another large group of professional staff pointed to Metro Tech's facilities (and equipment) as one of its greatest assets. Of the 18 respondents who cited this as a strength, almost half (8 or 44%) were at the South Omaha campus (South Omaha represented 28% of all respondents). Some Fort Omaha respondents (4 faculty and 3 administrators) also cited facilities as a strength. Only 3 Southwest respondents made comments in this category, and 1 said "construction of facilities" (presumably the Elkhorn Valley campus) and another of them
specified equipment.

Six (6) staff members referred to the College's community relations efforts including advertising and advisory committees.

Approximately 6% of the comments (13 of the 219 comments made by the 122 staff members who answered this question) were classified as miscellaneous and contained such suggested strengths as: "strong desire to do the right thing in performing its mission," "minimum of academic elitism or snobbery," "high performance for dollars spent," "personal involvement of college board," and the fact that Metro Tech was the only community college in the area.

VI. Areas Needing Improvement

A useful evaluation of Metropolitan Technical Community College should also produce information which would enable the College to improve. Therefore, professional staff were asked to "list two areas needing improvement in the performance of its mission." The volume of responses to this question was similar to the question on strengths; 120 respondents listed approximately 217 areas needing improvement (122 respondents listed 219 strengths).

A large number of the comments about areas needing improvement were classified as related to organization and administration. Chief among these referred to the problem of inter-campus relations. Most of the 13 commenting about this area suggested greater consistency or uniformity on the three campuses, but 1 suggested greater campus flexibility, and 1 merely asked that the problem of "central versus campus administration" be resolved. Elimination of the duplicated programs was also mentioned by 1 respondent.

At least 5 staff saw the need for clearer role descriptions, while 3 addressed themselves to decision-making responsibilities (2 stressed a need for fewer committees and committee involvement in decision-making; 2 spoke generally about a need for reorganization, but 1 suggested having a Dean of Instruction as a line rather than staff position). One (1) suggested a need for greater accountability, and another said administrative priorities had to be redesigned.

Ten (10) staff members focused on the need for better communication, both between campuses and within each campus. Communication problems might also be a factor in the conflict between faculty and administration that was noted by 5 respondents, and at least 1 of these referred to the need for a "climate of trust and cooperation." The conflict between faculty and administration was also evident in the criticism of administrators made by 6 faculty and 1 "other staff"; most of these comments referred to the quantity of administrators but some referred to their quality.
Several comments went beyond the administration. Five (5) comments were made suggesting a need to clarify missions—e.g., recognizing that occupational-vocational education was different from traditional education but also realizing not all occupational-vocational education was identical and "for the college to admit it can't be all things to all people." Four (4) respondents were critical of the board.

Approximately 50 comments were made related to faculty and faculty needs. Ten (10) staff members complained about the workload being too heavy. Eight (8) commented about the need for higher salaries. Seven (7) spoke of problems in the recruitment and retention of qualified staff. The need to attract high quality staff was noted by 9 respondents. The need for time and other support for professional and personal development of the staff was noted by 8 respondents. An improved institutional climate—e.g., "more faith in . . . instructors," and "treating faculty, staff, and students as people and not machines" was noted by 4 faculty members. Four (4) referred to problems related to the use of part-time instructors (2 of these comments suggested providing better orientation for them). Several other comments related to the development of personal policies were also noted.

Of the 28 comments related to programs, 10 specifically noted a concern for program quality. A need for new programs and courses was mentioned by 9, including a need for more electives, general studies, and cooperative education. More continuing education courses and workshops were suggested by 5 faculty and administrators. The 4 comments related to individualized instruction as an area needing improvement could also be included in this general area.

An almost equal number of respondents (29) cited public relations and information as an area needing improvement.

Comments related to students and student support services were made by 27 respondents. Eight (8) cited counseling or advising; (1 of these asked for more counselors while another cited the need for more counselees); the job placement service was cited by 2 respondents as needing improvements. Seven (7) mentioned a need for more instructional support; 1 of these said more attention needed to be given to the basics before a student could be successful. Five (5) saw a need for more interest, attention, or communication focused upon students. Three (3) respondents saw a need for entrance exams and three (3) were for stricter standards to judge progress.

Facilities and equipment (including printed materials) needs were cited by 9 respondents (two-thirds of whom were faculty at the Southwest campus).
Four (4) respondents saw needs related to recruitment, with 3 of them seeing a need to do more recruitment in high schools or among recent high school graduates.

Finally, 13 responses were coded as miscellaneous, including a request for semesters, better class scheduling, and more efficient use of available funds.

The respondents were also asked to add any other comments they wished at the end of the questionnaire. Generally, these statements repeated their earlier views, and these themes have been reported throughout this report. These comments are reproduced, however, in the Appendix.

VI. Conclusion

The survey administered to the professional staff at Metropolitan Technical Community College indicated that they saw many areas of success but that the need for improvement existed also.

Most respondents thought the College was mostly successful in achieving its missions and goals. For example, 78% said it was very or mostly successful in the overall achievement of its missions and goals; the proportion making these same evaluations about the individual missions or goals ranged from a high of 89% to a low of 48%. The staff were most critical of the College's attempt to provide the environment or institutional climate needed to accomplish the educational missions and of its attempt to communicate its missions to the public.

Similarly, most evaluations of 14 specific services and activities were favorable, but some weaknesses were noted, especially in reviewing current programs, coordinating the programs and courses offered across several campuses, and in planning new programs.

The educational need cited most frequently as being unmet by Metro Tech was a program of general studies. The staff were also surveyed about a policy related to program expansion/retention/reduction, and most favored expansion of program offerings without necessarily reducing current programs.

Metro's major strengths were its professional staff and the quality and variety of its occupational and technical programs. Among the areas cited as needing improvement were its organization and administration; the needs of faculty—primarily reduced workload, increased salary, and increased opportunity for professional and personal development—were also frequently noted.
APPENDIX I:

Questionnaire with Frequency Distribution
1. At which campus location do you do most of your work?
   40% Ft. Omaha
   28% South Omaha
   30% Southwest Omaha
   Other (please specify: ______________________)

2. What is your position at Metropolitan Technical Community College?
   57% Faculty
   32% Administration — Skip to Question 7
   10% Other staff — Skip to Question 7

3. Is your position
   100% full-time
   part-time

4. What is your teaching area at Metro Tech? ____________________________________________

5. When do you teach most of your students?
   morning
   afternoon
   evening
   other (please specify: ______________________)

6. How many years have you been teaching (including all teaching experience)? Mean = 8 years (median = 6 years)
   1 year = 17%
   2-3 years = 25%
   4-5 years = 34%
   6+ years = 24%
   Average = 4 years

7. How many years have you been employed at Metropolitan Technical Community College?
   2-3 years = 25%
   4-5 years = 34%
   6+ years = 24%
   Average = 4 years

8. How successful do you think Metro Tech has been in achieving the following missions and goals?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Mostly</th>
<th>Mostly</th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>N.A.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Successful</td>
<td>Successful</td>
<td>Unsuccessful</td>
<td>Unsuccessful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Providing high-quality education</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Providing comprehensive occupational and technical career education programs</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Providing useful general studies courses and continuing education programs</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Providing a comprehensive program of student services</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Providing individualized instructional support</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Promoting an institutional climate which enhances trust, confidence and cooperation</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Providing an environment for staff to achieve their professional and personal goals</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Communicating College missions to the public</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Overall achievement of missions and goals</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. Please list two of Metro Tech's major strengths in performing its mission.

