# DESEGREGATING HIGHER EDUCATION: AN ANALYSIS OF THE MARYLAND PLAN


by

**Merritt J. Norvell, Jr., Ph.D.**

**University of Wisconsin-Madison**

# DESEGREGATING HIGHER EDUCATION:

# AN ANALYSIS OF THE MARYLAND PLAN

By

MERRITT J. NORVELL, JR., Ph.D.
University of Wisconsin-Madison

Published
By
SOUTHERN EDUCATION FOUNDATION
811 Cypress Street, N. E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30308

# FOREWORD

The Southern Education Foundation has had a continuing interest in the Adams litigation and in the consequences that have flowed from the opinion and orders of Judge Pratt in the District Court of the District of Columbia. The Foundation has seen this case as most important in opening up access to higher education opportunities for black students, particularly in the South. SEF has sponsored a series of conferences on various aspects of the access problem which have surfaced following the Adams litigation. From these conferences a number of monographs have been published, and this publication is another in the series.

SEF supported Dr. Norvell's research in Maryland and is now glad to publish a summary of his larger research study. It is our feeling that in this careful study of desegregation and the changing of the dual system in Maryland there is much to be learned for the guidance of other states, whether or not they are among the ten states named in the Adams litigation.

Additional copies of this report may be obtained from the Foundation at a cost of $2.00 per copy.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to express his appreciation to the Southern Education Foundation and its Board of Directors for recognizing the timeliness of this study and for providing the financial support to make it possible. A special note of thanks to Dr. Steven J. Wright who was instrumental in providing counsel and guidance during the formative stages of the study. It is with deep appreciation that I thank Professors Joseph F. Kauffman, B. Dean Bowles and Donald J. McCarty for their expert guidance and assistance.

Finally, a very special thanks to Dr. Glenwood C. Brooks, of the Maryland Council for Higher Education, Mr. Tony Miles, former Assistant General Counsel for HEW-OCR, and the administrators in Maryland's three public segments of higher education for taking time out of their busy schedules to participate in this study.

ABSTRACT

One of the principal legal cases that has initiated what appears to be a very lengthy and controversial legal struggle between the courts and higher education, and the state and federal governments, is the case of Kenneth Adams, et al. v. Elliott L. Richardson (currently Mathews). Adams is a comprehensive class action suit that charges HEW with defaulting in its legal responsibility to enforce Title VI of the U. S. Civil Rights Act of 1964, and permitting ten states to receive federal funds while continuing to operate racially dual systems of higher education.

This monograph is based on a larger study which was designed to identify and clarify the local campus, inter-campus, and inter-segment problems and issues confronting the administrators and governing board members in the State of Maryland's three public segments of higher education as they implemented the MARYLAND PLAN FOR COMPLETING THE DESEGREGATION OF THE PUBLIC POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS IN THE STATE. The study focuses on the five program categories of the State Plan: Student Composition, Financial Aid, Employment Composition, Program Cooperation, and Administrative Coordination. It also identifies those problems that are associated with the variables of inter-campus and inter-segment relationships and the variable of race.

Major Findings

(1) The most complex and visible desegregation problems and issues were related to the plan categories of Student and Employment Composition, which reflected the greatest differences and

# I. INTRODUCTION

While most local and national attention regarding desegregation and public schooling has focused on elementary and secondary educational systems, there has been increasing concern and controversy surrounding the desegregation of higher education. The relationships between desegregation, increased educational opportunity, and the organization of higher education are extremely complex and are not well understood by citizens or by educational administrators and public policy makers.

The purpose of this monograph is to provide insight into the problems and issues encountered in the implementation of a statewide plan for eliminating a racially dual system of higher education by using the State of Maryland as a case study. The monograph is, in fact, based on a larger study by the author titled THE DESEGREGATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION: A CASE STUDY OF THE PROBLEMS AND ISSUES CONFRONTING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MARYLAND PLAN FOR COMPLETING THE DESEGREGATION OF ITS PUBLIC POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS.[1] This monograph focuses on the findings of the larger study which are perceived to be most relevant to educational administrators and policymakers in related agencies who are responsible for preparing, implementing, or monitoring state desegregation plans.

---

[1] Merritt J. Norvell, Jr., "The Desegregation of Higher Education: A Case Study of The Problems and Issues Confronting The Implementation of The Maryland Plan For Completing The Desegregation Of Its Public Postsecondary Education Institutions," (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Educational Administration, University of Wisconsin-Madison), 1976.

Legal Background of the Larger Study

Much of the recent public interest in the desegregation of higher education has been precipitated by a private litigation against the U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW), 206 elementary and secondary schools, and 10 state systems of higher education. The principal legal case that has initiated what appears to be a very lengthy and controversial legal struggle between the federal and state governments is the case of Kenneth Adams et al., v. Elliot L. Richardson,[2] (currently Mathews). Adams is a comprehensive class action suit that charges HEW with defaulting in its legal responsibility to enforce Title VI of the U. S. Civil Rights Act of 1964 by permitting ten states to receive federal funds while continuing to operate racially dual systems of higher education. The suit was filed in October, 1970,by the Legal Defense Fund of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP-LDF) on behalf of thirty-one students and two taxpayers.

On February 16, 1973, U. S. District Judge John H. Pratt[3] agreed with the plaintiffs that HEW had indeed failed to enforce compliance with Title VI; his decision was later upheld by the U. S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia on June 12, 1973. Ten states (Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, and Virginia) were ordered to submit comprehensive state plans for desegregating their public systems of

---

[2]Kenneth Adams, et al. v. Elliot L. Richardson, 480 F.2nd 1159, 356 F.Supp. 92 (1973).

[3]Adams v. Richardson, U. S. Court of Appeals, 480 F.2nd 1159, at 1164-65.

higher education. On June 21, 1974, HEW accepted the desegregation plans of eight states. Louisiana refused to submit a plan and Mississippi submitted only a partial plan; both are currently involved in litigation with the Department of Justice.

Fourteen months later on August 4, 1975, a Motion for Further Relief in the Adams case was filed in the U. S. District Court for the District of Columbia by the NAACP-LDF. The motion charged that except for a small increase of white students and faculty at the formerly black schools, and a continued token black presence on the white campuses, the higher education institutions in the ten states remained essentially unchanged; their student bodies, faculties, distributions of program offerings, physical plants, and governance still reflected the segregated pattern and racial stratification which prevailed before 1954.

Thus, the Adams case which has already been in litigation for more than six years has prompted debate on some very fundamental issues. It has moved beyond the issues of equal access and freedom of choice to attack the questions of equity, racial balance, affirmative duty, the future role of black schools, state-wide responsibility, and of course the constitutional rights of the federal and state governments. This monograph which is based on the larger case study of the statewide desegregation of higher education in Maryland (cited above) is designed to shed light on some of these issues and asssociated problems.

## Design of the Total Study

The exploratory field study was conducted in Maryland during 1974-75. It was designed to identify and clarify the problems and issues confronting administrators and governing board members as they implemented

the state's plan for eliminating racial dualism in its three public segments of higher education: the University of Maryland Segment, the Maryland State College Segment, and the Community College Segment. Maryland was selected for the study because it seemed to have many of the same problems that were confronting the other nine Adams states; that is, it seemed to have the necessary ingredients of educational organization, political history, and racial participation.

The study focused on the five program categories of the Maryland desegregation plan: Student Composition, Financial Aid, Employment Composition, Program Cooperation, and Administrative Coordination. One predominantly black and one predominantly white campus were selected from each of the three higher education segments for inclusion in the study. They were: the University of Maryland-Eastern Shore, the University of Maryland-College Park, Morgan State University, Towson State College, the Community College of Baltimore, and Essex Community College. The research instrument was an interview schedule which utilized eight open-ended questions that focused on the five program categories (see Appendix A). The respondent sample included 69 individuals who represented the principal line officers on each campus, those campus and segment administrators whose primary responsibility was directly related to the five program categories, the governing boards of the segments, the Maryland Council for Higher Education, and the community at large. In addition to the interviews, public documents, reports, and studies that related to the desegregation plan were used as primary sources of data.

## The Focus of the Monograph

This monograph focuses on the issues identified in the larger study which have broad applicability to the desegregation of higher education. The categories of Student Composition and Employment Composition seem more useful in this regard than the other three. While some findings related to Financial Aid, Program Cooperation, and Administrative Coordination do have implications beyond the State of Maryland, these areas are more directly tied to specific political and organizational conditions in Maryland than are the other two categories. Therefore, Section II of this monograph describes briefly the six institutions with regard to desegregation issues related to Student Composition and Employment Composition, and Section III discusses the differences and similarities between the three higher education segments and between the black and white colleges on these two variables. Also included is a summary of similarities among all six institutions.

The author believes that the problems faced by predominantly black institutions in attempting to desegregate deserve special attention and that Adams has specific implications for both urban and rural black schools. Section IV of the monograph presents a comparison of problems faced by two such institutions: The University of Maryland-Eastern Shore located in rural Maryland, and Morgan State University located in urban Baltimore.

Finally, the monograph concludes with a summary of some practical implications of the findings for educational administrators and a set of recommendations which are based in part directly on the findings of the study, and in part on the opinions and observations of the author.

Hopefully, this discussion will prove useful to administrators and policy-makers throughout the country who are responsible for eliminating racial dualism in higher education.

## II. SIX INSTITUTIONS: STUDENT AND EMPLOYMENT COMPOSITION

The study included six institutions: one predominantly black and one predominantly white institution from each of three postsecondary education segments. They were: the University of Maryland-Eastern Shore and the University of Maryland-College Park; Morgan State University and Towson State College; the Community College of Baltimore and Essex Community College. In this section each of these institutions is described briefly in terms of findings related to student composition and employment composition.

### The University of Maryland-Eastern Shore

The predominantly black University of Maryland-Eastern Shore (UMES) is a 1890 Land Grant College which was founded as a private institution in 1876, and in 1970 became the first public black college in the U. S. to become a branch of a predominantly white public university. Located in sparsely populated rural Somerset County on Maryland's lower Eastern Shore, UMES is the smallest of the five schools in the University segment with a Fall 1974 enrollment of 1,212 students.

#### Student Composition

Much of the investigation in this category focused on the institution's efforts to recruit, admit, financially support, and retain other race students.* The student composition at UMES in the fall of 1974 was

*The term other race students is from the MARYLAND PLAN and refers to non-whites (primarily blacks) at predominantly white institutions and to whites at predominantly black institutions.

67.6 percent black, 2.1 percent other minority (all other non-whites such as American Indians, Asian-Americans, and Spanish-surnamed Americans), and 30.2 percent white. Therefore, at UMES increasing other race enrollment meant increasing the number of white students. However, this goal must be viewed in the context of efforts to increase overall enrollment at UMES--because of being small, black, and rural this campus had experienced a problem of underenrollment for the past decade. The following factors were identified as local campus problems and issues which were related to orderly enrollment growth, increased white student presence, and the ability of the institution to create an acceptable multiracial and cultural environment.

Location and Community Attitudes

Located in Princess,Anne which had a population approximately the same size as the campus, UMES is not easily accessible via public transportation. Its geographic isolation is complicated by the fact that predominantly white Salisbury State College with an enrollment of 3,025 students is only nine miles away in a more densely populated city, with a modern physical plant, broader program base, and a graduate school. As one college administrator asserted, "Attitudes in this area are Southern, white Southern and black Southern, and there still exists strong separatist desires among the residents." These desires were reflected in the attitudes of local residents and high school counselors, toward UMES.

Poor Public Image

Interviewees described the majority of the student body as educationally

disadvantaged and lacking in preparation for entrance into a more selective institution. In addition to its local image of academic mediocrity, UMES had received negative publicity as the result of the murder of a faculty member and a physical confrontation between the former Chancellor and an administrator.

White Student Recruitment

The white student recruitment program was found to be fragmented and disorganized. It was coordinated by the Human Relations and Chancellor's offices rather than the Admissions Office. Also, in recruiting both black and white students, numbers rather than quality were claimed to be a guiding principle. Because of low enrollment the school admitted students below University of Maryland segment standards and increased the number of unclassified (i.e., non-degree-seeking) students.

White Students and Campus Environment

The institutional environment of UMES did not accommodate the social needs of white students, even though they represented the highest concentration of Eastern Shore residents enrolled at UMES. They tended to be older, academically motivated, male, and married; 96 percent lived off campus. Also, 23.2 percent were found to be in the unclassified student category as opposed to 10.9 percent of the black students. As a result white students were described as "being on the campus, but not of it." They did not participate in campus activities (which generally reflected black themes), did not make demands on the institution regarding their social needs, and did not wish to be considered special. As a result, no special programs had been created for them.

