

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 034 514

JC 690 351

AUTHOR Yarrington, Roger, 5th.
TITLE Junior Colleges: 50 States/50 Years.
INSTITUTION American Association of Junior Colleges, Washington,
D.C.
PUB DATE 69
NOTE 306p.
AVAILABLE FROM American Association of Junior Colleges, One Dupont
Circle, N.W., Washington, D.C. (\$2.50)

EDRS PRICE MF-\$1.25 HC-\$15.40
DESCRIPTORS *Educational History, *Higher Education, *Junior
Colleges
IDENTIFIERS American Association of Junior Colleges

ABSTRACT

This book republishes 20 articles that first appeared as "Junior Colleges; 20 States" (ED 011 767) and adds several more, including a comprehensive one on developments in 22 states. All the articles have appeared in the Junior College Journal. The original 20 articles have been updated with a brief addendum (a "revisiting") for each state. The only exception is the article on Missouri, which has been completely rewritten for this volume. The publication of this collection, presenting an over-all view of junior college developments in the 50 states, was supported by the Shell Companies Foundation, Inc. (HH)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE
PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION
POSITION OR POLICY.

ED 034514

JUNIOR COLLEGES: 50 STATES/50 YEARS

2
12
iii

Articles on Two-Year College Growth
Reprinted from the JUNIOR COLLEGE JOURNAL
With Additional Material, Including a
Previously Unpublished Article on
Developments in Twenty-Two States

Edited by Roger Yarrington

American Association of Junior Colleges

JC 690 351

iv

Copyright 1969

American Association of Junior Colleges
1315 Sixteenth Street, N.W.
(After November 1, 1969: One Dupont Circle, N.W.)
Washington, D. C. 20036

Printed in U.S.A.

Price: \$2.50

**"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED**

**BY AMERICAN ASSOCIATION
OF JUNIOR COLLEGES**

**TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING
UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF
EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE
THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF
THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."**

Contents

Introduction.....	vii	
<i>Roger Yarrington</i>		
Introduction to <i>Junior Colleges:</i> <i>20 States</i>	x	
Impact: Missouri's Community Colleges.....	1	
<i>Mildred E. Bastian</i>		
Progress in Maryland.....	21	
<i>Frank B. Pesci and Robert T. Novak</i>		
The Explosion in Arizona.....	31	
<i>Robert J. Hannelly</i>		
The Oregon Story.....	38	
<i>Don P. Pence</i>		
Five Years of Progress in Florida.....	54	
<i>James L. Wattenbarger</i>		
North Carolina Is Counting on Community Colleges.....	63	v
<i>Howard R. Boozer</i>		
Bold Plans for the Bay State.....	73	
<i>Walter M. Taylor</i>		
Something New in New Jersey.....	84	
<i>Kenneth C. MacKay</i>		
Washington Shows New Life at Forty.....	95	
<i>Frederic T. Giles</i>		
Fifty Years of Community Involvement in Michigan.....	104	
<i>Philip J. Gannon</i>		
Ohio Joins the Club.....	116	
<i>Charles E. Chapman</i>		
It May Happen in Alabama, Too!.....	130	
<i>Walter A. Graham</i>		
Crossroads in Texas.....	138	
<i>Kathleen Bland Smith</i>		
Pennsylvania Opens the Door.....	150	
<i>A. Martin Eldersveld</i>		

Full Partners in California's Higher Education	158
<i>Henry T. Tyler</i>	
Progress and Plans in the Empire State..	169
<i>S. V. Martorana</i>	
Rebirth in Illinois	180
<i>Clifford G. Erickson</i>	
Iowa Sets Its Course	187
<i>Louis R. Newsham</i>	
Hawaii Plans for Community Colleges...	196
<i>Richard H. Kosaki</i>	
Minnesota Turns to State Junior Colleges	204
<i>Philip C. Helland</i>	
A New State in Montana.....	210
<i>Larry J. Blake</i>	
A New Law for Colorado.....	216
<i>George Hodson and Allan P. Crawford</i>	
Fifty-One Years in Kansas.....	222
<i>Carl L. Heinrich</i>	
Oklahoma Looks to 1970.....	230
<i>E. T. Dunlap</i>	
Community College Progress in Virginia.....	236
<i>Fred L. Wellman and Dana B. Hamel</i>	
The Community College in Connecticut..	246
<i>Shafeek Nader</i>	
Georgia's Junior Colleges: An Important Role.....	259
<i>Harry S. Downs</i>	
State and Local Partnership In Mississippi.....	267
<i>G. H. Johnston</i>	
The Other Twenty-Two.....	276
<i>James L. Wattenbarger</i>	

Introduction

An earlier book, *Junior Colleges: 20 States*, published by the Association in 1966, presented the first twenty articles that appear in this book. To make the present volume we have added several articles that have since appeared in the *Junior College Journal*, as well as a comprehensive article on developments in twenty-two states by James L. Wattenbarger which appears here for the first time in print. Dr. Wattenbarger, former director of the Division of Community Junior Colleges in the Florida Department of Education, is now director of the Institute of Higher Education, University of Florida, where he is making a study of state legislation affecting two-year colleges.

In addition, the original twenty articles have been updated by the use of brief addendums "revisiting" each state. An exception is Mildred E. Bastian's article on Missouri which was rewritten for this volume.

Thus we present a description of junior college developments in the fifty states at the time the American Association of Junior Colleges is approaching its fiftieth anniversary year. And thus the title *Junior Colleges: 50 States/50 Years*. We are indebted to the Shell Companies Foundation, Inc., for support of this publication.

We had a dramatic story to tell in 1966 when the original volume was published. Events of the past three years have added significantly to the drama.

What was evident in 1966 is even more apparent in 1969: junior colleges are growing at an impressive rate and the story is basically a state-by-state story. Each of the stories is different, yet they all have common themes. Taken together they help explain the national development of a new kind of institution, the community college.

Readers may find that what has happened since publication of the *20 States* book is extremely fascinating. The capsules of developments in the past three years which have been added to the original set of articles illustrate how fast the junior college picture is changing in some key states.

The addendums were written by the authors of the original articles except in a few cases where the authors have moved to new locations. In these cases, persons closer to recent developments were asked to write the updating material.

Original authors were identified in the "Introduction" to the 1966 book, reprinted here as pages x-xiii.

New authors in this volume:

George L. Hall is president of Arizona Western College in Yuma, Arizona.

Earl L. Klapstein is president of Mt. Hood Community College in Gresham, Oregon.

I. E. Ready is director of the Department of Community Colleges in the State Board of Education in North Carolina.

Louis W. Bender is director of the Bureau of Community Colleges in the Pennsylvania Department of Public Instruction.

James D. Broman is executive director of the Illinois Association of Community and Junior Colleges.

George Hodson, formerly director of Education Beyond the High School, Colorado Department of Education, is now president of North Country Community College, Saranac Lake, New York.

Allan P. Crawford is president of Arapahoe Junior College, Littleton, Colorado.

Larry J. Blake is president of Flathead Valley Community College, Kalispell, Montana.

Carl L. Heinrich is director, Community Junior Colleges, State Department of Public Instruction for the State of Kansas.

E. T. Dunlap is chancellor of the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education.

Fred L. Wellman is deputy director and *Dana B. Hamel* is director, Virginia Department of Community Colleges.

Shafeek Nader is associate director of the AAJC Program with Developing Institutions. He is president of the Committee on a Community College for Northwestern Connecticut, a Connecticut educational corporation which founded that college.

Harry S. Downs is assistant vice-chancellor, Regents of the University System of Georgia.

G. H. Johnston is state superintendent of education for the State of Mississippi.

The helpful cooperation of these contributors is gratefully acknowledged as well as the skillful editorial assistance of Anna C. Britz who helped to organize this material into the present book.

Roger Yarrington

Washington, D.C.
1969

Introduction to *Junior Colleges: 20 States*

Here is one of the most exciting stories in higher education today—the rapid growth in numbers of junior colleges.

In the fall of 1965 fifty new junior colleges opened, making a total of some 780 in the nation. By 1970 there will be 1,000.

The reason for this unprecedented growth may be found by looking at steps recently taken in a number of states. The stories of twenty of these states are reported in this booklet. In general, they are stories of states that have recognized a need for increased opportunity for higher education, have commissioned studies, written master plans, passed legislation, and begun building. The goal: statewide systems of community junior colleges.

æ

These are states that are looking to the day when low-cost, comprehensive, community-oriented, two-year colleges will be located within commuting distance of every citizen. The stories vary in method, tempo, and degree of success; but that is the theme which runs through the book.

Originally, these reports were published as articles in the *Junior College Journal* during 1963-65. The earlier articles have been updated for this volume.

Other states could have been included in the collection. But this booklet is not designed to be a complete story of junior college developments in the various states. That would be impossible for this is a running story with new developments in a dozen states every week. Rather, this booklet is a collection of case examples which illustrate the “why” and “how” of current junior college growth.

And, to some degree, this is also a how-to-do-it handbook. For when one reads what has happened in the twenty states represented here one sees how junior colleges can be developed in other states.

However, the articles also illustrate the fact that each state starts from a different point and must move in the way that suits its need and potential. Thus, Maryland is developing junior colleges under unified school districts (although this may change), while Pennsylvania has chosen independent junior college districts, and California is in the midst of changing from the former to the latter, and Minnesota has chosen another way altogether: a state-level board of control. In the area of finance, Oregon fixes the state's contribution to operating expenses in terms of full-time student equivalents, North Carolina in terms of percentages, Iowa in terms of student days, and Massachusetts pays the whole bill from the state budget, while in Ohio the state proportion is not stipulated at all.

Nevertheless, some guidelines do emerge and it becomes apparent that certain factors must be present for junior colleges to develop in a state: cooperation among educators, citizen awareness, careful studies, legislative planning, persistent leadership.

xi

But the most important message of the book is the simple testimony from twenty states: "It can be done; we are building junior colleges."

The authors of the articles:

Mildred E. Bastian is chairman of the board of trustees of the St. Louis-St. Louis County Junior College District in St. Louis, Missouri.

Robert T. Novak and Frank B. Pesci were administrators at Prince George's Community College in Maryland at the time their article was written. Dr. Novak was president, and Dr. Pesci was dean of academic affairs. The former has since become president of Orange County Community College in New York. The article was revised for this booklet by Dr. Pesci, who is still dean at P.G.C.C.

Robert J. Hannelly is president of the Maricopa County Junior College District in Arizona.

Don P. Pence is president of Central Oregon College.

James L. Wattenbarger is director of the Division of Community Junior Colleges in the Florida De-

partment of Education.

Howard R. Boozer is associate director, North Carolina State Board of Higher Education.

Walter M. Taylor was executive director of the Massachusetts Board of Regional Community Colleges when he wrote his article. Now he is director of continuing education at the College of the Virgin Islands. His article was updated for this volume by *William G. Dwyer*, president of the Massachusetts Board of Regional Community Colleges.

Kenneth C. MacKay is president of Union Junior College in New Jersey.

Frederic T. Giles is professor of higher education at the University of Washington.

Philip J. Gannon is dean of Lansing Community College in Michigan.

Charles E. Chapman is president of Cuyahoga Community College in Ohio.

Walter A. Graham is president of Southern Union State Junior College in Alabama.

Kathleen Bland Smith is director of news and information at San Jacinto College in Texas.

A. Martin Eldersveld was director of the Bureau of Community Colleges, Department of Public Instruction in Pennsylvania when his article was published in the *Journal*. Now Dr. Eldersveld is president of Prince George's Community College in Maryland.

Henry T. Tyler is executive secretary of the California Junior College Association.

S. V. Martorana is executive dean for two-year colleges in the State University of New York.

Clifford G. Erickson was executive dean of Chicago City Junior College when he wrote about trends in Illinois. He is still active in the state's junior college development but in a new capacity: he is now president of Rock Valley College in Rockford.

Louis R. Newsham is dean of Fort Dodge Community College in Iowa and, at the time he wrote his article for the *Journal*, he was president of the Iowa Junior College Association.

Richard H. Kosaki is vice-president for community colleges, University of Hawaii.

Philip C. Helland is executive director of the Minnesota State Junior College Board.

We appreciate the contributions made by these authors to the *Journal* and to this booklet.

We are also grateful to Louise Scott Wrigley, editorial assistant, and Sylvia Lindsey, secretary, for their help in assembling and updating this collection of articles.

Roger Yarrington

Washington, D.C.

1966

xiii

Impact: Missouri's Community Colleges

By Mildred E. Bastian

It was past ten o'clock, June 29, 1961, when an able young representative rose in the House of the Missouri General Assembly to move final passage of Senate Committee Substitute for Senate Bill 7. At midnight of June 30—just hours away—the 1961 session would be brought to a close. Final passage of S.C.S. for S.B. 7 was the climax of an effort begun the previous January to create a statewide system of public junior colleges with the cost to be shared between the local community and the state. Moving the proposal along—through the House, to the Senate, back to the House—had been a difficult but exciting process.

Missouri's House of Representatives is much less staid than its Senate. A great clanging of bells (as opposed to a sedate buzzer in the Senate) warns any representative, wherever he may be, that a vote is being taken. Votes are recorded on a large scoreboard which lights up with green for "Yes," red for "No," and white for "*Present but not voting.*" No racetrack "tote" board was ever eyed more eagerly than was the vote board in the Missouri House that night.

It was a singular tribute that attention from the floor, however, was focused on the gallery, where the chairman of the junior college committee watched the green lights come on. It was a rewarding experience for her at the end of a long struggle. The final tally was 131 votes "Yes" and only 4 votes "No." And the next day, the newspapers were hailing S.C.S. for S.B. 7 as the ". . . most significant piece of legislation passed by the 1961 Missouri General Assem-

bly!" In retrospect, evaluating the impact of the junior college on the State of Missouri eight years later, perhaps this was truly a prophetic judgment.

1969 Review

At the time the law was enacted, there were six public junior colleges in Missouri, all operated by high school districts and financed by local taxes, with no state aid. Many of them occupied a part of the high school, and the faculty taught both high school and college courses. They offered primarily traditional transfer programs, with little or no vocational technical programs or developmental education. The total enrollment across the state was approximately 3,500 students.

The 1961 junior college law permitted the creation of junior college districts across school district or county lines; provided state aid in the amount of \$200 per student in full-time enrollment (based on 30 credit hours, and paid on previous year's enrollment); vested authority for state control in the State Department of Education, including the setting of rules and regulations, accreditation, and approval for proposed new districts; provided for local control through an elected board of trustees; and gave power to the local district to tax and bond for junior college purposes.

Today, in 1969, four of the original junior colleges are part of enlarged new districts, each operating under a board responsible only for junior college operation. Two continue operating as a part of high school districts, but both are in newly remodeled facilities of their own, and have separate faculties. Six new junior college districts have been formed.

During the 1968-69 academic year, Missouri's public junior colleges served a total of 26,065 students—an increase of 750 per cent in less than eight years. The public junior colleges in 1968-69 enrolled 16.7 per cent of all students enrolled in colleges and universities in Missouri, both public and private.

Not only have the colleges grown in enrollment, but other changes have occurred as well. Missouri's

public junior colleges are comprehensive institutions, offering diverse programs to meet the varying needs of their students and of their communities. Here, in alphabetical order, is a thumbnail sketch of each of them:

Crowder College, at Neosho, serves the counties of Newton and McDonald in the far southwest corner of the state. Classes began in September 1963 on a 546-acre site which was formerly a part of the Army's Camp Crowder. The land and facilities were a \$1.6 million gift from the federal government. Enrollment in the 1968 fall semester was 541 with a faculty of twenty-five, who teach college transfer and eight career programs. Crowder is an area vocation center, permitting it to offer use of its facilities and faculty to high school seniors in the general area.

East Central Missouri Junior College will open its doors in temporary facilities for the first time in the fall of 1969. As is implied in its name, it is centrally located near the east border of the state. Curriculum in the new college will include college transfer, career, general studies for students with uncertain objectives or poor achievement, and community service programs to meet the special needs of the rural and urban communities it serves.

Jefferson College, Hillsboro, serves the Junior College District of Jefferson County, on the eastern side of the state just south of St. Louis. Classes began in temporary facilities for 303 students in the fall of 1964. Permanent buildings on a beautiful wooded site provided classrooms for an enrollment for fall 1968 of 1,266. A faculty of forty-nine instructors teach college-transfer and thirteen career programs. Jefferson was the first Missouri junior college to be designated an area vocational school. A special research and development program regularly funded by the college has resulted in major innovation and experimentation by the faculty.

The Junior College District of St. Louis-St. Louis County encompasses some 550 square miles and serves both the city and county. The district began its first classes in two temporary locations in Febru-

ary 1963 with 798 students on a 4 p.m. to 10 p.m. schedule. In the fall of 1963, more than 12,000 students were enrolled in the three colleges of this multi-campus district. In addition to the traditional transfer program, the J.C.D. offers about forty career programs, plus general studies and community service programs. The professional staff numbers more than 600. A \$47.2 million bond issue, supplemented by federal grants, provided funds for permanent buildings now nearing completion. The colleges are strategically located throughout the district: Forest Park, the urban campus in the city; Meramec, located in south county; and Florissant Valley, on rolling acres in north county. The campuses should be completed by 1970 at a total cost of \$63 million and are planned for 16,000 day students, with an equal number of evening students anticipated by the mid-1970's. Staff creativity has gained national prominence for the J.C.D., which regularly budgets funds for research to develop better courses, better methods of teaching, and better use of innovative materials and equipment.

4

Metropolitan J.C.D. of Kansas City is an outgrowth of the junior college formerly operated by the school district in Kansas City. The new district was voted in May 1964, and encompasses eight public school districts in three counties, an area of about 400 square miles. Enrollment in fall 1968 was 6,104 with faculty and administration numbering 252. The district is on the threshold of expanding to three new campuses, although 1968 classes were held in two leased buildings. Interim facilities will be used in 1969-70, on the site of the Maple Woods campus in the northern part of the district, and on the site of Longview in the southern part. Classes of Penn Valley will continue in interim facilities near the new campus in the heart of metropolitan Kansas City. In addition to transfer courses, the colleges offer eighteen career programs, general education, and community service activities. Construction of permanent facilities, made possible by a \$25.2 million bond issue, will be under way in 1969, with the first

phase planned to be completed by 1974 to provide for a total of 14,500 students.

Mineral Area College, in Flat River, is an outgrowth of the junior college formerly operated by the public schools. The district was formed in April 1965, by voters in thirteen school districts in two counties. Prior to that time, the junior college was closely linked to the high school. Sixteen of its twenty-five instructors were shared with the high school; its chief administrator was the superintendent of schools; its enrollment in fall 1964 was 481. In the fall of 1968, enrollment had reached 838. Forty of the forty-seven instructors taught full-time at the college, which now has a full-time president. From purely college transfer programs, the curriculum was expanded to include eight career programs. Classes are held in interim buildings on the site of a new campus, while construction is underway on four permanent buildings.

Missouri Southern, in Joplin, created in April 1964, serves Jasper County. Joplin formerly operated a junior college as part of its high school district. The college is in new buildings provided by a \$2.5 million bond issue, and enrolled 1,947 junior college students in the fall of 1968. There are eighty-two full-time and forty-four part-time instructors, and the college offers transfer programs as well as nine career programs.

Missouri Western, in St. Joseph, encompasses eleven public school districts in five counties, and was created in January 1965. Prior to that time, the public schools operated a junior college. In the fall of 1968, the college enrolled 1,465 junior college students in traditional transfer programs and eight career programs. There were eighty faculty members. Presently operating in four interim facilities, the district has a new 390-acre campus site. Nine buildings in the first phase of construction are planned for occupancy by September 1969. Funds were derived from a bond issue of \$6 million, authorized in 1966, supplemented by federal grants.

Moberly Junior College is one of the two remaining

junior colleges in Missouri operated as part of the public school district. State aid, available since enactment of the junior college law in 1961, has made it possible for the college to strengthen its program. Since fall 1968, it has occupied the former high school building. Enrollment in 1968 was 364, an increase above 1967 of 50 per cent. Its faculty increased from five full-time and seventeen part-time teachers to eighteen full-time and nine part-time. In addition to the traditional transfer program, Moberly offers seven career programs, including agri-business and practical nursing.

State Fair Community College, in Sedalia, serves the Pettis-Benton County J.C.D. created in April 1966. The college opened its doors to its first 485 students in September 1968, in interim facilities on a fifteen-acre site. An adjacent 125 acres is under option to buy, and a bond issue will be proposed for construction of permanent buildings. In addition to general studies and college transfer, State Fair offers four career programs, with two more planned for 1969. State Fair is designated as an area vocation school, making its facilities and faculty available for training high school seniors in the district.

Three Rivers Junior College, in Poplar Bluff, was created in April 1966. The district covers twenty-five school districts in four counties in the southeast corner of the state. The college began with an enrollment of 480 students in September 1967 and offered transfer courses. By 1968 fall semester, enrollment had grown to 664, and offerings had been expanded to include seven new career programs, taught by a faculty of thirty-five instructors. The college is currently operating in a renovated high school building, with new laboratories and modern electronic equipment. The college has acquired property for a permanent campus.

Trenton Junior College, located in the north central area of the state, is the other college which continues to be operated as part of a school district. Again, state aid has made it possible to greatly improve its offerings. During the summer of 1967,

the college moved to the former high school building and became entirely separate for the first time in its history. Expansion of its curriculum offerings is being carefully planned. Enrollment for the 1968 fall semester was 307 students, and offerings include transfer courses and four career programs. There are seventeen faculty members.

There, in capsule, is the 1969 picture of Missouri's system of public junior colleges.

Today, as we review the growth and development that has taken place, even we who have been privileged to share in this undertaking are a little awed. We believe, with Tertullian, "It is certain because it is impossible!" For what is certain in 1969 was truly the "impossible dream" of a decade ago. Those of us who have shared responsibility for this new segment of higher education in Missouri are well aware of the excellent framework through which it operates; we know many crucial steps preceded its creation. For that reason, perhaps, this story should begin in 1958, with the involvement of people in a study of their higher educational needs.

Showing the Need

In mid-1958 the Committee on Higher Educational Needs of metropolitan St. Louis (a subcommittee appointed by the Governor's Committee on Education Beyond the High School in Missouri) undertook an intensive survey and study of the needs of young people and the community for higher education. The study was financed by business, labor, industry, public schools; services were contributed by two fine, private local institutions—St. Louis University and Washington University. The committee studied for more than a year before reporting to the governor's committee and to the community in January 1960.

No group or organization had previously given thoughtful consideration to the problem of college education for the ever-increasing numbers of students then enrolled in the area's elementary and high schools. It was, therefore, a shocked and startled

community which took a long, hard look at the committee's findings:

Admission pressures: Twice as many young people in city and county would be seeking admission to college by 1966, and three times as many by 1973.

Abilities: I.Q.'s of 110 or more were recorded for 39 per cent of the seniors in the area's high schools; 41 per cent had I.Q.'s ranging between 100 and 110.

College costs: Not only had tuitions in the area more than doubled in the preceding nine years, but the cost of living away from home had soared. The closest state institutions were 125 miles from St. Louis. Too many able students were not going on to college. Thirty-eight per cent of city and 36.8 per cent of county seniors listed "lack of finance" as their reason for not entering college.

Diverse educational needs: Not all young people of ability wish to pursue a baccalaureate degree—nor should they. Industry needs well-trained technicians; two-year, terminal-technical programs could prepare many young people for careers. St. Louis stood almost alone among large metropolitan areas in the nation in its failure to provide post-high school technical training.

Selective admissions: Local independent colleges and universities were becoming increasingly selective, thus closing still another door to many able young people who did not score high on college entrance examinations. The slow-to-mature students were being denied an opportunity to begin a college career.

In short, St. Louis was failing to provide for the needs of its young people graduating in 1958 and 1959, and unless a major breakthrough could be made, the future was bleak indeed.

The first, and major recommendation among the fourteen made by the committee was for the establishment of a two-year, public college, financed by state and local taxes and student tuition, offering curriculums both terminal and transfer in nature. Implementation required passage of enabling legislation—hopefully in the 1961 session of the Missouri

legislature—and the community was urged to work toward this end.

Report to the Community

The report, "Higher Education and the Future of Youth in Metropolitan St. Louis," was one of twenty such surveys listed in an extensive article on higher education in *Saturday Review*, January 21, 1961. No matter how good a report may be—how valid its statistical data, how worthy its recommendation—if it is placed on a shelf to gather dust, as often happens, it fails in its purpose. Too often, after an initial reaction of consternation and alarm, a community settles back into complacency from which it emerges only when disaster, in the form of consequences, overtakes it. That this did not happen was due to the leadership of the committee and its extensive efforts to keep the issue alive and before the people.

Higher education was the topic of discussion at the annual spring meeting of the St. Louis White House Conference on Education, where the principal speaker was Dean McHenry (now chancellor of the University of California at Santa Cruz). The *St. Louis Post Dispatch* printed his address on the editorial page, and added its own entitled "*First, the Junior College.*" In November, the White House Conference, which had previously concerned itself only with elementary and secondary education, used the report as the topic for discussion at its 1960 biennial conference. Six hundred delegates—two-thirds laymen and one-third educators—endorsed its recommendations and urged implementation of the report.

Proposed legislation had been drafted to provide for the needs of the St. Louis area. The Governor's Committee on Education Beyond the High School, meanwhile, had considered the recommendations and now endorsed them. The proposal was rewritten to permit the establishment of a statewide system of junior colleges. By the time the legislature convened in January 1961, the organization of a state committee to sponsor the proposal was well under-

way. This was just one year after publication of the report.

A New Committee for the Next Step

The "Missouri Citizens Committee for State Aid for Junior Colleges" was initiated and sponsored by the Committee on Higher Educational Needs of Metropolitan St. Louis. The committee represented labor, agriculture, industry, business, education, and civic interests throughout the state. The names of some 7,000 citizens from all over Missouri were compiled as a mailing list for a bulletin which was issued regularly throughout the legislative session. Its purpose was to inform the people of the exact status of the proposed junior college legislation, and to urge their support in the form of letters, wires, and telephone calls to their own representatives in the General Assembly. When the bill was assigned to House or Senate committees, special bulletins were addressed to those whose representatives were members of the committees.

Early in January, the committee called together legislators who were known to be interested in junior colleges and urged them to combine their forces to support the bill as drafted by the committee. The bill, cosponsored by a Republican from an urban area and a Democrat from rural Missouri, was introduced early in February as House Bill 221.

In the House and the Senate

H.B. 221 was assigned to the Education Committee and a hearing date was set. The Missouri committee organized attendance and arranged for key witnesses to speak on behalf of the bill. In order to accommodate the overflow crowd, the hearing was moved from a committee hearing room to the House chamber. Shortly after, the bill was revised—but not damaged—and reported out "do pass" as House Committee Substitute for H.B. 221.

Meanwhile, in the other branch, junior college legislation in the form of Senate Bill 7 had been introduced and assigned to the Senate Education Committee where it awaited a hearing. When it

became apparent that the junior college bill coming from the House was imperiled, the contents of H.C.S. for H.B. 221 were virtually "lifted" and became Senate Committee Substitute for S.B. 7. It was the same proposal with a different name.

It required all the energies and resources of the junior college committee and friends in the Senate to defeat a motion to send S.C.S. for S.B. 7 to a "deep freeze" committee. (No bill requiring appropriations had as yet emerged from it for action.) A move to delete the provision for state aid was defeated on the floor of the Senate. After it reached the perfection calendar, the bill had to be withdrawn for an important corrective amendment. That the bill survived in spite of all these hazards was due largely to the interest and support which was forthcoming from the people.

There were many tense moments for committee members who recorded votes from the gallery in both House and Senate as the bill proceeded toward enactment. Through all the panoply of parliamentary procedure, senatorial courtesy, and yes, sheer drama—there was a dominant lesson: the people back home, and what they think, are very important to those who represent them. On a first visit to discuss the merits of the bill with legislators, junior college committee members were apt to be received rather casually. On the second follow-up call, after an appeal through the bulletin for letters, wires, and telephone calls, interest on the part of the same legislators was remarkably sharpened. They do care and they do listen to their constituents.

From a very shaky beginning, strengthened by each newly weathered crisis, the bill passed the Senate on June 7, by a vote of 19-7. Though essentially the same proposal passed by the House earlier, it carried a Senate amendment and so was returned for reconsideration; again it was assigned to the House Education Committee.

Now began the very real "countdown" against time—for the session would end on June 30. A special warning bulletin went out, asking people to urge

the Education Committee to act quickly. On June 15, with fifteen days remaining (and not all of them working days), the committee sent out the bill "do pass." It now took its place far down on an overloaded perfection calendar.

This was a frustrating, nerve-wracking period for members of the committee. They visited with those in a position to expedite passage of the bill, and telephoned colleagues who might also bring influence to bear. It was a time of sitting in the gallery, while precious hours sped away, listening to endless debate and argument (some of it important, some of it amusing, most of it dull) over bills fortunate enough to be ahead of S.C.S. for S.B. 7 on the calendar. At the beginning of a late evening session, there was genuine envy of the resourcefulness (and power) of a wily senator whose "pet" bill was lifted from its place far down on the calendar, and passed before unsuspecting stragglers answered the bell! There was real concern that the session would end before "The Bill" could work its way to the top of the calendar for final passage.

There were literally few working hours remaining, as noted in the beginning of this narrative, when the dramatic moment of final passage came. And it was five minutes before midnight—and before final adjournment—when the omnibus appropriation bill, with funds for junior colleges, was "finally passed." On July 25, the Honorable John M. Dalton, then Governor of Missouri, signed the bill, to become effective in October 1961.

The legislative struggle was over: Missouri had an excellent junior college law. The next step was to use that law—to move within its framework, to provide a new kind of education for Missouri's youth.

The First

The Missouri law requires local initiative as a first step in creating a junior college district. During the summer of 1961, the Committee for the Junior College District of St. Louis-St. Louis County was formed. Since the J.C.D. was the first district formed

under the new law, the pattern established by the committee has been followed by succeeding new junior college districts. The activities of the committee, therefore, are a part of this brief history.

The committee was fortunate to have free office space made available, and received funds to provide part-time secretarial services. Information about the proposed district was mimeographed and given to a corps of volunteers who spoke before hundreds of organizations and groups throughout the area.

Simultaneously, the committee gathered data on students in the area to update the statistics contained in the 1960 report, and prepared material to be presented to the State Board of Education.

At the same time, an army of volunteers—equal to 5 per cent of voters in the last preceding election of school board directors—prepared to circulate petitions for signatures. Circulation of petitions began on October 13, when the law became effective, and by November 15, the goal had been exceeded. Where 3,692 signatures were required in St. Louis County, 11,000 were obtained; in the city where 8,000 were needed, 15,000 were turned in.

On November 29, 1961, petitions and the proposal for the creation of the J.C.D. were taken to Jefferson City and submitted to the commissioner of education. At a meeting of the state board on December 4, representatives of the J.C.D. committee appeared to speak for the proposal. An opponent, who sought to set up a district in the county only, excluding the city, also appeared before the board. After careful study and deliberation, the board acted on January 5, 1962, to approve the J.C.D. proposal, and set the election for April 3, 1962.

A Campaign for Votes

The most important factor in a successful campaign must be the many volunteers—those who gave their time, energies, and minds to creating public interest and support. When no money was available for printing, and information sheets were desperately needed, these were mimeographed by member

organizations. Later when funds were at hand, an attractive brochure was printed.

The proposal was supported editorially by both metropolitan newspapers—the *Post Dispatch* and the *Globe Democrat*. Both provided extensive coverage of news releases, as did the local radio and television stations. The issue was endorsed by many organizations and individuals of great strength, including the Labor Council, Chamber of Commerce, League of Women Voters, P.T.A.'s, patron councils, teachers' associations, boards of education, heads of government of both city and county, and many others.

The important job of the J.C.D. committee was education—to inform people of the purpose of a good, comprehensive, public junior college program, a form of higher education heretofore unknown in this area. The work of education begun in the campaign is still being carried on by the administrative staff and the Board of Trustees. Much more remains to be done.

Candidates for Board of Trustees

On the same day that the voters decided the issue of creating the district, they were to elect six trustees—two from the city and four from the county. A group of citizens, realizing the importance of a slate of qualified candidates, organized a committee to induce people to file. The citizens committee for the trustees began to work in February, with the final filing date just a few weeks away. It was difficult to know whether any candidates would file for the new office, and whether those who did file would be committed to the best possible program for the district. The trustee committee, therefore, sought out qualified people in the area and after interviewing many, chose six who were endorsed as a slate.

The fears that no one would file for the office proved groundless. By the end of the filing period, there were candidates aplenty: seven from the city, which would elect two, and twenty-nine from the county, which would elect four. Those of us who were elected were impressed with the fine qualifica-

tions of many of the unsuccessful candidates who filed independently.

Organized Opposition to District

It is proper, perhaps, to insert an account of the organized opposition to the J.C.D. proposal. (The attempt of a small group to exclude the city and form a county district failed, as was recounted earlier.)

In 1961, while the bill was in the House Education Committee, the Citizens for Educational Freedom appeared to oppose the proposal—the only opponents. Earlier, at the annual meeting of the White House Conference, a spokesman for the C.E.F. had publicly opposed the proposal. Briefly stated, the C.E.F. favored state grants to students to permit them to attend institutions of their choice. They contended it was “unconstitutional” to set up a public two-year college since it deprived parent and student the right to choose the institution the student would attend.

As stated in its printed literature, the C.E.F. is a national organization with headquarters in St. Louis. Its efforts to defeat the J.C.D. proposal included the distribution of leaflets in markets, churches, parking lots, etc. The printed leaflets, purporting to interpret the report of the Committee on Higher Education, contained inaccuracies and repeated the charge that the proposal was “unconstitutional.”

When the J.C.D. committee learned that C.E.F. literature had been handed out at churches, markets, etc., it attempted to obtain permission to distribute its brochures in the same places. In some instances, permission was granted—in others it was not. Members of the C.E.F. appeared at public meetings where the J.C.D. issue was discussed, and advocated defeat of the proposal. The C.E.F. contacted radio and television stations early in the campaign, demanding equal time on the air for any time given to the J.C.D. committee.

A “rumor buster” sheet was prepared by the J.C.D. committee and furnished to all of its speakers so that they could effectively answer the questions raised and the charges made by the C.E.F.

Election Eve—And the People Speak

In the closing days of the campaign, the committee redoubled its efforts to gain interest and support and to get out the vote. On April 2, a breakfast rally was organized. This provided a forum for leaders in the community. Statements of support from the community's most respected leaders were given excellent press and radio coverage.

The committee spent the remaining hours making speeches and assigning more volunteers to work at the polls on election day. Volunteers handed out brochures, answered questions, and telephoned beginning at 6 a.m. on election day and staying with it until the polls closed at 7 p.m. Many polling places were covered by volunteers every hour, and some workers, relieved at one polling place, moved on to another which was not covered. The contribution made by this group of hardworking people was invaluable.

The period of waiting when the polls have closed is fraught with anxiety. Fortunately, it was a short period, for the first return came from a city precinct which is conservative and traditionally defeats public issues. The J.C.D. issue carried there, and by a substantial majority. The law required only a simple majority—and by 10 o'clock it was clear (even to those fearful of believing it) that the issue had carried. The final tally showed a better than two-to-one majority. The trustees elected were those whose candidacy had been endorsed by the citizens' committee.

The Community's College—Role of the Trustees

“Every effort must be made to prevent the waste of the community's most important resources, its young men and women. The facts speak for themselves. The total cost of expansion of our educational facilities must be measured against costs of inadequate education. The consequences of too little and too late are social and economic instability. Neither this area nor the nation can afford such consequences.”

The vote was in! The people had provided a *framework* through which could be provided two-year college programs so sorely needed. The next step was up to the board of trustees, who remember with gratitude the help which was forthcoming.

The Danforth Foundation provided \$3,000 immediately so that the board could seek professional consultation. Advice and free consultation was available from the American Association of Junior Colleges. Leland Medsker, a recognized junior college authority, provided great leadership.

From across the state and the nation, professional educators were brought together to act as a screening committee while we sought a president for the district. When the board chose Joseph Cosand, his professional colleagues added their persuasive arguments to those of the board to bring him to St. Louis. This community has welcomed him warmly and values him for his integrity, hard work, decisive action—and the excellent results he has achieved.

It has been said that this was our claim to greatness; perhaps it is.

Prolog

Since enactment of the junior college law in 1961, substantial changes have been made at the state level.

The 1961 law provided state aid in the amount of \$200 per student equated on thirty credit hours, paid on the previous year's enrollment.

In 1965 the legislature amended the law to equate enrollment on the basis of twenty-four credit hours, and to provide state funds on *current* enrollment. This is in conformance with F.T.E. and current enrollment used for appropriations to the state colleges and universities. In addition, the amount per student was increased to \$240.

In 1966, at a special session, the public junior colleges were added to the list of institutions in Missouri which may issue revenue bonds to finance buildings of income-producing facilities.

In 1967, the amount of state aid per student was increased to \$320, or one-half the operating cost, whichever is less.

Planning Ahead

These proposals are before the 1969 Missouri General Assembly:

1. To increase the amount of state aid to \$450 or one-half the operating costs, whichever is less
2. To permit public junior colleges to admit non-high school graduates to specialized programs
3. To increase the amount of local tax which may be set by boards of trustees, without voter approval, from the present levels of ten, twenty, thirty, and forty cents to twenty, thirty, forty, and fifty cents. (Present limitations are based on ability—the assessed valuation of property in the district)
4. To provide state funds for capital expenditures, equal to one-half the cost. (No state aid is now provided for building purposes)
5. A proposal to set up a commission to study, revise, and recodify the junior college law, bringing authority for junior colleges into one separate chapter of the Missouri Revised Statutes.

While there is a friendly reception to our 1969 proposals, it is too early, as this is being written, to know whether our success of the past years will be repeated. The five proposals are essential to the future well-being of Missouri's public junior colleges. The cooperative effort begun in 1961, between the state and local communities, has resulted in a system which is a source of pride to those who share responsibility in both state and local community. The needs of the junior colleges have been favorably considered by the members of the legislature.

Today and Tomorrow

Much space has been devoted here to legislative action, community support, and building. All of these are but the framework, however important, for providing comprehensive programs to serve the young and adult students, the community, and the state.

In many areas of Missouri, only the privileged had been "going away" to college. How do you measure the value to the hundreds who now come from the farms, from the hills, from the hamlets outstate, to

enroll at Crowder, Three Rivers, State Fair, Moberly, and Trenton? How much has Missouri *gained*, in bringing further training and educational opportunity to this group? And how little did it *cost*?

The community served by Jefferson College is one of the fastest growing, burgeoning areas of the state. What does it mean to that community to have a bright new college, enrolling students in a wide variety of programs to transfer, to gain new skills, to enrich their lives?

What does it mean, what is the value to Joplin and St. Joseph, where the junior college was established long ago, to have their newly developed comprehensive programs training young people to enter directly into careers?

For metropolitan Kansas City, with a long tradition of excellence in a transfer program, what has been the impact of the exciting new programs, such as inhalation therapy, pilot training?

What has the J.C.D. meant in its St. Louis urban community? What is the value to students in the general curriculum, overcoming deficiencies? What has it meant to the hospitals who employ graduates of the J.C.D. nursing program, medical record librarians?

For junior college students across the state who are financially handicapped, could one put a price on what it means to enroll in the community college?

And finally, could one measure the cost, in terms of the loss of human resources, if the community colleges did not exist?

A Legacy to the Future

Much remains to be done. Recent studies have pointed up the need, evidenced here, to enlarge some districts and to form new ones to serve parts of the state not now providing community college education. New districts and old alike must be adequately financed and have enough students to permit them to offer truly comprehensive programs. Career program offerings at existing colleges should and must be expanded to meet new needs. Just as the state university, through its extension division, brings

classes to non-high school graduates, so should the community colleges. There is a special need today, to upgrade job skills, to retrain those whose skills have become outmoded and, to provide enrichment for those who seek admission for the sheer joy of learning.

In retrospect, those in whose care it was entrusted during the 1960's have provided an excellent framework for today's comprehensive community college. Leadership has come from the national, state, and local levels. Lawmakers, community leaders, boards of trustees, have cooperated to create this comprehensive community college which executive director of AAJC Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., calls "democracy's college of the century." The administrators and faculty who provide professional direction are responsible for how well it does its job.

Those who continue in a position of leadership, lay and professional alike, and those who succeed them as new leaders, could well remember the broad vision of Thomas Jefferson. He once said:

A system of general instruction which shall reach every description of our citizens from the richest to the poorest, as it was the earliest, so it will be the latest of all public concerns in which I shall permit myself to take an interest. Nor am I tenacious of the form in which it shall be introduced. Be that what it may, our descendants will be as wise as we are, and will know how to amend and amend it, until it shall suit their circumstances. . . .

The comprehensive community college of the future will need to be tailored, as it is today, to meet society's needs. Those who have had responsibility for this bright new institution in the 1960's will leave a legacy to those who follow:

A sense of pride in what has been done, for the students, for the community, for the state, and for the nation

A strong sense of urgency about the need for excellence—in teaching, in counseling, in use of facilities

And perhaps, most important of all, that spark: a "divine discontent" that seeks to improve, to develop better ways and methods of serving

For that, finally, is the purpose of the comprehensive community college that Missouri believes in.

Progress in Maryland

By Frank B. Pesci and Robert T. Novak

Maryland is one of the states advancing toward the goal of locating a community college within reach of every citizen. This trend, which is changing the entire picture of higher education in the state, is the result of leadership provided by gubernatorial commissions, the state legislature, the efforts of local civic groups and boards of education, the State Department of Education, and the recently created Advisory Council for Higher Education.

Maryland has had public junior colleges since 1927 when a state-supported institution was incorporated in what is now St. Mary's College of Maryland.¹ The idea of community junior colleges first appeared in the 1931 Shriver Commission report, which envisioned state-aided colleges "relieving the state university of some of the students in the freshman and sophomore years."² In 1935 the State Board of Education endorsed a plan establishing junior college divisions of the normal schools (now state colleges) at Frostburg and Salisbury.³

The story of Maryland's community colleges began in 1939 when the state legislature, recognizing a trend toward education beyond secondary school, created the Maryland State School Survey Commission. Up to this time Maryland had no standards for the accreditation of junior colleges although three institutions were in existence. With leadership provided by the State Department of Education, standards were adopted late in 1939.⁴ According to the 1939 standards, the State Department of Education would consider for accreditation as a junior college any local, nonprofit institution which offered at least one two-year curriculum to which admission was limited to high school graduates.⁵

In its report, the Maryland State School Survey Commission encouraged the expansion in Baltimore City of "one or more of the secondary schools to include the junior college years."⁶

In 1945 the Maryland Commission on Higher Education, created by legislative enactment, contracted with the American Council on Education to conduct a survey of higher education, including a special study of the junior college situation. Establishment of a statewide system of locally controlled junior college units was first on the list of recommendations made by the so-called Marbury Commission, which was submitted to Governor Herbert R. O'Connor early in 1947.⁷ As a result of the special study which was conducted by Koos,⁸ it was decided that sixteen of Maryland's twenty-three counties could have at least one junior college, and four counties could combine to establish two institutions. The survey suggested three or four junior colleges for Baltimore City.⁹ The Commission also recommended establishment of a permanent State Board of Higher Education which would assist in the development of locally controlled junior colleges.¹⁰

Meanwhile, the return of veterans seeking the advantages of higher education following World War II brought about the establishment of two locally controlled institutions in 1946: Montgomery Junior College, and Hagerstown Junior College.¹¹ Baltimore Junior College was begun in 1947 as an extension of the Veterans Institute, which was a temporary organization to provide high school courses for World War II veterans.¹²

In 1955 the Governor's Commission to Study the Needs of Higher Education in Maryland recommended that the establishment of community colleges be the first step in "meeting the demands that cannot be met by expanding existing institutions."¹³ In addition, the commission suggested that "semi-technical courses be developed and sponsored by community junior colleges as a part of the higher education program of the State."¹⁴

Four community colleges were established in

1957: Catonsville Community College and Essex Community College in Baltimore County, Frederick Community College, and Harford Junior College. Prince George's Community College and Charles County Community College were begun the following year.¹⁵

The State Department of Education, at the request of the Allegany County delegation to the 1957 General Assembly, conducted a study of the needs of higher education in western Maryland and recommended the establishment of a community college at Cumberland.¹⁶ As a result of the survey, Allegany Community College began operation in 1961. Anne Arundel Community College came into existence that same year.¹⁷

In 1959 the department, at the request of officials from a four-county area on the Eastern Shore, prepared a study on the feasibility of establishing a community college to service the area. It was recommended that two community colleges, at Easton and Cambridge, be established.¹⁸ To date no action has been taken on the recommendation. However, in 1965 the General Assembly passed legislation which permits the State Board of Education to establish regional community colleges for two or more counties.¹⁹ The state legislature also passed a companion measure which provides a \$5 million fund for the construction of regional community colleges.²⁰ This means that two or more counties may operate a community college cooperatively and may apply for 75 per cent of construction costs from the fund.

The Maryland State Board of Education, in its 1960 report, recommended that the state "pledge itself to vigorous support of existing community junior colleges" and "that the state grant substantial assistance in establishing additional junior colleges where they are needed and in accordance with an overall state plan approved by the board."²¹

Finally, in 1961 the General Assembly adopted a resolution authorizing the appointment of a commission by Governor J. Millard Tawes, who charged it with the task of formulating a plan of organization

for the entire system of public higher education in Maryland.²² The commission recommended that a Division of Higher Education within the State Department of Education be established so that the department could better exercise its responsibilities to community colleges.²³ Furthermore, the commission indicated that the community colleges should provide programs for transfer students and "other students who need a two-year terminal program with training in general and technical education."²⁴

Legislation

An examination of the laws of the State of Maryland by Koos²⁵ and DeCicco²⁶ for authority to establish and maintain junior colleges found no specific reference to them by name. There was, however, a section providing for "a general program of continuing education"²⁷ which was interpreted as giving this authority to local boards of education.

Although not passing any specific legislation, the General Assembly in 1947 included in the public school budget \$60,000 for community colleges. In 1949, again without legislative action, the General Assembly increased its appropriation to community colleges to \$100 per equivalent full-time student, or \$116,000.²⁸ Subsequently, the amount of state aid to community colleges was increased to \$125, \$150, \$175, and \$225 per equivalent full-time student.^{29,30} Beginning July 1, 1966, the state's contribution toward operating expenses at community colleges will be increased to \$300 per equivalent full-time student.³¹

After over a decade of operating community colleges on the strength of a law providing for a program of continuing education, the General Assembly passed two significant pieces of legislation in 1961. One statute legalized the creation of community colleges by authorizing local boards of education to establish these institutions which would be financed by the state, by the sponsoring political subdivisions, and by student fees.³² The second law author-

ized the issuance of bonds totaling \$5 million for the construction of community colleges.³³

In 1962, the General Assembly provided an additional \$5 million for construction, to be matched by the local school systems.³⁴ Two years later the state legislature provided for the issuance of \$15 million in bonds to be distributed to subdivisions for the acquisition of sites and construction of community colleges.³⁵ In 1965, the General Assembly amended the 1962 and 1964 acts which provided construction funds on a matching basis.³⁶ The 1965 act provides that state grants be made at a rate equal to the percentage of state aid a school system receives under the public education current expense formula, or at 50 per cent, whichever amount is greater. This introduces an equalization element and will greatly assist rural counties with community college construction projects.

In 1963 the General Assembly enacted a plan which was an outgrowth of the 1962 report to reorganize and expand public higher education in Maryland. The legislation³⁷ established the Advisory Council for Higher Education to guide the growth of all higher education. Prior to final passage, a provision for an assistant state superintendent of schools to supervise a division of higher education in the Department of Education was stricken from the original bill.

The authorization by the state legislature to create a \$30 million debt for community college construction has given great impetus to local boards of trustees for planning separate college facilities. Today, six community colleges in Maryland are operating in separate facilities. Four are operating entirely in local high schools. Plans for separate facilities, however, are underway for these institutions. A recent survey revealed that four of the community colleges are in the plant planning stage, two are expanding their campuses, two are building new campuses, and one is completing a second campus.

During the 1964 fall semester, Maryland's eleven public community colleges enrolled 10,939 full- and part-time students, an increase of 39 per cent over

a period of two years.³⁸

The degree programs offered in Maryland's community colleges are designed for both college transfer and occupational education. Four basic transfer curriculums are offered in all eleven community colleges: arts and sciences, business administration, engineering, and teacher education. Some institutions also offer transfer programs in agriculture, art, communications, general studies, home economics, international affairs, medical technology, and music.

The occupational curriculums offered at the community colleges vary considerably. Local needs are the primary basis for establishing these programs. Some examples of these occupational curriculums, taken from 1965-1966 bulletins, are accounting, business, chemical technology, construction technology, data processing, dental assisting, electronics technology, engineering technology, laboratory technology, law enforcement, mechanical technology, medical secretarial, nursing, radiation technology, secretarial studies, and urban development assistant.

It is significant to note that all of the community colleges offer at least one occupational curriculum. As these institutions continue to move into separate facilities and as community surveys are conducted, the number and kind of occupational programs undoubtedly will increase.

Prospects

Eleven sites have been identified by the State Department of Education as having enrollment potential, with five of these in counties already having community college programs.³⁹ Plans in various stages of development are underway for the establishment of new community colleges on the Eastern Shore and in Carroll County.⁴⁰

Two recent events may have a profound effect on the future development of community colleges in Maryland. A piece of local legislation was introduced near the end of the 1965 session of the General Assembly. The measure, sponsored by delegates from Prince George's County, would have

established a separate governing board for Prince George's Community College, replacing the local board of education.⁴¹ The bill was referred to the House Education Committee and later referred to the Advisory Council for Higher Education for study.