1. See Appendix for List

2. See Appendix for List

10. Please list two areas needing improvement in the performance of its mission.

1. See Appendix for List

2. See Appendix for List

11. Are there any educational needs that you feel Metro Tech should be attempting to meet, but is not meeting now?

58% yes  no

11a. What are these needs? See Appendix for List

12. How would you rate the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>N.A.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Facilities (classrooms, laboratories, equipment)</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Teaching aids (supplies, material, etc.)</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Instructional Resource Centers</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Quality of the instruction</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Vocational and career counseling</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Academic counseling and advising</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Placement service</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Other support services</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Coordination of programs/courses offered on more than one campus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Recruitment of staff</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Flexibility in class scheduling to permit multiple entry points and early completion by students</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. College's efforts to assure program quality</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Planning and implementing new programs</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Reviewing and revising existing programs</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Should Metro Tech:

70% expand program offerings for new occupations
29% keep the current program offerings
10% drop a program offering before adding a new program offering
5% reduce the number of program offerings

Comment: See Appendix for List
14. What is the highest level of education you have completed?
   - Did not complete high school (11%)
   - Completed high school (26%)
   - Completed vocational or technical training beyond high school (39%)
   - Some college (13%)
   - Associate's degree or equivalent (11%)
   - Bachelor's degree (26%)
   - Master's degree (39%)
   - Doctorate degree (13%)

15. What is your age category?
   - <25 (1%)
   - 25 - 29 (12%)
   - 30 - 39 (43%)
   - 40 - 49 (25%)
   - 50 - 59 (14%)
   - 60+ (4%)

16. What is your sex?
   - Male (59%)
   - Female (38%)

17. Any other comments which would be helpful in the Metropolitan Technical Community College planning process?

   See Appendix for List
APPENDIX II:

Coding Instructions
### CODING INSTRUCTIONS

For Survey of MTCC Professional Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Column</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Variable Name</th>
<th>Value Labels (O=N.A., N.A.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1        | 4      | 1        | Campus location | 1. Fort Omaha  
2. South Omaha  
3. Southwest Omaha  
4. Other (hospital)  
5. All campuses, area wide |
| 2        | 5      | 2        | Position       | 1. Faculty  
2. Administration  
3. Other staff |
| 3        | 6      | 3        | Work hour      | 1. Full time  
2. Part time |
| 4        | 7-8    | 4        | Teaching area  | (See list) |
| 5        | 9      | 5        | When teach     | 1. Morning  
2. Afternoon  
3. Evening  
4. Morning and evening  
5. Morning and afternoon  
6. Morning, afternoon, and evening  
7. Afternoon and evening  
8. Varies |
| 6        | 10-11  | 6        | Years teaching | (Code as is) |
| 7        | 12-13  | 7        | Years at MTCC  | (Code as is) |
| 8a       | 14     | 8        | How is MTCC    | 1. Very successful  
2. Mostly successful  
3. Mostly unsuccessful  
4. Very unsuccessful |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Column</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Variable Name</th>
<th>Value Labels (O=N.A., N.A.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Educational needs</td>
<td>1. yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12a</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>1. Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12b</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Very good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12c</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12d</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12e</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12f</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Expand</td>
<td>1. Marked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12g</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Keep</td>
<td>2. Not marked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12h</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Add &amp; Drop</td>
<td>3. None of this group marked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12i</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Reduce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12j</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12k</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12l</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12m</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12n</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Highest education</td>
<td>1. Less than H.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. H.S. graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Vocational beyond H.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Some college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Associates degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. Bachelor's degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. Master's degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8. Doctorate degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1. &lt; 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. 25–29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. 30–39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. 40–49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. 50–59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. 60+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1. Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Field</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Psychology/Sociology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>Secretarial Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>Management/Marketing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>Business Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>Social Science-Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Criminal Justice/Private Security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Automotive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>AMT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Allied Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Electronics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Dental Assisting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Ornamental Horticulture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Practical Nursing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>T &amp; I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Commercial Art</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Welding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Drafting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Photography</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Apparel Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>BWS, FIN, RES, EDP, ECC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>SES, EDP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Interior Design Assistant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Accounting/Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>COA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Eng &amp; Tech.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Natural Science and Horticulture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>HRM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Auto Parts Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Child Care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX III:

Open-Ended Comments
Question 9

Please list two of Metro Tech's major strengths in performing its mission.

001 - Some very dedicated staff members
001 - Good support services - e.g., student services, financial aid, learning resources, and instructional media.
002 - High quality people in classroom
002 - Personal involvement of college board
003 - Dedicated faculty until they are burnt out
004 - Personalized student advisement/counseling
004 - Inexpensive tuition
005 - Good facilities
005 - Willingness to try new things and expand into new areas
006 - Dedication of faculty despite extremely high workload
006 - Generally effective leadership at division level
007 - Physical facilities
007 - A "few" extremely capable staff
008 - Recruiting excellent faculty
008 - Recruiting under-represented students
009 - Offering vocational technical programs where there have been none.
009 - Offering an inexpensive educational opportunity to many disadvantaged publics
010 - Individualized instructional support
010 - Dedicated administration and faculty
011 - Recruiting minority and handicapped students
012 - Quality and attitude of staff and administration and secretaries.
012 - Pro-student orientation
013 - Physical facilities and equipment
013 - Dedicated personnel
014 - Comprehensive programs
014 - Flexibility in scheduling classes
015 - Highly trained and motivated faculty
015 - Only community college in area
016 - Concerned, well-prepared faculty
016 - Wide variety of program offerings
017 - Dedicated staff who work long hours and well together
017 - Increased visibility (advertising, career programs, etc.)
018 - Dedicated faculty and middle management
018 - Providing mostly successful occupational education
021 - Facilities
021 - Faculty
022 - Proximity
023 - Faculty
023 - Willingness to change
026 - Good facilities
026 - Competent instructors
027 - Excellent facilities
027 - Campus location
030 - Has the potential for a fine educational institution
030 - Some very competent personnel who are willing to contribute much to the college
031 - Faculty
031 - Facilities and equipment
034 - Strong and dedicated faculty
034 - Providing occupational and technical training
Question 9, cont.

035 - Buildings
035 - Faculty

036 - The college is open to the general population
036 - The counseling department is very strong

037 - A wide variety of relevant programs for today's occupations
037 - Good student support services
038 - Its counseling department

039 - Construction of three separate campuses in limited period of time
039 - Maintaining a consistent growth in student enrollment

040 - Commitment of most faculty
040 - Attention to most needs of community

041 - Good nature of faculty towards each other
041 - Having three campuses

042 - Has some good ideas (educational), but is lacking in implementation.

043 - Students who complete programs are very well qualified
043 - Considering pay scale, instructors are extremely well qualified

044 - Variety of programs
044 - Dedicated staff
045 - Quality of teachers

045 - The percentage of students placed in their field of training
046 - Working to provide community needs
046 - Working to provide student needs

047 - Growth and development, especially physical plant acquisition.
048 - Facilities

048 - Quick response to occupational needs
049 - Providing a core of support courses in most programs
049 - Providing educational opportunities in 3 campus locations
Question 9, cont.

050 - Provide vocational-technical programs
050 - Work closely with students
051 - Offer a variety of programs and courses to the public
051 - Meet the needs of the various community groups
052 - It serves a wide variety of people in the community
052 - Continues to offer new programs as need arises
053 - Has promoted the college to the public most successfully
053 - Has provided high level of vocational programs
054 - Offer wide variety of educational experiences
054 - Meet the needs of underprivileged and minority groups
055 - Community involvement and advertising
055 - Hiring quality instructors
056 - Community effort - public relations
056 - Number of program offerings
057 - Vocational technical training
057 - Counseling and career development
058 - Active staff members
058 - Generosity of institution to employees
059 - Holding fees and offering programs within reach of a vast majority of people
059 - Keeping in touch with business and industry to keep programs viable
061 - Dedication of staff
061 - Instructional support
062 - Dedication on the part of a small group of administration and staff
062 - Ability to meet community needs in specific areas
063 - Small personalized classes
063 - Diversity of programs
Question 9, cont.

064 - Strong, dedicated faculty and staff

064 - Good physical facilities

065 - Quality of hard technology courses

065 - Good faculty and administrative leadership

066 - The college and its staff are very flexible in most situations

066 - For the most part a very hard working staff

067 - Construction of facilities

068 - Responsive to community needs

068 - Open admissions

069 - Especially dedicated instructional staff

069 - Available and affordable programs and courses

070 - Cost of education (for the student)

070 - The different amount of programs

071 - Lack of coordination in public image

072 - Good administration and staff

072 - Good course offerings

073 - Placement of students

073 - Competency in career field

074 - Special programs

074 - Ind. standards

075 - Present locations of South and Southwest campuses

075 - Experienced faculty

076 - Good technical education

077 - Faculty (Hardworking and dedicated while underpayed)

077 - Broad range of technical programs
Question 9, cont.

078 - Comprehensive occupational and technical training

078 - Overall achievement of goals and objectives

079 - Comprehensive technical education

079 - Individual self-paced instruction

080 - Strengths in technical areas

080 - Good equipment

081 - I feel at this time we have none. I believe we are floating along with no direction and political infighting on the board is so strong that the concern for students and future students has been completely forgotten.

082 - Caring instructors

083 - Career programs that lead to employment for students

083 - Services designed to consider the needs and convenience of students

084 - Strength of staff

085 - Program offerings are appropriate

085 - Excellent staff

087 - Low tuition rate

087 - Excellent job placement staff

088 - Offering a variety of vocational programs

088 - Meeting individual needs of a variety of students

089 - Faculty

089 - Job placement services/low tuition

090 - Easy access-entrance

090 - Low tuition rates/financial services

091 - Generally, a positive, or success approach toward education

091 - Minimum of academic elitism or snobbery

092 - Good business programs

092 - Good technical programs
Question 9, cont.

