Much of the recent literature relating to junior college finance emphasizes efficient use of existing resources as well as the search for new funds. Several research reports are reviewed here, including (1) a study in Florida that investigated the use of federal funds for junior colleges; (2) fund-raising practices in selected private junior colleges; (3) two comparison studies relating the estimated cost per student of general or liberal arts curricula with the cost per student of vocational and technical programs; (4) the effect of possible tuition increases in public institutions of higher education in California; and (5) a descriptive study of present policies for financing junior colleges in California. (BB)
Paying for Junior Colleges

For the past two decades, the American people have been paying more and more for education. During the 1950's, the increased cost was primarily for elementary schools, which were absorbing the enrollment increases resulting from the postwar baby boom. As the elementary schools clamored for more money, the people began to complain about their efficiency, and legislators expressed the belief that the elementary schools should be able to handle the enrollment increase without such increases in cost.

The enrollment increase during the 1960's hit the high schools, where the per pupil cost was somewhat greater than it was in the elementary schools. As high school enrollments skyrocketed, there was a corresponding demand for more classroom space and additional teachers. Criticism of the efficiency of the school system shifted from the elementary schools to the high schools, and people began demanding that the high schools be operated more efficiently.

In the 1970's, enrollment increases will affect the junior colleges and the four-year colleges as never before. The junior college enrollments are especially troublesome, since they reflect not only the increase due to more births but also the increased number of students who are staying in school for more years. Under these conditions, it is not surprising that much of the recent literature relating to junior college finance emphasizes efficient use of existing resources as well as the search for new funds. This issue of the Junior College Research Review examines a few of the reports on financing junior colleges that have been received and processed by the Clearinghouse.

A study in Florida investigated the use of federal funds for junior colleges (ED 012 591) and, in particular, asked whether the increased support from state and federal sources would provide additional funds for junior colleges or merely replace local funds. Whether state and federal grants would result in greater efficiency in junior colleges was also questioned. The study pointed out that Florida junior colleges have been affected by increased federal grants in the following ways: (1) each of the colleges has employed a person or persons whose full-time job is to work with the federal program; (2) vocational funds have stimulated program development in the occupational areas; (3) the student-aid program has enabled a number of students to attend who might not otherwise have had an opportunity — however, the availability of federal funds has diminished local effort in this area; (4) the availability of federal funds, accompanied by passage of the Civil Rights Bill, has meant a gradual elimination of colleges serving only members of one race, although federal legislation has also resulted in the perpetuation of some small, inefficient colleges for black students; and (5) the federal government's emphasis on the deprived portion of the population has enabled junior colleges to give more than lip service to their stated purposes of providing educational opportunity for all. The general conclusion of this study is that federal funds have been effective in improving the junior colleges in Florida.

A study investigating private funds for junior colleges (ED 011 764) based its findings on 294 replies to questionnaires sent to 376 public community colleges. It was reported that 131 colleges (or 44.5 percent) received no voluntary support and the remaining 55.5 percent received a total of $19 million for the three-year period from July 1960 through June 1963. This was an average annual amount of slightly over $6 million. The researchers pointed out that the largest amount of support was earmarked for buildings and equipment. The second largest category was scholarships, which amounted to 10 percent of all gifts during the three-year period. One hundred and twenty-nine colleges that were independent of public control fared substantially better than the public junior colleges in the receipt of donations from private sources.

For a study aimed at identifying educational fund-raising practices in selected private junior colleges in the United States (ED 020 722), a questionnaire was
sent to 174 private two-year colleges. Sixty-six percent of the colleges replied to the questionnaire. In summarizing the findings, the investigator concluded that most of the two-year colleges participating in the study did not have well-defined long-range plans, nor well-organized plans to solicit money from their constituencies. Based on these findings, the study recommended that junior colleges should consider the employment of at least one full-time fund-raising officer and suggested that adequately staffed financial-advancement programs for larger junior colleges should have a director, a fund-raising officer, a public relations officer, and an alumni officer.

