

interested students. Graduate deans and other academic officials from the various campuses also attend. Traditionally this program has been hosted by Virginia Polytechnical Institute (VPI) and State University or one of the comprehensive traditionally white institutions. For the summer of 1984, the program was also operated at Virginia State University (VSU), a traditionally Black institution. Over fifty percent of the previous participants are reported to have subsequently enrolled in graduate programs in one of the state universities. For the summer of 1984, 70 students participated in the programs at VPI and VSU.

Campus Level Initiatives

Virginia's doctoral granting institutions offer the full range of diversity in terms of geographic location and tradition. They offer very distinct and contrasting histories. The University of Virginia, William and Mary and VPI are the older established universities while Old Dominion University and Virginia Commonwealth are more recent. George Mason is recent among the Ph.D. granting universities. UVa and VPI are both in the picturesque western and southwestern areas of the state with low population densities and mainly rural settings. By contrast William and Mary, VCU and ODU, along with GMU are located in major metropolitan centers or adjacent to them. Finally all but UVa and VPI have easy and very proximate access to Virginia's Historically Black Institutions, public and private, or to HBI's in neighboring states (GMU is within 50 miles of the University of the District of Columbia, Howard University, Coppin State, Bowie State and Morgan State Universities),

These locational features and their respective histories have greatly influenced institutional responses. We take special note here of the program features at Old Dominion University. The graduate dean at Old Dominion has arranged for financial assistance to be provided to part-time black graduate students and reports that this feature has greatly expanded the accessibility of the University to employed blacks who are unable to commit to full-time graduate study. With this mechanism, Old Dominion exceeds its goals for black graduate enrollment.

The funds for part-time graduate study are renewable and their average length is for one academic year. The funds for part time study cover up to nine (9) credit hours currently but were previously limited to six (6). In 1983-84 part time tuition grants supported ten students.

Such a program feature would appear to have special merit as an inducement, especially in the metropolitan areas where there are larger concentrations of potential black candidates for graduate study.

The response of Virginia is two-fold: it has an affirmative action component with support for current employees and a generative component with support for current students. Newly initiated efforts will greatly enhance the number of students supported in Virginia which, until recently, funded the fewest black doctoral candidates.

Virginia's funding is not retentive but is renewable on an annual basis. It is, however, greater in average size than are the comparable awards in the other states. Virginia also funds a more comprehensive range of services from the system level in contrast to

the other states, providing centralized funding for recruitment and support services.

Interviews with Virginia's campus level officials provide insights to two issues worth repeating here: one administrative and one programmatic. Centralized administration at both the campus and state level is very important. Virginia campuses interpreted Adams to mean that they could not extend graduate support to non-residents resulting in several missed opportunities and a smaller availability pool. Moreover, for at least two of the doctoral granting institutions, the responsibilities for administering the services were not clearly delineated. One respondent suggested that a designated officer, reporting directly to the chancellor would improve the administration of the Adams response.

Programmatically, the availability of financial assistance to part-time students at the graduate level is an attractive innovation. Especially for doctoral campuses located in urban/metropolitan areas where blacks with the appropriate credentials and experiences are more concentrated, such a provision would certainly increase the availability pool and could do so without significantly higher costs.

Summary of State Commitments

In this chapter we established the context for the five states in terms of their contribution to black graduate enrollment and to earned doctorates by blacks as well as to describe the systemwide and campus level responses to increasing the production of black doctorates.

The public colleges in these five states are clearly major producers of blacks with educational credentials at each degree level, producing over 9% of all black bachelor degrees and over 7% of all black doctorates as recently as 1981. Among these states, Virginia, Florida and Georgia produce the larger supply of bachelor degrees earned by blacks and the same is true at the doctoral level. These figures offer sufficient evidence of the importance of the role of public colleges and universities in these states.

The broad responses of the five states to Adams show conceptual, financial, and administrative differences which we have described. Briefly, the program responses differ conceptually in their relative emphasis on increasing the production of black doctorates for affirmative action employment purposes as opposed to a more general need to improve the supply. Arkansas and Oklahoma are more clearly affirmative in their structure, while Florida and Virginia are mixed.

Financially, only one of the states has constructed its aid in a retentive fashion--Oklahoma, for up to four years--while the remaining states are offering renewable aid. It is important that the latter avoid the potential "revolving door" possibilities of such aid packages.

Finally, the campus level administrative structures differ greatly. Considerable benefits in communications, service delivery, program development and program execution appear to occur with greater centralization at both the campus and state level. This seems true despite the need to honor departmental autonomy in recruitment and admissions policies at the doctoral level.

In the next chapter we summarize our findings on overall funding, graduate enrollment and degree production for the public doctoral granting institutions in these five states.

Chapter 4

Results

Having presented a brief historical overview and description of key activities for each state, we provide a summary of our findings for the five states. The summary findings which follow are a compilation and synthesis of data derived from our interviews in each state and from compiled data. Where necessary, the source of our data is indicated. We begin with our core concern, the effectiveness of state financial aid in the production of black Ph.D.'s.

For the purpose of this research three indicators were used to assess the effectiveness of financial aid:

- 1) Has the aid produced an increase in the number of doctorates awarded to blacks?
- 2) Is the increase in aid availability reflected in increasing rates of first-time black graduate enrollees?
- 3) Does the quality of the aid, as indicated by amount, length of award, type of award (i.e. fellowship, assistantship or some combination), suggest that it is sufficient?