093 - Short term, intensive training leading to program completion
093 - Easy access, low cost, open entry policy
094 - Extremely dedicated faculty who care about their students
094 - Student service and development is extensive
095 - Heuristic growth of programs
095 - High performance for dollars spent
096 - Top level administration
096 - Willingness to be open for new ideas and change
097 - Meeting broad range of community
097 - Supplying broad range of programs
098 - Offering programs that are needed
098 - Qualified staff
099 - Growth of F.T.E.
099 - Admissions Policy
102 - Providing different entry levels for the student
103 - Provides opportunity for useful life supporting occupational skills to the individual
103 - Provides useful preparation service to the community
104 - Technical programs essential to commercial industries
104 - Ease of access to large number of students
105 - A faculty with second incomes
105 - A lot of facilities
108 - Recruiting and retaining of students
108 - Three available campuses to attend - accessibility
109 - Staff
110 - Dedicated faculty
111 - Good personnel - in many areas
Question 9, cont.

112 - Its accessibility
112 - The relative low price of tuition fees
113 - There has been a strong desire to do the right thing in performing its mission
113 - It is a young college and there is no way but up, but the up must be done with logic
114 - Concern for students progress
114 - Selection of staff for individualized instruction
115 - The complete dedication to the college's mission and goals
115 - The college's vocational and career counseling program
116 - Contact with industry needs
116 - Sincere people
117 - Good selection of programs
118 - A variety of courses for credit and non-credit
119 - Preparation for the world of work
119 - Adapt to students needs - financially and academically
120 - Quality of staff
120 - Facilities
121 - Faculty
121 - Facilities
122 - Community need
122 - Dedicated staff
123 - Professional faculty
123 - Facilities
124 - By hiring better qualified staff
124 - Constantly updating their programs
125 - Dedicated faculty and staff
126 - Ability to instill pride in students
126 - Teacher concern for students
127 - Student centered operational methods and services

128 - Wide variety of associate degree programs

128 - Easy accessibility city-wide

129 - Dedicated staff

129 - Fills a need in the community

130 - Metro is fortunate to have dedicated faculty and staff who are concerned about students

130 - The college meets many needs of the community

131 - Qualified Faculty

131 - Commitment of staff

132 - Dedicated faculty and staff

132 - Developmental studies program

133 - Open to a wide variety of students

134 - Community outreach/publicity/public awareness efforts

134 - IRC at my campus is well-equipped and holds a fairly comprehensive collection. Very useful to me, and I assume to students. Hope its support will be increased, or at least maintained.

135 - Providing high quality career programs

135 - Locating campuses to meet the needs of each area that the college serves

136 - Advisory committees

136 - New president with more curriculum experience
Question 10

Please list two areas needing improvement in the performance of its mission.

001 - Better quality of instruction
001 - Better assurance of academic program quality
002 - Lower work loads for faculty
002 - The piecemeal charade of individualized instruction
003 - A training session for part-time staff. This would be directed by a full-time faculty member who covers the same courses. Only in this way can we ensure that the objectives are the same for a course.
003 - Objectives need to be the same on each campus and also tests standard.
004 - Increased public relation activities
004 - Increased career help for special needs students
005 - Improvement in attitude of all personnel toward high administration and vice versa.
005 - Reduction in staff turnover.
006 - Relationship image within service area
006 - Faculty salaries and workload are respectively too low and too high
007 - To use capable staff and other resources where they will maximize benefits in the College.
007 - Hiring the "best" person for some of our advertised positions has not occurred too often in the past.
008 - Too many administrators
008 - Too many incompetent, untruthful administrators
009 - Business services are vastly insensitive to the publics it is supposed to serve.
009 - Quality of instruction is much less than it should be.
010 - Public relations with community and local education institutions
010 - Recruit in high schools
012 - More recognition of value of staff and administration and positive aspect of high morale and dedication.
013 - Coordination among intercampus concerns like Assessment testing and textbook selection
013 - Weakness in curriculum development to keep pace with new technology and the job market
014 - Stricter standards in the classroom
014 - "Weed out" students who do not progress satisfactorily
015 - Faculty load too heavy
015 - P.R. to area
016 - Treating faculty, staff, and students as people and not machines (teaching or otherwise) and fodder for the institution
016 - Insuring student success by proper placement in programs and courses
017 - Improved printed materials
017 - Resolvement of central vs. campus administration
018 - A governing board which is less divided and more concerned about faculty, staff, and quality education.
018 - Personnel policies which promote trust and loyalty
021 - Better college/Community relations (PR)
021 - Reducing faculty workload and improving faculty salary
022 - Recruitment of recent H.S. grads
023 - Counseling/placement/recruitment
023 - Increased professionalism
026 - Need entrance level exams
026 - Positive program goals
027 - Lack of full time instructors in some areas
030 - Establish standards of learning minimum competencies
030 - Ensure all students graduating possess minimum job entry level skills
031 - Serve the needs of all the people by expanding course offerings
031 - Streamline the excessive administration
034 - Public image
034 - Additional technology program offerings
035 - Maintenance staff
035 - Security
Question 10, cont.

036 - Need to expand the developmental areas
036 - Need to increase the number of counselors
037 - Providing developmental level courses
037 - Providing programs for students at varying skill levels
038 - Individualization
038 - Inadequate instructors
039 - Sense of unity and enthusiasm among staff members
039 - Consistent high quality in faculty
040 - Increasing the awareness of the community towards the services MTCC provides
040 - Smooth delivery of services
041 - Communications between administration and faculty
041 - Quality of material being taught in all classes - some classes are a waste of student money
042 - Too many classes are "stacked" in same hour. Instructor is ignored in both salary and work load complaints.
042 - Student also suffers - community image goes!
043 - There needs to be better intra- and inter-campus communication
043 - Faculty are overloaded, unable to do their best
044 - Staff development program
044 - Redefine role of various staff members
045 - Giving instructors more time to update their curriculum
045 - Salaries are not realistic
046 - More freedom for teachers to improve
046 - Better quarters for teaching
047 - Continuing education could offer better (and more) services
047 - Quality checking of programs
048 - High quality instructors
048 - Monitoring of instructor performance
Question 10, cont.

049 - Better support of public to community college education

049 - Improved attitude toward our college by staff

050 - Quality education

050 - Meaningful continuing education courses

051 - Offer continuing education workshops for staff and public

051 - Better orientation for part-time faculty

052 - Making staff development and inservices available to all staff

053 - Needs to keep current with the need for new programs

053 - Lack of communication within college between administration and faculty

054 - Need to offer continuing education workshops for faculty and community

055 - Emphasis on retention of faculty for consistency

055 - Climate of trust and cooperation

056 - Curriculum development and guidance

056 - Public image

057 - College should be able to offer an academic transfer program

057 - Greater campus flexibility is needed to design programs to meet student needs at each campus

058 - Rearrangement of organizational structure

058 - Clearer delineation of roles and responsibilities

059 - Improve working relationship with other educational institutions

059 - Recruit the highest level of faculty and improve conditions for retention of same

061 - Consistency between campuses

061 - More support from board is needed

062 - Program evaluation

062 - Quality instructors, program heads

063 - Better match of student needs and educational needs

063 - Need to attract more students from high schools
064 - Student counseling
064 - Less board involvement in day to day management
065 - Equal quality of programs on each campus
065 - More efficient use of available funds
066 - Difficulty in coordination on like programs between campuses
066 - At times there is a lack of communication between different college areas
067 - Recruitment and retention of qualified professional staff
067 - Improved institutional climate which would foster excellence in teaching
068 - Freedom and opportunity for exchange of views; debate
068 - More faith in its instructors, teachers; less apparatus
069 - Definition of and commitment to qualify in instruction
069 - Attract more highly qualified instructional staff
070 - Facilities
070 - Better class scheduling
071 - Acquiring and retaining high caliber faculty with better incentives
072 - Physical environment needs improvement
073 - Time to develop programs and support areas
073 - More of the right equipment
074 - Quality programs
074 - Educational materials
075 - New board of governors
075 - Fewer administration
076 - Institution is not fully committed to some of its programs
077 - Money for faculty and equipment
077 - Slow down and not be everything to everyone
078 - Lack of good public relations promoting our college
078 - Lack of interest in students on campus
Question 10, cont.