A study of the support for junior colleges that is derived from philanthropic organizations was conducted (ED 023 403). The researcher found that the majority of junior colleges, both independent and church-related, maintain some type of development programs for voluntary support. For church-related junior colleges, however, there appeared to be no relationship between the average annual amount received and the presence of a development officer, an alumni organization, or an alumni fund. In this respect, the study's findings seemed to contradict those in the study on fund-raising practices in private junior colleges in the United States.

Several articles have been written in an attempt to identify the cost per student of various courses offered in junior colleges. In one study, a brief history of efforts to establish a system of classifying data on the income and expenditures of colleges and universities is presented (ED 013 492). The author reviewed the literature on unit cost studies and summarized the major findings of these studies. The work does not deal specifically with junior colleges as a distinct type of institution, however.

In a study related specifically to junior colleges (ED 013 085), the researcher compared the cost of special and technical curricula of less than four years in length to the cost of general or liberal arts curricula leading to programs of study that require four or more years of college. The report concluded that most of the vocational and technical programs offered in junior colleges cost more per student than do the liberal arts and transfer programs in the same institution. The recommendation was made that state support for junior colleges should be on a budget-approval basis, so that the excessive costs of vocational courses would not represent an undue burden upon local taxpayers.

The Office of Survey Evaluation of the Virginia Community College System published a report (ED 019 021) that compared the per student cost of vocational and technical courses with the corresponding costs of other courses. The report concluded that, on the average, it costs more per student to provide the specialized vocational and technical curricula than it does to provide the liberal arts curricula designed for transferring. Smaller student-staff ratios in shops and laboratories, and the need for additional equipment are given as reasons for the cost differences. The report suggested that there is a tendency for local boards of control to establish and operate the least expensive programs, and it urged that new curricula leading to employment in new occupations should be established and operated even at a high unit cost until enrollments increase to make it possible to operate these programs on a more economical basis.

The effect of possible increases in tuition fees for public higher education in California was analyzed by the Coordinating Council for Higher Education (ED 011 197). All segments of the educational system were considered and the report suggested several alternative policies—other than tuition. One proposal was to increase the tuition payments at four-year colleges while leaving junior colleges tuition free. The possible effects of this and other policies were analyzed.

A descriptive study of present policies for financing junior colleges in California was presented in a publication issued by the California State Department of Education (ED 011 451). This publication reviewed the history of junior college finance in California and presented guidelines for a satisfactory finance program; in the final chapter, several alternate plans were suggested for improving the basis for junior college financial support.

Summary

Since states organize their junior colleges in various ways, the problems associated with junior college finance naturally differ from state to state. Much of the literature pertaining to junior college finance, therefore, is inaccessible because it is scattered and associated with other kinds of studies. Sometimes the financing of public junior colleges is regarded as an integral part of the total public school finance system; in other cases, the financing of public junior colleges is handled as essentially a separate system or as closely associated with the financing of higher education. There are also private junior colleges that are financed...
by tuition and by grants from private sources. Since much of the junior college finance literature is part of other studies, researchers interested in pursuing the subject may have difficulty locating and utilizing all of the available literature that has been collected by the Clearinghouse.

Studies pertaining to the per student cost of various courses, especially studies that compare vocational and technical courses with college transfer courses, should be very useful for the development of a broader and more comprehensive junior college program. Several of the studies cited in this review contain valuable information on this subject and lead to significant suggestions concerning the best ways to finance a broad and comprehensive junior college program.

Erick L. Lindman
University of California, Los Angeles
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THE PERSON: A CONCEPTUAL SYNTHESIS
by Florence B. Brawer

The Clearinghouse has released Topical Paper Number 11, which is part of an ongoing project to develop models that will aid junior college research. Because research on students and staff is particularly needed, the presentation of an original model designed to stimulate such study seems appropriate at this time. This paper offers some guidelines for a different way of looking at people within the colleges or, indeed, wherever they may be found. The model includes descriptions of students' modes, orientations, family, school, and other media and goals. It combines many existing concepts stemming from sociological and psychological theories of personality functioning and development. As such, it should be of use to investigators in many disciplines.
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