

GRAND RAPIDS JUNIOR COLLEGE

PROSPECTS and ALTERNATIVES

Citizens Research Council of Michigan

1526 David Stott Building
Detroit, Michigan 48226

405 Bauch Building
Lansing, Michigan 48933

Report No. 228

January, 1967

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		<u>Page No.</u>
LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL		
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS		i-iii
INTRODUCTION		1-6
	The Role of Community Colleges	1
	Community Colleges in Michigan	4
CHAPTER I	GRAND RAPIDS JUNIOR COLLEGE	7-32
	Grand Rapids Junior College Programs.	9
	Transfer Program	9
	Vocational-Technical Programs	14
	Adult Education	22
	Student Counseling.	24
	Other Programs	25
	Interschool Relations	26
	Prospects and Alternatives	30
CHAPTER II	POPULATION AND ENROLLMENTS	33-42
	Population	33
	Enrollments.	37
CHAPTER III	JUNIOR COLLEGE FACILITIES AND LOCATION	43-47
	College Facilities	43
	Student Station and Room Period Utilization	44
	Junior College Location	46
CHAPTER IV	ORGANIZATION AND FINANCE	48-61
	Finances	48
	Revenues	50
	Prospects and Alternatives	58

TABLES

1.	Michigan's Junior and Community Colleges, Organizations and Control, Fall, 1965	6
2.	Cumulative Grade Point Averages of Grand Rapids Junior College Students at Selected Universities (Mean Averages)	11
3.	Vocational-Technical Occupational Areas of Training Available at Grand Rapids Junior College	16

CITIZENS RESEARCH COUNCIL OF MICHIGAN

Ray R. Eppert, President
William R. Clark, Vice President
J. Donald Orth, Treasurer

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

W. R. Boris	James B. Gordon	Chester F. Ogden
Harold W. H. Burrows	Max P. Heavenrich, Jr.	Guy S. Peppiatt
Clifford C. Christenson	Joseph L. Hudson, Jr.	Meyer L. Prentis *
William R. Clark	Frederick B. Hunt	Kenneth S. Reames
Hugh C. Daly	Frank N. Isbey	Thomas R. Reid
H. D. Doan	James A. Kennedy	E. H. Rydholm
Ray R. Eppert	W. D. MacDonnell	Robert B. Semple
Richard C. Gerstenberg	William A. Mayberry	Howard J. Stoddard
	William G. McClintock	

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

W. W. Whitehouse, Chairman
H. R. Wickes, Vice Chairman

Roy Abernethy, Detroit	Ernest C. Kanzler, Detroit
Wendell W. Anderson, Jr., Detroit	James A. Kennedy, Ann Arbor
A. H. Aymond, Jackson	Harry J. Loynd, Detroit
Walter D. Baldwin, Allen Park	W. D. MacDonnell, Romulus
Albert J. Berdis, Detroit	William A. Mayberry, Detroit
Henry T. Bodman, . Detroit	George P. McCallum, Detroit
Reid Brazell, Alma	John W. McEachren, Detroit
Ernest R. Breech, Detroit	Ralph T. McElvenny, Detroit
Prentiss M. .Brown, St. Ignace	Charles S. McIntyre, Monroe
Lawrence D. Buhl, Jr., Detroit	Arjay Miller, Dearborn
Henry L. Caulkins, Detroit	George W. Miller, Detroit
John E. Chubb, Dearborn	Frank W. Misch, Detroit
Walker L. Cisler, Detroit	Burrows Morley, Saginaw
Peter B. Clark, Detroit	J. Donald Orth, Detroit
William R. Clark, Detroit	F. W. Parker, Jr., Detroit
Earl E. Conlin, Detroit	Guy S. Peppiatt, Detroit
M. A. Cudlip, Detroit	Raymond T. Perring, Detroit
Harry B. Cunningham, Detroit	Meyer L. Prentis, Detroit
W. Clark Dean, Albion	Walter J. L. Ray, Detroit
William M. Defoe, Bay City	Byron W. Reeve, Iron Mountain
Henry F. DeLong, Detroit	Thomas R. Reid, Dearborn
Simon D. Den Uyl, Detroit	James M. Roche, Detroit
H. D. Doan, Midland	Robert B. Semple, Wyandotte
Lester R. Downie, Detroit	B. P. Sherwood, Jr., Grand Haven
Ray R. Eppert, Detroit	R. P. Shorts, Saginaw
A. P. Fontaine, Detroit	James M. Smith, Detroit
Frederick S. Ford, Detroit	Howard J. Stoddard, Lansing
Harry G. Gault, Flint	Stanford C. Stoddard, Detroit
Dan F. Gerber, Fremont	Lynn A. Townsend, Detroit
J. H. Gerstenmaier, Lansing	E. Clifford Upjohn, Kalamazoo
Richard M. Gillett, Grand Rapids	Donald F. Valley, Detroit
G. M. Harrington, Muskegon	James M. VerMeulen, Grand Rapids
H. Stuart Harrison, Cleveland	W. W. Whitehouse, Albion
Willis E. Hazelwood, Tecumseh	H. R. Wickes, Saginaw
Lee Hills, Detroit	J. C. Wright, Jr., Detroit

Robert E. Pickup, Executive Director

* President Emeritus

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

1. Grand Rapids Junior College, founded in 1914, emphasizes college-transfer programs. Approximately 80 percent of its enrollment is in this program.
2. While Grand Rapids is primarily a college-transfer institution, there is no accurate knowledge of exactly how many of its students move on to senior colleges or what happens to those who do not transfer. An accurate knowledge of what happens to these students is important in order to evaluate how well the college fulfills its role as a college-transfer institution.
3. The performance in senior institutions of those Grand Rapids Junior College students who do go on to senior colleges compares favorably with the performance of students of other community colleges and with the native students.
4. In the past, the vocational-technical programs and students have not received the close attention received by college-transfer programs and students. However, the college is undertaking to move forward in the vocational-technical area. New vocational-technical programs have been introduced and an office of Program Development and Placement has been established to develop new vocational-technical programs and to assist students in finding jobs.
5. Responsibility for vocational-technical programs and adult education is divided in Grand Rapids. While the junior college has substantial responsibilities in these areas, the director of vocational education for the school board has responsibility for high school vocational programs, the apprentice programs, and the evening adult trade and industrial programs. Arts and crafts or leisure time adult programs are administered by the department of recreation. At a minimum, a clear cut definition of responsibilities is needed. The lodging of all such responsibilities in the junior college might be considered.
6. Grand Rapids Junior College must come to terms with the proposed vocational program for out-county schools. Should the out-county school districts create an out-county community college to provide vocational-technical education, the junior college's technical and academic programs might be adversely affected.
7. While 60 percent of the junior college enrollment pays resident tuition, only 30 percent of the student body are graduates of the Grand Rapids public high schools. Another 20 percent are graduates

of the parochial schools located in Grand Rapids. One-half of the enrollment comes from high schools outside of Grand Rapids.

8. County population outside the city of Grand Rapids exceeds the population inside the city. In 1960, Grand Rapids had more college-age population than the rest of the county. However, by 1970 Grand Rapids will have less than half of the college-age students in the county.
9. Based on present trends, junior college enrollments are projected to reach 6,300 in 1970 on a head count basis and 5,000 on a full-time equated basis. For 1975, the respective projections are 6,900 and 5,400.
10. Present facilities, which provide 50 square feet per student, will be inadequate to meet this projected enrollment. Future facilities, planned for a full-time equated enrollment of 4,000 students, will provide an average of 135 square feet per student.
11. The downtown location of the junior college appears to have a number of advantages: central location in relation to students served; easy access by public and private transportation; availability of part-time employment for students; availability of cultural, social, and governmental facilities, etc.
12. The Grand Rapids Junior College per student operating costs for 1965-66 were fourth lowest of the 17 Michigan community colleges for which figures were available. The median expenditure of these institutions was \$578 per student, while for Grand Rapids it was \$553.
13. The junior college derives its revenues from tuition (38%), state aid (49%), local support (8%), and miscellaneous (5%). The average for all 19 community colleges in the state was tuition--33%, state aid--21%, local support--38%, and miscellaneous--8%.
14. Annual tuition charges of Grand Rapids Junior College of \$210 for residents of the school district and \$360 for non-residents were at the median of the 19 Michigan community colleges.
15. Grand Rapids Junior College is one of seven operated and supported by an individual school district. The majority of Michigan community colleges are organized on a county or intermediate school basis with a separate board of trustees and independent taxing powers.
16. While the arguments for the establishment of a single community college for Kent County are persuasive, it seems evident that such a shift at this time might be detrimental to the developments that

appear to be underway to expand the college campus and programs.

17. One possible consequence of the failure to establish a countywide community college could be the decision to create a second community college by the out-county school districts.
18. A practical alternative might be for the Grand Rapids board of education to determine and make known its position on the desirability of establishing a countywide community college district. If it is the belief of the board that this is in the best interest of the junior college and the people of Grand Rapids and Kent County, then the board might set a timetable for the development of the college and a target date for its establishment as an independent community college.

INTRODUCTION

The Role of Community Colleges

Since the turn of the century, when the first public junior college was established to provide a post-high school curriculum, public junior or community colleges have assumed a large share of the higher education task in America. In the 50 years from 1915 to 1965, the public community colleges have increased in number from 19 institutions with an enrollment of 600 students to 422 schools with 1,043,378 students. By 1965, public junior colleges were enrolling 35% of all students enrolled in the public institutions of higher education. Of those students enrolled in public junior colleges, 71% are pursuing programs creditable toward a bachelor's or higher degree.

Initially, advocates of the junior college concept proposed that such institutions assume the responsibility for the first two years of the undergraduate curriculum, thus freeing the senior colleges for the teaching of the last two years of the undergraduate curriculum and for graduate studies. Junior colleges did not supplant the initial two years of the undergraduate curricula of the senior colleges but, instead, supplemented it by servicing an additional and, sometimes, different student clientele. Of those junior colleges' students doing work creditable toward a degree, 41% are doing so on a part-time basis, compared to the 27% part-time students in all the four-year institutions of higher learning. Junior colleges also enroll a very large share of the students engaged in non-degree work. Seventy-six percent of the non-degree students are enrolled in the public junior colleges.

Public junior colleges have come to play a special role in American higher education. The application of the concept of extending public education beyond the twelfth grade as a matter of right has placed the four-year colleges and universities, particularly the public institutions, in a predicament. Basically, the question is: can a major institution of a society which reflects as well as shapes some of that society's values continue to discriminate, in the proper sense of the word, through the use of standards which admit only those students with the potential to succeed in the educational endeavor? The junior college may be considered as an answer to this problem in that it may be an institutional device to maintain the educational excellence of the senior colleges and universities and, at the same time, to satisfy the aspirations of those citizens calling for equal opportunities in higher education regardless of their previous academic record. Devoid of all euphemisms, one of the functions of the

junior college, according to Burton R. Clark in his The Open Door College, is to extend "education beyond the high school to academically less competent students." In accepting these "academically less competent students," the junior college does two important things--it acts as a screening agent for the senior colleges, passing on the students who show capabilities for doing further college work, and it guides unqualified college aspirants into other programs and career endeavors.

Most modern junior colleges are considered to have five basic functions or programs:

1. Transfer

This program is for the college aspirant who takes courses paralleling the first two years of a senior college. Upon the successful completion of such a program, the student may transfer to a senior college for further work leading to a bachelor's degree. College parallel work was the first raison d'etre for the junior colleges and in many institutions this is still the predominant program.

2. Vocational-Technical

Long labeled terminal, vocational-technical programs are designed for those students not seeking to transfer to a four-year college. It serves to train and to educate those students entering the job market who may need or desire some education beyond the high school. Vocational-technical programs did not play a role in the initial development of junior colleges, but in the last several decades these types of programs have been used as one of the justifications for the existence of junior colleges. Vocational-technical programs are one of the several factors which permit junior colleges to claim a unique role in the American educational system.

3. Counseling and Guidance

In order to determine the potentialities of each of the students, professional counseling and guidance services are considered necessary by junior college advocates. Through this function, each individual may be assisted in utilizing whatever talents he may have in pursuing whatever educational goals he may be capable of pursuing. Once again, this function, when carried out, permits the junior college to make a distinction between itself and the senior college.

4. Adult Education

Programs in adult education are considered a part of the junior college's function. These programs tie in with the institution's role as a democratizing agent in the educational process, providing the opportunity for education to all within the community.

5. Community Service

Junior colleges have and are expected to provide, because they receive public support, services to the community in the way of special lectures, programs, exhibits, and other cultural events. The provision of these special services and the enlargement of the college's base of enrollment and financial support has induced many public junior colleges to acquire and utilize the name "community" college.

A sixth program, in some instances, may be the provision of enrichment courses for high school students, for either high school or college credit.

Enumeration of junior college functions does not imply that such functions are performed by all junior colleges or that there is adequate and satisfactory performance of any one function in any one institution. In fact, a major criticism of junior colleges is that they have not emphasized the one program which its advocates claim makes the junior college unique in the educational scheme--vocational-technical education. National statistics show that while two-thirds of the junior college students pursue college transfer programs, only one-third transfer to senior colleges. According to Leland L. Medsker, in his The Junior College: Process and Prospect, the facts do not substantiate the junior colleges' role in vocational-technical education. Other criticisms are that student personnel services are inadequate, and that the objectives of general education are unmet.