079 - Providing an environment for staff to achieve their personal and professional goals

079 - Providing instructional support

080 - Building image

080 - Improving in public relations

081 - Need to look at other trade and vocational programs - leave business to four year schools

081 - Need to pay instructors more money to attract better ones

082 - Administrators who don't owe favors

082 - More attention given to students and not administration

083 - College-wide coordination of programs and services

083 - More definition to the role and function of offices and services

084 - Better delineation of who is responsible for what

084 - Have instructional dean in line position, not staff

085 - Career development programs

087 - The image of our college needs improvement

087 - Need improvement in the PR area

088 - More realistic job descriptions

088 - Need more emphasis on student educational needs and quality and quantity of professional teaching staff

089 - Public relations - improve our community image

090 - Entrance and retention requirements

090 - Semesters rather than quarters

091 - All support courses should now be redesigned to fit in a voc-tech environment

091 - Reluctance of middle administration to get behind improvements that I'm sure they perceive as being needed

092 - Build morale of employees - provide for promotion for quality employees and facilitate self actualization

092 - Build public relations image
Question 10, cont.

093 - Strive for more uniformity among campuses

093 - Policies should be spelled out more clearly relating to faculty and staff

094 - Mini courses and seminars related to personal goals but tied in to a curriculum for credit

094 - More or more effective job placement of graduates

095 - Lowering number of part-time instructors

095 - Focus on quality of instruction

096 - Unite each campus

096 - Open channels of communication

097 - Support for professional development of staff

098 - Cooperative education program

098 - Public relations office

099 - Public relations

099 - Update equipment

102 - More resources and personnel should be applied to the function of classroom instruction

103 - That occupational and traditional education are not the same in objectivity or function

103 - That all career occupation—vocational or technical—education is not the same

104 - Physical facilities. Southwest is improved by Elkhorn Valley

104 - Need less rigid academic course offerings and more supportive course development

105 - Work load

105 - Administrative integrity

106 - Improvement of program quality

106 - Marketing plan

107 - Public information

108 - Counseling - get the word out to more students - a little P.R.
Question 10, cont.

108 - Offutt way needed to get larger enrollment
110 - Administrative priorities need redesign
111 - Organization
111 - Accountability
112 - Program instructional quality
112 - Employee salary rates
113 - To make the public better informed as to what Metro is and can do!
113 - To bring the three campus concept together as one unit.
114 - More communication with students
114' - Grievance committee to work with students
115 - Communication with the public
115 - Better communications within the college
116 - Public relations
116 - Staff development (good staff development people no times set aside)
117 - Better coordination between department
119 - Establish definite guidelines for program requirements
120 - Cut down on the number of committees
121 - More decisions should be made by administrators, not by committees
122 - Closer contact and cooperation with industry
122 - Reputation in industry
123 - Ability of the college to make necessary decisions
124 - More time is needed for the student to learn a program
124 - Basics are needed before a student can be successful in a program
125 - Eliminate duplicated programs
125 - Slim down area wide administration
127 - Improve program quality in those that are lacking
127 - Public awareness on specific program offerings
Question 10, cont.

128 - Facility improvement - Fort Omaha

128 - Positive publicity

129 - Need to review admissions requirements to include ability to succeed in programs which will enhance quality of education and student body

129 - For the college to admit it can't be all things to all people and proceed accordingly.

130 - There is a great need for the direction of the institution to be determined and communicated regularly to the faculty, staff, and community.

130 - There are a number of problems with the management system (i.e., reporting functions) of the three campuses as it relates to central administration. Functions and accountability should be clearly defined

131 - More general studies courses (range of electives within programs)

131 - Better counseling of new enrollees as to career potential

132 - Meeting needs - professional and personal - of faculty

133 - Provide a lower teaching load so staff can stay current

134 - Teaching load (in Business and Humanities) is much too heavy to support either quality education or to provide an atmosphere conducive to the support of faculty personal/professional goals. Academic divisions should not be treated the same as T&I. This simplistic policy is harmful to all concerned.

134 - The institutional climate needs improvement. There is too much friction and competition for resources between campuses. Faculty-administration relationships have a tradition of being "strained."

135 - Providing a more encouraging professional development program for faculty

135 - Paying faculty a better salary

136 - Faculty turnover (high rate)

136 - Image building/marketing in community
Question 11a

What are any educational needs that you feel Metro Tech should be attempting to meet, but is not meeting now?

002 - Developmental classes are very unevenly used

004 - General studies/humanities

005 - But they are attempting to expand programs and facilities to meet needs of more students all the time

006 - General education is vital to the majority of students at MTCC

007 - A comprehensive curriculum that would include legitimate general studies/education/college transfer courses

008 - The need for high-quality education

009 - There should be a stronger concentration on hard technologies; such examples are millwright, shoe repair technology, computer repair, etc.

012 - Transfer program

013 - Machinists, Boiler Room Operator, FCC Preparation, Semi Truck Driver Training, Engineering, Computer Operation, Office Machine Repair

014 - Transferability of credits

015 - Program for recent high school graduates

016 - General studies

017 - General studies type needs - MAT/PSY

018 - General studies program

019 - General studies program

021 - Law Enforcement Education (Police Science)

022 - Expanded general studies

030 - The student

031 - Many students would like to attend college for academic areas, but lack the funds to attend UNO or Creighton

034 - Program expansions into another campus. Particularly the basics.

036 - Expansion of developmental studies

037 - Programs geared to those who have been out of school many years

039 - Programs that are too restrictive (do not allow for experimentation into other areas). Personal development (health, nutrition, etc.)
Question 11a, cont.

040 - Basic skills development
043 - Basic office-clerical
044 - Need to assess entrance competencies
045 - Our department needs a closer relationship with business and industry
046 - Stronger ties to industry
048 - Diesel mechanic training
049 - Development of career education as a continuing responsibility of students who enroll
057 - Involvement in community and economic development
059 - Construction trades related programs
061 - We should support Dodge/Washington counties more
062 - Diesel Mechanics - trades, i.e., electrical, masonry, etc.
063 - World of work classes - what to expect in an office
065 - I feel there are, but am not familiar with industry needs
067 - Courses in general studies, particularly American Government
068 - Philosophical, religious, and political ignorance and discontent of students
071 - More emphasis on "core" or foundation courses
072 - Numerous vocational trade courses, such as machining, etc.
073 - Teach, teachers to break down the must know of their area
074 - Many
075 - Instructors and divisions need more continuing contact with industry
079 - All around general home economics 2 yr. degree
080 - Extend training in Word Processing and Data Processing areas
083 - No comprehensive Career Development Service
   No system to accommodate the undecided/exploratory student
   No college transfer program
085 - Career development - human development
091 - System of tutoring
Question 11a, cont.

092 - Comprehensive community college education track for students to transfer to 4 yr. institutions

093 - More work towards dual enrollment and area high schools

094 - Better use of advisory council members expertise (such as interrelationship of commercial art and photography looking toward use of video)

095 - Consistent instruction in library/research techniques

103 - Student potential assessment and selected program achievement

104 - More programs need stronger first aid, safety, and occupational responsibility training

105 - An expanded offering in general studies so that we may validly claim to be a "community college" and not simply a trade school

106 - Associate degree in general studies

108 - More management classes offered each quarter

110 - General studies at a "below freshman level"

112 - I feel the continuing education program could use some expansion with more P.R. efforts put into it

113 - To make the out county residents aware of the offerings and treat them as tax payers

115 - To try to regain the general studies classes taken from us by the unicameral

122 - The needs of industry

125 - More advanced soft technology programs

126 - More technical skills at Fort Omaha

127 - Effective human relations training to supplement the technical training

128 - Provide more incentive for talented students

129 - Need support system so that people with special needs do not "fall through the cracks" and disappear

130 - Provide for the varied needs of students through greater options in training, i.e., students with poor basic skills have difficulty in the time needed to upgrade skills and enter program courses - alternatives are needed

131 - English as a second language
134 - The institution desperately needs to address the need for academic assessment and placement of students. We have been "fooling" with this for at least four years. With an open enrollment policy, we get multitudes of students who can neither read nor write, then throw them into classes that they in no way are prepared to handle. This leads to high student attrition, the reinforcement of a psychological "failure syndrome" amongst many students, and places faculty (who are already overworked) in a very untenable situation - trying to meet the needs of such a heterogeneous group of students.

135 - General studies

136 - Courses for students in general studies courses of community interest that may not be part of a program
Question 12a

How would you rate . . . facilities (classrooms, laboratories, equipment)?

002 - Mostly first rank
013 - Probably the best in Omaha for programs covered
034 - Depends on campus referred to
036 - Need to improve and expand the facilities for reading and math
037 - Renovations have been excellent
041 - Students can't learn in rundown buildings
042 - Limited budget at Fort Omaha compared to South Omaha and Southwest
043 - Extensive renovation needed at Fort Omaha
045 - Classrooms are not adequate for programs
046 - Needs improvement
047 - Will move to "good" with opening of Elkhorn Valley. Fort Omaha - a problem
048 - Will improve with Elkhorn
049 - Some still in planning stage, but overall very good
051 - For nursing program - fair
052 - For nursing program - fair
054 - Average of old and new
055 - Our lab and classroom is in no way adequate
057 - Lacks flexibility and functionality in some cases at the Fort
061 - This is changing when Elkhorn Valley opens
067 - Varies by campus
068 - Instruction is only as good as the teacher
072 - Very good equipment, but poor rooms
077 - Elkhorn will correct
079 - When we move to Elkhorn Valley, it will be excellent
083 - Very good except Southwest, which is poor
087 - Facilities will be better in the new building
Question 12a, cont.

