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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

The enigmatic role of federal involvement in post-secondary education dates back to July 17, 1787 and the passage of the Northwest Ordinance by the Congress of the United States. Included in the provisions of the sale was the following reservation: "Not more than two complete townships to be given perpetually for the purposes of an university, to be laid off by the purchaser or purchasers, as near the centre as may be, so that the same shall be of good land, to be applied to the intended objects by the legislature of the state." As profound as these words may sound it is generally believed that federal support of post-secondary education was, at best, of secondary importance. Rainsford tells us, "The first university grant represented simply one feature of a private bargain between Congress and the business representatives of a commercial company...Congress had little concern for support of education that was not tied to the question of the sale of public lands."

During the nineteenth century more widespread and direct efforts to support post-secondary education emerged. Congress witnessed an increase in the type of resolution proposed in 1818 by Virginia's Congressman John Floyd: "Resolved, that the committee on the Public Lands be instructed to inquire into the expediency of granting to each
state, a tract of land, not exceeding one hundred thousand acres, for the endowment of an university in each state."4 Such efforts by state representatives culminated some years later when the House, by a vote of 90 to 25, passed the now famous Morrill Act5 and President Lincoln signed it into law.6 The conditions imposed by the federal government involved not only that 30,000 acres be granted for every senator and congressman under 1860 census, but also that colleges were required to teach agriculture, mechanical arts, and military tactics.7 Several years later another milestone in the arena of federal support for post-secondary education was reached with the passage of the Hatch Act. This legislation called for the establishment of "agriculture experiment stations in connection with colleges established in the several States under the provisions of an act approved July 2, 1862."8 Then, on May 8, 1914, the President signed the Smith-Lever Act whose purpose was to finance a program of cooperation between land-grant colleges and the Department of Agriculture.9

In summary, it can be said that federal support for post-secondary education up to World War II was largely dominated by the specific national needs of agriculture and the applied sciences. In order to meet these challenges the federal government's response was to appropriate public revenue for post-secondary education with the provision that these funds be allocated in accordance with the national priorities of agriculture, commerce, mechanical arts, military, and expansion. In short, as the Nation grew so did the needs of a more sophisticated and complex society. The end of World War II brought a rapid growth in federal spending for higher education in addition to changes in its financing mechanisms.
With the passage of the G. I. Bill, Congress authorized that federal expenditures be made toward assisting a specific group of citizens (returning servicemen) to further their education. Following this expenditure federal support went toward satisfying the demand for science and scientists in the mid-1950's, and toward research and development in federal facilities, industry, and universities in the 1960's. Though its primary financing mechanism continued to take the form of categorical aid, other mechanisms were also utilized. In brief, examples of these mechanisms are institutional support, general institutional support, construction aid, tax benefits, and various forms of student aid. It is also noteworthy that federal expenditures for post-secondary education rose from $500 million in 1950 to $2 billion in 1958, and to $8.1 billion by 1972.10

By the end of the 1960's federal support for post-secondary education in the collegiate sector amounted to 12.3 percent of the income of private institutions.11 The federal role, it has been argued, is to give direct and indirect encouragement to the training of persons with specific skills that are believed to be in short supply nationally, and to attempt to equalize educational access across state lines.

This role withstanding, federal expenditures or assistance to post-secondary education have carried several implications, historically. Namely, federal expenditures for post-secondary education have been for immediate and temporary national interests or concerns. Being based on specific concerns, the logical sequence was to finance programs aimed at solving or improving these specific conditions. By 1972, approximately 85 percent of the 380 programs funded by the federal
government in support of post-secondary education was financed through
categorical aid programs. A natural inference can be drawn that
in ameliorating specific national problems through categorical aid
programs, the federal government's financial involvement in post-
secondary education is anathematic to the total objectives and goals
of the system. In short, by offering or extending federal dollars for
certain programs, and under regulations or guidelines, federal dollars
impede the institution's ability to plan and carry out its own program.
Nevertheless, there is also strong evidence that federal assistance
should not only continue, but increase. The Carnegie Commission on
Higher Education projects that federal support will have to increase
significantly in percentage and absolute terms in the years ahead.
The Commission projects that by 1976-77 total financial needs of higher
education will be $41 billion, which will necessitate a greater com­
mitment by the federal government since private, state, and local
sources are unable to increase their support.

Kenneth Ashworth states the dilemma in his treatise Scholars and
Statesmen when he says:

As long as the magnitude of involvement of the Federal
Government in higher education was relatively small, the
impact of its programs on the colleges and universities,
and the conflicts and inconsistencies among such programs
were not sufficiently significant to cause major concern.
However, with the marked growth in federal programs in
recent years, and the need for increasing commitment of
federal funds in higher education in the years ahead, all
parties concerned must become aware of the policy conflicts
that arise. When such conflicts are resolved we need to
know what compromises and sacrifices in goals and values
are made.

Concomitant with the increase of federal funds to higher education in the
20th century has been the phenomenal growth of community colleges. At the turn of the century a limited number of students were enrolled in two-year institutions. By 1960, the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education reported there were "more than 600,000 students...and by 1969, their number had grown to almost two million."\(^{16}\)

These facts prompted Robert Finch, Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, to make the following statement in relation to the community junior college:

We are confronted at the outset with the explosive growth of the community college--a truly unique American educational effort. It is a development as revolutionary for this era as was the land-grant college concept for the nineteenth century. Community colleges now number a thousand--almost double the 1960 count. The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education has urged the establishment of an additional 500 by 1976.

Enrollment has been growing more rapidly. Today, two-year colleges serve about two million students--three times the 1960 count. This year, for the first time, more freshmen entered junior colleges than entered four-year institutions.

The mushrooming growth of the community college promises to be the chief means of approaching universal higher education in the United States.\(^{17}\)

With community colleges playing a larger role in the spectrum of American higher education and with federal funds viewed as increasing in significance as a means of support, it seemed appropriate to study the impact that federal funds, financed through categorical aid programs, have had on this educational system by examining a specific institution with a history of participating in such programs.

In accomplishing this research topic and methodology the writer acknowledges the scholarly work accomplished by Dr. Clinton Cook
Daniels whose study closely parallels the present one. However, where Dr. Daniels' study was concerned with assessing the impact of all federal expenditures on a specific community college, this study focuses on only federal expenditures financed through the mechanism known as categorical aid.

The Problem

Statement of the Problem

The major objectives of this investigation were: (1) to develop a model whereby the impact of federally funded categorical aid programs on a public community college can be ascertained and, (2) to assess the impact of these funds by applying this model to a selected public community college in Florida. Specifically, the investigation sought to answer the following question:

In what ways has the receipt of federal dollars financed through categorical aid programs affected a community college's development?

Delimitations

The scope of this study was confined to a single public community college in the State of Florida. Additionally, the time frame which is encompassed by this study was restricted to the 1970-1973 fiscal years. A third confinement of this investigation was in the type of federal expenditure that was assessed. Specifically, it can be argued that any and all federal expenditures have a subliminal effect on the operation of the college, i.e., highways, community service programs, welfare programs, etc. This study was concerned with only those federal
expenditures financed through categorical aid programs which were received by Santa Fe Community College.

Limitations

The main limitation of this study was that its focus was on a single community college; thus, any generalizations concerning its outcome are limited to similar institutions. Additionally, any instrumentation utilized in the study had only face validity.

Justification for the Study

The National Commission on the Financing of Post-Secondary Education reports that "...85 percent of the 380 federal programs that provide funds for post-secondary education may be classified as categorical aid; that is, the funds are allocated to the achievement of some specific purpose rather than as general aid to be expended according to the wishes of the reciprocal institution or agency."18

Federal legislation to aid post-secondary education has been enacted to meet certain national needs. Based on the record of the last decade, continuing and quite possibly increasing increments of federal funds may be made available to community colleges. Decisions relating to (1) making federal funds available, (2) the type of funding, (3) the means of administration and disbursement, and (4) the particular purposes to be realized will be made at the national, state and local level. These decisions should be based to some degree on an understanding of the impact of past programs on the institutions--particularly on the way individual community colleges have been affected by specific types of federally financed programs.
Additional justification comes from the fact that the public community college selected for this study has a history of involvement in various federal programs. As such, the data collected and analyzed had more validity in light of the longitudinal effects of this involvement.

**Definition of Terms**

**Public Community College** - A professionally organized and operated tax supported network of activities and services whose purpose and structure are responsive to the continuing formal and informal educational needs of its community which fills the hiatus between the functions of high schools and four-year colleges or universities.

**Impact** - The term impact, as used in this study, referred to the ways in which federal funds affected the recipient institution. Assessment focused on strength and direction of influence and is expressed numerically where available data permit.

**Federal Funds** - This term refers to those explicit dollars which were received by the college, made available under explicit supporting federal legislation and financed categorically.

**Assessment Model** - A structure for analysis of impact of federal funds on a public community college. The model consists of criteria derived from the literature and validated by knowledgeable persons which can be compared to a public community college for purposes of assessment.

**Categorical Aid** - A financing mechanism employed by the federal government whereby funds are allocated for the achievement of some specific purpose as opposed to general aid where funds may be expended according to the wishes of the recipient institution or agency.
The Review of Related Literature

The review of literature, which will be expanded in Chapters II and III, identifies the historical role of the federal government in post-secondary education in general and community colleges in particular. Additionally, certain chapters that follow contain extensive review and references to the literature and related documents germane to the problem under study. By acknowledging these facts, the writer wishes to convey that the present review merely indicated a sample of materials that was consulted for purposes of this study.

In a book entitled *Emerging Patterns in American Higher Education*, Logan Wilson articulates the magnitude of the present problem:

> Higher education will be financed adequately when costs are regarded as investments rather than expenditures. Although there is no consensus concerning the best ways to support colleges and universities, there can be no disagreement about their pressing needs for greatly increased funds. The inordinate amounts of time and energy educational leaders now have to give to fiscal problems and the consequent neglect of more strictly educational problems are evidences of an almost critical situation.19

In a later article, Wilson suggests that President Kennedy's program of assisting post-secondary education became a benchmark for future programs since it was "aimed at expanding individual opportunities, improving quality on all levels, and strengthening vocational, special and continuing education."20

Yet in fulfilling these goals, several incongruencies emerge, especially in defining relationships or conditions between the Nation
and the institution. John Gardner, in addressing himself to this anomaly, says:

The ideal relationship as far as the university man is concerned would be entirely without any complicating context, which is to say without any context at all, money passed in the dead of night from a donor who would never know the object of his largesse to a recipient who would never know who gave the money or why. Some government observers refer to this as the "leave it on the stump" approach.21

Gardner goes on to point out that as federal involvement in post-secondary education increases, "the universities must become exceedingly knowing in the art of preserving their own autonomy."22

There have been numerous writings on the reason federal assistance is required. L. R. Morrell, writing in the August, 1971 issue of College and University Business, suggests that the increased level of expenditure is caused by such factors as:

(1) "the upward adjustment in professional salaries,"

(2) "price level changes" which can't be offset if a goal of equality is to be pursued,

(3) "the changing nature of the educational program," for example, highly technical programs "requiring substantial outlays for equipment and facilities," and

(4) "on the administrative side, life has become more complicated."23

To the last point Morrell concludes:

The introduction of new programs has also necessitated more administrative effort in such areas as the college work study program, educational opportunity grants, NDEA loans, summer institutes, federal equipment grants, and federal construction loans. Each of these programs requires the establishment of methods and procedures for their administration and reporting which results in added costs even for the institution with a constant enrollment.24
Though relatively new when compared to its older brother, the university, community colleges in America are also concerned with the difficulties surrounding federal assistance to its institutions.

By observing the high quality of research and scholarship in German universities, a number of American educational leaders began to argue for a differentiation between the first and last two years of the American university. According to Hillway, Henry P. Tappan, then President of Michigan University, promoted the idea of extending secondary education two years, thus "admitting to the universities only students who had completed the 14th grade."\textsuperscript{25}

Another 19th century scholar whose views coincided with Tappan's was William Rainey Harper, President of the University of Chicago. John S. Brubacher and William Rudy suggest in the following quotation how Harper sought to accomplish these goals:

\begin{quote}
To heighten the university atmosphere on the central campus, he developed a plan of dividing the American undergraduate college into "junior" and "senior" divisions. His hope was that all work of the first two "junior college" years would be ultimately removed, through affiliations and the establishment of local branches, from the main university precincts altogether.\textsuperscript{26}
\end{quote}

In summary, the seed for community colleges was planted by these iconoclasts for two separate, but interrelated reasons. The first, and most explicit, was to raise the level of scholarship on the American university campus and second, the extension of two years of formal schooling to the general populace. Therefore, the first signs of quality and equality in post-secondary education had begun to emerge.

Through the remaining decade and into much of the 20th century, federal leadership toward achieving these goals by assisting the
development of community colleges was subtle. Even though there were
countless federal enactments that had influence upon its growth, it
wasn't until 1947 and President Truman's Commission on Higher Education
that the philosophical relationship between the federal government and
community colleges was unequivocably forged. In its report to the
President the Commission stated:

We shall have to educate more of our people at each
level of the educational program, and we shall have
to devise patterns of education that will prepare
them more effectively than in the past for responsible
roles in modern society.

The time has come to make education through the
fourteenth grade available in the same way that
high school education is now available.

The time is come to provide financial assistance
to competent students in the tenth through four­
teenth grades who would not be able to continue
their education without such assistance.

The Federal Government assumes responsibility for
supplementing state and local efforts in military
defense against the Nation's enemies without;
surely it may as justifiably assume responsibility
for supplementing state and local efforts against
educational deficiencies and inequalities that are
democracy's enemies within.27

Recognizing the same problem that brought this writer to investigate the
impact of federal assistance on community colleges, The President's
Committee on Education Beyond the High School, in its second report,
articulated the parameters of federal involvement:

The Federal Government should provide leadership...but
it should do those things only by methods which strengthen
state and local effort and responsibility and, in the case
of direct financial assistance, only through programs
which are periodically reviewed and which are promptly
terminated when no longer clearly justifiable. Finally,
the Federal Government should studiously avoid programs
and policies which would carry the threat of either control
or other adverse effects upon the educational institutions.28
(author's emphasis)
The federal government's involvement in regard to the two-year college manifested itself in 1963 with the passage of the Higher Education Facilities Act. Here, for the first time, "...the junior college was specified by name in a Federal enactment...."29 In fact, the law specified that 23 percent of the funds be allocated to these institutions. By 1972, the Catalogue of Federal Domestic Assistance listed approximately 380 separate programs of support for post-secondary education, many for which the community college is eligible.

Even though the growth and development of the American community college is enlarged upon elsewhere in this study, it seems only proper to include an excerpt from an article by Frank G. Jennings that shows the significance of these institutions:

In the fall of 1969 something happened in the lower reaches of higher education which will find a small place among history's footnotes. More students enrolled as freshmen in the junior and community two year colleges than in the four year institutions in the United States. Thus, the century-long career of the ugly duckling of higher education was properly, if quietly, capped. The legions of vocal supporters of the junior college movement will insist that a swan was born.30

**Procedures**

The procedures used in this study were descriptive in nature. Initially, the expressed issues and concerns regarding federal funds to higher education were ascertained by reviewing funding guidelines, legislation and relevant studies. From these, criteria for institutional development in relation to federally funded categorical aid programs were developed, the intent of which was to assess the impact of federally funded categorical aid programs on institutional
development at public supported community colleges which are part of a state system of community colleges.

These criteria were presented to the National Council of Resource Development for validation. Final adoption of the criteria included in the assessment model was based on deletions and additions made by these persons. Questions in relation to the criteria were then determined by the writer and his advisory committee. These questions were posed to personnel at Santa Fe Community College knowledgeable with federally funded categorical aid programs and the College's development.

Conclusions were drawn as to the impact that federally funded categorical aid has had on the College from this process.

Organization of the Research Report

The study is reported in seven chapters. Chapter I contains an introduction, statement of the problem, delimitation and limitations of the study, justification for the study, definitions, a review of related literature, and a description of the procedures.

Chapter II reports a history of federal involvement in post-secondary education in general and community colleges in particular. Included in this chapter is a review of studies and documents pertaining to the federal government's financing of higher education.

Chapter III focuses on the assessment model used in the study. This segment also includes an examination and discussion of the various financing mechanisms utilized by the federal government to assist community colleges.
Chapter IV's purpose is to present a complete listing of federal enactments and programs to which the College applied and received federal funds during FY 1970 through FY 1974.

Chapter V describes Santa Fe Community College as part of the Florida State community college system. Also included in this chapter is a discussion of the College's ten-year plan which is used for purposes of comparison. In addition, a complete listing of federal funds received by the institution during the years in question is enumerated in tabloid form, as are funds received from private and other public sources.

The Application, Analysis, and Report of the Assessment Model is discussed in Chapter VI. The above mentioned information is presented by comparing the College's ten-year plan which was written in 1969 and the present situation where applicable and with interviews with appropriate College personnel.

Chapter VII offers a concluding commentary on the study and on the future role of categorically funded programs in public community colleges.
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CHAPTER II
HISTORY OF FEDERAL INVOLVEMENT IN POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION

The origin of the Federal Government's financial involvement in post-secondary education formally began with the passage of the Northwest Ordinance in 1787. While providing the logical starting point for possible support of post-secondary education, it should be remembered that this enactment was actually a metamorphosis of English legacy and the colonial environment.

According to one writer, the early English settlers were accustomed to having their colleges and universities supported by either private and religious means or through land endowments from the Crown which yielded rent, not from general tariffs. Yet such a system in a world abounding in land would not produce the necessary revenue to operate these institutions. Therefore local colonies initiated a system of repeated public support which included donations of receipts from taxes and licenses, referral of income from public utilities such as mills and ferries, and grants of patronage fees. An illustration of this point may be found in reviewing the beginnings of Harvard College where the General Court of Massachusetts agreed "to give 400£ towards a school or college, whereof 200£ to bee paid the next yeare, & 200£ when the worke is finished, & the next Court to appoint wheare & wt building." In his book, Congress and Higher
Education in the Nineteenth Century, George N. Rainsford summarizes the foregoing when he says:

Most education exhibited a mixed nature, being private in its organization through semipublic in its financing. Thus the distinction between public and private education, so pronounced in current discussions of federal aid to higher education had as little meaning in the colonial context as did the idea of separation between church and state. In fact, in this regard colonial America more closely resembled sixteenth- and seventeenth-century England than it did nineteenth- and twentieth-century America. Government support of education represented as much the extension of an English practice as it did the beginning of an American one. Interaction with the colonial environment changed the original English pattern, but the English origins are clear.

As public support for education became more pronounced so did its influence. Emerging ideas of church and state separation and a more broadly based political structure soon began to impact on the degree of public support extended to higher education. For example, the College of Rhode Island (Brown) was not granted financial aid because The Assembly of Rhode Island was of the opinion that Baptist control of the college would result in sectarian bickering, thus illustrating the fact that changes in pattern and function of public higher education has been more often than not a result of changes in government philosophy.

Shortly after the close of the Revolutionary War, The Congress of the Confederation passed the Northwest Ordinance of 1787, providing public land for the establishment of a university. As profound as it was, this enactment is generally believed to be a result of economical concern rather than education concern. Nevertheless, the leaders of the newly founded nation were not remiss in their attention to the latter.
President George Washington in his first address to Congress remarked, "Whether this desirable object (higher learning) will be best promoted by affording seminars already established, by the institution of a national university or by other expedients, will be well worthy of a place in the deliberations of the Legislature." Other evidence of the government's interest in post-secondary education can be seen in Thomas Jefferson's presidential address to the Congress of 1806:

> Education is here placed among the articles of public care, not that it would be proposed to take its ordinary branches out of the hands of private enterprises, which manages so much better all concerns to which it is equal; but a public institution can alone supply those sciences which, though rarely called for, are yet necessary to complete the circle, all the parts of which contribute to the improvement of the country, and some of them to its preservation.

In his second message to Congress on December 5, 1810 President James Madison attempted to circumvent the Constitutional problem while still extolling the need for such a system:

> ...by super adding to the means of education, provided by the several states, a seminary of learning, instituted by the National Legislature, within the limits of their exclusive jurisdiction, the expense of which might be defrayed or reimbursed out of the vacant grounds which have accrued to the National within those limits. Such an institution, though local in its legal character, would be universal in its beneficial effects.

These proposals suggest that the early presidents desired that the states, local communities and private groups retain primary responsibility for education and the federal government should complete the system with a national university. Or as W. T. Harris, U. S. Commissioner for Education remarked in 1891, "National Education does not begin as it is sometimes supposed, with primary education, but with higher education."
Henry Commager provides insight into the federal government's early recognition of the need for publicly supported education when he said:

No wonder education so quickly became the American religion; no wonder all the Founding Fathers were educators - Franklin, Washington, John Adams, John Dickinson, Noah Webster, and, above all, Thomas Jefferson. Education was to be the instrument of change, change of nature (science was to make that possible) and of human nature...

American schools were, and are, required to do a hundred and one things not expected of European schools...

What America recognized almost by instinct, and what Europe is only slowly coming to recognize, is the immense range and variety of abilities necessary for the efficient functioning of modern society, and the potential role of schools and universities in providing these abilities.

Commager is saying that after securing its independence the new nation was confronted with its own brand of future shock. That such problems as defense, mingling of cultures and expansion were of such magnitude that the national government had to respond in solving them. In addition, living in a country where organized religion was, by law, separated from government the emphasis on federally supported education was axiomatic if the democratic experiment was to survive.

Survival around the turn of the century, meant meeting the challenge of foreign encroachment. To satisfy this need, the Congress established in 1802 the United States Military Academy at West Point, New York and in so doing laid the foundation for later federal involvement in higher education. Babbidge and Rosenzweig summarize, "...that the Federal Government, in seeking highly skilled manpower with which
to carry out the legitimate objects of concern of the Federal Government, would be willing to engage in and support educational activities to this end."\textsuperscript{12} To this end, the Military Academy, the strongest supporter for states' rights, had no objections.\textsuperscript{13} But visualizing the need for trained military officers was for many not the same as being sensitive to the need for trained farmers, teachers, lawyers and doctors. Land Grants had been a legitimate form of supporting higher education but more was needed. A growing sense of the legitimacy of federal involvement soon surfaced under "the general welfare" provision.

One of the first to recognize this tactic was John Nicholson of New York when he submitted the following resolution to the House in 1809:

\begin{quote}
Resolved, that provision be made by law for a general national establishment of banks throughout the United States, and that the profits arising from the same, together with such surpluses of revenue as may accrue, be appropriated for the "general welfare," in the construction of public reach and canals, and the establishment of seminaries for education throughout the United States.\textsuperscript{14}
\end{quote}

Though never passed, the resolution is significant because of its language. One wonders what the effects would have been had this and similar proposals reached fruition. But no such enactments were passed and consequently the federal response was to return to land grants as its primary vehicle for assisting higher education.

\textbf{Public Lands and Education}

As previously indicated the idea of a national system of education was rejected early in our history. But the federal government's early role in assisting education would soon be articulated through the
vehicle of land grants. Historically, the first mention of a national dedication of public lands is seen in a proposal submitted to General Washington in 1783 which read: "All surplus lands shall be the common property of the state and disposed of for the common good; as for laying our roads, building bridges, erecting public buildings, establishing schools and academies, defraying the expenses of government, and other public uses." Congress, to whom Washington forwarded this proposal, failed to act but the idea of public land for education had surfaced. A further effort to defray expenses the new government was fast accumulating was seen in a motion by one Theodoric Blank in 1783, it read, in part:

And be it further ordained, that out of every hundred thousand acres so granted there shall be reserved as a domain for the use of the United States ten thousand acres, each of which ten thousand acres shall remain forever a common property of the United States, unalienable but by the consent of the United States in Congress assembled; the rents, shares, profits, and procedure of which lands, when any such shall arise, to be appropriated to the payment of the civil list of the United States, the erecting of a frontier forts, the founding of seminaries of learning, and the surplus after such purposes (if any) to be appropriated to the building and equipping of a navy, and to no other use or purpose whatever.

Even though both of the above mentioned plans failed, it is interesting to note that the concept of supporting education was of secondary importance. Yet what these plans do represent is the dichotomy between federal and state control of education, an issue that still plagues many students of this subject. The plan submitted by Washington provided that education would come under state control. Blank's proposal would have had the federal government in control.
An additional inference can be drawn from these early proposals that the federal government should play a complimentary role in providing education to the populace and not usurp the rights given to the states by the Constitution.

Inspired by the intent of the above proposals, Congress soon passed the land ordinance of 1785 to promote stability and organization in the Northwest territory. The ordinance, as finally adapted, included these remarkable words, "There shall be reserved the lot No. 16, of every township, for the maintenance of public schools, within the said township..."17 Having articulated its concern for children and education, the national government in 1787 included as one provision in the sale of land that, a portion "be given perpetually for the purposes of a university..."18 This arrangement between newly formed federal government and the Ohio Company of Associates, headed by William Parker Cutler, is considered the first federal support of higher education. Even though the language in the provisions for sale seems to indicate a strong concern for higher education by the federal government, in retrospect, it must be said that it was principally a financial agreement. However, as subtle as this ordinance was in promoting higher education, it did constitute the first commitment by the federal government to the concept of assisting its citizens' education beyond grammar school. On the other hand, by virtue of its primary intent, the Northwest Ordinance initiated a series of occurrences which demonstrates the secondary nature that federal support of higher education has taken. This fact
becomes critical when one attempts to examine the future role of the federal government in the 20th century pertaining to higher education.

The Land-Grant Act of 1862

Three years prior to the catastrophe that would tear the Republic apart and throw it into the midst of an intersectional war, Congressman Justin S. Morrill brought forward a bill which provided 20,000 acres of public land to each state for every senator and congressman under the 1850 census for:

The endowment, support, and maintenance of at least one college in each state where the leading object shall be, without excluding other scientific or classical studies, to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanical arts as the legislatures of the states may respectively prescribe, in order to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions of life.19

It would take five years and many modifications before this proposal would be ratified and signed into law by President Lincoln during the carnage of the War between the States. Mounting casualties from Bull Run, Shiloh and the Red Ridge, no doubt necessitated that military science be taught by institutions established under this enactment in addition to agriculture and mechanical arts. Another modification of Morrill's first proposal was that Congress grant 30,000 acres for every senator and congressman under the 1860 census.20 But of all the changes made in the first proposal, perhaps the most ironical is that the bill signed into law was introduced by Senator Benjamin F. Wade of Ohio and thus, the more accurate term would be the Morrill-Wade Land Grant Act.21
There surrounds the Morrill-Wade Land Grant Act an area of uncertainty in regard to its motives and intentions. Yet, its impact on higher education is clearly beyond speculation when judged by the number and kind of institutions it fostered. In regard to its impact one writer has commented:

Land grants specifically directed to the support of higher education were given to all states on a nationwide basis for the first time. Congress imposed specific conditions on the manner of selection and sale of the lands granted as well as on the reinvestment and use of the funds realized. A definite pattern reflecting need based on population replaced the diffuse basis of earlier grants. By directing the grants to the support of technical education, Congress forced education to fit the changing social and economic patterns of an expanding nation. The 1862 act also established the practice of annual reporting and accounting of federal funds. Finally in order to be eligible for a grant, the states had to pass legislation pledging acceptance of the terms.