While junior colleges have expanded in numbers of student enrollment, this expansion has not been without its problems. Burton Clark claims three basic problems in the role of junior colleges--status, identity, and autonomy.

The place of the junior college in the overall education system is not as well defined as that of the high school and the senior college. If the junior college has a legitimate function in the educational picture, then it will have to have a status in keeping with its assigned position. As to the problem of identity, the fact that junior college programs overlap with those of the senior college and the vocational-technical high school causes some confusion. In a sense,

it must be decided whether the junior college is a high school, senior college, or a distinct entity in the educational scheme of things. This determination is necessary to resolve the third problem-- autonomy. In some instances, those junior colleges controlled by public school administrative systems lack independence of action.

Community Colleges in Michigan

Michigan was one of the pioneering states in the junior college movement in the United States. The President of The University of Michigan, Henry P. Tappan, as early as 1852 suggested that the first two years of college work be transferred to the high schools. However, when the first junior colleges were created in Michigan, they did not supplant the first two years of the senior colleges but developed along parallel lines. Michigan, one of the first states to have a junior college law, passed Act 147 of the Public Acts of 1917 which permitted school boards of districts with more than 30,000 population to provide post-high school education of a college level by a junior college department.

The actual founding of the first junior college in Michigan preceded the passage of the junior college law by three years. Grand Rapids Junior College, established in 1914, holds the distinction of being the first in Michigan. By mid-century, Michigan had ten public junior colleges, enrolling 5,795 students. A decade later, by 1960, there were 16 public junior colleges, an increase of 60%, enrolling 27,690 students, four and three-fourths as many students as were enrolled in 1950. By the fall of 1965, Michigan had 19 junior colleges enrolling 60,016 students, more than twice as many as were enrolled in 1960. On a yearly basis, enrollments in junior colleges have been increasing, but the rate of increase has been diminishing. This trend is expected to continue into the future. Seven new colleges are expected to open their doors to students by 1967, four in 1966, and three in 1967. The anticipated enrollment for the fall of 1966 is 72,749 students, a 21% increase over the 1965 enrollment. By 1970, junior college enrollments are expected to exceed 100,000 students, with this figure reflecting the enrollment of future colleges as well as the increases in the existing institutions.

Over the last decades, several overall plans have been proposed for the establishment of community colleges in Michigan. The most detailed of these plans was the Martorano study (Study #1) for the John Dale Russell Legislative Survey on Higher Education in 1954. This report recommended the creation of 23 new junior colleges on a first priority

basis. Fourteen additional colleges were recommended in a second priority. A total of 49 junior colleges was contemplated. Twelve years later, the Citizens Committee for Higher Education recommended that the state be divided into 29 community college districts with a total of 43 community colleges and three service areas, to be served by special community service centers at existing four-year colleges. The Citizens Committee on Higher Education recommended that Kent County, Ionia County, and four townships of Allegan County be organized into one community college district--district 15--with a college in Grand Rapids and one in Ionia.

Grand Rapids Junior College has no strictly defined geographical service area. Seventy-five percent of the students come from high schools in Kent County, about 6% from high schools in Ottawa County, 4% from high schools in other neighboring counties, 8% from other Michigan high schools, 6% from out-of-state high schools, and half-of-one percent from foreign countries. Should new colleges be organized in Ottawa County and Ionia County in accordance with the recommendations of either the Martorana or the Citizens Committee studies, some reduction of Grand Rapids Junior College enrollment from the high schools of these counties might be expected.

To date, no new community colleges have been established in these counties. Ottawa County is now considering the establishment of a community college to serve as a vocational-technical center. This district would include two school districts in Allegan County. Ionia County has had two votes to establish a community college, but both proposals were rejected. No further action is contemplated at this time. Allegan County has no plans to move toward the establishment of its own community college district. Five school districts in the southern part of Allegan County are contemplating joining the proposed Van Buren community college district.

The first Michigan law on junior colleges permitted the establishment of such an institution by a school district as a department of that school system. Today, junior colleges may still be created by individual school districts as junior college departments under authority of Act 269 of Public Acts of 1955, as amended. Seven districts, including Grand Rapids Junior College were so organized. Act 188 of Public Acts of 1955, as amended, permits community colleges to be organized on the basis of one or more school districts, one or more counties, or one or more intermediate school districts--in each case the community college being independent of any particular district board of education. Nineteen community colleges organized under the provisions of this act as of fall, 1965. Eleven of the 19 college districts were comprised of one or more counties; one district of more than one school district, and seven districts of one or more intermediate school districts. (See Table 1, next page.)

Table 1
Michigan's Junior and Community Colleges
Organizations and Control
Fall, 1965

<u>Community College</u>	<u>Date Organized</u>
Act 188 of Public Acts 1955	
A. One or more Counties	
1. Bay de Noc Community College	1963
2. Delta College	1957
3. Jackson Community College	1928
4. Lake Michigan College	1946
5. Macomb County Community College	1953
6. Monroe County Community College	1964a
7. Muskegon County Community College	1926
8. North Central Michigan College	1958
9. Northwestern Michigan College	1951
10. Southwestern Michigan College	1964a
11. Washtenaw Community College	1965a
B. More than One School District	
1. Schoolcraft College	1961
C. One or More Intermediate School Districts	
1. Clare-Gladwin Community College	1965b
2. Crawford-Oscoda-Ogemaw-Roscommon Community College	1965b
3. Glen Oaks Community College	1965b
4. Gogebic Community College	1932
5. Lansing Community College	1957
6. Montcalm Community College	1965a
7. Oakland Community College	1964
Act 269 of Public Acts 1955	
A. As a Department of a District School System	
1. Alpena Community College	1951
2. Flint Community Junior College	1923
3. Grand Rapids Junior College	1914
4. Highland Park Community College	1918
5. Henry Ford Community College	1938
6. Kellogg Community College	1956
7. Port Huron Junior College	1923

^aEnroll first students, fall 1966.

^bEnroll first students, fall 1967.

Source: Michigan Council of Community College Administrators.

CHAPTER I

GRAND RAPIDS JUNIOR COLLEGE

Grand Rapids Junior College, founded in 1914, was the first junior college in the state of Michigan and the seventh in the United States. The college was founded as a unit of the Grand Rapids school system by the Grand Rapids board of education. At the time of its inception, The University of Michigan agreed to give full transfer credit for certain courses offered by the new junior college. With this arrangement, the junior college became, primarily, a transfer institution providing the first two years of a liberal arts education for students who would then be expected to transfer to The University of Michigan. While the initial emphasis was on liberal arts, some vocational-technical courses were offered.

The college was first housed in the Central High School, with the college and the high school having the same man serving as president and principal of the respective institutions. In 1926, the college was moved from the Central High School to what is now known as the East Building. Eighteen years later, the Davis Technical High School became the new, main quarters for the college. Today, the Grand Rapids Junior College utilizes portions of three buildings--the East Building, the Main Building (formerly the Davis Technical High School) and the recently acquired West (Lear-Siegler) Building. Throughout its 52 years of existence the Grand Rapids Junior College has been located in the same area, close to the Grand Rapids central business district.

Objectives

Educational objectives for Grand Rapids Junior College are spelled out by the college catalogue for 1966-67 (page 5) in the following manner:

Grand Rapids Junior College seeks a level of distinction in its faculty, its student body, and its educational programs which will provide quality higher education for the youth of this community. To this end, all of the College activities, curricular and co-curricular, are directed; and to this central purpose, the College devotes its resources--human, financial, and organizational.

The College believes that modern society requires of its leaders not only the basic human understandings, knowledge, and values which a liberal education is intended to supply, but also the professional and applied skills which an increasingly complex civilization demands. In specific objective, therefore, the College endeavors to help the student prepare himself for the inevitably broad range of his responsibilities and opportunities, and accordingly develop a vocation or profession.

The liberal arts and pre-professional curriculums are intended to develop and stimulate the student's understanding of the scientific, social, and cultural forces among which he will live, and to acquaint him with the significant ways men have interpreted these forces. This exploratory education provides a sound basis for intelligent living and citizenship. And the applied arts and sciences curriculums offer many one and two-year specialized programs for those who wish to prepare for positions in business, industry, and community service.

The educational programs of the College, then, provide a solid foundation for advanced study at senior educational institutions, and provide opportunities in both vocational and community service training.

In keeping with this statement of general objectives, and in performance of its functions, Grand Rapids Junior College recognizes clear obligations to its students, its alumni, and the community, and will constantly seek more effective ways of meeting these commitments•

Thus, the College's objectives are consistent with those that have been established for American community colleges in general--the humanistic development of man, the teaching of practical skills, and rendering service to the students and community in general.

Grand Rapids Junior College organizes its programs of instruction into four areas--degree, diploma and certificate, other, and evening college. These programs will be briefly described according to this format, but a fuller examination of the college programs will be made under the headings of the five programs generally associated with junior colleges.

Degree. Grand Rapids Junior College offers four programs leading to an Associate degree in arts or science. The liberal arts and pre-professional programs are designed for students wishing to transfer to a senior college. The applied arts and sciences program is designed both for students who

wish to transfer into specialized curriculum in the senior institutions and those who wish to make the junior college program terminal. A fourth program under this heading is a cooperative venture with Michigan State University to train teachers.

Diploma and Certificate. In this area, the junior college provides classroom instruction for the affiliated nursing programs of Blodgett Memorial and Butterworth hospitals and for practical nurses.

Other. This catch-all heading includes the general studies program for those students with an average high school achievement record, who, after successful completion of one semester, may transfer to one of the associate degree programs. For those students who had a below-average high school record, a developmental program provides remedial work so the student may satisfy the minimum requirements for admission to one of the other programs.

On the other side of the academic scale, the college provides three programs for the able or gifted student. An honors program provides incentive and challenge, as well as honors credit, for those able junior college students desiring to go beyond the scope and depth of the regular course work. For high school students two programs are available--the advanced placement and the high school enrichment programs. High school students may be admitted under the advanced placement into college prior to their graduation from high school. The enrichment program permits qualified high school students to take college courses for high school credit only.

Evening College. Evening college programs include the regular evening college, providing college-degree and non-degree work in the evening **for** working students; the evening high school, providing work for those who wish to finish requirements for a high school diploma; and the Americanization program providing citizenship preparation for those desiring to become American citizens.

Grand Rapids Junior College Programs

The following analyzes the junior college programs in terms of the five functions associated with community colleges.

Transfer Program

Grand Rapids Junior College was originally founded to provide the first two years of college work applicable for transfer credit to The University of Michigan. Thus, the college-oriented transfer program has received the

major emphasis at Grand Rapids Junior College over the last 50 years. Currently, about 80-85% of the students in Grand Rapids Junior College are enrolled in college transfer programs, whereas, nationally the comparable percentage is about two-thirds. In Michigan, about 73% of the junior college enrollment was concentrated in college transfer programs. Thus, the Grand Rapids enrollment in college transfer programs tends to be higher than both the national and Michigan averages. In the fall of 1965, of 19 Michigan junior colleges, six had a higher percentage of their enrollment in college transfer programs than did Grand Rapids. These are Alpena, Gogebic, Highland Park, Lake Michigan, Macomb, and North Central. The other 12 colleges had enrollments in college transfer programs ranging from 77% (Port Huron) to 54% (Henry Ford).

While the tendency, both locally and nationally, has been for a large proportion of junior college students to enroll in college transfer programs, junior college surveys have indicated that only a small proportion of junior college students actually enter a senior college. A nationwide survey of junior colleges, conducted in 1962, showed that only 33% of the regular students enrolling in junior colleges in 1952 had transferred to a senior college by 1956. There are no available figures to show the number of Grand Rapids Junior College students entering senior colleges.

Students in the college transfer programs are assisted by the junior college to prepare for transfer to senior colleges in several ways. Historically, because Grand Rapids Junior College was established to prepare students for transfer to The University of Michigan, junior college courses were patterned after those of The University of Michigan by having similar course numbers and by using the same syllabi and text books. Today, however, junior college students transfer to a number of senior institutions. The divergent requirements of Michigan's senior institutions require a different mode of assistance today. Thus, the junior college catalogue outlines the general requirements of 12 of Michigan's colleges, showing the junior college courses which satisfy the senior colleges' requirements. In a separate publication, the Curriculum Guide, the junior college spells out in detail the requirements for about 60 programs of study at the different senior institutions. This guide tells the student the courses he may take at junior college to satisfy the requirements of the senior colleges in these various programs. Grand Rapids Junior College permits the waiving of its own degree requirements if it is necessary for a student to meet the requirements of a senior institution.

Grand Rapids Junior College also maintains a close liaison with the senior institutions by having representatives of the latter visit the junior college campus. In these visits, officials of the junior college explain its programs to the representatives of the senior institutions. Two of

senior institutions, Western Michigan University and The University of Michigan, also send programmers to the junior college where they counsel and register junior college students who are transferring to their respective institutions.

Student Performance. While definitive data are not available, some evidence can be presented from various sources which might be the basis for a broad generalization on how well junior college students fare in the senior institutions.

A principal source of evidence is the performance of junior college students in the senior institutions. Four senior colleges have provided the junior college with information on the performance of its students compared to those coming from other community colleges and/or to all the students in the senior college. Unfortunately, the data available do not follow a uniform format; nor are they available consistently for a number of years. Available data on grade point averages have been summarized in Table 2. With the exception of the grade point average shown for seniors in 1965 at Institution B, the grade point averages for Grand Rapids Junior College transfers were as good as, or better than, the grade point averages of students transferring from other junior colleges or the grade point averages of all the students at the four institutions shown in Table 2.