091 - Southwest campus only - good

092 - Fair at SW - will improve at Elkhorn Valley

104 - Better at Elkhorn Valley

105 - For 6 years we have taught in a warehouse

109 - Poor - funding

115 - With continued growth this should improve

120 - Need more classroom space. In our area we need more space in lab

123 - Need minor improvements

125 - Need improvement in some areas

127 - Fort Omaha needs improvement

134 - These are improving
Question 12b

How would you rate . . . teaching aids (supplies, material, etc.)?

013 - No trouble securing these items
037 - Too much impersonal use of video equipment in some programs
045 - Programmed materials are excellent
046 - More equipment
049 - More than most colleges of comparable size
068 - Teaching aids are only as good as the teacher
089 - New 16 mm projectors are needed at Southwest
091 - Requests always given consideration
104 - Possibly need to expand petty cash - inflation
123 - Could always use more
Question 12c

How would you rate . . . Instructional Resource Centers?

002 - Require more investment
005 - More time will help develop IRC's
007 - Campus level IRC's need much better service from the CAP unit
009 - Poor use of human resources
013 - South Omaha needs more books
016 - We need more books, faster shelf placement of those ordered, and more A.V. materials and equipment. We need more librarians to provide more services to students and faculty.
018 - The staff of the campus IRC's is great but the backlog of ordered books is disgusting
037 - More orientation for students needed
039 - Expansion is definitely needed
042 - Need better equipment
043 - Excellent A.V.; however, replacements are becoming more difficult
045 - Could work more closely
049 - More than adequate for type of students college enrolls
061 - Collections should be larger
092 - Need more volumes
103 - Would like to know actual use factor
104 - With facility improvement this should be excellent
109 - Limited by facilities
112 - I would like to see our resource material expanded beyond its current limits
120 - Needs to stock more classroom books that are in use
135 - Need a greater variety of books and periodicals
Question 12d

How would you rate the quality of the instruction?

002 - Would be excellent except for a few "poor" teachers
003 - Almost impossible with workload
005 - There needs to be greater coordination of programs on all 3 campuses
006 - Varies widely between instructors
007 - Most faculty have little knowledge of classroom dynamics—a few are improving
008 - 24-contact hours
009 - Quality of instruction is much less than it should be
013 - Most of the comments I have heard have been positive
017 - Too many part-time students
021 - Depending on program area
036 - Generally good, there are problems in some areas
037 - Varies by program—some excellent
039 - Ranges from very good to very bad—not consistent
041 - Some classes are poor
042 - Instructors need training on how to deliver individualized instruction
043 - Instructors could do a better job if not overloaded
045 - All instructors are knowledgeable in their teaching field
049 - Some areas need improvement, but overall very good
061 - Need better monitoring systems
067 - Many instructors have no background in education; lack knowledge of teaching methods
068 - Instructors feel afraid, limited, constrained
075 - Faculty should visit other community colleges
081 - Especially true of business courses—poor instruction
104 - Leadership could make this excellent
105 - Deteriorating because of irrational workloads
108 - Some areas are weak because of laxness
Question 12d, cont.

113 - There are many very good instructors but we have too many who are not good

114 - Students complain about inconsistency in treatment

127 - I see intercampus variations in some programs

134 - Variable across institution. We have many excellent and dedicated faculty who could perform better under more realistic demands.
Question 12e

How would you rate . . . vocational and career counseling?

002 - Unevenly offered - hard to evaluate - not the same at all campuses
006 - No major attempt to counsel students outside of arranging class schedules.
007 - Counseling on our campus is very good, though there is no perceived follow-up.
009 - A couple of counselors maybe should seek employment outside the college.
013 - Most comprehensive free service in the area -- CAT, Voc Evaluation, and HIP
017 - Need more specialized programs
018 - Organization of counseling makes effectiveness very difficult.
021 - More effective placement in programs required (based on ability)
037 - May vary by campus but excellent at Fort Omaha
043 - Resources available, but students are not always encouraged to utilize
045 - Could work harder with faculty
049 - The forgotten part of counseling at college
057 - Need more emphasis in career planning and development
061 - Need more coordination
067 - Need more for use of assessment testing
068 - Racism, sexism, economic prejudice
075 - Counselors need exposure to industry
104 - Doesn't always give clear statement of programs
108 - These counselors should be more available
113 - The whole counseling department needs to be overhauled and redirected.
123 - Counselors need to be more aware of what they're counseling
127 - Very student centered
130 - Vocational counseling lacking in the overall system
Question 12f

How would you rate . . . academic counseling and advising?

002 - Would be excellent if teach loads were lighter
003 - Many times counseling is out of touch with faculty
006 - Time is too limited at registration for adequate advising
009 - A couple of counselors maybe should seek employment outside the college.
013 - We need improvement here
016 - With a 24-hour workload, academic counseling and advising can't possibly be better than "poor."
017 - No guidelines or support
018 - Organization of counseling makes effectiveness difficult
021 - More effective placement in programs required (based on ability)
037 - Excellent on Fort
039 - Too many students being allowed into classes in which they can't succeed.
042 - Advisement day for current students has turned into just another "registration day."
043 - Counseling might be better coordinated with departments
045 - Has really improved
049 - Overdone
057 - Need better system in some divisions
061 - Need more faculty involvement
068 - Racism, sexism, economic prejudice
081 - Lack of good advising and counseling for currently enrolled students
108 - This is a very important area in getting the student.
109 - Counselors - inadequate program knowledge
113 - The whole counseling department needs to be overhauled and redirected.
116 - Improving
118 - Orientation for new students could be better.
134 - Need an assessment and placement system. Faculty should maintain student records for occupational majors.
135 - Need a good faculty advisement program
136 - n/a coordinated effect
Question 12g

How would you rate . . . placement service?

002 - Hard to evaluate. Figures released only relate to graduates.

005 - . . . have done an outstanding job.

007 - Service not too visible to staff or students.

013 - Placement statistics are very impressive.

017 - Information needs better dissemination method.

021 - If conducted through program area faculty - very good

036 - Could improve for students on Fort Omaha campus.

039 - Should be expanded to include all students who wish the service.

043 - Graduates are so well qualified, placement is easy.

045 - Students seem to be well pleased with placements' services.

046 - Stronger ties to community

049 - More work to be done to make it exemplary.

055 - We don't use this or need it at present.

057 - Need better data breakdown on placement by sex and race.

103 - Would like to know actual use factor

104 - Student well prepared will normally find work.

108 - To my knowledge has been very good.

109 - More emphasis

115 - No matter how good we are in this area, we could always improve.

126 - There are problems with industry--prejudice, unions.

127 - Individualized--serves all students

134 - From what I read in Metrogram - appears successful.
Question 12h

How would you rate ... other support services?

006 - Processing of library orders is extremely slow at CAP unit.

007 - What, for instance?!

021 - Generally good, however support services tend to develop "empires" and forget primary mission, that is, support.

043 - Too many committees

045 - Could work more closely together

048 - Financial aid - very good

049 - Adequate

061 - Need automated Business Office.

068 - What is a curriculum specialist?

104 - Rather loosely structured and limited.

113 - There needs to be more coordination of the other services.

134 - Increased emphasis on personal supportive counseling role for counselors. Let faculty do more of the academic advisement.

136 - Need better interpreters for hearing impaired program.
Question 121

How would you rate . . . coordination of programs/courses offered on more than one campus?

002 - Mixed bag - ranges from marvelous to atrocious

003 - No follow-through on decisions

005 - Very little similarity in many cases

006 - Varies widely

008 - Without program heads, this is impossible

009 - More centralization is needed. People tend to do their own things.

011 - Depends on program

013 - Problems getting textbooks and content to match across campuses.

037 - Often different make-up of population on campuses not accounted for.

039 - Too much differential, student has difficulty in switching campuses.

042 - Administrators assigned do little. Faculty does nearly all of this.

043 - Some instructors are not interested in coordination.

045 - This varies with programs

048 - Seems to be competitive rather than cooperative.

049 - Has hurt the growth of the college because of lack of cooperation.

057 - Need for a more defined system to allow for more campus flexibility.

061 - Poor coordination - especially content wise

068 - More substance, fewer forms and apparatus

073 - No control - No visible sign it will be better

081 - Have trouble understanding why business courses need to be at all three campuses.