In summary, it can be said that the Ohio Company Contract and Morrill-Wade Act were similar in many ways. Both assisted higher education through land-grants and in both, assisting education in general was of secondary importance. What did emerge from these acts, especially the Morrill-Wade Act, was that federal assistance to higher education was within the confines of the Constitution when based upon the national need of trained manpower. This postulate established a pattern of federal aid to higher education. An additional commentary is that the land grant institutions provided practical education. In short, education had to be good for something in a manner befitting the general populace. It is to this point that Babbidge and Rosenzweig support the Morrill-Wade
Land Grant Act when they say:

It was the failure of the existing institutions, largely under private or religious control, but including state universities, to respond to popular will and wishes that led to the most noted and significant Federal action during the nineteenth century. The so-called land-grant colleges were brought into being to provide a form of higher education not systematically viewed by established institutions and not available under circumstances that made it available to large number of people.23

So notable was the success of the institutions established by the Morrill-Wade Land Grant Act that steps were taken to embellish upon their accomplishments. Most noticeable was a bill passed by both houses and signed into law in 1887 named after Congressman William H. Hatch of Missouri.24 Known as the Hatch Act its title connoted its juxtaposition to the land grant of 1862. "A bill to establish agricultural experiment stations in connection with colleges established in the several states under the provision of an act approved July 2, 1862 and of act supplementary thereto."25 The language of the act leaves little room for argument over its intention:

That in order to aid in acquiring and diffusing among the people of the United States useful and practical information on subjects connected with agriculture and to promote scientific investigation and experiment respecting the principles and applications of agriculture science, there shall be established under direction of the college or colleges or agricultural departments of colleges or each state or Territory established, or which may hereafter be established, in accordance with the provision of an act...(the Morrill Act of 1862 and its supplements) a department to be known and designated as an "agriculture experiment station."26

Hill and Fisher point out the significance of this enactment in that "for the first time a system of annual payments would be given direct to the institutions and not the states and that any funds
remaining at the end of the year would be deducted from the next year's appropriation."\(^{27}\) Clearly, the federal government had increased its degree of control through this mechanism.

**Other Involvement**

It should be noted that the federal government's involvement in higher education was represented in other ways, too. In 1830, the Secretary of the Treasury contracted with the Franklin Institute to conduct a study of boiler explosions.\(^{28}\) This agreement is often cited as the first research contract between the federal government and higher education. However, for purposes of this treatise, the grant made to Samuel F. B. Morse in 1842 has more significance since Congress and not an agency made the appropriation. The grant was for the amount of $38,000.00 and provided expense money and personal reimbursement to test the feasibility for public use of the electromagnetic telegraph system.\(^{29}\) Though made to an individual and not an institution per se, this grant illustrates the federal government's concern for science and experimentation which was manifested in the Hatch Act.

Additional concern and involvement in higher education by the federal government during the 19th century was the establishment in 1867 of the United States Bureau of Education, thus making it one of the oldest federal agencies in existence.\(^{30}\) Two historians have noted that the history of the Office of Education itself would provide a "kind of barometer of Federal interest in and concern for higher education."\(^{31}\) Known as a "Committee on Education," its purpose was
to "take into consideration all measures and propositions relative thereto, which shall be referred to them by the House and to repart their opinion thereupon, together with such propositions relative thereto as they shall deem expedient." Even though the status of the Office of Education has been in doubt, historically, its significance lies in the fact that it has been a federal agency for more than a century.

In summarizing federal involvement in higher education in the 19th century, it can be said that federal assistance began with a single, broad scale program of assistance to states "for the purposes of a university...to be applied to the intended objects of the Legislature of the State" as in the Ohio Company Contract; and grew to the legislation of 1862 which specified the kinds of institutions to receive aid and, finally, to the Hatch Act which by-passed the states, making the institutions the recipients.

First Signs of the Public Community Junior Colleges

The spiraling effects of practical education for the general populace fostered by the land-grant acts led American educators during the mid-19th century to seek different forms of higher education. Brubacher and Rudy suggest the reason why "William Rainey Harper was interested in the German system of higher education: 'To heighten the university atmosphere on the central campus, he developed a plan of dividing the American undergraduate college into junior and senior divisions.'"
The German university system must have appealed to American educators since it promoted high levels of scholarship and research. However, it should be noted that whereas the Rhineland was a "caste" oriented country, the young Republic had no such system of government. Therefore, it is not appropriate to extol the virtues of the German system of higher education without mentioning the anomalies that existed between the two countries. Specifically, the democratic philosophy of the United States had already impacted on its system of higher education from the founding fathers' early proposals to the passage of the Morrill-Wade Land-Grant Act, the idea was fostered that America would need an educated populace in order to survive. And, survival meant establishing the Military Academy in 1802, just as survival in the agriculturally dominated 19th century meant fostering the concept of "practical" education. In addition to promoting this concept the land grant colleges were tasked with the requirements of experimentation, research and the traditional curriculum of a liberal education. It is no wonder then, that Rainey, and other visionaries foresaw the problems seeping into their institutions and began arguing for change. In addition to having to provide so much for so many higher education was confronted with the increasing changes of a country moving toward the industrial age. Faced with these enormous complexities many American educators began to view lower division work as inappropriate for the true university.

It would take almost another one-half century (1901) before the concept espoused in the mid-1800's would reach fruition with the establishment of the first publicly supported two-year college.
The apparent slowness which existed between the time the idea was first enumerated and when it took effect can be attributed to its futuristic properties. The 20th century would thrust the nation into the industrial and atomic ages and bring about changes in America's philosophy about higher education.

The Federal Government and Higher Education in the Twentieth Century

The bonds of purpose between the federal government and higher education begun during the 19th century grew and matured during the first half of the 20th century. Emanating from the Morrill Act of 1862 the federal government continued to be active in the agriculture. Initially intended to assist the farmer in receiving practical knowledge, the Morrill-Wade Act failed according to the U. S. Commissioner 1890-91 report which said, in part, "even the most cursory examination of colleges thus aided will show that in the large majority of cases these branches (agriculture and mechanical arts) have not been made the leading objects...." To bridge the gap between the universities' proclivity towards the theoretical and the farmers requirements for the practical, the president on May 8, 1914 signed the Smith-Lever Act. The act's purpose was to finance cooperative programs between land grant colleges and the Department of Agriculture "in order to aid in the diffusing among the people of the United States useful and practical information on subjects relating to agriculture and home economics, and to encourage the application of the same." The significance of this act lies not only in its intent but also in the
fact that it carried the most exacting provisions of any federal grant passed to date. An equal matching amount of funds had to be "appropriated for that year by the legislature of such state, or provided by state, county, college, local authority, or individual contributions from within the state" before the federal government would allocate funds for the program. Additionally, the appointment of an administrator for the extension program at an institution would need the approval of the secretary of agriculture. But the most restrictive provision was that the proposed program had to receive prior approval from the Department of Agriculture before the institution would receive federal funds. In fact, the secretary could withhold funds already appropriated if the program did not conform to provisions stipulated in the act.

As the federal government's ability to influence higher education increased through such tactics as prior approval, annual financial reporting and withholding provisions, so did its philosophical thrust. Where federal aid to higher education had once been for the general welfare of its citizens, the 20th century was to experience a continuation and enlargement of financing specific programs for specific national concern. To accomplish this task a financing mechanism termed categorical aid, came into vogue. While splintering its interest in higher education into dozens of programs, the federal government's financial support of higher education diminished considerably. To substantiate this fact, one has only to recognize that the percent of federal spending on higher education relative to
means of support fell from 34.2 percent in 1900 to 11.9 percent in 1920.\textsuperscript{42} The principle to which these facts address is that lacking a comprehensive plan with clear-cut goals, federal aid to higher education was responsive to political expediency. Just as need to satiate the farmer's desire for educational opportunity led to the Smith-Lever Act of 1914 the federal government in 1918 responded to discontent among industrial workers with the Smith Hughes Act of 1917.\textsuperscript{43} This act resembled the act signed in 1914 but was not a college-level or even college associated program. Under the supervision of the federal government the act called for practical, vocational education for discrete groups within the society, a characteristic that was to become more pronounced.

As previously noted, the government did not have a well defined policy toward higher education. Thus, its financial support lacked substance and continuity. In short, higher education was viewed as a temporary means to a temporary problem. The problems associated with this philosophical lack of commitment were summarized in 1931 by the National Advisory Committee on Education:

\begin{quote}
The Federal Government has no inclusive and consistent public policy...in the field of education. Whatever particular policies it seems to be pursuing are often inconsistent with each other, sometimes in conflict. They suggest a haphazard development, wherein policies of far reaching effect have been set up as mere incidents of some special attempt to induce an immediate and particular efficiency.

Without a comprehensive forward looking and coherent public policy in regard to education, the present educational situation in the Federal Government can not be greatly improved.\textsuperscript{44}
\end{quote}
1945 to 1972

As the Second World War drew to a close, there was a great deal of discussion concerning what benefits the federal government should extend to returning servicemen. An extensive vocational rehabilitation program for disabled veterans had been undertaken after WWI, yet there were no such benefits for those who escaped injury. Moral perplexities concerning the Nation's gratitude to men who had interrupted or foregone educational training in order to defend their country led to the more practical problem of absorbing several million workers into a peace-time economy. The legislation finally enacted provided educational allowances for any veteran who could be admitted and maintain passing grades at any school, college and university recognized by his state or the Veteran's Administration. Eligible servicemen could use these benefits to pursue almost any level of education, from completing high school to studying philosophy in graduate school.

A key feature of this enactment was that eligibility rested exclusively on military service and not on aptitude for education. Like the Morrill-Wade Land Grant Act of 1862, the Smith Lever Act of 1914 and the 1917 Smith-Hughes Act, political expediency, not national policy, established the parameters for this invasion into the practices of higher education. As if by some cosmic knowledge the Congress decreed that the furthering of educational opportunities for veterans and dependents would benefit the Nation as a whole. Senator Pepper reflected this implication when he said:

...while I understand thoroughly what the Germans have always done about segregating those who are qualified
for higher education from the masses who are destined for manual work and that sort of thing, at the same time it looks to me like any boy or girl who wants to go to college and who is able to make creditable grades if they go there, should be entitled to go without some board somewhere getting this fellow into a laboratory, as it were, and deciding what potentialities are within him.48

The Senator's timely reference to a recently defeated and hated system of government probably served emotional rather than logical purposes, yet it did suggest that in a democracy the opportunity for continuing education should be extended to all. An indication of the impact this social experiment had on higher education can be gleaned from the fact that in 1939 some 1,365,000 persons were enrolled in degree-credit institutions but by 1949 enrollment had risen to almost 2-1/2 million.49 Forged by the G. I. Bill, the link between the federal government and higher education following the Second World War produces a new setting for the conduct of higher education.

President Truman's Commission on Higher Education (1947)

If World War I brought America reluctantly into the world, World War II removed any doubt that we were in it to stay. Every part of our society was affected with new responsibilities as a result of the war. Scientific discoveries and innovations that had brought the Axis powers to their knees were now deemed essential if the world was to avoid another catastrophe. Higher education was to become an integral part of the solution to meet these new demands. Prompted by these facts President Truman appointed a Commission on Higher Education in
1946 to recommend the federal government's role in higher education. No novice to the importance of continuing education, the law school drop-out challenged the Committee, in part, to find:

...ways and means of expanding educational opportunities for all young people; the adequacy of curricula, particularly in the field of international affairs and social understanding; the desirability of establishing a series of intermediate technical institutes; the financial structure of higher education with particular reference to the requirements for the rapid expansion of physical facilities.50

In response to this direction the Commission produced a report of considerable length which did not receive, according to Axt, "unanimous acceptance from the academic community, not did the Truman administration see fit to sponsor legislation to put into effect more than a small fraction of the program envisaged by the Commission.51

Considering the times, probably the greatest weakness in the Commission's proposals was that it foresaw the need for universal or equalitarian access to post-secondary education and was slanted toward public higher education. The Commission estimated that about half of all American youngsters had the ability to complete 14 years of schooling and about a third could complete four or more years of college training. The Commission regarded this fact as a waste of human potential which would have an adverse effect on the nation. To offset this problem, it was recommended that state and local governments provide free public education through the fourteenth grade in both community and four year colleges and that tuition be reduced to the levels prevailing in 1939.52 The federal government,
argued the Commission, should immediately institute a program of grants-in-aid to the states for both operating expenses and capital outlay. Furthermore, in order to meet the new demands for higher education the Commission specified that: "Immediate steps be taken to establish a national program of Federally financed scholarships and fellowships as a means of removing further the economic barrier and enabling our most competent and gifted youth to obtain for themselves and for society the maximum benefits...from higher education."

In addition to the above recommendation the Commission pointed out the shortcomings of the U. S. Office of Education. Though failing to specify what steps could be taken to improve the Office, the Commission did point out that federal control of education could result as much from a lack of centralization as it could from the opposite.

The proposals suggested by the Commission were broad and far-reaching and as such had little chance of being translated into public policy. Yet it is interesting to consider the Commission's report in light of the experiences since its writing. Namely, the acceptance of the fact that universal post-secondary education is a legitimate goal for those Americans who desire and who can prosper from it. To this last point, Willingham comments:

More than 20 years ago, the Truman Commission (1947) declared, "The time has come to make education through the 14th grade available in the same way that high school education is now available." This prophetic statement stirred up enough excitement to require lengthy rebuttal to the critics. On the other hand similar sentiments expressed during the past ten years by such public groups as the Eisenhower Commission
(1957), the Educational Policies Commission (1964), and the Carnegie Commission (1968) have been accepted without a ripple. Furthermore, the Higher Education Facilities Act (1963), and the Higher Education Act (1965), and the Higher Education Amendments (1968) represent concrete evidence of the political acceptability of substantially broadened opportunity for higher education.55

The President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School (1956)

Ten years passed before the next presidentially appointed committee recommended many of the same points as the Truman Commission when in 1956, President Eisenhower called for a re-evaluation of the federal role in higher education. Chief architect for this group was its chairman, Devereaux C. Josephs, Chairman of the Board of the New York Life Insurance Company.56 Perhaps due to the lack of impact by the Truman Commission on federal policy, Eisenhower's Committee took a more conservative approach in its recommendations.

Like the previous groups, this body estimated that about one half of American young people could profit from education beyond high school.57 Yet its recommendations centered not on the economic barriers to continuing education but on the need for better advisement and counseling in secondary schools. If money was needed to assist students, the Committee felt that students' support should come through loans.58 Again, as with the Truman Commission, the specific substance of the recommendations fell on deaf ears. Nevertheless, for purposes of this study, the Committee made one major proposal in its effort to bring order to the policy-making apparatus of the federal government. It said:

The Committee, therefore, urgently recommends that the President authorize and direct the Secretary of Health,
Education, and Welfare to develop for his consideration specific proposals on the best means for setting up whatever machinery may be necessary (a) to further a continuous and orderly review and development of the national and intergovernmental aspects of education beyond the high school and (b) to fulfill the other needs relating thereto which are identified in these conclusions and recommendations.59

But what the Committee didn't know at the time of its report was that in October of the same year, Russia would launch its first satellite into orbit and turn what was perhaps a rather desultory debate on higher education into a burning national issue.


To some, the National Defense Education Act represents a turning point in federal interest in higher education.60 Title I of the Act articulates what amounts to a declaration of policy. It states, in part:

> The Congress hereby finds and declares that the security of the Nation requires the fullest development of the mental resources and technical skills of its young men and women. The present emergency demands that additional and more adequate educational opportunities be made available.

We must increase our efforts to identify and educate more of the talent of our Nation. This requires programs which will give assurance that no student of ability will be denied an opportunity for higher education because of financial need...

To meet the present educational emergency requires additional effort at all levels of government. It is therefore the purpose of this Act to provide substantial assistance in various forms to individuals and to States and their subdivisions, in order to insure trained manpower of sufficient quality and quantity to meet the national defense needs of the United States.61
The significance of the "no student of ability..." statement cannot be over emphasized since now, the Congress of the United States and not an appointed committee acknowledges this fact. Alice Rivilin supports this contention when she wrote in 1961:

The National Defense Education Act may represent the beginning of a new era of explicit recognition of higher education as a legitimate area of federal concern. To be sure...there is considerable verbiage about "national security"...Nevertheless the Act comes closer to being an out-and-out education measure than any previous legislation. The provision for the student loan program seems to indicate congressional acceptance of the idea that it is in the national interest for the federal government to help undergraduates finance their education on a continuing basis...The efficacy of the measure may be questioned, but the intent of the National Defense Education Act clearly was to use Federal resources to strengthen higher education generally. This recognition of higher education as a national concern may well turn out to be the most important feature of the Act.62

Conclusion

It would be unfair to say that the two Commissions discussed here have had no impact on federal activities as they relate to higher education. Federal spending on higher education has increased tremendously during the period mentioned. The Commissions presented here had the unenviable task of examining the entire spectrum of federal activities in higher education and make recommendations accordingly. To this last point, it must be noted that if a single thread of philosophy can be seen through each report it was that benefits of higher education accrue to the nation as a whole. And, the federal government has no inclusive and consistent public policy towards higher education. Though claimed as great milestones in the
history of federal support for higher education, it can be argued that each represented only a temporary national concern. Much of the same logic can be applied to the National Defense Education Act of 1957, about which one educator commented:

"History will smile sardonically at the spectacle of this great country getting interested slightly and temporarily in education only because of the technical advancements of Russia, and then being able to act as a nation only by assimilating education into a cold war and calling an education bill a defense act." 63

The Higher Education Facilities Act (1963)

Following the passage of the National Defense Education Act, the Congress was soon urged "to provide every student with adequate physical facilities to meet his instructional, research and residential needs." 64 Though never witnessing the function of his mandate, President Kennedy's early address to Congress had stipulated the need for federal assistance. As passed by the 88th Congress, its purpose is as follows:

An Act to authorize assistance to public and other non-profit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities in undergraduate and graduate institutions. 65

According to Section 2:

The Congress hereby finds that the security and welfare of the United States require that this and future generations of American youth be assured ample opportunity for the fullest development of their intellectual capacities, and that this opportunity will be jeopardized unless the Nation's colleges and universities are encouraged and assisted in their efforts to accommodate rapidly growing numbers
of youth who aspire to a higher education. The Congress further finds and declares that these needs are so great and these steps so urgent that it is incumbent upon the Nation to take positive and immediate action to meet these needs through assistance to institutions of higher education, including graduate and undergraduate institutions, junior and community colleges, and technical institutes, in providing certain academic facilities.66

The specific mention of junior colleges should be noted. According to Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., "the first major federal attention given to two-year colleges was in 1963 with the passage of the Higher Education Facilities Act."67

Description

The Act has four titles. Title I deals with "Grants for Construction of Undergraduate Academic Facilities," Title II is concerned with construction grants for "Graduate Academic Facilities," Title III encompasses "Loans for Construction of Academic Facilities," and Title IV covers "General Provisions."

It is Title I which is of particular interest for present purposes. The original act and subsequent amendments allotted to the states a certain percentage of the appropriated funds to be used specifically for public community colleges and public technical institutes. Up to the end of fiscal year 1967 this was 22 percent; for fiscal year 1968, it was 23 percent; and for fiscal years after 1968, it was 24 percent.

Section 103 of Title I covers the criteria for disbursement of funds among the states. The basis is fundamentally the number of high school graduates and the per capita income of a state.
Section 105 under Title I outlines the requirements with regard to establishment of State agencies (a State Commission) to administer P.L. 88-204 and to develop a state plan for participation in the grant program. The state plan includes establishment of relative priorities of eligible projects and determination of the federal share of such projects. Section 107 states that the federal share cannot exceed 50 percent of the cost.

Section 106 under Title I outlines eligibility standards which essentially are based on an urgent need to provide for substantial expansion of enrollment capacity, or capacity to provide health care to students, or to carry out extension and continuing education programs.

Higher Education Act (1965)

If indeed the posture of the federal government toward higher education "turned the corner" with the passage of the NDEA, then Congressional actions in 1965 thrust the federal government into the center lanes of influences on higher education. On November 8, 1965, the Congress passed legislation whose purpose was: "To strengthen the educational resources of our colleges and universities and to provide financial assistance for students in post-secondary and higher education."68

The Higher Education Act (1965) represented the most comprehensive higher education related legislation to date. Its scope can be demonstrated by nature of its various titles. They are: Title I - Community Service and Continuing Education Programs;
Title II - College Library Assistance and Library Training and Research; Title III - Strengthening Developing Institutions; Title IV - Student Assistance; Title V - Teacher Programs; Title VI - Financial Assistance for the Improvement of Undergraduate Instruction; Title VII - Amendments to Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963; and Title VIII - General Provisions. While this act will be described in detail later in this study, two significant points are worthy of mention here. First, from the language of the act one can discern that community colleges' role in higher education was more definite and, secondly the act's intent was to rectify specific problems within the "concept" of post-secondary education. This latter statement means, that for the first time, the purpose of post-secondary education was accepted as being necessary for the well-being of all and not just professional preparation. It also implies the national post-secondary education role in a democracy. And yet, as one writer has commented, "all of these tend to fall into the background in relation to the potential impact, if funded, of the Educational Amendments of 1972."69

President's Task Force on Higher Education (1970)

In 1970, President Nixon appointed a Task Force on Higher Education and instructed it to develop a statement of priorities for higher education and ways in which the federal government could render assistance. Based on their findings, the Task Force enumerated the following priorities for the federal government:
and the institutes of higher education:

I. Financial Aid of Disadvantaged Students,

II. Support of Health Care Professional Education,

III. Increased Tax Incentive for Support of Higher Education,

IV. The Expansion of Opportunities for Post-High School Education,

V. The Support of High Quality Graduate and Professional Education.70

The four areas which the Task Force believed constituted institutional priorities were:

I. Clarification of Institutional Purposes,

II. Improvement of the Quality of the Curriculum and Method of Teaching,

III. More efficient uses of Resources,

IV. Clarification of Institutional Governance.71

With regard to community colleges the Task Force recommended:

We believe the expansion of post-secondary education should take place largely in the two-year colleges and equivalent programs that combine a variety of educational and occupational options. These two-year colleges should accept the major responsibility for increasing access to post-high school education and also for offering remedial and compensatory education. Many of these should be located in urban centers.72

The responsibility of the federal government was also spelled out:

Aid to student: The major program of financial aid to economically disadvantaged students as an Immediate Federal Priority must be continued for many years to come. In addition, we urge the establishment of a national loan fund to enable other students to spread the cost of education over a period of time.

Support for Two-Year Colleges: Where local funds are inadequate, federal funds should be made available to public and private organizations to create and expand
two-year institutions which serve the comprehensive purposes described above. Such support should also be made available to four year institutions that offer comprehensive two-year programs. In addition, where local funds are inadequate, special federal programs should provide funds to support operating costs...73

The Education Amendments of 1972 (Higher Education Act, 1965, P.L. 89-329)

The Education Amendments of 1972 passed the Senate in late May and the House during the month of June and was signed into law.74 In addition to the extension of a number of existing programs the Bill provides emergency assistance for institutions of higher education, a new basic opportunity grant program for low-income students, a matching state incentive scholarship program, a community college planning and support program, a post-secondary occupational education program, provisions for funds and structures for statewide post-secondary education planning, a National Institute for Education, funds for innovation in post-secondary education and cost-of-education aid to institutions of higher education.75

Two of the most striking concerns of the act were its emphasis on state leadership and educational planning. Permeating the entire Act are provisions for state commissions, statewide planning for post-secondary education, community college planning and post-secondary occupational educational planning. For example, under Title X, Section 1202, is the provision that states deserving to receive assistance shall develop a statewide plan for the expansion and improvement of post-secondary education programs in community colleges. The plan must:

1. Designate areas of the state without two-year free or
low-tuition institutions in reasonable distance of the student's home.

2. Plan for the establishment, expansion and the improvement of community colleges in order to make the opportunity to attend community colleges available to all residents.

3. Establish federal and non-federal funding priorities to achieve its goal.

4. Recommend adequate state and local support within the priorities in the above provision.

5. Analyze duplications in post-secondary programs and recommend coordination to eliminate such duplication.

6. Develop a plan to achieve its goal including modifications of state plans for federally assisted vocational education, community services and academic facilities.

The state plan would then be submitted to the Commissioner of Education for final approval prior to a state receiving funds.

The above example serves to illustrate the increased role of change agent being assumed by the federal government. Recognizing the problems of duplication and coordination within states that is caused by a lack of state-wide planning, the government's intent was to ameliorate this malady by offering federal funds.

**Conclusion**

This chapter's purpose was to trace the federal government's involvement in higher education since 1800. Obviously, no student
of this vast subject could hope to accomplish such a magnanimous task under the circumstances of a research document without mentioning that only a surface record of this history was presented. Nevertheless, in reiterating highlights of the federal role in higher education several observations can be gleaned:

1. The federal government has not dealt with problems of higher education itself as an important segment of society but in terms of what it could contribute to other parts of society.

2. There has been an increase in the magnitude of federal support for higher education without a comprehensive and integrated plan.

3. There has been an increase to raise the minimum level of education of the entire populace.

4. There has been an increase in categorical aid programs in response to changing national needs.

5. The federal government has assumed the role of change agent by providing funds for specific purposes.

6. Attempts have been made to coordinate federal programs with institutional and state programs.

7. There is a growing belief that allocating federal funds directly to students makes the institutions more responsive to them.

8. There is little evidence of support for "cost-of-education" allowances to post-secondary institutions.
9. The federal government approach to education was as a means rather than as an end in itself. Educational benefits derived from increased individual growth and competence were only by-products of federal aid.

10. The immediate objectives of federal aid to higher education were to facilitate the sale of land, to assist the development of new public-land states during the 19th century, and to answer the demands of political powerful groups; such as farmers, returning servicemen, and scientists.

11. The amount of federal control has increased during the period discussed but does not appear threatening to higher education.

12. Since the Higher Education Act of 1965 there has been an increased interest in consolidating federal support of students and institutions and providing federal assistance to low-income students, community service programs and vocational training.
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CHAPTER III
CONSIDERATIONS REGARDING THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN THE
DEVELOPMENT OF AN ASSESSMENT MODEL FOR EVALUATION OF
FEDERALLY FUNDED CATEGORICAL AID ON COMMUNITY COLLEGES

The present chapter reports on an effort to develop, through a
review of the literature and through interviews with knowledgeable
persons, a set of criteria for evaluating federally funded cate-
gorical aid as it applies to the development of a community college.
The criteria from the literature were structured and then submitted
to the National Council for Resource Development (NCRD) for validation.

The chapter is divided into four main parts: (1) reviews of
studies, articles, and books, (2) structuring of criteria, (3)
suggestions and validation by the NCRD, and (4) summary.

Review of Studies, Articles, and Books

This section is composed of reviews of written materials pertaining
to issues related to federal funds and higher education. In many cases
the reference institution is the university rather than the junior
college and many of the expressions were made before some of the
higher education bills now on the scene were passed. Nevertheless,
the issues raised are applicable for present purposes. This is a
selective rather than a comprehensive review of possible sources on
the subject. The intention is to present a representative sampling of
expressed concerns, and of related studies, toward the end of developing
an analytical framework for assessing federal fund impact on the public community college.