Table 2
Cumulative Grade Point Averages
of Grand Rapids Junior College Students
at Selected Universities
 (Mean Averages)

College	Date	Grand Rapids Junior College	All Comm. Coll. Transfers	All Students
A	June, 1966	2.60		2.27
B	February, 1963	2.47	2.43	
B	September, 1965	2.49		2.48a 2.65b
C	February, 1966	2.56	2.34	2.39
D	September, 1963	2.62	2.58	2.60c

^aJuniors

^bSeniors

^cMedia

In the fall of 1963, one state university reported that Grand Rapids Junior College students earned a grade point average of 2.47 as compared to a grade point average of 2.43 for all community college transfer students at that institution. On a school-by-school basis, the Grand Rapids grade point average of 2.47 was exceeded by five other community colleges. Students of ten other community colleges earned grade point averages which were lower than those of the Grand Rapids students. One school had the same grade point average as Grand Rapids.

One report of a senior institution provided information other than grade point averages. This university reported that only 2% of Grand Rapids Junior College students were dismissed compared to 9% for the other community colleges. Six percent of the Grand Rapids Junior College students withdrew from the senior college compared to eight percent for other community college students. A difference of ten percentage points appears, however, between the percentage of Grand Rapids Junior College students receiving degrees--91%--and the percentage of other community college students receiving degrees--81%.

While the evidence is limited, it does tend to indicate that those students going on to senior colleges from Grand Rapids Junior College as a group perform well in relation to other students in the senior colleges.

Another method of measuring an educational institution's contribution to the community is the number of professionals and prominent businessmen in the community who attended the institution. Data collected by Grand Rapids Junior College officials show that 16% of the doctors, 21% of the lawyers, and 18% of the dentists in the Grand Rapids area are former students of the junior college. Of the teachers and administrators in the Grand Rapids school system, 19% have received training at the junior college. Among its graduates going on to careers in higher education, Grand Rapids Junior College includes a state university president and some 15 college professors and department heads. The record on graduates entering the business field is not as specific as the record for those in professional careers, but the roll call of junior college graduates in the city's business life includes the presidents of four city banks.

Community Attitudes. Surveys have been used by the Kent County Vocational-Technical Education Survey Committee and these indicate a preference for the junior college by the students of Kent County. In the 1965 survey of high school seniors, 52% definitely planned to go on to college and another 14% thought they might do so. This expectation was matched by the parents perceived attitudes as expressed by the seniors, wherein 26% of the parents would expect their children to attend college and another 56% would want college attendance if the child so desired. A survey of parents indicated 42% of the parents responding to the survey planned for four years of

college for their child, while another 8% planned for two years of college.

In terms of the high school seniors, 40% of those planning to go on to college indicated that they would expect to attend Grand Rapids Junior College. (A 1964 survey showed that 30% of the responding seniors who planned to go to college indicated a preference for Grand Rapids Junior College.) Preferences for other individual institutions of higher education did not exceed 7% of those seniors intending to go on to college.

A survey of high school graduates of 1961 tends to indicate that the preference for Grand Rapids Junior College is motivated to some extent by the lower tuition as well as boarding costs involved in attending a senior college away from home. In this survey, 51% of the respondents characterized community college students as not having enough money to go away from home. Less than 1%, however, characterized junior college students as those who failed in other colleges, and 6% characterized junior college students as not having grades good enough to get into other colleges. On the other hand, 16% of the respondents thought that junior college students could succeed at any college and 6% thought such students were taking programs offered only by junior colleges.

In short, students tend to view junior colleges as offering work at the college level which primarily attracts students who cannot afford to go away from home; that courses offered may not be available elsewhere, and that the students might fare just as well at the junior colleges as at other institutions.

As to the characterization of the junior college itself, 39% of the respondents described Grand Rapids Junior College as an extension of another college or as a part of a four-year college.

The foregoing evidence tends to support the conclusion that Grand Rapids Junior College students transferring to senior colleges perform satisfactorily as a group and, subsequently, that these students make a contribution to the community as they pursue their careers. Also, there are some indications that the public served by Grand Rapids Junior College believes it offers as good an education as that offered by the senior colleges. However, there is no evidence which permits an evaluation of whether or not the junior college might do a better job than is now being done for those students who transfer and for those students who enter the college transfer programs but never find their way into the senior colleges. Unfortunately, not only is evidence lacking for such an evaluation, but the criteria against which such evidence must be measured are also non-existent.

Vocational-Technical Programs

Historically, public junior colleges were established, with few exceptions, as college preparatory schools. Terminal programs of a vocational-technical nature were added to meet particular needs. The general rationalization for such programs was that junior or community colleges supported by the community should meet all the needs of the community. With the senior institution making little provision for individuals neither desirous nor capable of pursuing an education leading to a four-year degree, the community colleges, as an extension of the high school, were used to fill the gap. Grand Rapids Junior College has followed this general pattern with its major emphasis upon college transfer programs and a limited commitment to vocational-technical courses, mainly in the area of semi-professional activities.

One of the problems encountered in any discussion of vocational-technical education is the difficulty in defining such programs. Traditionally, community college programs were designated college transfer and terminal, but in many instances it was discovered that many students in the college-transfer programs did not go on to college. Also, the use of the concept "terminal" created public relations problems for the vocational-technical programs. A better description divides the vocational-technical curriculum into collegiate technical programs and non-collegiate post-secondary vocational education. Within these categories the vocational-technical curriculum may be divided into industry-related technologies, business-related technologies, medical-related technologies, and service-related technologies.

Grand Rapids Junior College offers the following vocational-technical programs:

Business Studies

Retailing

Secretarial

Technical Business

Nursing

Affiliated

Practical

Home Economics

Technology

Chemical

Dental Assisting

Drafting

Electronics

Mechanical

Additional programs are being added in data processing, nursing leading to an associate degree, and machine tool operation. The latter program is being offered as a result of the findings of the Kent County Industrial Survey. Some of these programs, according to the college catalogue, are designed to prepare students for transfer to other institutions, whereas

some are designed to prepare students for immediate entry into the employment field.

Thus, with the possible exception of the machine-tool operations program, it appears that the primary emphasis of the vocational-technical programs is on semi-professional or office-type jobs.

Tables 3 and 4, taken from the Kent County Vocational-Technical Education Survey, give data on types of programs and courses, the number of teachers, the number of students enrolled, and the number and types of courses offered in the technical programs of the junior college. As shown in Table 3, 34 teachers are assigned to vocational-technical programs. The same table shows that the bulk of the students enrolled in vocational-technical programs are enrolled in the business education program. In fact, of the 22 types of courses enumerated in Table 4, only four are what could be considered strictly trade or industry-oriented.

In its college transfer program, Grand Rapids maintains a close liaison with the senior colleges to which junior college students expect to transfer. No comparable activity exists with respect to the prospective employers of the job-bound junior college students. The results of the survey of the needs of business and industry for trained personnel, conducted for the Kent County Vocational-Technical Education Survey, indicate that there is a lack of effective communication between the junior college and employers in the Grand Rapids area. An analysis of this business and industry survey for junior college purposes by its faculty evaluation committee calls attention to the fact that employers recommended a number of courses and programs which are already available. "One interpretation, therefore, might be that employers are not aware of what is available. Another interpretation might be that employers are aware of what is currently available, but are saying that current programs are inadequate, that different or more courses must be made available." In order "to improve 'education and training opportunity in the Kent County area,'" Kent County "employers recommended (that) 39 different programs be established," of which "eleven . . . were suggested for establishment at the junior college level" However, "Grand Rapids Junior College is already offering training in at least a dozen of these recommended areas." A 1964 study of evening college students brought out the fact that only 44 of 777 respondents (about 88% of whom were employed) had heard about junior college offerings from employer sources.

In the past, job-bound students were neither assisted with formal job placement services nor evaluated in their work performance. In connection with this latter, it is interesting to note that in the business and industry survey, 312 out of 492 employers thought that junior college

Table 3
Vocational-Technical Occupational Areas Of Training Available At Grand Rapids Junior College

OCCUPATIONAL AREA	Area does not apply	Total number of students enrolled	Number of teachers	Number of full-time (30 teaching hours per week) teacher equivalents. Give fraction if necessary.	Number of first year courses	Number of advanced courses
Agriculture						
Business Education		400	15	12	17	18
Distributive Education		80	3	2	5	2
Homemaking Education		70	2	2	12	2
Technical Education		111	7	7	11	10
Service Occupations						
Practical Nursing		125	6	5 ¹ / ₃	9	0
Dental Assistant		9	1	1	3	0

Source: Report, Kent County Vocational-Technical Education Survey, April, 1966.

Table 4
 VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL COURSES BEING OFFERED AT
 GRAND RAPIDS JUNIOR COLLEGE

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
COURSES	Number of rooms in college	Number of first year courses offered	Number of advanced courses offered	Number of teachers assigned to classes	Total number of students in classes	Average number of hours per day each room is in use	New vocational facilities definitely scheduled For 1965-66 school year	New vocational facilities definitely scheduled For 1966-67 school year	Average number of hours per evening each room is in use
Accounting	4	2	5	8	593	6			3
Advertising	1	2	0	2	34	1			1
Agriculture									
Appliance Repairman									
Auto Mechanic									
Auto Body Repair									
Business English	1 ½	2	1	2	195	3			1
Business Machines									
Business Math	1	1	0	3	93	1			½
Bookkeeping									
Clothing	1	2	0	1	50	1			0

(Continued next page)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
COURSES	Number of rooms in college	Number of first year courses offered	Number of advanced courses offered	Number of teachers assigned to classes	Total number of students in classes	Average number of hours per day room is in use	New vocational facilities definitely scheduled for 1965-66 school year	New vocational facilities definitely scheduled for 1966-67 school year	Average number of hours per evening room is in
Dictation-Shorthand									
Data Processing	3	2	3	5	268	5	x		3
Dental Assistant	1	3	0	1	9	3			0
Drafting	3	2	5	4	93	3			1
Electricity-Electronics	2	3	4	2	190	4			2
Foods	3	4	2	3	137	3	x		1
General Shop									
Graphic Arts									
Home Mgt.	1	1	0	1	24	1/2			
Hospital Aide									
Landscaping									
Machine Shop	1	1	1	2	68	5			0
Marketing	1	0	1	1	24	1	x		1
Metal Shop									
Nurses Aide									
Office Practice	1	1	0	1	70	3	x		1
Power Mechanics									
Practical Nurse	2	9	0	6	125	6			0
Retailing	1	5	1	1	55	2	x		0
Typing	2	2	2	2	231	4	x		1 1/2
Welding	1	1	0	2	36	1	x		0
Wood									
Cooperative Office	1	2	1	1	28	1/4	x		0
Child Development	1	1		0	42	1			
Industrial Science & Measuring & Gaging	1	1	1	3	27	1			0

Source: Report, Kent County Vocational-Technical Education Survey, April, 1966.

graduates were adequately prepared for employment. On the other hand, 229 out of 328 employers suggested that high school graduates were either only partially or inadequately prepared for employment.

To cite these shortcomings in, or the lack of emphasis on, the vocational-technical programs is not to state that college officials are unaware of the situation. Actually, the junior college administrators are fully cognizant of the situation and are in the process of strengthening the college's vocational-technical role. However, the determination of the college administrators to expand the school's vocational-technical role must be matched by the willingness of the general community to permit its children to seek vocational-technical training, and by the willingness and ability of industry and business to make its general needs known.

The desire of students to pursue college transfer work, rather than vocational-technical education, appears to be a strong force in shaping the student college program. In a 1965 survey of Kent County high school seniors, 66% of them saw themselves entering college, whereas only 50% of the seniors were enrolled in a college-preparatory curriculum in high school. A similar 1964 survey of high school seniors also found that 66% of the seniors saw themselves attending college. Both surveys showed that only 3% of the respective respondents had any plans to attend a trade or technical school during the first year after graduation from high school. Another 3% of the respondents, in both surveys, indicated plans to attend nursing school after graduation. Business college was the choice of another 3%. Hence, only 9% of the respondents indicated an interest in what might be considered terminal or non-transfer programs. Interestingly, the same survey reported that 24% of the respondents had aspirations for occupations requiring four or more years of educational training. The vocational goal of the remaining 76% would require post-high school education of less than four years, and in the case of approximately 4%, no additional education might be necessary.

The survey of high school graduates in the class of 1961 tends to reflect the same general pattern as the 1965 survey of high school seniors. In the former, 55% of the respondents indicated that they had enrolled in college after graduating from high school, 5% in business college, 5% in trade or vocational school, and 2% in apprentice programs. The 1961 high school graduates perceived a strong college orientation on the part of their parents. Eighty-five percent of the graduates felt that their parents either expected them to go to college or were willing to have them go if they so desired. Similar results were reported by the 1965 survey of high school seniors.

Finally, the Vocational-Technical Educational Survey indicated that there were 5,136 students in the 1964 graduating class of the Kent County high

schools, 51% of whom entered a two or four-year college. Only 5% of these graduates went to a business, trade, technical, or other vocational school. The known preference of present students for the college transfer program and the results of these surveys would indicate that there must be a change in the attitudes of the youth of the community and their parents if efforts to expand and to enrich the vocational-technical program at the junior college are to be successful and meaningful.

Business and industry must also cooperate by making their employees aware of junior college offerings and encouraging their use whenever feasible. The information above, indicating a lack of communication between the college and employers, also indicates that more must be done to increase the employers awareness of the junior college and its programs.