091 - Attempts at coordination usually run out of gas.

092 - Revise organizational chart to facilitate coordination.

094 - Automotive appears to be the only program attempting to coordinate.

103 - Too much individualism

104 - Distance is a problem getting greater

108 - There is a need here to be more of a team-family working together.
Question 12i

111 - Each campus attempts to develop their own territory.
113 - This must improve if the college is to move ahead.
127 - I see wide differences in graduate quality between campuses.
134 - Need to foster more cooperation and unity in program areas - not competition.
136 - Difficult process - too many leaders above faculty who hinder progress.
Question 12j

How would you rate . . . recruitment of staff?

002 - Crippled by poor pay and high workload.

003 - You have had much experience.

006 - Cannot attract people to teach with current salary levels.

007 - Most faculty have little knowledge of classroom dynamics - a few are improving

008 - Good-old-boy system thrives here.

011 - Difficult because of contact hours

013 - We need more policy developed on procedures

021 - Recruitment of qualified faculty poor because of low salary and heavy workload.

036 - Need to increase the number of minorities

039 - Am familiar with my area only - very good.

041 - Some staff and faculty have poor or no skills at all for the job they are in.

042 - Faculty involved has little input.

043 - Considering salaries, staff is excellent

045 - This could be improved - present method not good

049 - Adequate - how about as good as can be expected

057 - In critical areas this is a problem

067 - Salary is too low to attract

068 - Will improve with college's reputation

092 - Too much left to Division chairs - not much help from personnel office

094 - Why does the school wait till a position is vacant to rehire (need overlap time)

104 - Staff losses have been the problem

108 - Awareness here is very important.

110 - Low wages and salaries

113 - I can find no logical method or intelligence used in the selection of some of the staff, both adm. and support.
115 - The present P.R. in this area needs help.

120 - Very good in our division.

126 - More minorities

136 - Need more minorities
Question 12k

How would you rate . . . flexibility in class scheduling to permit multiple entry points and early completion by students?

002 - Where this occurs it is outstanding - limited to a few areas

006 - Results in complete and utter confusion

008 - Only in a few programs

011 - Depends on program

018 - Early completion is OK, but multiple entry points is a problem.

021 - It is impossible to individualize all courses

036 - Flexibility exists only in typing courses.

037 - Done only in 1 program and not without major problems for students

038 - Generally good, but too often classes are cancelled without regard for student needs.

043 - Varies with program

045 - This varies with programs

049 - Started out, but very little now

057 - Our present system does not allow this to occur

068 - Should be improved.

071 - Lock-in in long time slots

075 - I think this is a joke (in practice).

091 - Some inflexibility on part of faculty

104 - Some programs fit this goal into reality (not all)

108 - Metro seems to be open and available for in this area

109 - More feasible in some areas

124 - None

130 - Very good in some programs - weak in others

134 - I see this as something to be avoided. Our student population is much too heterogenous (with little provision to handle their diversity in an individualized manner) to maintain flexible enrollment.

136 - Good, but not to the extent of destroying all other teaching methodologies.
How would you rate . . . College's efforts to assure program quality?

- The jury is still out - its well to try, but the results
- With the faculty turnover rate and course load this is almost impossible
- Quality varies drastically between campuses
- Impossible with current teaching load
- Quality of instructors tends to be low
- More effort needed for technological and mechanical advances
- Standards too low
- In some cases the college uses a warm body as an instructor
- Again, heavy emphasis on over-administration and low faculty salary and heavy faculty workload do not assure program quality
- Major problem
- Need to check up on some faculty to see the bad job they are doing.
- Varies with programs, campuses
- We work hard to keep a quality program.
- "More" has been the watchword, rather than "better."
- Just beginning - very little in past
- Program quality should be tied to reduced faculty load
- College has just recently made progress here.
- Good effort misdirected!
- (Like what?)
- Seems course waivers too easily granted
- Full accreditation (N.C.) essential. Self help good
- Need to definitely stay on top of this.
- Have wrong priorities
- It's improving
- Need to keep good faculty
Question 12m

How would you rate . . . planning and implementing new programs?

002 - Some are excellent. I have doubts about some of our surveys.

005 - Work is being done to expedite growth

007 - A virtual halt to program development has resulted for over a year because of the delay in completion of the College impact/need survey.

008 - Process is too slow

009 - Changes are slowly made.

013 - The programs that I have seen implemented are first rate.

021 - Too many new programs with too little potential

039 - Planning and implementing takes too long a period of time

043 - Too many levels of authority; response to need too slow

045 - Again, time is a factor - 24 contact hours does not allow time.

046 - Needs more study

048 - Question whether some programs are really needed

049 - Needs improvement

057 - Too many barriers in getting new programs started

068 - Slow, conservative

073 - Lack of proper expertise in the area

074 - No money

091 - Very slow and cumbersome

108 - Need to enlarge and insure program we now have

110 - Needs looking into

113 - There seems to be too much of personality and ego in deciding whether a new program goes or not.

115 - Present procedure too bulky.

130 - Lack of area coordination due to multi-campus problems

134 - Improving
How would you rate ... reviewing and revising existing programs?

002 - We should require fewer electives. We should build in more humanities courses, English, History, etc.

003 - Difficult to do with workload and discouraging when results are not seen or used.

005 - Necessary to periodically review all programs

006 - High cost; low FTE programs are currently offered by habit

008 - No faculty have time

009 - Changes are slowly made

013 - More effort needed for technological and mechanical advances

021 - Not enough time/money for revising by those who are qualified to review/review, that is faculty.

023 - Individual program faculty have done a reasonably good job, but the College doesn't seem to have an overall plan for reviewing and revising programs and courses.

036 - Some programs need to be evaluated

039 - Status quo is retained

042 - With workload is rather difficult to achieve. Administrators need to do more in this area.

043 - Too many levels of authority; response to need too slow.

045 - We could do a better job, if we had no time.

048 - Some programs are of questionable worth to society.

049 - College has overdone in a few cases.

054 - Referring to PNP which is the only one I am familiar with - Excellent

057 - System is not totally formalized at this point.

061 - Need emphasis in improving existing programs.

068 - Use more people-exchange, less paper-exchange.

073 - No time, from instructor position - supervisor unable to do this. Comes off teacher's back.

091 - Can think of a program or two where administration must be blind.

092 - Need more of this.

108 - This area is of most importance.
Question 12n, cont.

115 - A program is usually dropped before a remedy can be prescribed.

134 - Needs improvement
Comment on whether Metro Tech should expand, reduce, or maintain program offerings.

002 - There is an apparent effort to expand courses teaching skills for which there is no apparent local market. For example: Human Services.

005 - May be necessary to drop a program offering that is not working well but NOT to aid expansion--programs should be added or dropped on their own merit.

006 - Program offerings should be based on community need and college ability to provide adequate training. Programs which do not meet community needs or which serve only a very few students should be discontinued.

007 - MTCC should drop unneeded programs and use limited resources for new endeavors.

009 - Some programs presently offered have extremely low enrollment and appear to cost more than the college can afford.

011 - Education should constantly evaluate existing community needs and meet them - if that means reducing or adding programs we should do so.

012 - Expand as situation warrants, but not at expense of ongoing programs.

013 - The most logical course of action is to build on past success for improvement of programs and to provide indications of needed programs.

015 - Serve area needs!

017 - Some programs need to be dropped and others added - I don't feel in all cases programs should be dropped before offering a new program.

018 - Depends on available resources but we should improve what we have before we expand.

021 - Providing appropriate "needs assessments" are completed and program is warranted - then expand program offerings.

027 - Expand and reduce course offerings as they are needed.

037 - Drop programs no longer relevant to the job market.

039 - The above questions obviously have some grey areas. I don't believe that all program offerings (current) should necessarily be retained.

042 - Too late in getting new programs because of going through C & I, etc.

043 - If there is need for employees, education should be offered.

045 - Word processing program

046 - Keep up to date with advisors

047 - How can this be answered intelligently without consulting research? I suspect we need to drop some, add some and keep some.
Question 13, cont.

048 - College has a number of programs, but question whether all are needed and of the quality expected by students and industry.

049 - Only with expansion of programs can College expect to continue growth.

050 - Expand only after developing current programs into quality offerings.

056 - Provide quality for all programs offered.

057 - Need to offer more attractive hard technology programs at the Fort. Also need to evaluate programs that are not growing.

059 - Work very diligently with business and industry to be ready to offer program training needs currently with no long drawn out delays.

061 - Course offerings should be expanded but not upon sacrificing existing programs.

065 - Programs not generating the student FTE should be evaluated for the purpose of dropping the program(s).

068 - Metro should improve "programs" so that they educate broadly - for more than one occupation.