Clark Kerr, The Realities of the Federal Grant University

This is the second of three lectures given by Kerr at Harvard in 1963 and published in a book entitled The Uses of the University. Although concern is with the university and especially with research oriented activities, some of the material suggests considerations germane to the present study.

The lecture begins with this statement:

Two great impacts, beyond all other forces, have molded the modern American university system and made it distinctive. Both impacts have come from sources outside the universities. Both have come primarily from the federal government. Both have come in response to national needs.

Reference is to (1) the land grant movement under the Morrill Act of 1862 and (2) the impact of federal support of scientific research during World War II. The latter involved financing of university research centers. To Kerr, it is interesting that institutions which are considered "private" or "state" have received "their greatest stimulus in federal initiative."

What is termed the "federal grant" university has been emerging over the past twenty years, and has not been based on any particular set of predetermined policies or institutional self-surveys. The first phase of federal grant development Kerr calls "the phase of 'intuitive imbalance.'" He feels that a new phase is being entered into and this is termed "bureaucratic balance."
With regard to intuitive imbalance, it is noted that for the past twenty years Congress has determined the general areas of partnership with the universities, which are defense, scientific and technological progress, and health. Expenditure decisions have not been based on a thorough study of national priorities and funds have gone to universities best able to implement the Congressional choice of programs. This has affected the universities and raised certain issues.

One issue is that of federal control and federal influence. Federal control is not the real problem but federal influence is. If a project is offered (reference is to research) a university need not accept it, but usually does, for fear of losing the faculty involved. A second issue refers to the university's control over its own endeavors. "University funds from tuition and fees, gifts and endowments, and state sources go through the usual budget-making procedures and their assignment is subject to review in accordance with internal policy." However, when federal research funds enter the scene, they are negotiated normally by individual faculty members and bypass the normal budgetary review process. Accordingly, a sizable chunk of the university's expenditures may fall outside of the normal channels. On the other hand, "these funds in turn commit some of the university's own funds." This includes influence on use of space and of faculty.

Kerr refers to the issue of university aid to the federal government whereby overhead allowances do not cover the indirect costs of federally sponsored research. "Also, matching grants for construction may force
a university to upset its own priority system in order to get federal funds. This, of course, is the intent. And additionally, "new classes of administrators have been created—the contracting officer and the research project manager." Another issue noted is the presence of some abuses because of the temptations of the huge sums involved.

Phase two, "bureaucratic balance," is a new approach where federal funds are more evenly spread among educational needs, among fields, and among institutions. Focus is mainly on studies and on proposed legislation in 1963 which appeared to support such an approach.

Kerr finishes his essay with some suggestions relating to federal involvement in higher education but these suggestions are limited to the university and especially to research and graduate programs.

Wilbur Anthony Bass, A Study of the Impact of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 on Selected Texas Public Junior Colleges

This dissertation, written at the University of Texas in 1967, had a stated purpose as follows:

The primary purpose of this study is to determine what impact the Vocational Education Act of 1963 has had upon the public junior colleges of Texas in terms of the number and kinds of courses offered and an investigation of the adequacy of the system for the distribution of funds will be made.

The study covered 31 public junior colleges in Texas in the 1965-66 academic year. The two objectives were to evaluate the effects of the Act in terms of curriculum changes in the colleges, and to determine whether distribution of funds under the Act were such as to realize the purposes of the Act.
A set of 11 hypotheses were developed to deal with the above objectives. A detailed listing of these hypotheses will not be offered here. However, the nature of some of them is reported in that they occasion questions of use to the present study.

Bass looked at annual increases in the number of vocational and technical courses as well as in the number of kinds of such courses which were available after Vocational Act funds were available as opposed to the year preceding the availability of such funds. He found that a greater annual increase had indeed taken place. He attempted to determine if more than half of such programs added since implementation of the act would be discontinued if funds were no longer available and found that this would not be the case.

The average expenditure for operations per FTE student apparently was not a determinant of receipt of federal funds. However, more federal money did go to schools where a large percentage of FTE students were in vocational and technical courses. Bass also found that his hypothesis that "the more federal money a school received for operations for vocational and technical courses, the higher the percentage of retention (lower the percentage of drop-outs) will be," was supported. Apparently, neither a greater number of federally financed vocational programs already in existence at a school nor a greater number of full-time counselor equivalents were determinants of receipt of proportionally more federal funds. The length of tenure of the chief administrative officer did not appear to affect the amount of
federal funds either. With this last notion, Bass assumed that if experience in the handling of federally funded programs served as a basis for more funds, that tenure of presidents could serve as a measure of such experience. 10

Seymour E. Harris and Alan Levensohn (Eds.) Education and Public Policy

In 1962-63 a seminar on Education and Public Policy was held at Harvard. The papers and discussions were published in 1965 in a book under the same title, edited by Seymour Harris and Alan Levensohn. The following material is selected from this volume.

In a discussion on federal aid to students a controversy arose over the relative importance of aid to students vs. direct aid to institutions for facilities, programs, etc. If needed income for support of colleges is to be gained by tuition hikes, then if more students are not excluded, more financial aid to students must follow. On the other hand, direct support to institutions would enable schools to avoid high tuition charges and hence fewer students might require scholarships. One disadvantage of institutional aid, as pointed out by Harris, is that if tuition is kept low, all students are benefited—even those who could afford to pay higher charges. "By raising tuitions and providing scholarships as needed, the cost of higher education can be more effectively distributed according to the students' ability to pay." 12

Another issue of federal aid that came under discussion was that of federal control. A graduate student at Harvard raised the point that federal research grants are "a type of control." 13
The issue of control was discussed in a paper presented by Neal Gross and entitled "Who Controls the Schools?" One short paragraph in particular seems appropriate for inclusion here. Professor Gross outlined the many questions which were occasioned by the title of his paper. One set had to do with what is controlled: "Who controls the budget? the educational philosophy? the curriculum? the selection of personnel? Who controls what takes place in the classroom?"\(^1\)

Another insight relative to control was offered by Michael S. March in a paper on "Allocation of Resources to Education." March reviews the decision-making process involved in federal aid to education. He notes the many separate agencies and separate programs involved. Also noted is the hierarchy of committees and offices included in development of policies and budgets. According to March, this "dispersal of decision making" ought to "lay to rest any fear of Federal control over education."\(^1\) The federal government, he contends, at least at that time, "has no consistent policy toward education."\(^1\) Rather, many policies related to many agencies are evidenced. Recommended is a comprehensive compilation of present governmental support of education and a review of objectives and outcomes of such support. "We must have searching analyses of such economic factors as the contribution of education to national growth and the marginal returns of Federal programs in education."\(^1\) March concludes: "This entire subject is ripe for advanced economic analysis. Such an analysis is, in fact, long overdue."\(^1\)
In the discussion of March's paper, Francis Bator of MIT "rejected economic arguments as a basis for policy decisions" on the issue of federal involvement in allocation of resources to education. Given all the political restraints, principles of economic efficiency have little relevance. Instead "the issue must be decided on the basis of some very crude gut-judgments as to what constitutes a good society."  

Alice M. Rivlin, The Role of the Federal Government in Financing Higher Education

This Brookings Institution study was published in 1961. In his foreword to the study, Robert D. Calkins noted the "active interest of the federal government in higher education" which had recently occurred "primarily because of the critical importance of higher education to national security, technological progress, and economic growth." The national interest in higher education is seldom questioned, but divergence of opinion does exist regarding the "appropriate role of the federal government in expressing this interest and in providing funds for higher education." Rivlin's work is designed to provide an historical treatment of federal programs and to delineate principal issues. It is the final three chapters of the book which contain the material, part of which is relevant for the present study.

Chapter 7 is titled "The Federal Government's Changing Role." In the past, Federal programs involving higher education have been by-products of other national concerns (agriculture, military needs, etc.). However, in recent years federal support of higher education
"is beginning to be recognized as an appropriate federal activity." Even though earlier federal activity was not directly oriented toward educational support, our system of higher education has been "profoundly affected" by it. The federal government has made use of existing national resources by recourse to the universities to accomplish national purposes. Especially with regard to research, it is charged that normal functions of universities are distorted. Yet, says Rivlin, had the programs been carried on outside of institutions of higher education, many such institutions "would not be as strong centers of research and teaching as they are today." Rivlin explains that federal programs in higher education have, to some extent, "grown out of each other." There is a "chain reaction." For example, under the G. I. Bill thousands went to college, putting strains on housing facilities. "The federal government then helped relieve the strain, first with surplus property disposal to the colleges, and later with the college housing loan program." Where stress was on the sciences and funds went to only a few research centers, concern developed that the social sciences and humanities and new graduate centers were being neglected and that these should receive funds as well.

With regard to stipulations for receiving federal funds, Rivlin discerns a trend wherein "the federal government has tended to define more specifically the purposes for which federal funds may be used by colleges and universities which receive them." Another trend "has been the inclusion of more and more institutions in the federal
programs over the years." The author also finds little historical support for the position that federal funds "inevitably bring federal control of the content and methods of instruction." There are difficulties of "red tape" in application and reporting requirements, and complaints of distorting curricula and of narrow selectivity in research grants. But academic freedom has suffered far less from the federal government than from state legislative and other bodies.

Chapter 8 is a review of "The Case for Government Subsidies to Higher Education." The chapter seeks to answer two questions: (1) Why should any level of government subsidize higher education?, and (2) "Why should the federal government play a role in subsidizing higher education?"

The arguments for government subsidy fall into the three categories of social justice, economic growth, and national interest. The explanations of these arguments given by the author will not be dealt with extensively here. Briefly, "the social justice argument is that society owes every individual at least a minimum chance to develop his own capabilities." Direct evidence on "how college-going is related to ability to pay for education" is not provided by recent studies but indirect evidence related to father's education, and other things related to income do show a relationship. In other words, low tuition and/or scholarships may not necessarily draw students to college. Motivation and ability are limiting factors, finances notwithstanding.
The economic growth argument is based on the relationship "of education to productivity and economic growth." That is, education increases capacity to produce and avoids other types of costs related to low levels of education—crime, disease, etc.

The national interest argument refers to things related to national defense, scientific personnel needs, research, and other needs which would otherwise not be forthcoming from society or the universities without government subsidy.

The role of the federal government is brought under analysis. The two principal arguments for stepping up federal contributions to higher education are (1) neither individuals nor states will be able to provide financial support equal to needs, and (2) "certain peculiarly national interests, especially defense, require a shift of resources toward particular types of education, and this may not happen without action by the federal government." With regard to the latter, "there are particular educational needs at the national level which may not be apparent to states, localities, and private persons, and which may not be met unless the federal government acts."

Chapter 9 is titled "Methods of Federal Aid: Issues to be Resolved." To review in detail these issues is beyond the scope of present purposes. Yet, some of the points made by Rivlin are fruitful for drawing out potential questions relevant to these purposes. Main issues are whether aid should go to institutions, or to students, or in some combination thereof; what form should
the aid take (loans, grants, matching); for what purposes; and how extensive the conditions for such aid should be.

With regard to aid to institutions, one question is whether aid should be limited to financing physical facilities or whether current operations also should be so supported. Some feel that less federal control of the total spectrum of collegiate activities may be involved with aid for buildings than for operations. On the other hand, it is argued that control of operations is not a necessary concomitant of federal funds, and that funds for operations are badly needed.

Another argument portrayed by Rivlin is that for undesignated federal grants--to do away with "the whole complicated structure of federal programs" and to substitute "a system of unrestricted block grants." Colleges themselves, it is contended, are in a better position than Congress or other federal agencies to determine the best allocation of expenditures of a subsidy. Earmarking may "distort college and university programs into patterns the institutions would not themselves have chosen." A school may be induced to apply for funds for one program, because funds are available for it, when it actually feels other programs are in greater need. On the other hand, earmarked funds "may simply free institutional funds for other purposes." Undesignated funds would come to the same end.


This report points to growth in enrollment and functions and the rising costs which beset higher education. The Commission notes
limitations to increased funds from state, local, and private sources necessary for higher education to achieve quality and equality—"quality of result and equality of access." Further federal support is necessary. The Commission asserts:

Although the financial impacts have differed, most institutions have by now had to absorb so many of these pressures that formerly available margins in facilities and resources have been depleted. These institutions are now being forced to choose among the alternatives of limiting enrollments, raising tuition fees, postponing expansion and new programs, or allowing quality to deteriorate. These alternatives are already being employed in varying degrees throughout higher education.

This adversely impacts national needs. New levels of federal support are recommended.

Part 4 of the study is concerned with "Forms of Federal Support." A list of requirements to be satisfied by the forms of federal aid includes, among others: (1) "Draw forth to the extent possible, rather than merely replace, state and private support," (2) "improve equality of educational opportunity for all able young people," (3) "preserve institutional autonomy and integrity, and (4) provide an incentive for innovation."

The remainder of the report is devoted to explicit proposals relating to federal aid to higher education. Grants and loans to students, support to institutions to meet increased costs of expanding enrollment, and extension of support for research, construction, and special programs are urged.

Harold Orlans, The Effects of Federal Programs on Higher Education

This Brookings study, published in 1962, deals with three
questions: (1) "What have been the effects of federal programs upon the quality of higher education, particularly at the undergraduate level?", (2) "To what extent can or should fuller use be made of institutions not heavily involved in present federal programs?", and (3) "What has been the experience of institutions with the administration of federal programs?". It focused on 36 institutions--24 universities and 12 liberal arts colleges. It concentrated on research and development expenditures, and on the liberal arts component of universities. Focus, then, is on "current research programs affecting liberal arts departments." Two-year colleges are not included nor are other federal programs pertinent to higher education. From the standpoint of when the study was completed, and from its focus, there is much that is not applicable to the present study. Yet, certain points are raised which serve to suggest relevant questions.

With regard to quality, it was found that "opinion on the effect of federal programs upon a department's ability to attract and hold the best faculty was directly related to the volume of federal expenditures in the field and institution." The question asked was: "What has been the over-all effect of federal programs on the ability of your department to attract and hold the best of faculty?" (Alternative answers were "Helped Us," "Had No Visible Effect," "Handicapped Us.")

In terms of student quality, the impact of federal funds on the ability of a department to attract and hold the best students was
more pronounced in graduate areas than undergraduate, and affirmative replies were also dependent on the type of institution and the field.

With regard to faculty-student contact, the focus was on the effect of federal research programs on teaching loads, size of classes, and generally on time spent on instruction duties vs. research oriented activities. A reduction in contact between undergraduates and faculty was noted and the size of undergraduate lecture classes had increased in order to handle enrollment increases economically and to reduce teaching hours.

The second major question with which this study was concerned asked whether present funds should be more widely dispersed. The focus was on funds for research and development and dealt with the concentration of such funds to relatively few institutions of higher education. This problem recurs in the literature on federal funds and higher education, and pertains to universities and predominantly graduate department of those universities.

Coverage of the third question, concerning the school's administrative experience, does have some application here although again emphasis is on research funds. Note is taken of the additional staff needed to handle applications and reports attendant to federal funding and of questions of other overhead expenses and salary payments pertinent to federal research projects. The need for better information relating to federal funds was discussed and the need was shown for better information on: (1) agency organization and staff, (2) programs and policies, and (3) proposals (especially the art of writing them).
Chapter 19 of Orlans' study is titled "Federal 'Control.'"

This issue is approached via the question "What is your view on the over-all issue of the role of the federal government in higher education?" Alternative possible answers were briefly that (1) such programs are unnecessary and should be discontinued; (2) are unfortunately necessary, or (3) are necessary and desirable. Only 2 percent of the faculty queried chose the first alternative. After some discussion, Orlans noted: "It is, in brief, easier to oppose federal programs in the abstract or on general principles than to refuse to participate in a specific program which--despite certain drawbacks, deficiencies, and controls--offers immediate advantages to an institution." But Orlans also concludes that "not merely opposing, but the stronger step of refusing to participate in undesirable federal programs and policies is, at times, necessary to manifest and thus, to maintain an institution's independence."

L. R. Morrell, "Tailoring Federal Funds to Fit Education's Goals"

This article was included in the August, 1970 issue of College and University Business. Morrell notes the need for increased levels of support to higher education even to maintain the status quo. The factors behind rising costs include (1) "the upward adjustment in professional salaries," (2) "price level changes" which in educational institutions is difficult to offset through productivity increases, (3) "the changing nature of the educational program" which includes highly technical offerings "requiring substantial outlays for equipment and facilities" (''obsolescence continues to play a role as
equipment requires constant updating"), and (4) "on the administrative side, life has become more complicated." In reference to this last point the author notes the sophisticated financial skills required and continues:

The introduction of new programs has also necessitated more administrative effort in such areas as the college work study program, educational opportunity grants, NDEA loans, summer institutes, federal equipment grants, and federal construction loans. Each of these programs requires the establishment of methods and procedures for their administration and reporting which results in added costs even for the institution with a constant enrollment.

Combining rising costs with need for more places in higher education leads Morrell to the question of federal assistance. In this regard, the objectives of support are examined. These are listed as (1) "to increase the equality of opportunity for higher education," (2) "improvement of the quality of higher education," (3) "increase the number and expand the mix of those having a college education," and (4) "to maintain diversity in higher education." Suggestions for federal aid have taken three forms: "direct aid to students, institutional grants, or a combination of the two." In relating these to the aforementioned goals, the author feels that direct student aid would best meet the goal of equality of opportunity and the direct institutional grants may best promote increases in quality. However:

The measurement of quality is extremely difficult to accomplish. It is true that more resources can provide for additional instruction personnel, better facilities, equipment and library books, but at the same time, it is the student who has a greater influence on results through motivation, ability and readiness.
Direct grants also are chosen by Morrell as the best means of increasing the numbers of places in higher education, while some combination of the two forms is chosen as appropriate to the maintenance of diversity. The author suggests that a general plan for a federal program in accord with the given objectives would "provide for an expanded student aid program, direct institutional grants based on an output factor such as credit hours or degrees granted, and a cost sharing provision for enrollment increases."^59

Alfred D. Morgan, Jr., A Study of the Impact of Federal Funds in Support of Vocational Programs on the Academic Program of Selected Public Junior Colleges in Texas

This was a dissertation written at the University of Texas in 1967. According to its author:

The study is based on the assumption that each public junior college district has a certain number of dollars flowing into its coffers from the local tax structure. The question then arises, should the available dollars be expended on the existing academic program of the college or should a portion of them be used to match and thus obtain federal funds for vocational programs.^60

The concern is essentially that local funds may be diverted from "academic support" to the matching of federal funds for vocational programs.^61 The purpose of the study is that of examining impact where such a decision has been made and where "increased revenue from the local tax structure does not offset the expenditure of funds that were previously expended on the academic program."^62

The main reason for including this source is to set out several
questions proposed by Morgan which constitute criteria for the present study. A listing of the hypotheses of the study and notation of the findings with regard to them will serve to indicate the nature of the research. According to its author, "The hypotheses of the study were as follows."

**Hypothesis 1** - The percent of increase of high school graduates in the county in which a public junior college is located may be considered a principal element when considering the expansion of academic facilities by the junior college.

**Hypothesis 2** - The annual receipt of federal funds by a public junior college for its academic program will generate an expansion of academic facilities by that junior college.

**Hypothesis 3** - The annual amount of federal funds received by a public junior college for its technical and vocational programs will have no relation to the expansion of academic facilities by that junior college.

**Hypothesis 4** - The annual amount of local funds used by a public junior college to match federal technical and vocational funds will negatively correlate with the expansion of academic facilities by that junior college.

**Hypothesis 5** - The annual expenditure per FTSE for operations and maintenance by a public junior college will have no relation to the expansion of academic facilities by that junior college.63

As a result of the study, Hypotheses 1 and 5 were rejected, Hypotheses 2 and 4 were accepted, and with regard to Hypothesis 3, a low negative correlation was found.64
As previously mentioned, several pertinent questions were brought out in this study. For example, questions put to college administrators included: (1) "Do you feel that the availability of federal funds for vocational programs will curtail the expansion of your academic programs in the future?" (2) "What amount of local funds were applied to vocational programs that would have been used for academic programs, if federal vocational funds had not been available during the school years 1961-62 through 1966-67?" and (3) "What courses of study were added to your academic program due to the availability of federal funds during the school years 1961-62 through 1966-67?"

In this study, reference was made to two papers delivered at the Ninth National Conference on School Finance. One of these was by James Reynolds who, according to Morgan, listed six activities generated by federal programs. These include: "making reports; administering funds; making applications, planning buildings and taking bids; selecting student recipients of grant benefits; and supervising construction." The point is that all these activities impact administrative staffs and that federal programs "do not generally include funds for these expenses." The other paper was delivered by James Wattenbarger and dealt with "The Impact of Federal Funds on Junior Colleges in Florida." Morgan suggests that several ideas are presented which "the thoughtful administrator will find worthy of consideration." Morgan makes special note
of one of Wattenbarger's statements as follows:

Of particular importance is the statement, "The need for occupational education, reflecting not only local but also state and national requirements have motivated federal support." This should generate the question, are the federal vocational funds of benefit to this institution as regards local needs or are they of more importance at the state and national level of need? Phrasing the question another way; which need, local, state, or national, should be considered first as local funds are budgeted for expenditures?70

It seemed to the present writer to be appropriate to include, in addition to the above material from Morgan's study, the following, which is the last paragraph of his dissertation:

If, as reported by Wattenbarger, a continued federal support of education is inevitable, and if, as reported by Reynolds, junior colleges in Texas are likely to continue to rely on federal funds as an integral part of their annual budget, then in-depth studies of the impact of this federal aid would be a valuable contribution.71

James L. Wattenbarger, The Impact of Federal Funds on Junior Colleges in Florida

This paper was delivered at the Ninth National Conference on School Finance in 1966 and focuses on the subject that this dissertation addresses.

Initially the paper discusses supporting education from (1) the global economic and social benefits of education and (2) trends, changes and implications relating to the plurality of community college financial support.72

Global benefits, as defined by Wattenbarger, suggest (1) "that curriculum must not be based solely on local considerations," (2)
that low fees and general tax support are appropriate, and (3) "that post high school education must be made available to all who can benefit therefrom." The author suggests that there is a shift with regard to support for community colleges away from local to state and federal sources. This being the case community college leaders should be concerned with the following: (1) "Does a change in local source of support reduce local control?," (2) "Will increased support from state and federal sources provide additional funds or merely replace local funds?," and (3) "Do sources of support patterns force 'efficiency' or other 'desirable improvements' in education?" After discussing each of the above, the author turns to the results coming from increased expenditures of federal funds in the support of Florida's community junior colleges. It is here that considerations for the present study are raised. The results suggested are the "each of the colleges has been forced to employ a person or persons whose full-time job is to work with the federal program." Budget planning and long-range projections must now involve consideration of all sources of support--local, state, and federal. Will federal funds replace or add to previous sources? In a time of rising costs, will they "permit enrichment of programs or merely an ability to maintain status quo?" "Vocational funds have stimulated program development to a great extent in the occupational areas." The student aid program "has enabled a number of young people to attend who might not otherwise have had
However, "the availability of federal funds has diminished local effort in provision of student aid." The availability of federal funds, accompanied by passage of the Civil Rights Bill has speeded up the elimination of colleges which served predominantly or exclusively members of a single race. Poor planning has resulted in a "great deal of slippage between the passage of bills and the availability of funds." "The urgency which sometimes occurs to spend before a specific date causes poor decisions and wasted effort." Deadlines which have been set arbitrarily often are impossible to follow in any sound manner, and have resulted in rushed planning which, more often than not, is poor planning. "Budgets which are constructed upon anticipation of receipt of funds have been carried over into the following fiscal year with great difficulty to everyone." "Funds are not made generally available but are aimed at limited purposes which may not be appropriate for an institution. Since money is available, however, the college will try to obtain it." "The development of remedial programs, the increased concern for occupational education, the ability to provide financial help" have been outcomes based on funds which were not formerly available. Improvement has occurred in "programs in foreign languages, mathematics, and in science in particular." Federal funds have also made it possible to "provide leadership in areas which would not otherwise have been adequately supported. Examples of this are in technical education, guidance and
counseling, and research." In addition, "there has been opportunity to improve the abilities and the quality of faculty personnel through summer programs, seminars, and conferences." Wattenbarger suggests, as part of his conclusion, that "the inevitability of federal support is firmly established. We now need to seek for the best ways to administer it." Homer D. Babbidge, Jr., and Robert M. Rosenzweig, The Federal Interest in Higher Education

This book deals with the background and development of relations between the federal government and the higher education community and attempts to describe the present status in relation of how each deals with one another. Chapter One presents a sketchy background of the historical involvement of the federal government in higher education. Many of the facts presented in the chapter were reiterated during the discussion related to the history of federal involvement in the present study.

The remaining chapters are titled: "The Posture of Government," "The Posture of Higher Education," "The Issues and the Future Dimly Seen." In presenting these discussions the authors comment that they "have conveyed a sense of process of government in a free society; of its delicate balances, its stubborn insistence on shades of gray, rather than either black or white, and its marvelous potential, if properly used, for constructive effort." In the chapter dealing with the "posture of higher education," the authors address the question of the impact of federal programs
on higher education. Their feeling is that among institutions federal impact has been enormous in bringing them together and making an effective lobbying organization. The authors state that:

The organization of Land-Grant institutions is probably the most dramatic example of the Federal impact on interinstitutional organization though the impetus is now ancient history. Their common purpose, as identified by Federal interest and support, has brought these institutions together into what is probably, pound for pound, the most effective educational association on the national scene. Though the individual members of the association now vary widely from one another in virtually every respect, the single fact of their original Federal subvention seems to hold them together. Certainly their unique relationship with the Federal Government has given them a sense of being at home with Federal policy and program issues that contributes to their aggregate effectiveness on the national scene. 94

On the other hand, the effects of federal activity within the institutions themselves is relatively unknown. More, the authors contend, needs to be done in researching the affairs of higher education. To the question of "Does the dispersed nature of programs affecting higher education within the Federal Government tend to fragment institutions of higher education and to cause a dispersal of policy-making power within them?" the authors agree that they do. 95 Commenting that..."this answer has important implications for institutions of higher education. Effective power in institutions of higher education has traditionally been decentralized. There are, of course, differences among institutions, but on the whole faculties have been quick to sense and ready to resist encroachments by the central administration upon their own rights and prerogatives. Local
circumstances, or skillful administration and faculty politics, can smooth over rough areas, but there are few, if any, American colleges or universities characterized by highly centralized power structures."  

In a later section the issue of federal control of higher education is discussed. Pointing out the lack of historical evidence that the federal government controls higher education, the writers conclude "it is clear that there is no evidence whatsoever that Federal officials have attempted to influence the substance of any course or discipline or have done so by indirection." To them, the crux of the debate between control and freedom rests with whether the Government attempts to control discipline or course content.