A third problem is the proliferation of responsibility for vocational education in Kent County. A more detailed discussion of this problem is presented below. For present purposes, it is sufficient to point out that in addition to the course offerings by Grand Rapids Junior College, vocational-technical programs are offered by the Grand Rapids school board through the high schools for high school students and for adults, including recent high school graduates. Also, some types of vocational education are provided by many of the other Kent County high schools.

To strengthen its vocational-technical program, Grand Rapids Junior College is, or contemplates, doing several things. First, its policy is to add a new vocational-technical offering each year, the exact offering and its nature being determined after a specific study and in consultation with the appropriate community, business, and industry leaders. It is under this policy that new programs in data processing, nursing, and machine tool operations have been instituted.

A most important development is the opening of the placement and program development office in 1965. The official in charge of this office has the twin responsibilities for developing new programs and for placing junior college students in jobs while they are in school and after they graduate. The objectives of program development have been stated to be:

1. Evaluation and revision of on-going occupational curriculums.
2. Identification of needed occupational curriculums.
3. Development of new occupational curriculums.
4. Interpretation of legislation regarding vocational-technical education.
5. Direction of staff members in the preparation of state and federal vocational-technical education proposals.

6. Interpretation of occupational curriculums to prospective students and their parents, educational groups, and employers.
6. Development and/or assisting in development of educational programs for business and industry.
7. Working on certain special problems such as long-range follow-up studies.
8. Working with certain special programs such as the federal Work-Study Program and the federal Educational Opportunity Grant Program.

Two interesting activities of the program development office are in the areas of public relations and student evaluation. In the former category, the college is preparing both an occupations brochure and a slide presentation to be used in disseminating vocational-technical information to parents, students, and businessmen. Also, faculty members teaching occupational specialties will be assigned to carry the message of vocational-technical education to the various schools within the junior college's service area through individual contact with the schools.

Secondly, a follow-up study is being conducted of the students who left the college during the 1964-65 school year. The purpose of the study is to determine what happened to these students and to determine what effect, if any, the college had on them. Should the results of such an evaluation prove fruitful, follow-up studies of this nature are expected to be conducted each year.

For the placement function, the following objectives have been formulated:

9. To seek full-time positions of employment for former students and graduates.
10. To seek part-time positions of employment for present students.
11. To inform individuals seeking employment of job openings.
12. To provide pre-entrance counseling.
13. To provide pre-employment job counseling.
14. To follow-up on full-time placements.
15. To keep such records and information as may be required to attain the above-mentioned objectives.

In addition to attracting job recruiters directly to the campus, the placement officer hopes to mail to 1,200 companies an occupations brochure describing the programs offered by the college. These companies will also be solicited to list their job openings with the placement office. To facilitate record-keeping and to enhance the value of the service to both the job-seeking student and to the prospective employer, a filing system based on the Dictionary of Occupational Titles (DOT) is now being developed.

Thus, while maintaining its commitment to its 50-year academic tradition, Grand Rapids Junior College is also moving forward in the area of vocational-technical education.

Adult Education

The adult education program of Grand Rapids Junior College is presented through the evening college. There are basically three programs: the evening college program, providing a two-year transfer program and two-year technical-vocational program; the high school program for adults wishing to earn their high school diploma; and, the Americanization program for aliens working to take English and citizenship instruction in preparation for obtaining American citizenship.

Total enrollment in the evening college for all of its programs was 2,258 students in 1966. The Americanization program has the smallest enrollment in the evening college--38 in 1966. Enrollment in the high school program accounted for 500 students in 1966. It should be noted that in this program the junior college does not award the high school diploma. Arrangements are made by the student with a high school to which he transfers the course credits and from which he receives his high school diploma. Enrollment in the evening college degree programs was 1,540 in 1966.

In the day program, 80% of the students are in the college-transfer programs and 20% in the vocational-technical programs. In the evening college, approximately 60% of the enrollment is registered in vocational technical programs and 40% in college-transfer programs. The evening college offers 100 different courses presented in 173 sections in its college-level program.

Adult education, in general, is difficult to define. A Michigan department of public instruction bulletin (Number 366, 1963), states that community colleges should fill "the need for programs of courses for adults and other community college students for which credit may or may not be given, designed to provide general education and to improve self-government, healthful living, understanding of civic and

public affairs, avocational growth, constructive use of leisure time, personal and family living satisfactions, cultural depth and to facilitate occupational advancement." (Page 3 of the bulletin.)

Leland L. Medsker states (The Junior College., Progress and Prospect, p. 73) that:

there is a common misconception that adult education . is comprised of a series of unrelated, noncredit courses developed through speculation or on popular demand, and that the courses pertain primarily to crafts, recreation, or vocational skills. These stereotypes do not fit the majority of junior college adult programs (for) the college . . . generally regards its period of operation as from early morning until late evening. Increasingly, regular day classes are offered at night, thus enabling a part-time student eventually to complete' two years of college work during evening hours. In fact, many adults who wish to do college work earn their A.A. degrees as part-time students.

The evening college enrollment figures presented above tend to substantiate Medsker's description of the adult programs. This is further substantiated by a survey conducted in 1964 of the evening college students. Forty-nine percent of the evening college students were between the ages 20-25; 86% were 20 years old or over. Ninety-five percent had graduated from high school and 76% graduated two or more years prior to the survey. Almost all (88%) of the students were employed, with 46% of those employed working over 40 hours a week and another 46% working between 21 to 40 hours per week. Non-credit college courses evoked little interest on the part of the respondents to the questionnaire since they were interested in either receiving a degree from Grand Rapids or transferring the credits to another institution.

Adult education programs, in general, are not without their problems. Medsker (pp. 76-77) mentions three of the many problems associated with the operation of an adult education program. They are: (1) the lack of counseling assistance to the part-time evening students; (2) the need to develop proper programs based on a proper interpretation of the community's needs; and (3) the coordination of the college adult program with those programs operated by other agencies.

Discussing these problems in reverse order, the matter of coordination will be discussed later in a section dealing with the junior college's relationship with other educational institutions in the area.

On the matter of interpreting community needs, this was one of the weaknesses pointed out in the self-study report of the evening college. The survey of students also indicates that the business and industrial community does not inform employees of the offerings available at the junior college.

This same self-study report points out that one of the strengths of the evening college is the "staffing of (the) counseling office, with testing and advising of the prospective, as well as the presently enrolled student." However, the report goes on to say that "advisement and counseling in the evening program should be carefully reviewed and changes made as necessary," and that "improvement of admissions and pre-admissions counseling is needed."

Student Counseling

The transfer, vocational-technical, and adult education programs of the junior college are educational functions. A fourth program, student counseling, is not primarily educational but is considered to be one of the most important of the junior college functions. It is the counseling program which marks the junior college as performing a unique service, distinct from that of the senior colleges.

Counseling in a junior college may take several different forms, from a formal program operated by trained, professional counselors to after-class discussions between a teacher and his students.

Grand Rapids Junior College provides formal counseling services to its students through a counseling center, staffed by five professionally trained counselors, and assisted by a clerical staff of two full-time and one part-time persons. The counseling service provides a range of services to the students of the junior college including pre-admission contacts with students in their secondary schools; multiple (group) advising and initial programming--particularly of students in the developmental and general studies programs; administration of tests and evaluation of results; counseling; follow-up and evaluation of college transfers; and sundry other activities involving student evaluation and assignment.

At the heart of the counseling center's work is the counseling function itself, involving a face-to-face contact between the student and the counselor with the objective of achieving the educational, vocational, and personal adjustment of the student. In 1966, the counseling center had 3,718 contacts with students and in 1965, about 3,520. While the number of student contacts is not indicative of the center's effectiveness, it does illustrate that Grand Rapids Junior College attempts to fulfill the function of guiding its students so that they may attain the goals that they are capable of attaining.

How successful, qualitatively, the staff may be is dependent not only on the training and skills of the individual staff members but on the individual students themselves. No evaluation of the counseling function has been undertaken for this report, but it is noted that some of the ingredients for qualitative success are present in the Grand Rapids Counseling Center. Among these ingredients are a trained, professional staff, who continually review their own internal procedures and techniques, constantly evaluate student performance in order to judge the effectiveness of college programs, and, most importantly, come into contact with individual students to provide assistance in the solution of their problems.

Other Programs

A fifth traditional function of junior colleges is that of community services. Aside from formal classroom adult education courses, community service programs might include lectures, art shows and other exhibits, theatre and concert presentations, special programs and institutes of various types, and special assistance in community projects. Programs of this nature make a junior college a truly community institution. Grand Rapids Junior College, according to its officials, does not have formal, extensive presentation of programs that might be classified as community service.

A new program which is now considered to be a proper task for junior colleges is the provision of enrichment experiences for high school students. Grand Rapids Junior College has two such programs for advanced or superior high school students. One program permits high school students to take junior college-level courses for high school credit. For the years 1965 and 1966, 58 and 60 students, respectively, participated in the high school enrichment program offered by the junior college. The second program permits selected high school students to register for junior college courses, with college credit, prior to their graduating from high school. Thirty and 39 students were in the advanced placement program in 1965 and 1966, respectively.

In summary, Grand Rapids Junior College engages in four of the five traditional roles of junior colleges neglecting only community service programs. Its major emphasis is upon the college-transfer program, but the college does have vocational-technical programs, adult education through its evening college, and a counseling service provided by a trained, professional staff. Finally, it is also involved, on a limited basis so far, in the provision of enrichment courses for high school students.

Interschool Relations

Educational programs in the Grand Rapids area are provided by institutions other than the Grand Rapids Junior College. Presentation of these programs do, of course, have an impact upon junior college programs. Future developments of junior college programs must also take into account changes contemplated in the offerings of the other institutions. A detailed analysis of the relationship between the programs of these other institutions and the junior college is fraught with a multitude of pitfalls and is not necessary for the purposes of this study. A general description of these programs and important developmental trends is possible and would be useful in charting the future course of the junior college.

Private Schools

Three private schools of higher education are located in Grand Rapids. Two are church-related, four-year institutions. These schools are Aquinas College and Calvin College, the former a Roman Catholic institution and the latter a Christian Reformed Church institution. The third institution is the Davenport Business School, which is now in the process of expanding its facilities.

On the basis of the survey of seniors conducted for the Kent County Vocational-Technical Education Survey, the impact of these three institutions on junior college programs may be negligible. Approximately seven percent of the seniors stated they anticipated attending Calvin College and another seven percent anticipated attending Davenport College. Slightly more than one percent of the seniors indicated they would attend Aquinas College. On the other hand, approximately 40% of the seniors stated they would expect to attend Grand Rapids Junior College. A total of 403 seniors stated that they expected to enter either Aquinas, Calvin, or Davenport Business College. It would seem that only with a drastic reorientation of their respective programs and a restructuring of their fee schedules would the three schools make any impact on Grand Rapids Junior College. These three schools and the junior college have different roles and clientele to serve and it could be expected that the differentiation in the roles and clientele would continue to be maintained.

Public Schools

Public school programs which have, or may have, some impact on or relationship to the junior college programs may be discussed under four headings-the full-time offerings of the new four-year institution in the area, Grand Valley State College; the

extension offerings of The University of Michigan, Michigan State University, and Western Michigan University; the adult education and vocational-technical offerings of the school board through its division of vocational education; and the future development of a county-wide vocational-technical education program and facility. Unlike the private school programs, the programs of these public institutions may parallel those of the junior college and may draw from the same clientele groups. The need for cooperation among these public institutions and the necessity for the integration of their programs may be more compelling than with the three private institutions because the public institutions are dependent upon the tax resources of the people. Elimination of duplicate programs might mean an improvement in educational programs for the area or in a reduction of the public burden required to support such programs.

Grand Valley State College. Grand Valley State College was founded in 1960 and opened its doors to the first students in the fall of 1963. The establishment of the college in the Grand Rapids-Muskegon-Holland area followed the recommendation of the Russell Report for the Michigan Legislative Study Committee on Higher Education for a new, four-year educational facility in the Grand Rapids area. The original intent of the new college was that it would provide a basic foundation-type, liberal arts program for its student body, most of whom would be mainly local, commuting students. Since its opening, Grand Valley has undergone modifications in its program and its student body composition. Today, one-half of Grand Valley State College student body is enrolled in teacher training. While about 75% of the enrolled students are drawn from the immediate three-county area, only 47% of the total enrollment commutes to the college. The remaining 53% reside in the college-provided dormitory residences or in college supervised, privately provided apartment housing.

Cooperative activities between Grand Rapids Junior College and Grand Valley State College have been minimal to this point. Junior college officials provided consultative assistance to the various committees and to the board of control in the initial stages of Grand Valley's development. Presently, officials of both institutions concede that there are areas in which both units might share facilities and staff in order to provide cooperative programs. Two such programs mentioned in discussions with officials of both the junior and senior institution were nursing and vocational teacher training. In the former instance, Grand Valley State College might provide the academic courses to the students enrolled in the junior college's nursing program in order to qualify the nursing students for a bachelor degree. For vocational teacher training, the junior college might provide the vocational-technical courses for Grand Valley students pursuing teaching careers in the vocational-technical area.

A third area of possible cooperation is suggested by the survey of evening college students conducted in 1964. Based on the fact that a large number of students were planning to continue their educational pursuits in senior institutions, the author of the survey suggested that the senior institutions might consider the initiation of a local extension center offering undergraduate evening courses at the upper division level. An alternative was to encourage Grand Valley to provide evening courses on its own campus or, preferably, in Grand Rapids.