Internal Black Resistance To Desegregation

While the campus leadership promoted a multi-racial campus with a black base, a growing number of black students and faculty were committed to preserving the black character of UMES. This attitude inhibited expression of the multiracial philosophy and was interpreted by others as being anti-white. Consequently, the level of institutional response to white student needs was significantly affected.

In addition to these local campus problems, there were inter-campus and inter-segment problems associated with the proximity of Salisbury State College, a predominantly white school with a strong regional flavor. Inter-campus rivalries, the politics and personalities of the individual campus leaders, and the consumer patterns of the students were three problems which were compounded by the issues of regionalization and institutional costs (higher per pupil costs at UMES). As a result most inter-campus and inter-segment programming appeared to be cosmetic and resulted in little increased other race student presence on either campus.

In summary, problems and issues associated with student composition at UMES included its geographic isolation, its public image as a black, academically poor institution, its fragmented recruitment program, the attitudes of local residents and high school counselors, the black internal resistance to desegregation, and the lack of campus involvement by white students. Inter-campus, inter-segment relationships did not help mitigate these problems.

Employment Composition

The employment aspect of the Maryland desegregation plan called for increasing and upgrading other race presence at all levels of employment

in the public postsecondary institutions. UMES was found to have been rather successful in recruiting and hiring a multiracial staff. In fact, it had the most racially integrated work force in the University segment, as 35 percent of that work force in the fall of 1974 was found to be white. However, this success was not without its problems. The following items were identified as local campus problems and issues associated with employment.

Recruitment and Hiring of Black Faculty

Frequently, there was only one black applicant per vacancy at UMES although salaries at the assistant and associate professor levels were the highest in the University segment. Its lack of modern facilities, its image as a school for the educationally disadvantaged, and its location in a reputedly racist area were factors which made competing in the national market for black faculty extremely difficult. Young white Ph.D.'s. on the other hand, were willing to spend a few years at UMES until new opportunities arose elsewhere.

Internal Black Resistance to Increased White Leadership

In line with his multiracial philosophy, the UMES chancellor had increased white employee participation in the middle management positions. This sudden increase in white staff caused strained relationships between black faculty and white administrators. As a result, the chancellor became the target of a student, faculty, and staff group which pledged to keep the campus predominantly black and black controlled, and he resigned on August 1, 1975.

Liberal White Faculty

The influx of young liberal white faculty members created several problems. They were accused by some of their black colleagues of refusing to place academic demands on black students, being personally occupied with such topics as sex and revolution, and tolerating street tactics by students in order to avoid personal confrontations.

White Faculty Retention

Faculty and staff turnover was identified as a major problem and was found to be particularly high among white faculty members. Black faculty felt that whites accepted employment at UMES as a temporary measure because they could not find comparable positions and salaries at other schools.

In addition to these local campus problems, there were inter-campus and inter-segment problems related to employment. Although University segment personnel policy allowed a faculty member to teach at least one course as an overload at another institution, this practice was not a major vehicle for creating other race faculty presence at UMES. There were no joint faculty appointments between UMES and other schools in the University segment nor were there faculty exchanges with schools in the other two segments. Reasons given were: the lack of uniform faculty policy and hiring standards among the campuses and segments, differentiated salary schedules, legal prohibitions against inter-segment appointments, and geographic restrictions on joint appointments (restricted to closely adjacent institutions). Also, cooperative ventures were inhibited by the rivalries which formed among schools as each attempted to maintain

a competitive edge in recruiting quality faculty.

In summary, recruitment and hiring of black faculty, internal black resistance to increased white leadership, the influx of white liberal faculty, high white faculty turnover, and lack of inter-campus/segment cooperation were all issues related to employment composition at UMES. In spite of problems in these areas, however, UMES was succeeding in desegregating its faculty and staff.

## The University of Maryland-College Park

The largest and most comprehensive campus in Maryland, the University of Maryland-College Park (UMCP) had an enrollment of 34,621 students in 1974. UMCP was familiar with the issues of desegregation as it was reportedly the first Southern public university to admit Negro undergraduates after the 1954 Brown decision. The campus is located in a suburban area north of Washington, D.C.

### Student Composition

According to the 1970 census, the non-white population of Maryland was 18.6 percent of the total population, with blacks alone representing 17.8 percent. However, minority students represented 10.8 percent of the total student enrollment at UMCP in the fall of 1974, with blacks accounting for only 6.2 percent of the total. Also, minority students were found to be overwhelmingly concentrated at the undergraduate level. The challenge at UMCP was to increase minority, particularly black, student enrollment and retention at both the undergraduate and graduate levels.

Several local problems and issues were identified as being obstacles to reaching this goal.

Racist Image

The campus still suffered from a racist image acquired during the days of segregation when admission of blacks was only possible via long and expensive court litigation. Local campus efforts to improve this image were frequently countered by what white respondents regarded as negative publicity from local civil rights organizations which continued to characterize UMCP as a racist institution. This publicity was regarded as a major barrier to attracting black students.

Minority Student Transfers From Community Colleges

There was a low number of other race student transfers to UMCP from the Community College segment in spite of the fact that (a) 41.7 percent of the state's total black student postsecondary enrollment was in the Community College segment, and (b) a new statewide matriculation policy permitted the inter-segment transfer of grades and credit among any of the state's public postsecondary institutions. In fact, while community college transfers accounted for 8.3 percent of the total student enrollment at UMCP, minority transfers represented only 7.4 percent of the total number of transfers, and black students represented only 3.3 percent.

Two consistent explanations were given for this phenomenon: (a) that the overwhelming majority of other race students in the Community College segment were enrolled part-time in terminal vocational degree

programs, and (b) that minority students in general, and black students in particular, tended to transfer into the state colleges, especially the predominantly black colleges. This second explanation is backed up by the fact that black students accounted for 21.6 percent of those community college students who transferred into state colleges and for only 4.8 percent of those who transferred into the universities.

Counselor Attitudes

The UMCP had difficulty persuading both white and black high school and community college counselors to refer black students to the campus. The most influential factor was probably that an overwhelming majority of the black high school teachers and counselors in Maryland graduated from the state's predominantly black colleges. Many reportedly still regarded the UMCP as a racist institution which is governed and administered by some of the same individuals who were present during the days of segregation.

Minority Student Isolation

Although black students at UMCP were politically active when their interests were at stake, they did not actively participate in campus sponsored student activities. It was a common practice for blacks, particularly males, to spend their weekends off campus socializing in the predominantly black communities of Washington, D.C. and Baltimore, a situation which reportedly had created a special set of emotional and social problems for black females.

Black Student Attrition

Minority students, black students in particular, had a higher academic attrition and lower performance rate than non-minority students. For example, although minority students comprised only 10.8 percent of the student body, they accounted for 24.03 percent of the students dismissed and 20.3 of those placed on academic probation in fall semester, 1974. Also, even black students that were reportedly upwardly mobile and primarily middle class achieved grade point averages that were well below those of their white counterparts. One study indicated that the performance gap increased as the students progressed toward their senior year.

Faculty Opposition to Remedial Educational Programs

Some faculty members were reluctant to participate in remedial and compensatory education programs. Three explanations were given for this resistance: (a) historically, white academics have rejected the non-achieving white student as a penalty for his academic nonachievement; (b) the institutional reward system (promotion, tenure, professional recognition) does not reinforce faculty participation in remedial programs; and (c) some instructors believe that only the most deserving students should be allowed to enter a major university. These values were regarded as a major barrier to desegregation.

Minority Programs

UMCP has an Office of Minority Student Education which houses five programs whose specific purposes are to increase other race enrollment and retention, and to provide academic and other services to minority students. While these programs have helped increase enrollment of

minorities and employment of minority staff and faculty, many white respondents were critical of them. They accused UMCP of creating a black cocoon within the larger white infra-structure. It was discovered that OMSE duplicated many of the traditional student services such as academic and personal counseling, admissions, etc. According to some respondents, this approach had encouraged the mainstream student personnel services of UMCP to remain white student oriented.

In summary, the major problems and issues identified with regard to student composition were the racist image of UMCP, the low number of minority transfer students from community colleges, the referral preferences of both white and black high school and community college counselors, the social isolation of black students, the high attrition rate of minorities, faculty resistance to remedial programs, and the structure of the Office of Minority Student Education. In addition to these local campus problems, inter-campus and inter-segment rivalries and politics created an environment which was not conducive to cooperative efforts to aid student desegregation goals.

Employment Composition

Nonwhite employees represented 19.9 percent of the total campus work force, with blacks accounting for 16.6 percent. There was a marked underrepresentation of blacks in both the faculty and the executive and administration classifications, however, where they accounted for only 1.9 and 4.1 percent respectively. Thus, one of the major desegregation employment problems facing UMCP was a more equitable distribution of its nonwhite employees throughout all four personnel categories: executive and administrative, faculty, professional, and non-professional.

Respondents identified six problem areas related to the status of other race employment on campus.

National Pool of Black Faculty

There was a limited national pool of black faculty members. This pool was even more limited in the case of UMCP, a major graduate research institution which requires research interest and credentials. Many blacks can obtain top salaries from state colleges which emphasize teaching without enduring the research and publishing pressures of an institution like UMCP.

Low Faculty Turnover

The tight job market had greatly reduced the number of faculty seeking jobs elsewhere. This resulted in a reduced number of available new positions and opportunities for promotion to tenure. Some officials agreed that they would pay the highest salary rate for new black faculty members but would not grant unearned rank or tenure under any circumstances.

Promotion of Other Race Personnel

It was not only difficult to hire a black faculty member, but it was also described as being equally difficult to promote that individual into a position of campus leadership. It was reported that in order to be promoted to such a position a black individual must have impeccable academic credentials and a reputation as a tough, smart administrator. Once promoted the individual becomes free game in the marketplace. Dr. Mary F. Berry was promoted to Provost at UMCP, and shortly thereafter was hired as Chancellor of the University of Colorado Boulder campus.

Economic Conditions and Competing Priorities

The no growth budget recommended by the governor for fiscal year

1976-77 was expected to have an impact on desegregation plans. All new personnel positions were to be phased in during the last part of 1975, which meant that new desegregation positions would only be partially filled and that the savings would be used to fill positions in other more critical areas of need for the remainder of that year.

Affirmative Action vs. Desegregation

The campus Affirmative Action Office staff was also responsible for coordinating the campus desegregation plan, a situation which was not universally approved. Some respondents felt that it would be easier and cheaper for the campus to respond to the women's demands because of their numbers, training, and political organization. By housing the two programs together it was believed that affirmative action might be promoted at the expense of desegregation which would require a greater allocation of resources and a more sustained commitment.

Isolation of Black Staff and Faculty

Campus minority personnel were isolated into black program areas and student affairs offices which were generally regarded as campus problem spots for minority students. The most critical consequence of this isolation was that it removed a large group of people from the mainstream of institutional decision making and policy, creating two classes of minority faculty and staff.

In summary, local problems related to employment composition included the limited pool of black faculty members, low faculty turnover, lack of promotional opportunities to executive positions, the no growth budget, the relationship of desegregation to affirmative action, and the isolation

of minority staff. In addition, as described in connection with Eastern Shore, differences among the campuses in the state regarding personnel and hiring practices mitigated against cooperative inter-campus or inter-segment employment arrangements which might have aided desegregation efforts.

## Morgan State University

Located in the Baltimore metropolitan area, Morgan State University is the largest and most comprehensive predominantly black campus in Maryland; it had a 1974 enrollment of 5,755 students. One of eight institutions in the State College segment, Morgan is a liberal arts school with 22 undergraduate departments and 18 graduate programs; its mission is to improve and serve the urban community. It officially became Morgan State University as of July 1, 1975 and was undergoing a transition from college to university status.

### Student Composition

White students represented only 12.3 percent of the total student body at Morgan. Further, 58.6 percent of the whites were graduate students, 47 percent of them were enrolled part-time, and 72 percent were male. The average white student enrolled at Morgan was described as: over 21 years of age; male, financially needy, but self-supporting; a transfer student; enrolled part-time; a good student academically; a graduate student; and a commuter from the immediate urban area. Because 42.8 percent of the total number of graduate students were white as compared to only 5.7 percent of the full-time undergraduates, a major

desegregation goal was to increase white full-time undergraduate enrollment. Further, because 95 percent of Morgan's full-time white undergraduates were found to be participating in the Other Race Grants Program, the campus needed to attract prospective white students who would not require such funds. The Other Race Grant Program was a state-funded student financial aid program which was used to promote attendance of students at institutions where they were in a racial minority. Several problem areas were identified as obstacles to meeting student desegregation goals.