Clinton Cook Daniels, *The Impact of Federal Funds on the Public Junior College: A Case Study of Daytona Beach Junior College, 1963-1969*

This study was particularly useful to the present study in that Dr. Daniels' study established a methodology for assessing the impact of federal funds on a community college. In the abstract to the treatise the author states that it was a study "...of the impact, on a single public junior college, of all federal funds received in a given time span, under a variety of federal programs, and applied to a variety of purposes..."  

The study includes a description of Florida's public junior colleges in general and Daytona Beach Junior College in particular. Attention was given in the study to the originating legislation and to the funds received by the College during this time period. The author reviewed several publications which were useful to this writer
and developed a series of questions concerning federal funds. Questions occasioned by the review were then presented to selected individuals in the College in an effort to assess the impact of federal funds. According to the author, his primary goal was to develop a process for assessing impact of federal funds. The process which resulted was a series of questions pertaining to federal funds and the location in the institution whereby answers to them could be procured.99

Dr. Daniels' voluminous study (over 400 pages) focused on all federal funds which impacted or could impact on a community college and thus differed from the present study. Nevertheless, some questions to which Daniels addressed were useful in establishing evaluative criteria for federally funded categorical aid funds presented here.

**Financing Mechanisms**

The federal government, like state and local governments, employs a wide variety of financing mechanisms to carry out its purposes; but, as the following discussion will indicate, the bulk of federal expenditures to higher education takes the form of categorical aid to institutions and to specific groups of students.

**General Institutional Support**

The federal government provides general institutional support through the federal budget to these institutions of post-secondary education: the four service academies, the U. S. Merchant Marine
Academy, the Air Force Institute of Technology, the U.S. Navy Postgraduate School and Howard University. In 1971-72 this support amounted to $235 million.100 During this same year the federal government allocated $12.6 million to 72 land-grant colleges and universities under the provisions of the Bankhead-Jones Act and the Second Morrill Act.101

Categorical Aid

At least 85 percent of the 380 programs listed in the 1972 edition of the Catalogue for Federal Domestic Assistance was classified as categorical aid; that is, the funds are allocated to the achievement of some specific purpose rather than as general aid to be expended according to the wishes of the recipient institution. In 1972, the National Institutes of Health and the National Science Foundation accounted for a total $1.7 million to support research and related activities.102 During 1971 colleges and universities received an estimated 22 percent of all federal expenditures for research and development.103

The major programs of categorical assistance for instruction are administered by the Office of Education, the Department of Agriculture and the National Institutes of Health. The largest programs administered by OE in fiscal year 1972 were those focused on adult and vocational education.104 In 1972, OE, through a formula, distributed an estimated $161 million for vocational education at the post-secondary level.105 In addition to these funds, expenditures for developing institutions authorized by the Higher Education Act of
1965 was in excess of $35.8 million during this period. The 226 institutions which received grants in fiscal year 1972 included 56 public two-year colleges and 18 private two-year colleges.

The largest program of categorical aid for occupational training administered in 1972 by the Bureau of Health Manpower Education (NIH) went toward the training of physicians, dentists, nurses and other personnel in the allied health field.

Community colleges can qualify for these funds when they have allied health programs as part of their occupational or vocational programs.

**Construction Aid**

Under the provisions of the Higher Education Academic Facilities Construction Act of 1963, the Office of Education administered grants for public and private institutions of approximately $527 million in 1965-66. As the need for this program began to diminish the Office of Education has been administering an interest subsidy program for privately financed programs.

**Tax Benefits**

Even though the impact of this assistance to community colleges is questionable, the tax deduction for voluntary contributions to non-profit institutions under the Internal Revenue Service Code is another mechanism used by the federal government.

**Student Aid**

The fastest growing form of providing financial assistance to higher education appears to be student financial aid. In 1972,
federal expenditures in this area amounted to some $5.0 billion, or 44 percent of the total federal aid to higher education.110

Structuring and Validation of Criteria

The review of literature presented above suggested a number of criteria ranging across the many concerns expressed. These required an organizational format together with the validation procedures used by this writer which are presented in this section.

The choice of structure is based on considerations of (1) coverage of the important elements or variables which should be included, or given attention to, in any assessment effort relating to an educational institution, (2) coverage of the concerns expressed in the literature as reviewed above, and (3) the usefulness of the results and findings, for varied purposes. The organization of the criteria is in five parts: (1) Purposes, Plans, and Philosophy, (2) Administration, (3) Educational Program, (4) Student Financial Aid, and (5) Fiscal Affairs.

The applicability of particular federal funds to considerations indicated in all categories and criteria is, of course, limited. But the given categories and criteria encompass possibilities across a range of institutional variables and endeavors, and thus seemed more representative.

Further, the fit of the criteria related to federal funds to these categories is not foreordained, hence the present writer engaged in both interpretation and choice. The tentative criteria, occasioned by the review of the literature, and organized as described, are given in Appendix A.
Validation of the Criteria

The list of criteria was submitted to the National Council for Resource Development, an affiliate of The American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, for validation. The Council's charter states that its purpose is to be "the communications link between community colleges and any organization or individual directly or indirectly associated with a source of funds that may be used in support of the developmental goals of a member institution." To fulfill this purpose NCRD has five major objectives.

1. Assist member institutions to more effectively utilize available resources for funding programs identified with the needs of their institution.

2. Provide a forum for member colleges to express their views and exchange information relative to generating support for community colleges.

3. Design systematic informational techniques for garnering the support of legislators in behalf of the financial needs of community colleges.

4. Provide a comprehensive program of resource development tailored to meet the needs of member institutions.

5. Establish an effective and mutually productive relationship in behalf of member institutions between the Community College Unit of USOE and the National Council for Resource Development.

Underscoring the purpose and objectives of NCRD is its basic philosophy that institutional planning precede activities associated with fund raising. The following quotation was taken from the NCRD's charter in this regard.

Without effective planning, the activity of program development made possible thru external funding will
have limited impact on the operation, expansion, and strengthening of the institution.

Generating dollars to support projects that lack an identifiable purpose, beyond their own existence and perpetuation, will many times result in unnecessary non-productive institutional costs.

Conversely effective planning will provide a guide and a time table for program development, and resource utilization will have a purpose intimately related to the needs of the institution.113

The original list of criteria was reviewed by the Officers of the Council and its ten Regional Coordinators. From this review several recommendations emerged concerning the diction of the criteria. Almost unanimously, the Council felt that each criterion should be stated in either a positive or negative tone. Additionally, the Council decided that, even though only minor changes had to be made for its validation, a committee be formed to study the matter in more detail. This committee, along with the original recommendations of the Council, accepted the final list of criteria used in this study. Persons to whom the original criteria were presented and those who formed the committee are listed in Appendix B.

Final Evaluative Criteria

Plans, Purposes and Objectives

1. Institutional goals and objectives determine the federally funded categorical aid programs with which the institution becomes involved.

2. Federally funded categorical aid strengthens and develops the institution's goals and objectives.

3. The governance of the institution (freedom in selecting students, staff and curriculum) is responsive to the goals of the institution rather than to the demands of federally funded categorical aid programs.
4. Changes in the relationships among parts of the institution as a result of federally funded categorical aid are made to promote the long-range efficiency and improvement in the institution rather than to conform to funding guidelines.

5. Categorical aid provides an awareness of national needs to which the institution can address its own goals provided local needs are given primary consideration.

6. The criteria used in awarding federally funded categorical aid program funds are evaluated and deemed appropriate and satisfactory to the predetermined needs of the institutions.

7. Federally funded categorical aid is considered in the annual institutional planning process.

8. Data generated as a result of federally funded categorical aid programs contribute to the institution's planning function.

9. A needs assessment is conducted prior to making application for federally funded categorical aid.

10. Federally funded categorical aid permits the addition of facilities which would otherwise be unaffordable.

11. Federally funded categorical aid building requirements assist the physical facilities planning process.

12. Projects and programs generated by federally funded categorical aid are evaluated prior to the institution continuing them with its own funds.

Administration

13. Decisions to establish administrative modes of operation and procedures are based on the needs of the community and not on the availability of federally funded categorical aid.

14. The time factor involved in application deadlines, project approvals and disbursement of federally funded categorical aid programs does not present any unusual difficulties to the institution.

Educational Program

15. The availability of federally funded categorical aid is not the prime consideration in changing the directions of a local education program.
16. Federally funded categorical aid serves as an incentive for innovation and a catalyst for improving the quality of offerings at the institution.

17. Educational programs stimulated by federally funded categorical aid programs are viewed as a foundation for future growth and development.

18. Federally funded categorical aid increases the college's ability to attract, develop and hold faculty of high quality.

Student Financial Aid

19. Local and state efforts in providing student financial aid are not diminished by federally funded categorical aid.

20. Federally funded categorical aid matching requirements do not decrease the total amount of student financial aid available.

Fiscal Affairs

21. Federally funded categorical aid does not supplant state, local and private sources as a means of financial support.

22. Matching funds are not an obstacle to the institution in seeking federally funded categorical aid.

23. Budget planning involves the consideration of federally funded categorical aid.

24. The institution's administrative overhead expenses incurred by participating in federally funded categorical aid are met with federal funds.

25. Categorical aid is not viewed as a vehicle to compensate for rising institutional costs due to inflation.

26. Cost differentials between on-going programs and educational programs generated by federally funded categorical aid programs are met through federal funding.

27. The requirements for space and facilities resulting from federally funded categorical aid pose no financial burden to the institution.
Structured Interview

The second part of the investigation focused on soliciting personal testimony regarding the previously mentioned criteria from personnel at the College considered knowledgeable with the subject. This task was accomplished by constructing a series of questions in conjunction with the previous instrument. These interviews were conducted during academic year 1973-74 and lasted approximately one hour in length. Questions posed during the interview process were determined by the writer, informal discussions with committee members of the NCRD and his advisory committee (see Appendix D).

The purpose of this process was to assist in substantiating the impact of categorical aid on Santa Fe Community College during fiscal years 1970-1974. Therefore, the assessment model is composed of the following: (1) a review of literature, documents and reports concerned with federal financing of higher education, (2) a set of criteria deemed appropriate for assessing the impact of categorical aid on a community college, (3) a validated instrument relative to these criteria, and (4) a structured interview with those persons at the College who had knowledge of the subject in question. In addition, pertinent reports and documents were used as a part of the assessment procedure when deemed applicable by the writer.

Summary

In presenting this chapter the writer was concerned with two
mutually inclusive concepts. The first was to identify those issues and concerns that surround the financing of post-secondary education categorically and, second, to determine what criteria should be used with regard to assessment of such funds on a community college. Granted, many of the articles, monographs and books mentioned here were concerned with university or four-year education and did not address themselves directly to the two-year college. Nevertheless, several of the treatises reviewed by this writer dealt with many of the mutual interests that both community colleges and universities share as well as with issues germane to the two-year college.

These criteria, once articulated in tentative form, were subjected to close scrutiny by the officers of the NCRD and its ten regional coordinators who, after making their recommendations, turned them over to a committee of three persons for final adoption. Also, the writer's advisory committee made pertinent suggestions and comments which proved to be invaluable to the classification of the criteria. Final adoption by the committee of NCRD came after rewording and classifying the criteria into (A) Purposes, Plans and Objectives, (B) Administration, (C) Educational Program, (D) Student Financial Aid, and (E) Fiscal Affairs. Once classified and the deletions and additions made, the NCRD committee adopted and validated the criteria and instrument for assessing impact of categorical aid.

The next step in the methodology was the construction of a structured interview questionnaire to help evaluate the foregone
criteria in terms of specific instances or occurrences experienced by persons at the College. In short, for each criteria a person or persons at the College was (were) asked to enumerate the ways federal categorical aid had affected the institution's development. In addition, certain documents and reports were discerned to have value in this procedure which are presented in a later chapter.

What emerged as a result of the foregone chapter was, succinctly, (1) a set of criteria with which a community college can assess the impact that federally funded categorical aid has had during the institution's participation in such programs, (2) a series of questions related to these criteria, and (3) a structured interview questionnaire which substantiates the impact such aid has had with a degree of specificity.
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CHAPTER IV

FEDERAL LAWS AUTHORIZING CATEGORICAL AID GRANTS FOR WHICH
THE COLLEGE APPLIED AND RECEIVED FEDERAL FUNDS

The purpose of this chapter is to present a selection of
authorizing legislation through which Santa Fe Community College
received categorical aid. The chapter is divided into two parts.
Initially, a discussion of selective federal laws authorizing that
federal funds be allocated to community colleges is presented in
detail. As part of this discussion the Florida State Plans are
offered where appropriate. The second segment of the chapter reports
the remaining categorical aid programs through which the College
received funds during the fiscal years in question. These categorical
aid programs are classified according to how each appears in the
Catalogue of Federal Domestic Assistance.

The chapter begins, then, with a discussion of the Higher Education
Facilities Act of 1963, the Vocational Education Act of 1963, as amended,
the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, the Higher Education Act of 1965,
as amended, the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 and the
Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968. The second segment
focuses on the remaining categorical aid programs through which the
College received funds as outlined in the Catalogue of Federal Domestic
Assistance. The primary intent in presenting these data is to demon-
strate the breadth and applicability of these laws and programs to
community colleges.
Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 (P. L. 88-204)

An earlier discussion of this Act was presented in Chapter II of the present study. However, in accordance with a provision in P. L. 88-204, a State Commission for Title I of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 was established in Florida, and a State Plan developed.

Among the assigned tasks of the Commission is the determination of relative priorities for projects which may be eligible under Title I. The State Plan explains the method for establishing these priorities for public community colleges. A point basis is used with varying numbers of points awarded in each case in accordance with such magnitudes as expected increases in enrollment, expected net increases in instructional and library space as a result of a given project, past grants, number of periods classrooms are used per week, applicant's ability to provide the non-federal share of the total project cost, capacity/enrollment ratios, and others.

The applicant institution submits its proposal to the Director of Federal Higher Education Programs in the State Department of Education. The proposal is considered by the State Title I Advisory Committee and if approved is considered by the State Commission. If State Commission approval is given, the application is sent to the U. S. Office of Education for final approval.

Vocational Education Act of 1963 (P. L. 88-210) and Vocational Education Amendments of 1968, as Amended in 1972

Public Law 88-210 is;

An Act to strengthen and improve the quality of vocational education opportunities in the Nation,
to extend for three years the National Defense Education Act of 1958 and Public Laws 815 and 874, Eighty-first Congress (federally affected areas), and for other purposes.5

The Act is divided into three parts, with Part B concerned with extension of the 1958 Act and Part C dealing with federally affected areas. The coverage of the latter two parts is not considered here as strategic to the present study. Therefore, attention will focus on Part A, "Vocational Education." Part A begins with a declaration of purpose which is as follows:

It is the purpose of this part to authorize Federal grants to States to assist them to maintain, extend, and improve existing programs of vocational education, to develop new programs of vocational education, and to provide part-time employment for youths who need the earnings from such employment to continue their vocational training on a full-time basis, so that persons of all ages in all communities of the State--those in high school, those who have completed or discontinued their formal education and are preparing to enter the labor market, those who have already entered the labor market but need to upgrade their skills or learn new ones, and those with special educational handicaps--will have ready access to vocational training or retraining which is of high quality, which is realistic in the light of actual or anticipated opportunities and gainful employment, and which is suited to their needs, interests, and ability to benefit from such training.6

Description of Part A--Vocational Education

Section 3 details the criteria for allotment of appropriated sums among the states. The criteria revolves around the number of persons requiring vocational education and the per capita income in the respective states.

Section 4 outlines the uses of federal funds. In brief, the funds may be put to the purpose of vocational education for such groups as
persons attending high school, persons already in the labor market needing training, and persons with educational handicaps. Additionally, funds may be used for construction of area vocational education school facilities, and for ancillary services which enhance the quality of vocational education programs.

Section 5 states that to receive federal allotments a state must submit a state plan which includes policies and procedures related to disbursement of funds among the uses outlined above. It also must include designation of a state board to administer the plan and the creation of a state advisory council. The plan must provide minimum qualifications for all those educators and others who have responsibilities under the plan. Cooperative arrangements involving public employment agencies is to be provided for. And procedures for accounting and reporting are to be set forth.

Section 6, which covers payments to states, rules that the state must expend for vocational education in fiscal year 1964 an amount of state or local funds at least equal to that expended in the prior fiscal year. Further, the allotments for fiscal year 1965 and succeeding years are to cover one-half of a state's expenditures under its plan for vocational education.

Section 7 concerns labor standards, and Section 8 contains a set of definitions of terms strategic to the law. Section 9 established an Advisory Committee on Vocational Education in the Office of Education. Note here might be taken of one of the
definitions. The term "area vocational education school" is defined to include several possibilities, one of which is described as:

...the department or division of a junior college or community college or university which provides vocational education in no less than five different occupational fields, under the supervision of the State Board, leading to immediate employment but not leading to a baccalaureate degree...7

Section 10 consists of amendments to George-Barden and Smith-Hughes Vocational Education Acts. The essence of these amendments seems to be that funds allotted to a state under those Acts may be transferred to, and used for, vocational education purposes in accordance with certain provisos. Section 11 extends Practical Nurse Training and Area Vocational Education Programs under the Vocational Education Act of 1946. Section 12 provides for periodic review of vocational education programs and laws.

Work-study programs for vocational students are outlined in Section 13. A state plan is a requirement for eligibility to participate in these programs. The program is to be administered locally and funds are provided for part-time employment of those who could otherwise not continue their vocational education program.

The remaining section of Part A covers residential vocational education schools, authorizations, and a statement concerning federal control. The latter section is as follows:

Sec. 16. Nothing contained in this part shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution or school system.8
Amendments of 1968

Public Law 88-210, outlined above, was amended (P. L. 90-576, Oct. 16, 1968) under the title "Vocational Education Amendments of 1968." The U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare issued a booklet under that title in 1969 which provides a resume of the amendments. The booklet says:

The Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 continue this emphasis on people instead of occupations. Major new requirements added by this law are annual and long-range planning and procedures for participation in the planning, review, and evaluation of vocational and technical education.

Under amendments, a National Advisory Council on Vocational Education was created and each state was required to establish a similar council. The state plan which was a requirement under the 1963 Act for participation in the program funds, became an annual requirement under the 1968 amendments. Further, the plan is to include an initial plan covering administrative policies, an annual program plan, and a five-year plan which projects the state's need for vocational education, its objectives, and plans for achievement of the objectives.

The State Plan with respect to the Amendments of 1968 became effective July 1, 1969. In the Foreword to the Plan, Florida's Commissioner of Education, Floyd T. Christian, explains:

The State Plan for vocational education is a contract between the State of Florida and the U. S. Office of Education. Part I describes the continuing administrative provisions governing the operation of vocational education programs, services, and activities at all instructional levels as offered by all public educational institutions and agencies.
Part II is a projection of long-range objectives of service to the people of this State in terms of the kinds of needs to be met and the program structure for meeting them. Part III contains the goals to be met each fiscal year and describes in some detail the specific approaches to be used in maintaining, strengthening, and extending the vocational education program of the State in all its phases and aspects. Parts II and III of the Plan are revised annually to reflect changes in district and statewide needs and the resources for meeting these needs.10

The two main sections of Part I of the State Plan deal with general provisions, and fiscal control and accounting procedures. The remaining sections are organized around the various parts of Title I "Vocational Education" of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968. These administrative provisions cover the state vocational education program, vocational education programs for the disadvantaged, research and personnel training in vocational education, exemplary programs, residential vocational education schools, consumer and homemaking education, cooperative programs, and work-study programs for students in vocational education. It would be a large and unnecessary task here to summarize the provisions in this 113-page document. However, the general process by which the community college participates in available funding might be briefly considered.

The Amendments require local educational agencies to develop comprehensive plans for program development. Accordingly, Santa Fe Community College submits to the Division of Vocational, Technical and Adult Education, a "Junior College Vocational, Technical and Adult Education Program Planning Guide" each fiscal year. This is produced in the spring and is essentially a "wish list" of the
college's federal funding requests covering vocational and adult programs. In the fall, and based on a state priority rating scale, the college submits a program proposal and grant requests selected from the earlier list. This process continues throughout the given fiscal year.

As explained earlier, Parts II and III of the State Plan deal respectively with "Long Range Program Provisions," and "Annual Program Plan Provisions." The Annual Plan follows roughly the same organizational pattern as Part I. Part II provides analyses of manpower needs and job opportunities in the state, availability of vocational education, characteristics of the state's population relating to vocational education needs, and the state's vocational education programs. It lists needs and objectives for vocational education.

**Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (P. L. 88-452)**

The purpose of Public Law 88-452 is "...to mobilize the human and financial resources of the Nation to combat poverty in the United States."

**Title I of this Act concerns youth programs.** It is divided into four main parts: Part A--Job Corps, Part B--Work-Training Programs, Part C--Work-Study Programs, and Part D--Authorization of Appropriations. For present purposes, it is Part C that is of interest. According to Section 121:

The purpose of this part is to stimulate and promote the part-time employment of students in institutions of higher education who are from low-income families and are in need of the earnings from such employment to pursue courses of study at such institutions."
 Appropriated sums are allotted among the states in accordance with criteria including enrollment in higher education, high school graduates and number of children living in families with annual incomes of less than $3,000. The Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity is authorized to enter into agreements with institutions of higher education regarding grants for work-study program purposes.

The basic idea of the program is to provide part-time employment of qualified students either within or outside of the institution itself but in accordance with certain restrictive provisions. The federal share of the compensation paid to such work-study students was not to exceed 90 percent through fiscal year 1966.

The work-study program was amended and extended in the Higher Education Act of 1965 and additional material on the program is included in the section of this paper which covers the latter Act.

Title II of P. L. 88-452 deals with "Urban and Rural Community Action Programs." Part B of Title II applies to the present study. Part B covers adult basic education programs. Part B of Title II, which covers adult basic education programs, applies to the present study. Part A outlines community action programs and Part C has to do with provisions for needy children. Part D authorizes appropriations.

The purpose of Part B, Title II is described in Section 212 as follows:

It is the purpose of this part to initiate programs of instruction for individuals who have attained age eighteen and whose inability to read and write the English language constitutes a substantial impairment
of their ability to get or retain employment commensurate with their real ability, so as to help eliminate such inability and raise the level of education of such individuals with a view to making them less likely to become dependent on others, improving their ability to benefit from occupational training and otherwise increasing their opportunities for more productive and profitable employment, and making them better able to meet their adult responsibilities.\textsuperscript{12}

Grants, in this case, are made to states which have approved state plans. The grants are for the purpose of supporting pilot projects or on-going programs which are geared to raising the basic educational skills of adults. The state plan provides for administration of the funds to agencies within the state. The federal share of the state's disbursements under this program was to be 90 percent through fiscal year 1966, and 50 percent for succeeding fiscal years.

As with the work-study grant program outlined above, subsequent legislation, in this case the Adult Education Act of 1966, amended the Economic Opportunity Act in regard to adult basic education. The remaining titles of this Act are not applicable for purposes of the present study.

\textit{Higher Education Act of 1965 (P. L. 89-329) as Amended in 1968 and 1972}

There are eight Titles in this Act. They are: Title I--Community Service and Continuing Education Programs, Title II--College Library Assistance and Library Training and Research, Title III--Strengthening Developing Institutions, Title IV--Student Assistance, Title V--Teacher Programs, Title VI--Financial Assistance for the Improvement of Undergraduate Instruction, Title VII--Amendments to Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, and Title VIII--General Provisions.
The Titles which are of direct relevance in terms of funds which have been received by Santa Fe Community College are I, II, III, IV, and VI. These are briefly described below.

Title I--Community Service and Continuing Education Programs

A community service program which encompasses continuing education offerings refers to a "program, activity, or service" which assists "in the solution of community problems in rural, urban, or suburban areas." The emphasis is on the latter two areas and is qualified to the extent that the offering is not otherwise available, and fits into the overall program of the offering institution.

A state desiring to receive funds under this Title must devise a State Plan which provides for administrative policies, procedures, and controls relating to disbursement of funds for the purpose of providing "new, expanded, or improved community service programs." Under this Title, provision is also made for creation of a National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education.

Title II--College Library Assistance and Library Training and Research

The important part of this Title for present purposes is Part A which deals with college library resources. Under this Part, basic grants not to exceed $5,000 annually are authorized. These are for the purpose of assisting in the "acquisition for library purposes of books, periodicals, documents, magnetic tapes, phonograph records, audio-visual materials, and other related library materials (including necessary binding)." In addition, supplemental and special purpose
grants are authorized under certain stipulations which essentially have to do with special needs or with impediments to proper development of library resources.

One requirement for a basic grant is that the applicant expend an amount for library purposes not less than the average amount expended in the two-year period ending June 30, 1965, and the amount must be at least equal to the amount of the grant. Another is that state agencies be kept informed of the college's participation in such grants.

**Title IV--Student Assistance**

Two parts of this Title are pertinent for present consideration. Part A covers Educational Opportunity Grants. A particularly interesting explanation and commentary of these grants is found in the College Scholarship Manual for Financial Aid Officers. In it, the program is described as follows:

The program is both exciting and innovative: exciting because institutions have at their disposal funds for grants to students on the basis of financial need rather than scholastic performance; innovative because for the first time the federal government has undertaken a grant program, not to expand training in fields such as medicine or critical areas of graduate study, nor as a benefit to veterans, but to assist all young people deprived of economic and educational advantages. It is a potentially effective program because it recognizes the institutions' wish to try to deal with the allied problems of education and poverty, and because it places directly on them the responsibility to channel the available funds to students from poor families.
The Educational Opportunity Grants Program is essentially the keystone of the federal aids for college students, as it requires for each grant an equal amount of financial aid from other sources, thus doubling its impact for a student who has exceptional financial need. These grants now range from $200 to $1,000 per year.

The other part of Title IV of present interest is Part C which amends and extends the College Work-Study Program, originally a part of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. The College Scholarship Service Manual explains that under the newer Act, administration of the program is shifted to the Office of Education from the Office of Economic Opportunity and coverage expanded to include all eligible students who need part-time employment earnings to continue study. "While these changes did not materially affect the major provisions of the program, they did make it more like a student aid program and less like a poverty program."

**Title VI--Financial Assistance for the Improvement of Undergraduate Instruction**

According to Section 601, "the purpose of this part is to improve the quality of classroom instruction in selected subject areas in institutions of higher education." Funds are allotted to states, and to participate, states must submit a State Plan and establish a state agency to administer Title VI funds. The plan includes priorities and procedures in the disbursement of funds for laboratory and other special equipment to be used in a variety of teaching areas. The federal share is not to exceed 50 percent in most cases.
The Florida Board of Regents issued a Progress Report for Title I, Higher Education Act of 1965, Florida, 1966-68. The following statement is from the introduction to this report:

Through federal and non-federal support, Title I puts the academic skill, knowledge and resources of higher education to work for the local community. Through this utilization of resources, Title I has emerged as a Federal-State program which has united colleges and universities together with local communities in one of the most practical and productive educational experiences in the United States today.19

The State Board of Education was given responsibility for supervision and administration of the Florida State Plan under Title I. In turn, the State Board of Regents was given administrative responsibility. Through the efforts of the State Advisory Committee for Title I, a plan was developed which "set forth the community services in continuing education to be carried on" in Florida's institutions of higher education, and "identified the major educational problems to which the institutions were requested to address themselves" under Title I implementation.20

Five major community problem areas were delineated under the plan with more detailed lists of types of programs under each problem area. Rather than detail the complete list, the major areas are identified here with one example of each: (1) Human Relations and Minority Groups—education for migrant agricultural workers, (2) Urban-Rural Public Administration—public administration, (3) Education for Economic Development and Full-Time Employment—
cooperative education, dropouts, (4) Human Resource Development--adult literacy programs, (5) Education and Community Welfare--marriage and family life.\textsuperscript{21}

Proposals are submitted by institutions for consideration by the Florida Board of Regents Office for Continuing Education and the State Advisory Committee. The proposals are reviewed, discussed, and selections for implementation are then made.