Extension Centers. Three senior institutions--The University of Michigan, Michigan State University, and Western Michigan University--offer some extension undergraduate and graduate courses in Grand Rapids in facilities provided by the Grand Rapids board of education. By mutual consent with junior college officials, the course offerings of the senior institutions do not duplicate courses given by the junior college. As long as this mutual arrangement is maintained, the extension offerings should have no bearing on junior college programs. A decision by the senior institutions to expand their upper division offerings in order to provide local students an opportunity to earn a bachelor's degree, as recommended by the 1964 survey of evening school students, would have some impact on the junior college offerings. Such a development would tend to increase junior college enrollments and would tend to encourage junior college students to continue with their education.

Vocational Education Division Courses. The Grand Rapids board of education, the controlling body of the junior college, also provides high school vocational-technical programs and adult educational programs in the Grand Rapids community through its division of vocational education. This division is separate and distinct from the junior college division. Vocational-technical programs are offered in the various high schools throughout the city. A student wishing to enroll in a particular vocational-technical program simply attends the high school offering the program. Among the courses and programs offered by the high schools are machine shop, printing, electricity, furniture repair, shoe repair, home economics, and business education. Particular courses may be taken by non-vocational students as industrial arts courses.

Additionally, the school board presents a program of adult education in the evening hours, with the classes meeting in one of the high schools and in the junior college buildings. Night school offerings include trade and industrial classes, manpower program classes, and apprenticeship classes. Approximately 2,200 adults in 130 classes were enrolled in the 1965-66 school year. Other than the personal participation of the junior college evening school dean and the use of classrooms in the buildings occupied by the junior college, Grand Rapids junior college has no responsibility for these adult education courses.

While the junior college is not now involved in these programs, there is a possibility that it may become involved in the future. Professor Donald Leu of Michigan State University is now examining the feasibility of using the junior college facilities and programs for all secondary pupils in the city. Under this plan, students from the Grand Rapids high schools would be sent to the junior college for enrichment programs and the junior college might also serve as the area vocational-technical center for the Grand Rapids school system. Should this plan prove feasible, the junior college would be involved in an expanded vocational-technical program at the high school level.

County Vocational-Technical Center. Late in 1964, a committee was appointed by the Kent County Superintendents' Association to evaluate vocational education needs in the county and recommend a course of action to meet identified needs. As a result of the survey--Kent County Vocational-Technical Education Survey--the study committee concluded that "training opportunities in vocational education should definitely be increased in the Kent County area (p. 82). It went on to propose that "area vocational-technical centers should be constructed, equipped and staffed in Kent County to provide curriculums . . . for 11th and 12th grade students . . . and increased and expanded offerings on vocational-technical programs at 13-14 grade or junior college level." Adults were not excluded from the considerations of the survey committee, for its report recommended "additional programs for upgrading and retraining adults at both the secondary area center and the junior college."

The survey committee made no specific proposal concerning the organizational pattern for the vocational program. It did suggest that the superintendents might explore the relative feasibilities of two different patterns of organization. Both patterns would require the construction of an area vocational center. Under one plan, the student would spend one-half day at the vocational center and one-half day at his local high school where he would receive his instruction in academic subjects, and from which he would receive his high school diploma. Under the second alternative pattern, the student would enroll in the vocational school on a full-time basis, taking all his subjects at the vocational school from which he would graduate.

Presently, a committee of Kent County school superintendents is discussing another alternative for organizing a vocational-technical center in Kent County. This alternative involves the developing of a new, out-county community college, which would be established primarily to provide secondary level and, possibly, community college level technical education.

Whether the area center is originally established as a community college or as a secondary vocational education center, the proposal must be approved by the electorate. Operating funds for either type

of school would also be dependent upon a successful request for millage by vote of the people.

Successful establishment of an area vocational center or a second junior college separate and apart from the facilities operated by the Grand Rapids school district without the participation of Grand Rapids Junior College would have a definite impact on the college programs and enrollments.

Prospects and Alternatives

Grand Rapids Junior College has traditionally emphasized the college-transfer programs. It is highly improbable that the junior college would or should reverse this traditional commitment to its academic program. A drastic shift away from the college-transfer program would be precluded by a variety of factors. First among the factors is the length of time that such a program has been in existence as at Grand Rapids Junior College. The academic program and Grand Rapids Junior College are almost synonymous. Within this 50-year time period, tradition not only tends to support the continuation of the academic program but so does the college's investment in facilities and faculty. Finally, the college-transfer program has served a need in the past and will, undoubtedly, continue to do so in the future.

Continuation of the college-transfer program, however, neither implies that the college-transfer program is without problems nor that Grand Rapids Junior College has no role in the other phases of community college activities. Far from it, the junior college should continually re-evaluate its college-transfer program and should continue to implement its plans to expand the vocational-technical program.

A large number of junior college students--and, undoubtedly, a great percentage of those in the college-transfer program--do not go on to complete their two years. This in itself may not be a serious matter. If the junior college had data showing the number of students that went on to the senior institutions before completion of the two-year junior college program or data indicating what happened to their "dropouts" an appraisal could be made. In the absence of such information, one can only raise questions. Data do exist to indicate that Grand Rapids Junior College transfer students perform at, or slightly above, the school average of the schools to which they transfer. Here, again, one wishes that there were better data than do exist.

Observers tend to agree that the unfulfilled role of junior colleges is generally in the area of vocational-technical education. Grand Rapids Junior College is now moving in the direction of expanding its vocational-technical programs. Expansion of these programs could be brought about without the college losing sight of its commitment to the college-transfer program.

However, in the developing of its technical education program, both the junior college and the community must be aware of the activities of other groups in the field and must work with these groups either to develop complementary programs or to assume the total responsibility for vocational-technical education in Kent County and perhaps beyond the immediate boundaries of the county. The groups with which the junior college must be concerned in the area of vocational education are the vocational education department of its own parent body, the Grand Rapids school board, and the Kent County intermediate school district and its committees studying vocational education in the county. In both of these cases, Grand Rapids Junior College must cooperate with these respective groups in defining a reasonable dividing line between high school and college-level vocational-technical courses and a proper relationship between itself and the proposed vocational-technical school.

An alternative is for the junior college to have primary responsibility for vocational-technical education in the county. Reasons for lodging responsibility for post-secondary vocational education and, in some instances, for all vocational education in community colleges are given by Harold T. Smith, in Education and Training for the World of Work, A Vocational Education Program for the State of Michigan (The W. E. Upjohn Institute, July, 1963):

Most individual high schools cannot offer the variety of programs needed. More and more vocational-technical courses beyond the high school level are needed. The public favors later initial employment than at high school graduation. Employers favor the older employee and the one who has taken his vocational training at a post-secondary institution. The post-secondary institution will have better facilities and a more specialized staff in many fields than the high schools can have. For these reasons, more and more youths, when post-secondary education is available to them, are likely to postpone their vocational training until after high school graduation. Adults tend to favor the post-secondary institution over the high school for their training and retraining for the additional reasons that the teaching methods and the professional climate may be more to their liking.

However, junior college responsibility for a county-wide vocational-technical program would not be without its own problems. First and foremost, continued control of the junior college by the Grand Rapids school board, which is discussed more fully in a later portion of this report, would complicate the college's relationships with the other school districts, particularly in the provision of high school-level courses. Another matter, concerning the offering of both high school and college courses, would be the physical location of the course offerings and the required shop facilities. In short, should all courses, high school and college, be offered at the college or should main college campus offerings be supplemented by offerings at various locations throughout the county? The latter alternative would, of necessity, require the dispersal and, possibly, the duplication of technical and shop facilities and equipment. Another concern would be the attitudes of the college faculty toward college acceptance of responsibility for a total program of vocational-technical education. Some studies indicate that academic faculty are not too receptive to the idea of vocational education at the junior college level. However, what little evidence there is does not indicate that the faculty attitude toward vocational education has been a major problem in the past at Grand Rapids Junior College. Whether it would remain so under differing conditions is difficult to forecast. There is also the additional factor of the attitude of the college vocational teacher toward teaching high school-level courses. Finally, if high school students were brought to the campus of the junior college, there would then be the problem of mingling high school students with college students. In the literature on junior colleges, the point is emphatically made that the modern junior college should be physically separated from the high school. This mixing of high school and college students was one of the reasons given by Professor Leu (p. 173) for rejecting an education park concept for Grand Rapids central high school in conjunction with the junior college campus.

Failure of the junior college and the Grand Rapids board of education to address themselves to the matter of the location of responsibility for vocational education in Kent County may have far reaching consequences for junior college if an out-county junior college is established to provide vocational-technical education programs at the high school level. Creation of such an institution may have adverse consequences not only on Grand Rapids Junior College technical program, but also on its academic program. Once an out-county junior college were established, it might be only a matter of time before such an institution moved fully into the field of college-level vocational-technical training and, possibly, college-transfer programs.

Perhaps the establishment of an integrated vocational education program between junior college and the division of vocational education in the Grand Rapids board of education might set the pattern for developing a joint program with the out-county school districts.

CHAPTER II

POPULATION AND ENROLLMENTS

Population

Kent County had a 1960 population of 363,187, a 26% increase over its 1950 population of 288,292 persons. The 26% increase is larger than the 23% and 18% growth of the populations of Michigan and the United States, respectively. Population growth was the pattern in all units of government in Kent County, with the exception of Lowell Township which had a 56% decrease. (See Plate I.)

The smallest population gains were registered by the city of Grand Rapids (less than 1%), the city of Rockford (7%), Bowne Township (7%), and the city of Lowell (16%). All of the other units had population gains between 1950 and 1960 of 24% or better. Some of the highest population gains were registered by the areas around the city of Grand Rapids--East Grand Rapids (71%), Grand Rapids Township (81%), Walker (81%), Grandville (294%), Wyoming (58%), and Paris Township (101%). Population for Kent County in 1965 was 385,159, according to the estimates of Dr. David Goldberg of the Population Studies Center, The University of Michigan. No breakdown for units of government is available for 1965 population estimates.

The population of Kent County is concentrated in the Grand Rapids area. Grand Rapids and the six units--Grand Rapids Township, East Grand Rapids, Paris Township, Wyoming, Grandville and Walker--immediately surrounding the city account for, on the basis of the 1960 census, 81% of the population of Kent County.

In 1950, this same area accounted for 85% of Kent County's population. Within the area, however, changes have occurred in the population distribution between 1950 and 1960. According to the data of the 1950 census, the population of Grand Rapids represented 61% of Kent County's population, but in 1960 the city's population represented only 49% of the total county population. Thus, the Grand Rapids' experience reflects the national pattern of a shifting of population to the suburbs.

Population movement was mainly an internal movement in Kent County. Of the 74,895 increase in population between 1950 and 1960, 82% was a



Plate I
Population 1960 and 1950
Kent County--Cities and Townships

Tyrone 1960: 3,189 1950: 2,502 + 27%	Solon 1960: 3,255 1950: 2,545 + 28%	Nelson 1960: 3,784 1950: 3,086 + 23%	Spencer 1960: 1,014 1950: 819 + 24%
Sparta 1960: 7,996 1950: 6,365 + 26%	Algoma 1960: 2,485 1950: 1,795 + 38%	Courtland 1960: 1,555 1950: 1,259 + 24% Rockford 1960: 2,074 1950: 1,937 +7%	Oakfield 1960: 1,471 1950: 998 + 47%
Alpine 1960: 4,764 1950: 2,841 + 68%	Plainfield 1960: 11,680 1950: 6,021 + 94%	Cannon 1960: 2,525 1950: 1,600 + 58%	Grattan 1960: 1,346 1950: 1,022 + 32%
Walker 1960: 16,381 1950: 9,028 + 81% Grand Rapids 1960: 177,313 ^a 1950: 176,515 + 81% Wyoming 1960: 45,829 1950: 28,977 + 58% Grandville 1960: 7,975 1950: 2,022 +294%	Grand Rapids Township 1960: 16,738 1950: 9,241 + 81% East Grand Rapids 1960: 10,924 1950: 6,403 + 71% Paris 1960: 19,235 1950: 9,578 +101%	Ada 1960: 2,877 1950: 1,966 + 46% Cascade 1960: 3,333 1950: 1,691 + 97%	Vergennes 1960: 945 1950: 760 + 24% Lowell Lowell 1960: 1,567 1950: 3,534 -56%
Hyron 1960: 6,036 1950: 4,088 + 48%	Gaines 1960: 6,120 1950: 3,302 + 85%	Caledonia 1960: 3,491 1950: 2,672 + 31%	Bowne 1960: 1,181 1950: 1,102 + 7%

^aLess than 1%.

Source: U. S. Bureau of Census

result of a natural increase (excess of births over deaths) and 18% as a result of net migration into the county. (See Table 5.) This same pattern existed in the decade between 1940 and 1950, when 77% of the population increase of 42,926 persons resulted from a natural increase and 23% from net migration into the county. Another indication of population stability as opposed to mobility is the fact that of the 1960 population of five years and over, 87% lived in the same county in 1955. In Grand Rapids itself, 86% of this same population group lived in the same county in 1960 as in 1955. This fact is corroborated by the study of high school seniors conducted for the Kent County Vocational-Technical Education Survey in 1965. Table 35 of that report shows that 91% of the respondents had lived in Kent County for three or more years and 86% for six or more years. A study of 1961 high school graduates for the same 1965 survey indicated (Table 41) that 73% of the respondents still resided in Kent County.