Counselor and Parent Resistance

White high school counselor and white parent resistance were barriers to the increased enrollment of white undergraduates. The counselors reportedly tended to refer only black students to predominantly black schools and parents were reluctant to financially support their children's attendance at these schools.

Black Image

Morgan had repeatedly expressed its mission as being urban oriented and as responding to the educational needs of black people, a message that some whites interpreted as anti-white.

Location and Housing

Because the overwhelming majority of Morgan's students were commuters, the racial transition from white to black that had occurred in the neighborhood surrounding the campus was identified as a barrier to increased white undergraduate enrollment. A related problem was inadequate housing as the campus sought to expand its housing facilities into the private

housing market in order to accommodate its growing number of out-of-state students (30 percent of the total).

Degree Requirements

Morgan was the only campus in the State College segment that required 128 credits for graduation rather than the 120 credits required by the state. This requirement extended the degree program an extra semester and added to both the campus's and student's educational costs.

White Transfers From Community Colleges

During the fall of 1974, 4.5 percent of Morgan's undergraduates were community college transfers but only 22.7 of these transfers were white in spite of the fact that whites accounted for 76.7 percent of the total transfers from Community College to the State College segment. As stated above with regard to the University of Maryland-College Park, there was a tendency for black community college transfers to enroll in the predominantly black state colleges and for whites to enroll in the University segment.

Unresponsive Student Personnel Services

According to some of the respondents, Morgan had been less than competitive in the recruitment and retention of both black and white students because of its unresponsive student personnel services. For example, Morgan did not have a separate Office of Student Admissions until 1970, and had a pregnancy rule for women until 1971. Morgan had historically catered to the children of the black middle class and student services had not changed sufficiently to meet the needs of the changing student body.

Changing Character of Student Body

With the emergence of desegregation, increasing numbers of middle class black students who had enrolled historically at Morgan began to enroll at white schools and the character of Morgan's student body began to change. Morgan was found to be attracting an increasing number of low income, ill-prepared inner-city youth. Some respondents theorized that as a result, some whites viewed Morgan's academic environment as being less competitive and as having different cultural values from their own.

Fee Cost

Morgan was found to have the highest fee cost of any state college and most respondents questioned whether the student received any more services for the costs than the rival institutions were providing.

Lack of Programs for White Students

No special campus programs for white students were identified with the exception of the employment of one white counselor and a white recruiter. According to one respondent, little was being done to develop a campus environment responsive to white student needs.

Internal Resistance to Desegregation

According to the respondents there was no overt resistance on campus to desegregation, but there was a population of students and faculty who wished to keep Morgan black. The presence of this group had reportedly influenced an administrative decision to keep the desegregation and affirmative action programs at a low profile as a means of reducing internal friction.

In summary, problems which contributed to Morgan State University's minimal success in increasing its white student enrollment were: resistance by high school counselors and white parents, Morgan's black image, its location in a black neighborhood, the 128 credit rule, the low enrollment of white community college transfers, unresponsive student personnel services, the changing makeup of the student body, the high fee cost, the absence of special programs for whites, and internal resistance to desegregation. In addition to these local problems, the intense inter-campus and inter-segment rivalries that existed among the postsecondary institutions in the Baltimore metropolitan area inhibited cooperative programs that might have aided the goal of desegregation.

Employment Composition

White employees accounted for only 14.4 of the total Morgan work force with their highest concentration being in the instructional faculty where they represented 17.8 percent. In the executive category, 15.5 percent of the personnel were white, but all the vice-presidents were black. Whites had their lowest percentage of representation in the non-professional classification where they accounted for only 10.9 percent of the total. Five problems were identified with increasing white faculty and staff representation.

Inconsistent Campus Leadership

A lack of sustained leadership had resulted in misunderstandings, indecision, and poor communication between the administration and faculty. Morgan has had two presidents and an interim president since 1973.

Fragmented Faculty

Morgan was undergoing a leadership transition in which younger faculty

and staff were being elevated into leadership positions. This transition was identified as a primary factor in the existing state of instability and low faculty morale because it had resulted in a split between the younger faculty and the old guard.

Low Faculty and Staff Turnover

The state of the employment market had created two problems for Morgan. First, there was low faculty turnover, leaving few available slots for new hires. Second, because of the high national demand for black faculty Morgan feared losing its most reputable young black scholars due to its low salary scale and limited facilities.

Ceiling on Faculty Ranks

A major obstacle in hiring and promoting faculty members was the hiring ceiling placed on the number of assistant, associate and full professors in each of their respective ranks by the State Board of Trustees. These restrictions limited the number of new faculty positions that were available at Morgan. In addition, 24 faculty positions were cut from the budget during 1974-75.

White Faculty and Staff Isolation

White faculty and staff believe the campus is too black oriented but have chosen not to push their opinions because (a) most whites recognized and endorsed Morgan's special mission to black education, and (b) most were aware that a block of faculty, staff, and students were committed to keeping Morgan black and they did not want to antagonize this group. However, several had chosen to push their own individual cases as Morgan had three law suits against it for sex and race discrimination.

In summary, problems associated with employment composition included: changes in administrative and faculty leadership, low faculty turnover, the hiring ceiling on faculty ranks, and white faculty isolation. Once again inter-campus and inter-segment efforts to cooperate in personnel matters were minimal, and did not help alleviate local employment-related desegregation problems.

## Towson State College

With an enrollment of 13,041 students, Towson State College is the second largest public college in Maryland. Originally it was devoted exclusively to preparing teachers for the public schools in Maryland, but since 1963 its program offerings in the arts and sciences have been expanded although the strong professional program in teacher education has been maintained. Like Morgan, it is located in the Baltimore metropolitan area.

### Student Composition

In 1974 the non-white student population at Towson was 8.3 percent of the total enrollment, with blacks accounting for only 6.6 percent. Towson was committed to a goal of 14 to 16 percent minority enrollment by 1980. Other race recruiting efforts were aimed primarily at blacks due to their under-representation and the predominantly black racial composition of Baltimore. Several local campus problems and issues were identified related to student composition at Towson.

#### Minority Recruitment

Several areas of concern were identified by the admissions staff of

Towson's minority recruitment program. First, white high school counselors continued to ignore Towson recruiters and were directing black students primarily to the black campuses. Second, the increasing performance gap between incoming black and white students was a concern because Towson was becoming more selective in its admissions process due to over-enrollments. Finally, the most serious admission problem related to black students was that they applied late, refused to participate in the summer orientation program, and waited until the last day possible to register.

Black Student Retention

Although no specific other race retention study had been conducted at Towson, respondents claimed that black student attrition was three times greater than that of the total student population which was generally regarded as approximately 15 percent. Towson had attempted to counteract this high rate by readmitting 60 percent of those black students dropped for academic reasons.

Insufficient Academic Support

Towson had been unable to provide the academic support systems to assist students, both black and white, who came under-prepared in writing and reading skills. The campus philosophy was to integrate, not isolate, the black student population. However, two changes had impacted specifically on under-prepared blacks. In an attempt to provide integrated student services, a Study Skills Center which had been black-focused became accessible to all students, and usage time available to blacks was

reduced. Also, tutors were suddenly required to take a proficiency exam and to have a grade point of 3.0 or better which resulted in a reduced number of black tutors and decreased participation by under-prepared blacks.

Faculty Resistance to Remedial Courses

Once again, respondents acknowledged that there was faculty resistance to remedial course work. Also, the faculty reportedly continued to associate blackness with academic inferiority.

Black Students and the Campus Environment

The majority of black students came from predominantly black high schools in the inner-city of Baltimore and had difficulty adjusting to the white campus environment at Towson. They experienced culture shock and language difficulties, and had a tendency to isolate themselves socially. Inadequate housing contributed to social isolation because blacks applied late and dormitory accommodations were granted in order of application. Although there was administrative resistance to segregated programming, black students were described as politically active. They demanded and received special facilities and social programs which tended to increase their isolation.

In summary, problems and issues related to increasing black enrollment and retention at Towson were: white high school counselor resistance, increasing performance gaps between incoming black and white students, late applications by blacks, high black student attrition, inadequate academic support services, faculty resistance to remedial programs, and social isolation of blacks. In addition, inter-campus and inter-segment

rivalries once again inhibited cooperative arrangements which might have helped increase other race presence on the campus.

## Employment Composition

Towson had experienced difficulty in increasing minority faculty and staff employment, and in promoting minorities into positions of campus leadership. Blacks accounted for 22.8 percent of the total full-time employees and other minorities accounted for 2.6 percent. However, 90.5 percent of the black employees were concentrated in the non-professional job classification while only 3.1 percent of them held executive and administrative positions, and only 5.8 percent were faculty members. In contrast, 11.5 percent of the other minorities held executive and administrative positions, and 73 percent were faculty members. Therefore, the goal at Towson was to increase representation of blacks in administration and faculty positions. Several problems were identified as potential obstacles to reaching this goal.

### Low Faculty Turnover and High Tenure Rates

The limited academic job market had greatly reduced faculty vacancies that would have been filled via normal attrition. At the same time, faculty hires had not kept pace with expanded student enrollment. Also, the ceilings placed on faculty ranks by the State Board of Trustees were identified once again as a major factor limiting the number of new available faculty positions. As a result of these ceilings, some departments were one year away from being completely tenured with a very high percentage of the others rapidly approaching the 90 percent tenured level. Thus, it became impossible in many departments to reward the achievements of their junior faculty with promotion.

Low Faculty Salary Scale

Respondents complained that Towson was unable to compete for strong black faculty because of its low salary scale. This fact, combined with the fact that the campus was hiring almost exclusively at the assistant professor and instructor levels, resulted in most new black faculty members being young, inexperienced, and inexpensive. Black students tended to expect leniency from these younger faculty members and refused to perform, a situation which was regarded as contributing to the high turnover of young black faculty and to the lack of black political solidarity on the campus.

Restrictive State Personnel Regulations

For all skilled classified positions (e.g., secretarial) the State Bureau of Personnel required a test, the results of which were used to supply a list of the top five candidates for each vacant position to the employer. Each of these candidates, according to their rank, had the right of first refusal of the position. Traditionally, blacks had not been on the list at all, or had not been among the top five applicants. Therefore, these regulations had the effect of restricting the hiring of blacks in the professional category at Towson. By contrast, no test was required for unskilled and semi-skilled positions which may be why 90.5 percent of Towson's black employees were found at the non-professional level.

Supervisor Resistance to Employee Improvement Programs

Only 10 percent of the employees took advantage of a Tuition Waiver Program which permitted them to take a maximum of two courses per semester, if approved by their immediate supervisor. Some supervisors

reportedly were reluctant to allow participation because increased preparation was thought to result in individual promotions and in increased competition at the supervisory level.

Economic Conditions and Competing Priorities

Once again the employment freeze imposed by the Governor of Maryland was described as resulting in reduced advertising and recruitment for desegregation positions. According to the Director of Finance, "Desegregation is headed on a collision course with other campus priorities and interest groups if we don't get extra funds to support our plan."

Affirmative Action and Desegregation

The Director of Affirmative Action was also responsible for monitoring the campus desegregation plan. She saw no major conflicts between the two programs, however, because 51 percent of all minority personnel were women. Her major concern was that continued budget problems together with low faculty turnover might mean that the number of open positions would be insufficient to meet desegregation objectives.

Program Isolation of Black Faculty and Staff

A majority of Towson's black employees in the executive, faculty, and professional categories were found to be concentrated either in minority programs or in line positions with responsibility for minority interests. As a result, these employees were isolated from the mainstream

of the campus.

In summary, problems and issues associated with increasing black employment at Towson were: low faculty turnover and high tenure rates, low faculty salary scale, restrictive state personnel rules, supervisor resistance to employee improvement programs, budget problems, potential conflicts between affirmative action and desegregation, and concentration of black staff members in minority programs. Once again inter-campus and inter-segment attempts to cooperate in order to help alleviate employment-related desegregation problems were minimal.