In the conclusions to the above mentioned \textit{Progress Report}, it was noted that several programs begun with Title I funds have been continued and financed by the individual institutions. It is also noted that through fiscal year 1968, the number of institutions submitting proposals and being funded had increased.

The Florida State Plan for Title VI

The State Board of Education has been designated as the State Commission and the Director of the Federal Higher Education Programs Section has been designated to administer Title VI-A, P. L. 89-329. The Programs Section also administers Title I of the Higher Education Facilities Act and its function and activities with regard to VI-A are the same. In the State Commission's \textit{Fifth Annual Report 1968-69} it was explained:

\textit{In organizing the administration of this program, the Advisory Committee was briefed on its functions, the State Plan was written, and procedures similar to those of Title I were established to receive and process project applications.}\textsuperscript{22}

The above mentioned procedures were outlined in the present paper in the section covering the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963.
Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 (P.L. 87-415)

This Act has undergone several amendments which will not be presented here in detail. However, Part B of Title II does specify the responsibility of the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare and thus is included here. It states:

Sec. 231. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall, pursuant to the provisions of this title, enter into agreements with States under which the appropriate State vocational education agencies will undertake to provide training needed to equip persons referred to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare by the Secretary of Labor pursuant to section 202, for the occupations specified in the referrals. Such State agencies shall provide for such training through public education agencies or institutions or, if facilities or services of such agencies or institutions are not adequate for the purpose, through arrangements with private educational or training institutions. The State agency shall be paid 50 percentum of the cost to the State of carrying out the agreement, except that for the period ending June 30, 1964 the State agency shall be paid 100 percentum of the cost of the State of carrying out the agreement with respect to unemployed persons. Such agreements shall contain such other provisions as will promote effective administration (including provision (1) for reports on the attendance and performance of trainees, (2) for immediate certification to the Secretary of Labor by the responsible training agency with respect to each person referred for training who does not have a satisfactory attendance record or is not making satisfactory progress in such training absent good cause, and (3) for continuous supervision of the training programs conducted under the agreement to insure the quality and adequacy of the training provided), protect the United States against loss, and assure that the functions and duties to be carried out by such State agency are performed in such fashion as will carry out the purposes of this title. In the case of any State which does not enter into an agreement which the State agency does not provide under such an agreement, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may provide the needed training by agreement or contract with public or private educational or training institutions.
The Act also provided guidelines for the allocation of federal funds in Title III of this Act when it enumerated the factors to be considered.

Sec. 301. For the purpose of effecting an equitable apportionment of Federal expenditures among the States in carrying out the programs authorized under Title II of this Act, the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall make such apportionment in accordance with uniform standards and in arriving at such standards shall consider only the following factors: (1) the proportion which the labor force of a State bears to the total labor force of the United States, (2) the proportion which the unemployed in a State during the preceding calendar year bears to the total number of unemployed in the United States in the preceding calendar year, (3) the lack of appropriate full-time employment in the State, (4) the proportion which the insured unemployed within a State bears to the total number of insured employed within such State, and (5) the average weekly unemployment compensation benefits paid by the State. The Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare are authorized to make reapportionments from time to time where the total amounts apportioned under this section have not been fully obligated in a particular State, or where the State or appropriate agencies in the State have not entered into the necessary agreements, and the Secretaries find that any other State is in need of additional funds to carry out the programs authorized by this Act.24

Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (P. L. 90-351)

Section 406 (a), (b), and (c) of this Act authorized a Law Enforcement Education Program. The Law Enforcement Assistance Administration under the Department of Justice was created as an agency to administer coordinated national efforts against crime and the education program was included. This program "provides financial aid for college studies by police, courts, and corrections employees, and students
preparing for careers in those fields."  The following is from a Department of Justice brochure describing this education program:

Two types of financial assistance are offered under the LEEP program: Loans of up to $1,800 per academic year; and grants of up to $200 per academic quarter of $300 per semester. The money does not have to be repaid if recipients fulfill service requirements in the criminal justice field. All grants and loans are administered by colleges and universities taking part in the program. In fiscal year 1969, LEAA had a total budget of $63 million--and that included $6.5 million for the LEEP program. All of the LEEP funds are used for loans and grants. The LEEP program began in time for the second half of the 1968-69 academic year, and its financial assistance went to 20,602 students at 485 colleges and universities.

The remaining enactments under which Santa Fe Community College applied for and received federal funds are presented as they appear in the Catalogue for Federal Domestic Assistance.

**Veteran's Cost-of-Instruction Payments to Institutions of Higher Education.** HEA of 1965 as Amended by Title X of Public Law 92-318. Section 420

**Objective**

The objectives of this grant are for support of improved and expanded services to veterans and to defray instructional expenses in academically related programs.

**Uses and Use Restrictions**

An applicant must be an institution of higher education and have had in attendance a number of undergraduate veteran students who qualify for benefits under Chapter 31 or Chapter 34 of Title 38, United States Code equal to at least 110 percent of the number of undergraduate veterans in the previous academic year. The institution...
will receive funds one FY for not more than $300 per full-time student and not less than $75 per half-time student.\textsuperscript{28}

\textbf{Types of Assistance}

\textit{Project Grants.}\textsuperscript{29}

\underline{National Science Foundation Act of 1950, Amendments through July 18, 1974; Public Law 81-507}

\textbf{Objectives}

To advance the state of the art and contribute to fundamental understanding in computer science and engineering, computer innovation in education, and computer applications in research.\textsuperscript{30}

\textbf{Uses and Use Restriction}

Grant funds may be used for paying costs considered necessary to conduct research or studies, such as salaries and wages, expendable equipment and supplies, travel, publication costs, other direct costs and indirect costs.\textsuperscript{31}

\textbf{Types of Assistance}

\textit{Project Grants.}\textsuperscript{32}

\underline{National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965; Public Law 89-209 as Amended by Public Law 98-348 and Public Law 90-346}

\textbf{Objectives}

To assist State arts councils in the development of programs for the encouragement of the arts and artists.\textsuperscript{33}

\textbf{Uses and Use Restrictions}

Funds may be used to develop arts programs, build audiences, encourage artists and provide assistance from the State level to
community organizations. Technical assistance is limited by the total funds available to the State and Community Operations programs. 34

Types of Assistance

Formula Grants, matching dollar-for-dollar. 35

Education Professions Development Act of 1967; as Amended. Part E, Section 541 through 543; Public Law 90-35 and Public Law 90-575

Objectives

To train personnel in higher education by providing support for institutes and short-term training programs to train persons who are serving or preparing to serve as teachers, administrators, or educational specialists in institutions of higher education. 36

Uses and Use Restrictions

For in-service or pre-service training, part-time or full-time training programs of up to 12 months duration; training of college personnel in a variety of fields, including academic subject matter areas, instructional methods and equipment, administrative skills, student personnel services, etc. Grants to the training institution cover all direct operating costs of the training program, participant support plus indirect costs.

Training must be of graduate-level quality; seminars, conferences, symposiums, and workshops are not eligible for support unless part of a continuing training program; funds may not be used for purchase of equipment or for travel expenses of trainees. 37
Types of Assistance

Project Grants.38

Education of the Handicapped Act, Title VI
(Part D, Section 631); Public Law 91-230

Objectives

To improve the quality and increase the supply of educational personnel trained to work with handicapped children. Grants are awarded to assist in developing and improving training programs for educational personnel for the handicapped.39

Uses and Use Restrictions

Funds may be used for students' stipends, dependency allowances, or institutional support. Program development grants may be reimbursed for direct costs. Grants may be used for undergraduate traineeships, graduate fellowships, summer traineeships, special study institutes, program development grants, and special projects.40

Types of Assistance

Project Grants.41

Higher Education Act of 1965, Title IV; as Amended by the Labor HEW Appropriations Act, 1970; Public Law 91-204

Objectives

To provide federal support for cooperative education programs including the planning, establishment, expansion, or carrying out of such programs in institutions of higher education. Cooperative education programs are those which alternate periods of full-time academic study with periods of full-time public or private employment.42
Uses and Use Restrictions

The planning, establishment, expansion, or carrying out by the funded institutions of programs of cooperative education that alternate periods of full-time academic study with periods of full-time public or private employment. Salaries and administrative expenses are payable from these funds.43

No money appropriated under this program may be used for payments of compensation of students for employment by employers.

Types of Assistance

Project Grants.44

Migration and Refugee Assistance Act of 1962; Public Law 87-510

Objectives

To provide long-term, low-interest loans to Cuban nationals who are attending eligible institutions and are in need of the funds to pursue their studies.45

Uses and Use Restrictions

Institutions must establish a special Cuban Student Loan Fund for making loans to eligible students. Amount of loan is $1,000 per academic year up to $5,000 for undergraduates.46

Types of Assistance

Direct Loans.47

Summary

This chapter has portrayed the variety and diversity of federal enactments which were applicable to one community college. In
accomplishing this task the fact is substantiated that community colleges can be eligible for a variety of federal programs under existing legislation. Additionally, many of these programs are not administered by the Office of Education but by other federal agencies.

Two factors are surmised from the legislation or program under which the College received federal funds. The first is that permeating the legislation or program authorizing these funds is the congressional intent of equalizing educational opportunity among the general populace at the community college level. The second factor is that a community college is eligible for more than educationally oriented funds. Germane to this last point is that federal enactments mentioned in this study are intended to satiate a variety of societal ills through an array of categorical programs.

A logical inference can be drawn from these factors that equalizing educational opportunity at the community college level and relieving a wrath of societal problems would be more effectively accomplished if community colleges had permanent federal financing rather than the temporary funds mentioned. The point is that the majority of the categorical grants received directly from the national or regional level have a built-in time duration of from 1 to 3 years, at the end of which the institution must assume the entire cost of the program sans federal funds. Implicit in this restriction is that the program will generate enough students to pay its own way.
Yet, this implication is totally incongruent for a community college attempting to maintain low tuition or matriculation fees. Thus, the permanency of federal financing would contribute to the healthy development of these institutions.
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CHAPTER V

AN OVERVIEW OF SANTA FE COMMUNITY COLLEGE AND FEDERAL FUNDS RECEIVED DURING FISCAL YEARS 1970-1974

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to convey a picture of Florida's state system of community colleges in general and Santa Fe Community College in particular. Rationale in describing the former is that even though the latter is governed by a local board of trustees, it is part of the state system and should be viewed in that context. However, since this study is concerned with appraising Santa Fe Community College only a brief description of the state system will be presented. A more detailed and comprehensive discussion of the College follows the discussion of the state system which articulates the following areas in the College: history and development, community setting, philosophy and objectives, educational programs and finance.

In addition to presenting the College as part of the state system the second segment of the chapter discusses the College's plan completed in 1969. As part of this treatise the writer will articulate those portions of the ten-year plan deemed relevant to the assessment of the impact of categorical aid. Specifically,
the discussion of the plan will focus on its relation to: purposes, plans and objectives, administration, educational program, student personnel services and fiscal affairs.

The third section of this chapter will report the amounts of federally funded categorical aid funds which were received by the College during the fiscal years 1970-74. The material will be organized in terms of the federal program or agency to which the College applied and received funds.

The primary reason for selecting FY 1970 as the initial year to begin study is that prior to that year Santa Fe Community College's participation in federally funded categorical aid programs was infinitesimal. Additionally, the College began operating in 1966 and as such had not developed and refined its goals and objectives. Finally, the College did undertake to articulate its goals and objectives in a document entitled Santa Fe in the Seventies: A Ten-Year Plan during 1969; thus any findings generated in the present study can be compared to this document.

Some difficulties were imposed with regard to completeness, comparability and availability of records as a result of changes in internal financial procedures at the College and changes in sums and purposes within given grants and grant periods. Additionally, the federal funding process involves a time dimension covering application, approval, actual funding, expenditure of funds and reporting which makes placement of federal funds into fiscal year
groups subject to interpretation. Nevertheless, as complete a representation of the historical record as could be assembled by the writer is offered.

The Public Community College in Florida

The History and Development of Public Community Colleges in Florida

The first publicly supported community college (then called junior college) in Florida, Palm Beach Junior College, was established in 1933 by the Board of Public Instruction of Palm Beach County as a part of the County school system. From this somewhat modest beginning the State now has 28 public community colleges located "within commuting distance, 35 miles, of 97 percent of the population of Florida." This quotation illustrates the fact that where once there was little emphasis on systematic organization and development of the two-year institution in relation to other types of educational systems, it is important today to consider the total educational picture.

Even though Palm Beach Junior College was the first publicly supported community college in Florida, St. Petersburg Junior College in 1927 has the distinction of being formally organized six years prior to Palm Beach's establishment. The difference in the two institutions is that where Palm Beach received financial support from local tax revenue, St. Petersburg was privately financed. It wasn't until 1947 and the establishment of the Minimum Foundation Program that both Palm Beach Junior College and St. Petersburg Junior College were approved by the State Board of Education to become part of their respective county systems. These facts represent that initially,
Community colleges in Florida were financed privately or were a part of the local school system.

Following the establishment of the above institutions was the founding of Pensacola Junior College and Washington Junior College in Pensacola, and Chipola Junior College in Marianna which, with Palm Beach Junior College and St. Petersburg Junior College, constituted Florida's junior college system until 1957. In 1955, the Community College Council was created by the legislature and over $4,000,000 was appropriated for buildings at the existing colleges. As part of its mission the Council developed a long-range master plan for community colleges in Florida. The plan, which envisioned twenty-eight junior colleges, was ratified by the legislature in 1957 and funds appropriated for six new junior colleges.

In succeeding years, additional institutions were established, bringing the total in 1974 to twenty-eight, a number of which have multi-campus operations.

Administration

The present administrative organization for the community college system has been the result of several legislative enactments. One of the most influential enactments after 1957 took place in 1968 when the state legislature created junior college districts governed by a local Board of Trustees. This action removed the junior college from under the direct administration of county boards of education.
Presently, the state community college system consists of a Division of Community Colleges under the State Board of Education staffed by a director and other professional staff.8

Due to its multi-faceted functions it should be noted that other bureaus within the State Department of Education also play a part in the operation of Florida's community colleges. Of particular note in this regard are those agencies which deal with vocational education, facilities and finance. In conclusion, Florida's system of community colleges has evolved from one or two institutions financed pluralistically to twenty-eight community colleges which are locally controlled but stats supported.

Santa Fe Community College

History and Development

Santa Fe Community College was established in 1965 as part of the state system of community colleges. Senate Bill No. 1 states as its purpose:

An Act relating to education; authorizing establishment of a junior college in Alachua county; making an appropriation for expenses involved in organizing the junior college; appropriating additional funds for operation of the junior college; providing an effective date.9

A document entitled Santa Fe Junior College--The First Two Years describes the College's activities during its formative stages:

Following extensive studies by committees representing the Boards of Public Instruction of Alachua and Bradford Counties, Santa Fe Junior College was established by the Florida State Legislature in 1965 as a community junior college. In the winter of 1965, Dr. Joseph W. Fordyce was selected as the first president of the College. The
College was given responsibility for all postsecondary education in Alachua County effective July 1, 1966, and the other parts of the comprehensive academic and occupational programs began in September, 1966 when the College opened its doors with an unexpectedly large first-term enrollment of 1,099 credit and 1,688 non-credit students.

While offering a wide variety of courses and programs in both academic and occupational areas, the College has placed intensive stress on educational planning and counseling for the individual student in order to prepare him for a richer, more rewarding, and more productive life. An atmosphere of innovation at the College has been conducive to the development of an overall philosophy for Santa Fe as a "College of Success" whose primary mission is to provide meaningful educational experiences to all post-secondary students of the region. After a highly successful first year which produced graduates even in the first term of operation, the second-year enrollment increased more than 60 percent over that of the initial year, and trends indicate that such growth will continue.

Enrollment increased rapidly at the College and by September, 1973 the total Full-time Equivalent (FTE) including non-credit students approached 6,000. In addition to the increase in student enrollment the College changed location during this time. Originally sheltered in an old post office building located in Gainesville, the College is presently operating in five centers in Alachua County and one in Bradford. In 1972, the first phase of construction of a permanent campus was completed, and classes opened on the 100-acre campus in September.

Community Setting

The following data were gleaned from the 1970 U. S. Census of Alachua and Bradford Counties and a document prepared by the North
Central Florida Regional Planning Council entitled Population and Economic Study.

Santa Fe Community College is located in the city of Gainesville, Florida, along with another state supported institution, the University of Florida. Alachua and Bradford Counties are part of the State's Second Congressional District which is a geographical area two to three counties deep, immediately south of the Florida-Georgia state line. In addition to serving as the district community college for Alachua and Bradford Counties, the College is also designated as the Area Vocational School. By definition of the 1970 Census, the Second Congressional District population is 52 percent rural, while the State is only 20 percent and the nation 27 percent. Alachua County is 31 percent rural. The District's per capita income before taxes is $2,608, compared to $3,294 state-wide and $3,663 nationally. Alachua County's per capita income is $2,873. The functionally illiterate (fifth grade or lower) in the Second District comprise 15.3 percent of the population, compared to 5.9 percent state-wide and 3.6 percent nation-wide. Alachua County's functionally illiteracy rate is 8 percent. Non-whites comprise 28 percent of the Second District, compared to 16 percent in Florida and 12.6 percent in the nation. Alachua County is 20 percent non-white. Bradford County's percent of high school graduates continuing post-secondary educational experiences is the lowest in the State of Florida. These statistics illustrate a community college district with a central core of high income families (university related) surrounded by a rural ghetto.
Philosophy and Objectives

This writer has discerned two major concepts that dictate policies and procedures at Santa Fe Community College. The first is that the College firmly believes that the learning process is its primary purpose for existing. Therefore, the College's faculty is encouraged to examine all of the traditional and historical educational trappings and induce whether they are conducive to learning. The second major concept is that Santa Fe is an open-door college in the sense that admission is unlimited for high school graduates and other adults in the community. In short, the College believes that learning can be a successful experience for all who wish to devote their minds and energies to it.

With these concept in mind, the College has set down eight objectives to which it adheres:

1. The student is the central focus for the process of learning.
2. Teaching occurs only when students learn.
3. Effective educational experiences will modify human behavior in a positive manner.
4. All human beings are motivated to achieve that which they believe is good.
5. Education should be an exciting, creative, and rewarding experience for the student and for the teacher.
6. All human beings have worth, dignity, and potential.
7. Experimentation and innovation are reflections of attitudes; when they are translated into practice, the process of education can be significantly advanced.
8. Traditional concepts of education (the lecture, the 30-student class, the 50-minute period, the standard textbook, the term course, the F grade, the rectangular classroom, the student desk) are suspect and in need of careful trial and evaluation to a degree at least equal to, and perhaps more than, new and innovative practices.24

Educational Program

The following information was furnished in several College documents concerned with Santa Fe's educational program.

Santa Fe philosophy places the student in the center of instructional activities. As the protagonist of many and varied instructional activities, students should be able to perceive an understandable sense of order relating to their objectives. While every kind of learning activity should be regarded as valid, the process of abstraction and synthesis as it pertains to changes in behavior. In accord with student centered learning, the most desirable goal for Santa Fe is that each student learn to examine problems, call on or acquire necessary information, skills, and concepts, evaluate total relationships, and resolve them into satisfactory solutions. The possession of these skills by students should be considered an ultimate aim for all instructional programs.

Provision for this kind of education demands that:

There is an insured condition for learning consistent with student goals by providing an opportunity for exploration, development, and understanding of these goals to the extent that they are mutually understood by each student and his instructors. Continued review and evaluation of these goals are implicitly. Consequent structure of classes should be subject to restructuring and limited only to the extent that current societal pressures dictate.

All activities of the College are considered to be of value in pursuit of student goals. Students should be allowed this pursuit without regard for divisional or disciplinary barriers to insure maximum mobility and consequent personal growth. Faculty should be aware of existing and developing learning opportunities in all areas of the College and community resources.25
Finance

The business affairs of the College are coordinated and directed by the vice president for business affairs. His office has the responsibility for budgeting, purchasing, accounting, payroll preparation, supervision of buildings and grounds, operation of the bookstore and the Materials Production Center, provision for mail service, provision for college security and traffic control and the general management of the fiscal resources of the College. In addition, the vice president for business affairs has the responsibility for hiring non-certificated personnel, for providing food services through contractors and vendors and for providing for the operation and maintenance of college plants. The business affairs office also cooperates with other divisions of the College in the allocation of existing space for classrooms, laboratories and offices and for helping to develop additional temporary and permanent instructional space. The vice president for business affairs and his staff serve as a service agency to the educational programs of the College. An important function of business affairs is to help in the development of policies which contribute to smooth and efficient operation of the College.

The Ten-Year Plan

Purposes, Plans and Objectives

A document entitled *Santa Fe in the Seventies: A Ten Year Plan* spells out those things to which the College was to address itself
Santa Fe Junior College accepts a role as the significant if not sole institution responsible for educational opportunity rendered to the adults of its service area. In this role the College should represent a source of special service to the individuals who desire educational or counseling services. Further, the College recognizes and accepts its responsibility to serve collective community needs. To accomplish goals subserved by these responsibilities, experimental activities that accommodate individual growth as developmental processes are recognized as significant means for achieving responsible participation in community and personal affairs.

To carry out its assignment, the College must continue to be aware that as there are wide and varied differences among individual and community needs, there will be similar variances and differences due to the passing of time.

The College, therefore, must be constantly alert to change in educational service required by the passage of time, as well as those defined by differences in individual and community segments. The College should constantly be aware of the need to change specific purposes in consonance with the demands of current appropriate need while maintaining the scope of broad purpose and commitment.

The College, in order to continuously recognize opportunity for service, must guard against institutionalization that places it above or apart from the total community it serves. At the same time it must resist the role of respondent tool of special or isolated interests. This implies that in many ways the College should be extended into the community and the community extended into the College so that the College provides a forum for exchange and deliberation from which needs, service, and involvement can be determined and rendered.

The College's purpose in the seventies was to become oriented toward community needs and to refrain from "institutionalizing" programs which had outlived their purposes and would place the College "apart" from the community. In order to establish objectives for the College
which would adhere to its philosophy and purpose, four societal
concerns were predicted to occur during the next ten years.

These were:

1. The Nixon administration has mirrored the rapidly growing
   concern for the preservation of our natural environment.
   Wildlife is being seriously threatened; more than sixty
   species of animals are currently listed as endangered
   species by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.
   Air and water pollution are becoming important concerns
   of most Americans. The publicity for environmental
   preservation in the past year clearly demonstrates that
   environmental engineering will be a major concern in
   the seventies.

2. Urban problems will continue to receive attention in the
   1970's. Since seventy percent of the U. S. population
   will be in one percent of the land area of the U. S.,
   extensive population centers called megalopoli will
   emerge. These population areas will appear from New
   York to Washington, D. C., Atlanta to Miami, Chicago
   to Cleveland, Houston to Dallas, and along the West
   Coast. Critical problems with urban ghettos, education,
   and social welfare will be exacerbated in the seventies.

3. As the basic needs for shelter, protection, and food are
   increasingly being met in the U. S., the economic orientation
   in our society will turn more and more to an emphasis on
   service occupations. Due to utilization of consistently
   more complex machines, the work force will be reoriented;
   the segment of the work force now considered skilled or
   semi-skilled will become more technically proficient. One
   or two years of post-high school vocational or technical
   training will be the educational fare of most members of
   society who do not pursue academic or professional careers.

4. Decreasing undeveloped land area coupled with decreasing
   work weeks will place considerable demand on some individuals
   to find means of self-entertainment; the society of the U. S.
   may well become increasingly introspective. The respectability
   of work as enunciated in the Protestant Ethic may fall into
   disrepute. A very complex yet basic consideration in the
   American society is that the economic philosophy that caused
   the U. S. to become the economic titan that it now is will
   probably not sustain this country in the future. Some
   fundamental reconsiderations of the philosophical base of
   this country will necessarily occur.
In addition to projecting what societal focus would have to be reckoned with during the seventies, the ten year plan also enumerated those forces working within the community. These trends are, in part:

Industrial employment in our community is limited. Sperry and General Electric represent the major employers in this area. They presently employ individuals with side varieties of training, from specialists such as engineers, to assembly line workers who receive on-the-job training. They report needs for persons with drafting and electronic skills. They predict limited growth in the size of their work force in the immediate future. Such information also seems related to educational programs at Santa Fe.

One fact was unearthed by our committee which we felt to be of great significance: in the not far distant future, three out of five persons working in our community will be employed in service occupations. These include professionals, domestics, repair services, and entertainment. This people-to-people aspect of our community seems to be a significant part of its uniqueness. Educational programs at Santa Fe might well recognize this unique aspect by not only providing technical and professional skills but providing growth for interpersonal skills as well.

Academic programs are recognized as an important part of the educational programs at Santa Fe Junior College. Our committee felt that those programs which combine academic advancement with technical, vocational, or professional specialization are particularly valuable. We feel that providing opportunities for individuals to both work in a job setting, and to receive both academic and job-related skills is both realistic and community-oriented. We feel that this type of program should be encouraged in the overall educational program at Santa Fe.

From these projections the document articulates seven recommendations for Santa Fe Community College during the seventies. These were:

1. There is a need for programs designed to provide an upgrading of the educational levels of those members of our community who are handicapped by insufficient basic skills.

2. SFJC must stand ready to respond as the educationally deprived become aware of the college as a place relevant to their lives, and be prepared to be relevant with realistic programs for these people.
3. Programs which provide young people and adults with job entry skills are vital.

4. Of special value are educational programs which combine on-the-job experience with educational specialization.

5. To overcome such problems as low motivation and inadequate transportation within the counties, the feasibility of taking educational experiences out into the community should be explored.

6. The counseling aspect of the education program at Santa Fe is of vital importance and should be maintained and magnified.

7. Increased emphasis on vocational-technical programs seems vital.\textsuperscript{30}

The document goes on to point out that the economic disturbances forecast for the seventies will cause the College to "be involved in many areas of training not traditionally considered to be junior college concerns."\textsuperscript{31} It also points out that: "While maintaining its program of providing transfer programs for professionally oriented students, junior colleges everywhere will place much greater emphasis on paraprofessional and vocational education."\textsuperscript{32} To reinforce the need for the College to become oriented to "vocational-technical" education the plan envisioned "...scores of new programs in the 70's..."\textsuperscript{33}

In addition to the increased emphasis on vocational-technical education the plan documents two other areas which the College would enlarge upon--community education and individual growth and development. To these concerns the plan projected that "the community school philosophy will be emphasized in preparing community interest courses in bridge playing, sewing, instrumental music, jewelry making, and the like."\textsuperscript{34} Additionally, "Discord among groups in our society
indicate the need for a greater thrust in the understanding and appreciation of others with their values, habits and culture."  