Speaking at the 1965 commencement at Charles County Community College, Maryland's Congressman-at-large Carlton R. Sickles called for a study to determine the feasibility of public financial support for two years of tuition-free education in the state's community colleges.

The prospect for continued development of Maryland's community colleges is indeed bright. The establishment of new campuses and the increase in state aid attest to this bright future. Indeed, the General Assembly, the governor, the State Department of Education, and the State Board of Education all favor and firmly believe in community college education. With this impetus and the continued support of the people, the community college movement in Maryland can do nothing less than flourish.

¹ Pullen, Thomas G. Jr. "History of the Development of Public Community and Junior Colleges in Maryland: Steps Ahead." Speech given at annual summer meeting, State Association of County Commissioners of Maryland, Ocean City, August 26, 1961, p. 6.

² Maryland Commission on Higher Education, *Report to Governor and General Assembly*, January 1931, p. 23.

³ Maryland State Department of Education, "A Decade of Progress in Education in Maryland: 1949-1959," *Maryland School Bulletin* 28, October 1961, p. 61.

⁴ Wilson, Theodore H. "New Standards in Maryland," *Junior College Journal* 10, May 1940, p. 582.

⁵ Maryland State Department of Education, *Maryland Standards for Non-Public Schools: Junior Colleges*, 1939, p. 1.

⁶ *The 1941 Survey of the Maryland Public Schools and Teachers Colleges*. Baltimore: Maryland State School Survey Commission, 1941, p. 401.

⁷ *Higher Education in Maryland*. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1947, p. 352.

⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 290-295.

⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 302-304.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 378-380.

¹¹ Pesci, Frank B. "The Junior College Movement in Maryland: 1939-1962," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The Catholic University of America, 1963, pp. 12-13.

¹² Whitney, Herbert Chester. "The Origin and Development of Baltimore Junior College," unpublished M.A. thesis, University of Maryland, 1949, p. 86.

¹³ *The Needs of Higher Education in Maryland*, Report of the Commission to Study the Needs of Higher Education in Maryland, 1955, p. 100.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 101.

¹⁵ Pesci, Frank B. *op. cit.*, p. 14.

¹⁶ Maryland State Department of Education, "A Decade of Progress in Education in Maryland: 1949-1959," *op. cit.*, p. 64.

¹⁷ Pesci, Frank B. *op. cit.*

¹⁸ "Eastern Shore Study," report prepared by the Maryland State Department of Education, April 1959, p. 23.

¹⁹ *General Assembly of Maryland*, 1965, Senate Bill No. 419.

²⁰ *General Assembly of Maryland*, 1965, Senate Bill No. 420.

²¹ Maryland State Board of Education, *A Program for Progress in Higher Education in Maryland*, May 1960.

²² *Public Higher Education in Maryland: 1961-1975*, The Report of the Commission for the Expansion of Public Higher Education in Maryland, Baltimore, June 1962, p. 6.

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 47.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 40.

²⁵ Koos, Leonard V. "A Junior College Plan for Maryland," *School Review*, vol. LV, June 1947, p. 336.

²⁶ DeCicco, John. "A Critical Analysis of Community College Legislation," unpublished M.A. thesis, The Catholic University of America, 1952, p. 24.

²⁷ *Annotated Code of Maryland*, 1939 edition, Article 77, sec. 41a.

²⁸ Martorana, S. V. "Recent State Legislation Affecting Junior Colleges," *Junior College Journal* 20, January 1950, p. 250.

²⁹ Pullen, Thomas G. Jr., *op. cit.*, pp. 9 f.

³⁰ *Annotated Code of Maryland*, 1961 supplement, Article 77, sec. 304b.

³¹ *General Assembly of Maryland*, 1965, House Bill No. 245.

³² *Acts of 1961, General Assembly of Maryland*, c. 134.

³³ *Acts of 1961, General Assembly of Maryland*, c. 373.

³⁴ *Acts of 1962, General Assembly of Maryland*, c. 22.

³⁵ *General Assembly of Maryland*, 1964, Senate Bill No. 132.

³⁶ *General Assembly of Maryland*, 1965, Senate Bill

No. 634.

³⁷ *General Assembly of Maryland*, 1963, Senate Bill No. 9.

³⁸ *Junior College Directory*. Washington, D. C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1965, p. 10.

³⁹ *Public Higher Education in Maryland: 1961-1975*, *op. cit.*, p. 37.

⁴⁰ *The Washington Post*, June 30, 1965, p. B10.

⁴¹ *General Assembly of Maryland*, 1965, House Bill No. 981.

Maryland Revisited

And flourish they have since the summer of 1965. During the 1968 fall semester, Maryland's community colleges enrolled 26,594 students, an increase of 143 per cent over a period of four years.¹

In 1966, the first regional community college was opened for a four-county area on the eastern shore. Later, the state's thirteenth community college was established in Cecil County.

During the 1969 fiscal year, the state's contribution toward the operating expenses of community colleges was \$5,236,640—up 11 per cent in one year.

Since 1966, four community colleges have moved onto new campuses, and one completed a second campus; five colleges achieved full regional accreditation, and four others became recognized candidates for accreditation. Two of these candidates may gain full accreditation during 1969.

The year 1968 saw Maryland change from community colleges under unified school districts to independent control.² The quest for independence from the secondary school systems, which began in 1961, ended on May 7 when former Governor Spiro T. Agnew signed the community college governance bill into law.³ On July 1, 1969, the State Board for Community Colleges took full responsibility for the public two-year colleges in Maryland.

The legislation also creates local boards of trustees for the community colleges when local boards of education wish to be divested of the responsibility for managing and controlling the colleges. On July 1, 1969, the three largest community colleges in Maryland came under new governing boards.⁴

One major problem facing the new State Board for Community Colleges is that of assisting the junior colleges in fulfilling the second half of their dual purpose, i.e., offering occupational programs. In spite of constant pressure to increase enrollments in occupational programs, most of the students continue to enroll in curriculums designed to enable them to transfer to four-year institutions, rather than in programs which prepare students for direct entry into an occupation.

Frank B. Pesci

¹ Maryland State Department of Education. *Public Education in Maryland Newsletter*. 17; November 1968, p. 1.

² Pesci, Frank B. and Hart, Royal. "The Question of Governance in Maryland." *Junior College Journal* 38; February 1968, pp. 7-9.

³ *Acts of 1968, General Assembly of Maryland*. c. 454.

⁴ "New Boards Created in Maryland for 1969." *Junior College Journal* 39; December 1968/January 1969, p. 84.

The Explosion in Arizona

By Robert J. Hannelly

Pinal, Cochise, Graham, Tombstone, Yuma, Maricopa, Grand Canyon, and Barry Goldwater. With which great state are these names associated? Well, we want to tell you about the phenomenal activity in the junior college business 'way out here in Arizona, pardner.

We'll start with Maricopa County because that's where we work.

Consider the drama of change from the fall of 1962 to the fall of 1963. We are talking, of course, about the junior college in Phoenix and Maricopa County. The full-time day faculty went from 120 to 180 teachers. Likewise, the student enrollment from 8,000 to 12,000, head count. The "footsie"—i.e. F.T.S.E., or full-time-student-equivalent—went from 5,000 to 6,400. The district of 150 square miles embracing Phoenix was changed to include all of Maricopa County with an area four square miles less than Vermont. The population to be served increased from 500,000 to 800,000.

All of this without buying any new land or building additional buildings. How, then? Simply by expending almost \$300,000 for rent and by purchasing a few portable classrooms. Rented units full- or part-time include the present Phoenix College plant; fifteen rooms at Temple Beth Israel; a former church community center with Olympic-size swimming pool; an insurance building which was formerly an L.D.S. church; and the plush new Jewish Community Center. The extension farthest from the main campus is sixteen miles away.

The budget was hiked from \$1,800,000 to over \$5 million. Disproportionate, did we hear you say? Ah, but about \$2.5 million of the \$5 million is for capital outlay and for rent! This latter is necessary since for the last few years Phoenix College has been run on an austerity basis in capital outlay. The present plan is to acquire a site and build one-third to one-half of a complete additional junior college within the fiscal year.

How can all of this happen?

First, because of the overwhelming approval of county electors at the polls to the tune of 90,000 to 40,000. Imagine, 130,000 votes on the incorporation of a junior college district. Is this a record? To get so many it's necessary to make the date coincide with the general political election.

Second, because of the blue-ribbon board. The members include Mr. Robert M. Jaap, vice-president of the First National Bank with seventy branches; Dr. C. Lester Hogan, vice-president and general manager of Motorola, Inc., which spends \$50 million dollars in the county; Mr. W. J. Miller, treasurer of the Del Webb Corporation, which builds million-dollar structures over the entire Southwest; Mr. Dwight Patterson, operator of a multi-million dollar cattle and agricultural spread; Dr. Robert F. Easley, well-known head physician of a local hospital.

In the third place, because of realistic state subsidy. The state pays \$525 for each of the first 320 students and \$350 for each over 320. This is for operation and maintenance. In addition it pays \$115 per capita per year for capital outlay which is cumulative. Wait, that's not all! The state will match the original capital outlay up to \$500,000, e.g., if the district builds a building costing \$800,000, the state pays \$400,000. If it builds one costing \$1,200,000, the state pays \$500,000. You may ask, "Who pays the rest?" The county. The state and Maricopa County share the entire cost about fifty-fifty.

All In Four Months

We hope that the reader has shared our excitement so far. If the reader happens to be a junior

college administrator, he may share more fully some of the details in his department. Perhaps we were not accurate to indicate at the beginning that cataclysmic change took place in a year. Actually the administrative work was accomplished in about four months from May 1 to September 1. Most of it took place between July 1 and September 1, since the district began operation July 1.

In the months of May and June we hired additional personnel on a conditional basis, executed conditional lease contracts for facilities, and prepared a tentative budget. All these steps became legal on July 1. During the period from December 1 to the present the county board has met weekly for three hours. The administrative staff carried a 30 per cent overload during that period. Their vacations were curtailed or postponed to get facilities and programs ready by September 9, opening date.

One of the thorny personnel problems was to move a teacher who had taught for years at the main diggings to toil in the garden at an extension. However, the administration had to be firm, since it had promised the extension students and their parents that the same high standard for faculty would be maintained out there. This standard is, as a minimum, the master's degree and sixty semester hours in the subject taught. Also, we promised that the extensions would not be staffed entirely by new teachers. Thus, we had to twist a few arms, although some old hands were glad to change.

Books for the library? Now there's a job. The board allocated \$75,000 for new acquisitions. This required the library staff to work all summer.

Dr. Robert Sullivan, associate secretary for the Commission on Colleges and Universities of the North Central Association, assured us that our previous accreditation status covers the extensions. For this we are grateful, because high school graduates ask frequently about accreditation.

Our problems in payroll, student accounting, budget, and inventory control will be solved by an I.B.M. 1620 and other machines.

At extensions we have an administrative dean

who is jack-of-all-trades including instruction, student affairs, faculty affairs, counseling, and discipline. Dr. John D. Riggs and Dean J. Lee Thompson will change from our main campus to direct extensions. During June, the administrators spent lunch hours nailing screens, repairing doors, watering trees, and swimming at the extensions. Although we were not to acquire control until July 1, we determined to prevent vandalism and deterioration, without funds. Imagine a dean ordering teenage boys, probable future students, to get out of the pool and off the property while he stood there with his swim trunks under his arm. Fun and inconsistency!

Some Setbacks

Unsolved problems at the extensions are physical education programs, athletic eligibility, and food service. At one extension there is a snack bar, cafeteria, pool, tennis courts, and health club. Another has snack bar, pool, and gymnasium. A third has none of these. Perhaps, for these students, Joe's Hamburger Stand down the street, the high school gymnasium a mile away, and the golf driving range across the street will suffice. The physical education teachers will have to play by ear, emphasize carry-over sports, and learn to use community facilities. Since the extensions will not have football, should an ace player living in the extension be allowed to strengthen the team at the main campus? Yes, indeed, but how about basketball?

A setback which spread gloom throughout the junior college personnel was the failure of a \$9,750,000 bond election on May 7. Passage would have resulted in three brand-new junior colleges in 1965. The electors, by their negative vote, were protesting higher taxes for all schools and colleges. They indicated that the new district should learn to crawl before walking. The shock was probably good for the junior college management. A bond election for a lesser amount was held before July 1, 1964. Much explanation and interpretation of the advantage of junior college education to the youth

and to the community was necessary beforehand. The district, despite the first setback, was not without funds. Substantial capital funds were available outside of bonds, as were operational funds. We had to reach in the drawer and pull out Plan II.

In Other Counties

By no means is junior college expansion in Arizona restricted to Maricopa County. Eastern Arizona Junior College changed over to a state-county college for Graham County. President Paul Guitteau has completed building classrooms, gymnasium, stadium, and other facilities to serve 800 students.

Arizona Western College, serving Yuma County, opened in 1963, under the direction of President John Barnes, to serve 350 students.

President William Harwood is directing the building of Cochise College in the county of the same name. It opened for 320 students in 1964.

Pinal County has a board and will build on a new location this year.

Arizona is unique in having a seventeen-man state board of directors for junior colleges, consisting of one representative for each of the fourteen counties, appointed by the governor, the state superintendent of public instruction, the state superintendent of vocational education, and a representative from the board of regents. Dr. George A. Spikes serves ably as chairman. Dr. John F. Prince, an experienced and able junior college administrator, renders invaluable service as executive director for the state board.

The 1960 Arizona Law

The evolution of the junior college law of 1960 warrants attention. Due to the maze of conflicting requests from various counties, the legislature provided for the appointment of a study-survey committee to consider the problem of post-high school education. This group consisted of six legislators and six educators. Wisely, it provided \$30,000 for expenses. Dr. Frank B. Lindsay of California wrote

the report, the main features of which were written into the law.

The main features of the law are the independent state board for junior colleges and the capital outlay provision of \$115 per student per year. The state board controls curriculum, locations of colleges, and titles to property. The county boards choose and employ personnel and make the budget. A county or combination of contiguous counties must have a minimum of \$60 million of assessed value and a potential student body of 320 or more students before it can become a district which participates fully in state funds.

In 1960 only ten persons in Arizona served on junior college boards, but now there are forty-two.

The people in Arizona no longer confuse the junior college with the junior high school or the junior chamber of commerce. They know it is different from the high school and the university. They still need to learn more about the opportunities of its comparatively low cost and its propinquity. Furthermore, they need to understand that better post-high school education raises cultural and business levels of communities and that it is an investment in youth comparable to investment in other fabulous developments in the fabulous state of Arizona.

Arizona Revisited

Arizona's community colleges have again exceeded all projections. In four years, 1966 to 1970, enrollments have increased 63 per cent and the number of colleges has nearly doubled. There are ten state-supported public community colleges enrolling about 35,000 students. The Maricopa County Junior College District enrolls more than three-fourths of the state's total community college students. Maricopa has four community colleges in operation with a new one opening in 1971.

Pima County (Tucson) with its first campus, anticipates an enrollment of 6,000 by 1973, at which time, a second campus will be opened.

The Navajo National has established a community

college at Many Farms where they share facilities with a high school. Plans are underway for a new permanent campus north of Window Rock. The Navajo Nation has elected their own trustees and the Indians are operating the college themselves. The Indians chose not to be part of the Arizona state system.

Arizona is making higher education available to nearly all of its people; in 1971, 90 per cent of all citizens will be living within a community junior college district.

Arizona follows the national pattern with 70 per cent of all community college enrollees in university parallel programs. Thirty per cent are enrolled in occupational education courses. The state goal is for 50 per cent enrollment in occupational education to meet skilled labor needs by 1980. Another prediction foresees eight out of ten lower-division students in Arizona attending community colleges.

George L. Hall

The Oregon Story

By Don F. Pence

Although the history of the comprehensive community college movement in Oregon up to 1961 is, to a great extent, the history of Central Oregon College, no institution is an island, and many forces and influences made their contributions to the historical development of the Oregon movement.

Central Oregon College, located at Bend, Oregon, enrolled its first class in September, 1949, and with the exception of the 1949-50 academic year, during which time it shared its existence, including staff, with a similar attempt at Klamath Falls, the college at Bend pioneered the Oregon movement for thirteen years. An attempt was also made at Baker, Oregon, in 1949, but the operation only lasted for one term. The Klamath Falls program also closed after one academic term, and the faculty of three full-time professors who had commuted every other day between Bend and Klamath Falls, a distance then of 140 miles, were employed by the Bend district alone for the 1950-51 academic year. Until 1964 Central Oregon College was an evening school only, using the facilities of the Bend public schools.

Oregon is often referred to as the "last frontier," and for many good reasons. The state has not developed as rapidly as her neighbors—Washington, to the north, and California, to the south. Until the last decade, most of Oregon's population was concentrated in the Willamette Valley, and with most of that in the Portland area. Population concentration outside this area was not sufficient to force development of post-high school institutions. State support for public schools was slow in coming to Oregon where the people, until recently, took great pride in local autonomy and would rather go without than

be dependent upon state and federal participation. Oregon was progressive, however, in establishing a coordinated state system of higher education in the early thirties, but until 1960 these institutions were not overcrowded and so did not lend real support to a state system of two-year colleges. The four-year schools were ambitious for their own growth and feared the further division of the tax dollar.

This is not to say Oregon has been without its proponents for the two-year college, both public and private, including the vocational type of school, as well as the junior college or liberal arts type. As early as 1884 the Y.M.C.A. in Portland developed an evening school which was later organized as a two-year, nonprofit educational institution (1946), under the name of "Multnomah College."

Legislators in Oregon were undoubtedly looking across the border to California when, in 1925, legislation was introduced to permit the establishment of a public junior college in a district with a high school enrollment of 300 students and an assessed valuation of \$4,000,000. The bill failed to pass, which was probably good, for the minimum conditions were somewhat inadequate. In 1927, Senator Roberts of The Dalles, Oregon, introduced a bill providing for the establishment of junior colleges. He would have divided the state into thirteen junior college districts and had them formed by a vote of the people in the district. The 1927 "Roberts Bill" was, in the estimation of the writer, a good bill, but it failed to pass.

Undoubtedly, the great depression of the early thirties forestalled any further attempt by the state or local districts until 1938.

Menegat, in his *History of Trade and Industrial Education in Oregon*, states that "in February, 1938, the first area vocational school in Oregon was formed at Eugene." He lists the Oregon Vocational School (now Oregon Technical Institute) as number two, starting on July 14, 1947, and Oregon City Vocational School as number three, opening in 1949. These three schools were of a public nature designed to serve post-high school youth during the first half of the twentieth century. Their programs were pri-

marily of the trade and industrial type and remained so for several years; however, within the last few years the three have taken different courses.

Central Oregon College enrolled its first class in 1949 and operated under a statute commonly known as the "Dunn Bill," passed by the 1949 Legislative Assembly. This was a very simple statute which provided that a public school district could enter into a contract with the General Extension Division of the State System of Higher Education to provide lower division collegiate courses in the local district, and that the school board might provide funds in the regular budget for support of such classes to be supervised by the General Extension Division. Obviously, this was the extension-type, two-year college, with local financial support guaranteed to the state system of higher education.

The Eugene school came within the financial framework of the "community college" law in 1961, and was operated until June, 1965, by the Eugene school system as a technical-vocational school. On October 19, 1964, the Lane County Area Education District was approved by a vote of the people to establish a comprehensive community college for the area. By statute, the Eugene Technical-Vocational School will now discontinue, and the new "area district" will take over its function.

When pressures begin to be exerted on legislatures, the customary thing to do is to study the "problem" and report back next session, and/or hire a "specialist" from some distance away and pay him to study the "problem" and make recommendations. How welcome the specialist will be in the state after his report is printed and distributed depends upon the degree to which the report agrees with the majority opinion as preconceived. As disturbing as the lack of immediate implementation of such studies and reports may be, the writer has learned in eleven years of experience in working on legislation and with legislators, that persistence, with patience and understanding, will bring results.

The 1949 legislative session called Dr. Leonard

V. Koos to study the situation, and the results were published in 1950 in his *A Community College Plan for Oregon*. Although the writer disagreed vigorously with the Koos philosophy of the "integrated" type of college, under the same board of control that has grades one through twelve, the argument is purely academic, for the resultant law passed by the 1951 Legislative Assembly had a far more significant weakness as far as the people were concerned. That weakness was a lack of realistic participation by the state in the financing of junior colleges. The law was never used.

In 1955, an attempt was made to implement the "Dunn Bill," under which Central Oregon College operated, as an "extension" type of community college. The proposed legislation would have provided \$100 per full-time student equivalent to be paid by the state. The legislation failed after heavy last-minute lobbying by the state system of higher education. Although the legislation was killed in the Senate Committee on Education, after having passed the House of Representatives by a three-to-one majority, the near-success did bring forth another interim study committee, this time set up by joint action of the State Board of Education and the State Board of Higher Education.

This resultant legislation was a community law to replace the unused Koos-inspired junior college law. The 1957 law provided \$150 per full-time student (based on twelve hours per term), or a theoretical 25 per cent of operating costs. Central Oregon College came under the provision of this law, beginning July 1, 1957, by a vote of the local district electorate, and severed connection with the General Extension Division. One rather unusual feature, characteristic of "extension" type programs, was the inclusion in the new community college law of a provision that all transfer courses, and the instructors teaching such courses, must be approved by the state system of higher education; the idea being to provide a built-in approval system to facilitate the transfer of credits to the senior institutions. This provision has

been carried along in subsequent legislation, and is probably unique. The approval system ends when the community college becomes accredited by the Northwest Association of Secondary and Higher Schools.

The 1959 session set up two parallel interim studies on vocational education: one by Dr. W. R. Flesher of Ohio State University, and the other a legislative interim committee. Unfortunately, there was little communication between the two study groups, nor any real attempt to coordinate or make a comparative analysis of the two separate studies. Although the studies were conducted separately, there were certain areas of agreement. Among these was the concept of the "service" area and administrative district being one and the same. With the exception of the large Portland metropolitan area, the administrative districts for post-high school education were envisioned as larger than existing public school districts and were essentially viewed as superimposed districts for college purposes, covering the natural geographic and service areas of the state.

Working Toward New Legislation

Although two bills were introduced representing the thinking of each interim study, the resultant compromise was, in the opinion of the writer, basically sound in principle. However, it turned out to be rather unwieldy from a mechanical standpoint, in creating area districts through a vote of individual school districts within the area (something that was corrected by the 1961 legislature). The concept of area districts as a more desirable administrative framework than community colleges being created within unified school districts in a fourteen-year system, was now mandatory—except in one instance, Portland, a city of over 100,000 population. The financial support pattern moved up to \$200 per full-time student equivalent (based on twelve hours per term). The theory, this formula was based on the concept of one-third state, one-third student tuition,

and one-third local tax, on an assumed \$600 per year per student cost for operational expenses. No money was envisioned for buildings. A bill to have the state assume 50 per cent of operational costs and 50 per cent of building costs failed in committee.

The important gains in 1959 were: (1) the comprehensive concept in program by including vocational, adult, lower-division collegiate, and guidance services in a single framework, and (2) the "area education district" under a separate board of education.

Although this concept was formulated for future community colleges and area vocational schools under local district control, the legislature disregarded the recommendation of the State Board of Education and the State Board of Higher Education, as well as the recommendation contained in the *Flesher Report* on the subject of "Oregon Technical Institute" (then entirely under the State Board of Education), and transferred its control to the State Board of Higher Education.

With the exception of Central Oregon College, which moved from old to new statute under the usual "grandfather clause," no other college was formed to come within the statute. There were three basic reasons: (1) the mechanics of formation, through consolidation of territory contained in existing school districts, created the possibility of a checkerboard arrangement; (2) it did not provide for zoning within a college area district to guarantee board representation for each community within the area district; and (3) the state financial participation was still inadequate.

The Coos Bay-North Bend area attempted to form but ended in litigation which lasted through the biennium. Although during the 1950-60 decade great strides were made by individual unified school districts in Oregon, operating in cooperation with the State Division of Vocational Education in developing vocational programs at the post-high school level, none of them actually formed under the area district statute until after the close of the 1961 ses-

sion, which further implemented the area district law mechanically, but, more significantly, provided for the first time in the long history of this struggle a realistic formula of state participation.

Central Oregon College, like all pioneers, was blazing a trail for others who might follow. The writer has a feeling of gratitude to society for the opportunity of being involved in such a worthy pioneering movement. The involvement gave the writer a supreme challenge, as well as an opportunity to further his own education while assisting in the promotion of the movement. Working cooperatively with the State Department of Education, the State Board of Education, and the Oregon State University School of Education under Dean Franklin R. Zeran, the writer developed his doctoral dissertation, *Criteria for a System of Area Education Districts for the State of Oregon (1960)*, as a guideline for further implementation of the movement.

The writer's major professor on the dissertation was Dr. Wendell L. Van Loan, who later became the first president of Southwestern Oregon College at Coos Bay, the first area district college to be formed under the new 1961 statute.

It must, then, be said that, although Central Oregon College was the only institution operating as a community college prior to 1961, representatives of the State Department of Education, particularly Mr. Oscar I. Paulson, then state director of vocational education, Mr. William G. Loomis, supervisor of trade and industrial education, and Mr. Paul Wilmeth, president of the Oregon Vocational Association, as well as other educators and interested citizens in the various communities, worked along with representatives of Central Oregon College, including Dr. Orde S. Pinckney, now dean of the faculty; Mr. Robert S. Johnson, director of continuing education; and members of the legislature to bring to fruition the 1961 law. Its basic concept remains fundamental to our present statute.

Special recognition must go to Mr. Henry H. Hansen of North Bend, who worked diligently and

effectively in bringing into existence the present Southwestern Oregon College, and who served as chairman of its first board of education. Mr. Hansen was chairman of the local Longshoremen's Committee on Education and, later, chairman of the local community college study committee. He worked with the writer as an unpaid lobbyist during the 1957 and 1959 sessions, and is one of an originally small group of civic-minded citizens in various communities throughout Oregon who took a particular interest in the early phases of the movement. Among these are such names as Dr. E. G. Palmrose, an Astoria physician; J. Richard Gerttula, a Clatsop County dairyman; Dr. John Easley, an Ontario dentist; and William E. Miller, a Bend businessman and current chairman of the Central Oregon College board. These few citizens are but representative of the many civic leaders and legislators throughout Oregon who, over the years, were determined to see the movement through to its logical conclusion. During the fifties the movement was held together by an occasional meeting of interested persons, at some central point, to coordinate efforts. Our true reward came in the realistic legislation of the 1961 session and the college formations that followed.

With passage of the 1961 statute and its acceptable financial pattern, the movement became a reality. (The state was committed to pay \$433 per F.T.E. on operational costs and 75 per cent of building construction costs). The writer feels that the delay, in spite of earlier frustrations, probably accounts for the healthy condition of Oregon community colleges today. Oregon, by waiting and developing far-sighted legislation, has been able to avoid the dilemma in which some of the other states find themselves. For example, nine of the present eleven community colleges in Oregon are comprehensive in nature (only the Salem and Oregon City schools are exclusively technical-vocational), and eight of the eleven are set up on an "area district" basis. (Portland, Salem, and Oregon City are under unified districts.) Recent studies have recom-

mended that these also be re-formed on a "service" area basis, with a separate board.

Southwestern Oregon College, North Bend-Coos Bay, was established on May 15, 1961 (Wendell L. Van Loan, president); Treasure Valley College, Ontario, was established on October 19, 1961 (Eugene F. Voris, president); Clatsop College, Astoria, was established on February 14, 1962 (Richard D. Boss, president); Central Oregon College, Bend, was reestablished on an area basis on February 14, 1962 (Don P. Pence, president); Blue Mountain College, Pendleton, was established on June 11, 1962 (Wallace W. McCrae, president); Umpqua College, Roseburg, was established on March 30, 1964 (Harry Jacoby, president); and Mt. Hood College (area northeast of Portland) was established on June 3, 1965.

Currently, the area around The Dalles (Mid-Columbia district) is preparing to vote on the formation of an "area district," and an area around Albany (Linn-Benton counties) is discussing possible formation. Two additional areas have attempted formation and failed: one southeast of Portland in the Milwaukee-Oregon City area failed on May 18, 1962; and the other just west of Portland in the Beaverton area (Washington County), failed quite recently (April 22, 1965). The chief argument against the Beaverton attempt was its close proximity to the proposed new Portland Community College westside campus location on Mt. Sylvania.

One of the first acts during the 1961-63 biennium of the group of then eight colleges was to form a state association of community colleges. Again, trying to take advantage of the most progressive thinking and far-looking developments in other states, the group met and studied the constitutions and organizational patterns of similar organizations in other states. The result was something more comprehensive in nature than seems the usual pattern. An initial meeting was held in May, 1962, with Dr. Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., Dr. Thomas B. Merson of

the American Association of Junior Colleges, and Dr. Henry T. Tyler of the California Junior College Association, present as consultants. This, along with later organizational meetings, eventually led to the formation of a state association with four basic organizations underpinning it: a section for the chief administrative officers, a section for members of boards of education, a section for faculty and other staff, and a sponsored, but independent, section for students. The officers of the first three sections elect the presiding officers for the overall state association.

The association held its first annual conference at Clatsop College, May 10-11, 1963, emphasizing its concern with academic matters by holding two general sessions: the first was "Improvement in Writing," with Dr. Albert R. Kitzhaber, professor of English, University of Oregon, as principal speaker, and the second was on procedures for applying for accreditation to the Northwest Association of Secondary and Higher Schools, with Professor Thomas E. Kerr, then executive secretary of the Commission on Higher Schools, as principal speaker. This general, four-way pattern of organization is still in effect. The annual meetings are well-attended with good representation from each segment.

One of the group's objectives was coordination of appearances and proposals before the Legislative Assembly. This objective was achieved, and the results in favorable legislation were as much as could have been expected; however, there were some anxious moments. Although the total amount of \$850,000 in 1961-63 and \$1,350,000 appropriated for classroom construction in the 1963-65 biennium was not adequate in total dollars, the matching formula remains reasonable and now stands at 65 per cent of building and equipment. The 1961-63 formula was 75 per cent of buildings only. These two figures are comparable if one estimates equipment at 15 per cent of building costs.

The association employed its first "executive secretary," Tom Rigby, on a part-time basis in 1964,

to act as legislative liaison and coordinator of information.

The operational support remains at \$433 per full-time student equivalent; however, the F.T.E. formula was changed to 15 hours per term, effective 1964-65 school year. This represented a 20 per cent reduction, but the 1965 legislative assembly approved a measure to allow federal vocational funds to be paid to districts, over and above the \$433, as long as the combined total does not exceed 85 per cent of the difference between actual operating costs and the amount received from tuition. The state reimbursement formula is subject to legislative review each biennium. The 1961 legislative concept was that the state should pay two-thirds of the operating costs, and the 1963 legislative assembly applied this general concept to buildings and equipment. In actual practice, considering constantly increasing operating costs, plus laboratory equipment, and, in the case of buildings, the general campus development costs, the actual percentage more nearly approximates a 50 per cent reimbursement. The improved federal legislation will help this situation.

State Department Reorganizes

With the advent of a system of community colleges, the State Department of Education was reorganized by the state superintendent of public instruction, Dr. Leon P. Minear, himself a former junior college president at Stockton, California.

The position of assistant superintendent of public instruction in charge of community colleges was created, and Dr. Robert O. Hatton, president of Kellogg Junior College, Battle Creek, Michigan, was named to the position. Dr. Hatton took office in the fall of 1962 and is now assisted by Dr. William G. Loomis, state director of vocational education, and Donald M. Gilles of the Division of Trade and Industrial Education.

Over the years, we in the forefront of the movement have had ideological differences with certain school superintendents who looked upon the super-

imposed "area districts" as unnecessary additions that might create problems of administration, be less economical, a threat to local tax bases, etc. Or, in some instances, individuals firmly believed in the educational philosophy of the "integrated" fourteen-year unified public school system. Some of this attitude was a carry-over of the Koos study and the concepts contained in the old, unused, junior college law. The former system in the state of Washington (recently under serious study by the legislature there) gave ammunition to this particular position. We of the opposition tried to think not in terms of what was, or had been, but how junior colleges *should* be organized. We recognized that the junior colleges in Washington and California, and many other states, had grown out of the extension of the secondary school system. We tried to appraise the trends and also predict the future on the basis of the current attitudes of junior community college presidents in these same northwest states if they had a choice. The writer's doctoral thesis gave some study to this and found that thirty out of thirty-four junior college presidents responding to the question favored the separate "area district" over any other type of control, including full state control. Time has played in our favor, and the college "area districts" now seem to have the full support of nearly all the public school administrators.

An Area Becomes a Community

Early-day towns and villages were developed as shopping and social centers, and were located as close together as a horse and buggy or ranch wagon could travel in a couple of hours. Travel is still measured in terms of "minutes" rather than "miles," but modern transportation has forced a change in our whole concept of distance, and makes it possible for a geographic area to behave in a cultural relationship comparable to what one town or community might have forty years ago. Yet the fear on the part of these separate towns or communities that they may lose their local autonomy is still very real, and the ghosts of ancient jealousies

often appear to cloud the issue of the college "area district." (Central Oregon College has approximately 10,000 square miles of territory, seven high schools, and all of three and parts of three additional counties in its area district.)

Our experience is proving that a community college can make a "community" of a rather large, natural geographic area. An analysis of voter reaction shows that although the original issue carried in five of the six counties—in fact, the only unanimous vote favoring formation came from the residents of the county farthest away (Lake County, the northern part of which is included in the college district)—the heaviest support came from the Bend area. (The college was scheduled to be constructed in Bend.)

Each vote of the general constituency since then has presented a more even distribution of favorable votes, and last May 3, 1965, the support pattern was approximately equal in all six counties, indicating a "community" of interest and support of an area larger than some states. This pattern of "grass roots" approval seems to be generally taking place in Oregon. Much of the credit must go to the type of persons who have been attracted to our local college boards of education. Most of our large "area districts" are zoned for directors, to allay the ancient fears, but once elected the directors hold the college interests paramount. In the main, these boards consist of leading professional, business, and labor leaders of the individual communities. Typical of the wholesome attitude is a remark made by a charter member of the Central Oregon College Board, Rupert Park. Mr. Park, an attorney and resident of the nearby community of Redmond, led a campaign to have the college located in Redmond, the center of population. He was opposed by a Bend attorney, Mr. Owen Panner, who later became the first chairman of the college board, and who led a campaign to have the college remain in Bend, the largest town of the area. These two outstanding attorneys brought this battle to a head in the form of a public hearing before the State Board

of Education. Testimony was presented by some forty persons on both sides to the largest audience ever to attend a hearing in Central Oregon (1,200 persons), and it consumed over four hours. When it was all over and the state board later rendered the verdict that the college would be located in Bend, Mr. Park remarked, "Although I believe in the Redmond location and have worked hard for it, I will now work equally hard for the success of a college in Bend"; and he has. This is typical of the fine caliber and attitude of the board members of the Oregon community colleges.

Learning from Each Other

Central Oregon College, having developed out of the General Extension Division of the State System of Higher Education, carried with it certain orientations that might differ from schools such as the ones in Eugene or Portland that have developed primarily out of secondary school vocational and adult education programs.

The fact is, that all of us seem to be learning from each other, as well as from other states, and we become more and more alike each year. Central Oregon College has pioneered academic rank for instructors, and now many others are adopting it. Southwestern Oregon adopted the system of higher education's salary plan and tenure system. Others are now considering this, or similar plans. Central Oregon College put into effect this year a system of paid sabbaticals, and we hope that others may follow.

Administratively, most of the Oregon schools are still divided into technical-vocational and liberal arts divisions, with each division headed by a dean. In 1963, Central Oregon College departed from this "two schools" concept, with two complete sets of curriculums, to a "one school" concept, with general education courses developed to support both the technical and the transfer programs, as well as a new series of preparatory courses in reading, writing, and math to prepare students found deficient to

enter either of these major areas. Administratively, we have one dean of faculty and four college divisions, with technical and vocational programs assigned to the division to which they are by their nature most related.

In Conclusion

It has not been the purpose of this article to go into details of the various statutes that have been, or are currently, back of the community colleges and technical-vocational schools of Oregon, but to provide the reader with an overview of the historical development of the community college movement in the state. We in Oregon are proud of our development and make no apologies for being late on the national scene. We anticipate making up for lost time. New construction and new site developments have taken, or are taking, place at nine of the eleven established schools. Four are now operating on their own permanent campuses as construction continues (Central Oregon, Clatsop, Salem, and Southwestern Oregon). Five others are operating in temporary facilities as they develop permanent campuses (Blue Mountain, Lane, Portland, Treasure Valley, and Umpqua). Mt. Hood College has just been formed, and the Oregon City school operates in its own quarters as part of the Oregon City school system. This area southeast of Portland was one of the two places where the "area district" vote failed, but the writer understands that proponents of this area are planning to bring the issue to a vote again soon.

We hope and believe that, in the formulation of our statutes for the two-year college, whether it be primarily a liberal arts program, a technical-vocational school, or a comprehensive program with all types of post-high school education being adequately represented, we have profited from the experience of other states and certainly from the counsel and advice of those in the national offices. We believe our current statute, including amendments from the 1963 and 1965 legislative assemblies, represents progressive legislation and provides an appropriate

framework for the development of a fine system of community colleges in the state of Oregon.

Oregon Revisited

Since 1965 community colleges in Oregon have "come of age." Enrollment has more than doubled with 18,600 reimbursable F.T.E. enrolled fall quarter, 1968. The colleges are serving over 36,000 students.

This four-year period has seen the creation of two additional community colleges: Clackamas Community College in Oregon City and Linn-Benton Community College in Corvallis.

Portland Community College has separated from the Portland School District and will operate in an expanded five-county area starting in June 1969.

Two of the three largest colleges—Portland and Mt. Hood Community College—are located in the Portland metropolitan area. It is predicted that within five years the community colleges of Oregon will be handling 37,000 F.T.E. or 66,000 headcount. Plans are now underway to bring about the development of two or three additional community college districts and the eventual inclusion of all parts of the state in some community college district.

The Oregon Legislature is providing a larger percentage of operational funds for these colleges. Under a "light-bill" approach, community colleges now receive \$575 for the first 400 reimbursable F.T.E., \$475 for the next 300, and \$433 for the F.T.E.'s above 700.

The Oregon Community College Association located office facilities in Salem in November 1967. Donald Shelton, executive secretary, heads the permanent staff. Board members, administrators, faculty, and students are represented in the four sections of the association.

Dale Parnell is now the state superintendent of public instruction. (Dr. Minear, the previous superintendent, is now with H.E.W. in Washington, D. C.). Currently, the State Department of Education is reorganizing the community college section of the department.

Earl J. Klapstein

Five Years of Progress In Florida

By James L. Wattenbarger

In the fall of 1962, over half of the Florida freshmen who enrolled in higher education were enrolled in Florida's public junior colleges. The percentage of freshmen enrolled in junior colleges has increased each year; the 1962 figures, however, represent the highest level to date. There were twenty-nine junior colleges operating in seventeen junior college areas located within commuting distance of 63 per cent of the state's high school graduates.

Because of the great increase in junior college attendance and because of the importance these institutions hold in relationship to the total program of higher education in the state, the State Junior College Board felt that one of its first activities should be to conduct an evaluative study to determine the progress which had been made over the five years since the 1957 legislature approved the expansion of the junior college program.

The board specifically set up three purposes for the evaluative study: (1) to determine the progress that has been made in Florida's junior college development; (2) to study the long-range educational planning as it may relate to the business and industrial development of Florida; (3) to develop specific plans regarding all phases of community junior college programs so that the quality and the effectiveness of the educational services of these institutions might be improved. The final report of the study is now available.

The board appointed five task forces which were made up of thirty-three members of junior college faculties. The study was also supervised by a co-

ordinating committee whose membership was composed of representatives from the legislature, from junior college faculties, from junior college advisory boards, and from the board of control.

The time of the study extended over eighteen months, at the end of which the board reviewed the recommendations of the task forces and the recommendations of the coordinating committee. From these its own recommendations were developed. These are outlined in the final report.

The study was divided into five areas: aims and purposes, students, faculty, year-round operation, and legal structure. Here is a summary of the reports:

Aims and Purposes

The basic functions of Florida's junior colleges as defined in the law and as interpreted by the task force of junior college faculty members, seemed to be accepted and understood by a selected sample of citizens of the communities served by these institutions. The sample of the opinions rated the described functions in the following order of importance:

1. The freshman-sophomore college program
2. A comprehensive program of guidance
3. Technical, business, and semiprofessional programs
4. Adult noncredit courses, seminars, and institutes
5. A program of student activities
6. Occupationally oriented programs of a vocational nature.

It was interesting to note that the order in which these items were placed varied from college to college. As a matter of fact, some colleges placed technical, business, and semiprofessional programs at the top of the list, while other colleges placed importance upon these items in a different order. This fact emphasized one of the findings which the State Junior College Board listed in its report: all communities do not expect the same service from their community junior colleges. There is a degree of di-

iversity between the communities and their expectations or their own local institutions. This diversity is reflected in the attitudes of the selected citizens in the communities as well as in the various programs that are available in the junior colleges.

In 1957, the Community College Council pointed out to the legislature that there were barriers which prevented young people from continuing beyond high school. These were described as geographic, economic, and motivational. The Community College Council suggested that community junior colleges would contribute toward overcoming these barriers. There is specific evidence that the junior colleges have done much to eliminate these barriers, and that junior colleges are extending opportunities to many citizens who otherwise would not have had an opportunity.

In a questionnaire directed to students 48 per cent of the junior college students reported that they attended a particular junior college because of its proximity to their homes; 27 per cent reported that the cost was a major factor influencing their decision to enroll in a particular junior college. Over 70 per cent of these young people indicated that they had achieved the highest educational level in their immediate family.

Students

Florida's community junior colleges have a varied student body. For example, the age of junior college students in Florida varies from 16 to 78. Men outnumber women students three to two; the usual collegiate ratio in this regard is three to one, indicating that Florida's junior colleges are being of particular service to young women who wish to continue beyond high school.

Some interesting facts about Florida junior college students' financial level were indicated by whether or not they work. Fifty-eight per cent of Florida junior college students work while attending the junior colleges. Approximately 10 per cent report that they have full-time jobs while attending junior college full-time.

Another interesting point is that 73 per cent of the junior college students in Florida plan to stay in Florida after they complete their education. This is a reversal of a past trend when students moved away from the state after they completed their higher education at an out-of-state institution.

The board noted that while Florida's community junior colleges served students who represent a wide range of abilities, approximately one-half of the college credit students in the state are readily admissible to the state universities under the present Board of Control admission policies. Over 50 per cent of the junior college students scored 300 or above. In actuality, less than 10 per cent of the students scored in the lowest quintile, emphasizing the fact that junior colleges probably are doing even less for this group than they are for the top group.

Faculty

The Faculty Task Force found out many interesting facts about Florida's junior college faculties. For example, over 12 per cent of these individuals hold doctor's degrees, and an additional 77 per cent hold master's degrees, leaving only 11 per cent who do not hold master's or doctor's degrees. These few are teaching in vocationally oriented programs which do not require an advanced academic degree. Almost half of Florida's junior college faculty members have previous experience teaching in a four-year college, and almost 70 per cent have taught at some other level of education previous to their teaching in the junior college.

These factors, a relatively high level of academic preparation and a diversity of experience, have contributed to quality teaching. The board found that the morale of junior college faculties is high. Ninety per cent reported that they were satisfied with junior college teaching as a career; only 8 per cent reported that the morale of the college was below average.

The median salary for Florida's junior college faculty members for 1960-61 was only \$5,800 for ten months. This is \$1,400 less than the national

median for junior college faculty members for nine months. Florida junior colleges are, in fact, going backward in this regard, since in 1957 there was an \$800 differential between the national and state medians. The provision for a more nearly adequate salary is a major difficulty in continuing to employ the quality of faculty which is needed in the junior college program.

It was also interesting to note that over 40 per cent of the faculty members reported that they were in favor of the principle of merit pay for teachers. However, three-fourths of the group indicated a strong opposition to the criteria currently in use.

During the five-year period, 1957-1961, Florida's junior colleges increased in number from five to twenty-five; in enrollment from 5,000 to 30,000; and in size of faculty from 240 to more than 1,100. This rate of growth was unmatched elsewhere in the United States. In the fall of 1962, a continued increase was reported when twenty-nine junior colleges enrolled 38,000 students.

The board also noted that there was a great need for year-round operation in the junior colleges, especially in relationship to the articulation with the universities. One of the strong recommendations from the study was for year-round operation of the junior colleges.

Legal Structure

The Legal Structure Task Force pointed up the need for continued state coordination. This becomes a more time-consuming responsibility with twenty-nine institutions than for the five which were in existence in 1957. With this in mind, the Junior College Board has recommended that the authority which had been granted to it by the 1961 legislature be described more clearly by specifying that the State Junior College Board has this statewide coordinative responsibility acting under the supervision of the State Board of Education. The board specifies that the Division of Community Junior Colleges in the State Department of Education con-

stitutes the board's staff and that the entire staff of the State Department of Education should continue to provide help to the board as needed.

Upon careful analysis of the local control status and function, the board reported that no better, no more economical, no more efficient organization could be devised for Florida. Florida's junior college growth and development has resulted largely because of the extensive help and support from the local public school systems. The board, therefore, recommended that no change be made in reference to local control.

As a result of the examination of the existing problems in administrative procedures, however, a joint committee of presidents and superintendents has developed policy statements designed to improve local procedures.

The study was an extensive one; it has provided a great deal of information regarding Florida's community junior colleges. New questions for continued investigation have appeared; more information about students who do not transfer is needed; more information about getting new programs started; more information about faculty improvement. *Five Years of Progress* takes its place as part of the continuing program for improving educational opportunity in Florida.

Addendum

Since the above article was written, additional developments have taken place in Florida. The median salary for two semesters of work is now \$7,200. The 1965 Florida Legislature approved five new junior college areas, and now the master plan for community junior college development is completed except for one area of the state.

There are twenty areas currently operating junior colleges. These provide a community junior college opportunity within commuting distance of more than 77 per cent of the state's high school graduates. When all of the junior college areas now authorized by the legislature are in operation there will be twenty-seven institutions providing junior college

education within commuting distance of 95 per cent of the state's population. After that, one more area will complete the master plan. It is estimated that all areas will be in operation before 1970.

During the past two years growth in enrollment in occupational programs has increased almost twice as fast as the total enrollment. Over ninety different occupational programs are available, and almost 25 per cent of the students are enrolled in these courses.

The total enrollment in Florida's community junior colleges during 1964-65 exceeded 104,000 students. Over 60 per cent of the freshmen in Florida were attending junior colleges last year, and in some universities the junior classes were the largest classes.

The estimates for 1970 indicate that almost 200,000 students will be enrolled in the junior colleges in Florida at that time. This growth will have occurred during the fifteen years since the 1955 legislature established the Community College Council Study—from 3,700 students to 200,000 students in fifteen years.

Florida Revisited

Major changes have developed in Florida's community junior college program since 1966. The 1967 session of the Florida Legislature approved the establishment of the last area in the state needed to complete the master plan. Twenty-eight community junior colleges are now authorized to provide education at this level within commuting distance of 99 per cent of the state's population. All of these are in operation as of fall 1968, except one.

The 1967 legislature memorialized the completion of this master plan by a concurrent resolution expressing "pride in the development of this program of post-high school education . . . and the contributions this program of higher education is making to the people of Florida . . ." (SCR1537, HCR2876). The legislature continued its appropriations of funds for current operating expenses and capital outlay in accordance with its previous, enthusiastic support.

In January 1968, a special session of the legislature approved an amendment to Florida's basic junior college law which (1) created junior college districts with boards of trustees as the governing boards and, (2) increased operating funds to provide for salary increases and special funds for faculty and program improvement.

The new districts are defined as the county or combination of counties which had previously been the basic areas of the state approved to operate junior colleges by the State Board of Education. The new boards of trustees are made up of the local advisory committees which had been serving in this capacity since the beginning of each college. The transition on July 1, 1968, was, therefore, a relatively simple one involving no change in geographical areas or board members.

The State Junior College Board continues its responsibility as the state-level coordinating board with an executive officer who also serves as the assistant state commissioner in charge of the Division of Community Junior Colleges. The state-level staff works specifically with the Junior College Presidents' Council which advises the State Junior College Board on matters relating to the community junior college development in Florida. The Council of Academic Affairs and the Council of Business Affairs, with membership representing each junior college, serve in advisory capacities to the presidents' council. These three councils meet regularly to consider matters pertinent to their responsibilities.

A major emphasis upon occupational education was made by providing 50 per cent more operating funds for vocational and technical courses. New programs and continued expansion of existing programs have resulted from this increased recognition of the costs of occupational education.

A new accounting system was also put into effect as of July 1, 1968. This system resulted from an eighteen-month study of the needs for budgetary planning and operation in the community junior colleges. The new system has been carefully planned

to be adaptable to large and small institutions and to various types of computer analysis; it also provides information for programmed budgeting procedures.

Fall enrollment for 1968 had been predicted to reach 81,300 college-level enrollments with an overall total of 111,925. Actual figures were 89,648 college-level students with a total of 112,898. These figures substantiate a continued 15 per cent increase over the previous year. Even if this increase experiences a proportionate drop, the Florida community junior colleges will be serving over 250,000 students by 1975.

Florida now has completed its planning phase and is ready to move into a continued improvement phase.

James L. Wattenbarger

North Carolina Is Counting On Community Colleges

By Howard R. Boozer

North Carolina has been slow to develop public community colleges. In 1950 the state superintendent of public instruction authorized a study of the need for a system of state-supported community colleges. This study, which included a basic plan for the development of such a system was published in 1952¹ but the recommended program was not adopted by the 1953 General Assembly.