## The Community College of Baltimore

The Community College of Baltimore (CCB) is one of sixteen two-year public institutions in the Community College segment. With an enrollment of 8,309 it is the third largest community college in the state and is the only one which is predominantly black. Community colleges enroll 41.7 percent of the state's total black postsecondary students and CCB enrolls 55.5 percent of this total. Like all the community colleges, CCB has never been segregated by law and has been regarded as a local, low cost, open door institution. As a public urban campus it offers a full range of liberal arts and career education programs. For purposes of this discussion CCB is synonymous with the original Liberty Avenue campus; a branch campus, CCB-Inner Harbor, was under construction and was opened in fall 1976.

### Student Composition

Like a number of two-year urban institutions, CCB was experiencing

a shift from a predominantly white to a predominantly black student body. Its enrollment had shifted from 46.6 percent black in 1971 to 67.5 percent black in the fall of 1974. Since the percentage of black students was considerably above the percentage of blacks in the Baltimore population (a disparity of about 18 percent), desegregation efforts were focused on stabilizing the black enrollment and increasing or at least maintaining the current white enrollment. Because more whites than blacks were enrolled part-time (72.5 percent as opposed to 67.4 percent) another concern was how to continue to attract working, part-time white students and stabilize the full-time white enrollment. The following problems were identified with regard to stabilizing and maintaining the white enrollment at CCB.

White Student Flight To County Community Colleges

During 1974-75, about 1,100 city residents, mainly white, were enrolled in the three community colleges located in Baltimore County whereas only 400 county residents were enrolled at CCB. Several explanations were given for increased white flight. It was argued that the county campuses had new facilities which were attractive to full-time white students and that these campuses were geographically closer to where many whites live in the outer perimeters of Baltimore City. Another explanation was that the rapid racial transition of CCB from white to predominantly black had socially intimidated and isolated white students and had reduced the school's appeal to whites. Also, the high crime rate in the predominantly black neighborhood surrounding the CCB campus was believed to be a negative factor in attracting whites. Finally, many respondents claimed that because area employers tended to recruit only

at white campuses many white students felt they would increase their probability of employment by attending those schools.

Poor Public Image

CCB was increasingly regarded as a black school with a high concentration of academically marginal students. Many respondents felt that this newly acquired image would be difficult to overcome and would negatively affect the enrollment of white students. Frequent classroom friction between black students and white faculty, who were reportedly insensitive and unresponsive to the needs of marginally-prepared students, only served to reinforce this image.

The New Baltimore Inner Harbor Campus

CCB was constructing a new multi-million dollar branch campus (CCB-Inner Harbor) in downtown Baltimore. This move was regarded by many blacks as an accommodation for white students and an attempt to recruit the white blue collar students of Southeast Baltimore back into the CCB. A major desegregation concern was that the original campus (CCB-Liberty Avenue) might end up with only a small population of white students who could not afford to go elsewhere.

In addition to these local problems and issues, three inter-campus/inter-segment problems were identified as affecting student composition at CCB:

Absence of a Tuition Charge Back Plan for Non-Residents

Maryland's Community College segment did not have a tuition charge back plan for students who enroll outside their political subdivision. This was regarded by respondents as a major obstacle to the segment's

desegregation plan and as having a significant impact on other race student access to two-year institutions outside their college jurisdiction.

Inter-Campus and Inter-Segment Rivalries

Enrollment in general was a major concern for CCB and other community colleges in the state because the four-year campuses were increasingly recruiting those students who traditionally had been community college prospects. Within the segment, Essex Community College was regarded as a principal rival to CCB because of its proximity to students from Southeast Baltimore.

Lack of Other Race Grant Funds

Unlike the University and State College segments, the community colleges do not receive other race grant funds from the state to assist in recruiting students. This policy was believed to give the other two segments a competitive edge.

In summary, six problems and issues were identified as affecting the ability of CCB to maintain its white student enrollment: white flight to county community colleges, the black image of CCB, the creation of the CCB-Inner Harbor Campus, the absence of a tuition charge back plan for non-residents, inter-campus/segment rivalries, and the distribution of other race grant funds.

Employment Composition

Although CCB had a non-white student enrollment of 68.6 percent, its non-white employees represented only 38.8 percent of the total work force, a situation which reflected the former predominantly white composition of

the campus. In fact, the distribution of non-white personnel was similar to that found at the other predominantly white schools in the sample. All of the line officers and 84.5 percent of the faculty members were white. Once again the highest concentration of blacks was found to be in the professional (21.3 percent) and non-professional (56.5 percent) classifications. The following problem areas were identified with regard to increasing black faculty.

Collective Bargaining

CCB was the only public campus in the state with a faculty collective bargaining contract. Violation of the negotiated union contract was grounds for grievance. Union guidelines governing the hiring of new faculty were:

> No new unit member should be hired at a rank and pay higher than either someone already assigned to the appropriate discipline or disciplines or another unit member desirous of that position unless the new person is better qualified according to the standard and criteria set by the administration for the position that is open.[4]

Involvement of External City Agencies

CCB is legally an agency of the City of Baltimore and must comply with the budgetary and Civil Service personnel guidelines of the city. The major concern associated with this arrangement is that Baltimore is a union city and unions frequently influence the outcome of major public policy decisions. This factor must be reckoned with in implementing a desegregation plan.

---

[4]Memorandum of Understanding Between The Board of Trustees of The Community College of Baltimore and the Community College of Baltimore Faculty Federation, Local #1980, AFT, AFL-CIO, July 1, 1975-June 30, 1976, Article II, Sec. H, p. 3.

Departmental Faculty Rank Ceilings

The faculty union contract dictated that 45 percent of all departmental teaching faculty must be of associate and full professor rank. This arrangement had resulted in increased salary costs and had limited the capacity of the school to hire new black faculty, particularly at attractive rank and salary levels.

High Tenure Rates and Low Turnover

The faculty was found to be 85 percent tenured with an average age of 40-plus years. There were two explanations: it takes only three years to obtain tenure at CCB, and the salary scale is quite attractive.

Buddy System of Faculty Recruitment

The faculty and administration at CCB included a high representation of Jewish and former high school teachers and administrators in the Baltimore Public School System. Some respondents accused these subgroups of using the old buddy system to recruit their friends and colleagues.

Limited National Black Faculty Pool

Once again the small national black faculty pool was identified as a major barrier to increasing the number of black faculty members. Respondents argued that the majority of blacks who applied to CCB for employment were those who had limited credentials, were unable to find employment in the four-year institutions, and were consequently in a less competitive position when compared to white applicants.

White Faculty Flight to the Harbor Campus

The proposed opening of the new Harbor Campus presented both hope

and concern for the personnel objectives of the desegregation plan. It was feared that because the seniority system would permit the senior faculty the right of first choice regarding transfer, the new campus might be regarded as an escape route for white faculty from the predominantly black Liberty Avenue setting. However, it was also likely that instructional vacancies at both campuses would provide opportunities for hiring minorities.

Civil Service Restrictions

The civil service staff was found to be 98 percent white at CCB. Two problem areas were identified. It was found that in contrast to their white counterparts, black clerical staff who served black administrators were more likely to be classified as Senior Typists than Administrative Secretaries. Also, a larger percentage of the black clerical personnel was hired as hourly help and was less frequently transferred to Civil Service status.

Inflated Minority Employee Statistics

Some respondents believed that the campus had inflated its black faculty statistics by counting its instructional personnel who were involved in off-campus auxiliary programs and some skilled craftsmen who were instructors in the building trades program but were not counted as regular faculty for other campus policy purposes.

In summary, there were a number of local problems related to desegregation of employees at CCB: collective bargaining, involvement of city agencies, faculty rank ceilings, high tenure and low turnover, the buddy system of recruitment, the limited national black faculty pool,

white faculty flight, civil service restrictions, and inflated minority statistics. Like the other campuses in the study, CCB rejected most inter-campus and inter-segment possibilities for cooperation, such as joint appointments, which might have aided in desegregation of personnel.

## Essex Community College

Essex Community College is a new modern campus located in Northeastern Baltimore County. In 1974 it was the second largest of the three community colleges in that county with an enrollment of 7,248 students. Contributing about 1,000 transfer students per year to nearby Towson State, and was regarded as the primary feeder school for that institution.

### Student Composition

Only 2.9 percent of Essex's total enrollment was minority students. Blacks represented 75.3 percent of the total minority enrollment, but only 2.2 percent of the total student body. As a result, the objective of Essex's student desegregation plan was to increase the number of minority students, particularly blacks, to 5 percent of its student body by 1980. Several barriers to reaching this goal were identified.

#### Limited Black Population in Baltimore County

While blacks represented over 50 percent of the population of the City of Baltimore, they accounted for less than 3 percent of the Baltimore County residents, and an equal percentage of the Essex political subdivision. This fact made it difficult to recruit black students without violating an unwritten agreement among the two-year institutions not

to actively recruit in each other's jurisdiction. (CCB's efforts to recruit whites were, of course, also affected by this tacit agreement.)

Absence of a Tuition Charge Back Plan for Non-Residents

Once again the absence of a tuition charge back plan for non-resident students was identified as a major obstacle to achieving desegregation objectives. While there were predominantly black neighborhoods in Baltimore that were geographically closer to Essex than to CCB, the non-resident rule and associated costs kept potential black students from attending Essex.

Poor Mass Transit System

The Essex campus was located in an isolated pastoral area which was distant from the county's main mass transit systems. A student from the inner city of Baltimore had to take three different buses to get to Essex.

De Facto Segregation of Housing

According to respondents, the segregated housing patterns in the county were a major contributor to the limited population of blacks in the Essex political subdivision. Through selective buying and selling of area housing, whites had escaped the problems of the city and had managed to exclude racial minorities.

Image of Essex in Black Community

Located in the lowest per capita income area in Baltimore County, the Essex subdivision was populated by white, first and second generation blue collar workers from the Appalachian areas of the southeastern

seaboard. As a result, "Essex is regarded as redneck country by many blacks."

Limited Black Academic Support Staff

As a result of its low black enrollment, Essex had moved slowly to increase its black support staff. Only one black counselor was found on the student affairs staff.

Non-Resident White Enrollment

The number of non-resident white students attending Essex was rapidly increasing. The indirect impact of this trend was that these students were filling slots that would normally be filled by county residents or minority students.

In summary, problems related to student composition at Essex included: the limited black population of the county, the absence of a tuition charge back plan for non-residents, the poor mass transit system, de facto segregation of housing, the negative image of Essex by blacks, the limited black support staff, and the increasing non-resident enrollment. Inter-campus and inter-segment problems and issues were similar to those experienced at CCB.

Employment Composition

As was observed at other predominantly white schools, black personnel at Essex were concentrated in the professional and non-professional categories. The minority work force represented only 5.7 percent of the total with black employees accounting for only 3.2 percent. Further,

76.9 percent of these black employees were found in the professional and non-professional classifications. Stated another way, 6.7 percent of the professionals at Essex and 4.2 percent of the non-professionals were black while only 1.2 percent of the faculty was black. Therefore, the major employment desegregation objective at Essex was to increase the percentage of blacks, especially at the faculty level. Problems and issues associated with this goal are summarized briefly.

Local Campus Problems and Issues

The principal reasons given for the low representation of black faculty at Essex were: good black faculty were reluctant to work in community colleges; the salary scale was lower than the public school systems in the country; and there was a very low employee turnover rate among the faculty and staff (the faculty was 50 percent tenured). An explanation that was given for the low number of black classified personnel and staff specialists was the geographic isolation of the campus and its redneck image among many blacks.

Inter-Campus and Inter-Segment Issues

Like the Community College of Baltimore, no major inter-campus or inter-segment personnel problems were identified because Essex had not initiated any such programs as part of its local campus desegregation plan. The major inter-segment issue raised was that Essex was unable to compete with the more prestigious four-year institutions in the area for black faculty and staff because of its limited resources and its geographic isolation.

## III. INSTITUTIONAL COMPARISONS: MAJOR FINDINGS

A variety of problems and issues were identified as having an impact on the implementation of state and local postsecondary desegregation plans in Maryland. Some problems were found to be common to all institutions in the sample, others were unique to certain institutions, while others were unique to certain segments or subgroups of institutions. In the preceding section each of the six institutions included in the sample was described in terms of student composition and employment composition, two important elements of the state desegregation plan. The institutions included one black and one white school from each of three postsecondary segments: the University of Maryland System, the Maryland State College System, and the Community College System. This section discusses the black and white subgroups and the three segments in terms of the student and personnel desegregation problems unique to each of them. It concludes with a description of problems that are common to all the institutions, regardless of subgroup or segment identification.