Table 5

Components of Population Change
Kent County
1950-1960 and 1940-1950

	<u>Population</u> <u>Change</u>	<u>Natural</u> <u>Increase</u>	<u>Net</u> <u>Migration</u>	<u>Migration as %</u> <u>of base year</u> <u>Population</u>
1950-60	74,895	61,040	13,855	4.8%
1940-50	42,926	33,137	9,789	4.0

Source: J. F. Thaden, Population of Michigan Counties, Projections to 1970, Technical Bulletin B-24, March 1962, Institute for Community Development, Michigan State University.

Age Patterns

Total population is less significant in an analysis focusing on a publicly supported education facility than the age pattern of the population for two reasons. First, there has to be an adequate number of individuals within the population to provide the potential enrollees for such an institution. Aside from the evening college, the bulk of junior college enrollment comes from the population group 18 to 21 years old, inclusive.

Table 6

Population Age Patterns
Kent County and Grand Rapids

Age Group	<u>Kent County</u>		<u>Grand Rapids</u>		<u>Out-County</u>	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>% of Total County Population</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>% of Total City Population</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>% of Total Out-County Population</u>
Total population	363,187	100.00%	177,313	100.0%	185,874	100.00%
18-21 years old	17,946	4.9	10,155	5.7	7,791	4.1
8-11 years old ^a	30,669	8.4	13,381	7.5	17,288	9.3
3-6 years old ^b	35,840	9.9	15,041	8.5	20,799	11.2
0-19 years old	148,606	40.9	66,689	37.6	81,917	44.1
20-64 years old	181,058	49.8	89,480	50.5	91,578	49.3
65 and over	33,523	9.2	21,144	11.9	12,379	6.6

^aThis age group will be 18-21 years old in 1970.

^bThis age group will be 18-21 years old in 1975.

Source: U. S. Bureau of Census, 1960 Census of Population.

Second, the population distribution has to include a sufficient number of persons in the working age group (20-64 years old) to support the public institutions and services which are to be provided in the community.

Census figures for 1960 show that Kent County had 17,946 persons, 5% of its population, between the ages 18 to 21. In 1960, the 8 to 11 year olds, the segment of the population that will be 18 to 21 years old in 1970, numbered 30,669-8% of the total 1960 population and 71% greater than the 1960 18 to 21 year-old group. Similarly, the three to six-year old group, which will be the 18 to 21 year-old group of 1975, numbered 35,840. This three to six year-old group in 1960 comprised 10% of the total 1960 population and was 17% larger than the 1960 eight to 11 year-old group and 100% larger than the 1960 18-21 year-old group. Thus, without considering the effects of mortality and migration, the number of individuals that will be 18 to 21 years old in 1975 should approximately double the 1960 figure. (See Table 6.)

The Kent County population in 1960 was evenly divided between working (20-64 years old) and non-working (0-19 years old and 65 years old and over) age groups.

Grand Rapids City also exhibits this even division between the working and non-working age groups. However, the over 65 population in Grand Rapids is a slightly larger component of the total Grand Rapids population than is the over 65 group in the rest of the county to its respective total. Grand Rapids has more persons over 65 and fewer in the 9-19 and 20-64 age groups than the rest of the county. In terms of the 1960 age groups that were or will be 18-21 years old, Grand Rapids has more 18-21 year-olds than the rest of the county, but it has fewer 8-11 year-olds and three to six year-olds than the rest of the county. While both Grand Rapids and the rest of the county will experience a gain in the size of this group in 1970 and 1975, the rest of the county should have a larger number of college-age youths than Grand Rapids in those years.

Enrollments

Determining the exact enrollments of a junior or senior college is a difficult task. First, there is the problem of defining enrollment. Two concepts are generally accepted in discussing enrollment: head count and full-time equated (f.t.e.) enrollment. The first term refers to a simple enumeration of the students registered and taking courses. Full-time equated enrollment is computed by counting the number of full-time students, defined as those taking 15 or more credit hours, and adding to it the quotient obtained by dividing the total credit hours taken by part-time students by the normal load of 15 hours. Thus, full-time equated enrollment would represent in general the number of students a college would have enrolled **if** a full-time load of 15 credit hours were being carried by full-time students.

A second problem in the task of determining a college's enrollment is selecting the time of enumeration. Enrollment varies over a semester as well as from semester to semester. For this reason, enumeration at different times of the semester may produce different results, and when schools are asked to report enrollments on different dates the enrollment figures tend to vary. These variations occur not only between colleges but also for one college. Junior colleges do make reports at different times to different agencies; therefore, an examination of enrollment figures for Grand Rapids Junior College will reveal discrepancies because of the date and the basis of the enrollment report. For this report an attempt has been made to present a consistent set of enrollment figures.

Past Enrollments

Grand Rapids Junior College has shared in the general increases in junior and senior college enrollments occurring in Michigan in the last decade. A head count enrollment of 853 students was registered by the junior college in 1950. By 1960, the head count enrollment more than tripled, to a total of 2,651 students. Head count enrollment for 1966 totaled 4,780 students, more than five and one-half times the enrollment of 1950. Table 7 shows the head count enrollment and the percent changes for each year 1950 through 1966.

Table 7

Enrollment
(Head Count)
Grand Rapids Junior College

<u>Year</u>	<u>Head Count</u>	<u>% Change</u>
1950	853	--
1951	666	+ 22%
1952	718	+ 8
1953	811	+ 13
1954	958	+ 18
1955	1,100	+ 15
1956	1,488	+ 35
1957	1,680	+ 13
1958	2,127	+ 27
1959	2,373	+ 12
1960	2,651	+ 12
1961	2,993	+ 13
1962	3,166	+ 6
1963*	3,401	+ 7
1964*	3,903	+ 15
1965*	4,497	+ 15
1966*	4,780	+ 6

Source: 1950 to 1961 Enrollments--A Special Report on the Jefferson Connector Junior College Area, planning Unit No. 67, January, 1964.

1962 to 1966 Enrollments; Grand Rapids Junior College, Registrar.

*Grand Valley State College opened in 1963 and was in operation these last four years.

Geographical Distribution of Enrollment

About 60% of students enrolled in the junior college pay resident tuition charges, indicating that this percentage of students claim Grand Rapids residency.

A recent survey of students showed that 60% of the evening students stated they lived within five miles of the college; and another 19% lived five to ten miles from the school. A survey of day students showed 47% lived within five miles from the school and another 23% lived from five to ten miles away. Thus, according to both of these surveys, 70% (day survey) to 79% (evening survey) of the students reside within ten miles of the school, with both groups of students relying preponderantly upon private modes of transportation.

In analyzing the high school origin of the students, 50% of them come from high schools located outside of the city of Grand Rapids. While 50% of the students come from schools located in Grand Rapids, 30% of the junior college enrollment graduated from the public schools of Grand Rapids and 20% from the private, parochial schools located in Grand Rapids. (Catholic school sources indicate that about 90% of the Catholic high school registration are residents of the city of Grand Rapids.) Data presented in Table 8 show that the largest percentage increases in enrollment from 1963 to 1966 came from the schools located in counties surrounding Kent County. Enrollment from these schools increased by 121% between 1963 and 1966. The second highest increase came from the Kent County high schools located outside the city of Grand Rapids. Among the high schools within Grand Rapids, the private, parochial schools showed a higher increase (51%) in junior college enrollment than did the Grand Rapids public schools (+23%) from 1963 to 1966.

Projected Enrollments

Enrollment projections are based on several factors. Of first importance is the potential supply of college students available in the community. This is determined by an analysis of census data to estimate the number of individuals that will be 18 to 21 at any particular time in the future; or by aging a school enrollment in those districts from which the junior college draws to determine the number of students in grades 9 to 12, inclusive. The second factor is a determination of the proportion of the enrollment potential that will actually enroll in the junior college. This is usually determined by comparing the enrollment over a period of years with the potential in these years. In this manner the trend or drawing power can be figured.

Table 8
High School Origin of Junior College Students
Stated as Percent of Total
1963 to 1966

	<u>1963</u>	<u>1964</u>		<u>1965</u>		<u>1966</u>		<u>1963-1966</u>	
	<u>% of Total</u>	<u>% of Total</u>	<u>% Change</u>	<u>% of Total</u>	<u>% Change</u>	<u>% of Total</u>	<u>% Change</u>	<u>% Change</u>	
Grand Rapids Schools	52%	50%	+ 9%	51%	+ 15%	50%	+ 5%	+ 33%	
Public	34	32	+ 7	31	+ 11	30	+ 4	+ 23	
Non-Public	18	18	+ 13	20	+ 24	20	+ 8	+ 51	
Other Kent County	19	19	+ 18	25	+ 47	25	+ 8	+ 88	
Surrounding Counties	6	6	+ 14	9	+ 73	10	+ 12	+ 121	
Other Michigan	15	17	+ 24	9	39	8	+ 1	25	
Out-of-State	7	6	+ 9	6	+ 11	6	+ 10	+ 32	
Foreign	1	1	+ 19	1	24	1	+ 7	+ 3	
Total	100%	100%	+ 14%	100%	+ 15%	100%	+ 7%	+ 39%	

Source: Grand Rapids Junior College, Registrar's Office.

Several projections have been made over the last several years by the college and by others in an effort to determine how many of these potential enrollees will enroll in the junior college. Table 9 summarizes the various projections for 1970 and 1975.

Table 9
Projected Enrollments 1970 and 1975
Grand Rapids Junior College

	1970		1975	
	Head Count	F.T.E.	Head Count	F.T.E.
Jefferson Connector				
College Study	A	6,300		
	B	8,300		
Junior College 8/65	6,300	5,000	6,900	5,400
Junior College Budget				
Requests 4/66	6,300	5,100		
Citizens Research Council	6,400	5,000	6,900	5,600

Head count enrollment in 1970 is expected to be at least 6,300 while full-time equated enrollment is expected to approximate 5,000. Projections for 1975 indicate a 6,900 head count enrollment and a 5,400 f.t.e. enrollment. (It should be noted that present building plans assume a 1970 f.t.e. enrollment of 4,000.)

Enrollment projections based on these statistical computations may be valid only insofar as that all the assumptions of the projection are maintained and non-statistical factors do not change. Such non-statistical factors include some which are within the control of the junior college and some that are not. In the former category, the rate of introduction of new courses might be an example. Past enrollment trends do appear to reflect new course introductions. Non-controllable factors include the state of the economy, the existence of nearby schools, the draft, and special legislation such as the G. I. bill for veterans.

By statistical measurement, Grand Rapids Junior College will have an increased enrollment potential by 1970 and 1975. In 1960, Kent County had 31,000 persons aged eight to 11 years and 36,000 persons aged three to six years. The persons in these two groups will be 18 to 21 years old in 1970 and 1975, respectively. Thus, the number of 18 to 21 year-olds in Kent County in 1970 and in 1975 will increase substantially from the 1960 figure of 18,000.

(The exact number of 18 to 21 year-olds in 1970 and in 1975 will depend upon the survival and net migration factors.) Analysis of present enrollments for grades five to eight, and kindergarten to three indicates--these children will be grades nine to 12 in 1970 and in 1975, respectively--a 1970 potential pool of 35,757 and 39,108 in 1975. (Note: for an accurate projection to 1970 and 1975, these figures must be subjected to a dropout rate.) Presently, there are 29,672 students in grades nine to 12 in Kent County schools.

A projection by the Research Council (using the 9-12th grade enrollment method), produces a projected 1970 student head count enrollment of 6,400 and a 5,000 f.t.e. enrollment. For 1975, the projections are 6,900 head count and 5,600 f.t.e.

As indicated earlier, future enrollments of Grand Rapids Junior College may very well be affected by its program development and by the establishment of other schools nearby. Should the junior college move rapidly in the expansion of its vocational-technical programs, to meet both the needs of the people and of industry, its future enrollment may very well exceed the statistical projections. Also, should the out-county school districts decide to launch a community college and should this new college become involved in the provision of competing college-level courses, then enrollments for Grand Rapids Junior College may fall substantially below the projections.

CHAPTER III

JUNIOR COLLEGE FACILITIES AND LOCATION

College Facilities

Grand Rapids Junior College was first housed in a high school building. The college originally occupied the top floor of the Central High School, where it remained until it moved in 1926 to what is now called the East Building. In 1944 the junior college moved into the Davis Technical High School, now known as the Main Building, which serves as the main junior college facility and as the headquarters of the board of education. While popular reference is made to the junior college and its facilities, it is appropriate to point out that these facilities are, in fact, board of education facilities. The board uses a part of the main building itself and assigns some space to other agencies as well as the junior college. Thus, extension offices of the three state universities--The University of Michigan, Michigan State University, and Western Michigan University--are assigned office space and classroom space in each of the facilities. Other agencies or functions which are assigned space in the buildings also used by the junior college include the Grand Rapids public recreation department, the Grand Rapids health department dental clinic, the Veterans' Administration, and the Grand Rapids high school R.O.T.C.

Presently, three buildings are used by the junior college. These buildings include the East Building, the oldest of the three and scheduled for replacement under the proposed campus plan. This building provides "16 general purpose classrooms, three laboratories for nursing education, a reading laboratory, and a men's physical education facility." Four faculty offices, occupied by 19 faculty members, are also located in the East Building.

The main building, the old Davis technical high school, has been the junior college's major facility. Besides classrooms and laboratories, the main building also houses the administrative offices of the junior college, the counseling center, the bookstore, the computer center, the library, the student commons, and the cafeteria.