However, in 1955, the General Assembly did make small grants-in-aid to the four municipally supported community colleges in the state, amounting, in the aggregate, to less than \$20,000 each year of the 1955-57 biennium.

Additional progress was made after the creation in 1955 of the State Board of Higher Education, when provisions were made for state appropriations for capital purposes on a matching basis and for grants-in-aid for operational purposes.

With the passage of the Community College Act of 1957, the continuing participation of the state was formalized. This participation was limited, however, to the provision on a matching basis of funds for the construction of academic facilities and grants-in-aid in partial support of the college parallel curriculum. One new college came into being under the 1957 act, making a total of only five public community colleges in the state as of the 1962-63 school year. One additional college was chartered in January, 1963; it began classes in September, 1964.

North Carolina, in company with many other states, faces a college enrollment crisis in the years immediately ahead. Its fifty-eight collegiate institu-

tions² enrolled 75,201 students in the fall of 1961—40,056 in tax-supported colleges and 35,145 in private institutions. Divided another way, 65,478 were enrolled in the senior colleges (public and private) and 8,846 were in the junior colleges: 6,438 in the fifteen private junior colleges and 2,408 in the five public community colleges. Junior college enrollment represented 11.8 per cent of the total in the higher education institutions in the state.³

Since 1957, in addition to public community colleges and other collegiate institutions, the state has also had a system of industrial education centers.⁴ As of September, 1963, nineteen were in operation. These centers are essentially post-high school institutions created to train technicians and skilled craftsmen.

The first I.E.C.'s opened in 1959 and within the twelve months preceding March, 1963, were attended by more than 35,000 persons. Approximately 2,100 students were enrolled in two-year technician curriculums in the spring of 1963 on either a full- or part-time basis, and as of June, 1963, more than 4,000 persons had completed these two-year programs.

The Governor's Commission

Early in 1961 the Board of Higher Education requested that Governor Terry Sanford appoint a Community College Advisory Committee which would undertake a thorough study leading to a long-range plan for the development of community colleges and possible additional senior institutions. The scope of the proposed study was enlarged, and in September, 1961, a Governor's Commission on Education Beyond the High School was appointed. This twenty-five-member commission was composed of legislators, educators, and laymen. The work of the commission was completed in August, 1962, and its report was published in December, 1962.⁵

In order better to understand the quantitative dimensions of the problems faced by higher education in the next two decades, the Governor's Commission and the Board of Higher Education jointly

authorized a study of enrollment projections. This study, completed early in 1962, predicted enrollment of 117,700 in the colleges and universities by 1970, an increase of 42,500 over the 1961 figure.⁶ Private colleges indicated in a survey that they planned to enroll 46,395 students in 1970, or 11,250 more than in the fall of 1961. This left the state with the responsibility of providing higher education opportunity by 1970 for approximately 71,300 students, about 31,250 or 78 per cent more than in the fall of 1961.

These projections dealt only with likely enrollments in regular collegiate programs and did not take into account the additional thousands who will need and desire post-high school education of a vocational, technical, or semiprofessional nature. A comprehensive study in 1961 of technical and skilled manpower needs in the years ahead revealed that industries in the state will require an additional 20,320 skilled craftsmen and 6,321 technicians by 1966, over and above the numbers then employed in these categories.

Hope in the Community College

It was immediately clear to the Governor's Commission, from the above projections, that the number of qualified persons who will be seeking post-high school education in North Carolina in the years ahead will greatly exceed the capacity of existing institutions. The policy question facing the commission and the state was how this tremendous need could best be met. The major problem was obviously related to enrollments at the undergraduate level, particularly in the freshman and sophomore years. The alternatives were the expansion of present residential institutions by building additional classrooms and dormitories, the creation of additional colleges, or a rational combination of the two.

The commission decided, not surprisingly, that a realistic expansion of existing institutions and the establishment of new colleges was the wisest course

to take. It recognized immediately that the hope for the future with reference to new institutions is the community college, diversified in scope and comprehensive in its programs and curriculums, which will put post-high school education within the financial and geographical reach of many qualified persons who otherwise will not be able to continue their education.

A study of the need for additional community colleges in the state, including their likely locations and service areas, was later made under the auspices of the Governor's Commission and the Board of Higher Education. Taking into account the accessibility of possible locations to potential students and the proximity of existing public and private colleges and universities, and on the conservative assumption that by 1966 a comprehensive community college should have a potential enrollment in college parallel courses alone of 400 students, fourteen areas in which community colleges were needed and would be likely to succeed were identified.⁸

Two Parallel Systems or One

In considering the future of the community college in North Carolina the commission took note of a number of facts. The few community colleges already in existence tended to concentrate their energies on college parallel programs. The relative emphasis on technical-vocational and adult education was minor. Two major factors accounted for this: the existence of a system of industrial education centers separately organized and administered, and the fact that state support was not provided in the community colleges for adult education programs or for technical-vocational-terminal programs of less than college grade. The focus of the public community colleges on college parallel programs, plus the location of three of the five in Charlotte, Wilmington, and Asheville (population centers lacking public senior colleges), combined to create strong currents in favor of the eventual conversion of these three institutions to senior colleges.

The community colleges and the industrial educa-

tion centers, both tax-supported, post-high school institutions of two-year grade, were completely separate systems. At the state level the community colleges were within the jurisdiction of the State Board of Higher Education; the industrial education centers were under the State Board of Education. The methods of financing were dissimilar. Capital expenditures for community colleges were provided on a matching basis by the county and by the state. Current support was provided from student fees, local taxes, and grants-in-aid from the state, with the limitation that state support could not exceed that provided by local taxes. In the case of the industrial education centers the land and buildings (and their maintenance) were provided locally and the operating funds were provided through various federal programs and by the state. No tuition was charged and fees were negligible.

The commission was faced with the question of whether there would be a system of community colleges, with their own functions and identities, and with the prior question of whether the state should perpetuate two parallel systems of post-high school two-year institutions ("community colleges" on the one hand, "industrial education centers" on the other), or create *one* system of "comprehensive" community colleges.

The commission was aware of the consensus among outstanding educators in the community junior college field that, in principle, the community college should be comprehensive, incorporating in one institution appropriate technical-vocational, college parallel, and adult education curriculums responsive to the needs of the area served by the college. Further, it was aware that in a number of other states the experience has been that technical-vocational institutions eventually add general education curriculums and become more comprehensive in scope.

This tendency was already apparent in the industrial education centers in North Carolina. There was recognition in many quarters that the I.E.C.'s

should make available a broadened curriculum. As early as February, 1962, two committees of the Governor's Commission had adopted resolutions urging the State Board of Education to make instruction in the liberal arts available in the industrial education centers as soon as practicable. On the other hand, the state, through the 1957 Community College Act, was already committed to support technical programs of college grade and college parallel courses in the community colleges.

Recommendations of the Commission

Major recommendations of the Commission⁹ with respect to the future development of post-high school institutions dealt with a statutory definition of the functions of the University of North Carolina (with three campuses—at Chapel Hill, Raleigh, and Greensboro) as the only tax-supported institution in the state with the authority to offer doctoral programs and award doctor's degrees; the conversion of the community colleges in Charlotte, Wilmington, and Asheville to senior colleges; and the development of a new system of comprehensive community colleges.

These recommendations were incorporated into the administration's bill on higher education which, with very few modifications, became law when ratified by the General Assembly of North Carolina on May 17, 1963.¹⁰

Major Features of the New System

The Governor's Commission came to the conclusion that the community colleges and industrial education centers would tend to become more alike than unlike; that the perpetuation of two increasingly similar but separate systems of post-high school institutions of two-year grade could not be justified on educational or economic grounds; and that the continuation of state-level supervision of the two systems in different agencies would lead to undesirable competition, lack of effectiveness and efficiency,

and economic waste. Therefore, the commission recommended that the state develop one system of public two-year post-high school institutions offering university parallel, technical-vocational-terminal, and adult education instruction tailored to local and area needs; and that comprehensive community colleges so created (including industrial education centers and technical institutes) be subject to state level supervision by one agency—the State Board of Education. The State Board of Higher Education concurred in this recommendation. This structure is now provided for by statute.

The commission also recommended that the State Board of Education perform its supervisory duties through a new agency created for that purpose and responsible directly to the board, with a professional staff composed of persons with training and experience appropriate to the supervision of collegiate institutions.

It further recommended that there be created a Community College Advisory Council which would advise the State Board of Education on matters relating to personnel, curriculums, finance, articulation, and coordination with other institutions, and other policy matters concerning community colleges.

Following the enactment of the Higher Education Act, which included the above provision, the State Board of Education in June, 1963, established a Department of Community Colleges with I. E. Ready as director. The Community College Advisory Council, consisting of sixteen members, was also appointed in June, 1963. Its chairman is Allan S. Hurlburt, professor of education at Duke University. Dr. Hurlburt was director of the 1952 Community College Study sponsored by the State Department of Public Instruction.

Other major features of the new law, largely reflecting the recommendations of the Governor's Commission, are that responsibility for local control of post-high school, two-year institutions (community colleges, technical institutes, and industrial education centers) is vested in a board of trustees of

each institution which is independent of other education boards; that the state may match local funds for the construction of facilities up to a maximum of \$500,000 at each institution;¹¹ and that operational costs at each institution are to be borne by the county of location (15 per cent), by the students (20 per cent), and by the state—including federal assistance in support of certain programs (65 per cent). These proportions are approximate. The operating budgets of these institutions are by line items with responsibilities at local and state levels specified. For example, localities provide for maintenance and operation of plant, and may supplement other items in the budget.

The 1963 and 1965 General Assemblies made available to the State Board of Education the funds required to implement the community college provisions of the Higher Education Act. Twenty-three institutions (five community colleges, fifteen technical institutes, and three industrial education centers) will be in operation by Fall, 1965, under the aegis of the Department of Community Colleges of the State Board of Education. Seven additional community colleges have been authorized (as of June, 1965), and will open their doors by Fall, 1966. Enrollment in these institutions is increasing by leaps and bounds. Full-time equivalent (F.T.E.) enrollment in 1963-64 of 8,500 students will have doubled in two years (by 1965-66) to approximately 17,000.

A Bright Future

The Higher Education Act included significant gains which will mark the 1963 North Carolina General Assembly as one of the most forward-looking in the history of the state. This enabling legislation provided the framework for the development of a system of comprehensive community colleges, open to all qualified students without regard to race, which will do much to democratize educational opportunity in North Carolina. This legislation augurs well for the future of community colleges in the state. They will be of vital importance in meeting

the post-high school and higher educational demands of the future.¹²

¹ *Community College Study*. Raleigh, North Carolina: State Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1952. 44 pp.

² There are, in addition, four theological or Bible schools.

³ Total enrollment had increased to 92,993 students (52,101 in tax-supported and 40,892 in private institutions) by Fall, 1964, a 24 per cent increase in three years. A study recently completed projects that the enrollment in Fall, 1965, will rise to 107,800—an increase of approximately 16 per cent in one year. “During the same period the number of new college freshmen is expected to increase by 30.5 per cent, that is from 26,125 in 1964 to 34,088 in 1965.” Hamilton, C. Horace, *Projection of Fall Enrollment in North Carolina Colleges and Universities*. Mimeographed, January, 1965, p. 1.

⁴ In addition, there are 113 proprietary, trade, and vocational schools in the state.

⁵ *The Report of the Governor's Commission on Education Beyond the High School*. Raleigh, North Carolina: 1962. 133 pp.

⁶ Hamilton, C. Horace. *Projection of Fall Enrollment in North Carolina Colleges and Universities, 1962-80*. Raleigh, North Carolina: North Carolina State College, 1962. p. v. Hamilton predicted that 80,000 students would be enrolled in Fall, 1962; 82,900 in Fall, 1963; and 87,300 in Fall, 1964. Actual enrollments in those years were 80,804 in 1962, 86,085 in 1963 and 92,993 in 1964.

⁷ Employment Security Commission of North Carolina. *North Carolina Study of Technical and Skilled Manpower Requirements*. Raleigh, North Carolina: Employment Security Commission, 1962. 87 pp.

⁸ Hamilton, C. Horace. *Community Colleges for North Carolina: A Study of Need, Location, and Service Areas*. Raleigh, North Carolina: North Carolina State College, 1962. 66 pp., abridged edition.

⁹ The sixty-one recommendations of the commission are listed seriatim in the *Report of the Governor's Commission on Education Beyond the High School* on pages 1-11. Those concerning community colleges appear on pages 4-6 of the report.

¹⁰ S.B. 72 (as amended), “An Act to Promote and Encourage Education Beyond the High School in North Carolina.” The 1965 General Assembly created a fourth campus of the University in Charlotte incorporating Charlotte College into the Consolidated University of North Carolina.

¹¹ This is the only point on which the legislation differed significantly from the recommendations of the Governor's Commission. The commission recommended that funds for all capital purposes be provided locally.

¹² A staff study concerning community colleges, completed in the spring of 1962 by the author, has been drawn upon heavily in this article. Parts of that study were incorporated in the report of the Governor's Commission on Education Beyond the High School (1962).

North Carolina Revisited

As of January 1, 1969, the only significant legal change has been to permit the State Board of Education to enter into agreements with local boards of education for the establishment of "extension units of the Community College System." These are essentially area vocational schools for adults, offering technical, vocational, and adult education programs. They are called "technical institutes, contracted." At present, fifteen such institutions are in operation. This provision has made it possible to avoid, in North Carolina, the setting up of a separate system of area vocational schools.

The total number of institutions now in operation is fifty. Of these, thirteen are fully comprehensive community colleges, twenty-two are independent technical institutes, and fifteen are contracted technical institutes. An institution is now located within commuting distance of 95 per cent of the population of the state.

The unduplicated headcount enrollment in full and part-time study during the four-quarter 1967-68 year was 189,276. Enrollment in basic and occupational education courses made up two-thirds of this enrollment.

Future planning does not contemplate much expansion in number of institutions, but rather concentration on improvement. The needs of students who have educational deficiencies will receive special attention. Emphasis will continue on basic and occupational education for adults, and on the "second chance" opportunity for college-level studies through the open-door policy, because this is the educational gap that the North Carolina community college system is uniquely equipped to fill.

I. E. Ready

Bold Plans for the Bay State

By Walter M. Taylor

"Massachusetts . . . there she is . . . Behold her."

A wag in the U.S. Senate gallery hearing Daniel Webster's oratory that day in 1830 is said to have appended an irreverent "All alone!"

The Massachusetts plan for public community colleges remains unique—comes close to being "all alone"—in perhaps seven respects:

1. Control and financing, wisely, resides at state level.

2. Costs are not reflected in local or regional tax levies.

3. The state plan assures coverage of 97 per cent of the homes of the state with "geographical accessibility." No student need travel more than thirty miles or forty-five minutes in one-way daily commuting.

4. The state plan assures all regions of equal financial support; economically poorer regions are not penalized.

5. The unpaid fifteen-member state board of control has responsibility for no other program than that of the community college; its energies are not diffused.

6. Policy does not have to respond to local pressures but can respond flexibly to differences in regional need.

7. As now composed, the board includes a significant number of the "best educational brains in the Commonwealth."

These uniquenesses require some explaining. If they are valid, they may be applicable to other states in which population density and the road network

make adaptation easy. The plan's progenitors share, in common with proponents of public junior-community colleges everywhere, their desire to make post-secondary education short of the baccalaureate degree available at low cost, with real geographic accessibility, to large numbers of young Americans including many for whom the doors of educational opportunity would otherwise be closed.

Authorization to establish public junior colleges had existed in legislation in Massachusetts since 1932, but no one had had the gumption or the persuasiveness, or both, to implement the authorization with dollars. Numerous state studies, dating back to 1922, had recommended community colleges, but only the cities of Newton, Holyoke, and Quincy had acted, as early as 1946, in establishing municipally controlled junior colleges to meet the demands of veterans returning from World War II. But these colleges have had to fight for their very existence with tax-conscious mayors and city councilmen who demanded that they operate at little or no expense to the local taxpayer.

With the passage of the Lee Bill in 1952, the three cities could claim reimbursement from the state for 50 per cent of the excess of cost over income, up to \$100 per full-time student. But the pressure on the municipally controlled junior college to "operate in the black" meant that Newton's \$400 per year tuition was the highest tuition rate in the nation for a publicly controlled junior college.

Audit of State Needs

The three cities continued, however, to provide post-secondary education for their constituencies and to build up an enviable record of successful transfer of their graduates to senior institutions—despite nonaccreditation. It was only in December, 1963, that Newton achieved accreditation, thus becoming the first publicly sponsored junior college in New England to gain that status.

Meanwhile, in 1957, researchers for gubernatorial candidate Foster Furcolo were auditing state needs.

The list of needs uncovered was imposing: tax reform, attraction of new industry to Massachusetts, an overdue constitutional convention—and increased opportunities for higher education.

By 1972, the New England Board of Higher Education declared, New England, the area of greatest concentration of institutions of higher learning, would be 95,000 student-spaces short for qualified high school graduates, 60 per cent of them in Massachusetts alone.

The Audit of State Needs declared expanded opportunities for higher education to be the primary need among the many it studied. The executive secretary of the audit, John Powers Mallan,* then a Smith College professor of political science and a member of the Massachusetts Board of Regional Community Colleges, drafted what became the implementing law of the Commonwealth (section 27, ch. 15) which set up the board and delineated its responsibilities for establishing and maintaining a system of regional community colleges strategically located throughout the state so that there would hardly be a home from which a student could not get to college in three-quarters of an hour. Tuition was set at \$200 per year, the same as for state colleges and the University of Massachusetts.

Generally, opposition to the plan, since it had Democratic blessing, was largely of a politically partisan nature, but fears were allayed when the stature and bipartisanship of the State Board of Regional Community Colleges was announced.

The board itself is unique. It has contained a generous share of topflight educators. Wellesley

* *An interesting historical footnote to the passage of the federal "Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963" is the part played by Professor Mallan and his success in obtaining the very active support of the Honorable John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House. One of the speaker's secretaries, Dr. Martin Sweig, was also a member of the Massachusetts Board of Regional Community Colleges. (Dr. Mallan is now a member of the AAJC staff.)*

College President Margaret Claff; Professor Seymour Harris of Harvard, now economic adviser to the President in Washington; and President Frederick Meier of the State College at Salem were among the leaders in education who provided assurance that policies adopted were sound. Roger Cutler, an adviser to President Eisenhower; Roger Lowell Putnam, industrialist (and a relative of A. Lawrence Lowell of Harvard); Gwendolyn Woods of the State Congress of Parents and Teachers; and William Belanger of the state AFL-CIO were among the noneducators who saw to it that the program was not conceived in any ivory tower and who could talk effectively to legislative ways and means committees. Appointments to the board are for five years.

One Man's Energy

76

There is practically unanimous agreement in Massachusetts that the program might have been stillborn, however, had not one man's energy and drive been there, on the spot, daily, weekly, monthly. The board's present chairman is Kermit C. Morrissey, now dean of students at Brandeis University. Mr. Morrissey was an instructor in government at Amherst College when he was drafted to organize a research team for Governor Furcolo. He remained with the governor as director of the budget and constant adviser to the Board of Regional Community Colleges, returning to academic life in 1960. In the same year he was nominated to fill a board vacancy and was subsequently designated its chairman. From this unpaid position he has directed its progress with singular purpose through the establishment of colleges at Pittsfield, Haverhill, Hyannis, Boston, Greenfield, Worcester, and, most recently, in Gardner, Holyoke, and Beverly. In Holyoke the municipally operated junior college now has become state-operated. To date colleges have thus been established at the rate of one or more per year.

The establishment of colleges in Brockton and Fall River has already been authorized. Only the west-of-Boston area requires legal approval to complete the original master plan of 1958. The legislature has appropriated \$100,000 for a new master plan study which is under the direction of Donald Deyo, former president of the American Association of Junior Colleges. But annually legislative representatives eager to bring colleges to their home areas present bills "authorizing and directing" the board to establish a college here or there. To date, wiser heads have prevailed and the initial plan still holds firm. Among the 3,000 or more bills going through the 1965 legislature are at least eight of these favorite-son bills.

This political fact points to one source of potential insecurity in total financing from the state level. Will the board always be able to maintain control over the location of the colleges? Will legislators, defeated in their ambitions to get colleges where they want them, ultimately deny colleges located elsewhere their proper financial support? The path of fiscal support will be no smoother than the path for any of the state's other institutions of higher learning. To date, the support of the community colleges has been increasingly nonpartisan if, in a few specific regards, discouragingly weak.

For example, the colleges are smarting under an 18-1 student-teacher ratio because all administrative personnel except the directors (now presidents) and their administrative assistants must be hired as faculty members. Thus, the dean of students, the librarian, and the director of guidance and counseling must occupy positions allocated for instructors, thereby reducing the number of positions available for full-time instructors themselves. Whether an effective learning-and-teaching outcome can be expected under this condition is open to serious doubt. To be sure there are few if any instances of the administrator who is not teaching one or more classes (except for the presidents themselves). And to require the full-time librarian to teach one or

more classes violates the spirit if not the letter of standards of accreditation. The colleges have asked for these positions in their budgets, without success to date.

Another area of grave concern is that of total, internal, financial responsibility as represented by the "autonomy" that the state university achieved by law in 1962 and the nine-state colleges achieved by law in 1963. Under "autonomy" a college may shift funds from one subsidiary account to another provided, of course, the total budget is not changed. The community colleges now have this privilege.

A quarter-of-a-million-dollar study of all levels of education in the commonwealth was conducted under the direction of Benjamin Willis and the recommendations of this commission have been enacted into law. One of the major provisions of this legislation is the coordination of publicly supported higher education in the state. The direction given to community colleges is consistent with the generally accepted purposes of a comprehensive program.

Starting a College

Meanwhile, the board's policy of getting a college functioning has resulted in the discovery that for \$250,000 and the gift of an existing building acceptable to the state board a region can have a comprehensive community college for 500 students. This policy has resulted in a 1963-64 enrollment of 2,500 students in abandoned college buildings (Hyannis and Boston); a former town hall and elementary school (Haverhill); a former junior high school (Pittsfield); a building that was successively a high school, a junior high school, and an elementary school (Greenfield); and an abandoned college building (Boston). Quinsigamond Community College (Worcester) occupied space at Holy Cross College, and Mount Wachusett Community College will occupy the civil defense facility in Gardner which was previously a high school.

Each college starts with a renovated building, \$80,000 to \$100,000 for furniture and equipment,

\$25,000 for a 4,000 book library. Land and buildings are apt to be gifts "for \$1 and other consideration," or for long-term leases at \$1 per year.

Cape Cod Community College will undertake construction of a new \$7 million campus of more than one hundred acres in the coming year. Plans for permanent campuses are underway for Massachusetts Bay, Northern Essex, and Berkshire Community Colleges. The donation of sites by regions is a problem only in that many more are offered than could possibly be used. Mount Wachusett Community College in Gardner already has thirty-three offers, including one by the City of Gardner of a site of two hundred seventy acres, or any land owned by the city. The colleges in Brockton and Fall River will be of new construction on permanent sites; both cities have donated over 100 acres for each campus.

State Board Members

The success of the long-range plans depends, again, on the wisdom of the state board and its dedication to its mission. Present on the board are Owen B. Kierman, the commissioner of education, ex-officio; John W. Lederle, president of the University of Massachusetts, ex-officio; George D. Blackwood, professor at Boston University and director of several state studies related to education; Henry E. Foley, lawyer, who has been active in public welfare, municipal research, crime and delinquency; The Very Reverend Raymond J. Swords, S.J., president of the College of the Holy Cross, who made facilities available at Holy Cross for the first year of Quinsigamond Community College in Worcester; James Hammond, president of the State College at Fitchburg; Joseph Driscoll, president of Southeast Massachusetts Technological Institute, ex-officio; and William Dean, director of the Holyoke Trade High School, who has had a long-time, active interest in the affairs of the youth of the commonwealth. Their regular presence at board meetings has provided the colleges with policies and standards of excellence which have resulted in lively centers of learning.

Two policies may be of interest: (1) no intercollegiate athletics until the problems of an intermural physical activities program for all have been solved: (2) no fraternities or sororities.

These have not been easy policies to swallow in view of the ordinary image of going to college. Nor have they been easy to enforce where faculty or others have asserted that a college is not a college unless it has these appendages.

Indeed the major problems of the community colleges in Massachusetts may be the ones observed elsewhere, particularly the unreadiness of many faculty members to study and act upon recognizable differences between junior and senior colleges; between community colleges with multi-purposes (including continuing education for adults) and liberal arts colleges; between transfer and non-transfer education; between effective and less effective teaching methods.

Nevertheless the Massachusetts picture for faculty members is not unattractive. Salaries took a leap for the better with the adoption, in November, 1963, of a seven-step scale with starting and top salaries as follows. Faculty positions do not carry rank, but the pay-scale uses the customary four categories, possibly with an eye to future developments:

Instructors	\$6,084.00 (Step 1)	to	\$ 7,768.80 (Step 7)
Assistant professors	7,066.80	"	to 9,032.40 "
Associate professors	8,174.40	"	to 10,420.80 "
Professors	9,750.00	"	to 12,464.40 "

At these rates it is not difficult to fill faculty positions except in the usual critical areas (electronics, for instance) in which colleges compete with industry for personnel. Even so, the percentages of full-time faculty with masters' and doctors' degrees is higher than for the nation and the percentage of those not yet possessing their master's degrees is

smaller. Possession of the master's is ordinarily the *sine qua non* to appointment.

Colleges are providing some in-service training utilizing counterpart conferences and intercollege workshops. The University of Massachusetts has instituted a program leading to the M.A.T. (C.C.) degree, "C.C." standing for "community colleges." Presidents are getting to the junior college administration seminars at Teachers College, Columbia University.

Surveys of students indicate the continuing need for guidance and advisement personnel, representing an area of concern with much room for improvement. The record of student transfers to the university and to senior colleges is good.

Currently, Cape Cod will have \$6.9 million and Northern Essex \$.5 million for site development toward the construction of new campuses in handsome settings. Massachusetts Bay has branched to a new Raytheon office building in Watertown and in two sites accommodates about 1,300 students. New construction will start next year for Massachusetts Bay.

The North Shore Community College opened in September, 1965, with 500 students. Berkshire has received \$.25 million for planning.

The system is, then, in Massachusetts to stay. Gains are to be consolidated, refinements to be made, new areas to be tackled with the same boldness that has brought the commonwealth from a state of somnolence to one of healthy ferment and growth.

Massachusetts Revisited

In 1959 both the Massachusetts Board of Regional Community Colleges and the legislature had adopted an attitude toward the community college idea of "let's see if it will take." Now ten years later the question is no longer pertinent. There are now thirteen colleges in the system and only four more necessary to complete the master plan recommended by Donald Deyo in 1965. Of these four remaining regions, one involves the phasing of city-operated

Quincy Junior College into the state system with a site proposal in study. Site possibilities are being explored for another. Bunker Hill Community College, to serve a segment of the Boston area, is in the final planning stages and scheduled to go out for bidding in the late spring of 1970. Only the suburban area west of Boston (where land and, therefore, available sites seem almost impossible to acquire) remains without specific plans for the future.

Although all the community colleges are struggling with the physical limitations of temporary quarters, the enrollment pressures have mounted to the point where some colleges are accepting only one applicant out of four. Plant utilization is excessively high, and growth of necessity has been limited. However, every attempt has been made to achieve the comprehensiveness of the community college. In the fall of 1968, there was further evidence of the continuing emphasis on occupational programs. The college transfer students accounted for 46 per cent of the total full-time enrollment; the balance was comprised of 47 per cent in specific occupational curriculums, and 7 per cent in exploratory programs which are designed to lead into the determination of more specific educational objectives.

When colleges are able to move into permanent campuses, facilities will make possible an even greater diversity of occupational programs. At the present time only Cape Cod Community College is under construction with four more to begin construction in the next few months. The legislature has already appropriated funds for these projects and four others are in various stages of planning. The state has already voted or committed itself to about \$150 million for construction of the nine projects. The question is no longer "whether or not," but rather a question of how planning and construction can be accelerated.

Continuing education has demonstrated an attractiveness similar to that of the full-time day programs and already enrollments are approximately 50 per cent greater than for the regular day operation.

Fire and police programs begun only a year ago for members of the two departments already exceed 2,000 students; only a scarcity of space and qualified instructors have limited the growth.

Massachusetts was the first state to embark on a fully state-financed system of community colleges with a single state board to determine policy for all the colleges. Some observers have referred to the system as state-controlled, while those who have studied the operation in practice prefer "state-sponsored." Most policy decisions have originated from the presidents' council, which is made up of the thirteen presidents and meets monthly with the president of the state board (state director) serving as chairman. Ideas for policy originating with the board are referred to the presidents' council for consideration, recommendation, refinement, or even disapproval. Joint committee meetings of board and council provide the means for effective communications. A faculty salary schedule developed through this joint effort resulted in a range of \$7,391 to a maximum of \$19,219.

In prospect, the rate of change seems frustratingly slow; in retrospect, it appears that the state has come a long way since 1960.

William G. Dwyer

Something New in New Jersey

By Kenneth C. MacKay

In May, 1962, when Governor Richard J. Hughes signed into law the so-called County College Bill, New Jersey received a second chance to move ahead with the rest of the nation in the development of two-year community colleges.

It was back in the depression days of the 1930's that New Jersey fumbled its first extraordinary opportunity to be among the earliest states in the Union to have a permanent state-wide system of junior colleges.

84

In 1933, at a historic meeting in Washington, a group of New Jersey educators persuaded Harry Hopkins, director of the Emergency Relief Administration (later the W.P.A.) to allocate funds for several new and experimental junior colleges. These colleges were to offer evening programs in certain available high schools pending permanent quarters. The purpose of these colleges was to provide post-secondary education for qualified students unable to go away to college or find employment. Union Junior College, the first of these "depression colleges," opened its doors in October, 1933. Altogether, six colleges, bearing county designations, were established.

When, several years later, federal support was withdrawn and no state funds were forthcoming (despite bills introduced in the legislature), and when World War II depleted student ranks, four of the W.P.A. colleges disappeared. Only Union and Monmouth survived, the former reorganized as an independent, liberal arts junior college, and the

latter eventually decided to become a four-year independent institution maintaining a junior college division. Without state legislation to provide governmental aid, both institutions have had to depend upon student tuition as the chief source of income.

Historically, several factors in New Jersey have worked against the establishment of a system of public junior colleges. The state has been, along with much of the eastern seaboard and New England, steeped in the traditional concepts of the academic four-year college programs. Venerable institutions of learning have molded a public image of what constitutes higher education. With several notable exceptions like Centenary, Union, and Trenton, the junior colleges of the state have been small institutions specializing in religious training.

An antiquated tax system based on property valuation has kept the state in an economic bind and prevented proper fiscal planning and investment in higher education.

New Jersey's geographic position, sandwiched between the great metropolitan areas of New York and Philadelphia, has encouraged an undue dependence upon the cultural and educational opportunities across the Hudson and Delaware rivers.

Periodically, starting in 1930, educational authorities and reports in New Jersey stressed the need for a permanent system of junior colleges, notably in the annual reports and recommendations of the Regents from 1930 through 1939, and in the Cullimore Report of 1950. But the result was always inaction—until 1958.

Of historical significance is the fact that the State Board of Education, upon the recommendation of the commissioner, Dr. Frederick M. Raubinger, created the Office of Community and Two-Year College Education in December, 1958. Further, the office was given special recognition by the classification of its director at the highest possible professional level within the State Department of Education. For a long time the commissioner had observed the growing role of the junior college and

appreciated its potentialities for New Jersey.

In 1959, a study committee of nineteen members was appointed by the commissioner to determine the needs of New Jersey for community-centered colleges. Specifically, the charge to the Committee to Study Community Colleges and Technical Institutes directed it "to explore not only the type of post-high school programs and opportunities to be developed, but also the legal and financial arrangements which would be best suited to the needs of New Jersey."

This committee represented all phases of higher education in New Jersey and included both professional and lay representatives.

For nearly two years this group met almost monthly, studying and analyzing surveys and gathering as much information as possible, both about the needs of New Jersey and the experience of other states. Professional consultants and national experts, including Dean Donald E. Deyo, members of the AAJC staff, and Dr. S. V. Martorana, were called in.

By the end of 1960, the report of this committee was ready, and in January, 1961, the New Jersey State Board of Education submitted its findings and recommendations to the governor and legislature in a document titled "Education Beyond the High School: The Two-Year Community College."

The recommendations, with endorsement from the state board, the commissioner, and the governor, found immediate and enthusiastic bipartisan support in the legislature. The next year, legislation incorporating the recommendations and providing enabling measures for a system of state-wide community colleges was signed into law by the governor. The colleges provided for in the New Jersey legislation are called "county colleges." The designation is significant. It reveals again the importance of the county as an administrative and governmental division in New Jersey.

The New Jersey statutes define a county college as "an educational institution established in one

or more counties, offering programs of instruction not more than two years beyond high school. . . .”

A county board of freeholders, after proper determination of the needs of the county, may petition the State Board of Education for permission to establish a county college. If the state board approves (after conducting its own determination of the county needs), the freeholders may proceed by selecting a nine-member board of trustees for the new college, one member of which must be the county superintendent of schools. Selection of the board of trustees is made by the director of the freeholders with approval by the rest of the freeholder board. The term is for four years.

In addition to the trustees, who act as the governing body of the county colleges, the law calls for each county college to have a Board of School Estimate, composed of the director of the freeholders, two freeholders appointed by the freeholder board, and two trustees appointed by the board of trustees. The Board of School Estimate determines the annual outlay both for capital and operating expense. Having such a board for the county colleges is in accord with New Jersey school practice.

Provisions of the Law

The plans for financing the new institutions reveal a marked similarity to the New York State community college system modified to harmonize with the traditional functions of county government in New Jersey. The costs of capital outlay will be shared on a fifty-fifty basis by state and county. The operating expenses will be borne by state, county, and student. The law sets a maximum of \$200 per equated full-time student as the state's share toward operation of the college. This will require the major operating costs to be borne by the county and/or student. Although the intent is to require the student to bear some part of the cost of tuition, there is no such requirement in the law, and it is possible, although not likely, that the county could bear all the operating expense. It is hopefully

expected that in most of these colleges the student will pay an annual tuition not in excess of \$250.

The county colleges will operate in accordance with standards and regulations established by the State Board of Education. Personnel of the county colleges will be eligible for membership in the Teachers' Pension and Annuity Fund. State authorities will determine and certify to professional qualifications, establish standards and requirements for degrees and certificates, determine tuition, and set up regulations for fiscal supervision and auditing.

It is interesting to observe that two or more counties may join together in the formation and operation of a single county college. Since it is anticipated that some of the less populous counties will not be in a position to sponsor colleges of their own at once, this measure will enable a degree of cooperation to permit regional facilities to be established at an early date. The law also provides that an existing county college may accept students on a reimbursement basis from any county not having its own county college.

Both Academic and Technical Courses

The New Jersey county college law specifically refers to the function of these institutions to include both college transfer work and "technical institute type programs." Surveys which have been taken throughout the state show that a need exists for both academic and technical courses. Consequently it is anticipated that most county colleges, as they come into existence, will provide comprehensive offerings from the start. Citizen groups active in promoting the passage of the legislation emphasized New Jersey's need in both areas.

What is the present status of New Jersey's county colleges? Not one has yet opened its doors, but if interest and activity in the various counties is any indication of things to come, New Jersey will soon be joining the growing ranks of the junior college states. Of the state's twenty-one counties, four have

county college boards of trustees and are planning campuses; three more have been approved by the State Board of Education to establish and operate a county college; another six have requested the permission of the state board to establish and operate a county college; and four counties are in the process of making local studies which must precede the request to establish and operate such a college. Only four counties have taken no official action on the county college.

In each county where a study has been made, the reaction of the citizens, of business and industry, of labor unions, of educators, has been most favorable. It should also be noted that the formation of these new colleges has been assisted by representatives of private colleges and universities. This has been an important consideration in a state where a tradition of independent and denominational higher education runs strong. Representatives of private colleges played an important and constructive role in the original committee that recommended the new institutions to the state. Thus the planning for the new system of colleges has meant a marshaling of New Jersey's resources in higher education and a manifestation of a spirit of unity refreshing to observe in a state which has so many times in its past neglected its educational capabilities.

It is expected that the blueprints for the first county colleges will become reality in some counties by the fall of 1966. Some counties have already pleasantly discovered that fortunate circumstances can facilitate their planning. For instance, three counties have received offers of land. Another county will take over an extensive reservation (equipped with buildings, hospital, and even swimming pool and golf course!) soon to be vacated by the United States Army.

This kind of development is infectious, and it may be presumed that citizens in some of the other counties, pricked by local pride (of which there is much within the counties of New Jersey) will begin to look about to see what they can do for their own

localities. This reaction manifests again the strong feelings of local identity in New Jersey education, a sentiment which some Westerners may find difficult to appreciate. This localism, although sometimes too provincial and segmented, does have its virtues, not the least of which is its capacity to engender the old college spirit in the home town boys. At best this can be a wholesome kind of competition through which the New Jersey communities can heartily support the cause of higher education.

A Companion Bill

A word should be said about a companion bill which became law at the time the new county college legislation was enacted. Reference has been made to the transient emergency junior colleges of the 1930's, of which only Union and Monmouth survived when federal support was withdrawn and World War II occurred. Since that time Union has continued to operate as a two-year college under independent auspices, working closely with the schools of its county and providing at-home college training for many young men and women of its area. Monmouth has expanded into a four-year college, although it still operates a separate and substantial two-year program in its junior college division. Recognizing the long service these institutions have given to their county communities and consonant with an expressed intent not to duplicate existing facilities, the legislature, with approval from Governor Hughes, has made it possible for these two institutions to fit into the pattern of the new county colleges. They are eligible for the county and state matching aid in operating costs. Union County has already appropriated funds for a tuition assistance program at Union Junior College.

For constitutional reasons they cannot participate in public aid for capital needs. It is possible that because of this arrangement allowing for the use of existing facilities at these two institutions, Union and Monmouth counties will go ahead with the formation of county colleges with emphasis in the

technical programs, assigning the academic programs to the existing two colleges which already provide accredited college transfer programs.

The county colleges appear to be on their way. A majority of the counties are preparing reports preparatory to asking permission to establish these new colleges. There has been a practically unanimous expression of support for them. With an exploding population New Jersey has urgent need of these colleges. We could, with every confidence, predict a fast and wholesome growth for New Jersey's newest colleges were it not for the fact that the state, for the past decade, has been postponing action to update an antiquated system of taxation. At the last election a tax and fund-raising proposal by the governor was soundly defeated by referendum and now a solution to the state's mounting fiscal problems must be worked out by a legislature and governor of diverse political persuasions.

This does not mean that the first county colleges to be approved by the state will not be able to get under way. Out of general appropriations for the coming budgetary year a sum of approximately \$4 million has been requested for matching monies to the county colleges for capital expenses. But what is at stake is the long-term development of the county colleges, and Rutgers, the state university, and the six state (teachers) colleges. Unless the decision is made to adopt a broad-based tax, either a sales or income tax, or a combination of these, New Jersey will be woefully unprepared to cope with the estimated doubling of the state's college population by the year 1970. In the past, New Jersey has led the nation in the proportion of its high school graduates "exported" to colleges outside the state. In the years ahead this deceptively simple solution to an enduring problem will not be applicable. The other states will have closed their doors.

Proponents of the new system of junior colleges confidently expect that these institutions will bring the opportunity of higher education to thousands of students in New Jersey who might otherwise be

denied the college experience. They see the technical programs in these county colleges as the best solution to the serious shortage of technicians in the state's mushrooming industries. They see the new colleges as important and valuable cultural assets to the counties of New Jersey.

Too often now great companies like Humble Oil and Bell Telephone find it necessary to look outside the state for the recruitment of certain types of skilled technical personnel. Too often plants considering a location in New Jersey go elsewhere after realizing our scarcity in technicians. Atlantic City looks forward to the college in Atlantic County as a means of both strengthening and stabilizing the economy of a community almost wholly dependent on a resort economy. Ocean County is counting on its college to attract more of the chemical and electronic companies which have started to move away from the congested metropolitan areas.

Excitement and Eagerness

Any plan with so much potential to change or modify the picture of higher education—and indeed, the social and economic picture of a state—must include some elements of danger against which proper safeguards are essential. To emphasize local or county control as much as these institutions do contains its dangers. The trustees must be residents of the county whose college they serve. This was done, of course, to assure that those in control would be sensitive to local needs. Freeholders will have a splendid opportunity to serve their counties well by selecting dedicated men committed to the highest ideals of civic service. It would be most regrettable if political considerations downgraded these appointments to the level of partisan choice or party plums. To their credit, the freeholders of New Jersey, through their state association, have already given serious consideration to establishing qualitative criteria for these appointments.

Another word of caution should be expressed concerning the latitude of local control and policy.

Standards of excellence can be maintained by common adherence to state requisites, audit practices, and so on. It is good that the legislation gives the State Board of Education this authority, and it is hoped that the board will exercise this authority effectively. Ample protection must be provided, for example, for the college faculty member who finds himself under pressure from some local organization in a matter involving academic freedom.

Yet, new as New Jersey's system of two-year colleges is, and mindful as we are of the pitfalls and problems, many of them financial, we sense something new and promising in the excitement and the eagerness of all different kinds of groups—junior chambers of commerce, citizens' committees for education, service clubs, P.T.A.'s, the League of Women Voters, both major political parties, and educators throughout the state. And it takes a lot to stir old New Jersey, celebrating, last year, its 300th anniversary as one of the original thirteen colonies.

Those of us who have been associated with the two-year college movement feel sure that, properly established, adequately financed, and correctly administered, these exciting young institutions will add a dynamic energy to New Jersey's efforts to cope with the oncoming tide of college students.

New Jersey Revisited

Twelve community colleges, known in New Jersey as "county colleges," have been established since legislation was approved in 1963. The first A.A. degrees were conferred in five of these in June 1968. The twelve existing institutions, representing a majority of the counties in New Jersey, stretch from Bergen and Morris in the north to Cumberland and Atlantic counties in south Jersey. Another county college, Burlington, will open next September. Several other counties are at the planning stage.

This year 15,800 students are enrolled in the county colleges. It is anticipated that enrollment will increase to 36,000 by the fall of 1971, and to 55,000 by September 1975. Between now and 1975, it is

estimated that an additional \$145 million will be needed for the capital expenditures of the New Jersey community colleges.

At present the students in transfer programs approximate 60 per cent, but it is the hope and expectation of the State Department of Higher Education that the next few years will see a greater choice of career offerings. While no attempt is being made to assign quotas, it is felt that a fifty-fifty balance between the two major program divisions is desirable in New Jersey.

In 1968 the so-called "chargeback bill" became law. This legislation makes it possible for the resident of one county to attend the community college of another county at in-county tuition rates. A chargeback system assesses the sending county. The law enables students living in counties without such a college or without the specific program of their choice to broaden their educational opportunity and free themselves of the limitations of their own counties.

Since the New Jersey community college legislation went into effect, the state has achieved a long-awaited revision of its archaic tax base. A state sales tax, instituted several years ago, supports the program in higher education. The legal maximum of \$200 annual state support for operation of the county colleges has been revised to \$600. In most of these colleges a student tuition charge of \$300 per annum now prevails.

Kenneth C. MacKay

Washington Shows New Life at Forty

By Frederic T. Giles

"Life begins at forty" has special meaning for Washington community colleges as the movement in this state celebrates its fortieth birthday. Although a careful examination today indicates strong and well-developed physical attributes, growth has been sporadic with periods of great expansion and plateaus of inactivity. At forty years of age the movement has its greatest strength and is headed into the greatest period of development in history.

During the past forty years, Washington community colleges have been involved in and have passed through nearly every phase of organization, administration, and finance that has characterized the history of the national junior college movement.

Today, Washington community colleges are comprehensive institutions organized as part of unified school districts, with various forms of administrative control, and financed primarily by state funds. As has been indicated this has not always been characteristic of the community colleges and elements of the description have not resulted from premeditated determination or design. How, then, did the present system come about?

Junior colleges in Washington were first conceived in 1915 as extended secondary education and were attached to existing high schools. This proved to be unsuccessful, however, and the junior college idea had to wait ten years before being taken up again.

Beginning in 1925 and continuing over a sixteen-year period, junior colleges were started as independent two-year colleges with no means of tax support. During this period state support was voted

three times by the legislature, and vetoed all three times by governors of the state, before the first junior college bill was passed in 1941. By this legislation the colleges retained their independent organization but were given state financial aid.

In 1945, after several unsuccessful attempts to increase state support to junior colleges, the legislature passed an amendment which allowed the junior colleges to again become part of school districts and permitted the districts to receive state monies through the regular state distribution formula. Thus, Washington junior colleges became extended secondary programs for the second time with an assured source of funds for operation.

The community colleges are now organized and administered under an act passed by the state legislature in 1961 and amended in 1963 and 1965. This act, designating the institutions as "community colleges," was the first legislation passed in twenty years directly related to community or junior colleges. It was during this twenty-year period, however, that there occurred the greatest expansion of new junior colleges, growth of existing junior colleges, and development of comprehensive programs and physical plants designed for community colleges. In essence, the 1961 law reflected many of the practices and developments of this twenty-year period. It also incorporated the recommendations of the 1960 Report of the Interim Study of Education by the Washington State Legislature.

One of the strongest recommendations of this report was: "That the orderly and controlled expansion of junior colleges constitutes a major means by which certain critical needs of post-high school education can be met."

As a result of this legislation and previous development, there are now seventeen community colleges operating in Washington, with five more authorized to begin operation by 1967. Seattle School District, the largest in the state, which has not had community college education, will begin in September, 1966.

The state legislature has retained control of the

number of community colleges by restricting the amount of funds and the number of new colleges that can be built. Authority for allocating the new colleges and establishing regulations for the distribution of state funds rests with the State Board of Education. The state board has developed excellent procedures for the consideration of new colleges through the use of district advisory committees and surveys, regional advisory committees and regional studies, and a state advisory committee with statewide studies and surveys. The result is a state plan for the development of community colleges which can be put into effect only as monies are appropriated by the legislature.

State board regulations for establishing new colleges give preference to comprehensive institutions but allow for specialized institutions on a professionally sound basis. This is consistent with the definition in the Legislative Act of 1961:

A community college shall be an institution established with the approval of the State Board of Education and maintained and operated by a school district, offering two years post-high school curricula of general education or vocational education, or both.

During the past fifteen years, every one of Washington's community colleges has designed and constructed a new campus, or is in the process of designing one specifically planned for the community college program. These new plants have been financed by monies from the state and by local district funds with the state providing an average of 60 per cent of the funds. Prior to 1948, public-supported colleges were housed in any available temporary facilities. New colleges being established now must indicate the ability to provide facilities before they are authorized to operate.

Community college operating budgets are funded primarily from state sources which provide approximately 80 per cent of the revenues. The remainder comes from student fees, which, by law, cannot exceed \$210 per year for state students, or \$480 an-

nually for out-of-state students. This amount includes a required annual tuition of \$60 for resident and \$330 for nonresident students.

Before 1963, the budgets were open-ended and monies were paid on a per-student basis for all those enrolled. The 1963 legislature eliminated this open-end feature by allocating a set amount of money for two years, which cannot be exceeded regardless of enrollment. Other financial changes included in the 1963 amendment were: the separation of the budgets of the colleges from the school district budgets; the separation of accounting and allocation of funds for colleges from the school districts; and the stipulation that state monies so allocated be used exclusively for the colleges. Monies for community colleges come from state sources because there is a constitutional amendment which prohibits the property tax from exceeding forty mills without a special note. The forty mills is allocated to other governmental agencies.

Community college development in Washington is least adequate in the highly populated urban areas. Until 1961, it was unlawful to use tax monies for community colleges in counties which had established institutions of higher education. This restriction was written into the 1941 law, when community colleges were considered only as the first two years of a regular four-year curriculum, and was instituted to avoid unnecessary duplication. As a result of this restrictive law, which took twenty years to change, community college facilities are lacking in the areas of greatest potential enrollment. This is best illustrated by a quotation from a 1962 report, "The Market for Community Junior College Service in King County, Washington."

As a result of the study, we can therefore expect a junior college day-school demand of from 9,500 to 14,000 students in King County by 1965.

This becomes more meaningful when it is realized that there were no operating community colleges in King County when the report was made and that the report indicates a need for ten community col-

leges in the region by 1975. Presently there are three colleges operating on a limited basis in the county and none in Seattle which has a public school enrollment of over 100,000, and which will have 50-55 per cent of the total potential enrollment. Three of the five colleges authorized by the 1965 Legislature are in King County. Thus, plans to provide community college education for the area are developing rapidly.

All Washington community colleges are organized as parts of regular school districts under the Unified District Plan. At present there are no alternative methods allowed by law. This is a subject of much interest, however, and the center of debate among educators, legislators, and other citizens. Many important factors and restrictions in the state affect or prevent an objective consideration of organization. Some of these factors are restrictive tax laws, organization of governmental units, population distribution, school finance, inadequate school district boundaries, vested interests, and the lack of strong pressures and concerted effort for study and change. As a result, no one method of organization and administration appears to include the attributes and resources necessary to answer the basic questions and concerns of any group, let alone the diverse groups.

Many observers and students of organization seem to feel that the best procedure would be to have permissive regulations which would allow use of the best type of organization for each college. Thus it would not be necessary to require the same type of organization for community colleges in various settings in the state. Allowances could be made for differences that have significant implications for the proper development of strong colleges.

As in the past, many bills were introduced in the 1965 session of the legislature, dealing with the organization and administration of community colleges. It was observed that next to redistricting, the community colleges received the greatest attention of the legislators. Both the house and the senate

approved similar but not identical bills which would have established separate community college districts; however, due to pressures of time, they were unable to work out satisfactory procedures for implementing either bill or any acceptable compromise version. Later, when the legislature was forced into an extraordinary session, a bill was enacted which contained three provisions that will have a profound effect on community college education in Washington.