### Differences Among Black and White Schools

#### Student Composition

Although some problems related to student desegregation were common to all schools in the sample, there were problems that were unique to white schools and to black schools.

Problems and Issues Unique to Black Schools

Some problems and issues were identified as being common among all three black schools in the sample while others were, of course, unique to a particular campus. For example, the three black schools had an average white enrollment of 21.8 percent of their total school population. The highest white enrollment was found at the Community College of Baltimore with 31.8 percent. The University of Maryland-Eastern Shore trailed slightly with 30.2 percent, and Morgan State had the lowest with 12.3 percent. Of the black schools, Morgan had the only graduate school and 58.6 percent of its white enrollees were graduate students. Stated another way, blacks accounted for 93.6 percent of Morgan's undergraduates in contrast to only 55.9 percent of its graduates. This situation was reflective of the general disparity in the state between undergraduate and graduate black enrollments as will be discussed later.

The most common problems associated with increasing white student enrollment at black schools were found to be: the black image of the schools; their geographic location in black neighborhoods or rural areas; the reluctance of white parents and white high school counselors to support and encourage attendance of whites at black schools; internal black student and faculty resistance to desegregation; and the general public's negative perception of the quality of the curriculum and the marketability of the degree from black schools. Problems related to black image and negative pupil perception were due, in part, to the fact that the student bodies of all three of the black schools were changing in character. UMES and Morgan were attracting an increasing number of academically under-prepared students from urban high schools. CCB was

undergoing a racial transition (white to black) which was forcing a re-evaluation of its desegregation objectives.

In addition to these problems associated with increasing white enrollment, there were problems and issues related to the type of white student the predominantly black institutions tended to attract. That student was found to be usually over 21 years of age, male, enrolled part-time, academically oriented, and self-supporting (unless attending Morgan State on an Other Race Grant). The student had no institutional allegiance to the black school, did not participate in extracurricular activities, and did not want to be considered special. As a consequence of the rather independent nature of the white students attending black schools, the black schools had not created special accommodations for them (except for the employment of one white recruiter and a white counselor).

Problems and Issues Unique to White Schools

The three predominantly white schools in the study had an average minority enrollment that was 7.3 percent of their total. The highest was the University of Maryland-College Park with 10.8 percent, and the lowest was Essex Community College with 2.9 percent. Towson had 8.3 percent.

The most common problems associated with increasing black enrollment at predominantly white schools were: the racist image of the schools; deadline violations by black students; the tendency of high school counselors to refer blacks to black colleges; increased competition for black students from all schools; self-imposed social isolation by black students; black student attrition; white faculty resistance to remedial coursework; black student stereotyping by white faculty and staff; and

low matriculation of black students from the community colleges.

In contrast to the black schools in the sample, the predominantly white schools tended to take special measures to accommodate their other race students. There was a much greater expenditure of funds to increase black enrollment and to rectify what these colleges perceived to be their racist image. They hired black recruiters, created educational opportunity programs, established minority cultural centers and study programs, and operated minority affairs offices. Many of these special accommodations have been created in response to demands by minorities. However, Towson State had already decentralized and integrated some student services due to cost/benefit considerations and UMCP was considering a similar move.

Summary: Black vs. White

There were some interesting similarities and differences between the black and white schools. Both suffered from their public image: black schools from a black, academically inferior image, and white schools from a racist image. Both had recruitment problems due to referral patterns of white high school counselors. Black students at predominantly white schools were socially isolated; the same was true of white students at predominantly black schools. In both instances, the isolation was self-imposed. However, white schools attempted to accommodate the needs of their black students by creating special programs and services while black schools made no special efforts to accommodate their white students.

A final interesting point of comparison is that the average black

student enrollment at the three white schools was considerably lower than the average white student enrollment at the black schools--5.2 percent as opposed to 21.8 percent. In other words, the predominantly black schools were found to be more racially integrated than the white schools with regard to student composition.

## Employment Composition

There were also similarities and differences among black and white institutions regarding desegregation of personnel. Each subgroup had its own unique problems and there were several interesting points of comparison.

### Problems and Issues Unique to Black Schools

At the three black schools, the white employees represented an average of 38.5 percent of the total work force, ranging from a high of 61.1 percent at the Community College of Baltimore to a low of 14.4 percent at Morgan. The University of Maryland-Eastern Shore had 31.9 percent. The highest concentration of white employees at black schools was found in the instructional faculty with an average of 49.8 percent of the total faculties--CCB had 84.5 percent white faculty, UMES had 47.3 percent and Morgan had 17.8 percent. Thus, only two of the three black schools could be regarded as predominantly black in their work force, UMES and Morgan. The work force at CCB was predominantly white and the principal desegregation task was to increase black employees, particularly at the faculty level. This fact reflected the former predominantly white status of CCB and resulted in personnel desegregation problems that were more similar to the white schools than the other black schools.

Problems associated with increased white employment at black schools were: internal resistance from black students, faculty, and staff; racial and social isolation of white faculty; and the schools' poor physical facilities. At UMES there were the added difficulties of the high turnover rates and teaching habits of liberal young faculty members. At the black schools the recruitment of white faculty per se was not regarded to be as great a problem as the recruitment of blacks and whites of outstanding quality.

Problems and Issues Unique to White Schools

Minority enrollment at the three white schools ranged from 5.7 percent of the total at Essex, to 19.9 percent at the University of Maryland-College Park, to 25.5 percent at Towson. The average was 17.1 percent. However, the average black faculty representation was only 2.9 percent of the total faculties, and black representation in the executive and administrative categories was 4.2 percent. Thus, black employees at the white schools were found to be concentrated overwhelmingly at the professional and non-professional levels.

Problems associated with increasing black participation in the faculty and administrative ranks at white schools were: the limited national pool of available qualified black faculty; low salary scales; low employee turnover; high levels of tenure in departments; and the social and professional isolation of black faculty and staff, particularly the tendency to concentrate black employees in minority-related programs. There were also discriminatory hiring practices which took the form of the buddy system at CCB and the requirement of credentialed persons who were research trained and oriented at UMCP.

Summary: Black vs. White

There were several interesting similarities and differences among the black and white subgroups with regard to employment composition. Both had campus environments that isolated other race employees: blacks were isolated socially and professionally at the predominantly white schools, and whites were isolated at the black schools. Also, both had problems with upgrading other race personnel into positions of institutional leadership. Black employees at white schools were concentrated in positions that were far removed from the areas of institutional policy, decision making, and the principal academic functions of the campuses. Also, no whites were found to be holding line executive positions at any of the black schools.

Table I indicates that there was a difference in the distribution of other race personnel at the black and white schools, however. In spite of the fact that whites occupied no line executive positions at black schools, they were concentrated in the faculty and management levels of the black institutions. Black employees in white schools, on the other hand, were concentrated in the professional and non-professional job categories. A final interesting point of comparison is that the average number of black employees at white schools was considerably lower than the average number of white employees at black schools--17.1 percent vs. 38.5 percent. As was the case with student composition, the black schools were found to be more racially integrated than the white schools with regard to employment composition.

TABLE I

Comparison of Student and Staff Distributions

At The Participating Schools

Fall 1974

| | Students | | | Staff | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Black | White* | Total | Black | White* | Total |
| University Segment | | | | | | |
| University of Maryland-Eastern Shore | 820 | 392 | 1,212 | 348 | 190 | 538 |
| University of Maryland-College Park | 2,153 | 32,468 | 34,621 | 851 | 4,256 | 5,107 |
| Totals | 2,973 | 32,860 | 35,833 | 1,199 | 4,446 | 5,645 |
| State College Segment | | | | | | |
| Towson | 856 | 12,185 | 13,041 | 223 | 752 | 975 |
| Morgan | 5,001 | 754 | 5,755 | 585 | 128 | 713 |
| Totals | 5,857 | 12,939 | 18,796 | 808 | 880 | 1,688 |
| Community College Segment | | | | | | |
| Community College of Baltimore | 5,609 | 2,700 | 8,309 | 145 | 231 | 376 |
| Essex | 162 | 7,086 | 7,248 | 26 | 780 | 806 |
| Totals | 5,771 | 9,786 | 15,557 | 171 | 1,011 | 1,182 |

*For purposes of this table all other non-white minorities except blacks were counted as white.

Source: First Annual Desegregation Status Report (February 1975).

## Differences Among the Three Segments

### Student Composition

There were only a few concerns with regard to student composition which were unique to the three segments. They are outlined briefly below.

#### Problems and Issues Unique to the University of Maryland Segment

There was only one student composition problem unique to the University segment: substantially fewer minority students transferred to that segment than to the State College segment. Black students in 1974 accounted for 21.6 percent of those community college students who transferred into the state colleges but for only 4.8 percent of those who transferred into the University segment.

In addition to this problem, uniqueness was found at UMES which had 30.2 percent white enrollment. Increased white student enrollment at UMES was found to be as much a consequence of its historical low enrollment problem as it was a commitment to the state's desegregation plan. A rather high percent (50.3) of the white students at UMES were part-time due to the fact that its low cost, low enrollment, and relaxed admission criteria made it appealing to some white Eastern Shore residents.

#### Problems and Issues Unique to the State College Segment

No student composition problems were identified as being unique to the State College segment, but Morgan did have some problems that were unique to it. Included were the 128 credit rule and its high fee cost.

Problems and Issues Unique to the Community College Segment

This segment had three problem areas associated with increased other race student enrollment that were regarded as being unique to it. They were: a no tuition charge back plan; an enrollment policy that attempted to restrict students to their political sub-division, and an overall student population that was 63 percent part-time. In addition, unlike the other two segments, the community colleges received no Other Race Grant Funds from the state to aid desegregation.

Employment Composition

As was true with regard to student composition, the three segments did not vary as greatly as did the black and white subgroups with regard to employment composition. However, each segment did have some unique problems.

Problems and Issues Unique to the University of Maryland Segment

There was found to be one employment problem unique to the University segment. Both of the schools in that segment were experiencing a crisis of leadership--one from no centralized leadership in desegregation (UMCP) and the other from an exuberance in leadership (UMES). In both instances, internal problems resulted. In the case of UMES, the chancellor resigned in response to criticism.

Problems and Issues Unique to the State College Segment

The two major employment problems found to be common to this segment were: the restrictions of the State Bureau of Personnel on hiring civil service employees, and the hiring ceilings on faculty positions imposed by the State College Board of Trustees.

### Problems and Issues Unique to the Community College Segment

The only problem found to be unique to the Community College segment was the restrictions which were imposed on the hiring of civil service staffs by each institution's local city and county personnel offices. Each campus was restricted to hiring only city or county residents.

### Summary: The Three Segments

Unlike the findings related to black and white subgroups, the findings related to the three segments provide no basis for critical comparisons. Instead, they suggest that the capacity of the individual campuses to reach student and personnel desegregation goals is often dictated by the segment, and in some cases, individual campus policies and practices. These policies and practices must be revised or eliminated before some desegregation objectives can be obtained.

## Problems and Issues Common to All Institutions

There were a number of problems and issues that were common to all (or most) institutions regardless of subgroup or segment identification. These problems will be related to the student composition and employment composition categories.

### Student Composition

There were three major problems and issues related to student composition that were common across the six campuses.

#### Parity vs. Access

The primary issue in enrolling black and minority undergraduates in Maryland's postsecondary system was found not to be a question of parity,

but access--not who goes to school, but who goes to school where. In the fall of 1974, Maryland's black student enrollment was 17.13 percent of the total, and when other minorities were added the total minority enrollment was 19.2 percent. In both cases the existing enrollment was found to be one percentage point above the percentage of black students graduating from the Maryland high schools and the minority percentage of the state's total population. However, 62.05 percent of the black students were found to be enrolled in the five predominantly black schools (there were 29 total postsecondary institutions). Morgan State University alone accounted for 19.23 percent of all Maryland's black students. Thus it was confirmed that racially identifiable institutions still exist in Maryland and the vestiges of racial dualism are still visible. As a result, at all six campuses desegregation efforts related to student composition were focused on recruiting, admitting, financially supporting, and retaining other race students. In fact, five of the six schools in the sample had increased other race enrollment between 1973-74. The only exception was the Community College of Baltimore which was in the process of changing from a predominantly white to a predominantly black student population and was found to be 67.9 percent black.