From these discussions and similar ones the document continued with a list of proposed courses, programs and curricula that specified an increased emphasis on new programs which would accommodate the environmental, economic and societal concerns projected for the seventies. A detailed listing of these offerings is not included here since, in the main, the plan did not specify how this growth was to occur but rather discussed the need for the College to be flexible and comprehensive in its approach to meeting these needs. For example, the document foresaw that in the area of environmental studies such new occupations as "zoological park planners, urban ecologists, and wildlife managers" might be needed. To meet the changing economic conditions the plan projected training in the following areas: "cybernetics technicians, lawyer's aides, teacher's aides, physician's assistants and accountant's assistants." As for individual growth and development the plan foresaw a need for more "...paraprofessional counselors, out-reach counselors, and counselors in special interest areas such as the disadvantaged, veterans and high school drop-outs."  

This, then, represents a synopsis of the College's plans for the period from 1970 - 1980 in regard to its purposes, educational program and student personnel services program.  

Inferentially, one can say that for the period of 1970 - 1980, the committee members who developed this ten year plan envisioned the
College: (1) being comprehensive in its approach of providing educational services to the community, (2) maintaining a good deal of flexibility with regard to modifying existing programs or initiating new ones in relatively short time, (3) continuing and improving its emphasis on meeting the students' needs and (4) practicing innovative techniques of counseling and instruction.

In addition, from the language of the plan one discerns that during the seventies the College would be emphasizing: vocational-technical or work oriented education, educational experiences for special interest groups, an improved inter-personal counseling program and community or continuing education.

**Administration**

There exist two other areas with which this study concerns itself--administration and fiscal affairs. The ten year plan did not explicitly focus on administration per se but rather on administration as it functioned as part of several areas, i.e., academic affairs, student personnel services and business affairs. Toward these specific areas one deduces several administrative functions. Primary among these is the task of coordinating and conducting institutional planning and the setting of priorities within the context of the College's philosophy and objectives. For example, the plan for student personnel services states, in part: "Thus, three full-time administrators at the Associate Dean level join with the Associate Vice President and the Vice President in the formation
of a top echelon team for the planning and implementation of the student personnel program..." The plan under study also posited that, in general, the administrative function should be couched in a construct of service to the faculty and students. Specifically, the plan foresaw the problems of course and program duplication, student-teacher ratio, research and physical facilities as tasks to be ameliorated by administrative services. Additionally, the concepts of two-way communication in decision-making and faculty freedom to pursue innovative teaching techniques was discussed in the plan as paramount with regard to administration.

Fiscal Affairs

The ten year plan was not remiss in giving attention to the importance of fiscal affairs. To this subject a financial resource committee speculated that additional revenues would be forthcoming from industrial and federal sources. Their rationalization was that as the College began providing more training in vocationally oriented fields the above mentioned sources would become more accessible. To this point the plan said, in part: "It seems likely that more federal funds will become available to the Junior Colleges in specialized fields such as air and water pollution, population control, law enforcement, etc." The plan goes on to say: "More funding of vocational education can be expected to provide training for those not inclined or adapted to the academic role." Thus, it would seem that prior to 1970, the College projected an increase in federally funded categorical aid and foresaw these funds as having utilitarian
value toward achieving its goals. It might be added that at no place did the plan discuss the effects of such external funding on its development but rather, prophesied the urgency with which the College should avail itself to these sources.

**Summary of the Ten Year Plan**

The foregone facts served as a succinct and informative discussion of those parts of a plan developed by the College for the period between 1970 - 1980, which are pertinent for this study. In reviewing these segments this writer attempted to specify as near as inference would allow those concerns which were projected for the seventies. This fact is made so that the reader will understand the plan's lack of quantification and in some instances qualification. These are not meant as derogatory or demeaning remarks but merely as explanatory statements on the reader's behalf. In short, had this writer discovered statements to the effect that, by a certain date the College would be involved in a specific program for a targeted population, it would have been mentioned and warmly received. Lacking such structure, the writer attempted in recalling this document to portray those objectives which could be included for this study. Summarizing these in accordance with the present classification are the objectives for the seventies.

**Purposes, Plans and Objectives** - The College would continue being innovative and student oriented. Additionally, through close communication with the citizens of its district the College would
stand ready to render services and programs designed to meet their educational needs, the objective being to become an integral part of the community.

**Administration** - Service to the various elements in the College would be the primary function of administration. Those administrative services included planning new programs, coordinating existing programs to avoid duplication and providing an atmosphere for innovation and democratic decision-making.

**Educational Program** - The educational program would direct its attention to programs and courses designed to prepare students for the world of work. Specifically, more attention would be given to vocationally oriented programs as opposed to traditional college parallel or general education programs.

**Fiscal Affairs** - The College, because of its educational emphasis, would become a recipient of federal and private funding during the seventies. These sources would provide a means to initiate and build programs which would benefit the local community.

**Student Personnel Services** - These services would continue the objective of complementing the educational objectives by enlarging their scope to include special interest groups such as women, minorities and vocational counseling. Also, as the College became an integral part of the community, these services would be extended to facilitate community cohesiveness and understanding.
In conclusion the writer would remind the reader that the foregone objectives are not sacrosanct. They are the result of the writer's careful and diligent analysis and as such are primarily inferential in nature. Nevertheless, these objectives were strongly implied in the plan and thus make a legitimate contribution towards assessing how federally funded categorical aid affected the College during the years in question.

Programs and Amounts of Federal, State, Local and Private Sources: FY 1970-74

The final segment of this chapter presents the total amount of funds the College received during the years in question. In the tables located in Appendix E, the funds are classified by year group and account for those federal, state and local funds received by the College during fiscal years 1970-74. Included in this table are the various federal enactments and/or agency from which the funds originated. It should be understood that in some instances the state's various governmental agencies served as a conduit in allocating federal funds.

The second table lists those federal funds which originated either at the national or regional level. Here, the amounts and programs which the College received as a result of making application directly to Washington, D. C. or Atlanta, Georgia are documented. The third table refers to those funds received by the College which were administered by either a state or local governmental agency.

The fourth table lists the College's programs which received
federal funds through the auspices of the State of Florida's Division of Vocational, Technical and Adult Education. These amounts are listed under the fiscal year they were received and by the College program to which the funds were applied.

Tables Five and Six refer to the amounts of federal and federally financed categorical funds received by the College in comparison to its budget for education and general purposes. Data included in these tables illustrate the magnitude of categorical aid funds in relation to the College's operational budget.

Table Seven concerns the location of the administering agency or source of the categorical aid funds received by Santa Fe. Included in this table are the amounts received from private sources as well as public sources.

The final tables report the amounts and percent of federal funds to the library program and a listing of the various student financial aid funding sources. Included in the information concerning student financial aid is the percentage of federal funds financing student loans, grants and scholarships.

The federal legislation which authorized the disbursement of federal funds to the College was discussed in the previous chapter. As shown in the discussion, these enactments represented an attempt by the national government to ameliorate a variety of societal problems through categorical funding. The congressional intent of the legislation focused on specific groups of people and specific
national concerns. However, as can be seen in the following tables, Santa Fe Community College was a recipient of a number of these programs.

This fact explicitly indicates the utilitarian value of a community college in relation to many of the intentions of categorical aid programs. This in turn raises a tripartition of issues. Since a community college does qualify and is funded for many of the federally funded categorical aid programs doesn't this fact connote general support for community colleges by the federal government? And, secondly, would congressional intent of these programs be accomplished more effectively through general institutional support rather than categorical funding? Finally, what effect does this type of funding have on a community college's development? The last question being, in part, a major segment of the present study.

One might agree that the writer's triangulation is accurate if, and only if, a community college is as comprehensive as the one under study. That, to be eligible for the variety and diversity of federally funded categorical aid programs Santa Fe has received a community college would need similar philosophies and objectives. Like most polemics there is partial truth in this statement. A community college located in a region where nurses and physician's assistants are not needed would not desire or require federal funds for these purposes. Or, if a two-year college had a curriculum designed solely for transfer students it undoubtedly could not avail itself of federal
funds to train students in areas deemed untransferable by four-year colleges or universities. In short, there are legitimate arguments for both general institutional and categorical support.

Unquestionably two facts are ubiquitous to this dilemma. First, the federal government's historical involvement in higher education has been to provide for national manpower requirements and equity in educational opportunity for the general populace. And second, the legislation authorizing federal funds to post-secondary education has splintered into a maze of categorical programs, many of which are not even administered by the Office of Education. From the congressional intent of this legislation being to reduce inequities in educational opportunity and meet certain national manpower needs, one induces that permanent federal funds would serve these goals more effectively.

Summary

The previous discussion has focused on the historical record of Florida's community colleges system and Santa Fe Community College. Insofar as examining the State system the treatise merely illustrated some significant benchmarks in its history and development. Santa Fe Community College was presented from the standpoint of its (1) philosophy and objectives, (2) community setting, (3) educational program, and (4) financial affairs. By examining these functions the writer desired to present a concise pictorial of the institution as it appears today.
After presenting a description of the College, the discussion turned to the document entitled: *Santa Fe in the Seventies: A Ten Year Plan*. There, inferences were made as to the plan's reference to purposes, plans and objectives, administration, educational program, student personnel services and fiscal affairs. In accomplishing this task the writer's intent was to portray the directions the College was predicted to travel during the following decade. This was explained for comparison purposes which will commence in the next chapter during the application of the evaluative criteria.

Following these presentations, the discussion turned to the federally funded categorical aid which the College received during the years in question. The amounts of federal funds and the administrative agency or program through which they were allocated were detailed in several tables. In addition, a percentage breakdown between these funds and the College's educational and general purpose (operational) budgets was offered, as well as data concerned with student financial aid and library expenditures.

Having presented the federal legislation, the College and its categorical aid programs in the previous chapters, Chapter VI will attempt to ascertain the effects this funding has had during fiscal years 1970-74 by applying the twenty-seven criteria discussed in Chapter III.
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CHAPTER VI


The report and analysis that follows is based on information gleaned from (1) a review of available documents and recorded data, (2) informal discussion with persons familiar with the subject, (3) a written questionnaire and (4) structured personal interviews. These data take the same format as the evaluative criteria in that they are reported and analyzed according to their major headings. This chapter therefore is organized into the following parts: (1) Purposes, Plans and Objectives, (2) Administration, (3) Educational Program, (4) Student Financial Aid, and (5) Fiscal Affairs.

Application of the Model

The ten year plan discussed in the previous chapter constitutes a foundation to which the evaluative criteria can be applied. For example, under the College's plan for its purposes and objectives during the seventies were the concepts of innovative teaching, student-centered learning and service to the community. Likewise, the criteria used to assess the impact of categorical aid in this regard were stated in a fashion befitting assessment. It should be understood that these criteria do not speak directly to the specific
objectives gleaned from the plan. Rather, the criteria, based upon
the judgment of experts, express the concern for institutional
development as it relates to categorical aid in general. In short,
whereas the criteria dealing with purposes, plans and objectives
make no mention of innovations in teaching, they do concern the
question of the extent to which categorical aid has affected the
College's purposes, plans, and objectives. This approach was taken
because it allows for more generalizability than one restricted to
specific purposes and objectives of a single institution as called
for in a planning document. In addition, the plain fact is that some
community colleges simply do not have an institutional plan, but are
receiving categorical aid. Thus, any assessment procedure predicated
on the assumption that an institution possessed such a document would
automatically restrict its usage. The study reports how categorical
aid has affected the institution's development relative to the
following areas: purposes, plans, and objectives, administration,
educational program, student financial aid and fiscal affairs. The
data reported resulted from a written questionnaire, a structured
interview and a review of pertinent documents in conjunction with
information supplied by the College's plan.

**Purposes, Plans and Objectives**

**Institutional Goals and Objectives Determine the Federally Funded
Categorical Aid Programs with which the Institution Becomes Involved**

During the time frame in question the majority of persons queried
by this writer felt that the institution's goals and objectives had
determined those categorical aid programs in which the College participated. The reasoning given to this writer most often was that the College's comprehensiveness allowed for a variety of programs. In a structured interview with the president and vice presidents, the writer discerned that prior to applying for a categorical aid grant a decision was reached as to its applicability to the College. Such factors as the community's needs and the institution's ability or inability to respond to those needs were examined before making application.

The facts seem to support this contention. Discounting the funds received from the Higher Education Facilities Act and Title II and IV of the Higher Education Act, the College has received over eighty categorical aid grants which can be counted in the areas of community service, vocational education and student needs. The two exceptions are the physician's assistant and the teacher education programs which will be discussed later in this study.

**Federally Funded Categorical Aid Strengthens and Develops the Institution's Goals and Objectives**

In the opinion of those persons responding to the written instrument most believed that federal funds, financed categorically, had strengthened and developed the College's goals and objectives. The president expressed the sentiment that categorical aid has allowed the College to offer a higher quality of education in a shorter period of time than it could have without the aid. In a conversation he specified the level
of sophistication reached in the area of vocational-technical education brought about through federal funding. The College, he conjectured, could not have acquired the expensive equipment needed for such programs without the assistance of federal funds. As reported in Table Four, the College has received over $600,000 since 1970 through the auspices of the State plan for vocational, technical and adult education. What seems significant in this regard is the increase over the years in the amounts received by the College.

In addition to vocational technical monies the College has been the recipient of funds for minority groups, policemen, unemployed persons, handicapped students and a myriad allied health professions students. The vice president for academic affairs expressed the opinion that without categorical aid the College would not have started the cooperative education program, the physician's assistant program, the diversification of health occupation programs and the air pollution technician's program.

Another area in which the respondents expressed that categorical aid had strengthened the institution concerned the unemployable. Since 1970 the College has received over $700,000 for its manpower development and training program (MDTA). These funds accounted for a sizeable proportion of the total College expenditures for this program during the years in question. Even though exact figures were unobtainable the director of budgeting estimated that federal funds made up at least 40 percent of the total cost of the program.
The vice president for academic affairs recounted the interchange of faculty and expertise with five other community colleges occasioned by funds received under Title III of the HEA. According to progress reports made to the Office of Education since 1972, there has been at least one meeting each four month period where faculty from six institutions met and exchanged ideas and teaching techniques. Though difficult to quantify, these gatherings did facilitate faculty exposure to different colleges, and in the opinion of the vice president, strengthened the College's goals of innovative teaching.

Another area strengthened by categorical aid was student personnel services. There, the vice president for student affairs and a director for special projects were solicited for opinions regarding the affects of categorical funding. Both expressed the philosophy that without categorical aid the College could not have employed the number of paraprofessional and out-reach counselors it has presented employed. In 1970 the College had six paraprofessional counselors and no out-reach counselors. During the subject years, ten paraprofessionals and six out-reach counselors were employed with categorical aid funds. In addition, the College initiated a human service aide program to train people as paraprofessional counselors, some of whom had been employed by the College. As iterated by both, there was a College and community need (paraprofessional counselors) to which financially the College was unable to respond and sought federal aid. The result being that presently the College is able to employ paraprofessional
counselors and provide trained people to work as paraprofessionals in community organizations.

In addition, the special projects director explained how she was able to initiate a program for physically handicapped students, unemployable women and a mobile counseling unit with categorical aid funds. In summary, both persons expressed the sentiment that categorical aid had strengthened the College's goals and objectives by enabling it to serve student and community needs.

The Governance of the Institution (Freedom in Selecting Students, Staff and Curriculum) is Responsive to the Goals of the Institution Rather than to the Demands of Federally Funded Categorical Aid Programs.

When this criterion was applied to the College one discovers that some categorical aid programs alter the selection of students, staff and curriculum. Most noticeable in this regard are the physician's assistant and nursing programs. In both programs criteria for selecting students, staff and curriculum are restrictive. Whereas the College adheres to the "open door" concept in its other programs for admittance, in the physician's assistant and nursing programs the College exercises a concept of meritocracy. Prospective students are given a series of aptitude related tests and must have a certain grade point average in previously attempted work before being selected into these programs. In addition to be admitted into the physician's assistant program the student must have at least three years of related work experience, i.e., corpsman, medic, etc., and must have satisfactorily completed one year of college level chemistry. In fact, over 50 percent of the students presently enrolled in the physician's assistant program have bachelor or graduate degrees.
In conversation with the president and the vice president of academic affairs the rationale for these anomalies was discussed. The primary reason given by both men was that in order for the College to be eligible for the physician's assistant program, it had to adhere to the certification standards of the American Medical Association (AMA). Therefore, when the College applied to the National Institute of Health (NIH) with the University of Florida, an agreement was reached that prospective students must have the previously stated qualifications.

Staff and curriculum selection have likewise been altered with respect to this program. Though difficult to determine, a perusal of the physician's assistant program shows that its curriculum places a heavy emphasis on the natural sciences. This fact is not particularly surprising in light of the program's nature but, in addition, a student who fails to maintain a "C" or better grade point average can be discontinued from the program. In effect the policy of non-punitive grading which permeates other programs in the institution is obliterated.

With the aid of the physician's assistant and the nursing directors other facts related to these programs were brought to this writer's attention. Namely, that there have been more students applying for these programs than can be accepted. Consequently, some basis for selection (or elimination) had to be implemented. The nursing director presented documentation pertaining to scores on the State nursing examination. Even though nursing students had satisfactorily completed
the College's nursing curriculum, many had failed the State's certification examination (see Appendix D, Table 13). An analysis of previous test scores showed that a student's grade point average at the College did not correlate with his/her performance on the test. What did correlate, according to the director, was race--whites passed, minorities failed. These facts prompted the nursing staff to attempt to develop some screening procedure for prospective students which was not completed as of this writing.

Two points seem significant in the light of the previous information. First, Santa Fe has been compelled to modify its "open-door" and non-punitive grading policies to be eligible for categorical aid funds. Second, by virtue of the demand and supply of health related personnel the College has been forced to practice restraint in student, staff and curriculum selection. An ancillary referent regarding allied health professions is the entire subject of accreditation by professional associations. A pedantic discussion of this subject in itself would prove interesting but is not germane for this study's purpose.

Changes in the Relationships Among Parts of the Institution as a Result of Federally Funded Categorical Aid are Made to Promote Efficiency and Improvement in the Institution Rather than to Conform to Funding Guidelines

Questions related to this criterion posed to the respondents were: (1) "Had the office for development or any other division in the College gained more influence on College operations than before categorical funding?" and (2) "Had programs occasioned by categorical aid funds become more segregated from the College?"
The majority of persons queried felt that neither the office for development nor any other division had significantly changed as a result of the College's participation in federal funding. It was the opinion of the vice president for academic affairs that the College's effort in integrating each program into the total operations of the institution had been relatively successful. The only exception being in the allied health professions area. The vice president expressed the concern that some of these programs were so unique to a community college that there was tendency to treat them as separate entities. However, his belief was that this situation would resolve itself as the programs continued.

The president was cognizant of the dangers of building small fiefdoms in the institution prompted by outside funding but did not believe this to be the case at Santa Fe. Conversely, he responded that categorical aid funds improved the internal operations of the College since they represented some financial autonomy to the person or persons involved.

While interviewing the director for special projects and the dean for vocational education these facts were substantiated. Both agreed that categorical aid funds had given them more freedom than in the College's normal fiscal operations. Even though the management of grants had been cumbersome and time-consuming, both felt the benefits had outweighed the inconveniences.
Categorical Aid Provides an Awareness of National Needs to which the Institution can Address its Own Goals Provided Local Needs are Given Primary Consideration

All persons asked to respond to this criterion expressed the sentiment that the College had participated in categorical aid programs only if those programs applied locally. It was generally assumed by the respondents that since Congress authorized funds for these programs there must exist a national need for them.

To substantiate these theories the writer interviewed the former director of the air pollution technology program to ascertain his experience in securing employment for his students. Fortunately, the director is in the process of writing an evaluation of the program and thus has some valuable follow-up data. His findings reported that every student who completed the program had been offered a job related to air pollution technology. Naturally, some students preferred to continue their education at a four-year institution but for those who desired, employment was possible. Many of the available jobs were located in various parts of the state since, in the main, these positions were limited to industrial areas. By offering this program the College was able to respond to national needs even though some students had been employed with state and local agencies located in Gainesville.

In summary, the president remarked that before Santa Fe had become involved in any categorical aid program an assessment had been conducted to ascertain its benefit to the community. Documents
reporting Santa Fe's programs did not reveal any unusual offerings to this writer. If any programs contradicting this fact exist they could conceivably be in the health professions area. However, the juxtaposition of the University of Florida's teaching hospital to the community college in some ways justifies these programs.

The Criteria Used in Awarding Federally Funded Categorical Aid Program Funds are Evaluated and Deemed Appropriate to the Predetermined Needs of the Institution by the College.

The College, obviously, has no control over guidelines or criteria formulated and administered by federal agencies. At the same time it does have an obligation to examine these criteria to ensure that they fall within the confines of the institution's needs. Based on this, several persons at the College were requested to explain the process undertaken to determine whether the grant's criteria were appropriate to the institution's needs.

Procedurally, the decision determining whether funding guidelines satisfy the College's needs is made by the president, the vice presidents, the dean for development and those faculty members who have knowledge in the specific area of concern. The dean for development explains the criteria and answers any questions the group may have. If, in the course of this analysis, questions arise which the dean is unable to answer, the agency administering the grant is contacted for clarification. The process concludes when, on the bases of these persons' opinions, a decision is reached regarding the effort that the College must put forth as compared to the returns to the institution. According
to the vice president for business affairs and the dean for development
the grant's financial returns are usually lucrative enough to appeal
to the College. Both remarked that if funding criteria prove onerous,
the College has not pursued the program. For example, if the funding
guidelines require a "matching" amount which would weaken the College
financially or operationally application had not been made.

Federally Funded Categorical Aid is Considered in the Annual Institutional Planning Process

The only formal planning process conducted by the College which
can be described as being institutional in scope focuses on the budget.
In addition to soliciting personnel at the College for their opinions
on the subject, the writer attended several meetings of the budget
committee during its deliberations. In these meetings the subject of
categorical aid or grant money never seriously surfaced. The only
mention of the subject was by a committee member who mused that if
the state restricted the College's budget the College should seek more
grant funds. Most persons interviewed on this subject indicated that
informal planning was continually conducted by personnel at the College
in this regard.

The vice president of academic affairs and the dean for development
related that the nature of most grants required planning by the College.
However, this writer was unable to discern much effectual institutional
planning related to categorical aid. The only exception to this fact
was an instance when the institution had applied for the advanced
institutional development program under Title III of the Higher Education Act. During the preliminary stages of applying for the program a series of meetings was conducted to solicit faculty members' suggestions regarding the grant's impact on the institution. Ironically the College was not one of the community colleges selected by the Office of Education, thus negating the described planning efforts.

A Needs Assessment is Conducted Prior to Making Application for Federally Funded Categorical Aid

The respondents reported that during the years in question some type of needs assessment has been conducted for every categorical program. In most instances this had been an informal process and was based on perceptions of persons having expertise on the subject and the community.

According to the president the process begins when a faculty, staff, administrator, student or member of the community makes the need known to the College. Then, if there is a substantial need for the program in the community or institution and the College is unable to respond, the dean for development initiates a search for categorical aid. This writer discovered that even though no formal needs assessment is conducted by the College, the requirements in many grants call for such information.

To comply with these requirements, the College has used such factors as employment trends in its district, population and migration projections and attrition or retention rates of students attending the institution. A complete discussion of the various
data required by categorical aid grants is beyond the scope of the present study. The data indicate that the College conducts more needs assessments as a result of categorical aid programs than it has with other programs in the College.

Federally Funded Categorical Aid Permits the Addition of Facilities which would Otherwise be Unaffordable at the Time of Their Construction

The College has received over $1,000,000 from the federal government through either the Higher Education Facilities Act or the Higher Education Act during the years under consideration. In the opinion of those solicited the construction could not have occurred without these funds. The science of economics being a science of scarcity for most people, the writer attempted to procure objective data on this subject by analyzing the College's budget.

The process proved fruitless since only an approximation between the amount of categorical aid funds and College funds spent on construction could be obtained. The categorical aid funds constituted roughly 20 percent of the total costs for construction during fiscal years 1970-74. The problem with analyzing budgetary data regarding construction is that a variety of categorical aid funds were used for construction or purchasing purposes and thus monies became intermingled and undiscernable. As unresolvable as the situation is, it is safe to report that, considering the rising costs for construction, those facilities built using categorical aid funds were built for less money than would be required if they were presently being constructed.
Federally Funded Categorical Aid Building Requirements Assist the Physical Facilities Planning Process

The only person at the College who could offer some specificity as to this criterion was the director of institutional research and planning. In his personal opinion categorical aid building requirements had always assisted the physical facilities planning process. The reasoning behind this statement was illustrated in our conversation. The director had not encountered any building requirements occasioned by categorical aid which were superfluous or anathemical to the construction planning process. In his view the construction requirements have been an aid in pointing out factors which would have been otherwise overlooked.

Two examples were related to the writer. One concerned the federal requirements imposed on the College in regard to building construction and provisions for students in wheelchairs. Specifically, the program directors from Washington or Atlanta required that a ramp be constructed for these students—an idea that had completely escaped the architectural firm and staff at the College. A second instance concerned the selection of doorknobs. Persons without sight are taught differences in the shape of various doorknobs to help them navigate in public buildings. One shape of knob indicates that there is nothing dangerous on the other side of the door, while another shape forewarns of potential danger. In order to meet federal requirements the College purchased doorknobs designed to meet these specifications. The
director reported that, for him, the various guidelines had given more depth and breadth to the planning process than would have been the case without such guidelines.

Projects and Programs Generated by Federally Funded Categorical Aid are Evaluated Prior to the Institution Continuing them with its Own Funds

The majority of respondents to the writer's written questionnaire indicated that some form of evaluation had been conducted on programs initiated with categorical aid. The president and the director of institutional research were asked to respond to these questions:
"What factors determine whether the College will continue a program initiated through categorical aid once the federal funds stop?" and,
"How is the success or failure of categorical aid programs evaluated?"

For discussion purposes the latter question is reported first. The director of institutional research reported that the College assumes that a categorical aid program is successful when students enroll, complete the program and find employment or continue their education. When queried about evaluation in terms of student learning, the director reported that the College had not formally investigated this concern, the assumption being that this process was conducted at the classroom level by the instructor. The president viewed success or failure of a categorical aid program as resting primarily with the directing faculty member's estimation of its continuing service to the institution or community.

Regarding the factors considered in determining the program's continuance, the primary consideration seemed to be financial. If the
program was paying for itself, or coming close, then in all likelihood it would be continued. A factor which the president brought to light was that when federal funds provided expensive equipment and supplies during the program's embryonic stages the cost per program was diminished later. The example given was the entire vocational technical area. Had the College not received categorical aid in this area the costs per program would have prohibited the diversity of programs presently offered.