First, the new law established the principle of community college districts by stating that "there shall be created to manage the affairs of each community college, whether presently existing or hereafter to be established, a community college district." Second, it required a comprehensive study as the basis for establishing a statewide plan by directing the Superintendent of Public Instruction to prepare and submit to the 1967 legislative session a proposal that would implement the principle of community college districts.

Finally, the law clarified the role of the community college president by stating:

"During the period from July 1, 1965 to July 1, 1967 the president of each community college *may* be held directly responsible to the board of directors of his school district. Thereafter he *shall* be held directly responsible to the board of trustees of his community college district, except in those districts where community college service areas and common school district boundaries coincide."

Cooperation among educational agencies has been a strong force in the development of the community colleges. Research is carried out cooperatively between the State Department of Education, the Washington Community College Association, the universities and the community colleges.

A recent research symposium delineated the various needs for research and study in community colleges and established procedures for orderly accomplishment. This symposium was a cooperative effort by the State Office of Education, the Washington

Community College Association, and the two state universities. Another example of cooperative effort is a uniform enrollment form and a centralized record and statistical service of the State Office of Education for all state community colleges.

Washington community colleges have established themselves as a necessary and integral part of the post-high school educational program. As in the readjustment and realignment of education programs and institutions, there are genuine differences of opinion about problems and concerns regarding community college development which necessitate continued study, research, and adjustment. Nevertheless, the community colleges are here to stay; they will continue to make a major contribution to the educational program of the state, and they have and will continue to have general support of the citizens, the educators, the politicians, and members of business and industry as a result of the educational services they perform.

It has been said that more citizens are familiar with, and involved in, planning, developing, and carrying out the programs of the community colleges than any other phase of education in the state.

The Next Forty Years

"Life begins at forty," but we are told that life after forty is dependent on the life led before forty.

I believe the forty-year-old community college program in Washington has a bright future based upon a successful, though difficult, past. However, the bright future is dependent upon the ability to make necessary refinements in administration, organization, and finance; to accommodate an ever-increasing oversupply of students without diluting the programs; to maintain the characteristics, attributes, and services which have made the community colleges successful; and to be creative and responsive to the educational role given to or assumed by the community colleges rather than imitative of educational roles given to or assumed by other kinds of institutions.

Continued development and improvement will be more difficult. Complacency and a feeling of acceptance and "having arrived" will have to be fought. But the next forty years should see the culmination of many dreams envisioned by the community college pioneers during the past forty years.

Washington Revisited

The 1967 legislature decided to make the ultimate structural change in community college education by dividing the entire state into twenty-two community college districts. Each district has a five-member board of trustees which has responsibility for providing community college education for all people in the district. This responsibility, in turn, has created a need for discovering ways of providing this opportunity on other than traditional college campuses as well as for developing multi-unit programs.

Primary responsibilities of the State Board and staff are twofold: (1) to provide community college educational opportunity for all citizens of the state; and (2) to provide for, through leadership rather than control, the continued development of the colleges and their educational programs.

A most difficult problem to solve was that of coordinating vocational-technical education. The alternative chosen was that of creating a Coordinating Council for Vocational-Technical Education. Its membership is composed of three members from the State Board of Education, three members from the State Board for Community Colleges, and three members appointed by the governor from labor, industry, and business. This coordinating council has major responsibility first, for designing a state plan which spells out the total vocational-technical program and, second, for allocating responsibilities and resources to carry out the various programs in the plan.

The community colleges of Washington are in the second year of this new organization for carrying out community college education, and have weath-

ered admirably the change-over period with its many unknowns. Developments are now being made for carrying out the major intent of the legislation: that all people of the state should have access to community college education.

Frederic T. Giles

Fifty Years of Community Involvement in Michigan

By Philip J. Gannon

Fifty years ago a community, six part-time faculty members, and forty-nine students made a decision concerning a new type of education for Michigan. From this beginning in 1914 has developed a system of twenty-four community colleges serving over sixty thousand people throughout the state.

It was appropriate in 1914 that Grand Rapids Junior College should limit its initial offerings to the traditional classical disciplines. This college fitted the times and met the needs of its community. Today Grand Rapids Junior College and the other twenty-three community colleges have developed or, as newly established districts, are developing unique programs for their communities and for the needs of the state and the country. The new role for Michigan community colleges has emerged as the state, once predominantly rural, has become predominantly industrial.

Because education in the United States is a function reserved for each state, it is important to record how Michigan community colleges have gone through the process of change. Some states have taken a position that central control and financing should remain at the state level with varying degrees of citizen participation. Michigan's tradition has been that local control, delegated by the state, and citizen involvement at all levels of decision making, is a meaningful and lasting way to develop an educational system.

Consequently, over the years Michigan public community colleges have progressed by using a coordinated approach that involves the Department

of Public Instruction, the legislature, the governor's office, and citizen groups. With this kind of commitment, progress has not always been as rapid or as clear-cut concerning overall state planning as may be found in states that centralize most decision making at the state level. However, the benefits from this more flexible position have allowed citizens and educational leaders the opportunity to make decisions and take responsibility for their action. This commitment appears increasingly difficult to hold in a society that is changing rapidly and becoming more complex. Possibly for this reason, among others, the frequency of studies concerning the needs of the state regarding community colleges have increased along with the request that these groups report more detailed and definitive recommendations within a framework which allows for a maximum of local initiative yet which is sensitive to overall state planning.

During the last ten years, many studies have been completed in Michigan pertaining to recommendations for the growth and development of community colleges. Local communities have conducted citizen studies in communities throughout Michigan with the help of Max S. Smith, Michigan State University; Gerald W. Boicourt and Sigurd Rislov, Wayne State University; Raymond Young, University of Michigan; and Ferris N. Crawford, assistant superintendent of the Department of Public Instruction. These studies have led to the establishment of twelve new community colleges with over ten more on the verge of being established. At the state level, study committees and commissions have been appointed to make recommendations concerning the role and function of community colleges and to develop a coordinated state plan.

The superintendent of public instruction notes, in the biennium reports, that the following committees and commissions were established and took the following actions:

In June, 1956, the Michigan Legislative Study Committee on Higher Education obtained the services of Dr. John Dale Russell, who was appointed

to make a survey of higher education in Michigan. Staff Study Number I of this report, "The Community College in Michigan," was under the direction of Dr. S. V. Martorana. The final report by Dr. Russell had forty-five recommendations, eighteen of which pertained to community colleges. The main recommendations of this report concerned the organization, control, program, financial support, and the desirable locations for new community colleges.

In August, 1958, the Governor's Commission on Junior and Community Colleges, comprised of twenty-five citizens, made recommendations to the governor concerning the functions, control, organization, standards, financial support, relationships to other institutions, and needs of community colleges.

Also in 1958, the state superintendent of public instruction appointed the Post Twelfth Grade Community Education Committee. This committee had thirty-eight representatives and made recommendations concerning the location, legal structure, curriculum, and financing of community colleges.

In 1963, this committee published a bulletin dealing with the instructional program development for community colleges.

In 1961, the state superintendent of public instruction appointed a thirty-six member, six-county Community College Development Commission. This committee was appointed to study the needs of additional community colleges in the Detroit Metropolitan area, and to bring recommendations back to the superintendent, the governor, and the legislature.

In 1962, the state superintendent appointed a State Advisory Commission on Community College Development, requesting them to develop recommendations concerning the financing of community colleges and to conduct a comprehensive study of enabling legislation for community colleges.

In March, 1966, a vote is planned for Wayne County, which encompasses the City of Detroit. This vote will determine whether the City of Detroit and

some of its suburbs will establish six new community colleges to serve this metropolitan area.

Council of Community College Administrators

Community college administrators in Michigan, after reviewing and discussing the John Dale Russell study and the governor's study in 1958, determined that it was advisable to establish a Michigan Council of Community College Administrators. This group meets regularly throughout the year and conducts a summer workshop to foster coordination between public community colleges and to function as a statewide coordinating group.

The purposes of this organization are as follows:

1. To recommend to the state legislature the amounts needed for operation and capital outlay after reviewing on a statewide basis the financial requirements of all public community colleges.
2. To improve the administration of community colleges by exchange of information.
3. To inform the public about the purposes and functions of community colleges by distribution of brochures and special reports.

From these many local studies, commissions, and committees evolved a mandate for curricular changes, strengthening of financial support, and a clarification of function. It is not always pleasant to have citizens asking questions regarding finance and curriculum but it does stimulate those in public service to appraise their actions carefully.

The same type of citizen activity at a different level was beginning in regard to other segments of higher education, forcing the state colleges and universities, and in many cases the private colleges, to evaluate their services to the citizens of the state. Also during this period, the people of Michigan made a basic decision concerning the need for the calling of a constitutional convention for the purpose of revising the constitution of 1908. At the time of the writing of the constitution in 1908 community colleges were hardly an idea in the state and consequently were not mentioned.

During the time the elected delegates to the

Constitutional Convention of 1961 were meeting in Lansing, it was fortunate that documents and reports and well-informed representatives were available to them for consultation in forming a statement in the new constitution regarding community colleges. Aggressive lobbying on the part of Michigan community college administrators plus the interest of many citizens brought about the inclusion of Article 8, under Section 7 of the new constitution, which states:

The legislature shall provide by law for the establishment and financial support of public community and junior colleges which shall be supervised and controlled by locally elected boards. The legislature shall provide by law for a state board for public community and junior colleges which shall advise the state board of education concerning the general supervision and planning for such colleges and requests for annual appropriations for their support. The board shall consist of eight members who shall hold office for terms of eight years, not more than two of which shall expire in the same year, and who shall be appointed by the state board of education. Vacancies shall be filled in like manner. The superintendent of public instruction shall be ex-officio a member of this board without the right to vote.

With this statement regarding community colleges in the constitution, some of the initial recommendations of John Dale Russell's study and other studies began to shape formally and legally the declared role of this segment of higher education.

Growing Financial Support

George Romney, who served as a delegate to the Constitutional Convention, was a member of its educational committee. In 1962, he was elected governor of Michigan. The governor, out of long interest concerning education, served on the Detroit Public School Citizen Committee and throughout his campaign voiced his interest in the problems of education, particularly those regarding higher education. To gain interest for these ideas, he appointed a citizen's committee on higher education (com-

monly known as the Governor's Blue Ribbon Committee on Higher Education). This committee completed their formal report to the governor during the fall of 1965. An interim report was produced by this committee with recommendations concerning the financing of community colleges, which was instrumental—with the cooperation of the legislature—in bringing about the greatest appropriations for community colleges in the history of the state. A total of \$6,905,106 was appropriated for the operation of community colleges, allowing for \$234 support for each full-time equated student. The capital outlay allocation was increased from \$1.5 million to \$4 million. Again in the 1965 legislative session support was increased to \$275 per full-time equated student for a total of over \$11 million for the operation of community colleges. The capital outlay remained at the \$4 million level.

Over the last several years, the legislature has been requested to allocate 50 per cent of the capital outlay needs for community colleges. Although the allocation for funds for capital outlay and operations were increased significantly in the legislative seasons of 1963-64 and 1964-65 they were still less than what was requested for public community colleges in the state. It is anticipated that during the 1965-66 fiscal year Michigan community colleges will need to construct facilities costing over \$25 million. One-half of this figure, or \$13 million, was requested of the legislature.

Federal and State Acts

The median tuition for students in Michigan community colleges for the college year 1964-65 was over \$180. It was felt that this tuition was too high and, consequently, the legislature was requested to allocate \$300 for each full-time equated student. This increase for operational funds would allow the colleges to "hold the line" on tuition as well as diversity and improve curricular offerings. The Governor's Blue Ribbon Committee, with other educational groups, advocated during the 1964-65 legislative season a considerable increase in capital outlay and

operational funds for community colleges.

Under the new federal acts for college facilities and vocational education, Michigan anticipates well over \$4 million for capital outlay. These funds should allow, with the \$4 million from the state, the opportunity for local community colleges to approach their capital outlay requirements for this fiscal year. At present, Michigan law limits the state capital outlay matching funds to community colleges to a maximum allocation of \$600,000. Consequently, if the college is in the midst of a major building program its share of its capital outlay expenditures on a matching basis could be severely limited. Previous to this year, \$500,000 was the upper limit, and as noted above, the legislature did change this to an upper limit of \$600,000.

Contacts with the governor and the legislature indicate that there is a great deal of sympathy for the needs of community colleges and the necessity of long-range campus planning. It is anticipated that, with the help of the new State Board for Community Colleges, many of the problems of financing will be changed in a way beneficial to the needs of community colleges.

Undoubtedly, one of the most significant legislative acts in the history of Michigan, concerning community colleges, was put into effect during the 1963-64 legislative season. This act developed out of the concern of the people of Michigan that community colleges should play a significant and primary vocational training role in the fields of the health sciences, business, and technology programs.

In a speech given at the annual workshop of the Michigan Council of Community College Administrators in Traverse City on July 22, Dr. Ferris N. Crawford gave the following analysis of Act 237 of the Public Acts of 1964:

In its 1964 Session, the Michigan Legislature enacted one of the most significant community college statutes of its history. Encouraged by the Michigan Council of Community College Administrators, the Superintendent and Department of Public Instruction, the

Michigan Association of Junior Colleges, and other organizations, the Legislature passed Act 237 which redefines the educational role of community colleges and specifies the supporting districts as charter units of government in accordance with Michigan's new Constitution.

In respect to the educational role of community colleges, this act:

1. Gives the community college the permissive authority to offer both collegiate and noncollegiate programs of education primarily (but not exclusively) for all persons above the 12th grade age level and primarily (but not exclusively) for those within commuting distance of the institution.

2. Removes the previous two-year limitations on the length of collegiate level courses which may be offered.

3. Specifically gives community colleges authority to grant diplomas including degrees known as associate degrees.

4. Restricts the community colleges from granting bachelor or higher degrees.

5. Expands the specified legal authority of a community college district so that it may now include area vocational-technical education programs in its curriculum.

6. Defines specifically the meaning of area vocational-technical education programs.

7. Gives the community college the authority to enroll students in an area vocational-technical program, those students being persons who have completed or left high school, who have already entered the labor market and need additional training, and under certain conditions persons who are regularly enrolled in the secondary school on a full-time basis.

In effect, the aforementioned provisions of the act extend the community college role both upward and downward on the educational continuum, while at the same time these retain the breadth and comprehensiveness of programs in terms of the needs of individuals and the society of which they are a part. Thus a student might attend a Michigan community college part-time while still enrolled regularly in a secondary school. He may be enrolled indefinitely, after graduation, in a community college program of a credit or noncredit type of any length. Or a non-high school graduate might be enrolled in a variety of educational programs of any length. But regardless of the length or comprehensiveness of any program completed by a student, in a community college, the act restricts the community college from granting to the graduate a degree higher than that known as the associate degree.

In respect to defining community college districts as charter units of government, the act:

1. Gives the electors of the district the authority to vote on the question of giving the board of trustees the authority to levy, for an indefinite period, a property tax rate for all purposes of the community college up to a rate of 5 mills (\$5 per \$1,000 state equalized valuation).

2. Gives the board of trustees the authority to issue bonds, in accordance with a defined formula, without an authorization vote of the electors, and to levy an annual property tax sufficient to pay the annual interest and principal payments for such bonds without a previous authorization vote by the electors.

With this change in the law, Michigan community colleges now legally will add to their traditional role of serving the academic needs of their community, through their transfer liberal arts curriculums, a strong commitment to vocational education.

During the last few years the Michigan Association of Junior Community Colleges and the Michigan Council of Community College Administrators have had to take several positions concerning the function of Michigan community colleges. Consequently, when Delta College requested of the state legislature that they be allowed to become a four-year college, these associations, as well as the Council of State College Presidents, opposed this action. This position was supported by the State Board of Education and Delta remains a part of the community college system in Michigan. During the 1964-65 legislative session, the state established a new, public four-year college for this area.

Toward a Statewide System

In the spring, 1964, the Michigan Association of Junior Community Colleges and the Michigan Council of Community College Administrators took a position regarding the University of Michigan's Flint Branch. At present, the Flint Branch offers only junior and senior courses. These two associations requested that the university not be allowed to extend offerings at the freshman and sophomore level on the campus of the Flint Community Junior

College. The Michigan Coordinating Council for Public Higher Education, composed of state college presidents and board members with a board and administrative representative taken from community colleges, appointed a committee of out-of-state representatives that has, in its report, substantiated the above position.

A newly formed association, the Michigan Association of Colleges and Universities (presidents of private and state colleges), has accepted as full members the deans and presidents of accredited Michigan community colleges.

It appears to the writer that the next several years will see development in Michigan of a system of community colleges within commuting distance of all the citizens of the state. This fast-evolving system leaves the important function of local control, allowing a community college to be unique and fit its particular community needs, under a state plan that will be balanced carefully to protect this position and the total interest of the state.

Michigan Revisited

Since 1966, five new community college districts have been established in Michigan, bringing the total to twenty-nine.

The State Board for Public Community and Junior Colleges has proposed a statewide districting plan recommending the establishment of thirty-two major districts for Michigan. This should provide a community college within commuting distance of most of the people of the state. The recommended plan will enlarge several existing college districts and provide for establishment of four new districts.

A few years ago, the major thrust for community colleges was to break away from the K-12 districts and establish community college districts under separate boards of control. This is underway or completed in all but six areas in Michigan. The recommendation by the State Board of Education and the State Board for Public Community and Junior Colleges is motivating the remaining K-12 districts toward area college district votes.

The dynamic growth in enrollment in Michigan community colleges since 1966 outdistances growth in all other areas of higher education. Headcount enrollment has grown from 69,500 to 95,000 for fall of 1968. One of the most significant changes in the community colleges is the accelerating instructional commitment to career education. Operational and capital outlay budgets signify a considerable shift toward strong vocational-technical education and continuing education programs in most of Michigan's community colleges. The state legislature has emphasized the importance of this role by establishing a differential between funding for the general academic student and the career-oriented student in technology, business, and health-career programs.

As one travels across Michigan he sees new community college campuses replacing the old high school buildings once used for community colleges. The most populous areas of the State of Michigan have had the most dynamic growth in community colleges, especially in the suburban areas. The Detroit metropolitan area has seen the development of several community college complexes with enrollments exceeding 10,000. Unfortunately, parts of Wayne County, which include the city of Detroit, failed in their last two elections to establish a community college district.

The Michigan State Board of Education has advanced a state plan for higher education which lists thirty-five goals—nineteen of these having direct application to public community colleges. This plan has been extensively reviewed by trustees and presidents, with resulting tense and extensive dialog regarding the respective roles of the local boards of trustees and the State Board of Education.

Present legislation allows for area vocational education to be operated by a K-12 district or a community college district. At present this approach is being followed by four community colleges in the state, making area vocational education available for students from the eleventh grade through the community college level.

Public Employees Relations Act 379, 1965, gives public employees the right to organize and bargain collectively with public employers concerning wages, hours, and conditions of employment. The impact of this state legislation is causing redefinition and a shift in the decision-making process within the community college structure.

A most important thrust of the community colleges in Michigan has taken place through curriculum innovation. The development of the audiovisual-tutorial approach has accompanied an increase in the number of programs being made available to students in health careers, technical and business areas. Colleges are more sensitive to the needs of general education, remedial education and, particularly, to programs directed toward the needs of the ghettos and depressed areas of urban, suburban, and rural Michigan.

Philip J. Gannon

Ohio Joins the Club

By Charles E. Chapman

On September 23, 1963, they came by the hundreds.

A bright-eyed teen-ager from a middle class suburban community—hoping to be a nurse.

A serious young man from the central city—looking ahead to a career in electronics.

A tall, slender lad from out of the county—with an eye on law.

A blonde miss from a deprived neighborhood—dreaming of being a private secretary.

A retired WAC—planning a teaching career.

They came from all parts of the county, from all walks of life, from seventy-one of the county's eighty-two high schools, and from the well-to-do suburbs to the depressed areas of central Cleveland. There were youngsters and oldsters; they represented multiple creeds and colors. They were a composite of the complex urban community of which they were a part.

They came to enroll at Cuyahoga Community College, the first public community college to be chartered under Ohio's Community College Act of 1961. By the end of the first week of registration, more than 3,000 full-and-part-time students had enrolled. It was estimated at the time that an additional 200 to 300 were turned away because of a shortage of faculty and classroom space. It was probably the largest initial enrollment in the history of the junior college movement.

The Cleveland Press hailed it as "the miracle on 14th Street."

This auspicious beginning of the community junior college movement in Ohio didn't happen by chance. Numerous statewide studies going back to the early 1950's indicated a need for community colleges in

the state. This feeling was climaxed on June 1, 1958, when three members of the Ohio Legislature, a businessman, the executive secretary of the Cleveland Commission on Higher Education, and a newspaper reporter huddled in a tiny office on Cleveland's public square.

"We're here to do something about getting a junior college in Ohio," said Ralph M. Besse, president of the Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company. Mr. Besse went on to say, "I'll do all I can to help, but it's up to you fellows to get a law so we can get started." He offered his good wishes and left for another meeting.

From that first informal meeting emerged the will to get something done for Ohio, and for Cleveland in particular. The legislators pledged their support at the coming meeting of the General Assembly. Evan B. Lloyd, executive secretary of the Cleveland Commission on Higher Education of which Mr. Besse was the chairman, pledged the commission's support. The reporter offered the support of his newspaper, *The Cleveland Press*.

During the fall of 1958 a bill was prepared, and in January, 1959, it was introduced to the General Assembly. It was enacted into law but was vetoed by Governor Michael V. DiSalle because of what he called "inadequate provisions" for the financial support of community colleges.

By this time the number of supporters of the junior college concept had grown considerably. Among the vocal and influential supporters were the Ohio Commission on Education Beyond the High School, the Ohio Interim Commission on Education Beyond the High School, and the Leagues of Women Voters.

An Unusual Day in the Legislature

Consequently, a similar bill was introduced into the legislature in 1961. This bill passed the house but failed in the Senate Committee on Education. A companion bill called for the establishment of technical institutes and fared better in the Senate Com-

mittee on Education. The day it was presented to the senate was one of the most unusual in Ohio's legislative history. As the bill was presented, Senator Frank King, the minority leader, jumped to his feet and moved to amend. He said, "Strike the words 'technical institute' and substitute 'community college.'" He did this at least a score of times while startled education committee members looked on. Senator King's amendments passed each time by one vote and within an hour Ohio had a community college law over some loud, but futile objections. Governor DiSalle, who favored the bill this time, signed it into law after some needed revisions.

In spite of numerous shortcomings in the law, the County Commissioners of Cuyahoga County, of which Cleveland is the county seat, decided to move ahead in the establishment of a community college. The commissioners felt that Cuyahoga County, with a population of 1.7 million and an industrial complex containing 70 per cent of all the types of industries listed by the U.S. Census Bureau, needed a public community college that was sensitive to the needs of the community. They wanted a low-tuition college that could help meet these needs by training, retraining, and upgrading personnel in such a complex industrial community, and could provide the first two years of a liberal arts program as well.

Consequently, the county commissioners voted the district into being and appointed a board of trustees of seven members in February, 1962. The board had the formidable task of obtaining answers to such questions as, "How does a public college get started without public funds or the authority to borrow them?" "How does a college board plan a program without a staff?" "How does a college get started with an inadequate law and in the absence of facilities, equipment, and curriculum?"

Although these problems seemed insoluble, the board was undaunted. A few weeks after assuming its responsibility, the board sought and received from The Cleveland Foundation \$75,000 with which to study its needs and plan for the future. Concur-

rently, it asked for guidance from the American Association of Junior Colleges. Through that office, Dr. Leland Medsker, vice-chairman of the Center for the Study of Higher Education, University of California, was employed as a consultant.

Dr. Medsker assisted the board in surveying the county's 15,000 high school graduates of 1962. He also recommended that the position of director of planning be established and filled at the earliest practicable time. This suggestion was accepted and the writer was appointed to the position in July, 1962. He has continued as president since the college was chartered in December, 1962.

A Decision to Start—Somehow

In spite of the numerous questions that remained unanswered, the board of trustees resolved in August, 1962, to start classes in September, 1963, somehow. What at the time could have appeared to be a rash decision, proved to be far-sighted and profound.

To accomplish this goal the following acts were effected: A series of public hearings were held to determine the need for the college; a county-wide, socio-economic survey was conducted to learn the characteristics of the community to be served; questionnaires completed by 12,000 high school seniors were analyzed; and scores of speeches were given along with participation in dozens of radio and television programs. During his first sixteen months in Cleveland, the writer gave more than 200 talks and appeared on more than a score of radio and television programs. Board members probably exceeded this number of public appearances.

Everywhere personnel of the college turned they were received with enthusiasm. Individuals and groups representing every segment of the community pleaded with them to "get the college started as soon as possible." The board moved with renewed confidence. In the absence of public legal counsel, private counsel was employed. The law was rewritten to

clarify its financial provisions authorizing the college district and the state to contribute both capital and operating funds to community colleges. Provisions were also included authorizing community colleges to offer technical-occupational subjects. A master plan for the college was prepared. It was approved by the State Community College Board on December 5, 1962, and thus the district became a college as well. The rewritten community college bill was presented in January, 1963, to the state legislature and was approved unanimously by all committees and both houses. It was signed by Governor James A. Rhodes in July, 1963. These amendments to the law established a firmer foundation for the development of community colleges in Ohio and assisted Cuyahoga Community College in reaching its announced objective to start classes in September, 1963.

Facilities

120

In the absence of public capital funds, the board of trustees sought additional private funds during the spring and summer of 1963 for the purpose of renting, renovating and equipping a facility for college classes. A total of \$350,000 was raised and used for these purposes and for necessary program planning and augmentation of the staff. The college leased from the Cleveland Board of Education, for a dollar a year, a seventy-five-year-old elementary school that had been vacated since 1955 due to an urban renewal program that converted a blighted residential area to nonresidential use.

Monies were contributed by seventy different companies, labor unions, foundations, and individuals. This was the first time that the industries of Cleveland had been asked to donate to local public higher education, although their contributions to private colleges and universities have amounted to millions of dollars over the years. Trustees of the college promised that such a solicitation was a "one shot" plan that was necessary if the much-needed college were to start on schedule. This was also the first opportunity that a sizable and important segment of

the public had to express its feelings toward the idea of a community college.

Contracts for refurbishing and equipping the leased facility were let in May and work was completed in October, 1963. This facility gave to the college twelve classrooms, including three science laboratories. The original gymnasium was converted into a library, and the kitchen became the office of student personnel. The original wood shop started life anew as a cafeteria. All fixed and movable equipment placed in this temporary facility was designed and installed so that it could be removed to permanent facilities later on. From the outset the facility has been used 85 per cent of the time from early in the morning until late at night.

To accommodate an increase in students from 3,000 in 1963 to 6,000 in 1964, an additional 60,000 square feet of space was leased. This was augmented by additional space in 1965.

Due to a shortage of time and personnel, and the absence of facilities, equipment, and money, courses in the area of technology were restricted during the first year to a number of single and multiple offerings. This void was filled in part for the academic year 1964-65, when the college initiated sixteen two-year degree programs. All of these are the result of close cooperation with more than 150 citizens who represent sixteen advisory committees. The programs include building construction technology, business, dental hygiene, electrical-electronic technology, industrial supervision, law enforcement, mechanical technology, medical assisting, nursing, and secretarial science. It is anticipated that an additional six to eight new associate degree programs will be started during the school year 1965-66.

Relationships with Other Schools

From the outset of the forming of the district, the board and administration at the college have been sensitive to their relations with other schools—public schools, private and public colleges, and universities.

Between April 15 and June 15, 1963, college personnel visited sixty of the eighty-two high schools in the county. In May, the college was host to 100 high school counselors. Through these endeavors and others, more than 1,000 freshman students were counseled during the summer of 1963. Radio and television programs and the distribution of literature were used to tell the story of the college during the short time available.

In spite of the fact that the community college concept was new to many senior college and university personnel in Ohio, relations with them were cordial from the beginning. Discussions and correspondence during the early spring and summer of 1963 resulted in acceptance of Cuyahoga Community College's credits at the leading senior institutions throughout the state. Liaison with these educational institutions has continued.

Financial Status

The first public monies received by the college were from the state. These monies, amounting to \$220,000, were appropriated for operating expenses for the year 1963-64. They were received six weeks prior to the beginning of classes and amounted to \$146 for each full-time equivalent student computed by the following formula:

$$\text{F.T.E.} = \frac{\text{Total student credit hours of enrollment}}{30 \text{ credit hours}}$$

Effective in 1965, state financial support was increased to \$200 per full-time equivalent student. For the biennium 1967-69 the Board of Regents plans to recommend a further increase to \$250 per full-time equivalent student.

Since November, 1963, voters have approved three separate college tax levies. The November, 1963, election was the first time the voters of the county had an opportunity to express their feelings toward the college. They approved it overwhelmingly. This levy assured the college sufficient operating funds for the upcoming five years. Due to an emergency

caused by a taxpayer's suit filed against the state (the expected source of capital money needed by the college to equip additional science and technology laboratories) the voters were again asked to approve a levy for the benefit of the college. The levy was approved by a 58 per cent majority on May 5, 1964.

In May, 1965, the voters again reacted favorably toward the college when they approved a five-year levy in the amount of \$17 million. Along with state support, the college now has sufficient operating funds to carry it through the 1969-70 school year and capital funds with which to build a \$22.5 million facility. The master plan for this first campus calls for a facility to accommodate 6,000 full-time equivalent day students. The location of the proposed campus consists of 40 acres in downtown Cleveland. It is at the focal point of public transportation in and out of Cleveland and is within a 30-minute drive of approximately 1.8 million people.

As part of an urban renewal project, land for this campus was acquired by the college at one-fifth its market value. Because of the need for additional educational services, other campuses are contemplated by the Board of Trustees.

The Law Today

The major provisions of the law as it exists in Ohio at this time are as follows:

1. One or more counties with a population of 70,000 at the preceding decennial census qualify as community college districts.
2. Districts may be initiated by a simple majority vote of county commissioners. Subsequent to the appointment of the initial board, the only continuing authority and responsibility of the commissioners is that of filling vacancies and making appointments as terms expire.
3. Community colleges in Ohio are a part of the system of higher education.
4. Community colleges and technical institutes and state-supported senior colleges and universities

are planned and coordinated by the newly established Ohio Board of Regents.

5. Community colleges have the right of eminent domain and other legal authority commonly associated with public agencies.

6. Curriculum authority includes liberal arts, adult education, and technical-occupational programs.

7. There are no credential or certification requirements for community college faculty personnel.

8. Tenure and other personnel benefits are a matter of local option.

9. Financial support includes operating funds from tuition (to be set up by the local boards), local taxes, and state appropriations. Capital funds may be received from local taxes and state appropriations.

The proportional financial responsibility of the local district and the state has not been stipulated in the law; nor is there a continuing local millage for either capital or operating expenses. Each has to be voted as needs develop. Capital and operating support from the state has to be negotiated biennially.

What is currently a good law would be an excellent law if its financial provisions were amended to provide planning money for newly created community college districts, and include a formula setting forth the proportional local and state responsibilities for the capital and operating costs of ongoing community college programs.

Plans and Expectations

It is the announced objective of Cuyahoga Community College to develop a comprehensive county-wide community college with emphasis on teaching, counseling, and course offerings—to include the arts and sciences, but with a great deal of emphasis on the area of technical and semiprofessional curriculums.

Enrollment at Cuyahoga Community College increased from the 1964 fall enrollment of 6,500 to approximately 9,800 in 1965. To accommodate this

increase, the college leased an additional 30,000 square feet of office space in nearby buildings. A demographic study conducted in the late summer of 1962 indicated that the college could have 10,000 to 13,000 full-time day students in less than ten years. Experience since the college started in 1963 indicates that this was a conservative estimate.

The early and continuing progress of Cuyahoga Community College encouraged other counties to start community college districts. Lorain Community College initiated its instructional program last fall with approximately 1,000 students. Approval by the voters of Lorain County of a tax levy in 1963 provided the college with capital and operating funds. Augmented by federal and state appropriations, Lorain Community College has been able to move quickly in the establishment of an ongoing instructional program; further, capital funds from the sources referred to above have permitted the college to move ahead with this building program. Contracts have been let for the first few buildings of a campus designed to accommodate 5,000 students.

Mahoning, Montgomery, Lake, and Columbiana counties have established community college districts. Inquiries from other counties are being made with increasing frequency. The progress of county community colleges in Ohio, during their short history, has gone a long way toward showing the state legislature and the state government that their decision to enact enabling community college legislation and to support ongoing programs was based on sound judgment.

While there is still a laissez-faire attitude on the part of some in Ohio who are responsible for the planning and coordinating of higher education, regarding the respective merits of the comprehensive community college, university branches, and separate technical institutes, the distinct advantage of the comprehensive community college is being more widely recognized as the practical and economical approach to filling a large part of the ever-

widening void between the high school diploma and the baccalaureate degree.

Ohio Revisited

During the past few years, Ohio has taken great strides in the development of existing community colleges, and in the planning for future ones.

Physical development has been impressive on the campuses of Ohio's two-year institutions. Cuyahoga Community College's new 15,000-student Metropolitan Campus in downtown Cleveland is scheduled for its grand opening in the fall of 1969. The largest structure of the ten-unit complex, the Science and Technology Building, opened for instruction in September of 1968, with 3,000 students. In addition to federal and state aid, the Metropolitan Campus construction is being financed through levies approved by county voters, including a one-mill, five-year levy in November 1967. Because of escalating construction costs, the total Metro Campus capital expenditure will be in excess of \$30 million.

Future capital development plans call for construction of a permanent Western Campus in suburban Parma and for construction of an Eastern Campus.

Tri-C's "instant" campus on the west side opened in the fall of 1966 on the site of a World War II V.A. hospital. A total of 130 acres and some sixty buildings comprise the campus, which was assigned to the college by the federal government for a nominal transfer fee early in 1966. Extensive renovation and equipping during the summer of 1966 readied the facility for college instruction.

A site is now being selected for a campus to serve the eastern sector of Cuyahoga County. The need for expanded, multicampus facilities is demonstrated by Tri-C's fall 1968 enrollment of 14,853.

At the community colleges in Lake and Lorain counties, which flank Cuyahoga County to the east and west, facilities have also expanded rapidly. Lorain County Community College now occupies its modern, six-unit \$11 million campus. Handsome

new facilities on the 250-acre campus include structures housing the science, technology, business, humanities, and physical education programs, and the library-administration-college center building. Building plans call for an additional eight structures on the campus by 1973, at which time enrollment of 5,000 is expected. Fall 1968 enrollment at L.C.C.C. was 3,259.

Financing for L.C.C.C.'s new campus is largely through a ten-year, 1.25-mill levy approved by Lorain County voters in 1963.

At Lake County's Lakeland Community College, groundbreaking for a new \$6.5 million campus was held in the summer of 1969. The campus, to be located on a 390-acre site, is expected to serve a total of 15,000 students during the next ten years. Lakeland currently has an enrollment of 1,600 students attending classes in leased facilities located in two Lake County cities.

In addition to approximately \$1.25 million generated by a 1.7-mill levy approved by Lake County voters in May of 1967, financing for Lakeland's new campus includes \$2.25 million in state funds and \$1.5 million from the sale of self-liquidating bonds. The remaining \$1.5 million is to be raised through contributions from private individuals and the business community.

Dayton's Sinclair Community College is also looking into the near future for completion of its new downtown campus. Construction for the \$22 million learning center, designed by internationally known architect Edward Durell Stone, is scheduled to begin in the fall of 1969. Completion of the buildings, planned to accommodate 5,000 students, is scheduled for late 1970. Sinclair, for nearly eighty years a private two-year college, became a public community college in the fall of 1966. The fall 1968 enrollment at Sinclair was 2,737. Financing of Sinclair's twenty-acre facility includes an anticipated \$4.3 million federal grant and revenue bonds of \$2 million.

Program development and expanded offerings have matched physical growth in the two-year insti-

tutions. Ohio's community colleges now offer two-year associate degree programs in dozens of technical-occupational areas, as well as comprehensive, university-parallel offerings. At Ohio's four community colleges, students may enroll in career-oriented degree programs in more than sixty areas of business, engineering, health and public service technologies, as well as in the college's arts and sciences programs and varied one-year certificate programs.

Ohio's community colleges have also addressed themselves to the specific, unique needs of their communities. At Cuyahoga Community College, for instance, among the community service offerings are evening classes for adults who wish to continue their education and Project EVE, an occupational and educational counseling service for adult women which has, thus far, assisted more than 3,500 women in preparing for the future. Other offerings include Project SEARCH, a comprehensive educational counseling center located in Cleveland's Hough area; and Project NEW CAREERS, a program presently training 100 inner-city men and women for positions as water servicemen, health-technician aides, plumbing inspector aides, and recreation aides for the city of Cleveland.

Similar community service programs exist at other Ohio community colleges. Lakeland Community College, for example, works with several county agencies to train Project Head Start aides for remedial work with children possessing weak communicative and other skills.

Of specific interest to Ohio's two-year colleges is a broad educational program for the state outlined recently by Governor James A. Rhodes. As part of a plan dubbed "Solutions for the Seventies," the governor has asked Ohio's legislators for some \$261 million for Ohio colleges and universities—\$96.4 million of which is planned for two-year colleges and technical education centers. Included in proposed funding is \$7.5 million to give impetus to the Mahoning Community College, construction of thirty-three

technical education centers, and \$10 million toward construction of the permanent Western Campus of Cuyahoga Community College.

Recognition by Ohio's legislators of the major role of the junior college in the educational "Solution for the Seventies" has already been reflected in comprehensive planning and financial support. Cuyahoga Community College presently receives from the state \$505 per full-time equivalent student. In addition, during the 1968-69 academic year, the state is providing tutorial money for such projects as the C.C.C. College Skills Program, designed for students with weak communicative skills.

Representative of the growing awareness among political leaders of the potential of the junior college in Ohio, Cleveland's Mayor Carl B. Stokes, in an address to members of the American Association of Junior Colleges at the 1969 convention, stated that "no group is better suited to aid cities in solving the urban crisis than junior colleges." These institutions are, he said, ". . . on the move to meet the diverse needs of the complex urban community . . . and to continue to provide comprehensive, up-to-date educational offerings. . . ."

Charles E. Chapman

It May Happen in Alabama, Too!

By Walter A. Graham

The state of Alabama and, more particularly, its governor, George C. Wallace, have been in the front pages news for many months. Regardless of one's feelings about the governor, his name will probably go down in Alabama history as the one man most responsible for the big push in junior college education in Alabama in this decade.

The Wallace administration came to office on January 14, 1963, and the biennial meeting of the Alabama Legislature was held in May of the same year. One of the very first pieces of business for the legislature, according to the wishes of the new governor, was a bill dealing with junior colleges and trade schools. Despite much opposition from some legislators, many school men (including administrators of state-owned and private senior colleges) and others, even before the regular school appropriation bills were passed, the governor was successful in having three acts passed.

New Legislation

Acts No. 92, 93, and 94, approved at 4:10, 4:11, and 4:12 p.m. on May 3, 1963, provided for an Alabama Trade School and Junior College Authority with the governor, the director of finance, and the superintendent of education as directors of the corporation. One of the acts provided for an increase of 1 cent in the current beer tax, 4/7 of the increase to be used to pay the principal and interest on bonds, not exceeding \$15 million for the Alabama Trade School and Junior College Authority.

One of the acts further provided that no more

than \$1.5 million "shall be expended by the Authority with respect to any one trade school or junior college." An additional provision was that "... no funds of the Authority shall be expended for the acquisition of sites or existing buildings ..." and "No such trade school or junior college shall be built on a site other than one donated to the Authority." (Incidentally, while none of the acts specifically mentioned the number of institutions to be established, it was generally understood there would be ten, this number being determined by dividing the total of \$15 million for all by \$1.5 million, the maximum amount to be spent for one college).

With such statutory enactments loaded with available funds, at least for new buildings, it is not difficult to understand how and why requests were received from each of the sixty-seven counties in Alabama to establish either a junior college or a trade school in either the county seat or some other community in the county. To deal with the numerous requests, the governor appointed a committee of nine citizens to receive them and make recommendations to the Alabama State Board of Education concerning the ten possible sites. The nine-man committee included representatives from Auburn University and the University of Alabama (Alabama's largest four-year institutions), a high school principal, superintendent of a large city public school system, a member of the Alabama State Board of Education, and several other prominent citizens.

Following the report of the special site committee, the governor announced that "ten new junior colleges and twelve new trade schools would be built throughout Alabama in an unprecedented fifteen-million-dollar program." The locations ran from far north to deep south and from east to extreme west, taking in both big cities and small, rural communities. Four were set aside for Negroes and the balance were for white students. Subsequently, an announcement was made by the governor that four more sites had been selected and, in addition, one existing college was accepted by the State Board of

Education, the definite date of taking over by the state to be dependent upon the state legislature making available the necessary operating funds.

After the sites are selected and the buildings constructed, the Alabama Trade School and Junior College Authority Act provides that ". . . the State Board of Education shall assume the responsibility for operating and maintaining . . ." the new institutions:

The State Board of Education, upon recommendation of the State Superintendent of Education, shall: Make rules and regulations for the government of such additional educational institutions; prescribe the courses of study to be offered and the conditions for granting certificates or diplomas; appoint the president of each such additional educational institution and, upon the president's recommendation, appoint the members of the faculty and affix the tenure and salary of each; direct and supervise the expenditure of legislative appropriations for the use of such additional educational institutions; accept gifts, donations, devises, and bequests of money and real and personal property for the purposes of this Act; disseminate information concerning and promote interest in such additional educational institutions among the pupils of public schools; and make such rules and regulations as the board shall deem advisable for the government of such additional educational institutions.

Plans have gone forward on the drawing boards of the Alabama State Building Commission (as charged under the enabling legislation) for the main administration buildings, including classrooms, library and dining facilities. There are no plans at present for dormitories, auditoriums or gymnasiums. The governor has stated publicly on several occasions that most of the new junior colleges and trade schools will be in operation by the fall of 1965.

Existing Junior Colleges

Alabama has not been without junior colleges as indicated by the fact that the Alabama Association of Junior Colleges, formed in 1958, is composed of six member colleges. (Four of these colleges are active members also of the American Association of Junior Colleges.) Marion Institute, at Marion, with

Colonel Paul Robinson as current president, was founded in 1842 and is the oldest junior college in the state. Although it is an independent institution, it receives contributions from the State of Alabama as does Walker College at Jasper, which was founded as an independent institution in 1938; it has had only two presidents, the current one being Dr. David Rowland.

The four other junior colleges, listed in the order of the date of establishment, and giving location, denominational affiliation, and current presidents are: Southern Union State Junior College (formerly Southern Union College), Wadley, 1922, Congregational Christian (now The United Church of Christ), Dr. Walter A. Graham; Snead College, Boaz, 1935, Methodist, Dr. John Tyson; Sacred Heart College, Cullman, 1940, Catholic, Sister Mary Lourdes Michel; Alabama Christian College, Montgomery, 1942, Church of Christ, Dr. Rex Turner. Daniel Payne College, for Negroes, was established in 1889 at Birmingham by the African Methodist Episcopal Church; Dr. Howard D. Gregg is president.

The purpose of the Alabama Association of Junior Colleges, as set forth in its working rules, is "to promote the common interest of the junior colleges of Alabama." The purpose is to be achieved "through representation in other agencies interested in education; through coordination of efforts on behalf of the junior college; through collaboration in exchange of resource material and personnel and through public relations."

In the more than six years of the association's life, it has sponsored an annual music festival, an annual meeting in conjunction with the Alabama Education Association (new officers are chosen at this time) and workshops for faculty and staff members. Meetings have been held on each of the various campuses which are located in widely separated parts of the state. The institutional membership dues are \$25 per year.

The most recent venture of the Alabama Association of Junior Colleges has been the preparation and

dissemination of a brochure about all of the present member Alabama junior colleges. Following the collection of certain pertinent information from each of the member institutions and the careful editing by a committee of three presidents, the presidents or their representatives met and pooled their lists of friends and supporters, eliminated the duplications and sent the brochure out. The purpose was to make as many people in the state as possible aware of the values and contributions of the junior colleges and also to appeal for wider support.

The Alabama junior colleges are not a part of the Alabama Independent Colleges although negotiations are presently underway to make this a reality. The current president of the Alabama Independent Colleges is a former president of one of the Alabama junior colleges so there is some basis to assume that he will take the lead in having his colleagues consider including the junior colleges.

When the present incumbent was notified that he had been elected the president of the Alabama Association of Junior Colleges, he said that the association "has a real opportunity in the coming year in view of the large number of junior colleges which the state is organizing. The present association anticipates with great pleasure working with the leaders and the communities as these new state-owned and operated junior colleges come into being."

Yes, the state-supported junior college movement may really get off the launching pad one day, even in Alabama!

Late Developments

Fourteen state-owned and controlled junior colleges opened their doors in September, 1965; ten of them are new and four of them have previously been in existence, one for two years and another for forty-three years.

The enrollments vary from a low of 142 to a high of 993, the average between 300 and 600, the total being 5,476 in 1965-66 and an estimated 10,000 in 1966-67.

Classes are held in churches, high schools, aban-

done hospitals, and various civic buildings. Contracts have been let for all of the new buildings, some of which were completed and occupied in the fall of 1965.

The State Board of Education has set the tuition charge of \$45 per student per quarter or \$135 for the year; this is for Alabama citizens or residents while out-of-state students will pay \$100 per quarter or \$300 for the year.

The legislature, following the leadership of Governor George C. Wallace and State Superintendent of Education Austin R. Meadows, has already made available, in special and regular sessions, a total of \$37.4 million for Alabama junior colleges and trade schools.

The Alabama Junior Colleges now operate a fleet of buses, the number varying from four to twelve per college, that follow scheduled routes on an express basis, without charge to students.

The time for the countdown for junior colleges in Alabama has passed and beginning of the first orbit is very near!

Alabama Revisited

Some people allege that there is magic in numbers 7, 13, 21, etc.; but if so, the magic changes with the times.

What started out to be ten state junior colleges in Alabama now turns in to seventeen, making a total of twenty-three junior colleges in Alabama, six of them private. The last two of the seventeen state schools to be organized will open in the fall of 1969, Fayette and Lurleen B. Wallace at Andalusia.

The latest figures for enrollment indicate that instead of a few hundred, as was true in 1963—the year the great emphasis was first placed on state junior colleges—the number is now 19,144 with more than 25,000 expected by 1972.

The amount of state support has not kept pace with the growth in enrollments, headcount, or full-time equivalent. Governor Albert Brewer, successor to the Wallaces, has not only called the Alabama legislature into special session but has recommended

for the operation of the seventeen state colleges a total of \$9.4 million for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1970, and \$9.5 million for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1971.

The first recommendation represents an increase over the past year of 38.7 per cent. While there is also a recommendation of \$1 million for capital outlay, everyone agrees that this is a mere token—but this seems to be all that appears possible on the horizon. Tuition was raised from \$45 to \$60 per quarter, effective in the 1969 spring quarter; out-of-state students now pay \$115 per quarter.

In accreditation, Alabama junior colleges are on the move. Northwest State Junior College at Phil Campbell with James A. Glasgow as president, was the first of the new state junior colleges to receive approval by the Southern Association of Colleges in 1967. Eight colleges received regional accreditation in 1968, and approximately eight more will be hoping for this honor in 1969.

The Alabama Association of Junior Colleges, first organized in 1958 with only six members, (all that were in existence at that time) has continued to make progress. The last annual workshop in Dothan, hosted by the George C. Wallace State Technical Junior College, was attended by more than 400 faculty and staff members.

The program of the A.A.J.C. (the Alabama, not the American Association) now includes a fully organized athletic conference—the member colleges being divided into a northern and southern division with duly elected officers and competition between teams in those areas. A.A.J.C. is fully integrated in all of its activities which include music, librarians, deans, and many groups organized according to disciplines.

Much of the opposition from the senior colleges has slackened, if not totally disappeared. The junior colleges, staffed by teachers all having at least a master's degree in their subject-matter field, have turned out excellent students for transfer to senior colleges and universities within and without the

state. The public has generally accepted junior colleges as true citadels of higher education.

What of the future? Anyone who looks into a crystal ball today and tries to prognosticate is either extremely brave or not fully aware of the rapidity of change. However, past experience would suggest that either the open-door policy has got to go or the amount of support must be tremendously increased. Beginning teachers with a master's degree now receive \$6,930 as opposed to \$6,000 of some years ago, and they are beginning to be hard to get. Junior colleges are here to stay in Alabama!

Walter A. Graham

Crossroads in Texas

By Kathleen Bland Smith

The thirty-two public junior colleges in Texas stood at a crossroads in 1965.

The direction of their development was discussed exhaustively—and altered—as the 1965 legislature considered the sweeping changes recommended for state-supported colleges by the Governor's Commission on Education Beyond the High School.

Texas junior colleges will no longer continue to grow as they always have—without plan or pattern, based simply on the desire and the energy of the people in the local district which they serve.

They have become part of a master plan for higher education in Texas, with course offerings determined by a strong, central coordinating board for public education beyond the high school.

The program proposed by the governor's commission, and sponsored by the governor in the legislature, was passed into law by the legislature in the spring of 1965, the changes to become effective the following September.

In September, 1965, Governor John Connally appointed the eighteen-member Co-ordinating Commission for Higher Education. The commission, in turn, has appointed an acting commissioner and staff, and the new program is in operation.

Texas junior colleges are under the same control as four-year colleges for the first time, and they will receive increased state aid. An important innovation is the establishment of a contingency fund which will be used to help rapidly growing colleges for the second year of the biennium. However, because of the big increase in enrollments, this fund will pay only about 25 cents on the dollar, according to Dr. Thomas M. Spencer, president of the

Texas Public Junior College Association. In several cases, junior colleges with rapidly growing enrollments have been educating a high percentage of their students for whom no state aid has been collected because of the Texas system of appropriating funds for a two-year period. The contingency fund will give these junior colleges relief.