Graduate Enrollment

While parity was not a question at the undergraduate level, it was a problem in the graduate and professional schools. Blacks represented only 4.3 percent of the enrolled graduate students and only 8.5 percent of the first year professional students. Therefore, most graduate schools in the state were faced with serious desegregation problems.

Morgan, the only predominantly black school in the sample with a graduate school, was an exception. Even in this instance, however, there was disparity. As stated above, 55.9 percent of Morgan's graduate students as opposed to 93.6 percent of its undergraduates were black.

Recruitment Competition

The low matriculation rate of minority community college transfers to the four-year campuses as well as the intense inter-campus rivalry for the recruitment of students in general and other race students in particular were found to be common inter-campus problems. Only 40 percent of the black community college students were enrolled in college transfer programs. As a consequence, the community colleges had not materialized as a principal recruitment reservoir of black students even though they enrolled 52.85 percent of the state's total undergraduates and 41.74 percent of the total number of black students. Also, black community college graduates tended to transfer to the state colleges, especially predominantly black Morgan, and whites tended to transfer to the University segment. General rivalry among the campuses with regard to recruitment was a result of budgetary problems, individual campus and segment desegregation goals, and lack of coordination within and across segments.

Employment Composition

While respondents of all six schools believed the institutions were in compliance with desegregation plan objectives after the first year of implementation, most felt their schools were vulnerable in the area of other race faculty employment and the promotion of other race personnel to leadership positions. The University of Maryland-Eastern Shore was

the exception (white employees represented 31.97 percent of its work force). There were a number of common problems with regard to employment.

Lack of Funds

Many respondents believed that the absence of a specific desegregation budget was a major deficiency of Maryland's desegregation plan. This deficiency was aggravated by general budget problems throughout the state. In general, faculty hires had not kept pace with expanded student enrollments due to the hiring freeze imposed by the governor. At UMCP and Towson limited funds and competing interests were creating anti-desegregation and anti-affirmative action sentiments.

Low Turnover and High Tenure

At all campuses except UMES, low turnover of faculty members and high percentages of tenure within departments created desegregation problems. These factors resulted in reduced opportunities for hiring and promoting other race faculty members.

Institutional Autonomy

All of the sample campuses rejected proposals of Other Race Faculty Chairs, joint inter-campus faculty appointments, and faculty exchange programs. Respondents seemed to agree that the issue of institutional autonomy and control of personnel matters was at stake and was regarded as non-negotiable. It was felt that invasion by external interests into personnel matters, especially faculty matters, would have a direct impact on the local and national reputations of the schools. Therefore, principal opposition to desegregation in the employment area was found

to be couched in arguments for the preservation of institutional quality and autonomy.

Effects of Tripartite State Structure

With increasing national and state pressure for centralized control, enforcement, and planning as a guarantee of equal educational opportunity, one of the major obstacles to achieving a coordinated statewide desegregation effort in Maryland was found to be its current tripartite structure of public postsecondary education. This structure gives considerable legal and operational autonomy to the governing boards of each segment, and to some individual campuses. Therefore, any attempt at statewide coordination and implementation, as well as enforcement at the federal level must take into consideration the political, economic, social, and academic forces which are operative in the three public postsecondary education segments in Maryland. The sources of influence and power were found to vary depending upon the subject and issues, and the value systems of the institutions varied with their stated missions and the interests of their faculty.

## IV. IMPLICATIONS OF ADAMS FOR RURAL AND URBAN BLACK SCHOOLS

This study has indicated that while there are some similarities in the type and scope of desegregation problems confronting both urban and rural black schools, there are some serious differences in their needs and roles in a desegregated state system.

Bowles and DeCosta in Between Two Worlds[5] suggested that integration represents the most difficult move in the expansion of educational opportunity because it produces a direct change in our institutions' values. The redistribution of privilege is perceived by many as a redistribution of power. This attitude was found in interviews with the respondents. At both black and white schools there was a preoccupation with institutional preservation, self-preservation and regional control. Many observers now suggest that the major issue that is complicating the process of desegregating state systems of higher education is the question of the survival and future role of predominantly black institutions. The future role of black schools in desegregated state systems has implications for certain types of black schools in particular state systems.

A case analysis of Morgan State University and the University of Maryland-Eastern Shore (UMES) provides an opportunity to consider the implications of Adams for an urban and rural black institution.

---

[5]Bowles, Frank and Frank DeCosta, Between Two Worlds: A Profile of Negro Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Books, 1971.

One of the visible consequences of Maryland's segregated past is that there are predominantly black and white institutions within a very close geographic proximity of each other which have had historical institutional rivalries, but are now competitive rivals for a common student market. Such is the case between UMES and Salisbury State College on the rural eastern shore and, Towson and Morgan State Universities in urban Baltimore. Survival within this new arena is dictated by each institution's ability to define its role in the new desegregated state system and to obtain the necessary facilities and resources.

Accomplishing this goal depends upon a combination of factors such as a fairly well defined student market to service; the acquisition of sufficient resources with which to attract competent faculty, the development of a strong curriculum and modern physical plant; a reliable and productive political base; a positive public image, and strong institutional leadership.

## The University of Maryland-Eastern Shore

As a result of its smallness, its blackness, and its geographic location in rural Somerset County, which has the lowest per capita income in Maryland, Adams presents a very complex set of problems for UMES.

The predominantly black University of Maryland-Eastern Shore (UMES) is not only the smallest school in the University of Maryland Segment with a 1974 fall enrollment of 1,212 students, but the first public black college in the U. S. to become a branch of a predominantly white public University.

Well Defined Student Market

While UMES did not have a well defined student market it was discovered that 30.27 percent of its total student enrollment was white and from the lower Eastern Shore areas of Somerset, Worchester, and Wicomico Counties. In addition, 96 percent of the white students were commuters. A greater percentage of the total white student enrollment was found to be unclassified students (23.2 percent) than black students (10.9 percent). In fact 15.7 percent of the total UMES student enrollment was unclassified students. The 1970 Maryland Census revealed that outside of Baltimore City, the Eastern Shore represented the second highest population of black people in Maryland. For example, 37.6 percent of Somerset's, 37.4 percent of Calvert, 32.9 percent of Worchester, and 31.1 percent of Dorchester County's population is black. However, 36.08 percent of the total student enrollment consisted of non-Maryland students who were primarily black, poor, and urban students from the District of Columbia, Philadelphia, and Baltimore. The local black population was described as functionally illiterate, rural, poor, and as having little identification with higher education.

The institutional data revealed that 36 percent of the black students were found to be non-residents of the lower shore or the state of Maryland, and an additional 30 percent of the total enrollment were white students from the area who were enrolled at UMES but had no allegiance to the institution. Consequently, only approximately 34 percent of the UMES student body was found to be black residents from the lower Eastern Shore of Maryland. This observation tends to highlight those factors regarding the survival of UMES as a branch of

the University of Maryland and its continued existance as a viable institution in the black tradition. First, it did not seem to be serving the local area population which it was originally intended to serve. This raises serious questions about its ability to develop a strong local political base. Second, by not defining its student market it placed itself in a reactionary posture rather than in an innovative posture in areas of new program development. The latter obviously is a much less competitive position. Third, its historical underenrollment will become a more significant factor to the state and segment budget coffers if the number of eligible college-going students in the area declines.

Acquisition of Faculty, Resources and Programs to be Competitive

It is common knowledge that the heart of any higher educational institution is the reputation and competency of its faculty. The inability of UMES to attract outstanding faculty, particularly black faculty, has been well-documented earlier in this monograph. Its attractiveness to young white Ph.D.s as a temporary source of employment has created its own special set of problems, some of which were found to be directly associated with the rural location of the institution and the racial attitudes on the Eastern Shore. Others were found to be associated with the student population and the school's inability to obtain the appropriate resources to provide the facilities and programs with which to compete with other area schools. Curriculum innovation is essentially a function and responsibility of the faculty. Faculty productivity is frequently a measure of ability of the local campus administrative leadership to encourage innovativeness. Thus, leadership

is a critical factor in obtaining the resources with which to build an outstanding faculty and competitive programs.

Reliable and Productive Political Base

Political support for an institution generally is derived from those persons who are recipients of the various services of that institution. Therefore it is essential that there be a strong local community identification with the campus. According to one respondent, "Community attitudes on the lower shore are Southern, white Southern, and Black Southern, and their still exist strong separatist desires among the residents." Another respondent commented, "UMES is not the community's school and what the white planters on the Eastern Shore have decided is that Salisbury State College will be the primary four year institution for their children." Salisbury State, with an enrollment of 3,205 students, is located nine miles from UMES in the more densely populated city of Salisbury, with a modern physical plant, broader program base, and a graduate school. SSC attractiveness is reflected by the fact that for the last decade it has experienced an average enrollment increase of 280 students per year and a capital budget of approximately 15 million dollars. Most of this growth spiral occurred after the white citizens of the lower shore rejected a 1970 study by Robert Heller and Associates which recommended that UMES become the region's primary four-year institution and that SSC become a two-year technical college. The public outcry by area residents and subsequent political pressure forced the Maryland Council for Higher Education to reject the recommendation.

The future role of UMES as an identifiable institution has now been surrounded with great uncertainty because of the recommendations of the

Rosenburg Commission[6] which calls for a regional university on the Eastern Shore by consolidating Salisbury, Chesapeake Community College, and UMES. Without a strong political base outside of Baltimore's black community, UMES is vulnerable to regional consolidation, because it is legally regarded not as an autonomous black institution but as a branch of the University of Maryland which is a predominantly white institution.

Positive Public Image

A positive public image is a prerequisite for any institution that is attempting to capture a new market particularly when it has historically served one particular racial group in a racially segregated region, is viewed as being primarily for the educationally disadvantaged student, and is regarded as having a mediocre physical plant. UMES has all these negative associations. In addition, gone are the great Maryland State football teams and the nationally-ranked basketball team which went to the N.I.T. Tournament and provided UMES with national visibility. These factors will make it increasingly difficult for UMES to obtain regional and national visibility and to be competitive in an area where it is not currently servicing a large portion of the local area needs. These same factors will greatly reduce its attractiveness to future non-resident students who are now being more aggresively recruited by their local institutions, both black and white.

Institutional Leadership

We are living in a consumer-oriented society and desegregation has thrust the historically black schools into the competitive mainstream.

---

[6]Governor's Study Commission on the Structure and Governance of Education in Maryland, Leonard H. Rosenburg, Chairman, 1975.

UMES is now forced to compete in center ring and it is necessary that it be led by individuals, governing boards, and support organizations that are capable of playing the game in center ring. The other four factors discussed above are dependent upon the quality and quantity of institutional leadership, and the ability of that leadership to develop and market its institution and programs.

Effective leadership at UMES will become an increasingly difficult task because of its geographic location, its branch status with the University segment, and the restraints imposed upon it by the central staff of the segment.

Summary

A desegregated campus will require the development of the appropriate campus accommodations for the new other race student; a more diverse curriculum; new styles and new demands for the faculty; new operation procedures; new administrative arrangements; and new relationships with the state and federal bureaucracies, the surrounding community and the business world. The task is not merely to provide learning arrangements congenial to the various racial subgroups, but to maintain the functional integrity of the institution while insuring that there is real social and economic utility in the educational outcome. This can only be achieved via diligent and innovative leadership.

## Morgan State University

Morgan State University is the largest and most comprehensive predominantly black liberal arts campus in the State of Maryland and is located in the heart of Baltimore. It has a self-defined mission to serve the

urban community. A student may obtain a degree from any one of its twenty-two undergraduate departments and a Master's degree from eighteen different graduate programs. In addition to being the largest predominantly black school it is also the only black school in Maryland which has its own Board of Trustees. Morgan has attracted both regional and national attention with its newly acquired university status. It has done so for several reasons. First, it has successfully developed a black state political coalition which was successful in pursuing legislation that resulted in Morgan receiving university status with its own governing board. Sixteen of the ninetten Maryland black legislators are from Baltimore City which means they can have concentrated influence on issues which affect Baltimore City, but have only limited impact on state-wide issues. Many political observers feel that their limited power on state-wide issues makes UMES very vulnerable. It also forces the black political caucus to make a choice between Morgan, the state's largest black school, and the remaining three four-year public black institutions. Second, Morgan is a reputable urban university in a border state, in a city which is 50 percent black and possesses a reasonably sophisticated and active black political community. Many black Baltimore residents are described as holding Morgan at a certain level of sacredness and as regarding court ordered desegregation as a call to preserve one of black America's most cherished institutions, the black colleges. Obviously Morgan has not only an available and identifiable student market, but also a productive and reliable political base which can be called upon to protect and promote its interests. Third, Morgan has continued to maintain a positive national image as a respected liberal arts campus with a graduate school. Fourth, it is a designated AIDP school under the Federal Title III program. Fifth, it has a new president and new administration. Sixth, it is located

in a state which has been ordered by the Court to desegregate. The majority of these factors have been frequently mentioned as prerequisites for survival for black schools during the next decade. Morgan has all of them with the exception of the fiscal resources with which to insure its future. Many of the prerequisites are available to Morgan because of its urban status, and others are available because of its historical status as a black institution. The true test for Morgan will be its ability to accumulate the fiscal support that will permit it to play the education game in center ring.