In addition to the above data, some categorical aid programs require semi-annual progress and evaluation reports. A perusal of these requirements shows that their primary concern focuses on the accomplishment of previously stated objectives of the program. For example, the evaluation report required by the U. S. Office of Education for Title III of the Higher Education Act calls for statistics concerning student retention, socio-economic status, race and follow-up after the student completes the program.

The situation as reported and analyzed by this writer shows a definite weakness in the College's approach towards this matter. In short, evaluation of the categorical aid programs is reflective of evaluation of the College in general--minimal. However, the data do report that more evaluation occurs in categorical aid programs than in programs not receiving external aid.

Administration

Decisions to Establish Administrative Modes of Operation and Procedures are Based on the Needs of the Community and the Institution and not on the Availability of Federally Funded Categorical Aid

Of the persons surveyed in regard to this criterion, the majority
responded that, during the years in question, decisions to establish administrative modes of operation and procedures had not been based on the availability of categorical aid. In addressing this point the respondents expressed the sentiment that the management of categorical aid grants required coordination among the various areas of the College, but each implied that this coordination was a healthy activity fostering better understanding within the institution. The major impact of categorical aid was in the establishment of a grants accountant in the business office and a director of grants in the development office. Both positions were filled internally by an administrative shift of duties during the time of this writing. Previously the College had relied solely on the dean for development when administrative problems arose. The dean for development and president substantiated these facts but added that the decision to create these positions was based on present institutional and community needs, not on future categorical aid. However, the implication is clear that had the College not received the volume and variety of categorical grants these positions would not exist today.

In addition, the president and the vice president for academic affairs remarked that their time has been consumed with categorical aid projects, but both implied that it was worth the extra effort.

Even though persons queried on the subject thought the College had based its decisions towards administrative procedures on the community's or the institution's needs, a caveat for other institutions
in this regard was inferred for the investigation. Participation in
categorical aid programs brings with it a certain degree of change
in administrative procedures. The change in this case seemed to take
the form of greater centralization in decision making and an enlarged
administrative staff. Granted, the two positions mentioned were
shifts in duties rather than creations, but this seems a problem in
semantics, not fact. In reality, the existence of these positions
is conclusive evidence that the management of categorical aid grants
has influenced the College's administrative mode of operation.
Further evidence supporting this contention can be found in the
College's ten year plan. The document does not mention an increase
in the development office's size nor the establishment of a grants
accountant in the business office.

Mitigating this last remark is the fact that the institution
has undergone several changes in its administrative structure and
procedures since the plan was written.

The Time Factor Involved in Application Deadlines, Project Approvals and
Disbursement of Federally Funded Categorical Aid Programs Does Not
Present Any Unusual Difficulties to the Institution

During the years in question, the majority of the respondents
reported that there had been some difficulties in this regard. The
major complaint expressed by the respondents was not in application
deadlines but in project approvals and disbursement of funds. These
inconveniences, though nominal, had been a source of frustration to
several respondents. The vice president for student personnel services
and the vice president of academic affairs explained a recent example
of this disturbance.
A project had been submitted to the United States Office of Education and had received informal (telephone) approval beginning fiscal year 1975. However, the College had not received formal (written) notification stating the grant's approval and thus could not disburse funds for the project. As part of the project the College intended to send two faculty members to a summer workshop commencing in July of the same year but, as of June 30th, had not received the award letter from Washington. A decision was reached at the College to send the faculty members in anticipation of receiving the award letter and subsequent funds.

This dilemma rarely occurs, but when it does it puts the College in a tenuous position. The institution's budgetary process is mandated by the state and must be finalized by the end of the fiscal year. During this process funds are allocated, when necessary, for categorical aid projects which commence the next fiscal period. The rub occurs when the College must disburse funds shortly after the new fiscal year begins, as in the case of this project. Whereas federal funds were to be used in sending the faculty to the conference, the College was required to make the expenditure since neither formal notification nor funds had been received. Even though such occurrences are infrequent, according to the respondents, it does place the College's normal budgetary routine in jeopardy.

In analyzing this situation one gleans more than the mere inconvenience of budgetary process. Two dangers to the College are implicit:
first, even though informal communication between the Office of Education and the College took place, the federal commitment was not legally binding. Thus, when the College shifted other funds to the project, it might never be reimbursed. The second danger inferred by this writer lies in the legality of such shifts within the confines of the College's budget. Without formal notification the business office is placed in the position of having to authorize expenditures from funds intended for other purposes, for which it is held accountable by the state auditor. In short, the business office is compelled to act in good faith and disburse funds believing the federal funds will be forthcoming in time to replace the shifted funds.

Even though the magnitude of this problem has been small, it does illustrate that some difficulties arise in categorical aid funding with respect to project approval and disbursement of funds. It should also be mentioned that this particular problem is one which can be resolved by the federal government and not by the institution, and that in instances when federal funds are impounded the results could be disastrous to a community college.

Educational Program

The Availability of Federally Funded Categorical Aid is not the Primary Consideration in Changing the Directions of a Local Education Program

The response occasioned by the written questionnaire and interview process to this criterion was that categorical aid had not been a factor in changing the local education program. In answer to the question, "What directions has the College's educational program
taken as a result of categorical aid which otherwise it might not
have?" the president, the vice president of academic affairs and
the vice president for student personnel services answered in the
following manner.

The president espoused the viewpoint that the process by which
the College becomes involved in categorical aid programs is based
on selectivity of programs. He further stated that it has been his
experience that the variety of categorical aid programs enable the
institution to choose those that are complementary to the needs of
the local educational program. His feelings were that the College
desired to offer these programs but was financially restricted and,
in order to remain a viable force in the community, the College must
be sensitive to the community's problems and provide a variety of
programs to meet those needs, which is has tried to do. Categorical
aid funds have allowed the institution financial flexibility in
meeting local requirements.

A reference to this last point was made in interviewing the
vice president for student personnel services. He reiterated the
president's sentiments and gave the following example. The College
desired to purchase a mobile counseling van for recruitment and
counseling purposes but there had been no funds available for such
a vehicle. Furthermore, the local board of trustees was not in
favor of making such a purchase with normal College funds. A grant
was prepared and submitted to the Florida State Department of
Vocational, Technical and Adult Education, which was funded. Thus, a local need had been met which would not have been without categorical funds.

In the opinion of the vice president of academic affairs, such a variety of categorical aid programs exists that the College maintains the prerogative in selection. In reviewing the categorical aid programs in which the institution is involved and in a discussion with the dean for development these facts appear to be true. The process of securing categorical aid funds commences after other means have been exhausted and not because of their availability. Any nuance in the educational program occurs when categorical aid funds permit the College to offer a wider variety of programs than was originally intended.

Federally Funded Categorical Aid Serves as an Incentive for Innovation and a Catalyst for Improving the Quality of Offerings at the Institution

Questions posed to persons at the College concerning this criterion were: "What innovations have been brought about as a result of categorical funding?" and "How have these innovations improved the quality of offerings at the institution?"

In addressing himself to these interrogatives the vice president for student personnel services cited the College's human service aide program. The original idea for the program was conceived by a counselor in the College. Lacking sufficient funds to initiate the program, the College submitted a grant to the federal government which was approved. This program has been successfully operating for three years and is
being tried in other educational institutions as well. To the last point the writer can attest, since he participated in negotiations between Santa Fe and the University of Georgia to start such a program. Lacking a validated method for measuring educational quality, the writer concludes with the point that in the opinion of those persons queried, categorical aid had improved the quality of offerings at the institution by providing more financial flexibility.

**Educational Programs Stimulated by Federally Funded Categorical Aid Programs are Viewed as a Foundation for Future Growth and Development**

The results of the written questionnaire show that in the opinion of the majority of the persons solicited, categorically funded projects had been viewed as a foundation for future growth and development. One fact in this regard is indisputable. As of this writing the College has not discontinued any program initiated with this type of federal funding.

During interviews with the dean for development and the vice president of academic affairs the point was raised that in the near future some categorically sponsored programs will have to be discontinued but, in the opinion of both, these programs will become parts of other programs. For example, both men felt that the College's drug education program per se saturated the need for drug abuse counselors but would become part of a larger program dealing with "substance" abuse.

The inference seems to be that by the time federal funds are no longer received by the College the program should be paying its own
way through enrollment. An important factor in this process is the amount of supplies and equipment purchased with federal funds. What would ordinarily be an expensive program unable to meet its cost through enrollment is now capable since the expenses of equipment and facilities have been offset through federal funding. The evidence seems to indicate that categorical aid programs are viewed as foundations for future growth and development.

Federally Funded Categorical Aid Increases the College's Ability to Attract, Develop and Hold Faculty of High Quality

During the investigation those persons asked to respond to this criterion expressed mixed emotions regarding the effect categorical aid had on the College's ability to attract, develop and hold faculty of high quality. Most implied that the College's reputation for innovation and teaching quality had been the primary factor in this concern. The vice president of academic affairs did remark that categorical funds had contributed in part to this reputation and as such had been an indirect influence. In light of this and the present study's limitations one can only report that categorical aid provides some budgetary flexibility and thus an atmosphere which would seem to be more attractive to faculty members.

Student Financial Aid

Local and State Efforts in Providing Student Financial Aid are not Diminished by Federally Funded Categorical Aid

The respondents did not think student financial aid from either state or local sources had diminished during the years in question. Table Eleven (Appendix E) supports their contention. The percentage
of non-federal (primarily state) funds to student financial aid had actually grown since 1970 from 7.7 percent of the total amount available to 28.3 percent. In an interview with the director of financial aid the rationale for this growth was explained to the writer. The director reported that the large increase in 1972 was a result of the state's student loan fund. Prior to that, the College had received the bulk of its student aid from federal sources but beginning in 1972 state support had begun to increase. One discerns from the same table that the dollar amounts per source also increased. In addition, Table Twelve (Appendix E) shows that the percentage of students receiving federal aid increased during the years in question. The data reported in the tables dealing with student aid would indicate a general growth in the amounts available from all sources.

**Federally Funded Categorical Aid Matching Requirements do not Decrease the Total Amount of Student Financial Aid Available**

As with the above criterion, the respondents did not believe the total amount of student aid had been diminished by the matching requirements of categorical grants. The largest categorical aid program has been funded under the Higher Education Act. Under this program the College received over $350,000 (see Appendix E, Table Nine) during fiscal year 1974 for an investment of a little over $40,000. In an interview with the director of student financial aid the question was posed to him concerning the acquisition of too much categorical aid, thereby reducing the total amount of
student aid available. His reply was that this could happen but that it was highly unlikely in a community college which was oriented to low income groups. In fact, he pointed out, the College had only loans and not grants available shortly after the spring registration of that year.

It would seem, then, from the data and from persons knowledgeable with the subject that matching requirements occasioned by categorical aid had not diminished the total amount of student aid available.

Fiscal Affairs

Federally Funded Categorical Aid Does Not Supplant State, Local and Private Sources as a Means of Financial Support

None of the persons queried on this subject felt that federal funds had supplanted state, local or private financial resources. As shown in Table Five (Appendix E), categorical aid has increased from 5 percent in 1972 to 10 percent in 1974 (excluding student financial aid). However, since the majority of the institution's funds are derived from the state's funding formula which is based on full-time students, and since enrollment has steadily increased during these years, the increase in state funds has made up the difference once federal funds cease. The College's growth has enabled it to receive the best of both worlds--state increases as a result of programs started with federal funds.

Matching Funds are not an Obstacle to the Institution in Seeking Federally Funded Categorical Aid

None of the respondents believed that categorical matching
requirements had been an obstacle to the institution. The vice president for business affairs concluded that the success enjoyed by the College with categorical aid had made decisions related to matching funds easier. More information was gleaned in an interview with the dean for development, who indicated that an important factor in seeking categorical funds was the College's intentions without federal funds. His view was that the College should become involved in programs with the idea that federal funds may not materialize. In short, that federal funds are used as temporary support for programs that the College would eventually fund.

This writer could not discover any evidence to contradict the opinions of those interviewed. Again, it would seem that the College's financial status resulting from its growth gives it a good deal of financial flexibility not enjoyed by institutions in a static environment.

**Budget Planning Involves the Consideration of Federally Funded Categorical Aid**

Data concerning this criterion were reported earlier in this chapter under institutional planning. Of the persons responding to the written questionnaire more than half felt that categorical aid funds had been included among the considerations in budgetary planning. To substantiate this fact the writer queried the vice president of business affairs as to what factors relative to categorical aid had been considered.
The main considerations focused on overhead or indirect expenses to the institution occasioned by the various programs and the amount of matching funds required. Different categorical aid programs allow varying amounts of indirect costs in the total amount requested. One problem created in light of these differences is that a categorical aid program with a low ceiling or indirect costs may be costing the institution more than is reported in the grant application.

A review of the categorical aid programs which the College has received during FY 1970-1974 shows that the amounts allowed for indirect costs fluctuates between 8 and 15 percent. Other evidence which seems pertinent to this criterion is that, as of this writing, the College is attempting to compute a negotiated indirect cost figure based on guidelines recommended by the National Science Foundation (NSF). This figure will assist the institution's budgetary planning process by stabilizing the amount of federal funds it can expect to receive for indirect costs.

Another factor considered in the budgetary planning process is the funding guidelines within each program. The dean for development spoke to this point by commenting that most federal agencies allow for maneuvering within the program's budget as long as the College fulfills its commitment. Problems arise when the College has not spent the total amount of federal funds and desires to carry funds into the next year or return the funds. The latter, according to the dean for development, is not a good tactic if the College desires
additional funding later. In sum, it would seem that categorical aid is considered in budget planning but that the data utilized by the College need refinement.

The Institution's Administrative Overhead Expenses Incurred by Participating in Federally Funded Categorical Aid are Met with Federal Funds

The remarks concerning the establishment of an indirect cost figure apply to this criterion. Persons responding to the written questionnaire believed that overhead expenses had been met with federal funds in the majority of programs. The vice president for business affairs stated that although not absolutely certain, he reasoned this had been true. The rationale for his belief was based on the fact that the volume of categorical grants received by the College during the years under study had lowered the per unit administrative costs. In addition, other than the two positions previously mentioned, the College had not employed persons specifically for grant administration.

Categorical Aid is not Viewed as a Vehicle to Compensate for Rising Institutional Costs Due to Inflation

The respondents to the written questionnaire reported that categorical funds had been used to compensate for inflation less than 25 percent of the time under study. In a conversation with the vice president for business affairs and the dean for development an explanation was given as to how each viewed categorical aid with respect to this criterion. Both said that the College would be in a
better financial posture if its normal sources had alleviated the inflationary burden, but since that had not been the case categorical funds have helped to compensate for rising costs.

The point made by both men was that the College used these funds for the benefit of the total institution. When categorical funds freed normal funds the latter were used in areas needing more dollars. When the College was participating in a program which could be improved and/or assisted financially then federal funds had been sought. When this occurs the College gains a certain degree of leverage for inflationary purposes.

In summary, of the twenty-seven criteria validated by the NCRD, this criterion caused the greatest amount of consternation; the findings reinforce the concept that the function of categorical aid is not to ameliorate the pressures of inflation but to enrich educational offerings.

Cost Differential Between On-Going Programs and Programs Generated by Federally Funded Categorical Aid Programs are met Through Federal Funding

At the present time the College is in the process of establishing cost differentials among programs but these data were not available to the writer. The majority of respondents assumed that federal funds had met any difference in cost per program. Likewise, during the interview process, the president, vice president for student personnel services and the dean for development concurred with the respondents but with some reservations.

These reservations were articulated by the vice president for business affairs as the lack of objective data on the subject. He did
believe that those differences in cost per program were being met with federal funds but he lacked the data to prove it.

As the College moves closer to PPBS the measurement of this criterion will be more readily accessible to future studies of this nature. For the present, probably the best measurement of it can be gleaned from the dean for development's approach to federal funding. His philosophy was that the federal source pays everything and the College buys as little as possible.

The Requirements for Space and Facilities Resulting from Federally Funded Categorical Aid Pose No Financial Burden to the Institution

The respondents to the questionnaire and structured interview reported that the institution had suffered no financial burden in relation to the requirements for space and facilities.

In the writer's interview with the vice president for academic affairs the question was posed as to whom priority had been given regarding space and/or room assignments. Subsequently he was asked whether the status of the program's financial source had been considered in assigning space and/or facilities; he replied that it had not been.

These and similar facts seem to indicate that during the years in question categorical aid space and facilities requirements have posed no financial burden on the College.
CHAPTER VII
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

This study has provided a description of the impact of federally funded categorical aid program funds on Santa Fe Community College during fiscal years 1970-74. The process used to assess this impact consisted of the following elements. First, a series of criteria were developed from a review of related documents, literature and persons knowledgeable with the subject. These criteria were then subjected to scrutiny and subsequent validation by the members of the National Council for Resource Development. Included in this validation process was a written questionnaire.

Once validated, the writer applied these criteria to a community college with a history of involvement in categorical aid programs. The methodology took several forms. The written questionnaire in conjunction with a series of structured interviews was administered to personnel at the College deemed knowledgeable with the subject. Where available and applicable supporting documents and related material were also used during the application process. In addition, the College's plan for the decade of the seventies was used as a benchmark in depicting what directions the College had been projected to follow.
Analysis of the data was conducted by the writer following this process. Assessment of the ways in which the institution had been affected by categorical aid funds was evaluated according to twenty-seven evaluative criteria. The major classifications of these criteria were: purposes, plans and objectives, administration, educational program, student financial aid and fiscal affairs. The data, in some instances, were mere personal opinion and as such lack some specificity. However, where available and pertinent, documentation was utilized in the analysis. The most frequently used document in the analysis being the College's ten-year plan.

The term "impact" connotes that change has occurred as a result of an internal or external force to the system. In this case the system was Santa Fe Community College and the external force was categorical aid programs sponsored by the federal government. In order to "assess" some reference has to be made regarding in what directions the system (College) was originally planned to travel. Fortunately, in this study some information was made available through the College's plan. Without such a document plotting the College's directions would have been a tenuous and speculative task.

This last point is made for future studies on the subject of federal funding and community college. Though limited in some areas, this study has shown the necessity of institutional planning for evaluative purposes. Many of the areas in which impact was assessed do not lend themselves to quantification. The emphasis now on
Planning, Programming, Budgeting Systems in community colleges in Florida and on follow-up studies will undoubtedly assist future researchers in this area.

The College received several millions of dollars from federally funded categorical aid programs during the years in question. Some degree of impact has been measured in terms of the criteria applied to the institution. More quantification in this area is needed and should become available as educational institutions refine their managerial procedures, and researchers their analytical skills.

Conclusions

Purposes, Plans and Objectives

From a review of related books, articles and documents, the writer developed a series of evaluative criteria which were validated by members of the National Council for Resource Development. Out of this list, twelve criteria were classified as being applicable to a community college's plans, purposes and objectives. These criteria were applied to Santa Fe Community College through a series of interviews, a written questionnaire and related documents and data.

The criteria indicate that federally financed categorical aid has influenced the College's plans, purposes and objectives. The study revealed that in some aspects these external funds have permitted the institution to strengthen and develop many of the objectives stated in the ten year plan. The most pronounced objective germinated by the addition of categorical funding was in the area of being responsive to community needs by increasing the breadth and diversity of college
programs. As reported in Chapter VI, categorical aid encouraged this objective by providing funds which permitted the institution to pursue its plan earlier than anticipated.

In addition, many areas throughout the College were strengthened by these funds. Perhaps the most noteworthy of these areas were student personnel services and vocational-technical education. In both, categorical aid allowed the addition of staff and equipment which contributed to their enrichment. An ancillary concern to which categorical aid has contributed implicitly is the concept of innovative teaching. Funds received from outside sources have given the College's faculty greater financial freedom in attempting new teaching techniques. These, then, illustrate one direction in which the college was influenced. The information gleaned during the study also points to another direction influenced by categorical aid.

The nature of this type of financing seems to have stagnated the College's ability to continue to plan its objectives. Even though the institution has pursued a course generally subscribed in the ten year plan, it has not examined its priorities. In short, data gathered and reported in this study imply a general lack of institutional planning regarding categorical funding. It is true that programs in which the College participates have been promulgated in an attempt to satisfy community and institutional needs. But in pursuing and participating in these programs, the data suggest that planning is more often than not considered a luxury rather than a prerequisite.
In addition to influencing the planning process, categorical assistance has forced the College to sacrifice some of its philosophical concepts. As reported in the study the College advocates the "open-door" and "non-punitive" grading philosophies. But the data show that the categorically financed program to train physician's assistants is neither open in its admission nor non-punitive in its grading policy. Of course, the terms "open-door" and "non-punitive" are subject to interpretation as to their relativity. The degree of "openness" within an institution once the student is admitted can vary according to available resources. But what the data show is that influence is exerted on Santa Fe Community College in order to be eligible for this program supported by outside agencies like the federal government and the AMA.

Administration

The conclusions based on the application of the evaluative criteria for administration take directions similar to those for purposes, plans and objectives. When compared to the "returns" of participating in categorical programs the data show that the "effort" exerted in administrative concerns seem worth it. The College has not suffered in unusual administrative burdens as a result of categorical aid programs.

In one instance certain problems occurred which could have serious implications for the College. The problems surrounded the time lag between notification of award and disbursement of federal funds. It was also mentioned that the institution has little, if any, influence over
this bureaucratic problem. The study's purpose in this regard was to discover these facts, not pass judgment or pose solutions for them. Additionally, grant management has occasioned two new administrative positions created as a result of categorical aid programs.

Educational Program

In the main the data report a general direction of increasing the diversity and breadth of educational offerings. Faculty are given greater financial freedom and encouraged to pursue innovative teaching techniques with the assistance of categorical funds. Also, the information reports that decisions to change the direction of educational programs have not been affected by categorical aid. Here again, there seems to be a lack of planning in that all programs have equal priority. While the data point out that categorical aid has supplied funds for salaries, equipment and facilities there is little evidence to show which programs the College will continue when these funds cease.

It would be highly tenuous to conclude a cause-effect relationship exists between categorical aid and program enrichment. However, there is evidence for one to make inferential conclusions. An environment which places emphasis on innovation and teaching requires substantial financial support. When categorical aid has fostered this environment, then to some extent teacher motivation and morale have been influenced. Thus, it would seem that the educational program
has been enriched. Conversely, when categorical aid promotes jealousies within the institution's faculty and staff the opposite may occur. Even though the data show a minimum of this during the years in question, the potential exists for it to occur.

**Student Financial Support**

During the years under study the College received a total of $3,287,921.00 for student financial aid. Of the total, $2,744,151.00 was financed by the federal government. The amounts received from local and state sources have increased as a percentage of the total amount available.

More students in terms of numbers and proportions received student financial aid in 1974 than the preceding years. These facts illustrate that federally funded categorical aid has contributed toward improving the College's status regarding student financial aid. There was no evidence to show that the total amount of student financial aid had diminished from matching requirements nor evidence to show that fee increasement had been occasioned by such aid.

It would be presumptuous to conclude that student enrollment has been increased through the College's ability to provide financial aid. On the other hand, it would be naive to say that financial aid is not a consideration in a student enrollment and retention. The case cited in the interview with the vice-president for student personnel services, though singular, adds credence to the fact that student anxieties toward continuing their education can be relieved.
when they receive financial aid. Another factor that was implicit in the study was that students from a variety of socio-economic backgrounds were served through categorically funded financial aid.

**Fiscal Affairs**

General factors were considered in assessing the impact that federal funds had on the College's fiscal affairs. Foremost among these factors were: (1) had budgetary planning included a consideration of categorical aid?, and (2) had these funds supplanted state and local financial support?

The evidence reported in Chapter VI indicates that little in the way of budgetary planning had been accomplished relative to categorical funding. Specifically, such factors as cost differentials among programs, administrative or indirect expenses occasioned by categorical programs and replacement of federal funds had been given cursory consideration in budgetary planning. Conversely, because of the rapid increase in student enrollment, the College has not suffered significantly from these omissions.

This last statement is significant when analyzing the financial well-being of the institution in terms of supplantment of local and state resources. Placed in an environment where student enrollment was static or decreasing the institution would be hard pressed to continue some of the programs presently offered.

During the years in question, the College received approximately 10 percent of its operational budget from federally funded
categorical aid. It would seem safe to conclude that if this funding were completely terminated, reductions in programs and/or staff would be necessary. The point is that the data report no effort on the College's part to anticipate this possibility other than considering increased enrollment, federal financing of equipment and facilities.

Construction costs to the College seem to have been diminished by federal funding which in turn led to an earlier implementation of the building plan. It can reasonably be concluded that since building costs tend to increase yearly, the College received a savings in this regard. In summary, the College has enjoyed greater financial freedom because of categorical funds during the years under study. Yet this freedom seems to have promoted a subtle influence as to replacement of funds. Fortunately, the institution has not suffered from this lack of foresight due probably to increases in enrollment and careful grant selection. Even so, the data show that more importance should be attached to this subject in the future.

Implications

One question which needs further study might center around the comparative effects of federal funds, financed through general institutional support against federal funds financed categorically. For example, a future study could take the percent of federal funds received by the College during these years and compare it with a computed percent based on the number of full-time equivalent students.
attending the College or a similar formula. Furthermore, if costs
data were then available, the study could compare revenue per program
financed categorically against revenue per program financed by general
institutional or formula allocations.

A study such as the one projected would begin to demonstrate the
equity or inequity between the two financing mechanisms. Until such
studies are accomplished higher education will continue to play a
secondary role to the vascillating political forces of the federal
government.
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APPENDIX A

TENTATIVE CRITERIA SUBMITTED TO THE
NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT
TENTATIVE EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FEDERALLY FUNDED CATEGORICAL AID

1. The institution's goals and objectives are strengthened and developed by federally funded categorical aid.

2. Institutional goals and objectives determine the federally funded categorical aid programs with which the institution becomes involved.

3. The governance of the institution (freedom in selecting students, staff and curriculum) is responsive to the goals of the institution rather than to the demands of federally funded categorical aid programs.

4. Changes in the relationships among parts of the institution as a result of federally funded categorical aid are made to promote long-range efficiency and improvement in the institution rather than to conform to funding guidelines.

5. Local rather than national considerations are given priority in procuring federally funded categorical aid.

6. The availability of federally funded categorical aid is not the prime consideration in changing the directions of a local educational program.

7. The criteria used in awarding federally funded categorical aid program funds are appropriate and satisfactory to the predetermined needs of the institutions.

8. Federally funded categorical aid is considered in the annual institutional planning process.

9. The institution's goals and objectives are congruent with guidelines for categorical aid programs.

10. Data generated as a result of federally funded categorical aid programs contribute to the institution's planning function.

11. Categorical aid provides an awareness of national needs to which the institution can address its own goals.

12. Federally funded categorical aid does not replace state, local and private sources as a means of financial support.

13. Decisions to establish mode of operation and procedures are based on the needs of the community and not on the availability of federally funded categorical aid.
14. Federally funded categorical aid serves as an incentive for innovation and a catalyst for improving the quality and equality of offerings at the institution.

15. Local and state efforts in providing student financial aid are not diminished by federally funded categorical aid.

16. The time factor involved in application deadlines, project approvals and disbursement of federally funded categorical aid programs does not present any unusual difficulties to the institution.