The effect of the new system on junior colleges cannot be judged at this time; however, most educators look on the changes favorably.

The concept of a two-year college, with its special functions, began in Texas. Decatur Baptist College, Decatur, Texas, founded in 1898 is considered by many to be the nation's first college founded specifically as a two-year college. Before then, however, another college in Texas taught a two-year course in business administration: Blinn College in Brenham, then a Methodist college and now a public junior college.

Blinn started as a Methodist prep-school and high-school-level academy, Mission Institute. College-level work was started when a wealthy Methodist minister, Christian Blinn, offered to donate money for a college building if the college would admit women, and offer college-level business administration, both radical ideas for 1896. After much discussion, the college board of trustees agreed to both requirements, and a two-year college course was started in Texas.

Other church groups started two-year colleges in the early 1900's, some of which, like Clarendon and Weatherford, have since become public junior colleges.

The state also started several two-year colleges, chiefly the "normal" type of college for teacher training. Since these were always fully state-supported and never locally controlled, they have not been considered part of the junior college movement in Texas. Each is now a senior college.

Growth of Public Junior Colleges

Not until 1920 was the first locally controlled public junior college founded in Texas: El Paso, which

was shortly discontinued. In 1922, the first permanent public junior college was founded: Hardin College, organized by the Wichita Falls Independent School District. Meanwhile the junior college idea had been developed by other states, notably California, which had at least eighteen public junior colleges before Texas' first permanent one was established.

In many ways, besides being the first one, Hardin was typical of the development of junior colleges in Texas. First, the junior college "grew up" from high school. So did twenty-four other public junior colleges, most of which later separated from the parent school district. Six of them, however, still remain under control of public school districts.

Furthermore, several junior colleges continued to "grow up" into senior colleges, among them Hardin, which developed into Midwestern University in 1961. South Park Junior College became Lamar College of Technology in 1951; the University of Houston, which had maintained a public junior college and privately supported upper classes and graduate school, became fully state-supported in 1963. In 1965, two more, San Angelo and Pan American in Edinburg, became senior colleges. Residents in many a junior college district are asking. "When will our junior college become a four-year college?"

Financial Support

This propensity for further development and the public acceptance of the role of the junior college as an adolescent senior college caused the state authorities to say that after Pan American and San Angelo became senior colleges, no other junior college would be permitted to "grow" into a senior college. Instead, junior colleges should fulfill their functions as two-year colleges, enlarging on their two-year technical training programs and adult education as well as the traditional two-year academic core.

Essentially, this is the function of the junior college as envisioned by the governor's commission.

Another aspect of the development of junior col-

leges in Texas has been the financial relationship between the two-year colleges and the state. The earliest junior colleges had no legislative recognition and no state support. From 1920 to 1928, eighteen junior colleges were created by independent school districts, with one discontinuing soon after founding. In 1929 came the first legislative recognition, when the seventeen colleges operating within the framework of the independent school districts were recognized by a validating act passed by the Forty-First Legislature. The same act also provided for creation of other junior colleges as separate entities in county-wide districts, multicounty districts, or union school districts governed by independent, elected boards of regents.

Seven new colleges were voted under this act, but three of them were never activated. By 1940, Texas had twenty-two public junior colleges in operation and three dormant districts. However, these colleges were still financed entirely from local funds.

This lack of adequate financing shows up best in the accreditation records of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. Twenty-five Texas public junior colleges are now members of the Southern Association; seventeen of them were accorded membership after 1950—after state aid gave them adequate financing, and more ability to pay qualified faculty.

State aid came in 1941, when the Forty-Seventh Legislature agreed to pay \$50 per full-time student. Aid was paid for 6,498 students that first year, but twelve new districts were established between 1940 and 1948, although one was never activated. By 1948, state aid had been increased to \$100 per full-time student and was paid for 8,822 full-time students in thirty-three public junior colleges.

Since 1948, the number of public junior colleges has not materially changed. Those junior colleges which became senior colleges were replaced by new junior colleges. But enrollment relentlessly increased in 1962-63 to 30,322 full-time students in thirty-three public junior colleges, and the relationship between the state and its junior colleges changed as

the legislature came to grips with its higher education problem.

First, the organization of the state Department of Education changed from an elected state superintendent of schools to an elected state board and an appointed superintendent. Although state colleges were put under a Texas Commission for Higher Education, junior colleges, because of their beginnings as outgrowths of public schools, were kept under the newly created Texas Education Agency, supervisor of the public schools. There was no relation between development of programs for the state's senior colleges and the state's junior colleges. However, each junior college has been free to develop programs which benefit its area, and through accrediting agencies, standards of course offerings have been maintained.

Second, enrollment jumped from 11,931 full-time students in 1952 to 27,296 in 1962, and 48,000 are forecast for 1970. At the same time, resistance to further taxation developed in some local districts. Three proposed junior college districts were turned down by the voters from 1949 to 1961, and the first one approved since 1949, San Jacinto College in Pasadena, encountered stiff opposition. Clearly, a financial crisis was coming, although state aid had increased to an average of \$243 per full-time student by 1963.

Third, although the state obviously felt an increasing responsibility for financing public junior colleges, districts never knew from biennium to biennium what proportion of junior college costs the state would be willing to pay. The legislative council report of 1947-49 advocated that the state pay all of the instructional costs of junior colleges, and for that biennium the legislature financed junior colleges on the same basis as two fully state-supported junior colleges, Arlington and Tarleton. Then junior college enrollment began to climb, as did senior college enrollment, and the proportion of state aid to local aid dropped considerably. One of the legislative aims of Texas public junior colleges this year was to convince the legislature

that the state should pay for all instructional costs, leaving local money free for the large building programs that will be necessary, for auxiliary programs, for administration, and for maintenance. A recommendation to this effect was made by the Governor's Commission on Education Beyond the High School. It would cost \$22 million in 1965-67 and \$28 million in 1967-69. This compares with actual state aid of \$8,304,139 in 1963.

Another aspect is that the state is becoming interested in pushing technical and vocational education in the junior college. College-level technical and vocational courses were given state aid for the first time two years ago, when the legislature appropriated \$228,000 as the 25 per cent requirement to receive federal funds under the National Defense Education Act. From this 1963-1965 program of approximately \$912,000 came satisfactory results. Before 1963, twenty-two colleges had some type of technical and vocational program. Now, all thirty-two have these programs, and the original twenty-two programs have been expanded.

Junior colleges are asking the state for approximately \$3 million for the 1965-67 biennium as the 25 per cent contribution toward a \$12 million program in vocational and technical education. This amount has been recommended by the governor's commission. It is obvious that a tremendous expansion in college-level vocational and technical programs will result if the legislature approves this amount. The relationship between the state and the junior colleges has changed materially.

The Coordinating Board

The key proposal was the establishment of a coordinating board, named the Co-ordinating Commission on Higher Education, with eighteen members appointed by the governor, which would have full authority over all higher education in Texas. One division of this board would be the Committee on Junior Colleges, while others would be concerned with colleges and universities, research and graduate programs, fiscal and management services.

Among its powers are the following:

The board should coordinate each level of education from the junior college through the university and:

1. Reject or accept institutional proposals for modification of role and scope.

2. Determine the number, character, and level of operation of each public educational institution beyond the high school.

3. Recommend to the legislature that, as a matter of policy, no junior college should be changed to senior college status, but if a senior college is needed, it should be recommended by the board.

4. Determine which institutions shall be classified as junior colleges, senior colleges, and as universities, and determine when institutions are operating beyond the scope defined for them.

5. Recommend to the legislature tuition policies for public junior colleges, senior colleges, universities, and vocational and technical programs.

The board should also assume responsibility for:

1. Directing the phase-out of obsolete, unnecessary, or inadequate programs or degrees, and creating new degrees and programs in any given institution.

2. Encouraging and developing new programs in technical and vocational education in the junior colleges as the needs of technology and industry may demand.

3. Approving a basic core of general academic courses to be offered at all junior colleges during the first two years of collegiate work which, when transferred, would be accepted among member institutions of recognized accrediting agencies on the same basis as if the work had been taken in the receiving institution.

4. Encouraging the consolidation of existing junior colleges where necessary to facilitate more effective programs and to assure higher quality in these programs.

5. Encouraging and developing increasing numbers of junior colleges.

Enactment of these recommendations gives the coordinating board powers now held by the local boards of regents and by the legislature itself. The local boards will continue to exist, under the proposals, and will operate within the framework of the board policies adopted by the coordinating board. Also, each junior college will offer academic, technical, vocational, terminal, and adult educational programs, and will be permitted to have a limited role and scope depending upon the needs of its locale.

The public junior colleges have come the full circle: from establishment to fill a need in the higher education structure with no connection or aid from the state, through recognition without aid, then to state aid administered through the public school agency, and finally, to inclusion in a master plan for all higher education in Texas with all instructional costs to be borne by the state.

A \$45 million bond issue was passed by Dallas, May 25, 1965. The Tarrant County election for the district, board, and operating tax was held and an \$18 million bond issue passed August 7. Galveston County, Killeen, Beeville, and Waco have voted for new districts. Eight more district elections are pending.

It is ironic, as the new era of junior colleges in Texas is dawning, that the nation's oldest junior college, Decatur Baptist, will cease operation at the end of this year. It will be consolidated with Dallas Baptist College. The tradition which it established still goes on in eleven private and denominational junior colleges in the state, and in the thirty-two vigorous, public junior colleges which are receiving increasing public recognition and state support as an essential factor in the solution of the higher education problems of Texas.

Texas Revisited

A far-reaching master plan for the development of higher education in Texas awaits action by the

Texas Legislature in its current session which began in January 1969.

Three years in the making, the master plan is the product of approximately ninety different studies made by educators in the state's junior and senior colleges. Called "Challenge for Excellence," the plan represents the results of a sometimes painful restudy of the higher education system in the state. The recommendations have pleased some, shocked some, irritated and antagonized others. Neither acceptance nor rejection of the plan is a foregone conclusion.

However, the plan firmly places the foundation of Texas higher education upon the junior college, proposes stronger financing for junior colleges, and has—on the whole—been favorably received by junior college partisans.

"Challenge for Education" was produced by the Coordinating Board of the Texas University and College System, the group charged by the legislature in 1965 to chart the course for the state's higher education institutions.

Working from the premise that by 1980, junior colleges will enroll 60 per cent of all freshmen and sophomores, instead of the current 40 per cent, the coordinating board has designated junior colleges as one of three component groups, each related formally and legally to the others, but each with specific roles, specialized governance, and interlocking central coordination. These recommended groups are:

1. A community junior college division
2. A division of senior colleges with program expansion possibilities through first-level graduate offerings
3. A division of complex universities with program jurisdiction over doctoral-level graduate work and post-baccalaureate education for the professions.

The board visualizes a network of junior colleges to achieve a large part of this goal. The junior college, in the board's opinion, should offer programs in three areas: two years of transfer courses; tech-

nical courses; and courses for updating cultural advancement and public service. Division of the state into fifty-three junior college regions, each of which could financially support and produce adequate enrollment in the next twenty years, has been proposed. When all the colleges have been established, a junior college will be located within reasonable distance of all Texans who could logically benefit from attending.

Recognizing that population trends may change, the board recommends these regional divisions be flexible.

Thirty-four of the proposed regions now contain junior colleges with at least one campus. Two colleges exist in each of six regions, which in some instances may create problems. While the board has no objection to more than one campus in a region, it recommends that each campus meet requirements as to potential students: 500 full-time student equivalents in the third fall term following opening and 1,000 in the fifth fall term. Some of the six regions now containing two campuses do not now have a potential for two campuses under that criteria. What the legislature will do remains unpredictable.

Financial recommendations of the board look good to junior colleges. The board urges the state to finance transfer-level curriculums based on a formula system determining appropriations—four areas of instructional costs (general administration and student services, faculty salaries, departmental operating expenses, and library). Adoption of this method would enable junior college districts to use local taxes and tuition for construction, operation, and maintenance of facilities.

The board also recommends contingency appropriations be made each year in both transfer and technical programs to take care of rapidly growing colleges whose enrollments outstripped by far their enrollment for the base period used for biennial appropriations.

In fact, the contingency fund is already in operation. Almost the first act of the 1969 legislature

was passage of a deficiency appropriation bill of \$2.1 million. This means that for the first time, the state had paid the full instructional costs of junior colleges according to Thomas M. Spencer, president of the Texas Public Junior College Association and president of San Jacinto College.

Several recommendations pertaining to senior colleges relate to junior colleges. The board had recommended establishment of three-year, upper-division senior colleges—offering only the junior and senior years, and master's degree-level graduate work. Bills to establish several of these colleges which cater to the junior college graduate are now pending before the legislature.

Also, the board has recommended maximum enrollments for existing state senior colleges and universities. Since many of these institutions are already near the recommended maximum, the effect will surely be to encourage more freshmen and sophomores to start in junior colleges as senior colleges must tighten entrance requirements.

While the appropriation picture has improved for junior colleges in recent years, there is a wide discrepancy between the amount of money junior colleges think they need and the amount recommended by the legislative budget board.

In 1966, appropriations took a big jump. The 1965 appropriations were based on \$375 per student for the first 350 full-time student equivalents, and \$285 for each full-time student equivalent over 350. In 1966, the appropriation rose to \$450 for the first 350 and \$410 for each full-time student over 350. Present appropriations are based on \$475 for the first 350 and \$450 for each full-time student equivalent over 350.

Recommendations for future appropriations made by the legislative budget board are considerably less than those requested, and the outcome of the current session is by no means certain. Junior colleges now have 52,437 full-time student equivalents and expect 78,745 in 1971.

The actual 1969 appropriation is \$26.5 million.

Junior colleges have requested \$37.3 million for 1970's expected 68,645 full-time student equivalents, and \$44.7 million for 1971. Legislative budget board recommendations are \$28 million for 1970 and \$31.3 million for 1971. Junior colleges requested \$7.1 million for the 1971 contingency fund; the budget board recommended \$3.6 million.

An even larger discrepancy exists in the technical education funds. Junior colleges requested \$15 million for 1970 and \$18.3 million for 1971. The legislative budget board recommended \$8.5 million for 1970 and the same amount for 1971. A bill has been introduced specifying slightly more than the junior college requests, but no action had been taken by publication date.

So the studies and the planning for a ten-year period are complete. Now the action moves to the legislature which authorized the studies and the master plan in 1965. There are new faces in the legislature; a new governor has been inaugurated. Will the blueprint be translated into a firm clear course for Texas higher education? No one, at this juncture, can say for sure.

Kathleen B. Smith

Pennsylvania Opens The Door

By A. Martin Eldersveld

When Governor William W. Scranton signed into law the Community College Act of 1963, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, after decades of unfortunate delay, accepted its responsibility to provide equality of educational opportunity for all of its citizens.

For generations this third largest state had been concerned, in the field of higher education, with a minority of its high school graduates. Recent studies reveal that less than 33 per cent of the state's high school graduates enter college, and that Pennsylvania ranks forty-ninth in the nation in the amount of state expenditure per capita of population for institutions of higher education. As one citizen perhaps exaggerated:

150

Pennsylvania, like many Eastern states, has traditionally held that only the economically and academically able are entitled to higher education. In such belief it continues to live in the past, refuses to recognize its obligation in this modern society to educate all of its people, and continues to experience a tragic loss of human resources.

But the picture is now changed. Four public community colleges are now in operation, three more have been approved, standards and regulations have been provided, and a state office has been created to direct further development. The period of waiting is over. A statewide system of community college education will become a reality.

Throughout the years, Pennsylvania has been frequently advised as to its educational needs. In

1948, Leonard V. Koos and S. V. Martorana, engaged by the Joint State Government Commission, submitted "A Community-College Plan for Pennsylvania." Again, the Governor's Commission on Higher Education in 1957, and the Governor's Committee on Education in 1961, encouraged the development of community college education. Unfortunately, however, as has been true in other states, the advice of experts often goes unheeded.

Continued evaluation of Pennsylvania's educational system by persistent and visionary educators repeatedly underscored the urgency for action. To them the picture was not satisfactory: One public and eight private universities with twenty-two extension centers, fourteen state colleges with six extension centers, ninety-five private colleges and seminaries, and eighteen private junior colleges—an abundance of 164 institutions, most imposing prohibitive tuitions and highly selective admissions. And, at the other end of the educational spectrum, limited vocational offerings within the context of secondary education, questioned by some as low in enrollment and therefore inadequate to the need. Obviously, a critical educational gap existed with a relatively large number of the youth of Pennsylvania being denied higher education opportunity.

But all of this is now history. Pennsylvania, though many years late, is now on the move. In its study of the educational system, the 1963 Governor's Committee of One Hundred for Better Education reported that Pennsylvania's high schools graduate nearly 20,000 potential public community college students every year; existing two- and four-year colleges do not serve all the people; the state suffers an incalculable loss of trained intelligence to its economy and culture; and three successive sessions of the General Assembly received proposed legislation but took no action mostly for purely political reasons. The committee's recommendation: "Pennsylvania needs a new kind of college—the public community college. . . . Many politicians, it appears, need a good bit of education in this particular subject." The result was the adoption

on August 24, 1963, of enabling legislation, Act 484, and development since that time has been very encouraging.

There has been a growing recognition of need and increasing local enthusiasm for the public community college as a partial solution to Pennsylvania's educational problems. On October 1, 1963, the governor appointed a seventeen-member State Board of Education including a Council for Higher Education. They are highly qualified and dedicated individuals who delegated responsibility for providing leadership in this area to George B. Mohlenhoff, deputy superintendent for higher education. To date, seven community colleges have been approved (Harrisburg, Philadelphia, Williamsport, Bucks, Montgomery, Butler, and Allegheny Counties). It is expected that the governor will authorize four public community colleges each year and that a statewide system of thirty may accommodate the educational needs of the state.

University of Michigan Professor Norman C. Harris served as a consultant to the state during the winter of 1963-64 to prepare standards, criteria, and guidelines for the public community colleges. And, in August of 1964, the writer was appointed as director of the newly created Bureau of Community Colleges. Alvin Eurich, Sidney Tickton, Earl McGrath, and Donald Dauwalder were engaged to conduct state studies for higher education, state colleges, and vocational education. Columbia University Professor Ralph R. Fields, together with his associate, Hans Flexner, assumed responsibility for developing a master plan for public community colleges by June, 1965.

Pennsylvania's First

A milestone in Pennsylvania education occurred in February, 1964, with state approval of the Harrisburg Area Community College. Over a year of research by Consultant John G. Berrier and an executive committee from sixty-one out of eighty-five districts within a three-county area had organized the college. Elected in March was a fifteen-

member board of trustees under the chairmanship of a local attorney, Bruce E. Cooper, who is referred to locally as the "dynamo" behind the scenes. Maurice C. Overholt, formerly registrar at Flint Community Junior College in Michigan, was appointed in June as business manager and dean of student personnel services. Also in June, Clyde E. Blocker, an administrator and author of national reputation, formerly dean at Flint Community Junior College and more recently professor of junior college education at the University of Texas, assumed the presidency. In these men, and many others, the Harrisburg Area Community College had found the knowledge and experience necessary to quickly and expertly develop final plans for Pennsylvania's first public community college.

Operating in temporary facilities, two naval reserve buildings, the college opened its doors in September, 1964, with an enrollment of 429 students, 252 in the liberal arts transfer program and 177 in the applied studies (civil and electronic technology, secretarial science, and business administration) all under the tutelage of forty-three full- and part-time faculty and staff. On July 1, 1965, Hershey Junior College merged with the Harrisburg Area Community College.

Concerning matters of finance, for its first year a budget of almost half a million dollars was approved for the Harrisburg Area Community College. Operational expense in accordance with state law will be shared on a one-third ratio by the local districts, the state, and the students. Cost per student was set at \$810, thereby establishing tuition of \$270 for the first year. The institution is financed through a capital expenditures appropriation of \$100,000 from the sixty-one districts for each of three years, in addition to an expected 50 per cent expenditure from the state. Recently, the Harrisburg Area Community College acquired as its permanent site 145 acres in beautiful Wildwood Park and expects to have its new campus completed by September, 1967.

The Community College Act of 1963 provides "for the creation, establishment and operation of public community colleges, granting certain powers to the State Board of Education, the Council of Higher Education, and the Department of Public Instruction; authorizing school districts, county boards of school directors, and municipalities to sponsor community colleges; authorizing school districts and municipalities to levy certain taxes; providing for reimbursements by the Commonwealth of certain costs and expenses, and making an appropriation."

Legislation Highlights

Highlights of the enabling legislation are many but may be briefly enumerated as follows:

1. The community college is wisely defined as an institution of higher education, its chief administrator as president.
2. College control is vested in an autonomous board of trustees, its sponsor empowered to levy local taxation.
3. Operational expenditures are shared equally by the community, the state and the student.
4. Capital expenses are shared equally by the state and the community.
5. The instructional program is broadly comprehensive including preprofessional liberal arts and sciences, semiprofessional business studies and technology, trade and industrial education, developmental training and adult education.
6. The state board of education is empowered to approve or disapprove plans and to adopt policies and minimum standards for the establishment and operation of public community colleges.

Pennsylvania is on the threshold of an exciting new venture. Interest is high and intention sincere. There is a genuine conviction among educators, legislators, and public alike that the youth of the commonwealth shall no longer be denied higher

education opportunity. As evidence of this interest, in addition to the colleges already approved, at least thirty communities are presently investigating this new opportunity and are, therefore, in various stages of community college development.

Problems remain, but resolution is apparently assured. The 1965 legislative session dealt with a recommended 50 per cent capital outlay state obligation, the only major obstacle to community college progress. Proponents of the community college hopefully await more favorable legislative action to assure continued community college progress.

Appropriations have been made for additional staff in the Bureau of Community Colleges so that consultative services may be extended and the state policies and standards for public community colleges may be administered.

A Bright Future

And finally, education in the state is now under the direction of a very capable board of education, one dedicated to the philosophy of equality of educational opportunity and one which recognizes the inadequacy of the existing system to implement this philosophy. In accepting this challenge, the board has directed the preparation of master plans to define the roles of existing institutions, to outline the needs of the future, and hence provide the necessary guidelines for an urgent educational reorganization. The board is aware that a sound educational system requires, among other factors, the selection of institutions which provide for a broad spectrum of educational needs beyond high school, a refusal to compromise in order to placate vested interest, and the mandatory appropriation of necessary monies. In this dedication the board has accepted the public community college as an important segment of higher education, one which can adequately fill the existing gap between the high school and the four-year institution.

Thus, the future looks bright. Although the "door" is not yet completely "open" and therefore

indoctrination as to the nature of the truly comprehensive community college continues as an important need, Pennsylvania has essentially altered its educational philosophy—one which now accepts that progress very largely depends upon equality of educational opportunity and therefore “judgments of differences in talent cannot be judgments of differences in human worth.”

Pennsylvania Revisited

The Pennsylvania community college program has continued a dramatic, positive development when viewed with the fact that more than fifteen years passed before enabling legislation was enacted in 1963. During the six-year period since that legislation, twelve institutions operating fourteen different campuses have increased enrollment from 429 students in 1964, to 31,000 students in the spring term of 1969.

Amendments to the community college act were enacted in 1965, which substantially improved the legal foundations of community colleges. The state became a full partner in the construction of physical facilities on a 50-50 per cent capital formula, and several significant retirement benefits for faculty were added. The State Board of Education has continued to support the development of a statewide program of community colleges within its master plan for higher education adopted in 1967. In 1968 a service-area boundary plan was adopted which identifies twenty-eight service areas for community colleges in Pennsylvania including the twelve institutions already in operation.

Expansion is also evident in the types of programs offered. The colleges now offer almost the entire range of occupational and technical programs, including such programs as aviation, forestry, urban planning, and recreational leadership. Activity in transfer curriculums is best illustrated by the many students from Pennsylvania's community colleges who already have transferred to over 200 four-year institutions across the nation.

Because the community college system is a totally new system of higher education in Pennsylvania, it is to be expected that growth in facilities would be remarkable. Thirteen of the fourteen campuses are either on their permanent sites or preparing to occupy one. The average size of the sites exceeds one hundred acres. Capital costs have exceeded \$28.5 million of state funds since the movement began with a book value in excess of \$65 million.

The immediate future looks bright. There is study activity in ten of the sixteen service areas which do not yet have a community college. With some additional time most of the service areas will be well along the way to having an institution.

Louis W. Bender

Full Partners in California's Higher Education

By Henry T. Tyler

California pioneered in the development of junior colleges. No less than eleven¹ of the state's seventy-four junior colleges are observing their fiftieth anniversaries during this decade. They continue to flourish, and to grow spectacularly, both in numbers and in enrollment. But recent developments in other states are suggesting possible new solutions to some of California's current junior college issues.

158

The state got an early start toward what became junior colleges when Anthony Caminetti, in 1907, obtained passage of a legislative act that authorized high schools to offer certain post-graduate courses of collegiate level to their graduates.

In 1921 an act authorizing establishment of school districts to operate junior colleges gave new impetus to the effort to make post-high school education more readily available.

Numerous subsequent actions of the legislature regarding extent of state support and other aspects of junior college operation have been taken. Prominent among these have been (1) the firm inclusion of junior colleges within the state's constitutional definition of free public education; (2) numerous acts increasing the amount (but not the percentage) of state support for junior college operation; and (3) recent acts, beginning in 1961, which, for the first time, extended state funds to the junior colleges to assist with the provision of physical facilities.

Several important studies of higher education in

the state have been made at the instance of the legislature. In particular, these have been the 1932 Suzzallo Study, the 1947 Strayer Study, the 1954 "Restudy," and the 1960 Master Plan Study. All have included the junior colleges.

The Master Plan Study of Higher Education in California was mandated by the 1959 session of the legislature because of the belief that pressures for more institutions of higher education and possible needless duplication of programs might strain the state's resources unless brought under some control. Many of its major recommendations were embodied in the resulting Donahoe Higher Education Act.

Among other things, the Donahoe Act defines the state's provision for higher education. It reads:

Public higher education consists of (1) all public junior colleges heretofore and hereafter established pursuant to law; (2) all state colleges heretofore and hereafter established pursuant to law, and (3) each campus, branch and function of the University of California heretofore and hereafter established by the Regents of the University of California (Education Code, section 22500).

Another section states, in part:

The public junior colleges are secondary schools and shall continue to be a part of the public school system of this State . . . (Education Code, section 22650).

As a result of these statutes, junior colleges are legally both part of the state program of free public education (by earlier constitutional and statutory definition also) and of its public higher education. Some people are confused by this situation; others see great virtue in it. This double legal status is true also of the California state colleges.

The Donahoe Act also defined the functions of each of the three public segments of higher education. Those of the public junior colleges are:

Public junior colleges shall offer instruction through but not beyond the 14th grade level, which instruction may include, but shall not be limited to, programs in one or more of the following categories: (1) standard collegiate courses for transfer to higher institutions; (2)

vocational and technical fields leading to employment; and (3) general or liberal arts courses. Studies in these fields may lead to the associate in arts or associate in science degree (Education Code, section 22651).

A third outcome of the Donahoe Act was the establishment of the Coordinating Council for Higher Education, a statutory body of fifteen persons. It is composed of three representatives each from the one private and three public "segments" of higher education, plus three persons representing the public at large. Though its functions are limited to an advisory capacity except for the authority to require reports from the public segments, it is charged with advising the governor and the legislature concerning "support levels" for the public segments."

Prominent among recommendations of the Master Plan Study not included in the Donahoe Act were several that are having considerable effect upon the junior colleges. These have been major concerns of the Coordinating Council, and of the California Junior College Association:"

1. The study called for gradual increase in the *proportion* of state support for current operation, then estimated at about 30 per cent of cost, to 45 per cent, to be reached by 1975. This remains an unrealized objective, though the legislature has, by resolution, endorsed it.

2. The study recommended that the state share in the cost of constructing junior college facilities. Passage in November, 1964, of a state bond issue assures at least \$50 million for this purpose, in addition to \$30 million previously allocated. The 1965 session of the legislature also adopted a continuing program of capital outlay aid to junior colleges.

3. The study called for the California state colleges and the University of California, through more selective admissions' policies, to reduce the proportion that lower-division enrollments bear to total undergraduate enrollments by approximately one percentage point a year. By 1975 some 50,000

students, who might otherwise have entered the lower division of one of the other public segments of higher education, would be diverted annually to the junior colleges. Both the University of California and the California state colleges are now committed to this plan by their respective boards.

Coordinating Council Activities

The Coordinating Council has been engaged in the process of assuring that the above recommendations from the Donahoe Act and the Master Plan Study, as well as numerous others affecting all of the state's program of higher education, are followed.

As part of its activities, the council has embarked on a study of the junior colleges, seeking to assist in resolving problems currently critical. In mid-November, 1964, as part of this study, the council convened a three-day seminar at which selected representatives of the State Board of Education, State Department of Education, University of California, California state colleges, Junior College Leadership Program, California Junior College Association, and Junior College Section of the California School Boards Association, met with junior college faculty and administrative representatives and members of the council staff. Papers prepared in advance presented numerous problems and issues with particular focus on the following areas:

1. Local control and types of organization
2. State-level control and supervision
3. Financing of current operations

It is hoped that outcomes of this seminar and the related council study will bring more rapid progress toward resolution of the problems considered.

Types of Junior College District Organization

Historically, junior colleges in California have operated under four types of control, although in each a local governing body has been the responsible authority. These types of controls have arisen because of the succession of legislative acts under which junior colleges could be established. They are:

1. High school districts maintaining junior colleges

2. Unified districts maintaining junior colleges

3. Junior college districts having a common administration (board of trustees and superintendent) with a high school or unified district

4. Junior college districts having a separate board of trustees.

Before the enabling act of 1921, all junior colleges in the state were obviously of the first or second type. As recently as 1958, of fifty-six districts maintaining junior colleges, less than half were of the fourth type. As of July 1, 1965, sixty-five districts were operating a total of seventy-five colleges, counting the "San Diego Junior Colleges" as one. Of these, fifty-one were colleges operated by forty-seven districts whose boards had junior college responsibility only. Two more separate districts have been authorized by the voters, these to become fully effective on July 1, 1966. Voting will be held early in 1966 on the formation of at least two, and possibly four, more new junior college districts.

There is, in some quarters, strong feeling that every junior college district should have a governing board responsible solely for junior college governance. That there is a notable trend in this direction may be seen by the figures just cited. Certain groups in the state are currently advocating legislation that would require this organization for all junior colleges. Proponents of unified (kindergarten through junior college) districts see advantages in that form of organization, and resist mandatory change. Still others argue for local option in determining the pattern to be followed. The 1965 legislative session ordered interim study of this problem, but changes in district boundaries and possible new legislation make it probable that the number having separate boards will rapidly increase.

Within the last five years, significant legislation

has been passed relevant to district organization :

1. The minimum population and wealth bases for projected new junior colleges have been raised. Except in situations of isolation, at the discretion of the State Board of Education, formation of a junior college district now requires a potential of 1,000 in average daily attendance within two years, and an assessed valuation per A.D.A. of at least \$150,000.

2. Junior college districts are now the only type that may be authorized to maintain junior colleges.

3. It is the intent of the legislature that all high school districts rapidly come within districts maintaining junior colleges.

4. By September 15, 1967, studies seeking to achieve the legislature's intent are expected to have been made in every county. After that date, the State Department of Education is required to make any such studies not earlier made by county committees. Already few of the heavily populated areas of the state are still outside of districts that maintain junior colleges, and at least 90 per cent of the high school graduates live in a district that maintains one or more junior colleges.

Current Developments and Issues

Multicollege Districts: These recent changes in legislation, coupled with rapid enrollment growth, are bringing quick development of multicollege districts. For about fifteen years Los Angeles has had seven junior colleges under one board, a board that also is responsible for the elementary and high schools and a separately organized adult program. The Contra Costa Junior College District has operated two colleges since its inception in 1950. These have been the only multicollege districts, though Hartnell, Long Beach, and Oakland have operated colleges having more than one campus. At present, however, at least ten more districts expect to be operating more than one college by 1970-71, and additional colleges are planned by both the Los Angeles and Contra Costa Districts. These expansions, plus new districts still in the study or plan-

ning stage, make it likely that by 1970 the state will have at least ninety public junior colleges in operation.

Recognizing that, as these multicollege districts—often large both in enrollment and in geography—increase, new problems of organization and operation must be faced, the new Los Rios District in northern California recently had a one-day workshop of board, administrative, and faculty representatives, with several outside consultants, to study these problems. Another such workshop was held in the fall.

Growth: California, in common with most of the rest of the nation, finds its higher educational enrollments skyrocketing. One-year increases in junior colleges of as much as 35 per cent are reported. In the fall, 1965, semester, the statewide growth over the preceding fall was 11.7 per cent. The number of full-time students, those carrying twelve or more units, is reported as 188,870, which is a gain of 23.9 per cent over Fall, 1964. More than 270,000 additional students were carrying lesser loads for credit. In addition, some 70,000 students were enrolled in noncredit classes, and a great many of the junior colleges conducted numerous music, drama, or speakers' series that attracted large numbers of persons. The problems of financing and constructing facilities for so great a student population, and of recruiting well-prepared and highly competent staff members who understand the comprehensive community-oriented junior college, are many indeed.

What is "Collegiate"? It is worth noting that the legal definition quoted above makes all offerings of the public junior colleges higher education, and therefore "collegiate." Not all Californians have yet recognized this fact. Still believed by many are the three "myths" described by Dale Tillery, assistant director, Junior College Leadership Program, University of California, Berkeley, in the paper he prepared for the Coordinating Council seminar already mentioned. They are:

Myth 1—Only those courses which are recognized by universities for transfer purposes are college-level.

Myth 2—There is some sort of absolute standard for college courses which is determined by the nature of the subject taught, and which can be readily determined and applied regardless of the students being taught.

Myth 3—Education for immediate employment is somehow less collegiate than education for work which requires transfer to another institution.

Tillery goes on to note that some "see the Master Plan as a mandate to 'raise standards' in junior colleges and to eliminate courses from the curriculum which are 'less than college-level'." He proposes the following as ideas essential to meaningful definitions of those terms:

"Standards": The only meaningful definition of "standards" in education is determined by the quality of teaching and the resources for learning. Badly taught courses have low standards whether they are at the freshman or graduate levels. Excellently taught courses have high standards whether they are concerned with remedial English or quantum physics . . .

"College-level": Those courses which concern themselves with the educational needs of young and mature adults as they prepare for advanced study, skilled work, or as they seek greater freedom and refinement of mind, are of college-level. In California such courses are to be determined by the characteristics of students who are to be educated in the various segments of a differentiated system of higher education . . .

Thus, in California, the entire spectrum of courses offered in the comprehensive junior college is higher education.

State-level Supervision and Service: An issue which, at present, is causing much discussion concerns junior college supervision at the state level. Since the first junior college was established, the appointed State Board of Education has been the state agency responsible for their supervision, maintenance of standards, and approval of courses. Its authority derives from statutes in the Education Code, and the board's regulations are placed in a section of the Administrative Code. Its authority is limited, and, in general, its regulations have developed from needs felt over the state at the operating level. The State Department of Education, serving in part as staff for the board, in part as a semi-

autonomous agency, under the elected state superintendent of public instruction, has performed the necessary functions of obtaining reports, maintaining records, apportioning funds, and providing consultant services for all the levels of public education, including the junior colleges.

Because the state board's agenda are often full, mostly with items not relating to junior colleges, and because responsibility for the state department's services to junior colleges has been scattered widely among the department's 1,800 staff members, some desire has recently been expressed for legislation that would give junior colleges a state board of their own, with necessary state-level staff. Partly to counter such a move, and partly to improve services, the state superintendent is, at present, seeking to make a number of internal changes in the department in order to bring together all of the persons with responsibility to junior colleges. Also, a junior college committee of the state board has recently been named, and is taking great interest in becoming more familiar with junior college needs. Whether these changes will forestall the move for separation remains to be seen.

From the foregoing it may be judged that the junior college situation in California is, to say the least, a dynamic one. With the junior colleges in California enrolling half a million full and part-time students this fall, in both graded and ungraded classes, with an annual growth rate of between 10 and 20 per cent, with a goal of attracting annually hundreds of instructors who love to teach and who believe in the open door to higher education opportunity, it is small wonder that those who know this field best call it the most exciting element in education today.

¹ Bakersfield, Chaffey, Citrus, Fullerton, Gavilan (originally San Benito), Riverside, Sacramento, San Diego, Santa Ana, Santa Rosa, Fresno.

² With passage of the Higher Education Facilities Act by Congress, the C.C.H.E. has been designated as the "State Commission" for California. It thus acquires an administrative function not originally contemplated for

it. By action of the 1965 legislature, the council will have six members representing the public, making its total membership eighteen.

³ All public junior colleges and several private junior colleges in the state hold institutional membership in this association.

California Revisited

Important events since first publication of this chapter include:

1. Enlarging of the Coordinating Council for Higher Education to eighteen members, by adding three public members to the previous three. Of the eighteen, nine are named by the governor, subject to state senate confirmation; in addition to the six public members, he names the three independent college and university representatives, after conferring with their professional association.

2. Passage of the 1967 Junior College Construction Act, under which, on a continuing basis, the state contributes one-half of the cost of those junior college facilities that are approved by state agencies and included in the state budget. Voters in June 1968 passed a state bond issue for \$65 million exclusively earmarked for junior college construction.

3. Continuing increase in the proportion of junior college districts having separate boards of trustees. As of July 1, 1968, of sixty-eight districts maintaining junior colleges, only six were still unified (K-14) districts; an additional eight had boards of trustees with high school responsibility also. Spring 1969 elections will probably increase the number having separate boards.

4. Efforts to bring all areas of the state into districts maintaining junior colleges. Currently, the nondistrict areas, except for small pockets in Los Angeles, San Diego, and Orange counties, are in sparsely populated regions. Of the state's total 1967-68 assessed valuation, 93.3 per cent was in districts with junior colleges.

5. Establishing of additional colleges by existing districts, as a result of rapid enrollment growth.

This increases the number of multicollege districts. The number of such districts is now thirteen, and within five years will be at least twenty, according to present planning. By 1974-75, instead of the eighty-nine junior colleges now operating, it appears that there will be at least 105.

6. Enrollment growing faster than was projected. Fall 1968 full-time students (12 units or more) numbered 238,394; this is approximately three years ahead of that projected in 1960 by the master plan. Total enrollment in fall 1968 was 665,490.

7. Creation, by the 1967 legislature, of the board of governors of the California community colleges. This body of fifteen persons, named by the governor and confirmed by the senate, is appointed for staggered four-year terms. On July 1, 1968, this board assumed all of the state-level responsibilities previously vested in the State Board of Education. The staff of the new board is headed by a chancellor, Sidney W. Brossman; its other members were transferred from the staff of the State Department of Education. Meeting bimonthly for two-day sessions, the board of governors has already shown constructive leadership, while fully committed to the continuance of California's historic local board control of its many junior colleges.

Henry T. Tyler

Progress and Plans in the Empire State

By S. V. Martorana

Even the oldest of the twenty-eight public community colleges in New York State is younger than this year's freshmen. The first public community college law was enacted, and the first community college established, in 1948—only sixteen years ago although some antecedent efforts to launch the movement date back ten or more years beyond this period. These institutions in New York, therefore, have operated only about one-quarter of the time that community colleges have in such other states as California, Illinois, Michigan, and Texas. The two-year technical colleges, which are integral parts of State University of New York and limited to occupational programs only, have a slightly longer history but only six now remain in their original form. Increasingly, they are becoming complementary institutions to the locally controlled community colleges in the overall community college movement in the state.

Yet, within their relatively brief history, the New York public community colleges have made striking progress. In the opening of the 1964-65 academic year public two-year colleges enrolled 39,749 full-time students, an increase of more than 9,500 over the preceding fall. A slightly larger number of persons—40,073—were attending on a part-time basis. Put another way, three out of ten of all full-time students in public, higher educational institutions in New York State in the fall of 1964 were in public two-year colleges, and almost four out of ten of all part-time students in public colleges and universities were in the two-year institutions.

To serve a college population of this size requires a substantial investment in human and material resources, varying greatly in size and complexity with different college locations and communities served. One metropolitan community college must accommodate nearly 3,000 full-time and about twice as many part-time students while another, in a rural area, has an enrollment of under 300. Only by encouraging diversity of this kind can the community college needs of the state be met. That progress is being made is seen in the fact that now in New York State 85 per cent of the population resides within daily commuting distance of a public two-year college.

These are the facts. The buildings can be seen, their costs calculated, and the students counted. It is harder to measure precisely the effect of community colleges on the force and direction of higher education in New York State, but an idea of this is seen in the nature of their programs.

Contrary to the way that public community colleges emerged in many other states, the first impetus for those in New York developed primarily from an emphasis on and a sense of need for greater opportunity for youth and adults to qualify for employment in technical and semiprofessional fields. Community college programs, therefore, are required by law to include occupational curriculums as well as ones equivalent to the first two-year liberal arts courses in four-year colleges and universities.

The list of current offerings in public community colleges directed to employment is as extensive as the kind of advanced skills demanded by New York State employers. The programs reflect the needs of business and industry, and are responsive to industrial change and movement, as is evident from the number and variety of courses offered. Fields of study range from agriculture and aircraft operations through administrative, accounting, marketing, retailing, and secretarial aspects of business; banking, insurance, and real estate; fashion and textile design; such health science fields as nursing, dental hygiene, medical laboratory, and optical tech-

nology; to heavy industrial occupations like automotive, chemical, construction, electrical, highway, and metallurgical areas.

Because of the early and historical emphasis on occupational training, community colleges in New York State have had larger enrollments in these programs than in the liberal arts and science curriculums. A trend reflecting recent encouragement of greater comprehensiveness in the direction of more arts and science programs is seen in the declining proportion of full-time enrollment in occupational fields. The proportion of students enrolled in such fields over the past decade has been as follows: 1953-54—95 per cent; 1958-59—87 per cent; 1960-61—75 per cent; 1962-63, 1963-64, and 1964-65—68 per cent. The static percentage of enrollees in occupational programs over the past three years suggests a leveling off of the trend downward.

During the last three years full-time enrollments in the community colleges in absolute numbers leaped forward greatly from 25,465 in 1962-63, to 39,749 in 1964-65. It is evident, therefore, that during the past three years absolute increases in enrollment in the occupational fields are occurring proportionately as fast as those in the liberal arts and sciences. Close attention is being focused on this topic, however, to identify any significant changes as soon as they might appear.

The chief impact of community college development in New York, therefore, is similar to that in other states where these institutions have been established on a widespread basis. The base of educational opportunity has been widened not only in terms of numbers of people reached but also with respect to the range of interests and abilities identified and trained to useful and productive purposes.

Acceptance Becomes Trust

Passage of the New York State community college law in 1948 was the culmination of more than thirty years of struggle, by advocates of the junior college idea, to gain official recognition and approval

in the state.¹ From 1948, when that struggle ended with success and final acceptance of the community college, to the present time may well be considered the period of "test and demonstration of the institution." Many critical eyes were focused on it over the sixteen years, 1948-1964. Some were clearly doubtful and antagonistic, others hopeful and helpful.

The doubters and skeptics gave way to the advocates of the institution and the great social, economic, and cultural forces demanding educational services of the community-college type. There is now in New York a strong unanimity among educational leadership groups in the view that community colleges have a clear, important, and very large mission to perform within the total educational program of the state.

In New York, the Board of Regents is the supreme educational agency. Its constitutional and statutory responsibilities encompass all levels of educational services, public and private. Early in 1964 the regents published and distributed widely a basic policy statement on the "comprehensive community college" and its role and scope of service.² This seven-point policy affirms the educational soundness of community colleges offering in a single administrative structure the five services of university transfer, occupational, general education, adult education, and guidance programs. Moreover, it asserts that community colleges, having functions different from both the high school and upper division collegiate levels of education, should be viewed as distinct and separate from both. Procedures for doing so while preserving a high degree of articulation and coordination with both levels were called for and indicated. The regents also commend State University of New York, which has responsibility for statewide supervision of the community colleges within overall, statewide, educational policies set by the regents, for having encouraged and implemented community colleges throughout the state.

The regents, by virtue of a statute enacted in 1961, are also responsible for developing each year, start-

ing with 1964, a statewide plan for the orderly development of higher education. The law stipulates that, in doing this, the regents must draw upon the master plans of State University and City University. In addition, the plans of the 167 privately controlled institutions must be taken into account. Although the regents had undertaken several actions toward state-wide planning before 1961, the new statute gave a new, strong impetus to coordinated planning.

A Mission in Future Plans

All segments of the large scale, statewide, planning program set in motion by the 1961 law give the community college a permanent place. City University, in its 1964 master plan,³ State University, in its planning document,⁴ and the regents, in their 1964 Statewide Plan which incorporates the approved proposals in the plans of the two public university systems,⁵ all make the community college a basic plank in their platforms for long-range planning. Their statements show beyond doubt that not only is the community college an accepted part of the higher educational enterprise but one on which critical reliance is put in planning for the attainment of post-high school educational goals.

The plans, however, show more than this acceptance and trust. They indicate also that the structure and programs in effect in community college education in New York State need to be strengthened. While the record of achievement, as already noted, has been great, the experience of sixteen years discloses basic deficiencies which need to be corrected so that the impressive record can be continued.

The proposed extensions and improvements in community college education fall into two large categories. One is the expansion of institutions, programs, and scope of services which can be fulfilled within the powers now legally vested in New York State higher educational authorities, and the other is the set of proposals for legislative changes to strengthen the structure and financial basis of community college education. The first classification of

proposals includes many detailed and extensive changes which can best be seen within the context of the four reports in which they are presented. Attention here, therefore, is concentrated on the proposals for legislative changes included in the regents' 1964 statewide plan.

Strengthening the Legal Base

Stated topically, the recommendations in the regents' 1964 statewide plan which are relevant to strengthening the legal base of the public community colleges in New York State are these:

The establishment of a program of "Regents' Junior Year Transfer Scholarships" for community and junior college transfer students who demonstrate superior promise for continued college study while attending community colleges or privately controlled junior colleges.

Continued encouragement of an articulated and coordinated development of both area vocational programs under local public school auspices and community college programs leading directly to employment as technicians and semiprofessional workers. The State should continue to make full use of all available resources for preparing technicians and semiprofessional workers, and such complete utilization should emphasize coordinated planning and development at both local and state levels.

That the Education Law be amended to permit public two-year colleges to offer programs of less than two years' duration as regular day offerings when these programs meet the needs of persons who have graduated from high school or are beyond the usual age of high school attendance.

Abolition of the legal provision authorizing establishment of a four-year community college.

Provision that, after a local sponsoring agency acts to establish the first community college in a given geographic area, the same agency must also be the sponsor of all later community college developments in that area.

Clarification of the realms of administrative jurisdiction and responsibility of the local sponsoring agency and the local boards of trustees of community colleges so that only the latter controls institutional operations such as the development of the budget, qualifications of staff, and specifications of physical plant equipment as well as matters of program development and instruction.

Provision that when a student leaves his home area where a community college exists to attend one located

elsewhere and enrolls in a program offered by the community college in his home area, no "charge back" to the area of residence should be levied. Provides further that exception to this general rule can be made for individual students, if approved by the board of trustees of the community college in the student's area of residence.

Establishment of another "charge back" to apply to costs incurred by a local supporting area for capital development and purchase of major equipment, with provisions similar to those relating to operating expenses.

The first of the proposals cited above would establish a statewide scholarship program for graduates of community colleges, who seek to continue their education in upper division work in four-year colleges and universities. If implemented it would probably operate much like the well-known "regents' scholarships" for high-ranking high school graduates. Such a measure is believed necessary to continue the state's long-standing policy of aiding worthy individuals to overcome barriers in the sequential progression of their educational careers. In this connection, attention should be called to another recommendation in the regents' plan which does not call for legislative action for implementation. It encourages State University and City University, in establishing new colleges which offer bachelor's and master's degree programs, to consider establishing institutions which begin at the usual junior year of college and which would build, thereby, on the programs of the community colleges.

The next two of the above propositions are related to current, proposed legislation in the state, which would provide for establishment of area programs of educational services shared among public school districts. Jointly, the two recommendations are intended to preserve the historical articulation and complementary services of high schools and community colleges in the occupational training field.

The fourth proposal would eliminate from the law a provision which has never been implemented or utilized in higher educational practice in the state. Its presence in the law, therefore, is anachronistic and misleading to the general public.

The last four recommendations cited are measures to strengthen the local control of public community colleges in their institutional boards of trustees and to improve the procedures for financing costs incurred by serving students who are not residents of the district supporting the college. The first of these would forestall repetition of a circumstance found to be disadvantageous, namely, the sponsoring of community colleges by two or more local agencies having jurisdiction in the same geographic area. In New York State, a community college must be sponsored by a local governmental body (a board of education, county board of supervisors, city council, etc.) which has taxing powers and which accepts the obligation to provide the locality's share of finances (one-third to two-thirds of operating costs, and one-half of capital costs). The controlling board of trustees does not have taxing powers and is fiscally dependent on the sponsoring agency.

The sixth recommendation cited recognizes some of the disadvantages that, in some localities, have resulted from this fiscal relationship of trustees and sponsors. It seeks to make the trustees solely and completely the controlling body of the institutional aspects of educational policy and management.

Finally, the last two proposals would require that boards of supervisors of the county of residence pay the locality's share of costs of attendance of residents to community colleges supported by other sponsoring agencies. This would be true for both operating and capital costs. No charge would be made if students left their counties of residence to enroll in courses available in their home counties.