070 - Expand if there is student need

072 - Addition of machine shop

073 - Need for machine shop and diesel program

075 - Any one and all of the above at a given time.

076 - I don't feel Metro is offering enough programs in new technology areas.

077 - Expand as needed but be able to finance any program and not go with a shoestring budget when a wardrobe is required. Don't do it if you can't do it right.

081 - I believe we need to look at more vocational offerings. Need automotive program at new Elkhorn Campus. Should look at offering business programs only on one campus, making it possible to hire better instructors by paying them more money.

083 - Expand, however, I would concentrate first on improving the quality of existing programs.

084 - Focus on quality of what we have

085 - Always keep abreast of needs of the job markets - and offer appropriate courses.

091 - This does not mean limited interest programs should not be dropped.

092 - Some programs should be dropped.
Question 13, cont.

094 - Metro is not on top of the changing job market; especially in the AV area (all companies use AV and need to know how to use it effectively). Industrial TV is growing rapidly.

103 - On valid reason and evidence of need and ability to produce quality results - may expand.

104 - Colleges that aren't growing in quality and offering to students today are next to dead!

105 - Should purge programs where Metro grads are not able to enter careers with better pay or career potential than "walk in" high school grads.

108 - Expand programs depending on area demands. Definitely keep the current program offerings - enlarge on each.

109 - Consolidate and make sure what we have is properly equipped and housed.

112 - I feel we should do some close observation of our current expansion before developing new programs.

115 - As our technological society advances toward the year 2000 is a time ripe for growth - not recession into oblivion.

116 - Keep it as it is until we are perfect enough to grow.

117 - Improve on programs offered now.

118 - Metro should explore solar energy.

120 - If there are needs in the area - expand program offerings.

121 - If there is a need for training in a new area, Metro should respond.

123 - Many dollars are spent very foolishly. Programs exist and the needs don't.

124 - If a program loses popularity by a drop in enrollment the program ought to be dropped.

125 - Reduce the number of duplicated high technology programs.

127 - Concentrate on improving and maintaining program quality.

130 - Programs should be dropped if they are found to be inefficient and not necessary in relationship to the job market.

131 - Reduce or eliminate programs providing little employment possibilities.

134 - Expand programs and keep current programs - according to needs assessment and community research - (data-based). Need personal contact with employers as well as survey-type research.
Any other comments which would be helpful in the Metropolitan Technical Community College planning process?

001 - Specific responsibilities of every employee and hold them accountable for their performance. Accountability for results is lacking. Mediocrity is setting in.

002 - We should strive for excellence. This means in every aspect of the college. It would not do to simply buy excellent equipment, build outstanding facilities, and attract a fine faculty. Our belief in our students and our expectations of them will, in the end, be the scales upon which our success or failure will be weighed.

003 - Faculty see no incentive for staying at Metro Tech. There is no sliding pay scale which would show the institution's recognition of dedication.

004 - Definite need for increased coordination with all departments and personnel. Possibly a revised organizational structure would enhance liaison among college offices.

005 - There is currently an underutilization of some facilities and of some areas of the program development process. A comprehensive look should be taken at current facilities before further expansion is planned.

006 - Visibility of MTCC in community is low - image is poor. Faculty is demoralized by low salary and excessive workload. Internal "empire building" leads to strife and inability to change existing situations. Relationships between faculty and central administration are in many instances based on suspicion and mistrust. Consequently, we have an adversary relationship which breeds conflict.

007 - You will need to interview staff if you wish to have any in-depth analysis of the data to effectualize positive change.

008 - Campuses are not located to serve community needs. A reputation for quality education is the only way to assure growth of a college. As long as students are allowed to enter without skills, remain in programs they cannot handle, and are unilaterally returned to classes after being finally placed on academic suspension, it is difficult for faculty to maintain enthusiasm for maintaining high standards.

009 - Higher quality instruction combined with more responsive and employable programs, plus elimination of high cost programs with low enrollment should be the priorities for Metro.

010 - Suggest remedial studies requirement for vocational/tech students before they take academic subjects/courses.

013 - 1. Establish another five-year mission/goal framework.
2. Try to solicit funds from private concerns for improvements like UNL and Creighton do - get Joe D. out there to beat the bushes!
3. Look internally for qualified personnel to advance to job openings rather than going outside the college.
Question 17, cont.

015 - Need to zero in on target populations as possible students. For example - recent high school graduates, etc.

016 - Overall, faculty morale is low because of the high teaching load, the lack of a pay scale ladder, the difficulty in receiving promotion, and the low pay. I am particularly disturbed by the need to "fight, argue, and cajole" for money (wages) due me for the work I perform. This started with the first paycheck I received and hasn't stopped. I have also had to "fight, argue, and cajole" for the wages due the part-time faculty in my department. There seems to be a prevalent attitude that Metro will pay as little as they can get away with, regardless of the amount justly owed.

Faculty are concerned about students, well prepared for the areas they teach, and desirous of professional growth. They are also frustrated, because, with the 24 hour teaching load, their concern for students cannot be expressed in positive ways to the students. There just isn't enough time. They (the faculty) are frustrated, because, for the most part, they could take their skills and education elsewhere and earn more money. The faculty is frustrated, because, although they are desirous of professional growth, with the 24 hour teaching load, there is little time, and, with no pay-scale ladder and difficult promotions, little reward for professional growth.

I am also concerned about the number of administrators who seem to be working at cross-purposes. There is no clearly defined chain of command for faculty to follow, when conflicting instructions and requests filter down to faculty from above. I am concerned, too, about curriculum and instruction policies being generated at levels higher than faculty and then taken upwards, without any input from faculty and with willful disregard to that old faculty perogative, academic freedom.

Finally, as a member of the assignment of duties committee, I am disillusioned. I thought the college was honestly planning to look into the problem of the 24 hour work load and do something constructive about it. I no longer think so.

017 - Salaries are not competitive particularly at the classified level. There are also grave indiscrepancies in workloads of offices.

018 - Metro is mostly successful at teaching, and I love teaching and Omaha - I think Metro has great problems to surmount and great opportunities to grasp.

Many parts of this evaluation are negative, but overall I feel positive about Metro - if we would just clean up our act and grasp our opportunities.

I would be happy to discuss this evaluation with anyone if it would help.

021 - This College is definitely "top heavy" with administrators, stumbling over each other and developing "make work" projects for already overworked operations level people (faculty) with one (1) administrator for every two (2) faculty; the faculty is over-administered and over-managed. We could eliminate ¼ of the administrative slots; use the money to improve faculty salaries and reduce workload, therefore affording the faculty the time and stimulus to assure program quality for our clients, the students.
Question 17, cont.

023 - Although improvements have been made during the four years I've been with MTCC, even more are needed in the area of planning and communicating those plans to people who must carry them out. This questionnaire, distributed in mail boxes on Tuesday, May 20, 1980, and due back by Thursday, May 22, 1980, is an example. This need is particularly felt by a faculty with a 24 hour workload.

The college also needs to specifically define responsibilities for some duties, and then give the person responsible the power to carry them out. Often, it is impossible to determine who is responsible for a particular task, and, therefore, it is impossible to know who to go to when problems arise in the area or when there are questions related to the area. For example, who is responsible for determining the prerequisites for a course? If the faculty in the area are responsible, why is someone else apparently changing those prerequisites without even consulting the faculty? This situation also creates problems getting things done. If no one has the responsibility for doing a particular task, how does it get done?

In some instances of curriculum/procedure development, ideas, plans, and/or proposals are not widely enough circulated before they are sent to higher bodies for action. I realize that it is impossible to have every employee represented on every committee and that some employees wouldn't want to be on any committees. It would be possible, however, to send information about the ideas, plans, and/or proposals to individuals affected by them before final action is taken. By doing this, employees who work most closely with particular things would have an opportunity to comment on any possible changes before the changes are made. In this way, it might be possible to avoid situations where unworkable plans and proposals are enacted, only to be revised when it becomes apparent that they won't work.

The college must continue its efforts it has begun to improve employee morale. I realize that change is sometimes an exceedingly slow process, but employees must see things are happening—that attempts are being made—or the efforts will increasingly be viewed as nothing more than another hollow statement made to placate unhappy employees.

Although the college's role and mission is a wide document, it must be realized that the college cannot be all things to all people. The desire and attempt to serve all areas of our wide public is laudable, but there are realities which must be considered. There have been cases of the college accepting students who cannot possibly benefit from a program of study. There have been cases of the college accepting students in order "to socialize" those students. These students may need help, but MTCC does not have the personnel resources to meet the needs some students have. We are not yet prepared to be all things to all people, and until we are, we should stop deluding our students and ourselves.

026 - Full speed toward present goals.

036 - We need a commitment to assessment testing. A student who is enrolling in six hours or more should be required to take the assessment test.