Since the preservation of the principal of free choice is the primary guiding principal for student institutional selection in the Maryland desegregation plan, then Morgan's ability to improve its competitiveness for white undergraduate enrollment in response to Adams will be directly dependent upon its improved image, facilities, student services, and program offerings. All of these require funds. Some will materialize with improved internal management practices, but most must come from hard fought efforts within the public and private arenas of the state and national funding agencies.

## Summary

Thus, while UMES and Morgan have revealed some similar problems as predominantly black institutions under court order to desegregate, each has its own individual problems and needs. Some of these needs and roles have been self-defined, others have evolved over the years, and yet others have been imposed by outside agencies, organizations, courts, and political interests. Much of their future as urban or rural institutions

will be dictated by the constituents they serve and their ability as institutions to meet those constituent needs. Leadership and its ability to market its product will become increasingly important in their competitive future.

## V. IMPLICATIONS FOR THE EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATOR

Adams signals the beginning of a very lengthy and controversial legal struggle between the courts, the states, and higher education as the educational arrangements of one era are being judged by the standards of another. Strong decisive leadership at all levels of the political, legal, and educational hierarchy will be necessary in order to achieve successful compliance with the stated objectives of the state desegregation plans and Title VI of the U. S. Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Federal enforcement of Title VI is occurring at a time when more general educational reforms are being demanded by both external and internal forces. It coincides with the emergence of budget stabilization and reduced funding in some states, and increased governmental involvement in educational policy and institutional autonomy in others. There is increasing concern about what some perceive to be the neglect of undergraduate teaching, the bureaucratic impersonality of some campuses, and the feudalism and fragmentation of academic departments. There is concern about a curriculum that can always be expanded but almost never reduced or reorganized. There is concern about the current national aura surrounding Affirmative Action and its impact on the higher education community. In many ways, desegregation has brought into focus the needs for more general forms of institutional and educational revitalization.

With its variation in size, purpose, and duties, the university campus is an extremely complicated social arrangement of individuals at work. Its formal structure is full of overlap, gaps, and contradictions.

It is fractured rather than integrated because it is made up of experts who identify with and are committed to the occupations that are commonly referred to as professions. In short, individualism is not only condoned by the academic community, it is encouraged and protected, because without it institutional objectives cannot be fully accomplished. This is the arena in which the educational administrator must work and survive.

The administrator becomes the conduit for these new demands to the academic practitioner and must search for ways to transmit them in a form appropriate to the flexible and informal traditions of the academic community. The administrator most frequently is the middle person who is twice removed from the decision-making levels of the federal and state bureaucracies, and is often set adrift in uncharted waters to sail what is frequently regarded as an unpopular course. The campus administrator still remains the key performer in the compliance activity of the state. It is clear that one of the major influences that dictates the degree of compliance with the law is the administrator's perception of the costs and consequences of compliance. Environmental factors may, therefore, become more important than the substance of law in determining the degree of compliance. For example, the political tolerance of the community is a very critical consideration for most policymakers. In Maryland such factors were found to influence the cost-benefit calculus of a law and to shape the decision-maker's perception of the costs and consequences of the compliance activities. When confronted with an unpopular federal policy demand, local authorities must at some point weigh the costs and benefits associated with compliance or resistance to the federal mandate.

If compliance threatens their political standing, local campus officials may decide that the utility of the situation favors noncompliance because when the compliance issues become highly salient, personal interests (both individual and collective) become supreme considerations. This in turn will require a high degree of coercion by the enforcement agencies, because the compliance behavior of the local campus administrator is frequently influenced by the compliance behavior of the state's leadership.

Thus, the absence of broad scale public support for desegregation in Maryland may well be an indication that increased federal coercion, private litigation, and continuous local political pressure are the prerequisites for the successful achievement of the objectives of a state desegregation plan. One fact is clear, however: if administrators and policymakers are to understand the factors that influence the efficiency of laws, then they must center their attention on those variables that influence compliance.

## Burden of Compliance: Black vs. White

Compliance and the implied burden that must be shouldered by each institution presents different sets of implications for black and white administrators and their respective institutions. The disturbing question confronting black administrators is: Can compliance take place without changing the structure and character of black schools as they currently exist? If compliance is carried to its absolute limits, the obvious answer is no. However, if compliance occurs with any measure of equity, it will also change the character and structure of the predominantly

white institutions as well. The evidence in this study suggests that both black and white schools will have their individual burdens to shoulder as a result of their segregated past.

White Schools

The major white graduate research institution will experience considerable difficulty increasing their black instructional faculty because of the low enrollment and production of black scholars nationally by the nation's major graduate schools. They will also continue to experience increasing difficulty retaining black students if they continue to apply traditional student services to the needs of non-traditional students, and if white faculty members continue to perceive black students as a community of youth who are incapable of learning in major selective institutions. Finally, the existing social systems of the white schools must undergo a transition in order for them to successfully respond to any substantial increases of black participation.

Black Schools

The burden of compliance for black schools is a more volatile subject, because it is perceived by many to be a question of the survival and preservation of one of black America's most cherished institutions. The burden of black public institutions is a political and economic burden as they must obtain the resources to make them competitive in the educational mainstream of this country. Unless their physical facilities and overall quality can be improved, the prospect of significant white enrollment will be minimal and black students will continue to suffer the consequences of a segregated past. Leadership in turn becomes a critical factor for black schools. Are they being led by

persons who can now play the survival game in center ring, and can those leaders muster the political support and resources to make it happen? There is no question that the termination of federal funds on a statewide basis would have its greatest impact upon black institutions and minority populations in general, as they are much more dependent upon federal resources than their white counterparts. All of the black schools were found to be receiving substantial amounts of federal subsidy, and the major support for minority programs at the predominantly white campuses could be attributed to such federally funded programs as Talent Search, Upward Bound, Special Services, and the categorical student financial aid programs.

## Administrators in a Desegregated Future

In light of these existing conditions the new task of the administrator in a desegregated system is to develop the appropriate accommodations on each campus for a new student market. This not only requires diverse subject matter, but new styles and demands for the faculty, new operating procedures, new administrative arrangements, and new relationships with the surrounding community and the business world. The problem is not merely to provide learning arrangements congenial to various minorities and subcultures; it is also necessary to maintain the functional integrity of the institution while insuring that there is real social and economic utility in the educational outcome.

If Maryland is to achieve a racially balanced system of post-secondary education it will require strong leadership from the state's executive branch of government, an endorsement by the higher education

community, and most of all, an initiative and commitment from the local campus administrator.

# VI. RECOMMENDATIONS

The primary underlying issue in the Maryland study was found to be the preservation of individual campus autonomy and control. This suggests a new direction for the monitoring and enforcement agencies if desegregated state systems are to be successfully achieved.

Historically the courts have taken the leadership role in desegregating the educational systems of the nation, and HEW has been willing to play the role of the assisting agent to the state and local districts in achieving desegregated systems. Local governing boards, administrators and state systems have found this previous arrangement to be a convenient tool for resistance. The Adams case attacks the arrangement and now demands that HEW fulfill its constitutional responsibilities of enforcing the federal laws that prohibit segregated education. As a consequence, HEW has been caught in the middle and has become the whipping boy for both the plaintiffs and defendants. The leadership of both the Executive Branch of the Federal Government and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare must be willing to play that role if successful enforcement of federal laws is to be achieved.

The following recommendations are viewed as some necessary policy requirements and tools for disestablishing a racially dual system of post-secondary education. Some are based on the research of this study and apply directly to the resolution of specific problems that were identified in Maryland. The remaining recommendations are directed to the federal agencies and are based on the observations and experiences of the author in the field of civil rights and the field of higher education administration.

(1) *It is suggested that the recommendations of the Governor's Commission on Education to consolidate the Maryland Council for Higher Education, the staff of the State College Board of Trustees and the staff of the State Board of Community Colleges be adopted.* The creation of a new State Department of Higher Education would increase centralized educational planning; reduce some of the intense inter-institutional rivalry; create increased standardization of programming and resource allocation; increase the stature and authority of the state's current planning agency; and eliminate some of the existing political blocs and segment conflicts that are currently inhibiting the state's desegregation efforts.

(2) *It is recommended that Maryland conduct a statewide program audit to identify areas of excessive course and program duplication. Specific attention should be given to those areas where there are clusters of two-year and four-year public institutions such as the Baltimore metropolitan area. All new personnel and program requests to those campuses, where excessive duplication is identified, should be frozen until those schools enter into acceptable inter-campus program arrangements. The state should provide additional funding to encourage inter-campus planning and programming.*

(3) *It is recommended that the federal government encourage increased state participation in the provision of graduate opportunities for minority scholars and professionals by developing a National Matching Fellowship Support Program for Graduate Study for Minority Students, similar to the State Student Incentive Grant Program for undergraduates.*

(4) *The state of Maryland and its Graduate and Professional Schools should initiate a nationally visible graduate program to increase its production of scholars and professionals from racial ethnic minority backgrounds. It should include the appropriation of a specific fellowship fund for minority students, and should have a component of coordinated recruitment and academic support services.*

(5) *It is recommended that the federal government require all the* Adams *states whose schools are receiving Title III funds as developing institutions, to guarantee a match of those funds as a provision of their desegregation plan.* The most critical need of historically black institutions is for compensatory funds to develop and upgrade their physical facilities, programs and management capacities. Many are recipients of federal grants under the Title III Developing Institutions Program. They have been recognized by the federal government as developing institutions and as such, should receive the same recognition from their parent state.

(6) *It is recommended that Maryland initiate a statewide management training program to upgrade the management and planning facilities of its officially designated developing institutions.*

(7) *It is recommended that the Maryland Community College segment implement a tuition charge back plan which is accompanied by a policy that encourages program regionalization particularly in the institutional cluster areas like the Baltimore metropolitan area.*

(8) *It is recommended that the State of Maryland review its existing budget formula ceiling for the Community College segment and take into consideration the increasing costs of the two-year campuses.* Greater state participation will be required if they are to

continue as low cost institutions.

(9) *It is recommended that the state budget formula be reviewed to cover the increased institutional costs of instructing students who have remedial needs, who require smaller classes, and additional support services.*

(10) *It is recommended that HEW accept no new state desegregation plans that do not have an attached guaranteed budget which is clearly committed to producing the stated objectives of the plan for the full term of the plan.*

# APPENDIX A

# MARYLAND DESEGREGATION INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

# MARYLAND DESEGREGATION INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

NAME OF INSTITUTION _____

NAME OF RESPONDENT _____ POSITION _____

ADDRESS _____ PHONE _____

* * * * * * *

## I. INTRODUCTION

### A. IDENTIFICATION OF INTERVIEWER

+ MERRITT J. NORVELL, JR., ASSISTANT DEAN, GRADUATE SCHOOL, UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MADISON, PH.D. CANDIDATE IN DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

+ REFER TO LETTER OF INTRODUCTION AND AUTHORIZATION FROM DR. GLENWOOD C. BROOKS, JR., CHIEF OF EQUAL POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION, MARYLAND COUNCIL FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

+ IDENTIFICATION OF OTHER SCHOOLS AND SEGMENTS PARTICIPATING IN STUDY

### B. GENERAL PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

+ TO IDENTIFY THE CAMPUS, INTER-CAMPUS, AND INTER-SEGMENT PROBLEMS, ISSUES AND CONCERNS IN THE AREAS OF STUDENT COMPOSITION, EMPLOYMENT COMPOSITION, ADMINISTRATIVE COORDINATION AND PROGRAM COOPERATION, AND FINANCIAL AID, THAT ARE CONFRONTING ADMINISTRATORS AND GOVERNING BOARD MEMBERS WITHIN MARYLAND'S THREE PUBLIC SYSTEMS OF HIGHER EDUCATION AS THEY IMPLEMENT THE STATE DESEGREGATION PLAN FOR PUBLIC POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS.