A Time for Greatness

New times bring new demands. During the past sixteen years New York State's community colleges have been battling for recognition and acceptance. This struggle is in large measure finished. Community colleges are now more than accepted; they are counted on to do the job their leaders claim is theirs to perform.

The test is now more than ever on the leadership, the boards of trustees, the administrators, and the faculties of the institutions, for on them depends translation of the concept of the comprehensive community college into an operating reality, fully and completely. Action taken now will determine the final results of new appraisals certain to come.

Sixteen years of groundwork have set the stage for a truly great educational service by community colleges in New York State. Fulfillment of the effort depends in large measure on the extent to which plans for new action now under discussion are fully implemented.

¹ This era of educational history in New York State is described in a doctoral thesis, "New York, New Yorkers, and the Two-year College Movement," by Kenneth T. Doran. Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York. 1961 (unpublished).

² *The Comprehensive Community College—Background, Objectives and Programs, Relationships to 4-Year Colleges and Universities.* A Policy Statement of the New York State Board of Regents. Albany, New York. April, 1964.

³ *Master Plan for the City University of New York, 1964.* New York: The Board of Higher Education of the City of New York, the City University of New York, 1964.

⁴ *Stature and Excellence: Focus for the Future—The Master Plan, Revised 1964.* Albany, New York: The State University of New York, 1964.

⁵ *The Regents' Tentative Statewide Plan for the Expansion and Development of Higher Education, 1964.* Albany, New York: The University of the State of New York, The State Education Department, January 1965.

New York Revisited

A strong thrust toward making the community and technical colleges an actual and effective educational opportunity beyond the high school continues to be the primary preoccupation of programs and institutional planning and development. All three of the state's major educational policy-formulating bodies (the Regents, State University Trustees, and

Board of Higher Education in New York City) reaffirmed and extended their acceptance and commitment to the community college idea in the 1968 editions of their "master plans." The State University Trustees, as the responsible state-level agency for implementing these plans, authorized the opening of two community colleges in the fall of 1966, one in the fall of 1967, and two more in the fall of 1968. The trustees have now approved two more to open in New York City in the fall of 1969, and three to open upstate at that same time. This brings the total number of approved two-year colleges in the state to forty-four (thirty-eight community colleges and six agricultural and technical colleges). Other localities are still conducting area studies to examine the feasibility of establishing community colleges under the criteria and guidelines observed in the state. In the fall of 1968, the community and technical colleges enrolled 77,951 full-time and 77,553 part-time students. By 1975 these are expected to grow to an enrollment of 151,300 full-time and 130,160 part-time students.

But these institutional developments alone are not sufficient to fulfill the ideals of a comprehensive and total post-high school educational opportunity envisioned in New York State. All two-year colleges in the state are under mandate to move as rapidly and fully as possible to the goal of providing a full range of services to all high school graduates and older persons who seek further educational improvement whether or not they have graduated from high school. This calls for new programs in vocational and technical education and in developmental academic studies, as well as an expansion of openings in the liberal arts and sciences. Accordingly, programs like these are appearing in the two-year colleges throughout the state.

A dramatic special effort in such programming is the "urban center" development in five heavily populated areas of the state. Aimed at giving particular attention to the educationally disadvantaged, all are totally financed by funds appropriated by the state

and provided through the state university, and all are administered by a locally controlled community college. Four "urban centers" opened in the fall of 1966: Bedford-Styvesant area in Brooklyn—New York City Community College; Harlem—Borough of Manhattan Community College; Capital District—Hudson Valley Community College; and Buffalo—Erie County Technical Institute. A fifth opened in the fall of 1968 in Rochester with Monroe Community College cooperating with State University of New York in its operation. All are ghetto areas in the city and provide a wide range of educational services of a compensatory academic and vocational nature.

The dynamics of the community college movement in New York State, therefore, are active and energetic. In New York State, as elsewhere, these colleges are in a flexible, adaptable position of service and concentration on true democratization of post-high school opportunity. No one can now predict how fully they will ultimately reach the idealistic goals set for them; the evidence is clear and growing, however, that no matter how tortuous and burdened the effort these colleges are making in their thrust to reach the ideal, progress continues to be observable and reportable.

S. V. Martorana

Rebirth in Illinois

By Clifford G. Erickson

The American public community college had its birthplace in Joliet, Illinois, in 1902. As the movement quickly spread to other parts of the nation, Illinois relinquished its leadership. In the intervening sixty-three years several other states encouraged a more rapid development of the public community college. But 1965 marks a year of rebirth and rededication in the state of Illinois. There are signs that this state will once again become a leader in community college education.

Post-high school education under the sponsorship of high school or unit district boards has been the pattern characterizing development in Illinois until the last several years. The history of the Chicago City Junior College typifies the pattern. The college was established in 1911, and after operating in several high school buildings, was consolidated in the Crane High School on the near west side, where it flourished until 1933 when, as an economy measure, it was closed. In response to public pressure the Chicago Board of Education reopened the college one year later on three campuses, one of them a separate unit, two of them shared facilities. In 1956 the board of education authorized a program of extension of campuses. At the present time there are nine locations, five of which are shared with high schools.

Elsewhere in the state this kind of development of public junior colleges was paralleled. Colleges were established under local control of unit districts. They were housed typically in high school buildings or, as in the case of Bloom Township Junior College and Belleville Junior College, in new buildings erected on the high school campus.

Until 1931, the junior college movement in Illinois

grew despite the absence of specific legal sanction. In that year, the first enabling legislation was enacted to ward off continuing attacks by those who questioned the legality of a junior college in the public school system. This legislation authorized the Chicago Board of Education to "manage and provide for the maintenance of not more than one junior college, consisting of or offering not more than two years of college work beyond the four-year course of accredited high schools, as a part of the public school system of the city." This was followed in 1937 by further legislation validating existing junior colleges outside Chicago and permitting the establishment of new ones.

An Enlarged Role

The years following World War II saw the emergence of the concept of the community college as a unique element in the system of higher education demanding operations extended into the evening hours, curriculum development in vocational and technical fields, and rapid expansion of guidance and adult education services.

Administrators, faculty, and the public became aware of the need of clarifying the legal status of the junior college in Illinois and of the need of achieving firm financial support at the state level. Strong efforts were made to obtain greater recognition of the two-year college. Finally, in the closing days of the 1951 legislature, the General Assembly established the junior college as a part of the common school system.

State aid for operating costs, however, was not provided until 1955 when provision was made for \$100 state aid per student per year. This sum was increased to \$200 in 1957, and to \$7.60 per credit hour of enrollment in 1959. The road was still far from smooth, however. Bills to provide state aid for sites, site improvement, building construction, and equipment failed in the legislature or were vetoed by the governor.

Nonetheless, the same 1959 legislative session took

action to guarantee the continued progress of the community college in Illinois. The General Assembly passed a bill encouraging the establishment of separate junior college districts with separate boards and taxing authority. The bill provided for the establishment of a community college in any district approved by the state superintendent of public instruction which has at least an assessed valuation of \$75 million and a population of not less than 30,000 persons.

Two years later, in 1961, Blackhawk College in Moline was the first to be organized under the Area Junior College Law. Triton Community College in Elmwood Park was organized in 1964, as was Rock Valley College in the Rockford-Belvidere area in the same year. Triton and Rock Valley offered classes for the first time in the fall of 1965.

The Illinois Master Plan

Over the years the Illinois legislature has also taken other action to further the community college cause. A number of studies of the junior college and its role in Illinois have been authorized. These studies were helpful in clarifying the role of the junior college. But they did little to help lift the junior college to its rightful position in higher education until the period 1963 to 1965.

The story of helping the community college find its place in higher education goes back to 1961 when the General Assembly created the Illinois Board of Higher Education as a successor to the former Commission on Higher Education. The new board was given authority to coordinate the budgets of the state universities and to prepare a master plan for higher education in Illinois. A series of ten study committees with memberships representing lay and professional interests completed a thorough analysis of the current status and future destiny of higher education in Illinois. Three advisory committees, one of lay persons, the second of college presidents, and the third of college faculty representatives, screened the recommendations to the board. After two years

of intensive work, in 1963 the board published a tentative master plan for higher education in Illinois and conducted public hearings throughout the state for discussion and debate on the proposals of the plan. A final master plan was drafted and adopted by the board in 1964, and in 1965 a series of bills was submitted for the consideration of the Illinois legislature. Prominent among these bills was the junior college bill (House Bill 1710), introduced on May 13, passed on June 29, 1965, and signed into law by Governor Otto Kerner on July 15, 1965.

The Master Plan for Higher Education in Illinois provides a significant and prescribed role for comprehensive junior colleges throughout the state. It has created an Illinois Junior College Board which has taken over the functions formerly carried out by the office of state superintendent of public instruction. It designates the junior college as a part of higher education—in contrast to its former status as a part of the common schools. It allows present junior colleges operated by high school and unit districts to continue in operation, but offers them state aid only for operation costs.

The plan encourages the development of separate junior college boards by allowing districts operating such boards to qualify for increased state aid at the rate of \$11.50 per semester hour and by providing state funds for site, site improvements, and construction in the amount of three-fourths of approved project costs up to 1971 and 50 per cent of these costs thereafter. It provides a mechanism whereby any student in the state not residing in the junior college district may attend a public junior college with tuition assistance from his local district.

The Stage Is Set

The stage is now set for an unprecedented development of junior colleges in the state of Illinois in the years immediately ahead. Whereas presently one college student in five is enrolled in a junior college, it can be confidently expected that in the years ahead a much larger percentage of college-level students

will be enrolled in community colleges. Unit and high school district boards will undoubtedly divest themselves of junior colleges and encourage the establishment of separate junior college districts in order that the benefits to be derived from increased state funds for operation and for construction can be made available to local communities.

In December, 1965, the Illinois Junior College Board reported that ninety of 102 counties were served by community colleges or had studies underway for the creation of new junior colleges.

Authorities on the junior college throughout the country have expressed the view that the Illinois Master Plan for Higher Education may well be the best in the nation. If it is and if it works, Illinois may reassume the position of junior college leadership it had in 1902.

Illinois Revisited

184

Since the public junior college act became law in 1965, developments in Illinois have been truly spectacular. With the counsel, guidance, and approval of the Illinois Junior College Board, thirty-four junior college districts have been established by local referendum in the state. More than 65 per cent of the state now is included within a junior college district, and over 85 per cent of the state's population lives within a district. Efforts to form additional districts continue and it is expected that Illinois will be blanketed in the not-too-distant future by the state system of junior colleges.

Growing student interest reflects unprecedented public acceptance of the master plan design for a state system of junior colleges. In fall 1967, freshmen and sophomores in public junior colleges for the first time exceeded lower division enrollments at public state colleges and universities. During the 1968-69 college year, 100,169 students—all accommodated in temporary or shared facilities—were enrolled in public community colleges; 8,206 students were attending private junior colleges in Illinois. The impact of increased population, efforts to raise the college-going rate in the state, and a plan adopted

to stabilize lower-division enrollments at state colleges and universities will push community and junior college attendance in Illinois close to the 250,000 mark by 1975.

Significant state financial support for construction has matched public acceptance for comprehensive junior college education. The Illinois General Assembly authorized \$20.5 million in 1965, and \$125 million in 1967 for construction of junior college facilities through the Illinois Building Authority. These state funds, plus local and federal monies, have made possible construction exceeding \$200 million at state system junior colleges. Five colleges completed the first phase of their campus master plan in spring 1969 and now use these facilities. Other colleges are at various stages of construction and planning. Building authorizations by the state legislature for the 1969-71 biennium will make possible again more than \$200 million of construction. By 1972, every existing junior college district in the state will have completed at least the initial phase of its campus master plan.

Reorganization and staffing of the state junior college association has paralleled the creation and development of the State Junior College Board. As a four-division organization, the Illinois Association of Community and Junior Colleges has emerged as an effective voice in state and national governmental affairs. Involvement and full participation of students, faculty, administrators, and trustees in the association's affairs has resulted in legislative programs and action, public relations, voluntary regulation of athletics, university cooperation and articulation, professional growth programs, maintaining local autonomy of colleges, and many other areas of academic and public concern. Recognizing the great need for extending educational opportunity to many more young people and adults, both the state board and the association have placed heavy emphasis on the development of strong, comprehensive programs in state system colleges.

Rapid progress toward master plan goals, dra-

matic construction of new facilities, strong state support for construction and operations, and the development of truly comprehensive programs have moved Illinois to the forefront of the national junior college movement. In Illinois we feel confident that community and junior colleges are destined to play a major role in the state's economic expansion and in resolving many of the social and economic problems confronting the state and the nation.

James D. Broman

Iowa Sets Its Course

By Louis R. Newsham

The first junior college in Iowa was established at Mason City in 1918 without the benefit of a specific legal basis.

Enabling legislation, passed in 1927, permitted a local school district to establish a junior college when approved by the State Superintendent of Public Instruction and when duly authorized by the voters.

Thirty-six junior colleges were started between the years 1918 and 1953. At the present time there are sixteen public community and junior colleges in operation.

Unlike those of the more populous states, Iowa's institutions have been characterized by extremely small staffs and enrollments, dual use of high school facilities and staff, and limited financial support. Consequently, development of the junior and community college in Iowa has been a slow and painful process. In fact, the inadequate structural base for the institutions and the drop in enrollments caused by World War II forced more than 50 per cent of these institutions to close prior to 1950.

In recent years the need for basic changes in support and organizational structure has become increasingly clear to Iowans. A number of informal and formal reports, designed to promote new structures have been developed.¹

These reports have differed in detail, but they have pointed to certain inescapable conclusions highlighted by:

1. The need for a statewide plan to serve *all* areas of Iowa
2. The need for an adequate financial base to support a varied program of instruction

3. The need for an adequate number of potential students in the areas to be served.

The Iowa General Assembly, at its regular session in 1965, enacted a basic law under which a statewide system of not more than twenty area vocational schools or community colleges may be established.²

This law provides permissive legislation, which opens wider the door of educational opportunity for Iowa youths and adults. The issue of area vocational schools versus community colleges has been subordinated to that of serving the educational needs of Iowa. Vocational-technical education is made a *must* by the law. This fact is underlined by the stipulation that an area community college is not permitted to exist apart from a vocational-technical school. Here is a legal requirement that the community college shall be the comprehensive educational institution so widely proclaimed by the literature in the field. Heretofore, no such guarantee has been present in the Iowa educational structure.

Thus, the legislature, speaking for the people of Iowa, has forced the parallel movements of college transfer education and vocational-technical education into a single stream.

A controlled pattern of offerings is designated by the new bill. Specifically, if the new institution operates as an area community college, it is required to offer (but not limited to) the following:

1. The first two years of college work, including preprofessional education
2. Vocational and technical training
3. Programs for in-service training and retraining of workers
4. Programs for high school completion for students of post-high school age
5. Programs for all students of high school age who may best serve themselves by enrolling for vocational and technical training while also enrolled in a local high school, public or private
6. Student personnel services
7. Community services
8. Vocational education for persons who have

academic, socioeconomic, or other handicaps which prevent their succeeding in regular vocational education programs.

9. Training, retraining, and all necessary preparation for productive employment of all citizens.

The proposed state plan developed in 1962 by the State Department of Public Instruction for providing a statewide system of public community colleges appears to be a logical general guide to follow as this permissive legislation is implemented.³

The act provides that county boards of education of two or more counties are authorized to plan for the merger of county school systems for the purpose of providing an area vocational school or community college.

No area may be proposed that has fewer than 4,000 public and private school pupils in grades nine through twelve.

All proposals for merger areas must be approved by the State Board of Public Instruction. This approval must insure the development of a statewide plan for post-high school education which includes *all* areas of the state. Upon approval of a proposed merged area, the respective county boards—after public notice—must proceed to accept or reject the merger plan.

The supportive areas into which the state is to be divided must each provide an adequate financial and potential student base. Since this was one of the criteria for developing the department's proposed state plan, it seems to follow that the twenty or fewer area districts as provided for in the new law should very much resemble the sixteen-area district plan suggested in its report.

The governing board for a merged area will consist of one member from each director district in the area. Each director will be selected by the electors of the respective district.

The director districts in the area will be limited to no fewer than five nor more than nine and must be of approximately equal population.

The board of directors will be authorized to levy

a tax of three-fourths mill for operating costs. This levy will require no approval by the voters of the district.

A school building tax levy not to exceed three-fourths mill in any one year and limited to a period of five years may be authorized by a vote of the people. This could be used for the purchase of grounds, construction of buildings, the acquisition of libraries, and for the purpose of maintaining, remodeling, improving, or expanding the area school.

Each area district when authorized by a vote of the people, may issue bonds to raise funds for building an area vocational school or area community college. In this connection the new districts have the same bonding privileges that are extended to other school districts. The bond issue must be approved by a 60 per cent majority of all voters voting on the proposition in the area.

State aid for area district students is at the rate of \$2.25 per student per day payable for the actual number of days the college is officially in session. Aid remains the same for resident students attending junior or community colleges supported by a local school district. This is at the rate of \$1 per day for a maximum of 180 days. The aid for nonresident students attending junior or community colleges supported by a local school district is \$2.25 per day for a maximum of 180 days. Area district schools have no limitation on the number of days for which aid will be paid.

State-Level Organization

The requirement that there be a division of community and junior colleges with a full-time director within the State Department of Public Instruction is important. It insures the organization and personnel necessary to give leadership and direction to the present community or junior colleges and the developing area community colleges.

Robert O. Birkhimer, director of junior colleges in the Illinois State Department of Public Instruction for the past six years, has been employed by the Iowa State Board of Public Instruction as com-

munity college director.

A newly created state advisory committee on community and junior colleges, parallel to the already established advisory committee on vocational education, will play a key role in the early development of the area districts serving post-high school needs. This advisory committee will advise the state board on the establishment of area community colleges and on the adoption of standards for area and public community and junior colleges.

The nine-member state advisory committee on community and junior colleges will be appointed by the governor. It will include three members to represent the general public and one to represent each of the following groups:

1. State Board of Regents
2. State Advisory Committee for Vocational Education
3. Private universities and colleges
4. Public and private junior colleges
5. Associations which have been established for the purpose of furthering the education and training of individuals with academic, socioeconomic, and other handicaps
6. Local school districts which offer programs of vocational education.

The new law further specifies that all public community junior colleges currently in operation may continue to operate and may be converted into area vocational schools or area community colleges in a manner provided for in the act. All agreements for such conversion are subject to approval by the State Board of Public Instruction. Reasonable compensation will be paid to any local district whose community college facilities are used for the area district.

Through Adolescence

All individuals must go through the adolescent stage of life, and this cycle cannot be bypassed by wishful thinking on the part of parents. It appears

that Iowa is destined to live through its share of "adolescence." Differing points of view arising from varied personal, political, and professional orientation of the proponents of post-high school education need to be harmonized. This takes time. The new law appears to provide a vehicle to carry Iowa through its next growth-stage in its progress toward an adequate, statewide community college system.

The stage for a comprehensive approach to Iowa's post-high school educational problems has been set by actions of an aggressive State Department of Public Instruction, professional cooperation by educators, leadership by the governor, and alert legislative enactments by the Sixty-First General Assembly.

The emergence of an area system of post-high school education which will guarantee the availability of vocational-technical courses and provide for the initial or later addition of full community college work is regarded by many Iowa educators and laymen as an intermediate step toward a statewide system of comprehensive area community colleges.

It is worth reemphasizing that the new legislation provides the area district board of directors with a ready means of changing from an area vocational-technical school to an area community college.

Governor Harold E. Hughes has emphasized the need in Iowa for vocational-technical education and has been a leading proponent for legislation necessary for establishing area schools. In an address to the Economic Development Conference at the University of Iowa, preceding the Sixty-First General Assembly, Governor Hughes stated:

It is my belief that the enrollment in the schools should not be restricted, that tuition should not be high, and that there should be sufficient diversity of programs to accommodate the interests and abilities of most students.

I think the main use of the comprehensive area schools should be for those who will terminate their education with a two-year course, but that a secondary purpose would be to provide a two-year transfer course.

This approach to the establishment of an area vocational-technical training system in Iowa, using a comprehensive community college set-up where feasible, is a combination of a number of recommendations offered by

leading educators in Iowa—and I believe it would have a broad base of support in the state.

I would emphasize again these characteristics of this approach that I think are particularly important—flexibility in adapting to local needs and existing facilities; the placing of the vocational-technical program in the setting of the state's general education system; local control of the schools, with a modest local participation in the financing; and with standards and coordination of programs provided by the state agency ultimately designated to supervise the program.

I realize that there will be many objections to this or any other plan—but the time has arrived when we must get down to specifics, work out our differences, and get moving.⁴

It seems reasonable to conclude that the pressures of cost, enrollment, and program expansion make it just a matter of time before the present public community-junior colleges operated by single local districts, take their place in a statewide area plan. If the history of other states is indicative of future developments, the people of Iowa will see the gradual evolution of a strong system of comprehensive community colleges.

¹ Starrak, James A., and Hughes, Raymond M. *The Community College in the United States*. Ames: The Iowa State College Press, 1954.

Educational Needs: *Iowa's Young Adults*. Developed at the Annual Junior College Workshop held at the State University of Iowa. Des Moines: Department of Public Instruction, State of Iowa, 1951.

Gibson, Raymond C. *Resources and Needs for Higher Education in Iowa, 1960-1970: A Summary Report*. State House, Des Moines: Iowa Legislative Research Bureau, undated.

Education Beyond High School Age: The Community College. Iowa State Department of Public Instruction. Report to the Sixtieth General Assembly. Des Moines: Iowa State Department of Public Instruction, 1962.

² *Senate File 550, Sixty-First General Assembly, 1965*. An act to provide for establishment and operation of area vocational schools and area community colleges, establish a division of community and junior colleges within the state department of public instruction and an advisory committee to the state board of public instruction on community and junior colleges, and to require establishment and enforcement of approval standards for public and

area community and junior colleges and area vocational schools.

³ *Education Beyond High School Age: The Community College. op. cit.*

⁴ Hughes, Harold E. *The Path for Progress*. Address by Governor Harold E. Hughes, Third Annual Economic Development Conference, Iowa State University, Ames, December 8, 1964 (unpublished).

Iowa Revisited

A statewide system of public area community colleges and vocational technical schools has been developed in Iowa since permissive legislation was enacted in 1965.

The State Board and Department of Public Instruction, the county boards, and county superintendents of education were dynamic forces as the permissive legislation was implemented. By July 1967, fifteen area schools were organized. Four of the schools were developed as vocational-technical schools and eleven evolved as community colleges. The eleven community college districts have assimilated all of the existing local community and junior colleges as a part of the area organization with the exception of one small junior college.

Presently, over 100 vocational-technical occupational choices are offered in the fifteen area schools. There are over 250 different programs available in contrast to the twenty-five post-high school vocational programs offered in 1965-66.

Adult education programs have shown a significant increase in the number of people served. The programs in adult basic education, high school completion, vocational-technical, and general adult programs have helped to demonstrate the contributions an area school can make to the adults in the area.

Full-time equivalent enrollment in the vocational-technical and arts and science programs has increased from 11,500 in 1965, to about 21,000 at the present time. In a study performed for the Higher Education Facilities Commission, it was estimated that there would be a full-time student equivalency of 31,275 students in 1970 and 61,225 by 1980.

In 1969, the sixty-third General Assembly appropriated a fixed amount of general aid for each area school based on an estimate of 1969-70 enrollment. A new formula was developed to be used for distributing aid in 1971-72. The distribution percentages reflect the legislature's orientation toward the need for vocational-technical education.

The General Assembly required the initiation of a new financial accounting system for the area schools which designates four basic funds: arts and science, vocational-technical, adult education, and services. Under this ruling, funds may be transferred from one area to another with the approval of the state superintendent of public instruction.

The position paper developed by the State Department of Public Instruction for the Iowa Coordinating Council on Post-High School Education on *Iowa's Developing Patterns for Area Schools* sums up popular acceptance of the area school as follows:

But the fact that the people in 92 of Iowa's 99 counties have initiated, established, and supported these schools, and the fact that potentially over 50,000 people this year will take advantage of the educational opportunities provided by these institutions cannot be disregarded. There may be problems to iron out, but with such enthusiastic support from the people of Iowa, and the desire of those responsible to improve this new system of post-high school education, the direction, most certainly, will be forward.

Louis R. Newsham

Hawaii Plans for Community Colleges

By Richard H. Kosaki

Education has always played a major role in the life of Hawaii. It is through education that the native and diverse immigrant groups in Hawaii have molded a thriving American community.

At present, Hawaii's high school retention rate is among the best in the nation. In recent years, consistently over 65 per cent of the high school graduates have proceeded on to some kind of post-high school education. The University of Hawaii, the state's major institution of higher education, has shown a 200 per cent increase in enrollment in the last fifteen years; from 5,000 students in 1950 to its present 15,000.

These rapid developments in education have been accompanied and abetted by Hawaii's fast-growing economy. Recent advances in transportation and communication have made Hawaii a hub of economic and cultural activities in the Pacific. Technological changes have increased productive efficiency and have brought demands for training in new skills.

Against this background of educational and economic advancement, the coming of community colleges to Hawaii was almost inevitable. Indeed, one is tempted to ask why it is occurring so late in a community so conscious of the value of education.

But now that the decision to establish a statewide network of community colleges has been made the support is overwhelming and the state impatiently awaits the opening of its first campus.

Past Studies

Although the decision to establish community colleges is recent, proposals for their creation have been suggested for some time. All of the recent surveys on education in Hawaii contained recommendations for their establishment. The Stanford Report of 1957 suggested "the development of regional community colleges on the larger islands."¹ A 1962 report on higher education in Hawaii, conducted by personnel of the U. S. Office of Education, made the establishment of community colleges one of its major recommendations.² The 1963 Hawaii Legislature asked for a detailed feasibility study, and, upon the findings and recommendations of this report,³ enacted the Community College Act of 1964.⁴

The Community College Act of 1964 was passed by an overwhelming margin in both houses of the legislature and signed by a governor who had campaigned for a system of community colleges. The act is brief and states the purposes of community colleges in broad terms: "to provide two-year college transfer and general education programs, semi-professional, technical, vocational, and continuing education programs, and such other educational programs and services as are appropriate to such institutions."

Provisions of the Act

The act contains three provisions which are noteworthy:

1. It establishes a statewide system of community colleges under the university board of regents.
2. It authorizes the transfer of the existing technical schools from the Department of Education to the University of Hawaii and their conversion into community colleges.
3. It excludes the island of Hawaii from the provisions of the act.

The exclusion of Hawaii, the largest island, can largely be explained in terms of the existence of a two-year branch campus of the university of that

island. There is a desire on the part of members of the community to develop this branch campus not into a community college but into a four-year college. A few blocks from the branch campus is a successful technical school; in combination they do provide for the island of Hawaii greater educational opportunities than currently exist on the neighboring islands. The exclusion of the island of Hawaii under these circumstances will provide an interesting comparison of two different ways of providing post-high school educational opportunities within the state.

A feature of the Hawaii system which interests many (and disappoints some) is the key role that the university assumes. Given the centralized nature of government and all education in Hawaii, local school board control was never given serious consideration. The other organizational control choices were: (a) an independent state board which was mentioned in legislative discussions but dismissed as adding unnecessary complexity to educational organization in a small state; and (b) the Board of Education which was passed over on the grounds that community colleges belonged in the province of higher education.

The dangers of university control are well-known; chief among them is that the university will stultify the proper development of community colleges by tight controls over the "academic" programs and by de-emphasizing or being indifferent to occupational programs.

But there is also the possibility that this relationship, like marriage, contains the potential for increasing the effectiveness and mutual well-being of both parties. Transfer problems should be effectively handled and the greater university resources in the arts and sciences ought to be taken advantage of by the outlying communities through the community colleges.

Of interest is the organizational pattern adopted by the university regents to administer the community colleges.

The regents intend to treat the community colleges

as "equal partners" or integral segments in the state's higher education program. Of importance also is the fact that University of Hawaii's president, Thomas H. Hamilton, has an understanding of community colleges, gained in his previous position as president of the State University of New York which includes among its campuses several community colleges.

The community colleges will also have local citizens' committees appointed to advise on the development of individual campuses. Trade advisory committees, now in use by the technical schools, will be retained.

Occupational Education

The most discussed aspect of the Community College Act was the role of occupational education. The growing importance of occupational education was recognized, but what programs should be assigned to the community colleges? The question was made complex by the existence of the technical schools (area vocational post-high schools) under the Department of Education, which quite naturally wished to retain their status and identity.

The decision to make Hawaii's community colleges truly comprehensive by including all phases of post-high school occupational education was arrived at in the belief that this was best for the student. Not only would he have the widest choice available but he would also be treated equally in terms of the co-curricular experiences which add much to post-high school education.

The University of Hawaii is well-aware of its responsibility in occupational education. After passage of the Community College Act, it secured the services of Norman C. Harris, of the University of Michigan, to evaluate the existing technical school programs and to suggest plans for future occupational programs. Professor Harris' comprehensive report⁷ will serve as a useful guide in the development of Hawaii's community colleges.

On July 1, 1965, by executive order of the governor, four technical schools with the following pro-

grams were transferred to the University of Hawaii. They now constitute the beginning of the community college system.

Occupational Programs	Technical Schools and Enrollments (Fall, 1964)				Total
	Honolulu	Kapiolani	Kauai	Maui	
Aircraft technology	65	—	—	—	65
Apparel trades	21	—	—	24	45
Automotive technology..	111	—	24	48	183
Building trades	60	—	24	38	122
Business education	—	627	65	78	770
Cosmetology	67	—	—	—	67
Electricity	39	—	—	—	39
Electronics	125	—	—	—	125
Engineering aide	16	—	—	—	16
Hotel, restaurant and food trades	45	72	—	—	117
Machine shop	33	—	7	14	54
Metal and welding trades	71	—	11	21	103
Health occupations	—	118	—	—	118
Refrigeration and air conditioning	39	—	—	—	39
Total	692	817	131	223	1,853

To the above will be added such occupational programs as registered nursing (now at the university with the understanding that it will be shifted to a community college as soon as facilities are built), police science, more options in the secretarial and business administration programs, and expanded programs in the hotel-restaurant fields. All campuses will have college transfer programs, as well as extended day or evening programs.

Thus, community colleges offering associate degrees in occupational and college transfer programs are expected to be established on Maui in 1967, and on Oahu and Kauai in 1968.

The five community colleges will differ in enrollments and programs. The larger ones on Oahu will be planned for 4,000-5,000 full-time day students; the smaller neighbor island campuses may not enroll more than 500 to 700.

The library and theater facilities will be designed

to serve the surrounding communities. Community colleges, especially in areas outside of urban Honolulu, should become educational and cultural centers of their region.

Three major tasks now confront those planning Hawaii's community college system:

1. The construction of five campuses. Two are extensions of present technical school sites, two call for the relocation of existing facilities, and one will be an entirely new campus. Classrooms, libraries, and campus centers are being planned for all. The architects are being challenged to design functional yet inviting structures in a warm and friendly climate.

2. The development of new programs and the possible revision of existing programs. Considerable work needs to be done in this area. Besides the college transfer program, new occupational programs will have to be added on most campuses. The statewide system calls for the careful planning and placement of new or expensive programs.

3. The recruitment of faculty and staff. The present faculties of the technical schools have responded well to the conversion; many are already undertaking courses to increase their knowledge of community college operations. They will need to be augmented by able instructors from within and without the state.

Hawaii's community college system has some unique features. But the underlying purpose is clear—to provide citizens with greater opportunities in post-high school education.

Hawaii, with her traditional and proven reliance upon education to better the life of her people, has focused her attention upon community colleges. With growing public understanding and support the community college has a golden opportunity to prove itself in Hawaii.

¹ Hanna, Paul R., and McDaniel, Henry B. *General Curriculum and Vocational Curriculum, Organization and Administration of the Public Schools, Territory of*

Hawaii, by the Odell Survey Staff. Stanford, California: June 30, 1957, pp. 76-77.

² U.S. Office of Education. *The University of Hawaii and Higher Education in Hawaii*. Report of a survey by S. V. Martorana, Ernest V. Hollis, and staff members of the Division of Higher Education. Honolulu: Department of Budget and Review, November 1962, pp. 266-67.

³ Kosaki, Richard H. *Feasibility of Community Colleges in Hawaii*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii, February, 1964.

⁴ Act 39 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1964.

⁵ Harris, Norman C. *Curriculum Development for Hawaii's Community Colleges with Emphasis on Occupational Education*. Honolulu: The University of Hawaii, December, 1964.

Hawaii Revisited

The five community colleges in Hawaii began their third year of operation in the fall of 1968 with an enrollment of 5,494 students. This was an increase of 57 per cent over the fall 1967 enrollment, and an indication of the growing popularity of these colleges.

When the Community College Act was passed in 1964, four existing technical schools were converted to community colleges. In fall 1968 a new community college was opened in leeward Oahu. The state legislature in spring 1969 is favorably considering: (1) the conversion into a community college of Hawaii Technical School in Hilo, the one remaining post-high school institution not within the community college system; and (2) the location of another community college on the windward side of the populous island of Oahu. The legislature is also considering the conversion of the University of Hawaii's branch campus in Hilo into a four-year college as well as the development of a second major university campus on the island of Oahu. It is believed that three university campuses and seven community colleges will bring public higher education within reach of almost all who seek such opportunities in the fiftieth state.

Only a few remain skeptical that a university-administered system can do justice to occupational education. Since the technical schools were converted into community colleges, new occupational programs—such as merchandising, data processing, police and fire science, and librarian assistant programs—have been added and enrollments in occupational programs have increased. University administrators, instead of emphasizing academic programs, have encouraged the occupational programs in the community colleges because they realize that the four-year campuses cannot meet the demands for these programs. The state legislature appears satisfied with the university's handling of occupational programs for it recently designated the University Board of Regents as the State Board for Vocational Education.

The community colleges in Hawaii are being well received by the students and the communities that they are attempting to serve.

Richard H. Kosaki

Minnesota Turns to State Junior Colleges

By Philip C. Hellard

In the closing days of its 1963 session the Minnesota Legislature passed a law which has already had a profound effect upon the development of junior colleges in Minnesota—a law which begins with the statement that “Not to exceed fifteen state junior colleges are hereby established under the management, jurisdiction, and control of a state junior college board which is hereby created.”

At the time the new law was passed there were eleven public junior colleges in Minnesota, all operated by local school districts under the regulations of the Minnesota State Board of Education.

These colleges had a long tradition of local support and local control. Rochester Junior College had operated continuously since 1915, Hibbing since 1916, Eveleth since 1918, Virginia since 1921, Ely and Itasca since 1922, Worthington since 1936, Brainerd since 1938, and Austin since 1940. The junior college at Fergus Falls had been opened in 1960 and the one in Willmar in 1962.

Financial support of each of these colleges had been entirely the responsibility of the local school district in which it was located until 1957 when the state legislature authorized state aid for operation in the amount of \$200 per pupil. This amount was raised to \$250 in 1959, to \$300 in 1961, and to \$350 in 1963.

The locally supported junior colleges in Minnesota were handicapped by the lack of adequate funds and by the fact that they were usually housed with the high school, and as a result their programs were largely college transfer in nature. The col-

leges saw semiprofessional and technical education as a great need but the school districts were not able to supply the space and equipment needed for such programs. In the college transfer programs the colleges established an excellent reputation and studies showed that their students performed well after transfer. The schools were able to attract and hold excellent faculty members, and made real contributions to the educational and cultural life of their communities.

Even with state aid, the locally supported junior colleges could not keep up with expanding enrollments and the need for broader programs. The building of facilities was still a local responsibility, and the districts had all they could do to keep up with the need for facilities at the elementary and secondary school level. Metropolitan districts which should have started junior colleges did not do so because of the financial problems involved. The 1963 legislature realized that Minnesota's junior colleges would not be able to do what would be expected of them in the future unless they became completely state-supported, and faced the problem squarely in the passage of the new law.

The original law was very brief. It provided for a State Junior College Board of five members, to be appointed by the governor, and gave the board all powers necessary to the management, jurisdiction, and control of the state junior colleges. It required that at least three of the state junior colleges should be situated in the five-county, metropolitan area which includes Minneapolis and St. Paul and their suburbs. It gave the board authority to determine the location of other area junior colleges and directed that consideration should be given to the needs for a state junior college in northwestern Minnesota. It provided that the board could take existing public junior colleges into the state system if it desired to do so, and if the colleges desired such takeover, and it prescribed a tuition rate equal to that charged in the four-year state colleges. It anticipated concern over loss of

local control and required the board to appoint local advisory committees in areas where state junior colleges would be located. It directed the board to prescribe courses of study, including undergraduate academic programs, training in semiprofessional and technical fields, and adult education.

The Minnesota Junior College Board was appointed in the fall of 1963 and the writer was hired as its executive director in March, 1964. Board members had visited all existing junior colleges during the winter of 1963-64 and in the spring of 1964 received requests for take-over from each of the existing colleges. The board agreed to take all of the colleges into the state system and to operate them at state expense, with the provision that since they are only four miles apart the colleges at Virginia and Eveleth will eventually be consolidated.

When the eleven colleges opened in the fall of 1964 they were state junior colleges. An "Agreement for Take-over" had been made between the Minnesota Junior College Board and each local board of education which provided that the state board would pay all costs of operation and that the local board would make its facilities available until state-owned facilities could be built. The state board agreed to pay faculty members according to the 1964-65 salary agreements already made with the local districts and to repay out-of-pocket costs that the local district incurred on behalf of the college. A spirit of enthusiasm and cooperation existed, and the transition was made with a minimum of difficulty.

Administrative patterns developed during the first year of operation make the local administrators, who are called deans, relatively autonomous but require that their access to the state board be through its executive director.

Budget requests for the entire system are made to the legislature by the state board. Appropriations are made to the system, rather than to individual colleges, and the state board has authority to vary

ratios and formulas from college to college. Deans do their own hiring within ratios authorized by the state board but payrolls are prepared and checks issued in the state office. Individual colleges initiate requisitions for equipment and supplies within allocations made by the state board but actual purchasing and payment is handled by the state office with the help of the state department of administration. Funds for buildings are requested for the entire system by the state board.

More Colleges, Programs, Facilities

Except for these changes in administrative patterns, the colleges are operating much as they did under local school districts. In looking to the future, however, the state board is committed to a program of additional colleges, broader programs and improved facilities.

The 1965 legislature responded to recommendations by the state board in authorizing expansion to a system of seventeen colleges. In addition to the ten colleges which would exist after the consolidation of Virginia and Eveleth, the legislature authorized a new college at Thief River Falls in the northwest corner of the state, a new college at International Falls on the Canadian border, and five new colleges in the Minneapolis-St. Paul metropolitan complex. It provided that the metropolitan colleges could each develop at more than one location if the board deemed it wise. It asked the board to make a study of the need for additional junior colleges, giving special attention to eight areas—the Fairmont area, the Redwood Falls-Sleepy Eye-Springfield area, the Pine City-Mora area, the Hastings-Wabasha area, the Owatonna-Albert Lea area, and the Wadena - Park Rapids-Detroit Lakes area.

The state board asked for an appropriation for operations which would provide for uniform salary treatment in all state junior colleges according to a schedule developed by the Minnesota Junior College Faculty Association, for new colleges in tem-

porary quarters at Thief River Falls and in the metropolitan area, and for a doubled enrollment by the end of the biennium. These appropriations were granted almost as requested. The faculty association had hoped for immediate implementation of the schedule they had proposed, but settled for implementation over a two-year period.

New Openings This Fall and Next

The state board asked for new buildings that would enable the existing colleges to be in facilities separate from high schools by 1967 and would also provide for the start of one new metropolitan campus by 1967. The request was granted, and the legislature went further by providing for the start of two new metropolitan campuses during the biennium. Plans are now being developed for "first units" at these various locations—buildings that will provide classrooms, laboratories, faculty and administrative offices, libraries, lecture halls, and multipurpose rooms. The legislative building commission and the state board have agreed upon a plan which will develop the various campuses concurrently and spread available money into as many institutions as possible.

New colleges were opened this fall at Thief River Falls and at two locations in the metropolitan area, all in space made available by high schools. Plans are being made for additional temporary locations in the fall of 1966.

The Minnesota Junior College Board is working with the newly established Minnesota Liaison and Facilities Commission for Higher Education in planning a long-range program for the development of its system of state junior colleges. The board is committed to the idea that Minnesota's state junior colleges should, as far as possible, be comprehensive institutions with a community-oriented approach. It has met with strong support from the legislature and from the public. It is convinced, as are its administrators, that the state junior college is the answer for Minnesota.

Minnesota Revisited

Since the article "Minnesota Turns to State Junior Colleges" was written, the Minnesota state junior college system has moved ahead at a rapid pace.

Enrollment has increased from 5,409 students in the fall of 1964, to 15,361 students in the fall of 1968. It is estimated that this number will be doubled by 1975.

Curriculums have been broadened to include more occupational programs. The State Board for Vocational Education has begun to reimburse programs in junior colleges. The Minnesota Higher Education Commission has recommended that area vocational-technical schools and junior colleges be allowed to merge, and one such merger has taken place. (There are twenty-seven area vocational-technical schools in the state, with a full-time enrollment roughly the same as that in the junior colleges.)

Seven new colleges have been opened, bringing the total to seventeen, and one more will be opened in the fall of 1970. The Minnesota Higher Education Coordinating Commission has recommended that six additional colleges be established by 1974. Bills to designate the locations are presently moving through the state legislature.

Eleven colleges have moved to new campuses. Four colleges will move to new campuses in 1969-70, and three more will move to new campuses in the fall of 1970. A total of \$52 million worth of facilities has been built, is under construction, or is in the planning stages.

Expenditures per student have doubled since the junior colleges became state institutions. Public acceptance of the institutions is assured. State junior colleges seem to be the answer for Minnesota.

Philip C. Helland

A New Start in Montana

By Larry J. Blake

In September 1967, Flathead Valley Community College opened its doors to 611 students and became the first public college to be established in the state of Montana since 1940. The establishment of the college was a direct result of new legislation passed by the Montana State Legislature in 1965, establishing community college districts. F.V.C.C. thus became the third community college in the state, along with Dawson College and Miles Community College.

210

The establishment of community colleges in the state of Montana has been held back because of the early establishment of an over-optimistic system of public colleges and universities. Although Montana ranks fourth in size among the states, it is forty-first in population, with a 1965 population of 706,000.

There are presently six units of the Montana university system and three private colleges in the state, in addition to the three community colleges. The six units of the Montana university system are the University of Montana, Montana State University, Montana College of Mineral Science and Technology, Western Montana College, Eastern Montana College, and Northern Montana College. The latter three were formerly two-year normal schools. The three private colleges are Carroll College, College of Great Falls, and Rocky Mountain College.

In 1939, the Montana State Legislature enacted a law permitting any county high school or any district high school with sufficient assessed valuation to establish a junior college under regulations to be made by the state board of education. In addition,

the laws of 1939 set up detailed requirements on methods of establishment, approval of state superintendent of public instruction and state board of education, location, faculty, general administration, tuition and budgeting, methods of operation, classes of students to be admitted, and qualifications of dean and instructors.

These junior colleges were not regularly recommended for accreditation to the state board of education, but, since they were departments of county high schools, they were recommended for accreditation by the department of public instruction along with the high school.

New Law Enacted in 1965

During the 1965 legislative session, an abbreviated nine-page law establishing separate community college districts was passed. Under this legislation, the voters in any area of the state may form a community college district in which the area to be formed into such a district has an assessed valuation of not less than \$30 million and has a total of not less than 700 pupils regularly enrolled in public and private high schools. The district may consist of a county, two or more contiguous counties, or contiguous parts of two or more counties. Each district has an elected seven-member board of trustees.

Supervision of community college districts is delegated to the state board of education. This eight-member, governor-appointed board, along with several ex officio members, is thus responsible for elementary, secondary, and community college education in the state of Montana. The control and supervision of the Montana university system, the division of vocational rehabilitation, and the Montana State School for the Deaf and Blind, are also vested in this board.

The legislation states that the duty of the state board of education is to: (a) establish the role of the two-year college in the state; (b) set up a survey form to be used for local surveys of need and poten-

tial for two-year colleges and provide supervision in the conducting of surveys; (c) supervise community college districts formed under the provisions of this act and the junior colleges in existence at that time, and formed prior to the effective date of the act; (d) formulate and put into effect uniform policies as to budgeting, record keeping and student accounting; (e) establish uniform minimum entrance requirements and uniform curricular offering for all community and junior colleges; (f) make a continuing study of the junior and community college education in the state; and (g) be responsible for the accreditation of each junior college and community college under its supervision. Approval of the state board of education must also be given to the conducting of courses and classes for vocational training in the trades and industries and commercial branches, and for adult education, as well as for the establishment of tuition charges.

Operating Costs

A community college in the state of Montana is considered a free public school for budgeting and financial purposes, and participates in the established foundation program for elementary and secondary schools. Other sources of revenue for operating expenditures include tuition charges, special tax levies in the local district, and monies for vocational education programs as allocated under the state plan from federal vocational programs.

The foundation program allocates state support on the basis of "average number belonging (ANB)" on a graduated decreasing scale. The term "average number belonging" for community colleges is defined in the legislation as "those students enrolled in attendance in a community college for a period of not less than thirty days, and carrying a course of study of not less than ten class hours in courses, including vocational courses meeting standards prescribed by the State Board of Education, during each calendar week." The average allocation per ANB for the size of the existing community colleges is approximately \$600 per year.

The Montana State Constitution further limits attendance at a free public school to students under twenty-one years of age. Thus, state support is available for full-time students under twenty-one years of age only. For support of the part-time student and the student twenty-one years of age or older, either a different tuition schedule must be used or these students must be supported by local levies. For capital construction, the total cost must be borne by the local district or from federal or private sources.

With the passage of the 1965 law and the popularity of community colleges in neighboring areas, a gradual but healthy growth of the movement is expected in the state. In addition to the three areas which already have colleges, several other communities are exploring the possibilities of community colleges for their areas.

Historically, Miles Community College, formerly Custer County Junior College, was established in 1939 in Miles City to become the first junior college in the state. It began operations in a high school building, moved to interim facilities in 1957, and occupied a new campus in June 1967. In addition to transfer programs, one and two-year programs in the secretarial area are offered. The college enrolled 295 students during fall quarter, 1967.

Dawson College, formerly Dawson County Junior College, was established in 1940, using high school facilities. It occupied a new campus in February 1967. In addition to a transfer program, the college offers occupational programs in accounting, marketing, office secretarial, and civil technology. Enrollment in the fall of 1967 was 400.

Flathead Valley Community College was authorized by the Montana State Board of Education on April 11, 1967, and began operations the following September. Its opening day enrollment of 611 is expected to grow to 810 in 1968 and 1,300 in ten years. The college offers transfer education, occupational education, and community service. In the occupational area, F.V.C.C. began with programs in

executive secretarial, auto mechanics, forest technology, welding, carpentry, and plumbing, with additional programs planned for the 1968-69 year. Currently operating out of temporary facilities, the college holds classes in thirteen different locations in the Flathead Valley. The college is undertaking a long-range planning program, with site evaluation underway and expects to occupy new facilities within five to seven years.

The 1967 session of the Montana State Legislature authorized a study of the total vocational educational needs of the state. This study is currently being conducted and it is hoped that the final report will reflect the value of the community college in occupational education.

Of the fifty-six counties in the state, twenty meet the minimum student enrollment criteria for the establishment of community colleges as set forth in the statutes. Although Montana remains one of the last frontiers of the nation, with its wide open spaces, rolling farmlands, rugged mountains, and a sportsman's delight in hunting and fishing, it, too, will experience a healthy growth of community colleges along with the rest of the nation. In the near future a significant portion of 's population will be within commuting range of a community college.

Montana Revisited

Since the publication of the original article on community colleges in the state of Montana one year ago, little has happened to change the situation in that state.

Due to legislative action by the 1969 Montana State Legislature, the maintenance-and-operation budget capabilities of community colleges has been improved due to a change in the method of calculation of the "average number belonging (A.N.B.)." This calculation is now performed by dividing the total number of student credit hours per year by a factor of thirty to determine the A.N.B. Thus, contrary to the former method, part-time students are eligible for state reimbursement. State funds are

still not available for students over twenty-one years of age.

The state legislature also requested that the Montana Association of Community Colleges propose a completely new method of financing to the 1971 session, to take community colleges completely out of the Public School Foundation Program.

Concerning additional community colleges—although several cities continue to explore the possibilities for community colleges—no additional ones have been voted into existence.

Larry J. Blake

A New Law for Colorado

By George Hodson and Allan P. Crawford

In May 1967 the State of Colorado took a dramatic educational step when Governor John Love signed into law the Community College and Occupational Education Act of 1967. This new law, which was given high priority by the governor and was the result of recommendations made by the Colorado Commission on Higher Education, became effective July 1 of that year. With the new law came vital and far-reaching changes for the state's community college system—changes in methods of control, methods of financing, and methods of forming new colleges.

216

Fundamental to these changes was the formation of a new state board—the Colorado Board for Community Colleges and Occupational Education. This new board, in addition to being responsible for the state's vocational and technical education, took over the nine existing junior college districts. It also assumed control of the two new community colleges authorized by the recent General Assembly, as well as all community colleges to be established in the future by the General Assembly. The legislature charged this new board to develop "a system of two-year colleges conducting occupational, technical, and community service programs, with no term limitations, and general education, including college transfer programs, with unrestricted admissions . . . in conformity with the plan for the development of higher education in the state. . . ."

The legislature implemented its desires by giving to the new board control of all financing, both of operation and of capital construction, of the junior and community colleges and of any others established by the general assembly in the future.

Colorado's then existing nine community junior colleges had the option to elect to join the state system, or to continue to operate substantially as they were doing. Lamar Junior College, Otero Junior College, and Trinidad State Junior College became state-system junior colleges effective July 1, 1967. The Community College of Denver opened its first campus fall 1968 (two more are planned for 1969 and 1970) within the state system; El Paso Community College will open fall 1969 under similar auspices, making a total of five institutions within the state system.