037 - More accountability for individuals; counseling centers considered on own merits; semester system; more centralization of support systems; equitable representation in MTCC Assoc. before negotiations. Contact hour system extended to all professionals; more input into college calendar; 12-month personnel get more than 2 weeks vacation.
Question 17, cont.

039 - There is a need for expansion of student services in the area of night time coverage for evening students. Common complaint is that evening students (who work during the day) cannot complete necessary business within the student services area at the time they come in for class. For example: a woman (executive type) became quite hostile and angry when she was not able to complete some business with Admissions and Records Office that had to be done in person, due to the fact that that office was open only two nights a week.

041 - Inform the faculty and community what the results are from these surveys and what MTCC is doing and has done to correct them.

042 - 1. Faculty pay too low corresponding to workload. Workload makes it difficult to meet students' needs to adequately deliver education. Students leave here when they should be continuing.
2. Instructors ignore students when this is the purpose of the institution, to deliver instruction.
3. As instructors contact students continuously the instructors should be trained on the human relations skills before allowed to teach.
4. Instructors should meet with administrators on a regular basis to discuss problems and for teamwork in delivery instruction.
5. Talents of faculty members should be utilized, such as research for the college.

043 - The school needs more publicity, student follow up, and alumni involvement.

046 - Helpful to clarify duties of instructor when starting teaching.

048 - Results of survey should be analyzed and studied in depth before any changes are made.

049 - College needs to focus on needs of learners and the needs of community instead of politics among geographical areas and/or staffs assigned to different campuses.

053 - The three campus sites function as three separate colleges. This must be overcome before Metro will become a type of community college which we need.

058 - We need a focus to our efforts - let's do a few things extraordinarily well and become more accountable. We need to rely more on staff members' expertise and less on the committee process or on consultants. More than anything, we need to all be singing the same tune - in a way this means more standardization and consistency and less "do your own thing" philosophy.

059 - Staff and faculty should work constantly and diligently to involve the community - this should be an ongoing goal since this makes for a true community college.

061 - Board splits have hurt the College in reaching its mission. Our Board has a national reputation for being divided. I hope that the new president will be able to heal the wounds.
Question 17, cont.

062 - More direct counseling with high school students. Most high school counselors are academically oriented and are not promoting Voc. Ed. in the post secondary area. Go out to the students, not sitting and waiting for them to walk in.

064 - Get the board back to policy issues, and out of the business of running the college; that's what administrators are for.

066 - Our Board of Governors sometimes becomes too involved in the day to day operation of the college.

067 - Emphasize quality instruction in present offerings and expand occupational programs to attract young students to each of the campus sites.

068 - Metro needs to eradicate its inferiority complex and assert its philosophic purpose and political mission. Its community services and responsibilities give it more energy, more legitimacy, and more "reality" than 4-year schools. We need to claim our mission, be free and willing to engage dissent, and hunt fearlessness. People need jobs, yes. But job training alone will not satisfy the hungers I see in Metro students. Trust the "big mind."

071 - Class schedules (some due to available time slots) back to back and lengthy "staff development days" permit no time to research and development of one's own area. Programs dispersed throughout the quarters may be a better solution.

072 - The college should become more involved with follow-up on students placed on jobs. Also should visit local industry on an on-going basis (to improve our image).

073 - Competency in administrative staff - less word service and more go.

075 - Need new board of governors and fewer administrators.

076 - I feel the institution must become more flexible in responding to educational needs; there seems to be very little imagination on the part of administrative planners. I feel they do not have adequate information to plan or that their information is limited to educational origin.

It would be worthwhile to hire the services of an outside consultant that has no inner institutional political burdens. That person to work directly with community employers, faculty and national survey information.

The institution seems to plan helter skelter, then only supports programs on a piece-meal basis.

081 - Metro needs to look at offering more skilled labor programs. Our business programs do not really prepare students to go out and earn the salaries they want to earn. We need to reassess our instructional staff salaries. If we had fewer administrators and used our administrators more efficiently, maybe we could pay more to instructors and, therefore, attract better teachers. I believe Metro is but can be an even better asset to the community if we better define our role and function in the educational community.
Administratively we are a mess - I think our first priority should be restructuring our administrative structure to add accountability, consistency, and definition to what we do. We need to examine the role and function of the student services area. There is overlap and lack of distinction to what each office does.

I sense the morale and attitude of staff, at all levels, is at rather low levels. The whole College needs to assess what we can all do to make MTCC a more pleasant environment in which to work.

I also feel that the general workload is too heavy for all professional staff. This College expects support staff, and administrators to work hard and long with evening/weekend responsibilities. There are frankly no rewards or benefits to compensate staff who "work their butts off." My feeling is that staff are just not going to continue to give of themselves to the institution without a feeling of compensation.

Eliminate staff development days. This is a total waste of time! I question the high percentage of administrators.

I feel there are administrative positions that should be eliminated. Staff development days should either be eliminated or made worthwhile.

There are too many political games played at the College. I feel it's a detriment to the faculty and college as a whole.

It seems unfortunate that we don't use our advisory committees more to our advantage. For the most part, they do exist, but in name only. A visible and active advisory committee can be the source of a great deal of favorable promotional effort for the College.

Morale problems a critical issue. Good employees will leave unless a good personnel plan is developed to retain them (both faculty and administrators) - people administrators discouraged because of lack of promotional path.

Their budget plan is horrible.

Metro Tech is a good idea - it is the hope of the future and a result of the past. It can not be all things to all people - students, faculty, administration, or community, but it must be best of what it can be.

We at Southwest are anxiously anticipating the move to the Elkhorn Valley Campus and hope support will be strong from students first, but the College in total additionally.

We should be ready in case move of Southwest to Elkhorn throws a big shift of students to the South Campus. I.T.C. space could be of importance. Utilization of space at South should be ready and available.

The College desperately needs reorganization and something to overcome the problem of "three" colleges.
Question 17, cont.

115 - The time is now to be an aggressive leader in our community and national attention will be our reward. To do as others do is to fail our local community. When local unrest descends upon the community, our college should be aggressive as it has in the past...now is the time to plan for the time part of the town could be burning.

116 - When new courses need to be developed time should be set aside to do it. This work should not be done as a secondary task in a hurry up deadline atmosphere.

122 - We need to improve our image in the industrial community - by producing a higher quality product.

123 - Decisions need to be made and implemented without wasting valuable time. Positive steps need to be taken to insure the quality, performance and efficiency of the college.

124 - Handicapped students need interpreters that are skilled in the vocation they are trying to learn. They need more individual instruction, therefore should be in a class of more than one rather than in a group of non-handicapped people. I think they would learn better under these circumstances.

126 - I think Metro Fort Omaha is a huge asset to the community. Many underprivileged persons will become self supporting and they will realize the importance of education, thus making Omaha a greater city to live in. Imagine a Welfare recipient telling her children "Mommy is going to college." Think of the impact and carry-over it will have on her children and others. Keep MTCC going as it is.

129 - "A rudderless ship gathers no moss"

130 - 1. Most of us are unaware of the plans or direction for the college.
   2. The organizational system has established barriers and a lack of understanding of responsibilities - the college should choose to centralize or decentralize, but not try to remain in the middle.
   3. The staff of the college need to feel that there is strong leadership from the top and that decisions will be made and policies and procedures implemented consistently throughout the college. The executive council should provide more leadership academically and educationally instead of protecting turf and viewing the college through only a campus perspective. Often ideas and recommendations are prepared by mid-unit managers and faculty, only to "die" at the executive level - too much democracy can be harmful - someone must be willing to take the responsibility and be accountable.

134 - To summarize, I would prioritize the following:
   1. Assessment and placement of entering students. (Continuous research on predictive value of assessment instrument).
   2. More equitable teaching load. Academic areas should not be above 15 hours - at the maximum.
   3. Improved institutional climate. Less competitiveness between campuses. Better faculty – administration relations. Perhaps an outside consultant could be employed to study this problem and make specific recommendations.
135 - These steps would help retain faculty and provide higher morale: reduce workload to 15 contact hours per week; raise salary for faculty to that equivalent to the average for other urban, multicampus community colleges; provide a basis for promotion on the basis of experience and merit; provide an adequate procedure for professional educational leave with some compensation.

These steps would help attract and retain students: lobby and persuade the legislature to reinstitute general studies at Metro Tech; provide a required testing program for all full time entering students to assess their basic skills in writing, reading, and math; provide an adequate program of student advisement, making use of faculty advisors; make orientation of new students mandatory.

136 - Support faculty articulation efforts with UNO, etc.
Support a comprehensive developmental studies and counseling program. Develop better relations with CETA, Voc. Rehab. so that they know our services - what we can and cannot do for students.