In 1964, the board of education acquired a nearby building, now known as the West Building, from the Lear-Siegler Corporation. Structural features of this building permit only a portion to be used for junior college

purposes. The building will provide additional library space; food service facilities; and, classroom and office space for the instrumental and vocal music departments, the business studies division, and the social sciences division. In total, the junior college has available about 178,366 square feet of space, or about 50 square feet per student. Not all of this space is available full-time to the junior college because some classrooms are used by the extension centers of the state universities and by the adult vocational division of the board of education. Junior college also uses some facilities of Central and Creston high schools for some evening division courses.

College officials and the school board consider the present space of the junior college to be inadequate. General standards for space requirements suggest 125 to 150 square feet per f.t.e. student. For the new, proposed campus, the architect is providing 135 square feet per student. In part the present space deficiency is in adjunct facilities such as student lounges, study areas, and faculty offices.

Student Station and Room Period Utilization

Data on utilization of space were obtained from the junior college, which prepares such analyses every semester. This consists entirely of room utilization data. Unfortunately student station utilization data are not compiled by the college.

Room-period utilization data were provided by the college which show the number of hours a classroom is used each week on the basis of a potential 100% utilization of 45 hours per week in the day school and of 20 hours per week in the evening school. Table 10 shows the percentage utilization per week of the junior college classrooms, both for the day and evening session.

During the day, 64% of the rooms occupied by the junior college have percentage utilization of 31% to 70% per week. Lowest percentage utilization is 7%, highest 96%. Overall utilization of junior college classrooms during the week works out to 46% per week--with 48% utilization of Main building classrooms, 40% for West building, and 37% for East building.

The evening division occupies 70 classrooms during the week. Seventy-five percent of these rooms are utilized less than 50% of the time, with the lowest percentage of utilization being 5%. The highest percentage utilization of a classroom in the evening is 80%. Overall utilization of classrooms in the evening amounts to 37%, which is lower than the daytime utilization.

Table 10

Room Period Utilization
Day and Evening Sessions - Grand Rapids Junior College
 Fall 1966

Percent Utilization	Number of Classrooms			
	Day Session		Evening Session	
	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total
10% or less	4	4%	3	4%
11-30%	15	17	31	44
31-50%	31	34	19	27
51-70%	27	30	15	21
71-80%	11	12	2	4
80% +	2	2	--	--
Total Rooms	90	100%	70	100%

Source: Grand Rapids Junior College, Use of Rooms for Scheduled Classes,
 Fall semester 1966-67 and Grand Rapids Junior College Evening
 College, Use of Rooms for Scheduled Classes.

These computations do not tell the full story, however, because they do not include utilization of rooms by agencies other than the junior college. As an example in the spring of 1966, the board of education held ten apprentice classes in the junior college during the day hours. Some of these classes were in rooms also used by the junior college, so these rooms would not have been available for the full 45 hours per week. A number of adult and trade industrial classes offered by the division of vocational education and extension classes of the state universities are offered in the evening. Some of these use junior college classrooms. Therefore, less than a 100% utilization by the junior college may not always permit the conclusion that a particular room is under-utilized. It would seem that a comprehensive analysis of room utilization and student station utilization could only be made by the central administrative staff of the school system which controls the assignment of space in the buildings used by the junior college.

Junior College Location

To meet the requirements of the student body the school board has embarked on a program of expanding junior college facilities in the general area of its present location. Expansion of college facilities is being undertaken as part of a proposed urban renewal program, which includes an adjoining cultural center complex. Application for federal planning funds has been made. In the meantime the city parking authority, in cooperation with the city commission and the board of education, is proceeding with plans to erect a parking facility to serve the junior college area. This facility is an integral part of the future junior college complex.

Assuming that the junior college is to be a true community college with a wide range of educational services and not merely a junior liberal arts institution, these are compelling reasons for locating it in the core city rather than outside. The very centrality of a downtown location if accessible to major highways becomes the prime reason for locating a community college in the core of the urban area. A central urban location for the junior college would place it closer to the bulk of educational clientele it is created to serve--the population in need of its programs and the business and industries in need of its graduates. Proximity to business and industry might assist the college in being sensitive to the needs of these institutions and might provide it with resources for part-time instructors.

Cultural, educational and economical advantages may accrue to the students of a centrally located college. With cultural facilities usually located in a central location, the proximity of such institutions makes them accessible to students and makes it feasible to utilize their services in broadening students' perspectives. Students in the social science and business fields also have available to them as a practical laboratory the vast and complex institutions of business and government located in the core area. Finally, location of the college in the central city affords students a greater opportunity for part-time employment, and, in general, it adds vitality to the economic life of the downtown area.

More specifically, what are the arguments for a downtown campus for Grand Rapids Junior College? First, the college and proposed campus is located near the major interchange of the east-west and north-south business routes of the freeways and the downtown terminus of the major bus routes serving the urban region. Thus situated, it is at the transportation center of the area and at the center of its drawing area. A new parking facility is being

planned as part of the urban renewal complex which is to serve the junior college and the surrounding institutions.

Cultural and governmental facilities are located nearby the college. Within three blocks of the present campus are found the art gallery and the public museum with its planetarium. In another direction, the new urban renewal complex is located, which is designed to contain the modern state, county, municipal, justice, and federal office buildings. With governmental agencies in such close proximity, a practical laboratory will be available for social science students.

The central business district provides part-time employment for an estimated 250-300 junior college students. Downtown merchants benefit from the proximity of the college by an estimated \$3,000,000 annually spent by students and employees of the college.

In addition to these arguments for maintaining Grand Rapids Junior College in its present location, there are two more cogent reasons for maintaining it where it is. In response to the need for a senior institution, the state legislature created Grand Valley State College. After much deliberation about its location, the college was established at its present site in Allendale. Hence, the Grand Rapids community has one institution with an idyllic, rustic setting to serve the desires of those students wanting such a setting. Thus, the Grand Rapids community has two institutions offering the advantages of each type of location, the suburban rural setting and the downtown setting. The final argument for the downtown setting is the practical fact that it is now located there.

A location outside the center city offers some advantages over a downtown location of a junior college. The downtown area of every vital city tends to be congested and the influx of almost 5,000 students is bound to contribute to this congestion. Further, the limited availability and the high price of land in the downtown area tend to preclude a traditional college campus environment, in which the college becomes a relatively self-contained entity, somewhat isolated and protected from outside persons and activities. A location outside the downtown area would offer more space for parking at a lower cost to the students.

CHAPTER IV

ORGANIZATION AND FINANCE

The Grand Rapids school district operates 52 elementary school buildings, nine secondary school buildings and Grand Rapids Junior College. General school district policies are fixed by the board of education elected by the district voters. The school district is essentially coterminous with the municipal boundaries of Grand Rapids. School board policies are administered by the superintendent of schools assisted by assistant superintendents. The administrative organization consists of ten divisions, each headed by a director responsible to the superintendent of schools through the assistant superintendents. Direct administration of the educational programs of the Grand Rapids school district is under the supervision of the dean (director) of the junior college, the director of secondary schools, the director of elementary schools and the director of instruction. The other divisions are purchasing, maintenance and operation, budget, food services, pupil personnel, and staff personnel. These six divisions provide staff and auxiliary supportive services to the first four, including the junior college.

Under this organizational scheme, the overall business and staff personnel matters of the junior college are handled by the six staff and supportive units of the board of education. However, the dean of the junior college has some freedom of action in recruiting of college instructors. Of the 19 community colleges operating in Michigan seven, including Grand Rapids Junior College, are organized as a department of a single school district system.

Finances

Total general fund expenditures in 1966 for Grand Rapids Junior College amounted to \$1,982,439 as reported to the State Department of Education. This excludes capital expenditures from the building and site fund of the board of education. Operating expenditures of \$1,959,008 represented 99% of this total. The remainder was for capital outlay. Instructional expenditures totaled \$1,443,474, or 73% of the total general fund expenditure for the year. Between 1962 and 1966, total expenditures for Grand Rapids Junior College increased 65%.

Table 11

Operating and Capital Expenditures
Grand Rapids Junior College
1962-1966

	<u>1962</u>		<u>1963</u>		<u>1964</u>		<u>1965</u>		<u>1966</u>	
	<u>Amount</u>	<u>% of Total</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>% of Total</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>% of Total</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>% of Total</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>% of Total</u>
Operating	\$1,116,953	93%	\$1,286,713	99%	\$1,300,447	91%	\$1,640,403	97%	\$1,959,008	99%
Capital	<u>15,858</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>15,304</u>	<u>1</u>	134,245	9	48,694	3	23,431	1
Total	\$1,195,334 ^a	100% ^a	\$1,302,017	100%	\$1,434,692	100%	\$1,689,097	100%	\$1,982,439	100%
Per Student Operating Cost	\$480		\$520		\$489		\$558		\$553	

^aTotal includes a miscellaneous expenditure from revolving funds.

Source: Junior/Community College Annual Statistical and Financial Reports, 1961-62, 1962-63, 1963-64, 1964-65, 1965-66.

Capital expenditures attributed to the junior college are also made by the school board from its building and site fund. These expenditures are financed by local tax levies, by state-aid, and by a \$3.00 per credit hour transfer of the non-resident tuition fee to the building and site fund by the Grand Rapids school board. Table 12 shows capital outlay for the junior college from state aid and local contribution, which includes both local tax funds and the non-resident tuition fee.

Table 13 shows 1965-66 per student operating costs for 17 of the 19 junior colleges. Data for Lansing and Jackson community colleges were not available. The figures show that Grand Rapids Junior College with a per student cost of \$553 ranked fourteenth. The median student cost was \$578. The lowest per student operating cost of \$482 was reported by Port Huron Junior College. Oakland Community College reported \$1,255 per student.

Various factors affecting the relative per student cost of the 17 schools would include relative salary levels, student-teacher ratios, and instructional programs. These factors have been examined within the limits of data available, and it has not been found possible to explain, thereby, the reasons for the variations in per student costs shown in Table 13.

Revenues

Total revenues of Grand Rapids Junior College for 1965-66 were \$1,982,439 as reported to the department of education. School board contributions represented 8% of this amount; student tuition, 38%; state-aid, 49%; and 5% represented revenues from other grants and miscellaneous services. Table 14 shows the revenues by sources for each year from, 1962 to 1966. For all the community colleges in the state, tuition represented 33% of the total revenues, state aid 21%, local support 38% and miscellaneous 8%.

Local Support

Financial support of the Grand Rapids Junior College by the school board amounted to \$164,000 in 1965-66. This level has pertained since 1963 with the exception of 1965 when the board contributed \$222,000. Over each of the last five years local support has ranged from 8% to 13% of the respective yearly total revenues of the college. Table 15 compares the school board contribution to the junior college for 1965 and 1966 to the state equalized values and total tax revenues of the district for those years. For 1965 the local contribution of \$221,741

Table 12

Junior College Capital Outlay
Building and Site Fund
1962-1966

	<u>1962</u>	<u>1963</u>	<u>1964</u>	<u>1965</u>	<u>1966</u>
State	\$105,100	\$90,250	--	\$101,008	\$114,508
Local Contribution	105,100	90,250	--	180,242	316,492*
Total	<u>\$210,200</u>	<u>\$180,500</u>		<u>\$281,250</u>	<u>\$431,000</u>

* estimate

Source: Grand Rapids Board of Education

Table 13

Per Student Operating Costs
Michigan Community Colleges
Ranked from Highest to Lowest
1965-66

Rank	College	Per Student Cost
1.	Oakland	\$1,255
2.	Flint	838
3.	Delta	817
4.	Schoolcraft	731
5.	Bay de Noc	681
6.	Alpena	649
7.	Northwestern Michigan	646
8.	Lake Michigan	595
9.	Henry Ford	578
10.	Highland Park	568
11.	Kellogg	562
12.	North Central Michigan	560
13.	Macomb	554
14.	GRAND RAPIDS	553
15.	Muskegon	540
16.	Gogebic	499
17.	Port Huron	482
	Median	578

Source: Junior/Community College Annual Statistical and Financial Reports, 1965-66.

Table 14

Grand Rapids Junior College Revenues
by Sources

	<u>1962</u>		<u>1963</u>		<u>1964</u>		<u>1965</u>		<u>1966</u>	
	<u>Amount</u>	<u>% of Total</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>% of Total</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>% of Total</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>% of Total</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>% of Total</u>
Tuition	\$421,024	35%	\$454,151	35%	\$527,426	37%	\$666,356	40%	\$747,361	38%
Percent Change	--		+8%		+16%		+26%		+12%	
Local Support	99,763	8	164,715	13	164,872	12	221,741	13	163,650	8
Percent Change	--		+65%		--		+35%		-26%	
State Aid	458,053	38	593,465	46	667,196	47	709,489	42	977,144	49
Percent Change	--		+30%		+12%		+6%		+38%	
Other	216,494	18	89,686	7	75,199	5	91,511	5	94,284	5
Percent Change	--		-59%		-16%		+22%		+3%	
Total	\$1,195,334	100%	\$1,302,017	100%	\$1,434,693	100%	\$1,689,097	100%	\$1,982,439	100%
Percent Change	--		+9%		+10%		+18%		+17%	

Source: Junior/Community College Annual Statistical and Financial Reports, 1961-62, 1962-63, 1963-64, 1964-65, 1965-66.