Arapahoe Junior College, Mesa College, Northeastern Junior College, and Rangely College decided to retain their independent status, with local governing boards, a large degree of autonomy, and continued dependence on local property taxes representing from one-fourth to one-third of their support. They were joined by two new independent colleges starting fall 1968: Aims College and Colorado Mountain College, for a total of six district-based institutions.

Inducements to Join

However, there are some sizable inducements to encourage district colleges to join the state system. These include the state assuming that portion of their operational and capital costs now provided by local taxes and their outstanding general obligation bonded indebtedness, if any. In return, they will come under more direct control of the state board, and would lose their districts because there are no district identifications in the state system.

Existing junior college district boards may petition the state board to join the system at any time, and the state board must honor the petition. If, at the end of five years, the board of a junior college district has not petitioned to join the new state system, the qualified electors of the district may petition the junior college district board to force them to petition the state board for admission to the state system.

When Lamar, Otero, and Trinidad boards held public elections as part of the prescribed dissolution plan, the votes in each case were overwhelmingly in favor of their joining the state system. Local sentiment was obviously for getting rid of the millage hitherto collected by the college districts.

The nine members of the Colorado Board for Community Colleges and Occupational Education are appointed by the governor: two from each of the state's four congressional districts and one member from the state-at-large. No more than five of these appointees may be from any one political party. The law further states that the board shall have one member representing agriculture, one representing labor organizations, and one representing business. The members serve six-year staggered terms. The board appoints a director of community colleges, a director of occupational education, and a secretary to the board. These individuals in turn appoint their own staffs. The organization thus established assumes the functions previously performed by the Division of Education Beyond the High School, which was a part of the Colorado Department of Education. It also, through its Division of Occupational Education, assumes the duties hitherto performed by the State Board for Vocational Education.

State and Local Board Duties

Duties of the state board consist of recommending locations and priorities for establishment of new community colleges, providing facilities for the community colleges, and determining redemption of indebtedness obligated by junior college districts joining the state system community colleges. Other duties include: approving the appointment of the chief administrative officer of each of the community colleges, recommending and reviewing proposals for new and changing curriculums, defining requirements of appropriate degrees, and developing liaison with senior colleges for transfer work. In addition, it is a responsibility of the state board to review and approve operating and capital budgets, plan alloca-

tion of federal funds, determine policies generally pertaining to the community colleges, and provide both state system and district colleges with such technical assistance as they request.

The new law also called for each state system college to have a local board, called the college council, whose duties are to recommend the election of the chief administrative officer, the annual budget, and curriculum changes and services; to confirm appointments of the professional staff as recommended by the administration; to review capital construction programs; and generally, to advise and recommend to the administration on any areas of management deemed advisable by the state board.

The elected members of the existing boards of the colleges which joined the state system were appointed by the governor to assure a smooth transition. In practice, they are functioning in much the same way as they did before, with a considerable measure of delegated autonomy.

The Colorado Commission on Higher Education continues to act as the general coordinative agency for the community and technical colleges and for the other segments of public higher education in the state. This commission has final jurisdiction over operational and capital budget requests to the general assembly and must approve of new degree curriculums for community colleges, as well as for the other institutions of higher education.

Some Problems

Although the new law represents farsighted and imaginative junior college legislation, there are, of course, some problems. One is the difficulty of defining the roles of the Colorado Commission on Higher Education, the State Board with its community college and vocational divisions, the two kinds of community junior colleges, and their relationship to each other.

Another is posed by financing. In Colorado, as in other states, community colleges find themselves in fierce competition for an inadequate supply of con-

struction dollars. Should these go to state or to district junior colleges? Are the needs of the Denver metropolitan area more compelling than those of less populated areas?

Operational budgeting also presents numerous difficulties. The new law plainly indicates that district colleges should continue to exist, so long as they so desire, side-by-side with state-system colleges. Yet the state support of district colleges have been pegged for the past five years at \$500 per F.T.E. student, with the legislature showing little interest in raising the amount. In the face of mounting costs on the one hand, and taxpayer resistance to mill levies, and stationary F.T.E. support on the other, district colleges may not be able to survive much longer outside the state system.

Future Expectations

However, after two years of operation under the new law, the members of the Colorado Association of Community Junior College Presidents expressed themselves in a policy statement as being generally satisfied with the new regime. They have, through this association, worked together harmoniously and avoided the tendency to become segregated into two camps, one "state system" and the other "district."

Although it is still technically possible to start a new community college unilaterally through local or legislative effort, it is unlikely that this will ever happen again. The expectation and hope is that any new institutions will be developed as a result of joint statewide planning by the Commission on Higher Education and the State Board for Community Colleges.

Although the junior college movement in Colorado dates from 1925, its development has been comparatively slow until recently. However, some excellent new buildings have extended the campuses of Lamar, Mesa, Northeastern, and Otero; the first temporary campus of the Community College of Denver will be shortly joined by two others which, with Arapahoe,

will mean a total of four in the Denver metropolitan area.

Having joined that small group of states which have separate state-level agencies for their community junior colleges, Colorado can hope soon to place a two-year institution within commuting distance of the vast majority of its citizens.

Fifty-One Years in Kansas

By Carl L. Heinrich

222

The Kansas junior college movement dates back to 1917 when the legislature passed the first enabling act for junior colleges. The law, with only slight modification, remained in the statutes of our state until its repeal in 1965. The original act was permissive in nature, authorizing boards of education of first- and second-class cities or community high schools to extend, by a vote of the people at a general or special election, the high school course of study to include grades thirteen and fourteen. Although the term "junior college" was never part of the law, "high school extension" was not used except in matters of legal reference, and the title of junior college was commonly applied in educational reference.

The 1917 law further provided that boards of education could levy a tax not to exceed two mills on the assessed valuation of the district to maintain the extension courses either wholly or in part. This was later changed to allow a five-mill levy in second-class cities and to limit first-class cities to a one and one-half-mill levy. It also provided that the State Board of Education prescribe the course of study for the extension programs. The course of study in the first and second year was to be approximately equivalent to the first two years of an accredited college.

After the official opening of four initial institutions between 1917 and 1919, twelve additional colleges were established during the period 1920-1938. This group of colleges, excluding two which lasted only a short time, provided the vanguard of such colleges in Kansas, and no new ones were established for more than twenty-five years.

Legislative Council Report

During these years of junior college development, Kansas has been involved in studies designed to determine the function of all colleges and universities and to improve the state's total higher educational system. The most significant study in terms of the junior college movement was the Kansas legislative council report on community junior colleges published in 1964. This study provided the foundation for the 1965 law and the report includes the following major points:

A state system of community junior colleges can be expected to:

Place at least two years of post-high school educational opportunities within commuting distance of the homes of all youth in the state.

Provide a curriculum responsive to community needs that will include academic and preprofessional college-level freshmen and sophomore courses, adult general education terminal and noncredit courses, and vocational or technical courses for students who will be seeking early employment.

Reduce the pressure of the enrollment explosion on the university and college campuses.

Reduce the cost of college attendance both to the students and to the state.

Offer high quality education; that is, community-oriented.

Raise, for more Kansas youth, the generally accepted goal of high school graduation to junior college graduation.

Provide opportunities for adults who want job retraining, a broader educational background, or to develop specialized skills and talents.

Establish a framework for community junior colleges in the state to operate more efficiently and effectively; and provide for orderly transition of existing junior colleges into the new system.

1965 Act

In line with many of the recommendations set forth in the 1964 legislative council study, the Kansas legislature during the 1965 regular session passed the community junior college act.

This law generally established a state system of public community junior colleges with the following

significant provisions:

1. The state superintendent of public instruction was designated the state authority for community junior colleges.

2. There was established an Advisory Council for Community Junior Colleges representative of the State Board of Regents, State Board for Vocational Education, state and private colleges and universities, community junior colleges, secondary schools, labor, professions, agriculture, business, and industry.

3. Junior colleges were changed from high school extension to provide separate boards of control, faculties, facilities, and administration.

4. The law provided for the expansion of community junior college taxing districts.

5. It authorized additional state aid and other revenues including out-district tuition paid by counties not in community junior college districts, but having students enrolled in such colleges, and student tuition for both in-state and out-of-state students.

6. It stipulated that a state plan for community junior colleges be developed specifying a philosophy which would include the role and function as well as procedures for the future development and establishment of new community junior colleges in Kansas.

Subsequently, all existing junior colleges have been reorganized under the new state system and two new colleges have been established making a total of nineteen public community junior colleges in the state.

Accomplishments Since 1965

The State Plan: The first state plan for community junior colleges developed by the newly organized advisory council was submitted and approved by the state superintendent of public instruction on March 11, 1966, with the following comments:

The State Plan is hereby approved subject to further study by the Advisory Council for Community Junior Colleges and the State Superintendent of Public Instruction. As additional information becomes available, com-

munity junior college areas will be developed together with standards, criteria, and policies governing the approval, establishment, operation, and development of community junior colleges in Kansas. These will be incorporated in the State Plan.

The preamble of the plan is the key to the function of the community junior colleges, and it states:

The purpose of the State Plan is to develop a uniform system of superior public community junior colleges integrated into the overall educational program of the State of Kansas. The plan seeks to provide post-high school education through a minimum number of institutions within reasonable commuting distance to every potential student in Kansas. Such community junior colleges shall be institutions of higher education, as differentiated from high school extension, and shall (a) have qualified, separate faculties of their own; (b) have adequate, separate facilities of their own; (c) offer comprehensive, diversified programs of studies; and (d) be available to all students who want, need, and can benefit from such programs.

Thus, the main responsibilities of the community junior colleges as specified in the plan are to take the institution to the student and to provide comprehensive, diversified programs of studies which include not only academic or general education, but vocational-technical and adult educational programs for the people of their service area.

The state plan further outlines the procedures for the establishment of new institutions. This process involves a comprehensive study to determine the need which generally requires the answers to three major questions:

1. Are the potential students available in the area?
2. Is there an adequate financial base to operate the institution?
3. Is there evidence that existing post-high school educational institutions are not now meeting the total educational needs of the community?

Thus, the community junior college was not established to compete with other post-high school educational institutions, but to complement them and the total higher educational system of Kansas.

New Institutions: Since 1965, two community junior colleges have been established under the procedures as outlined by law and set forth in the state plan. These new institutions are Johnson County Community Junior College and Seward County Community Junior College.

Separation from High School Extension: All existing community junior colleges organized prior to 1965 are now completely separate from high school extension, having elected their own boards of trustees who in turn have hired presidents. All have expanded their taxing districts to include one county except two which each share equally one county. Thus, we have seventeen county community junior colleges and two with one-half county districts.

Facilities: To date, twelve community junior college districts have passed bond elections for purposes of constructing complete new campuses. Six such campuses are now completed (Butler County C.J.C., El Dorado; Colby C.J.C.; Fort Scott C.J.C.; Cloud County C.J.C., Concordia; Neosho County C.J.C., Chanute; and Pratt C.J.C.). Four new campuses are now under construction and will be completed by September 1969 or early 1970. These colleges include: Allen County C.J.C., Iola; Barton County C.J.C., Great Bend; Dodge City C.J.C.; and Garden City C.J.C. Two colleges, Independence C.J.C. and Kansas City, Kansas C.J.C., plan to begin construction within the next year. Three additional community junior colleges have added or are adding new facilities to their present campuses. These include: Highland C.J.C.; Hutchinson C.J.C.; and Coffeyville C.J.C.

Finances: Operational revenues for community junior colleges are obtained from four major sources. These include local *ad valorem* tax, state aid, out-district tuition, and student tuition. A fifth source comes from federal aid. Last year, 1967-68, the percentage of each source in relation to the total was approximately 20 per cent state aid, 3 per cent federal aid, 13 per cent student tuition, 19 per cent

out-district tuition, with the remainder being provided by local property tax.

Unburdening Taxpayers

In 1967-68 the state provided aid of \$5.50 per Kansas resident credit hour, a total state contribution of approximately \$1.4 million for operation. During the 1968 Legislative Session, in Senate Bill 479, this was increased to \$8.00 per credit hour. This will probably increase the state aid contribution by some 6 to 8 per cent. However, as recommended by the Legislative Council Study of Community Junior Colleges, published in 1964, 50 per cent of the operational costs should be borne by the state, 40 per cent by the local district, and 10 per cent by the student, taking a major portion of the load from the local property taxpayer.

Curriculum: Kansas junior colleges have, since their inception, accepted the responsibility of offering comprehensive programs. These colleges provided not only the liberal arts curriculums, but also some vocational-technical programs. A survey in 1936 found that the following vocational programs were being offered: accounting, salesmanship and advertising, office practice, machine shop, auto mechanics, carpentry, printing, costume design, clothing, foods, and general business including secretarial courses, to name a few.

From the early 1950's to the present, the community junior colleges have offered over sixty-five different vocational-technical programs. In 1966-67 over 1,300 students were enrolled in vocational offerings—approximately 15 per cent of the total enrollment of all community junior colleges. Enrollment in these types of offerings increased 24 per cent in 1967-68.

Plans for the Future

Probably the two most important issues facing the community junior college movement in Kansas are finances and the role and function of these colleges in relation to the existing system of area voca-

tional-technical schools.

In order to broaden the tax base of our institutions, and in complying with the 1965 community junior college act, Murle M. Hayden, state superintendent of public instruction, has proposed that the state be divided into not more than twenty-two taxing areas or districts for the purpose of establishing a property tax base for community junior colleges and area vocational-technical schools.

Under the area vocational-technical school law, we have one community junior college that has been designated as an area vocational-technical school (Cowley County); two colleges participating under the Type II plan in area vocational-technical schools (Hutchinson and Coffeyville Community Junior Colleges); a community junior college offering programs for the area vocational-technical school but with a separate board of control from the community junior college (Dodge City C.J.C.); and other community junior colleges offering vocational-technical education not related to the area vocational-technical school system.

It is imperative that we determine the roles of these two types of institutions, simplifying, if possible, the financial and administrative organization, thus eliminating unnecessary duplication both at the state and local levels.

Minor Revisions Needed

Other minor revisions should be made in the law such as: repealing the section that requires the community junior college name to be that of the county or city where located; an amendment to allow the State Board of Education to determine the minimum qualifications for junior college instructors; a possible revision of the law concerning out-of-state and foreign student tuition, hopefully to allow the State Board of Education to set this tuition for community junior colleges instead of using actual full-time equivalent student costs which have to be computed each year.

In summary, the Kansas community junior col-

leges are committed to meet the present and future educational and training needs of the people in their communities. They are accomplishing their goal by providing comprehensive programs at a minimal cost to the student, so that all who desire and can benefit may attend regardless of financial capability.

Oklahoma Looks to 1970

By E. T. Dunlap

Oklahoma is probably unique among the fifty states in that no new public junior colleges have been established since 1919 in spite of the fact that community junior colleges have been opening at the rate of one-a-week nationally in recent years.

Even more surprising is the fact that although enrollments in the public sector of Oklahoma higher education have quadrupled since World War II, the number of public junior colleges in the state has actually declined from twenty-six to eleven during that period.¹

Though anomalous, Oklahoma's junior college situation is at least partially explainable through an examination of its early history and development.

Early Development

Throughout most of its seventy-eight year history, Oklahoma higher education has been characterized by a surplus—not a shortage—of colleges and universities. Even before universal secondary education became a reality in Oklahoma, universal higher education was available through a diversified system of colleges and universities. Prior to 1907, the year that Oklahoma became a state, a dozen public and private institutions were already functioning in what were then Oklahoma and Indian territories. By 1911, four years after statehood, nineteen public and six private institutions were in operation. So dispersed was the opportunity for higher education that a farmer could gaze on the horizon and come as near to seeing a college as a tree.

The 1920's and 30's saw even further extension of college opportunity with the creation of nearly two dozen junior colleges, enabling legislation which permitted local school districts to establish the thirteenth and fourteenth grades of post-secondary education in conjunction with their high school programs. By 1939, there were nineteen of these one- and two-year junior college programs in operation, as well as seven state-supported junior colleges and three private institutions, making a total of twenty-nine.

Today Oklahoma can boast of thirty-five colleges and universities, made up of eighteen state-supported institutions, five community junior colleges, and twelve private and church-related colleges and universities. This number of institutions places Oklahoma fifteenth among the fifty states in the ratio of total institutions to population, with one college for each 70,000 citizens. With regard to institutions of public support, Oklahoma ranks even higher, standing seventh in the nation in the ratio of state-supported institutions to population. This year 4 per cent of Oklahoma's population is enrolled in higher education, as compared with a figure of approximately 3.5 per cent for the nation as a whole.

Junior College Picture

Because Oklahoma's citizens have had easy access to higher education opportunity since statehood and because the state's population has been relatively stable over the past two decades, the junior college movement has not gained the momentum observable in other states, notably California, Florida, Texas, Illinois, and New York. At present, five state-supported junior colleges are in operation, and these institutions enroll the bulk of students attending two-year colleges. Also, five community junior colleges (formerly municipal) are operated by local school districts but are jointly financed by state and local jurisdictions.

Thus, there is a dual system of public junior colleges in Oklahoma—one fully state-supported and

controlled, the other controlled at the local level but practically financed and coordinated at the state level. In addition to the public junior colleges, there are four private, church-related colleges, controlled and supported by various religious denominations.

The 10,666 students enrolled in Oklahoma two-year institutions in the fall of 1968 plus the 3,617 students enrolled in two-year programs operated by one of the state universities make a combined total of 14,283 students enrolled in two-year programs of post-high school education in Oklahoma. That number amounts to about 14 per cent of the total enrollment in Oklahoma higher education.

Oklahoma did not consciously set about to create a junior college system of state-supported and state-controlled institutions. Instead, most of the present state junior colleges were initially established as preparatory schools for either the state university or the state land-grant institution. Subsequently, however, when the need for preparatory schools subsided, the system of existing secondary schools became state junior colleges and four-year institutions. Only one institution, Oklahoma Military Academy, still enrolls high school students in connection with the junior college program.

The state-supported junior college in Oklahoma differs from the typical two-year college over the nation in at least two respects. First, the typical two-year college is located in a rural area and is state-controlled. A second distinguishing feature of the typical American junior college is its dedication to the dual function of general and preprofessional education on the one hand, and terminal-vocational training on the other. In Oklahoma, the college parallel program has traditionally overshadowed the technical-vocational program to a degree greater than the national average.

The laws of Oklahoma provide authorization for the establishment and operation of community junior colleges in accordance with criteria and standards, rules and regulations prescribed by the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education. The

governing body or bodies of one or more cities, counties, towns, and/or school districts proposing the establishment of a community junior college may file a petition for the state regents; if a feasibility study conducted by the state regents determines that there is a need in the proposing district for a community junior college, the state regents will issue a proclamation calling an election to be held in the community. If a majority of the legal voters residing in the community vote in favor of establishing the junior college, the state regents will then issue an order authorizing the establishment of the institution, designating the name by which it shall be known and describing the boundaries of the community junior college area. Community junior colleges established under this legislation are eligible to receive state funds for both current operations and for capital improvements.

Coordination of Two-Year Colleges

The Oklahoma State System of Higher Education was established on March 11, 1941, when the people of the state adopted an amendment to the constitution, Article XIII-A, setting up the state's system. The amendment provides, ". . . all institutions of higher learning supported wholly or in part by direct legislative appropriations shall be integral parts of a unified system to be known as The Oklahoma State Program of Higher Education."² Higher education, as the term is used, is defined ". . . to include all education of any kind beyond or in addition to the twelfth grade or its equivalent as that grade is now generally understood and accepted in the public schools in the state of Oklahoma . . ."³

Coordination with emphasis in the areas of functions and programs of study, standards of education, and finances is provided for at the state level. Responsibility for providing the leadership for this is vested in the coordinating board of control which is the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education. Both the five state-supported junior colleges

and the five community junior colleges come under the coordinative arm of the state regents. Operation and management responsibility for each institution is vested in a governing board of regents.

The amendment to the state constitution, Article XIII-A, in addition to providing for The Oklahoma State System of Higher Education, also provided for the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education as the coordinating board of control of the state system. This board is composed of nine members, appointed by the governor and confirmed by the state senate. They serve nine-year overlapping terms. The constitution provides as follows with regard to the responsibilities of the coordinating board of controls: ⁴

1. It shall prescribe standards of higher education applicable to each institution.

2. It shall determine the functions and courses of study at each of the institutions to conform to the standards prescribed.

3. It shall grant degrees and other forms of academic recognition for completion of the prescribed courses in all such institutions.

4. It shall recommend to the State Legislature the budget allocations for each institution.

5. It shall have the power to recommend to the legislature proposed fees for all of such institutions and any such fees shall be effective only within the limits prescribed by the legislature.

The constitution also provides that the state regents shall allocate funds to each institution "according to its needs and functions" from lump-sum appropriations made by the Oklahoma legislature to the state regents.⁵

With the functions and courses of study of each institution determined, standards of education established, and funds allocated to meet the needs to carry out functions, the governing boards assume the responsibility for operation of the institutions. The governing boards of regents of institutions in the state system: (1) determine management policy; (2) employ personnel, fix their salaries, and assign

their duties; (3) contract for other services needed; (4) have custody of records; (5) acquire and hold title to property; and (6) assume general responsibility for the government of the institutions.

Also, the governing board through its administrative officer assumes responsibility for making recommendations to the coordinating board—the state regents—regarding possible change in functions and programs of study, possible change of standards, and budgetary needs both for general operation and for capital improvements.

Future of Junior Colleges

The year 1970 will be an historic one for the junior college movement in Oklahoma, for that year will see the opening of two new junior colleges in the state. One institution, Midwest City Junior College, will operate as a community junior college under the legislation and criteria previously described. The other, Tulsa Junior College, will be a fully state-supported institution created by the 1968 Oklahoma legislation as an “integral part” of the Oklahoma State System of Higher Education. It is expected that these two institutions, the first to be opened in Oklahoma in more than fifty years, will be the harbingers of a new era in Oklahoma junior college education.

Community College Progress in Virginia

By Fred L. Wellman and Dana B. Hamel

Historically, the Commonwealth of Virginia has been a leader in developments in higher education. The College of William and Mary in Virginia is the second oldest institution of higher education in the United States, and Thomas Jefferson's recommendations for the development of the University of Virginia are well known.

However, Virginia was relatively slow to develop comprehensive community colleges even though there was a great need for additional opportunities in higher education. In 1965, statistics indicated that college enrollments in Virginia were equivalent to only 27 per cent of the college-age group in the state—significantly below both the average for the Southeast and for the nation. Nevertheless, since the passage of the Community College Act in 1966, Virginia is making up for lost time by rapidly developing a state system of comprehensive community colleges that will provide post-high school educational opportunities for high school graduates and adults throughout the state. In less than three years Virginia has developed a community college system that includes thirteen operating institutions with over 16,000 full- and part-time students. The state-wide bond issue which passed in November 1968 will help ensure the development of six additional new community colleges within the next two years.

In the past, Virginia has had a number of public two-year post-high school institutions. However, none of these institutions could be called comprehensive community colleges because they were either two-year branch colleges of state universities or area

vocational-technical schools operated as extensions of local public school programs.

Prior to 1966, Virginia had twelve two-year branch institutions operated by three of the major state universities. Three other state colleges operated two-year technical institutes as a part of their programs. Also, five local public school systems offered post-high school programs in area vocational-technical schools.

The first step toward the development of a comprehensive community college program was initiated by the 1962 Virginia General Assembly which authorized a study to investigate the need for post-high school technical education facilities. As a result of this study, the 1964 General Assembly authorized the establishment of the State Board for Technical Education (and the State Department of Technical Education as its administrative agency) to build and operate a system of technical colleges throughout Virginia. Dana B. Hamel was appointed the first state director of technical education.

In 1965, Northern Virginia Technical College opened as the first institution under this new program of technical colleges. The school is often referred to as the "100-day wonder" as classes began in temporary facilities within 100 days after the employment of the president of the college. Programs were planned, faculty hired, and equipment ordered within this short period. At the same time two additional technical colleges were on the drawing boards—Blue Ridge Technical College in the Shenandoah Valley and John Tyler Technical College in Chesterfield County, south of Richmond.

The 1964 General Assembly also established the Higher Education Study Commission to review all programs of higher education and provide recommendations to the General Assembly on the needs and future development of higher education in the state. One of the key recommendations in the report of this study commission was the development of comprehensive community colleges throughout Virginia.

The 1966 General Assembly, with leadership from Governor Mills E. Godwin, Jr., and acting upon the recommendations of the Higher Education Study Commission, passed legislation to establish a state system of comprehensive community colleges. This legislation changed the State Board for Technical Education and the State Department of Technical Education to the State Board for Community Colleges and the State Department of Community colleges, respectively. It provided (a) for the immediate conversion of the three technical colleges into comprehensive community colleges, (b) for the transfer of seven of the two-year university branch institutions to the community college system at a future date, and (c) for the immediate transfer of the post-high school programs in the five area vocational-technical schools to the new community college program.

Official Operations

238

The Virginia Community College System officially began operations on July 1, 1966, and Dr. Hamel was appointed state director of community colleges by Governor Godwin. During the 1966-67 college year the system served over 7,000 full- and part-time students in two community colleges and the post-high school programs in five area vocational-technical schools. The two colleges were Northern Virginia Community College, formerly a technical college, and Virginia Western Community College in Roanoke, a combination of two former university branch institutions.

During 1967-68, the system served over 12,000 full- and part-time students in eight community colleges and three area vocational-technical schools. The six new community colleges included (1) Blue Ridge Community College in the Shenandoah Valley (which included the post-high school programs in one of the area vocational-technical schools), (2) Central Virginia Community College in Lynchburg (which included a former university branch college), (3) Dabney S. Lancaster Community College

in Clifton Forge (which included a former university branch college), (4) Danville Community College in Danville (which included one of the former area vocational-technical schools and in 1968 absorbed a university branch college), (5) John Tyler Community College in Chesterfield County, and (6) Wytheville Community College in Wytheville (which included a former university branch college).

Fall 1968

By the fall quarter of 1968, the Virginia Community College System consisted of eleven operating community colleges along with post-high school programs in two area vocational-technical schools serving over 16,000 full- and part-time students. The three new colleges included (1) Frederick Community College in Portsmouth (which was formerly a private four-year college), (2) Southwest Virginia Community College near Richlands, and (3) Thomas Nelson Community College in Hampton (which included the post-high school programs in one of the area vocational-technical schools).

A twelfth community college, Virginia Highlands Community College in Abingdon, is expected to open in 1969 and will include the post-high school programs in one of the area vocational-technical schools. Thus, it can be seen that there has been rapid growth in the number of institutions and in the number of students in the Virginia Community College System since its organization less than three years ago.

The 1966 legislation provided for the establishment and maintenance of a statewide system of comprehensive community colleges; the State Board for Community Colleges was organized with the responsibility for the establishment, control, and administration of all comprehensive community colleges in Virginia. Local community college boards were authorized to act in an advisory capacity to this state board and to perform such duties with respect to the operation of a single comprehensive community college as may be delegated to it by the state board. The State Department of Community

Colleges was established under the control of this state board as its administrative agency. The legislation provided for the appointment of a state director of community colleges who serves as the chief executive officer of the Virginia Community College System and Department of Community Colleges in addition to serving as the secretary to the State Board for Community Colleges.

The State Board for Community Colleges consists of fifteen members appointed by the governor. It is the governing board for each of the community colleges in the system. This state board has the responsibility of preparing and administering a plan providing standards and policies for the community colleges. It has the authority to control and expend funds appropriated by law and to fix tuition fees and charges. Additionally, it has the responsibility of establishing and maintaining standards in all curriculums and has the right to confer diplomas, certificates, and associate degrees.

The state board also is responsible for creating a local community college board for each institution and for establishing the procedures and regulations under which such local boards shall operate. During the first two years, only advisory responsibilities were delegated to these local boards; however, as a result of the recommendations of an *ad hoc* state-wide Local-State Articulation Advisory Committee, additional responsibilities were delegated to the local boards in October 1968. The local community college boards now have both advisory responsibilities and certain operating responsibilities as delegated by the state board.

The State Board for Community Colleges adheres to the policies of the State Council of Higher Education which has the responsibility for the coordination of higher education in the state. The community colleges have been included in the activities and recommendations of the state council and have been involved in the various committees of the state council as they take their place among the institutions of higher education in Virginia.

The legislation also states that any institution of higher learning which conducts extension programs shall not offer courses of study similar to those offered in an area by a community college except as authorized by the State Council of Higher Education. Also, whenever practicable, the community colleges shall provide facilities for such institutions of higher learning to conduct extension programs not in conflict with the programs offered by the community college.

Master Plan

Numerous consultants have been utilized for the development of various phases of the community college program in Virginia. Most importantly, with the aid of consultants, a master plan for community college education in Virginia was developed. This master plan recommends that the state be divided into twenty-two community college regions. Several of these regions are expected to have two or more campuses because of being either high-density urban regions with heavy concentrations of prospective students or low-density rural regions where long distances dictate a second campus. Each region is designed so that it normally has a minimum of 100,000 population and 1,000 high school graduates annually; the community college campuses are being located so that practically every Virginia resident will be within commuting distance (thirty to forty-five miles) of a community college campus. The master plan indicates that a total of 102,000 students (32,000 full-time and 70,000 part-time) will be served in Virginia within five years after all facilities are available.

Political Subdivisions

Each region generally includes three or more political subdivisions (cities and/or counties). These political subdivisions are responsible for providing (1) the site for the community college, (2) any needed local funds for site development and special projects, and (3) appointment of the members of

the local community college board. Previously, the State Board for Community Colleges appointed the members of the local advisory board upon recommendation from the political subdivisions; however, the State Board now has delegated to the political subdivisions the responsibility for directly appointing the members of the local boards.

The State Board for Community Colleges has generally followed the recommendations of the consultants regarding the designation of the regions (political subdivisions) for each new community college and for the location of the community college sites within the region. Prior to fall 1968, the state board had designated sites in twelve of the twenty-two regions. With the passage of the state bond issue in November 1968, the State Board for Community Colleges is presently in the process of designating sites in most of the remaining regions. Several regions are still under study, and selection of sites in these regions will be delayed until the studies are completed.

The state will provide the initial basic instructional facilities (classrooms, laboratories, shops, temporary student center, temporary library, and basic administrative offices) in each region before providing expansion funds in those regions where student demands exceed the initial facilities.

The basic financial support for the community colleges in Virginia comes from the state legislature. The state provides all of the basic funds for maintenance and operations and for capital outlay including buildings and equipment. Student tuition for Virginia residents is \$45 per quarter or \$135 per academic year. No local funds are required for basic maintenance and operations, nor for buildings and equipment.

The local political subdivisions must provide the funds for the site and for site development including roadways, parking lots, outdoor lighting, and landscaping; these are the only required funds. However, most of the local political subdivisions also

provide some local funds under state guidelines for community service programs, student scholarships, local board activities, and other special projects. In some cases the local political subdivisions have provided funds for additional capital outlay projects to supplement the basic facilities provided by the state.

Current operating expenditures for the comprehensive program vary from approximately \$900 to \$1,200 per full-time equivalent student depending upon the size of the college and the types of programs offered. This includes approximately \$100 for the addition and replacement of instructional equipment and library materials although funds for the initial outlay for instructional equipment and library books are provided in the original capital outlay projections. The present capital outlay formula provides approximately \$2,000 for building construction and \$1,000 for equipment for each projected full-time student. The allotment for equipment was developed because of the numerous occupational-technical programs offered in the colleges.

Programs

The community colleges in Virginia are designed initially with comprehensive programs; facilities are constructed so that an appropriate balance is available to serve the following programs:

1. Occupational-technical education
2. University parallel-college transfer education
3. General education
4. Continuing and adult education
5. Foundation-development (remedial) programs
6. Special training programs for new and expanding industries
7. Noncredit community service programs for citizens in the region.

A strong guidance and counseling program is also developed in each of the colleges. Although facilities for student activities are limited during the initial stages of operation, most of the colleges are establishing various types of student activity programs with many of these programs utilizing facilities in the community.

Each occupational-technical program is usually developed only after a local citizens' advisory committee works with the college administration to provide appropriate recommendations for the program. All curriculums must be approved by the local board and the State Board for Community Colleges, while all associate degree programs must be approved also by the State Council of Higher Education. Special efforts are being made to provide appropriate articulation and coordination of the college transfer programs with the other state-controlled institutions of higher education in Virginia.

Although many community colleges in the nation emphasize the college transfer programs, the community colleges in Virginia are striving for and achieving a good balance on enrollments in the various programs. Approximately 50 per cent of the students are in occupational-technical programs; many of the students are taking one or more foundation or developmental courses.

Progress is also being made towards full accreditation for the colleges. The first college, Northern Virginia Community College, just recently received full accreditation from the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. Five additional colleges have the status of "recognized candidates for accreditation," and others hold "correspondence" status with the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools.

A Director's Advisory Council of Presidents has been organized which brings together in monthly meetings the chief administrator of each college, the state director, and the staff of the State Department of Community Colleges. In addition, various system-wide *ad hoc* committees meet on special projects, and system-wide workshops are held by the department for various college staff members periodically. During the 1968-69 college year special *ad hoc* statewide advisory committees will be working on numerous topics including (a) academic freedom and tenure, (b) student-orientation programs, (c) the foundation and developmental (remedial)

programs, (d) personnel staffing formulas, and (e) development of state guides for curriculums, student handbooks, faculty handbooks, and catalogs.

Conclusion

Progress has been made in the development of a comprehensive community college program to serve the citizens of Virginia. The community colleges already in operation are making plans for the expansion of their facilities and programs. New community colleges are on the drawing boards and will be opening within the next few years. Local community college boards have been delegated more responsibilities, and these boards are rapidly taking a full role in the development and operation of the program.

Well-qualified staff and faculty are being recruited from throughout the nation; other institutions are accepting the community colleges as partners in higher education; the governor, state legislature, and citizens are providing tremendous support for the program. And most important of all, students are coming to the community colleges in large numbers, achieving success in their studies, and moving into good-paying jobs or transferring to senior colleges. The community college program most definitely has achieved great success in Virginia.

The Community College in Connecticut

By Shafeek Nader

246

The 1965 Connecticut General Assembly, on the eve of its political reapportionment of districts which was later to shift the balance of power from the rural areas to the urban centers, passed an act which included provision for establishing community colleges. This laid the legal basis for state-governed regional community colleges within a new coordinated system of governmental higher educational institutions. The fact that top legislative priority was given to community colleges reflected the deep-seated conviction that education was the first line of defense for the rural towns that controlled the legislature under the old reapportionment; this "lame duck" session of the legislature firmly announced that continuing and further education and learning for every individual must be insured for all communities no matter how small or remote from the urban centers of new political power.

There is need to draw with broad stroke the basic elements of the past socioeconomic forces in and around Connecticut if one is to understand present behavior in regards to this burgeoning popular organization of societies—the community college. Such an overview, along with recognition of the principal assumptions upon which rest current affairs, helps in better understanding and appreciating the accuracy of predictions of future activity.

The events that gave rise to this pronounced policy of publicly supported, open-door, comprehensive community colleges in Connecticut were the natural results of long-existing common urges that rose and ebbed with the generations, but were ever advancing

and gaining strength. The seeds of these colleges go back to the origins of the colony that was to become the State of Connecticut—to the first base of common purposes and goals, of traditions and folkways.

The white settlers who obtained the charter from the English king to take and colonize the lands of Connecticut came for the purpose of freedom of expression and of equalizing and maximizing individual opportunity; they formulated the Fundamental Orders, the basic laws of the society that gave expression to equality, participatory democracy, and the open-door social order. The main characteristic of the social order was democratic; the people ruled themselves by town meetings with representatives from the town units constituting the Connecticut General Assembly, thus creating a circular authority/power structure that eventually and slowly became aristocratic in reality though continuing to hold high the democratic ideals. The nature of the terrain nurtured self-reliance and cooperative effort, but in the operation of social institutions the mode evolved towards centralism and patrician authority.

Exploration behind them and having settled in the land, the Connecticut inhabitants developed a patrician class that easily evolved into an aristocratic "standing order." This was a natural outcome of the relations with the aristocratic establishment of the mother country and sister colonies. With the ascendancy of this group and its control over the government and economic process, the democratic reality faded. Institutions, including those of education, were pressed into the service of nourishing the self-renewal and perpetuation of this class. The history of Connecticut is the history of the communities attempting to regain their democratic configuration and power—to put back the balance in the community. The struggle has never ceased. In the educational scene it has produced many firsts. The founding and establishing of two-year colleges within the communities for all desiring to attend represents the latest and a most important triumph of the popular forces for the "open society" over very cohesive

forces working for the "closed society."

It is important to understand how these colleges were founded; what the nature of the forces were within and without the state that promoted citizen awareness; how individuals in the communities prodded the "educators" who in turn worked together in leading the communities to prod the legislature; how a special agency of the legislature commissioned by an agreement a comprehensive study by the U.S. Office of Education; the dynamics of political discussions; the continuing legislative planning and persistence of community leadership and work in the face of obstacles and reversals from the open-door philosophy of the comprehensive community college.

Traditionally, those young graduates from the secondary schools of Connecticut who could and wanted to pursue their learning further looked to and enrolled in the state universities and colleges of the Midwest—Iowa, Michigan, Illinois, and Ohio. Traditionally, the well-to-do attended the several church-supported or related institutions in Connecticut or in the New England region in general. It was tradition that some of the financially disadvantaged would be given scholarships to these "private" universities or colleges if qualified and considered a good risk to succeed.

During the last century, the weight of the economy in Connecticut shifted early from agriculture to goods-producing industry where the hands-on skills were highly prized all the more; thus, there developed another tradition that expected the common folk to acquire a skill by apprenticeship or trade school while the "standing order" sent its young to the private institutions for further education. The rapidly developing frontier in the West attracted many of the Connecticut young who found no room for growth in their home state; their stock in trade being their manual skills in industry or agriculture, they were in demand consistently. Benjamin Franklin recognized this need early by establishing technical institutions in Boston and Philadelphia; he

predicted a chronic shortage of skills for many generations to come.

While all sorts of institutions of education and learning were being founded and established through the political structure in the rapidly mushrooming societies in the West, these same types of institutions in Connecticut found their development and nourishment and, therefore, control through the private sector. As long as the West was available for the aspiring young adults, there was no need to establish government institutions of education beyond the primary at first, and then the secondary levels.

However, beginning with the end of World War II, the Midwestern institutions began to fill to capacity from their own population and to slowly close their doors. The returning servicemen in Connecticut, under the G.I. Bill of Rights, swelled the University of Connecticut and its branches; the four state teachers colleges, which established two-year associate degree programs within them; the state technical institutes; and the private institutions. It was at this point that a strong trend to acquire post-secondary education was started, never to diminish but always to increase on an ever-widening popular base. It was this experience that gave a large number of individuals diffused throughout the state the idea that access to higher education must and can be made available to all if the individual is to rise on the social and economic ladder. Coupled with the demands of industry, business, government, and the social services for better and more highly skilled individuals, this demand was the nucleus of the ferment.

At first a murmur, then a cry, a shout, now a chorus with ever-increasing volume—the latent educational forces and leadership of the old society joined with the new to fan the demand and provide the facilities for more equal access to further education beyond the high school. Thus, concurrent with the regeneration of the communities led by individuals more attuned to the needs of new environment, the political forces were being prodded for more action.

The community college movement in Connecticut started with the founding of five independent community institutions of higher education: Hillyer College in 1879, which in 1957 was incorporated into the University of Hartford; the Junior College of Connecticut, which in 1948 became a component founding part of the University of Bridgeport; New Haven College in 1926; Mitchell College, organized as New London Junior College, in 1938; and Quinipiac College, formerly Connecticut College of Commerce, in 1935.

In 1955, 1957, and 1959, citizens of Norwalk introduced bills in the State General Assembly to permit local town boards of education to have town tax-supported junior colleges. In 1959, enabling legislation was enacted. Section 10-38a of the General Statutes required approval by local voters in a referendum. No state funds were provided in support. Two years later, additional permissive legislation was extended to "regions" or groups of towns having a contiguous boundary. This effort was devised and promoted by the Northwestern Connecticut public educational force led by the Committee on a Community College for Northwestern Connecticut, Inc., representing a growing and permanent voluntary regional organization of citizens (with statewide influence) in collaboration with the State Department of Education.

Despite the lack of state funds for such colleges, three were licensed: Norwalk in 1961, Manchester in 1963, and Northwestern Connecticut centering at Winsted in 1965.

In 1965, Public Act 330 was passed establishing a state system of higher education including a State Board of Trustees for Regional Community Colleges as the board responsible for public community colleges. As a result, additional public community colleges, state controlled and financed rather than locally controlled, were established by 1968 in Hartford, New Haven, Middletown, Stratford, and Waterbury. The Connecticut Association for Public Community Colleges, a group of citizens and edu-

cators from all over the state, did much to marshal support for this component in the system.

Sequential Steps

In order to evaluate the legislative act, we will look at the steps taken in sequence beginning from 1963. In the 1964 U.S. Office of Education year-long special study of the various aspects, programs, structures, and needs of higher education in Connecticut, authorized by a study commission on higher education by direction of the 1963 State General Assembly, the following recommendation was put forward:

"... it is necessary that the Board of Regents be established by the Constitution of the State in such a way that its responsibility and authority are clear, complete, and conducive to the development of a quality system of higher education.

Their (the people) higher education is far too important to be left to the mercy of ever-changing political groups. Proper education requires careful planning, both long range and immediate, and it should be done by a stable group of well-qualified nonpartisan individuals.

This Board of Regents must be freed from political pressure and control to the greatest extent possible. It is necessary then . . . that it have general supervision of the State System of Higher Education and the direction and control of all expenditures from the fund and/or funds of the components parts."¹

Thus having sensed the brooding presence of a powerful political machine ready to intrude for purposes of directly influencing the control and operation of institutions of higher education, affecting adversely their nature, the study group made such a recommendation. This recommendation failed to receive the approval of the legislative study commission. What was not taken into account by concerned citizens was the extent of the strong patronage interest of the political organization in power resulting in a compulsion to so intrude. The entrenched state university, college, and technical institute systems succeeded in retaining their organizational integrity and autonomy. Public Act 597 of the 1967 General Assembly that established a Board of Trustees of State Technical Colleges renamed the technical institutes as technical colleges. The emerg-

ing community colleges, then under the control of local towns, were brought into a new state system without the benefit of a statewide institutional organization born of common experiences. Being new and without sponsorship by a constituency, it was quickly subjected, according to public statements made by its critics, to political patronage and the concomitant disadvantages of overcentralized control which caused the resignation of the first vice-chairman of the Board of Trustees for Regional Community Colleges—a citizen/lawyer from Norwalk who was a prime founding member of Norwalk Community College.

Northwestern Connecticut Community College was the first of three charter members to negotiate a place in the state system, and until recently, the only one with its own physical facilities allowing a full daytime program. The other two are Norwalk Community College and Manchester Community College.

A Commission for Higher Education was mandated by the same 1965 act as amended by Public Act 751 (1967) of the Connecticut Legislature with sixteen members, twelve appointed by the governor with the advice and consent of the General Assembly; the remaining four represent the boards of trustees of the constituent units—University of Connecticut, state colleges, regional community colleges, and state technical colleges. This body has coordinating functions and broad powers regarding programs, new facilities, degrees, and evaluation. "Six of the major responsibilities of the commission are: planning and coordinating; improving opportunities in higher education; conducting research; reviewing budgetary proposals; licensing and accrediting collegiate institutions; publishing reports and information." 5

The constituent boards of control in the system, having established manpower, policies, and procedures, are enabled to be in a bargaining position regarding the parent commission; the Board of

Trustees of Regional Community Colleges, not being so established, is in fact a division of the commission. If one is to know where the decisions are really made, the commission is the place to go. Inappropriately placed personnel on the professional staff of the Board of Trustees for Regional Community Colleges have contributed heavily to the imbalances and a disheartenment of the creative urge in the community college system and to its loss of control by default to the commission.

The Commission for Higher Education is mustering its best efforts and the best talent it can acquire to establish order and progress in long- and short-range planning so that the goals set by the legislature, and the public before it, may be met.

A new Connecticut Constitution, approved by the people in December 1965, treated higher education as follows:

“Article Eight—Of Education Sec. 2—The state shall maintain a system of higher education, including the University of Connecticut, which shall be dedicated to excellence in higher education. The general assembly shall determine the size, number, terms, and method of appointment of the governing boards of the University of Connecticut and of such constituent units or coordinating bodies in the system as from time to time may be established. Sec. 3—The charter of Yale College, as modified by agreement with the corporation thereof, in pursuance of an act of the general assembly, passed in May 1792, is hereby confirmed. Sec. 4—The fund, called the SCHOOL FUND, shall remain a perpetual fund, the interest of which shall be inviolably appropriated to the support and encouragement of the public schools throughout the state, and for the equal benefit of all the people thereof. . . .

(In 1795 Connecticut Western Reserve lands—now northeastern Ohio—were sold for \$1.2 million with proceeds constituting the School Fund.)*

Believing that the community college should be an organ of—a part of—the local system of people and environment, and not a machine of state government functioning according to plans drawn by men far

* Connecticut State Register & Manual 1968

from the scene of action, citizen groups began then and are continuing to address themselves to this proposition.

At the dedication ceremonies of Northwestern Connecticut Community College, the following statement was made:

We hereby dedicate Northwestern Connecticut Community College to the people of the communities out of which it springs. There emerges a proposition to found an institution that would be a part of the fabric of the people. . . . We have entrusted its welfare to the State of Connecticut. . . . We must decentralize our brainpower and bring higher education into the smaller communities if we want to preserve our ideals of a balance between the giant metropolis and the rest of the nation.⁴

These words expressed the feelings in any part of the state where a community college was felt needed; they present principles deeply imbedded in the minds of large groups of people . . . that is that such colleges are to hold the immediate, practical concerns of the communities served paramount, that the people would have comprehensive involvement, and that in the drive to care for the dire urgencies of the inner city, the smaller communities are not forgotten—therefore ensuring the rural-urban balance in brain-power and educational opportunities necessary for a healthy region.

The citizens asked, "Why cannot the education function have its planning proceed on a regional basis integrated with state master planning and coordinated with the economic regional planning communities and with the State Development Commission? Why cannot the development and operation of any approved plan of higher education be the work of a district specially constituted to provide local control and administration of the community college?"

The present system is, of course, not so constituted. As the writer stated elsewhere, "the regional districts exist for the administrative convenience of the State Central Office force in placing their educational service stations, clearly dispensing the benefits of the state with the mere semblance of assist-

ance and guidance proffered to the State Board of Trustees for Regional Community Colleges by college councils composed of local leaders"; in this way, it becomes easy for the state governing configuration to become the "Great White Father" to the "Indians," the life giver, and the source of all good. This is a handout type of operation and not state service in the best sense; the communities then are not enabled to attempt mastery of their future but must yield muscle-flexing to the experts in central government—the new class of patricians. As an interested Connecticut citizen said: "In the affairs of education . . . all ambitions must bow to reason and not to the results of the exercise of power by partisan politicians engaged in a free-wheeling poker game with the cards marked."

In a study entitled, "Design for Opportunity: A Plan for a State System of Community Colleges in Connecticut," reported in December 1965, Paul Orvis, consultant and former executive dean of the New York Two-Year College and Technical Institute System, showed that "early action and adequate financial support" must be rapid if "to avoid denying thousands of qualified youth educational opportunity." He recommended including technical institutes and other two-year units into the two-year college administrative structure in order "to avoid duplication or competition and to make possible more realistic and effective statewide planning, budgeting, and operation." Orvis used thirteen planning assumptions laying down sound conditions for a comprehensive community college, the last of which is ". . . that both the technical institutes and the university branches will continue, at least temporarily, under their existing administration but that continuing study will be given to the desirability of their eventual inclusion within the state community college system."³

The Orvis report proposed that a total of twelve community colleges in twelve community college geographic regions be established.

The State Board of Trustees for Regional Community Colleges, intending to request the 1969 State Legislature to authorize two new colleges, commissioned a study to determine amongst others the two regions with the greatest need. The recommended regions were New Britain-Bristol and Southeastern. Population trends toward the urban areas, student characteristics such as the need for self-support, and the rapid shift to a service economy indicated locating these colleges in "urban areas with substantial economic activity." One was located near Norwich where there exists a state technical college and the other in the New Britain-Bristol area where there is a state college, thus reiterating the recommendation made by Orvis that, in the words of the 1969 report, "serious consideration should be given to future relationships among the community colleges and the state colleges and technical institutes in order to avoid unnecessary duplication of facilities and curriculums and to take advantage of possible economies of scale." 7

There are twenty-two institutions of higher education in the state system of which eight (soon to be ten) are community colleges. With the high cost of establishing such a rapidly growing system of community colleges in a short time, the implications of conserving state resources is clear.

Taking a cue from the recommendation expressed by many publics in the previous decade and supported by the many examples of interinstitutional cooperative arrangements, the Commission for Higher Education advanced for serious consideration the concept of sharing facilities among institutions of higher education in Connecticut. A study was made to see if it was feasible to implement such a concept in the Central Naugatuck Valley Region through a Higher Education Center composed of a community college, a technical institute, a university branch, and a private two-year college—each retaining its own identity. An act concerning the establishment of a Higher Education Center in the Central Naugatuck Valley Region was approved by the 1969 Gen-

eral Assembly with initial capital funding of \$6.25 million.⁶

Student enrollment for the total system was as follows: Actual full-time equivalent enrollment for 1965-66 was 1,502; for 1966-67 it more than doubled to 3,443; for 1967-68 it increased to 5,322; and in 1968-69 it again increased to 7,570.