### C. USE OF INFORMATION

+ THE RESULTS AND COPIES OF THE STUDY WILL BE AVAILABLE TO PARTICIPATING CAMPUSES, SEGMENTS, AND OTHER INTERESTED AGENCIES AND ORGANIZATIONS

+ USE OF YOUR NAME AND/OR QUOTES

YOUR INTERVIEW IS ONE OF APPROXIMATELY 70 INTERVIEWS THAT INVOLVE SIX CAMPUSES, THREE GOVERNING BOARDS, THREE SEGMENT CENTRAL OFFICES AND M.C.H.E. WHILE I CANNOT GUARANTEE ABSOLUTE ANONYMITY ON CRITICAL ISSUES, PLEASE I.D. THAT WHICH YOU DON'T WANT QUOTED OR ATTRIBUTED TO YOU.

+ STUDY IS PART OF MY DOCTORAL DISSERTATION FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION, UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MADISON

D. WHY I AM INTERVIEWING YOU -- HOW I GOT YOUR NAME

+ SCHOOLS AND POSITIONS WERE SELECTED FROM THE STATE DESEGREGATION PLAN SUBMITTED TO HEW. YOU WERE IDENTIFIED AS A PERSON WHO IS OFFICIALLY RESPONSIBLE FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PLAN (OR) YOU WERE IDENTIFIED AS A PERSON WHOSE PRIMARY ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSIBILITY INCLUDES PROGRAMS THAT ARE DIRECTLY RELATED TO THE FIVE CATEGORIES OF THE PLAN BEING STUDIED.

II. BIOGRAPHICAL

A. EDUCATIONAL HISTORY OF RESPONDENT

B. EMPLOYMENT HISTORY OF RESPONDENT

+ SPECIFIC HISTORY OF RESPONDENT AT THE CAMPUS OR IN THE SEGMENT

III. OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS ON THE FIVE DESEGREGATION PLAN CATEGORIES

A. STUDENT COMPOSITION

+ PLEASE IDENTIFY THE MOST IMPORTANT PROBLEMS, ISSUES, AND CONCERNS IN THE AREA OF (INSERT PLAN CATEGORY) CONFRONTING YOU (CAMPUS/ SEGMENT) AS IT IMPLEMENTS THE MARYLAND PLAN FOR COMPLETING THE DESEGREGATION,OF THE PUBLIC POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS(*)

HOUSING, ADMISSION, RETENTION POLICIES, COUNSELING, CAMPUS ORIENTATION, FINANCIAL AID TO OTHER RACE ORGANIZATIONS, TUTORING, CURRICULUM, RECRUITMENT, STUDY SKILLS, 1972 STUDENT TRANSFER POLICY

+ ISSUES AND PROBLEM WITH INTER-SEGMENT AND INTER-CAMPUS EFFORTS?

+ WHAT PERCENT OF TOTAL ENROLLMENT ARE OTHER RACE STUDENTS (ORS)?

+ COMPARATIVE RETENTION RATE OF BLACK VS. WHITE STUDENTS IN (CAMPUS/ SEGMENT. PROBLEMS AND ISSUES CONFRONTING PLAN TO REDUCE THE RATE

+ WHAT PROBLEMS ARE ENCOUNTERED INCREASING OTHER RACE ENROLLMENT?

(*)This is the initial open-ended question for each Plan category under investigation. These categories and organizational units (campus/segment) will be substituted in the parenthesized areas when the focus of investigation is on them.

B. FINANCIAL AID

+ OPEN-ENDED QUESTION. IDENTIFY MOST IMPORTANT PROBLEMS, ISSUES, AND CONCERNS.

+ INTER-SEGMENT, AND INTER-CAMPUS PROBLEMS, ISSUES AND CONCERNS

+ IDENTIFY PROBLEMS, ISSUES CONCERNS WITH FOLLOWING ITEMS AS THEY RELATE TO PLAN

STUDENT AID DISTRIBUTION
OTHER RACE GRANT PROGRAM
SENATORIAL SCHOLARSHIP
NATIONAL DIRECT STUDENT LOANS
BASIC GRANT PROGRAM
STATE SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM

+ PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL STUDENT AID DISTRIBUTED ON NEED FORMULA

+ PERCENTAGE OF FEDERAL, STATE, AND CAMPUS STUDENT AID FUNDS AWARDED TO OTHER RACE STUDENTS?

+ AVERAGE AWARD FOR ALL STUDENTS VS. AVERAGE AWARD FOR OTHER RACE STUDENTS. (O.R.S.)

+ PERCENT OF ORS ENROLLMENT WHO RECEIVE FINANCIAL AID?

C. EMPLOYMENT COMPOSITION

+ OPEN-ENDED QUESTION PROBLEMS, ISSUES, AND CONCERNS (INTER-SEGMENT AND INTER-CAMPUS)

+ BASIC PHILOSOPHY BEHIND CAMPUS/SEGMENT FACULTY EMPLOYMENT PATTERNS, EXAMPLES OF PRESSURES TO CHANGE? EXAMPLES.

+ PERSONNEL POLICY -- PRINCIPAL POINTS OF DISAGREEMENT BETWEEN SEGMENTS, CAMPUSES, AND MCHE

+ ISSUES AND PROBLEMS WITH FOLLOWING ITEMS:

RECRUITMENT (FACULTY, ACADEMIC STAFF, & C.S.)
OTHER RACE FACULTY CHAIRS
VOLUNTARY INTER-SEGMENT FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATOR EXCHANGE PROGRAMS
IN-SERVICE TRAINING
TENURE
PROMOTION
JOINT APPOINTMENTS
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT
SALARY SCALE
BUDGET

+ IN WHAT WAY IS RACE A FACTOR IN ANY OF THESE?

+ EFFECT OF STATE CIVIL SERVICE POLICIES ON ABILITY TO RESPOND TO PLAN OBJECTIVES.

+ EXPANSION OF ROLES OF BLACKS IN POSITIONS OF EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP (DEANS, DEPARTMENT HEADS, AND FACULTY MEMBERS), SPECIFY IDENTIFY MECHANISM TO ENSURE THIS.

++ POLICIES GOVERNING FACULTY TRANSFER
++ RAIDING AMONG CAMPUSES AND SEGMENTS

D. PROGRAM COOPERATION

+ OPEN-ENDED QUESTION PROBLEM, ISSUES AND CONCERNS (INTER-CAMPUS AND INTER-SEGMENT)

+ INTER-INSTITUTIONAL COORDINATING COMMITTEES

+ PROBLEMS ASSOCIATED WITH POLICY OF DIFFERENTIATED CURRICULUM FOR AREAS WHERE THERE ARE MORE THAN ONE SCHOOL OF SAME RACE TO ENSURE RACIAL BALANCE IN AREA

+ BUDGET -- COSTS

+ MCHE AND PROGRAM COOPERATION

+ CAMPUS/SEGMENT DECISION TO ELIMINATE DUPLICATIVE COURSES?

+ POLICY AND PROCEDURE FOR SPECIALIZED PROGRAMMING WITHOUT UNNECESSARY DUPLICATION

+ IDENTIFY MAJOR AREAS OF ACADEMIC SPECIALIZATION THAT WILL PROMOTE DESEGREGATION OF YOUR (CAMPUS/SEGMENT).

+ WHY HASN'T IT BEEN A PRIMARY FORCE IN INCREASING ENROLLMENT OF ORS IN PAST?

E. ADMINISTRATIVE COORDINATION

+ OPEN-ENDED QUESTION PROBLEMS, ISSUES, AND CONCERN (INTER-CAMPUS AND INTER-SEGMENT)....IMPACT STATEMENT

+ INFLUENCE OF STATE'S MANAGEMENT REQUIREMENTS ON THE BUDGET PROCESS, CAMPUS, AND S EGMENT ROLES....EFFECT ON PLAN

+ BUDGET AND COST OF PLAN TO (SEGMENT/CAMPUS)

+ RESTRAINTS ON INTER-CAMPUS ADMINISTRATIVE COORDINATION WHEN THE DESEGREGATION ISSUE TRANSCENDS THE EXISTING SEGMENT

+ SEGMENT COORDINATION PROBLEMS CREATED BY VARIATIONS OF CAMPUS ROLES, PROGRAM OFFERINGS, CAMPUS SIZE, SALARY SCALES, ETC.

+ INTER- AND INTRA-SEGMENT AND CAMPUS PROBLEMS CREATED BY CAMPUS AUTONOMY IN DEVELOPING A RESPONSE TO THE PLAN

+ PHYSICAL EXPANSION OF CAMPUS/SEGMENT GROWTH

IV. OPEN-ENDED NON-CATEGORY QUESTIONS

+ DEFINE DISCRIMINATION, INTEGREGATION, DESEGREGATION, AND COMPLIANCE

+ DOES COMPLIANCE PLACE THE GREATEST BURDEN ON PREDOMINANTELY BLACK SCHOOLS OR ON PREDOMINANTELY WHITE SCHOOLS? IDENTIFY AREAS.

+ IDENTIFY THE TWO MOST CRITICAL FACTORS THAT WILL INFLUENCE THE STATEWIDE PRIORITY LEVEL OF THE DESEGREGATION PLAN.

+ IS YOUR SCHOOL IN COMPLIANCE WITH ITS PLAN OBJECTIVES.

+ IDENTIFY THOSE AREAS OF VULNERABILITY

V. CHECKLIST -- FOCUSED QUESTIONS

DO YOU WISH TO MAKE ANY ADDITIONAL COMMENTS ABOUT THE FOLLOWING:

STUDENT COMPOSITION

+ ENROLLMENT OF ORS
+ RETENTION
+ RECRUITMENT AND ADMISSIONS
+ CURRICULUM
+ ACADEMIC SUPPORT SERVICES
+ STUDENT TRANSFER POLICY
+ STUDENT DISTRIBURION POLICY TO ACHIEVE RACIAL BALANCE
+ BUDGET AND COSTS

EMPLOYMENT COMPOSITION

+ FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF RECRUITMENT
+ BUDGET AND COSTS
+ TENURE, PROMOTION, AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT
+ FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATOR EXCHANGE
+ SALARY SCHEDULES (UNIFORMITY VS. LOCAL OPTIONS)
+ EXPANDED LEADERSHIP ROLES OF BLACKS
+ PERSONNEL POLICIES AND PRACTICES
+ CIVIL SERVICE
+ AFFIRMATIVE ACTION (RACE VS. WOMEN)

FINANCIAL AID

+ TUITION VARIATION
+ STATE STUDENT AID DISTRIBUTION
+ RACIAL DISTRIBUTION OF STUDENT AID
+ STATE AND FEDERAL CATEGORICAL AID PROGRAMS
+ ORGP
+ BUDGET AND COSTS

PROGRAM COOPERATION

+ INTER-INSTITUTIONAL COORDINATION
+ DIFFERENTIATED CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION PROGRAMS
+ SPECIALIZATION
+ BUDGET AND COSTS
+ INTER-SEGMENT COORDINATION
+ QUALITY
+ NEW PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

ADMINISTRATIVE COORDINATION

+ BUDGET AND COSTS
+ INTRA-CAMPUS, INTER-CAMPUS AND SEGMENT COORDINATION
+ CAMPUS AUTONOMY
+ MANPOWER
+ PHYSICAL GROWTH
+ COMMUNICATION
+ INTER-INSTITUTIONAL COORDINATION COMMITTEE

DEFINITIONS

+ DISCRIMINATION
+ INTEGRATION
+ DESEGREGATION
+ COMPLIANCE

COMPLIANCE AND INSTITUTIONAL BURDEN

FACTORS DETERMINING STATEWIDE PRIORITY LEVEL OF DESEGREGATION

VI. REFERRALS

OTHER KNOWLEDGEABLE AND INFORMED PERSONS WHO WOULD BE WILLING TO ASSIST IN THIS STUDY AND PERHAPS BE INTERVIEWED? WOULD YOU BE WILLING TO SERVE AS A REFERENCE FOR ME?

VII. MAY I COME-BACK OR TELEPHONE YOU FOR ADDITIONAL DATA NEEDS OR FOR INFORMATION AND CLARIFICATION?