Grand Rapids School Board Support of Junior College
Compared to School District's State Equalized Value
and Tax Revenues
 1965 and 1966

<u>Year</u>	<u>S.E.V.</u>	<u>School Millage</u>	<u>Tax Revenues</u>	<u>Local Contributions to J. C.</u>		
				<u>Amount</u>	<u>As Millage on S.E.V. (\$1/\$1,000)</u>	<u>As % of Revenues</u>
1964-65	\$614,550,375	13.3	\$8,173,520	\$221,741	\$0.36	2.7%
1965-66	621,405,090	13.3	8,140,407	163,650	0.26	2.0

Source: Grand Rapids School Board, Annual Statistical and Financial Report, 1964-65 and 1965-1966; Operations and Capital Outlay Budget Request, Fiscal Year 1966-67.

amounted to 2.7% of the school board's tax revenues and to an equivalent tax millage of 36 cents per \$1,000 of state equalized value. For 1965-1966, the contribution represents 2% of the school board's tax revenues and the equivalent of a 26 cents rate per \$1,000 state equalized value.

Grand Rapids' 1965 state equalized value of \$621,405,090 was approximately 51% of the \$1,214,000,000 state equalized value of the Kent intermediate school district. (State equalized value for Kent County is \$1,273,000,000.)

The percent of local support for Grand Rapids Junior College is compared with the percent of local support for the other community colleges of Michigan in Table 16. Grand Rapids ranks 15th highest of the 19 colleges in the percent of total revenues derived from local support. For all 19 districts, local support accounted for 21% of total revenues while in Grand Rapids local support accounted for 8%.

Among the seven community colleges controlled by the local school district, Highland Park and Port Huron receive no support from the school board. Alpena receives 22% of its total revenues from the school district--the highest percentage of local support in the group. For Flint, Henry Ford, and Grand Rapids, school board funds represent 12%, 10% and 8%, respectively, of total revenues.

Table 16

Michigan Community and Junior Colleges
Sources of Revenue as Percent of Total

<u>Independent</u>	<u>Tuition Percent</u>	<u>Local Support Percent</u>	<u>State Aid Percent</u>	<u>Other Grants & Miscellaneous Percent</u>
County-wide				
1. Bay de Noc	22%	24%	32%	22%
2. Delta	29	33	32	7
3. Jackson	30	34	31	5
4. Lake Michigan	31	24	39	6
5. Macomb	33	24	39	3
6. Muskegon	38	8	46	8
7. North Central Mich.	38	17	42	3
8. Northwestern Mich.	48	11	38	3
Intermediate School District				
1. Gogebic	38	10	48	4
2. Lansing	33	10	45	12
3. Oakland	15	59	19	7
Multi School District				
1. Schoolcraft	34	19	38	9
<u>School Board Controlled</u>				
1. Alpena	32	22	42	4
2. Flint	35	12	32	20
3. GRAND RAPIDS	38	8	49	5
4. Highland Park	45	--	48	7
5. Henry Ford	38	10	47	5
6. Kellogg	41	5	47	7
7. Port Huron	49	--	46	5
All Community Colleges	33	21	38	8

Source: Junior/Community College Annual Statistical and Financial Reports, 1965-1966.

As a group, the school board controlled community colleges receive a smaller portion of their total revenues from local support than the independent community colleges. Community colleges operated independently of a local school district have power to levy millage, with the approval of the voters, to finance their operations. Colleges under the direction of a local school district are financed through the general tax levies of the school district.

State Aid

State-aid for operations to Grand Rapids Junior College for 1965-66 amounted to \$977,144, which represents 49% of the total revenues of the college. Revenues from this source have more than doubled in the past five years, as shown in Table 16. The 49% of total revenues from state-aid received by Grand Rapids Junior College is higher than that received by any other community college in the state and exceeds the average for all schools by 11 percentage points. The above figures do not include state aid for capital outlay which is shown for Grand Rapids Junior College in Table 12.

Tuition

For 1965-66, student tuition amounted to \$747,361, or 38% of total revenues. Among the 19 community colleges in the state, Grand Rapids Junior College ranks seventh highest in the percent of total revenues derived from tuition and is higher than the average of 33% for all districts.

Annual resident tuition charges for 19 community colleges range from a low of \$100 per year to a high of \$279 per year. Grand Rapids Junior College charges residents \$210 for 30 credit hours, which is the average (median) charge of the 19 community colleges. (See Table 17.)

All 19 colleges charge higher tuition rates for non-resident students from other parts of Michigan, and six schools charge a still higher rate for out-of-state schools. For non-resident and out-of-state students, Grand Rapids Junior College charges \$360 per 30 credit hours. This is the median tuition rate in both classifications.

Table 17

Annual Tuition Charge
Michigan Community Colleges
Based on 30 Credit Hours*

	Resident	Non-Resident	Out of State
Northwestern Michigan	\$279	\$351	\$351
Jackson	276	432	612
Delta ^a	255	450	450
Kellogg	240	360	450
Schoolcraft	240	360	360
Port Huron	240	340	400
North Central Michigan	240	300	300
Flint	225	495	540
Muskegon	225	300	300
GRAND RAPIDS	210	360	360
Oakland	206	520	720
Lake Michigan	200	350	350
Lansing	185	263	263
Henry Ford	180	360	360
Macomb	180	360	360
Bay de Noc	180	240	240
Gogebic	180	210	240
Alpena	165	235	235
Highland Park	100	272	272

^a Delta College also charges a differential tuition for evening school: \$300 for resident, \$510 for non-resident and out-of-state.

* Ranked according to highest resident charges; where resident charges are the same, ranked according to highest non-resident charges.

Source: Junior/Community College Annual Statistical and Financial Reports, 1965-66.

Prospects and Alternatives

Future prospects of Grand Rapids Junior College are closely related to the matters of organizational control and finances. The latter two are, of course, inter-related in that different organizational control patterns may provide different financial bases and resources.

Presently, of the 26 junior/community colleges (19 now in operation) organized as of the fall, 1965, only seven, including Grand Rapids, are organized as a department of a school district and dependent upon the school board for policy formulation and financial support. With the exception of Schoolcraft which covers part of a county all other colleges encompass one or more counties or one or more intermediate school districts. At least five of these colleges were originally organized as a department of a single school district and evolved into county-wide or intermediate school district-wide community colleges.

The Citizens Committee on Higher Education emphatically stated in its final report:

. . . within the framework of the overall state plan for higher education, it is important that each community college have its own district and its own governing board entirely separate from the K-12 school district and its governing board. The community college needs a larger district and tax base than the Michigan public school district normally has. It must develop its own educational philosophy and program, have its own faculty, its own budget and salary scale, and otherwise develop into an independent post-secondary institution.

There are two basic organization alternatives available to the Grand Rapids board of education--a county-wide community college and or continuing the present system of control.

County-Wide Community College

A county-wide community college would have an independent board of trustees, responsible directly to all the people of the county. (In this discussion the term county and county-wide college is used, but the arguments would apply equally to a community college covering the area of the intermediate school district or a multi-county district.) The area served by the community college under the jurisdiction of the independent board would include 75% of the present Grand Rapids Junior

College enrollment while the area served by Grand Rapids board of education provides 60% of its enrollment. Thus, a sizable majority of those served by the college would have a voice in the selection of its policy-makers. Policy-making for the college would be separated from policy-making for elementary and secondary education. Some observers claim that the community college should not be an extension of the secondary schools and the only way to achieve a distinction in policies is to have separate boards for the two levels of education. Top administrators of an independent community college would have direct access, organizationally, to the policy-making board and would not have to compete with other areas of the educational system.

Grand Rapids Junior College, if placed on a county-wide basis, would follow the prevailing practice for community college organization and the general intent of the recommendation of the Citizens Committee for Higher Education. It could provide educational leadership throughout the entire county, particularly in the area of vocational-technical education and adult education. Separated from the Grand Rapids school board, it might serve the other school boards in the same capacity it now serves Grand Rapids and provide educational services to all school districts in accordance with their particular needs and requirements.

A further argument in support of turning Grand Rapids Junior College into a county-wide institution is that such a move would give it a broader tax base and that it would be financially independent of the limited funds available to it from the school board. Shifting to a county-wide organization would almost double the college's tax base, from Grand Rapids' (school district) state equalized value of \$621,000,000 to Kent County's \$1,273,000,000. The rate of an independent county-wide community would be set by the board of trustees within the tax limitations established by the voters.

A counter argument to this is that the creation of a county-wide community college with an independent board of trustees with taxing powers would add to the tax burden of all the citizens of Kent County. However, the out-county junior college student would benefit by the \$150 reduction in annual tuition. (One observer suggested that the most appropriate solution would be to amalgamate all present school districts in the county into one county-wide school system, including the junior college.) One possible consequence of the failure to establish a county-wide community college could be the discussion to create a second community college by the out-county school districts. Such a move would dilute the financial resources available within the county for junior college education and split the potential enrollment between two institutions and, thereby, limit the development of Grand Rapids Junior College. The out-county area now has approximately half of the tax base and more than half of the pool of potential enrollees.

Grand Rapids School Board Control

A second alternative is to retain the present system under which the college is a department of the Grand Rapids school system. Arguments in favor of the present arrangement are several, but they are generally related to two basic themes, unity of educational policy and administration and tradition.

Presently, with the junior college under the school board's jurisdiction, the Grand Rapids school system can plan educational programs for the K-14 level and utilize the junior college to achieve some of its policies related to the K-12 programs. With the board's recent commitment to the social policy of assisting in the removal of de facto segregation in Grand Rapids, the junior college may also be used in achieving this policy. Finally, it is argued that the type of student clientele that a junior/community college is designed to serve resides primarily within the jurisdiction of the Grand Rapids school board.

Administratively, there are advantages to the unified K-14 system. The entire school system comes under the supervision of a general administrative officer, the superintendent of schools. He is administratively responsible for the supervision of the schools, and the argument that the board is too busy to supervise the junior college in addition to elementary and secondary schools is not, therefore, a sound one. Integrated administration should provide economies of scale in purchasing, hiring, and other central services. A separate, independent community college would have to duplicate these services at a possibly higher cost. Finally, from the point of view of a career system, the junior college offers teachers in the secondary system an opportunity for advancement, and it offers the college an available pool of teachers.

The argument of tradition is based on the fact that Grand Rapids Junior College was founded and organized by the Grand Rapids board of education before the first state law permitting the creation of junior colleges in Michigan was passed by the state legislature. Throughout the years, through prosperity and depression, the board of education has supported the existence of the junior college. It was under the jurisdiction of the school board that the junior college developed its value to the community and acquired the reputation it now has. Therefore, this argument runs, it seem incongruous to shift the control away from the school board, a known quantity, to an independent board, an unknown quantity particularly at a time when the present school board is in the midst of implementing new policies for the future of the junior college. A transfer at this time would undoubtedly cause a set back in the forward movement of the college.

A Possible Solution

Arguments for the establishment of a single community college for Kent County built upon the 50 years of service of the Grand Rapids Junior College are persuasive. It also seems to be evident that a shift in the basic control of Grand Rapids Junior College at this time would interfere detrimentally in developments that appear to be underway to expand the campus and the programs and services of the college. A more practical alternative might be for the Grand Rapids board of education to determine and make known its position on the desirability of establishing a county-wide community college district. If it is the belief of the board that this is in the best interest of the junior college and the people of Grand Rapids and Kent County, then the board might set a timetable for the development of the college and a target date for its establishment as an independent community college.

In this manner, the board might resolve the issue of the organizational pattern for the college and at the same time prevent any disruption of the present developmental plans for the college. In the interim period of time, the school board and other responsible officials could address themselves to the exact conditions of the transfer, to the prospective problems that might arise, and to the matter of developing support for such a program.

As part of its commitment, the Grand Rapids board of education might explore the possibility of creating an advisory committee representing the entire county to assist in development of the present plans for the college and its eventual transfer. The board might also consider reducing its non-resident tuition fee for students living in the county but outside of the Grand Rapids school district if the county board of supervisors is willing to provide financial assistance as provided by Section 794 of the school code of 1955 (Public Act 269). This section permits "any county . . . to contribute annually toward the support of a community college to a school district maintaining such institution: Provided that whenever such contribution is made, the fees charged by the said school district for instruction shall be uniform throughout the said county. . . ."

This suggestion does not constitute a simple solution to the problem of providing junior college opportunities for all the people of Kent County. It does, however, provide a means of obviating the consequences that might result from the Grand Rapids board of education retaining permanent control of the junior college or switching the college to county-wide control without giving present plans for development a chance to gel.

A Fact Tank Cannot Run on Fumes

Do you find this report useful and want to support analysis that will lead to better policy decisions and better government in Michigan? Your support of Citizens Research Council of Michigan will help us to continue providing policy makers and citizens the trusted, unbiased, high-quality public policy research Michigan needs.

Please visit www.crcmich.org/donate or fill out the form below and send it to:



Citizens Research Council of Michigan
38777 Six Mile Road, Suite 208
Livonia, MI 48152-3974

You can learn more about the organization at www.crcmich.org/about.

**YES! I want to help fill Michigan's Fact Tank
and support sound public policy in Michigan!**

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

EMAIL / PHONE _____

- I wish to make a one-time, tax-deductible gift of: \$ _____
- I wish to pledge a total of \$ _____ with an initial payment of \$ _____
- I would like my contribution to support: _____ Annual Fund _____ Endowment

e Please mark my gift:

Anonymous In Honor Of: _____

In Memory Of: _____

- Gift will be matched by:

Or donate online at www.crcmich.org/donate