17. Communication between the institution and federally funded categorical aid program sources is a continual process.

18. The institution's formal decision making process is equally applicable to federally funded categorical aid programs within the college.

19. Educational programs stimulated by federally funded categorical aid programs are viewed as a foundation for future growth and development.

20. Local, state and private financial resources are not diverted to federally funded categorical aid purposes unless those purposes promote economy and efficiency in the institution.

21. A needs assessment is conducted prior to making application for federally funded categorical aid.

22. The responsibility for coordinating federally funded categorical aid is designated to a single individual at the institution.

23. Matching funds are not an obstacle to the institution in seeking federally funded categorical aid.

24. The possible awarding of federally funded categorical aid does not determine the amount of funds held for contingency purposes.

25. Budget planning involves the consideration of federally funded categorical aid.

26. The institution's administrative overhead expenses incurred by participating in federally funded categorical aid are met with federal funds.

27. Categorical aid is not viewed as a vehicle to compensate for rising institutional costs due to inflation.
28. Additional "costs of education" to the institution are compensated by federally funded categorical aid.

29. A decrease in federally funded categorical aid does not place a burden on the institution's operating budget.

30. Cost differentials between on-going programs and educational programs generated by federally funded categorical aid programs are met through federal funding.

31. Federally funded categorical aid increases the college's ability to attract, develop and hold faculty of high quality.

32. Federally funded categorical aid enables students to enroll who otherwise would not be able to attend college.

33. Federally funded categorical aid matching requirements do not decrease the total amount of student financial aid available.

34. Federally funded categorical aid permits the addition of facilities which would otherwise be unaffordable.

35. Federally funded categorical aid enables the college to purchase modern equipment and facilities.

36. Federally funded categorical aid building requirements assist the physical facilities planning process.

37. The requirements for space and facilities resulting from federally funded categorical aid pose no financial burden to the institution.

38. Projects and programs generated by federally funded categorical aid are evaluated prior to the institution continuing them with its own funds.
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APPENDIX C

WRITTEN QUESTIONNAIRE ADMINISTERED TO SELECTED PERSONS AT SANTA FE COMMUNITY COLLEGE
This Questionnaire represents one part of an attempt to assess the impact of federally funded categorical aid on a public community college. You were selected to respond to this instrument by virtue of your experience and knowledge with the subject. The questions focus on the time period between 1970 and 1974 fiscal years.

Purposes, Plans and Objectives

1. Institutional goals and objectives have determined the federally funded categorical aid programs with which the institution has become involved.
   A. _____ 100% of the time
   B. _____ 75% of the time
   C. _____ 50% of the time
   D. _____ 25% of the time
   E. _____ 0% of the time

2. Federally funded categorical aid has strengthened and developed the institution's goals and objectives.
   A. _____ 100% of the time
   B. _____ 75% of the time
   C. _____ 50% of the time
   D. _____ 25% of the time
   E. _____ 0% of the time

3. The governance of the institution (freedom in selecting students, staff and curriculum) has been determined by the demands of federally funded categorical aid programs.
4. Changes in the relationships among parts of the institution as a result of categorical aid have been made to conform with funding guidelines.
   A. _____ 100% of the time
   B. _____ 75% of the time
   C. _____ 50% of the time
   D. _____ 25% of the time
   E. _____ 0% of the time

5. Categorical aid has provided an awareness of national needs to which the institution has addressed while giving local needs primary consideration.
   A. _____ 100% of the time
   B. _____ 75% of the time
   C. _____ 50% of the time
   D. _____ 25% of the time
   E. _____ 0% of the time

6. The criteria used in awarding federally funded categorical aid program funds have been evaluated and deemed appropriate and satisfactory to the predetermined needs of the institution.
   A. _____ 100% of the time
B. ____ 75% of the time
C. ____ 50% of the time
D. ____ 25% of the time
E. ____ 0% of the time

7. Federally funded categorical aid has been considered in the annual institutional planning process.
A. ____ 100% of the time
B. ____ 75% of the time
C. ____ 50% of the time
D. ____ 25% of the time
E. ____ 0% of the time

8. Data generated as a result of categorical aid programs have contributed to the institution's planning process.
A. ____ 100% of the time
B. ____ 75% of the time
C. ____ 50% of the time
D. ____ 25% of the time
E. ____ 0% of the time

9. A needs assessment has been conducted prior to making application for federally funded categorical aid.
A. ____ 100% of the time
B. ____ 75% of the time
C. ____ 50% of the time
D. ____ 25% of the time
E. ____ 0% of the time
10. Federally funded categorical aid has permitted the addition of facilities which would have been unaffordable.
   A. ____ 100% of the time
   B. ____ 75% of the time
   C. ____ 50% of the time
   D. ____ 25% of the time
   E. ____ 0% of the time

11. Federally funded categorical aid building requirements have assisted the physical facilities planning process.
   A. ____ 100% of the time
   B. ____ 75% of the time
   C. ____ 50% of the time
   D. ____ 25% of the time
   E. ____ 0% of the time

12. The success or failure of projects and/or programs generated by categorical aid have been evaluated before the institution continues them with its own funds.
   A. ____ 100% of the time
   B. ____ 75% of the time
   C. ____ 50% of the time
   D. ____ 25% of the time
   E. ____ 0% of the time

13. Decisions to establish administrative modes of operation and procedures have been based on the demands of federally funded categorical aid programs.
14. The time factor involved in application deadlines, project approvals and disbursement of federally funded categorical aid has presented unusual difficulties to the college.
A. _____ 100% of the time
B. _____ 75% of the time
C. _____ 50% of the time
D. _____ 25% of the time
E. _____ 0% of the time

15. The institution's formal decision making process has been as equally applicable to categorical aid programs within the college as other programs.
A. _____ 100% of the time
B. _____ 75% of the time
C. _____ 50% of the time
D. _____ 25% of the time
E. _____ 0% of the time

16. The availability of federally funded categorical aid has been the prime consideration in changing the directions of the local educational program.
17. Federally funded categorical aid has served as an incentive for innovation in improving the quality of offerings at the institution.

A. _____ 100% of the time
B. _____ 75% of the time
C. _____ 50% of the time
D. _____ 25% of the time
E. _____ 0% of the time

18. Federally funded categorical aid has been a catalyst for improving the quality of offerings at the institution.

A. _____ 100% of the time
B. _____ 75% of the time
C. _____ 50% of the time
D. _____ 25% of the time
E. _____ 0% of the time

19. Federally funded categorical aid has increased the college's ability to attract, develop and hold faculty of high quality.

A. _____ 100% of the time
B. _____ 75% of the time
C. _____ 50% of the time
D. ____ 25% of the time
E. ____ 0% of the time

20. Educational programs stimulated by categorical aid have been viewed as a foundation for future growth and development.
A. ____ 100% of the time
B. ____ 75% of the time
C. ____ 50% of the time
D. ____ 25% of the time
E. ____ 0% of the time

Fiscal Affairs

21. Categorical aid funds have been viewed as a vehicle to compensate for rising institutional costs due to inflation.
A. ____ 100% of the time
B. ____ 75% of the time
C. ____ 50% of the time
D. ____ 25% of the time
E. ____ 0% of the time

22. The requirements for space and facilities demanded by categorical aid has been a financial burden to the institution.
A. ____ 100% of the time
B. ____ 75% of the time
C. ____ 50% of the time
D. ____ 25% of the time
E. ____ 0% of the time

23. Matching funds have been an obstacle to the institution in seeking federally financed categorical aid.
24. Budgetary planning has involved the consideration of federally funded categorical aid.
   A. ___ 100% of the time
   B. ___ 75% of the time
   C. ___ 50% of the time
   D. ___ 25% of the time
   E. ___ 0% of the time

25. The institution's administrative overhead expenses incurred by participating in categorical aid programs have been met with federal funds.
   A. ___ 100% of the time
   B. ___ 75% of the time
   C. ___ 50% of the time
   D. ___ 25% of the time
   E. ___ 0% of the time

26. Federally funded categorical aid has supplanted state, local and private means of financial support to the institution.
   A. ___ 100% of the time
   B. ___ 75% of the time
   C. ___ 50% of the time
   D. ___ 25% of the time
E. _____ 0% of the time

27. Cost differentials between on-going programs and programs generated by categorical aid have been met through federal funding.
   A. _____ 100% of the time
   B. _____ 75% of the time
   C. _____ 50% of the time
   D. _____ 25% of the time
   E. _____ 0% of the time

Student Financial Aid

28. Local and state efforts in providing student financial aid have been diminished by federally funded categorical aid.
   A. _____ 100% of the time
   B. _____ 75% of the time
   C. _____ 50% of the time
   D. _____ 25% of the time
   E. _____ 0% of the time

29. Federally funded categorical aid matching requirements have decreased the total amount of student financial aid available.
   A. _____ 100% of the time
   B. _____ 75% of the time
   C. _____ 50% of the time
   D. _____ 25% of the time
   E. _____ 0% of the time
APPENDIX D

QUESTIONS POSED DURING STRUCTURED INTERVIEWS
QUESTIONS FOR STRUCTURED INTERVIEW WITH
VICE PRESIDENT OF STUDENT AFFAIRS

1. In what ways has the receipt of categorical aid affected the number and mix of students served by the College?

2. How has categorical aid affected the attrition or retention rate of students enrolled at the College?

3. What administrative modes of operation or procedures have been based on categorical aid funding criteria and/or guidelines?

4. What administrative problems have been occasioned by participating in categorical aid programs?

5. What instances of which you are aware has categorical aid freed state and local support for student affairs purposes?

6. How has federally funded categorical aid enriched the student affairs program at the College?

7. In what ways has categorical aid detracted from the student affairs program at the College?

8. In what ways has the receipt of categorically financed student aid affected policies in regard to matriculation fees?

9. How has the receipt of categorical aid contributed to the College's goals and objectives?

10. What factors have been considered in establishing a need for a program that is funded with categorical aid funds?
QUESTIONS FOR STRUCTURED INTERVIEW WITH DIRECTOR OF STUDENT FINANCIAL AID

1. How has the receipt of categorically financed student aid increased or diminished the total amount of student financial aid available to the College?

2. In what ways has the receipt of student financial aid financed by the federal government supplanted state and local student financial aid?
QUESTIONS FOR STRUCTURED INTERVIEW WITH
PRESIDENT OF SANTA FE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

1. In what ways has federally funded categorical aid strengthened the institution's goals and objectives?

2. How has categorical aid provided an awareness of national needs to which the institution has addressed itself?

3. How have the criteria used in awarding grants been evaluated prior to the College making application for federal funds?

4. How has categorical aid been considered in the annual institutional planning process?

5. What factors are considered in the needs assessment conducted by the College prior to making application for federal funds?

6. How has the success or failure of categorical aid projects been evaluated?

7. In what ways has the College's formal decision-making process been inadequate with regard to categorical aid programs?

8. What programs offered by the College could not have been offered without federal funds?

9. How has the governance of the institution (freedom in selecting students, staff, and curriculum) been affected by categorical aid requirements?

10. What administrative problems are occasioned by participating in federally funded categorical aid programs—internal and external?

11. What directions has the College's educational program taken as a result of categorical aid which otherwise it might not have?

12. What factors determine whether the College will continue a program initiated through categorical aid once the federal funds stop?
QUESTIONS FOR STRUCTURED INTERVIEW WITH VICE PRESIDENT FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

1. What programs has the College instigated as a result of federal funds which it would not have done with its own budget?

2. What innovations have been brought about as a result of federal funds?

3. How has the quality of offerings been improved through federal funds?

4. How does federal funds enable the College to attract, develop and hold faculty of high quality?

5. What programs stimulated by federal funds have grown into "regular" College offerings?

6. In what ways has federal funds changed the direction of programs offered at the College?

7. What problems have resulted from continuing a program after the expiration of federal funds?

8. What external administrative problems are occasioned by participating in categorical aid programs?

9. What internal administrative problems result from participating in categorical aid programs?

10. In what ways would the present educational program differ had federal funds been unrestricted?
QUESTIONS FOR STRUCTURED INTERVIEW WITH DIRECTOR OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH AND PLANNING

1. In what ways have data generated by categorical aid programs contributed to the institution's planning process?

2. What factors are considered in assessing the need for categorical aid programs?

3. Which facilities have been constructed which would not have been without federal funds?

4. What categorical aid building requirements have assisted the physical facilities planning process?

5. How is the success of failure of categorical aid programs evaluated?
QUESTIONS FOR STRUCTURED INTERVIEW WITH
VICE PRESIDENT FOR BUSINESS AFFAIRS

1. Would the College have been able to maintain its present operational budget without federal funds?

2. What programs or activities depend on the College receiving federal funds?

3. What administrative problems are occasioned by participating in categorical aid programs?

4. What obstacles insofar as matching requirements have been caused by categorical aid?

5. What factors are considered in budgetary planning with regard to federally funded categorical aid?

6. What is the administrative overhead expense incurred by participating in categorical aid programs?

7. Is there any indication of institutional dependence on federally funded categorical aid? Please specify.

8. How would the pattern of expenditures of federal funds differ had these funds been unrestrictive?

9. When federally sponsored projects begin to lose their federal support is a burden placed on future budgets?

10. What purposes were state and local support freed by federal funds?
APPENDIX E

TABLES
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title I, Community Service</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>18,813</td>
<td>18,856</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>37,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title II, Library</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>14,932</td>
<td>22,961</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title III, Developing Institutions</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title IV, Student Financial Aid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) College Work-Study</td>
<td>18,456</td>
<td>23,977</td>
<td>50,650</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>59,896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Educ. Opp. Grants</td>
<td>29,804</td>
<td>42,100</td>
<td>58,840</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>104,757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Student Special Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Cooperative Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title V, Teacher Education</td>
<td>74,000</td>
<td>67,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title VI, Undergraduate Facilities</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>1,238,281</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title X, Veteran’s Cost of Instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education of the Handicapped Act</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Streets Act of 1968, as Amended</td>
<td>46,287</td>
<td>52,000</td>
<td>67,579</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>23,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manpower Development Training Act</td>
<td>116,531</td>
<td>152,670</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>132,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Education Act of 1963, as Amended</td>
<td>61,511</td>
<td>76,175</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>135,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Science Foundation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Endowment for the Humanities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Protection Act, 1968</td>
<td>16,079</td>
<td>40,056</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>17,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Institute of Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allied Health Professionals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physician's Asst.</td>
<td>44,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing Loans</td>
<td>8,393</td>
<td>26,381</td>
<td>33,860</td>
<td>30,600</td>
<td>25,832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing Grants</td>
<td>8,435</td>
<td>27,260</td>
<td>22,400</td>
<td>24,400</td>
<td>12,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing Capital Grant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>48,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X-Ray Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Action (OEO)</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>3,700</td>
<td>3,300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State &amp; Local Fiscal Asst. Act of 1972</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Security Act, Title IV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration &amp; Refugee Asst. Act of 1962</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuban Loan</td>
<td>32,534</td>
<td>45,442</td>
<td>51,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Direct Student Loan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>107,156</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Defense</td>
<td>52,782</td>
<td>67,090</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>235,559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federally Insured Loan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>135,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>410,312</td>
<td>889,664</td>
<td>2,051,854</td>
<td>1,079,897</td>
<td>1,315,429</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Business Affairs, SFCC, and Office for Development, SFCC
### TABLE TWO

PROGRAMS AND AMOUNTS OF FEDERALLY FUNDED CATEGORICAL AID PROGRAMS FROM NATIONAL OR REGIONAL LEVEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title II, Library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14,932</td>
<td>22,961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title III, Developing Institution</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title IV, Student Asst. (a) College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Study</td>
<td>18,456</td>
<td>23,977</td>
<td>50,650</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>59,896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Educ. Opp. Grant</td>
<td>29,804</td>
<td>42,100</td>
<td>58,840</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>104,757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Special Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Cooperative Ed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title V, Teacher Ed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education of the Handicapped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Streets Act of 1968, as Amended</td>
<td>46,287</td>
<td>52,000</td>
<td>67,579</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>23,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Science Foundation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Protection Act, 1968</td>
<td>16,079</td>
<td>40,056</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>17,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Institute of Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allied Health Professionals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35,501</td>
<td>32,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physician's Asst.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing Loans</td>
<td>8,393</td>
<td>26,381</td>
<td>33,860</td>
<td>30,600</td>
<td>25,832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing Grants</td>
<td>8,435</td>
<td>27,260</td>
<td>22,400</td>
<td>24,400</td>
<td>12,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing Capitalation Grant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>48,035</td>
<td>43,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X-Ray Technology</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Action Agency</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>3,700</td>
<td>3,300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration &amp; Refugee Asst. Act of 1962,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuban Loan</td>
<td>32,534</td>
<td>45,442</td>
<td>51,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Defense Student Loan</td>
<td>52,782</td>
<td>67,090</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Direct Student Loan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>107,156</td>
<td>235,559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federally Insured Student Loan</td>
<td>135,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>114,770</td>
<td>537,006</td>
<td>524,717</td>
<td>859,897</td>
<td>943,719</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Business Affairs, SFCC, Office for Student Financial Aid, and Office for Development, SFCC
TABLE THREE
PROGRAMS AND AMOUNTS OF FEDERALLY
FUNDED CATEGORICAL AID PROGRAMS THROUGH STATE AGENCIES
SANTA FE COMMUNITY COLLEGE: FY 1970-74

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title I</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>18,813</td>
<td>18,856</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>37,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title II</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title IV</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,238,281</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Education Act</td>
<td>78,237</td>
<td>67,900</td>
<td>124,000</td>
<td>241,051</td>
<td>181,504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Security Act</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Department of Commerce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Endowment for the Humanities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via Fine Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council of Florida</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manpower Development Training Act</td>
<td>116,531</td>
<td>152,670</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>132,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>212,268</td>
<td>344,383</td>
<td>1,561,785</td>
<td>381,051</td>
<td>364,464</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Business Affairs, SFCC and Office for Development, SFCC
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Funds Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Vocational Counselor Aide</td>
<td>$3,700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VTAD Conference</td>
<td>$879.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business Education</td>
<td>$14,217.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marketing &amp; Distribution</td>
<td>$1,846.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Audio-Tutorial Lab</td>
<td>$2,982.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dental Assistant</td>
<td>$7,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family Living Aide</td>
<td>$2,128.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Air Conditioning &amp; Refrigeration</td>
<td>$7,348.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Electrical Construction</td>
<td>$5,278.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Machine Shop</td>
<td>$5,987.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upholstery</td>
<td>$1,684.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trowel Trade</td>
<td>$1,992.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Welding</td>
<td>$6,900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Air Pollution</td>
<td>$4,954.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Civil Construction</td>
<td>$6,422.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Electrical Technician</td>
<td>$7,497.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Radiological Technician</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$78,237.95</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Secretarian-Clerical</td>
<td>$9,973.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dental Assistant</td>
<td>$9,951.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Day Care Worker</td>
<td>$1,491.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Automotive Technology</td>
<td>$11,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data Processing Technician</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Radiologic Technician</td>
<td>$5,280.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Electrical Construction</td>
<td>$6,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heating, Air Conditioning</td>
<td>$9,117.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cosmetology</td>
<td>$1,189.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VTAD Conference</td>
<td>$1,189.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upholstery</td>
<td>$1,817.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Air Pollution Technology</td>
<td>$4,954.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family Living Aide</td>
<td>$2,128.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$67,900.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Year</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Funds Received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Vocational Research &amp; Evaluation Ctr.</td>
<td>$ 645.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fire Science</td>
<td>2,162.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Welding</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marketing Distribution</td>
<td>1,350.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Air Conditioning &amp; Refrigeration</td>
<td>7,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Electronics Technician</td>
<td>6,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Civil Construction</td>
<td>21,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Major Appliance Repair</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data Processing Technology</td>
<td>60,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Day Care Center</td>
<td>1,491.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secretarial-Clerical</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dental Assistant</td>
<td>11,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$124,648.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Radiologic Technology</td>
<td>$12,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Automotive Technology</td>
<td>11,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Law Enforcement</td>
<td>3,543.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>18,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data Processing Techniques</td>
<td>17,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secretarial-Clerical</td>
<td>15,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vocational Technical Learning Program</td>
<td>8,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physician's Assistant</td>
<td>14,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mobile Counseling for Disadvantaged</td>
<td>14,267.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medical Science Equipment</td>
<td>9,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cosmetology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heating, Air Conditioning &amp; Refrigeration</td>
<td>17,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Welding</td>
<td>9,791.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VTAD Conference</td>
<td>1,900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Addendum to State VTAD Plan</td>
<td>$88,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$241,051.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Secretarial Program</td>
<td>$7,581.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nuclear Medicine Technology</td>
<td>53,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Computations</td>
<td>9,210.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physician's Assistants</td>
<td>21,654.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Audio-Tutorial</td>
<td>15,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mobile Counseling Clinic</td>
<td>14,267.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emergency Technicians</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cosmetology</td>
<td>12,412.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heating &amp; Air Conditioning</td>
<td>17,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Welding</td>
<td>9,791.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Occupational Specialist</td>
<td>8,825.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VTAD Conference</td>
<td>2,264.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$181,504.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE FIVE

STATEMENT OF REVENUE FOR EDUCATIONAL AND GENERAL PURPOSE AND FEDERAL FUNDS RECEIVED BY SFCC: FY 1970-74

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Educational and General Purpose Budget</th>
<th>Total Federal Funds</th>
<th>Federally Funded (Total) Categorical Funds</th>
<th>Categorical Funds Excluding Student Financial Aid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>4,988,768</td>
<td>410,312</td>
<td>331,301</td>
<td>259,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>5,471,600</td>
<td>889,664</td>
<td>689,676</td>
<td>522,414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>6,823,200</td>
<td>*2,051,854</td>
<td>704,717</td>
<td>488,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>7,505,520</td>
<td>1,079,897</td>
<td>979,897</td>
<td>539,897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>8,231,250</td>
<td>1,513,429</td>
<td>1,076,219</td>
<td>782,702</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Santa Fe received $1,238,281 in 1972 for facilities construction.
## TABLE SIX

PERCENT OF FEDERALLY FUNDED EDUCATIONAL AND GENERAL PURPOSE BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Percent of Federally Funded Educational and General Purpose Budget</th>
<th>Percent of Educational and General Purpose Excluding Student Financial Aid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Federal Funds</td>
<td>Categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Business Affairs, SFCC and Dean for Development, SFCC
### TABLE SEVEN

**SOURCES OF EXTERNAL FUNDS TO SANTA FE COMMUNITY COLLEGE**  
**FISCAL YEARS: 1970-74**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>National or Regional Level</th>
<th>State Level</th>
<th>Local Level</th>
<th>Private Contributions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>114,770</td>
<td>212,268</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>537,006</td>
<td>344,383</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>534,717</td>
<td>1,561,785</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>859,897</td>
<td>381,051</td>
<td></td>
<td>16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>943,719</td>
<td>364,464</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>* 2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>2,976,109</td>
<td>2,863,951</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Interest on Henry Beck Foundation Trust Fund bequeathed to SFCC in 1973

Source: Business Affairs, SFCC and Office for Development, SFCC
### TABLE EIGHT

**FEDERAL FUNDS RECEIVED BY SFCC FOR COLLEGE LIBRARY RESOURCES COMPARED WITH NON-FEDERALLY FUNDED EXPENDITURES FOR LIBRARY RESOURCES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Institutional Expenditures (Excluding Federal Funds)</th>
<th>Federal Funds for College Library Purposes</th>
<th>Federal Funds as a Percentage of the Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>$231,333</td>
<td>$2500</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>245,000</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>270,000</td>
<td>14,932</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>319,000</td>
<td>22,961</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>340,000</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Office for Development, Federal Grant Reports, Business Affairs SFCC*
### TABLE NINE

FEDERALLY FUNDED FINANCIAL AID TO STUDENTS
AT SFCC FISCAL YEARS 1970-74

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>HEA</th>
<th>Work-Study</th>
<th>LEEP Loans</th>
<th>LEEP Grant</th>
<th>Allied Health</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>98,450</td>
<td>23,069</td>
<td>15,102</td>
<td>11,908</td>
<td>16,828</td>
<td>165,357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>121,100</td>
<td>42,272</td>
<td>36,907</td>
<td>18,449</td>
<td>40,345</td>
<td>259,073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>167,990</td>
<td>85,738</td>
<td>39,543</td>
<td>21,447</td>
<td>39,719</td>
<td>354,437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>428,056</td>
<td>93,600</td>
<td>41,695</td>
<td>19,295</td>
<td>58,471</td>
<td>641,117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>366,486</td>
<td>74,870</td>
<td>21,403</td>
<td>26,120</td>
<td>60,229</td>
<td>549,108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>1,182,082</td>
<td>319,549</td>
<td>154,650</td>
<td>97,219</td>
<td>215,592</td>
<td>1,969,092</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Financial Records and Reports, SFCC Office of Student Financial Aid
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>State &amp; Local Scholarships</th>
<th>State and Local Loans</th>
<th>Federal Grants</th>
<th>Federal Loans</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>10,215</td>
<td>50,147</td>
<td>182,783</td>
<td>246,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>2,750</td>
<td>9,555</td>
<td>87,809</td>
<td>278,019</td>
<td>378,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>126,000</td>
<td>98,789</td>
<td>319,514</td>
<td>546,603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>1,950</td>
<td>170,000</td>
<td>151,253</td>
<td>595,423</td>
<td>918,626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>210,000</td>
<td>215,827</td>
<td>774,587</td>
<td>1,207,914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>525,770</td>
<td>603,825</td>
<td>2,150,326</td>
<td>3,287,921</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Financial Records and Reports, SFCC Office of Student Financial Aid
TABLE ELEVEN
FINANCIAL AID TO STUDENTS AT SFCC
FY 1970-1974
FEDERAL AND NON-FEDERAL AMOUNTS AND PERCENTAGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Non-Federal Total</th>
<th>Federal Total</th>
<th>Non-Federal and Federal</th>
<th>Percent Non-Federal</th>
<th>Percent Federal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>13,715</td>
<td>165,357</td>
<td>179,072</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>92.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>12,305</td>
<td>259,073</td>
<td>271,378</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>95.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>128,300</td>
<td>354,437</td>
<td>482,373</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>73.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>171,950</td>
<td>641,117</td>
<td>813,067</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>78.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>217,500</td>
<td>549,108</td>
<td>766,608</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>71.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Financial Records and Reports, SFCC Office of Student Financial Aid
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Total Credit Enrollment</th>
<th>Total Number Receiving Federal Financial Aid</th>
<th>Percent Receiving Federal Financial Aid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>2,944</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>3,597</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>3,729</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>3,997</td>
<td>1,148</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>4,376</td>
<td>1,431</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>18,643</td>
<td>4,042</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Registrar; Office of Financial Aid, SFCC
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Students</th>
<th>date</th>
<th>% Passed 1st Time</th>
<th>% Passed as of 4/15/74*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Dec. 1970</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Sept. 1971</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>June 1972</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Dec. 1972</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>June 1973</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Dec. 1973</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Students are permitted three attempts to pass the State Examination

Source: Director, Nursing Program, SFCC
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