The Commission for Higher Education's budget recommendation for the operation of regional community colleges was based on projected enrollments of 9,948 for 1969-70, and 12,435 for 1970-71; the total budget is \$24 million, recommended to the legislature for the 1969-71 biennium, representing an increase from \$10 million for the last biennium. At the closing session of the State General Assembly which ended at midnight June 4, 1969, it was the feeling of close observers that these amounts were authorized, but at this writing no firm information is available.⁸

"The intrusion of politically motivated outside forces" . . . means the assertion of new power structures composed of social units less advantaged than those in seats of power. The demand and drive by a new great majority of citizens for a place in the sun is so strong and intense that existing institutions of learning in Connecticut, as elsewhere, may change in nature so that the traditional forms of learning may become a diminishing benefit. Thus, being less able to meet needs, in fact may give way to new mechanisms of learning now being experimented with utilizing audiovisual-electronic/film storage and retrieval of information in much less formal learning associations.

With the electronic medium of education—in any form, to be found everywhere on an individual or mass basis; with easy and prolific use of the print and film mediums; with leisure time and the satisfaction of basic needs secured and assured, the individual, being liberated, feels compelled to reexamine the present uses, efficient composition, and regulations of the governing power structure of society—including the educational institutions.

In Connecticut this is happening. Close observers

3

may easily predict imminent, beneficial, and highly visible changes to occur in form and substance. It seems that Connecticut will again demonstrate leadership in effective innovations to meet the needs of the day.

¹ *Higher Education in Connecticut. Report of a Survey. Vol. I—Working Papers. Vol. II—Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations.* Prepared for the State of Connecticut, Study Commission on Higher Education by the U.S. Office of Education, December 1964.

² Study Commission on Higher Education. *Report to the State of Connecticut.* February 1965.

³ Orvis, Paul. *Design for Opportunity: A Plan for a State System of Community Colleges in Connecticut.* December 1965.

⁴ "Technical Programs in the Community College Plan." Executive memorandum to the Committee on a Community College for Northwestern Connecticut Corporation. June 1966. Unpublished.

⁵ *Digest of Connecticut Administrative Reports to the Governor, 1967-68, XXII.*

⁶ *Higher Education Center: The Potential for Sharing Facilities Among Institutions of Higher Education in Connecticut, and Higher Education Center: Recommendations for Central Naugatuck Valley Region—Site, Facilities, Cost, Organization.* Caudill, Rowlett and Scott, Architects, Planners, Engineers for the Connecticut Commission for Higher Education. November 1968.

⁷ Arthur D. Little, Inc. *1969 Location Priorities.* Report to Board of Trustees for Regional Community Colleges. December 1968.

⁸ Commission for Higher Education. *Recommended Budget, 1969-71 Biennium. Connecticut System of Higher Education.*

Georgia's Junior Colleges: An Important Role

By Harry S. Downs

The Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia is charged under the constitution of the state with the responsibility for the control, operation, and management of all state-operated institutions of higher education. The state's junior colleges, senior colleges, and universities are units of the University System of Georgia.

The board of regents, initially established by an act of the legislature in 1931, is a board of fifteen laymen appointed by the governor and confirmed by the senate. Two members are appointed for seven-year terms each year with three members appointed every seventh year. This board has broad powers for the management and control of public colleges, including the responsibility for the establishment of new institutions. It is within this organizational structure that Georgia's junior colleges are developed and operated.

259

History of the Junior Colleges

In 1933, immediately following the time the public colleges of Georgia were organized into a system under the control of the board of regents, there were eight junior colleges and eight senior colleges and universities in the university system. These sixteen institutions were located in communities in all sections of the state. Between 1933 and 1958, four of the junior colleges were converted to senior colleges; no new junior colleges were established during this time.

Between 1958 and 1968, seven new junior colleges were opened, and two additional community-oper-

ated junior colleges were taken into the system. The new junior colleges established were: Columbus College, 1958; Brunswick Junior College, 1964; Albany Junior College, 1966; Gainesville Junior College, 1966; Kennesaw Junior College, 1966; Dalton Junior College, 1967; and Macon Junior College, 1968.

The two community-operated junior colleges taken into the system were Augusta College, 1958, and Armstrong College, 1959. Four of the system junior colleges were converted into senior colleges sometime during the 1958-68 period.

During the 1968-69 academic year, nine junior colleges are in operation in the university system. Two additional junior colleges are under construction or design: Clayton Junior College is scheduled to open in September 1969, and Floyd Junior College is slated to open in September 1970. The board of regents has also authorized the establishment of a new junior college to serve the west metropolitan Atlanta area.

During its 1958 session, the Georgia Legislature enacted a bill entitled "The Junior College Act of 1958." One primary provision was authorizing local communities to develop and operate junior colleges with the assistance of state funds for operating expenses. The act also required that the board of regents develop criteria by which interested communities would be measured to determine eligibility for developing new junior colleges.

The criteria adopted by the board of regents set minimum standards of community size and potential college enrollment. Since no state funds were provided in the act for the acquisition and development of campuses and for the construction of facilities, one criterion required that interested communities be able and willing to construct the necessary facilities for a new junior college.

The act also provided the opportunity for communities meeting the minimum criteria to develop

new junior college facilities and deed these facilities to the board of regents. Junior colleges developed in this manner were to be operated by the regents as units of the university system with no further community financial support required. It was under the provisions of this act that six new junior colleges were developed as system institutions—two existing community-owned junior colleges elected to become units of the university system, and one junior college was developed outside the system. In 1964, this act was amended to provide that all future, state-supported junior colleges would be developed as units of the Georgia university system.

Following the 1964 amendment to The Junior College Act of 1958, the board of regents directed the chancellor of the university system to conduct a comprehensive study to ascertain the need in Georgia for additional junior colleges and to recommend locations for new junior colleges to be established. This action came as recognition that systematic, statewide planning was desirable if Georgia were to develop a system of colleges to meet the educational needs of the states in the most efficient and economical manner. The basic plan of study included the use of an eight-member advisory committee of outstanding Georgia educators and two nationally recognized consultants. These committee members and consultants participated extensively in developing plans for the study and in analyzing and synthesizing the data collected.

The report of this study, adopted by the board of regents in June 1965, recommended the immediate development of three new junior colleges and identified three additional communities as potential future sites for new junior colleges. The areas to be served by the three colleges recommended for immediate development are: (1) the Macon area; (2) the south metropolitan Atlanta area; and (3) the west metropolitan Atlanta area. The three areas recommended as potential future sites are: (1) the Floyd County area in northwest Georgia; (2) the

Thomasville area in southwest Georgia; and (3) the Griffin area in central Georgia.

The cooperative, state-local community plan for the development of new junior colleges has been maintained. Under this plan, the local community provides funds for the acquisition and development of a campus and for the construction of the initial physical facilities for the college; the board of regents assumes responsibility for the operation and expansion of the college.

Macon Junior College, one of the colleges recommended in the Junior College Study of 1965, opened in September 1968. Clayton Junior College located in Clayton County to serve south metropolitan Atlanta is under construction and will open in September 1969. Plans for a new junior college to serve west metropolitan Atlanta have not yet materialized. Floyd Junior College, in Rome, is being planned and will open in September 1970. Continuous study is given to the other potential junior college locations, and additional colleges will be recommended as needed.

262

The first new junior college to be developed following the junior college study of 1965 was Macon Junior College. With a grant from Educational Facilities Laboratories, Inc., New York, the college was developed by effectively combining the techniques of (1) computer simulation of space, faculty, students, courses, and time; (2) modular construction of buildings using a system of standardized components to make the original construction and future changes easy and economical; and (3) employment of the critical path method (C.P.M.) in design and construction.

Following these techniques, a campus to accommodate 5,000 equivalent full-time students was planned for construction in three phases. The first phase is designed to accommodate 1,500 equivalent full-time students and includes a combination library, student center, and administrative offices

building; a building with six lecture halls radiating from a central core projection room; a science building; a classroom building; a physical education building; and a building housing a shop, central storage, and power plant.

Phases II and III of the campus facilities will be added as enrollment increases. This expansion will consist of the addition of new buildings and the conversion of the multipurpose, library-student center-administration building into a library. This building is the proper size for a 5,000 student library. The relocatable partitions in the building will permit conversions for new space use to be achieved quickly and inexpensively. In addition, partitions in the classroom, laboratory, and office buildings are relocatable to permit adjustments in space as educational needs change.

The initial planning of this new college was begun in November 1966. The college opened twenty-two months later in September 1968. The techniques used in the development of the Macon Junior College are being used in the development of other new junior colleges in Georgia.

Programs of Study

All junior colleges in Georgia provide as a primary function the course offerings of the first two years of baccalaureate and professional degree programs. Effective with the fall quarter of 1968, this function is achieved through a core curriculum which has been adopted by the junior colleges, senior colleges, and universities of the Georgia university system. The core consists of sixty, quarter-credit hours of general education common to all baccalaureate degree programs and thirty, quarter-credit hours of courses related to the student's major program of study. The general education core consists of twenty hours of humanities, twenty hours of mathematics and natural sciences, and twenty hours of social science. The specific require-

ments in these areas are limited, permitting a maximum of institutional flexibility.

The thirty hours of courses related to the student's major have been prescribed by university system faculty committees representing the major academic disciplines. Students completing this ninety-hour core at any system are guaranteed full credit for the total ninety hours toward a bachelor's degree upon transfer to any senior college. Students completing only a fractional part of this core at a junior college prior to transfer to a senior college are required to complete a total of only ninety hours to fulfill the core requirement.

A second function of Georgia's junior colleges is to provide two-year career programs. Only those career programs which require some regular college-level courses in the curriculum are offered by junior colleges. Vocational and technical programs are offered beyond the high school level by separate area vocational-technical schools which are operated by local public school boards and the State Board of Education. Some two-year career programs are common to most junior colleges, while others are offered by only one or two institutions. Career programs offered by one or more institutions include nursing, dental hygiene, accounting, secretarial science, marketing, agriculture, forestry, agricultural-equipment technology, surveying, police science, and chemical technology. In some communities where both junior college and vocational-technical schools are located, appropriate two-year programs are offered cooperatively by the two institutions.

Programs of continuing education for adults are offered by all junior colleges. These offerings do not carry college credit and are typically offered during evening hours. The specific courses and programs offered by a college are determined by community interest and needs. Programs vary in length from single-session seminars or speeches and one-day conferences to eight-week courses meeting two nights weekly. The most popular courses offered vary from community to community but typically

include art, music, mathematics, history, government, economics and investments, typing, foreign language, and topics unique to local interests.

All junior colleges operate on a quarter system and offer regular courses during the day and evening hours. The typical daily schedule of classes begins at 8 a.m. and ends at 10 or 10:30 p.m., making college credit and noncredit courses available at times convenient to employed adults.

Junior Colleges Today

During the 1968-69 year, there are nine junior colleges operating in the university system: Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College, Tifton; Albany Junior College, Albany; Brunswick Junior College, Brunswick; Dalton Junior College, Dalton; Gainesville Junior College, Gainesville; Kennesaw Junior College, Marietta; Macon Junior College, Macon; Middle Georgia College, Cochran; South Georgia College, Douglas.

Three of these junior colleges, Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College, Middle Georgia College, and South Georgia College, are older institutions and provide housing for students. The remaining six institutions have been developed as new institutions since 1963 and are located in larger communities to serve as a commuting population. Clayton Junior College and Floyd Junior College presently are being developed. Other institutions include four institutions offering graduate studies at the doctoral level (University of Georgia, Georgia Institute of Technology, Georgia State College, and the Medical College of Georgia) and twelve senior colleges, some of which offer graduate work at the master's degree level. In addition, a two-year engineering technology institute, the Southern Technical Institute, is operated as a division of the Georgia Institute of Technology.

These twenty-six institutions are located in communities throughout the state. At least one of these institutions is located within a thirty-five mile radius of more than ninety per cent of Georgia's population.

The expansion of Georgia's junior colleges has been accompanied by an unprecedented growth in enrollment. University system institutions enrolled slightly over 30,000 regular students in the fall of 1960. This number increased to 76,000 in September 1968 and is expected to exceed 90,000 by 1970.

Georgia's junior colleges will continue to play an important role in higher education in the state. New junior colleges will be added as needed, and new programs will be developed in response to changing occupational and educational requirements.

State and Local Partnership in Mississippi

By G. H. Johnston

The seventeen public junior colleges of Mississippi are a state system of local institutions dedicated to offering educational and training opportunities to all the people of their districts and also to providing trained workers for business and industry of the districts and state.

All district high school graduates are eligible for admission. Provisions also are made to accept those who have not graduated from high school into terminal vocational and technical programs. These programs (ranging from one or two weeks to two years) can provide the first two years of fully accredited college work acceptable by state and regional senior colleges or universities.

267

Control

Mississippi junior colleges are an integral part of higher education available to the people on a local level in all regions of the state. Each school is under the control of a local board of trustees which is locally selected and is a policy-making body with powers, duties, and responsibilities clearly defined in the basic junior college law.

The board of trustees has the responsibility of selecting the president and of approving presidential recommendations for professional staff members. It also has the responsibility of adopting policies for the development and general welfare of the school.

The duties of the president are also defined in the basic law which provides him with the authority to operate the school but makes him responsible to the

local board of trustees for any action.

The state exercises general supervision and coordination through the State Board of Education and the Junior College Commission. Each of these state agencies has clearly defined responsibilities which prevent conflict of action. The state superintendent of education is chairman of both agencies—an arrangement which also serves to coordinate the actions of these groups.

The junior colleges operate as a division of the State Department of Education with a director who is appointed by and responsible to the state superintendent of education. The director serves as secretary to the Junior College Commission. The staff of the Division of Junior Colleges provides professional, technical, and clerical services needed by the commission.

History and Development

The public junior colleges of Mississippi have developed over the past forty-six years into a joint responsibility of local districts and the state. This partnership has evolved in response to the concern expressed by the people that administrative and operational control be retained at the local level with provisions to insure coordination and requirements of minimum standards for the educational program at the state level.

The junior colleges are an outgrowth of the county agricultural high schools which were authorized by the legislature in 1908. Fifty-one of these schools were established between 1908 and 1919 to provide secondary education for students of the rural areas. Prior to this time, public secondary education had been available only in the separate school districts of towns and cities located primarily along the railroads.

In 1910, the legislature authorized the organization of consolidated high school districts; by 1920, practically every community of the state had access to a consolidated high school. County agricultural high schools had served their purpose and now

began to lose prestige and popularity as there was no longer any need for boarding high schools. Many of the county agricultural high schools become community high schools in the new consolidated districts. Others, through aggressive and farsighted leadership, developed into junior colleges.

Legislation enacted in 1922 provided that any county agricultural high school located not less than twenty miles from a state college could add the freshman and sophomore years of college work to their curricular offerings. The law also required that all teachers in such schools have a college degree and that those teaching the sophomore courses have graduate credit equivalent to one year. The law further provided that schools which offered college work must be fully approved for four years of high school work by the State Department of Education, and the library must have 1,500 well-selected volumes, exclusive of pamphlets or government publications. No state appropriation was to be made to support such college work.

In the school year of 1922-23, freshman college work was first attempted in Mississippi by the county agricultural high schools of Pearl River and Hinds Counties with a combined enrollment of forty-three students. By the beginning of the school year of 1924-25, four schools, with an enrollment of one hundred and six freshmen and fifteen sophomores, were offering freshman and sophomore college work.

In 1928, the state legislature brought forward the laws of 1922 and provided that counties may join together and tax themselves to establish a junior college with equal representation on the board of trustees. The laws also provided that other counties may join an existing junior college district, levy a tax to support it, and have representation on the board.

The law of 1928 established, as well, the Junior College Commission as the state regulatory agency and controlling agency for the establishment of new junior colleges. The commission was composed of

the state superintendent of education who would serve as chairman; the president of the Agricultural and Mechanical College; the chancellor of the University of Mississippi; the president of Mississippi State College for Women; and three junior college presidents selected by the executive heads of the existing junior colleges. This act also provided for the deletion of the provision of the 1922 law which prohibited state appropriations for the operation of junior colleges. As a result of this deletion, the legislature appropriated \$80,000 for the support of junior colleges for the biennium of 1928-30. In the fall of 1928, eleven junior colleges were in operation with an enrollment of 633 freshmen and 245 sophomores.

Since the first appropriation of \$80,000 in 1928 for support of junior colleges for the biennium of 1928-30, each succeeding legislature, except that of 1932-34, has increased the appropriation.

The legislature of 1950 enacted legislation updating all existing junior college laws; validated the fourteen junior college districts previously enacted by the Junior College Commission, and provided methods of selection and terms of office for junior college trustees. The Junior College Commission received additional powers and authority to regulate junior colleges, particularly in establishing new junior colleges and setting up standards for participating in state funds. The act also defined in detail duties of trustees and junior college administrators, authorized the transportation of students, and provided that local junior college districts could levy a maximum of three mills for capital improvement.

In 1962, the legislature expanded the Junior College Commission to include three lay members in addition to the three university and college presidents and three junior college presidents. The state superintendent was retained as chairman, making a total of ten members. The powers of the commission were greatly increased including the authority to allocate vocational-technical training

functions based upon studies conducted by the commission. It also gave the commission authority to approve or disapprove the borrowing of funds for all capital improvements and authorized the establishment of junior college attendance centers when approved by the commission.

In addition, the 1962 legislature approved a special bill to create the Mississippi Gulf Coast Junior College District which had originally operated in the same four counties as Perkinston Junior College. The primary provision was the authority given to the Mississippi Gulf Coast board of trustees to determine the tax levy up to three mills necessary for maintenance and operation and three mills for bonded indebtedness for capital improvements, and require that the tax be levied. The only difference between this law and the general laws applicable to all other districts was the authority to require the tax levy. All other districts request tax levies through the county governing boards who may refuse to increase, but may not decrease, the tax levy without approval of trustees.

Finance

The local districts and the state have jointly accepted the responsibility of providing funds for the cost of operation of the junior colleges. The provision of funds for repair and improvement of old buildings and construction of new buildings is also a joint responsibility when surveys and studies indicate such needs.

The appropriation of funds and the enactment of much needed legislation has been, to a great degree, the result of vigorous and aggressive action by the State Junior College Association. This organization is made up of presidents or their representatives of each junior college district. Legislative programs are carefully planned and agreed upon by each junior college president. A legislative committee is appointed to present the program to the governor, the lieutenant-governor, and all

members of the legislature with supporting and substantiating information to document the need.

The state appropriation is made for the biennium and is divided into two components. One part is designated for support of the regular junior college program, and the second part is provided for support of vocational and technical programs.

Appropriations for buildings and repairs are made through the State Building Commission, but each junior college district is listed in the bill for a specific amount depending upon the number of full-time students enrolled at the time of the last reporting period.

Beginning in 1950, after the passage of the revised Junior College Law, the financing of junior colleges began to show definite signs of improvement. This law set a maximum of three mills for operation and three mills for capital improvements which governing authorities of counties could levy but were not required to do so. All junior college administrative staff concerned with finance began a vigorous campaign with the boards of supervisors of the counties in their districts to increase local support toward this maximum and, at the same time, initiated public relations programs throughout the state emphasizing the importance of junior colleges.

In 1964, the state legislature passed legislation placing every county of the state in one of the existing fourteen junior college districts. Prior to this time, a county had voluntarily become a part of a junior college district. This law also provided that new junior college districts could only be established by an act of the legislature, but it did provide with approval of the Junior College Commission, for the establishment of attendance centers within the legally constituted districts.

The legislature of 1964 also provided that for specific purposes within the economic, industrial, and educational fields, any county not currently authorized to withhold state *ad valorem* taxes, upon

approval of the State Commission of Budget and Accounting, could withhold up to two mills for the specific approved purpose. All junior college districts with counties not withholding such taxes applied for and were granted withholding privileges under this law for capital improvements.

The 1964 legislature provided funds through the State Building Commission, on an equal matching basis, for the construction and improvement of vocational-technical facilities and for the purchase of equipment for these facilities. This 1964 act provided \$1.75 million and was refunded in 1966 for \$1.815 million. This legislation together with the refund of state *ad valorem* taxes has made it possible for all junior colleges to build and equip new vocational-technical facilities.

By January 1, 1968, all counties in the state but two were levying a tax to support the junior college of the district in which the laws of 1964 placed them. The majority of counties also levy taxes for capital improvement.

The junior college budgets for the 1968-69 session indicate that the operating funds are derived from the following sources: (1) student fees—10 per cent; (2) local districts—45 per cent; (3) state appropriation—45 per cent.

Capital improvement funds are derived from three sources: (1) local districts—30 per cent; (2) federal—35 per cent; (3) state—35 per cent. In the ten-year period of 1958-1968, capital improvement funds in the amount of \$42 million were spent for construction and improvement of buildings by the junior colleges.

Total fund expenditures for the 1966-68 biennium amounted to \$43,845,922. Funds budgeted for the 1968-70 biennium are estimated at \$48.5 million.

The current state appropriation for operation and maintenance is \$14.371 million for the 1968-70 biennium.

Since the initial enrollment of forty-three students in 1922, there has been a consistent increase

of enrollment in junior colleges in Mississippi with the exception of the World War II years. At the close of the war, many veterans differing widely in background and preparation enrolled in junior colleges. Special programs were developed to assist those who needed refresher courses and foundation subjects. Enrollments began to increase and have continued to do so over the years. In 1957, there were 9,912 students enrolled. Since that year, there has been an increase of approximately 5 per cent each year. In 1965-67, enrollment reached 20,000 students. By the close of the 1967-68 school year, this figure had jumped to 31,500 students who enrolled for full-time or short-term courses. It is projected that by the end of the 1968-70 biennium, this number will reach the 40,000 mark.

The junior colleges of Mississippi operate on the philosophy that financial cost should not prevent any deserving student from attending.

There is no tuition charge; the average cost is \$60 per semester for a matriculation charge which covers all fees including library, laboratory, athletic event admissions, medical, and the yearbook and college paper.

All but two of the colleges provide dormitory and cafeteria facilities for boarding students. The average cost of room and meals is \$450 per year. Tuition for out-of-state students ranges from \$150 to \$200 per semester. Daily transportation is also provided by many districts for a nominal cost to the students of their districts.

A Bright Future

After many years of struggling for acceptance, junior colleges in Mississippi are now recognized and accepted as a vital and necessary part of the educational system of the state. The question of transfer of credit to senior colleges and universities is no longer a problem. All of the junior colleges are fully accredited. Senior colleges and universities accept without question college credit earned

at the junior colleges. The annual Junior-Senior College Conference has contributed much to the solution of credit problems. Each year the presidents, deans, and registrars meet for two days to discuss problems and suggest solutions for these problems.

The problem of the attitude of legislators who once considered junior colleges as local institutions which should be completely financed by local tax funds is no longer prevalent. There is general recognition of the contribution made by junior colleges to the progress and development of the state.

The challenge to the junior colleges of Mississippi is great, but stimulating. The partnership of state and local district is equal to the challenge, and the future is bright.

The Other Twenty-two

By James L. Wattenbarger

While the great majority of the community college development in the United States has been found in the twenty-eight states which are described elsewhere in this volume, there has been some interest in community colleges and concern for continued educational opportunity demonstrated in the other twenty-two states. These twenty-two, as of 1969, operate about fifty community junior colleges varying from a complete system of sixteen institutions in Kentucky, seven in Alaska, six each in Wyoming and Nebraska, down to six states with one junior college and seven states which operate no public community colleges as of this date.

276

It is interesting to note, however, that even in the latter seven states there is one or more institutions—a technical school and/or a branch of the universities—which carry out at least a part of the function of the comprehensive community junior college. While these twenty-two states are found in all geographical areas of the United States, they are not among the large states in population size. The entire group includes about 20 per cent of the total United States population.

While there are few commonalities which can be said to characterize these states, some interesting generalizations may be drawn:

1. Eighteen of the twenty-two may be considered together since they have three or fewer junior colleges at the present time.
2. The other four have developing community college programs which serve their present populations fairly adequately. (One state, Tennessee, may be considered a part of this latter group since plans for expansion are already in operation.)

3. A number of new laws have been passed (several since 1965 in particular) authorizing the establishment of community colleges. The laws have not been fully implemented as yet. Federal legislation has had a definite effect upon the states. The Higher Education Act is dated the same year in which a number of states either passed a new law or amended an existing one.

4. Apparently continued pressures are building up in state legislatures to provide for community colleges where no law exists at present.

5. Considerable overlapping still exists in many of these states among vocational education, technical education, freshman and sophomore education, and continuing education. When several different types of institutions carry on one or more parts of the total education program, there seems to be an inevitable and often expensive duplication of effort.

6. There seems to be a rather consistent definition of a community college accepted and understood by those who write legislation in this field. This definition almost always includes provision for freshman-sophomore work, vocational and/or technical education, and continuing education for adults. One state did invent an unusual term—intermediate institution of higher education—in its law.

7. Even in states where there are no community colleges, there are some provisions for technical education and for regional centers of universities. In three states this pattern is so pronounced that it must be accepted as a feasible alternative to the community college development.

8. There is recognition in all states that there is need for post-high school education. Historical developments in some states have either prevented, curtailed, or delayed the establishment of community junior colleges. Active opposition on the part of existing colleges, especially their presidents, has delayed junior college development. The failure of state legislatures to appropriate funds—even though enabling legislation was passed—prevented implementation of existing laws. In a few states institu-

tional jealousy and empire-building has inhibited growth of community colleges. Poor leadership at the state level, or even in a number of instances—lack of any leadership at the state level—has delayed or deterred community college growth.

9. Several of these twenty-two states are building very fine programs and should be considered in the category of "late bloomers" in the junior college field. These states have taken very long steps toward providing an adequate number of community colleges to serve their populations.

10. There is evidence that master planning is being expected in almost every instance. In those states where such planning is limited or inadequate, continued concern for overall planning is being expressed in legislative acts. Once again federal funds in the Higher Education Facilities Act has encouraged this type of planning.

11. Financial support may or may not include local taxation as a source of revenue. The assigned role of the community college does not seem to be related in any way to the source of financial support. State and federal funds, plus an increasing student tuition fee, comprise the support in a majority of instances. Capital outlay, on the other hand, is more often than not a local responsibility.

12. There is still an indefensible dichotomy in many states between support and control of academic education and support and control of vocational-technical education.

13. It appears that wherever possible many states combine their vocational-technical institute programs with other institutions—even four-year colleges and universities in several instances. An alternative to this combination is the procedure developing in several states of permitting a technical institute to offer an associate degree including the appropriate general education—in other words to become a community college.

14. Continued expansion in these twenty-two states is needed. If they include almost 20 per cent of the total population of the United States, there

should be a considerable increase in the number of junior colleges in these states. A three to four hundred per cent increase over the next ten years would not be unrealistic.

In addition to the public community college systems summarized above, however, each of these twenty-two states can point with special attention to junior colleges which are privately supported and controlled. While this particular study is focused upon the public institutions, the specific contributions of these privately supported colleges should be recognized. They quite often provide the only opportunity for continued education made available to thousands of people in the various localities. In these twenty-two states, however, there are five which have no private junior colleges; the other seventeen report fifty-three institutions, about the same total number as the public institutions in these twenty-two states.

Alaska

Seven community colleges enroll almost 3,900 students in the state of Alaska. One privately supported junior college enrolls about 200 students. These institutions are all small, however, with the exception of Anchorage Community College which enrolls almost two-thirds of the total number.

Legislation authorizes the establishment of community colleges by the University of Alaska in cooperation with local school districts. An amendment in 1962 authorized the qualified local school districts to develop an agreement with the university for the purpose of establishing, operating, and maintaining these institutions. The law emphasizes the state's responsibility for academic education beyond the high school; but at the same time it requires the local district to pay all operating costs for nondegree college programs.

The first community college was established in Anchorage in 1954. The most recent institution has been established as the Kodiak Community College in 1968.

Where there is an apparent *built-in* dichotomy caused by the university being assigned responsibility for the academic programs, and the local board handling the "nondegree" programs, the overall planning has been placed in the hands of the university. Financial support must also come from two sources: the university budget for academic programs and the local taxes for nondegree programs.

The University Board of Regents is empowered to employ all community college instructors for academic programs; the local school governing board has similar responsibility for instructors in non-degree programs.

The divided authority described above would cause some difficulties in the development of total programs of education in these institutions. Future considerations require that an evaluation of this procedure is desirable at least.

Arkansas

Arkansas currently includes two community colleges, Phillips County Community College and Westark Junior College. These two institutions enroll almost 2,000 students. Another 700 students are enrolled in a two-year branch of Arkansas State University and 1,500 are enrolled in four privately supported junior colleges.

This enabling legislation for community colleges was passed in 1965. A Commission on Coordination of Higher Educational Finance is charged with responsibility for coordinating the establishment of any new junior colleges. Although the state contributes one-third of the operating funds, it makes no contribution to capital outlay—the latter costs are considered a local responsibility.

Predicted trends for future growth envision a larger state contribution than is true at the present.

Delaware

As of 1969 the State of Delaware is operating one public community college—the Delaware Technical and Community College. This institution has two

campuses: one in Georgetown and one in Wilmington with a total enrollment on both campuses of more than 1,700 students. An additional 2,400 students are enrolled in two privately supported junior colleges.

A law passed in 1967 constitutes the enabling legislation for the Delaware Technical and Community College. The college is state operated and supported. Tuition fees are charged to in-state as well as out-of-state students, although out-of-state fees are more than double the in-state rate.

The curriculum is varied including technician courses in a number of special areas as well as the first two years of a baccalaureate degree program.

Future plans include the construction of two additional campuses. The projections of enrollment are 2,550 by 1970, 7,500 by 1978, and 9,000 students in 1985. There is evidence of sound master-planning being conducted.

Idaho

There are two community colleges in operation in Idaho. A third junior college, the largest, has recently become a four-year institution. These two community colleges include technical institutes as a part of their programs. Three other technical institutes are operating—two as parts of four-year colleges and one as a part of the university.

Enrollment in the junior colleges equals more than 3,000 students, a considerable increase over fall 1967. The interest and support for these institutions continues at a high level. There are also two privately supported junior colleges enrolling more than 4,000 students—3,974 in Ricks and 124 in St. Gertrude.

While each of the public junior colleges is under the operational control of an elected local board of trustees, the State Board of Education has overall coordinating responsibilities. The junior colleges are defined in the law as "intermediate institutions of higher education." A local election is required to establish junior college districts when the area under consideration has more than 800 high school students

in attendance and more than \$10 million of assessed property.

Local trustees are authorized to assess and collect taxes for the support of these institutions. Additional support is derived from local liquor taxes. An interesting section of the law authorizes the board of trustees to levy a one-half mill on each dollar for maintenance and care of the gymnasium.

Indiana

The only community junior college in Indiana is Vincennes University. In spite of the unusual name, this institution can claim to be one of the oldest junior colleges in the United States. Originally established in 1801, it became a junior college in the 1870's, and a public institution in 1931.

Vincennes University carries out the functions of a public community junior college. It is a part of the public school system of Indiana, and receives support from both local and state taxations. The current enrollment is 2,800 students who are enrolled in a wide variety of courses and programs, including such occupational programs as machine technology, drafting technology, and laboratory-technician education.

The universities, Indiana, Purdue, and Indiana State, have established (apparently with no particular legal authorization) a number of branch campuses in various parts of the state. Twelve of these are listed in addition to the main campus of each university (Indiana State: one campus; Indiana University: seven campuses; and Purdue: four campuses). The Indiana Vocational Technical College has established five institutes in various regions of the state although thirteen geographical regions are designated to operate programs. The enrollment in the university branches exceeds 32,000 students, and in the Vocational Technical College the enrollment is about 4,200 students. Two privately supported junior colleges enroll about 300 students.

There is, then, no legal basis which specifically establishes a system of community junior colleges in Indiana. A recent report (December 1968) of the State Policy Commission on Post-High School Edu-

cation recommends the establishment of a board of regents to coordinate post-high school education in Indiana. The commission recommends that the board of regents develop a system of community colleges using the Indiana Vocational Technical College as a base for this expanded opportunity. The report further urges the establishment of a State Community College Board to operate these institutions, with local boards to organize and plan institutional programs. The commission envisions a transition period for developing these new community colleges which will serve the need for comprehensiveness at the post-high school level.

Kentucky

Sixteen community colleges enrolling almost 10,000 students constitute the community college systems of the University of Kentucky. One of these is a specialized forestry and wood technicians school, the other fifteen are designed as comprehensive institutions.

As Ellis Hartford, dean of the system, points out:

The public junior college movement got under way slowly in Kentucky. There was some slight transitory interest in the later 1920's (one doctoral dissertation by Adams at U.K. proposed a state plan) and the first permissive legislation for "municipal" junior colleges came in the early 1930's. Only two cities, Ashland and Paducah, utilized these laws and established public junior colleges. Ashland initiated a municipal junior college for its city school district under a privately-sponsored two-year institution to public control and support after a year or two of operation under the title of Paducah Junior College. Both colleges were dependent upon financial support from local tax sources (approved by referendum) and income from tuition. These colleges continued in operation under municipal control for more than twenty and thirty years, respectively at Ashland and Paducah.

The University of Kentucky opened a northern extension center at Covington in 1948. This institution became Northern Community College in 1964, and thus was the first of the University of Kentucky's community college system. However, Ashland became the second unit in 1957 when the local

board requested the University of Kentucky to provide for it in their new system. During the next few years other units were added until Paducah came into the system in July 1968.

The basic legislation authorizing the University of Kentucky Community College System was passed in 1962. The law specified that each unit in the system would include the words "community college" in their names and that the governor would appoint a local advisory board for each community college.

The new president of the University of Kentucky in fall 1963 began to implement the law. The new units were established, purposes were more clearly defined, and a dean who reports directly to the president was appointed. In addition, a faculty advisory committee on the community college was appointed to provide recommendations on approval of associate degrees.

In 1966 the legislature authorized the four state colleges to provide programs of a community nature in their own communities comparable to those listed for the University of Kentucky community college system. The 1966 law also defined the purposes of the community college as:

284

1. A general two-year academic curriculum with credits transferable to two-year and four-year colleges and universities
2. Technical and semiprofessional programs of two years or less
3. A two-year college curriculum with courses in general education, including adult education, not necessarily intended for transfer nor technically oriented.

Overall responsibility for planning higher education in Kentucky is centered in the Council on Public Higher Education, composed of nine lay members appointed by the governor. This council is currently sponsoring a study of the community colleges in Kentucky. Privately supported institutions, seven in number, enroll about 2,000 students—the great majority attend the public institutions.

Louisiana

A legislative act in 1928 authorized parish school boards in Louisiana to create junior college districts and to levy up to two mills of taxes for the construction, maintenance, and operation of such junior colleges after a favorable vote from the property taxpayers. This authority was used in only one instance.

Other junior colleges were established, however, but these were placed under the control of Louisiana State University. They became four-year colleges and were transferred to the operating control of the State Board of Education.

In 1964 the legislature created several junior college branches of Louisiana State University and of Southern University. Funds were provided for the purchase of land and authorized construction of buildings. The same session of the legislature further authorized the State Board of Education to establish a junior college in one of the parishes although no funds were provided.

The 1966 legislature authorized Louisiana State University to establish another branch but no funds were made available. Other legislation in the same session requested that the State Board of Education establish pilot programs in at least two high schools on a junior college level. One of these was authorized. Studies and surveys to determine need for a junior college were requested and/or authorized for other sections of the state.

New Orleans operates a municipal junior college, Delgado College, which receives substantial support from state funds. In addition to this junior college, there are four branches of public universities operating at this level of education. The great amount of interest exhibited in recent legislative sessions is indicative of support for the community college idea in principle—but apparently not yet in money. Another noteworthy fact is that there are no privately supported junior colleges reported for Louisiana.

Maine

There is one public junior college in Maine at the present time (operated by the University of Maine).

Four vocational-technical institutes offer a variety of occupationally related, non-degree, one- and two-year programs. These institutions are under the operational control of the State Board of Education.

A report to the Advisory Commission for the Higher Education Study in Maine recently (1966) pointed out that "Maine seems to be running three separate programs of post-secondary education—at the university, at the vocational-technical institutes, and at the state colleges." There is still need to examine this procedure, especially as it may relate to the development of community junior colleges. There are only two privately supported junior colleges in Maine.

Nebraska

The Nebraska public junior colleges are authorized under state legislation which permits these institutions to be established as a part of a secondary school system or as a separate junior college district. The law also provides that only nine junior colleges may be established in the state.

As of 1969, six are established; one of these is scheduled to open in September 1969. The five colleges operating as of fall 1968, reported a total enrollment of 2,615 students. In addition to these six junior colleges, there are five area vocational technical schools, two designated specifically as post-high school. The University of Nebraska operates a school of technical agriculture also. Only a private institution is in existence at the junior college level.

All of these institutions report rather limited enrollments (all but one under 1,000 students) although several have been in existence for a number of years. For example, McCook College was originally established in 1926. In spite of this span of years, there has not been a great amount of growth and development at this level of education. Recent legislation (1967) has attempted to force development of larger districts by requiring a total average daily attendance of 1,200 students in the high school (or schools) included in a junior college district.

An interesting provision in the new law permits two existing school districts which *are not contiguous* to form a junior college district. The law also permits existing junior college districts to annex noncontiguous school districts. An added protection against small districts is the provision in the law which authorizes the commissioner of education to suspend (dissolve) any district when enrollment falls under forty students.

The Nebraska law as amended in 1967 makes a very obvious attempt to encourage the development of junior colleges (up to nine institutions). The Department of Education is assigned the responsibility for accreditation and inspection of colleges as well as the authority to approve courses of study. Operational control is placed in the hands of local boards of education which have a limited taxing authority.

A board composed of presidents of all junior colleges and of all municipal universities establishes the tuition rates for students. These funds are placed in the operating funds of the junior college district along with state funds and local tax funds.

Plans for the future include the possible establishment of a Nebraska Coordinating Council on Higher Education which will coordinate all post-high school education in the state. This illustrates the expressed concern for the variety and diversity which will be required for the post-high school education of the masses.

Nevada

A community junior college was opened in Elko, Nevada, in September 1967. This is the first and the only community college in the state. Although the legislature authorized this institution as a "pilot project" as a function of the Elko County school district, no state funds were provided for its support.

The same law also directed the State Department of Education to study and recommend to the 55th session of the Nevada Legislature a master plan for education. The study was established to include:

1. The feasibility of creating throughout the state or in suitable areas thereof area community colleges or vocational-technical centers

2. Plans for the adaptation of vocational-technical training in high school to take maximum advantage of further training to be offered in such community colleges or vocational technical centers

3. Plans relative to finance, curriculum, organization, and facilities

4. Exploration to determine community desire and sponsorship for creation of such community colleges

5. The potential enrollment and business and industrial opportunity for graduates of such community colleges.

The superintendent was empowered to contract with consultants to make this study.

To illustrate a major legislative concern, the statute further directs that the recommendations of this study shall include the minimum tax base, minimum population, and initial local financial effort necessary to support a community college as well as plans for cooperative financing from federal, state, and local sources.

There are also two university branches in operation in Nevada. Predicted trends for this state envision the community colleges and other post-secondary institutions as being under the university regents. A consultant firm is conducting the study outlined in the law.

New Hampshire

Although there are seven vocational technical institutes and three two-year branches of the university in operation in New Hampshire, there are no designated public community colleges. The technical institutes offer the associate degree to graduates of two-year curriculums. About seventeen or eighteen special occupational areas are available to students. Fees paid by students are fairly high for residents and very high for nonresidents when compared to other states.

A joint committee of university trustees and members of the State Board of Education are currently discussing the topic of junior college development. Future trends are not easy to predict. Privately supported junior colleges, three in number, are designed to attract out-of-state as well as in-state students—their fees are the same for each category. These three colleges currently enroll around 1,000 students.

New Mexico

New Mexico Junior College, Hobbs, with an enrollment of more than 1,000 students, is the only community college in the state. (There are no privately supported junior colleges.) This institution operates under a junior college act, passed in 1963, which defines the "junior college" as a "public educational institution which shall provide not to exceed two (2) years of training in the arts, sciences and humanities beyond the twelfth grade of the public high school curriculum; or in lieu of such training or in addition thereto, not to exceed two (2) years of a vocational and technical curriculum and appropriate courses of study for persons who may or may not have completed the twelfth grade of public high school." The law also authorizes the formation of a junior college district.

Local junior college boards may work in conjunction with the State Board of Education or with the board of regents of a higher educational institution. The State Board of Educational Finance is responsible for overall coordination of higher education and specifically for approving the establishment of any community college.

There are—in addition to New Mexico Junior College—eight branches of universities and one military institute which serve educational purposes at this level. These are established under a law which authorizes "branch community colleges" although the law does not define the term. Initiative to establish such branch community colleges apparently falls upon the local board of education which must con-

duct a survey, select a parent institution, request approval from the State Board of Educational Finance, and act in an advisory capacity to the board of regents.

The local board also must be responsible for the tax levies for these institutions.

Therefore, two types of community college operational control are authorized by the New Mexico legislation. These two types very likely represent some differences in philosophy of curriculum and leave a major area of educational policy undetermined at the present time.

North Dakota

North Dakota has two junior colleges, two specialized state schools, and one two-year center of the University of North Dakota. These institutions are supported by student fees supplemented by state and local funds. More than 4,500 students are enrolled in these institutions. The two privately operated junior colleges are very small, enrolling a total of less than 130 students.

There is no overall coordinating or planning agency at the state level and future plans for community college development is uncertain at this time.

Rhode Island

The 1960 law in Rhode Island authorized the establishment of community colleges in Pawtucket Valley, Mount Hope, and Bladestown Valley. All of these were to be under the control, management, and operation of the Board of Trustees of State Colleges.

However, Rhode Island Junior College was not established until 1964 in Providence. This institution currently enrolls almost 2,600 students. Additional institutions which may be established will be under the responsibility of the president of Rhode Island Junior College who is in turn responsible to the Board of Trustees of State Colleges.

The program of studies made available includes a variety of occupational programs as well as the first two years of a baccalaureate degree program.

There are several special emphases in the occupational program, e.g. nursing, civil engineering technology, mechanical design technology, as well as a variety of nondegree programs in vocational-technical education.

The college is supported by state appropriations and student fees. Funds for vocational-technical education come from State Department of Education funds set aside for this purpose.

The two privately supported junior colleges enroll almost 4,500 students.

South Carolina

Although there are no public community junior colleges in South Carolina, there are twelve technical institutes and eleven branches (centers) operated by the University of South Carolina (nine) and Clemson University (two). In six of these locations, both a university branch and a technical education center are in operation. In two locations there is also a private junior college (plus three others elsewhere in the state).

These public institutions enroll about 15,000 students and are supported by both state appropriations and local taxes as well as student fees. Capital costs are considered to be a local responsibility.

While apparently there is no overall statewide legislation authorizing the establishment of university branches or technical education centers, a series of local bills does create local commissions on higher education and local technical education center committees. These are established to provide local orientation to the programs of the institutions.

The South Carolina Commission on Higher Education has recommended to the 1969 General Assembly that, among other things:

1. The university branches and centers be placed under a separate statewide governing board operating under the aegis of the Commission on Higher Education

2. The State Advisory Committee for Technical Training be changed into a commission or board to

operate the technical education centers under the coordinating aegis of the Commission on Higher Education.

It will be interesting to watch this development in South Carolina.

South Dakota

Five area vocational technical schools enroll almost 1,500 students in South Dakota. There are no community junior colleges, however, and the present facilities for higher education (seven baccalaureate degree-granting public colleges and six private colleges) would appear to meet the needs for most of the state's population of 700,000 persons.

A 1967 law authorized independent school districts to establish junior colleges provided the high schools are more than 125 miles from a college or university. A vote of the local people is required to authorize the organization of a junior college district. The law has not yet been implemented, however.

The two privately supported junior colleges enroll less than 350 students. Interest in this level of education is apparently not very strong as yet.

Tennessee

Rapid development of the community colleges in Tennessee is already a characteristic of this state. Although Columbia State Community College is only three years old, it enrolls more than 1,000 students. Two other community colleges enroll an additional 2,800 students, making a total of almost 4,000 community college students in fall 1968. In addition there are two post-high school technical institutes in operation (enrolling 2,162 students) and seven privately supported junior colleges with a total of 2,600 students.

The State Board of Education in February 1965, adopted a resolution asking the legislature to provide sufficient appropriations to establish three community junior colleges. No legislation resulted from this action although monies for three community colleges (capital outlay and current operating funds) were included in State Board Institutions appropriations.

Since that time (1965), three more community colleges were provided for by the legislature making a total of six authorized by appropriation.

The members of the 1967 legislature apparently became concerned over the variety as well as the increasing support given to the community colleges by the general public. The newly created higher education commission, among its other duties, has been asked to coordinate the establishment of new community colleges. The commission has also developed a long-range plan for the eventual establishment of a number of community colleges designed to serve the entire state.

Support for these institutions by direct appropriations is the basic support pattern in Tennessee. Operational control is in the hands of the State Board of Education. The master plan will provide this level of education within reasonable commuting distance of everyone in the state.

Utah

Three community junior colleges enroll more than 2,500 students enabling them to continue their education beyond high school. In addition another 3,000 students are enrolled in two technical colleges. Each of these institutions has been authorized by a special act of the legislature. There are no private institutions.

The Mormon Church system of academies, beginning in 1875, was the basis for the junior colleges. When high schools began to emerge, the church closed some of the academies but changed three of them into junior colleges. Later, these were given to the State of Utah and the legislature passed the several acts making them into state junior colleges. One of these, Weber College, has become a four-year degree-granting institution. Each of these institutions is operated under a different board, i.e., one under the University of Utah Board of Regents, another under Utah State University's Board of Trustees, and a third under the State Board of Education.

A Coordinating Council of Higher Education has developed a "master plan" which will provide for all levels of education. This plan has not been implemented as yet.

Vermont

There are no community junior colleges in Vermont. The Vermont Technical College with an enrollment of around 500 students is the only public institution which currently serves any of the functions at this level of education; about 2,100 are enrolled in four private junior colleges.

A dissertation entitled "A Proposed Master Plan for Public Comprehensive Community Junior Colleges for the State of Vermont" was completed by Donald Lee Harbert at the University of Florida in 1968. Dr. Harbert outlines in his study a system of community colleges for Vermont. His recommendations envision a state-operated system of five institutions serving the entire population of the state. No specific action has been taken to implement this study, however.

West Virginia

There are no community colleges in West Virginia. West Virginia University operates two centers, one in Parkersburg and one in Keyser, which enroll less than 1,500 students. These are characterized by comparatively high tuition charges. One of these, Potomac State College of West Virginia University, was originally established in 1921. There is no general legislation authorizing junior college development in this state. Four private junior colleges enroll over 2,000 students.

Wisconsin

Although Wisconsin does not officially designate institutions as community junior colleges, there are sixteen technical institutes offering post-high school education and sixteen branches of universities. Thirteen of these "centers" are a part of the University of Wisconsin system, and three of these are branches of state universities, Stout, Oshkosh, and Wisconsin State. It is interesting to note that one

of the technical centers was called a community college for a few years before changing its name to Technical College. There are three private technical colleges in Wisconsin.

Historically, the State of Wisconsin has had a strong, independent vocational-technical school system as well as a large and varied university extension program. In 1933 the University of Wisconsin began the development of an extension center system through which the first two years of regular university work was offered in a number of selected cities.

Beginning in the 1960's, legislature authorized the technical institutes to offer an associate degree. The law authorizes these institutions to offer "liberal arts collegiate transfer programs" except where "there is an existing public institution of higher learning." This prohibition does not apply in cities having a population of 150,000 or more. Therefore, it would appear that the technical institutes could become institutions that would be defined as community colleges in other situations. It is interesting to note, however, that similar authorization for branch campuses to offer occupational education is not found. Nicolet College and Technical Institute, Rhinelander, and Wisconsin Rapids Technical Institute have been designated as experimental "dual-track" (i.e., academic and occupational) institutions although neither has developed programs in the academic area at the present time.

The financing of these institutions follows a similar dichotomy: the university centers are state supported with local areas providing land and facilities while the technical institutes are locally supported with substantial state aid. Seven localities have both types of institutions.

The Coordinating Committee on Higher Education is assigned responsibility in the law for approving communities where the center may be established. No master plan has been made public as yet.

Wyoming

Six community colleges in Wyoming enroll more than 4,000 students. A seventh college is scheduled

to open in September 1969, in Cheyenne and this will very likely be the last junior college to be established for some time to come. There are no university branches, technical schools, or private junior colleges now in operation.

Early legislation in Wyoming was passed in 1945 authorizing the establishment of Casper College under control of the local school board. Since that time additional legislation has authorized the establishment of junior college districts.

A Community College Commission is the state-level agency responsible for these institutions. This commission is made up of two representatives of each community college, one of whom is usually the president, the state superintendent of education, and two representatives of the University of Wyoming. Among other responsibilities, the commission distributes the state appropriations to the various colleges. The commission's executive officer is on the staff of the University of Wyoming.

While seven community colleges do not include all of Wyoming within a service district, about 60 per cent of the population lives within forty miles commuting distance of these seven institutions. The areas outside of community college districts include Laramie, the location of the University of Wyoming. A major portion of the state's population lives near some type of post-high school education.

Local taxes are the major source of support for these institutions although state funds help to some extent. Tuition from students is a third source of revenue. Capital outlay is the exclusive responsibility of the local district. A difficulty found in the current support program is the exclusion from state support for nondegree programs, summer programs, and short-term continuing education. There is particular need to give attention to vocational-technical education in this regard.

An added difficulty is the fact that no state support is available for capital outlay. Local bonding capacities have thus far, however, provided the basic

structures for the community colleges.

While there seems to be no current likelihood that additional colleges will be established, continued expansion of the program and increasing sensitivity to local needs is indicated by Wyoming's junior college leadership.