Each of these indicators is addressed below using both the secondary data and interview data. First, the Adams states are committed to achieving parity with respect to access at the graduate level measured as equal percentages of black and white in-state bachelor degree recipients from public institutions who enroll in graduate school in the following year. In general, these states approached but did not attain parity on this measure on a consistent basis. The January 1983 letter of evaluation to the respective state governors reveals that, with the exception of Virginia, no state achieved parity on this measure for the period 1979-80 through 1980-81 and 1981-82. Thus, with respect to this standard measure of equity,

progress was minimal. Similarly, the elimination of black/white disparity with respect to degree attainment at the doctoral level has not been achieved.*

Tables 3 and 4 provide data on black degree attainment at the doctoral level and first-time graduate enrollment for each of the five states beginning in 1976. We begin with a discussion of Table 3.

If "effectiveness" is indicated by an increase in the number of black Ph.D.'s produced, based on the figures of Table 3, the efforts of the Adams states individually and collectively did not achieve hoped-for success. As shown in Table 3 only two states (Arkansas and Virginia) awarded more Ph.D.'s to blacks in 1983-84 than they awarded eight years earlier in 1975-76, approximately two years before plan implementation in 1978. Even these differences were minimal (1 and 2 respectively) while the decreases for Georgia and Oklahoma, comparing the two time points were slightly greater--4 and 5 respectively--about fifty percent fewer than eight years earlier for Oklahoma. Similarly, the totals for these five states show that for 1983-84 these states produced 78 black Ph.D.'s, six fewer than eight years earlier.

*See Tables 1-10 and 11-20 (Appendix D) for the actual counts and percentages of enrollment and degree attainment by race and ethnicity for each state. The tables include the earned degrees for the bachelors through the professional degree.

TABLE 3

Black Ph.D. Degree Attainment for Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Oklahoma, and Virginia

	1975-76 1	1976-77 1	1978-79 1	1979-80 2	1980-81 1	1981-82 2	1982-83 2	1983-84 2
Arkansas	5	3	4	5	3	6	6	6
Florida	36	39	27	26	34	28	30	36
Georgia	18	10	20	14	20	18	12	14
Oklahoma	10	6	22	7	11	11	13	5
Virginia	15	18	27	16	19	24	23	17
TOTALS	84	76	100	68	87	87	84	78

1. Earned Degree data for 1975-76, 1976-77, 1978-79, and 1980-81 are based on data from the Higher Education General Information Survey of degrees and other formal awards confirmed between July 1 and June 30 of the respective years (HEGIS XI, XII, XIV, AND XVI).

2. Earned Degree data reported for 1979-80, 1981-82, 1982-83, and 1983-84 are based on Annual Reports supplied by the state systemwide offices.

In addition to the above comparison, perhaps the more accurate and more revealing description of the patterns in Table 3 is the year-to-year fluctuations that occur for each state: there are no clear trends in the data for any one state or across the states. At best, the years 1980-81 to 1982-83 would appear to be relatively stable overall and for each state except Georgia. It could be suggested, based on the degree attainment figures, that the post-Plan implementation period has offered no substantial improvements over the pre-Plan period. In essence, the availability of a statewide program has not discernibly altered the number of black recipients of the doctorate at public institutions in these states. It appears that rather than increasing the number of students aided, the new sources of aid are being used by the same numbers of students.

A second indication of "effectiveness of state financial aid" is increased enrollment. That is, if increased amounts and sources of financial support are available, the expectation would be increases in the number of first-time black graduate students enrolled. The lack of financial support is cited as a major barrier to continuing one's schooling, especially for blacks (Copeland, 1984; Thomas, 1985). Table 4 presents the first-time black graduate enrollment figures for 1976 through 1984.

The numbers in Table 4 show a similar pattern of unevenness as is true for the degree attainment table. It is clear, however, that the reported figures for 1983 and 1984 are differently compiled

TABLE 4

First-Time Graduate Enrollment for Black Students in
Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Oklahoma, and Virginia¹

	1976 ²	1978 ²	1980 ²	1982 ²	1983 ³	1984 ³
Arkansas	86	102	79	40	106	131
Florida	204	238	278	226	-	115
Georgia	488	554	334	309	144	136
Oklahoma	116	109	97	72	137	145
Virginia	263	215	277	215	164	230
TOTALS	1157	1218	1065	862		757

1. The enrollment data reported in this table is given only for those four-year institutions in each state that awards the doctorate degree.
2. First-time black graduate enrollments for 1976, 1978, 1980 and 1982 are based on data from the Higher Education General Information Surveys of Fall Enrollment, public use data tapes for the respective years (HEGIS XI, XIII, XV, and XVII).
3. First-time black graduate enrollments for 1983 and 1984 are based on reports from the state system offices for each of the five states.

compared to the prior years reported. Taking Arkansas and Oklahoma as exceptions, we do see evidence of considerable improvements for 1983 and 1984. Nonetheless, using only the 1976 to 1982 years (based on HEGIS public use data tapes) it is readily apparent that the overall movement in black first-time graduate enrollment is downward. Here, the first year of plan implementation, 1978, is the year of highest first-time black graduate enrollment overall. By 1982 the overall enrollment figure is about 30% lower. Note also that 1978-79 was the year when the greatest number of doctorates was awarded to blacks. It is likely that increased sources or amounts of financial aid could have influenced both degree attainment and enrollment in that first year of full implementation especially in the limited case where near-Ph.D.'s were assisted to completion in one year. As we shall see below, that is not a remote possibility for Oklahoma and Virginia, the two states showing the largest increases in Ph.D.'s awarded to blacks from 1976-77 to 1978-79.

It is still the case, however, that the enrollment figures do not reflect a general pattern of change which would suggest that increases in financial aid have been effective in increasing the pool of black candidates for the doctorate. First-time graduate enrollment figures include those who will terminate with a Master's degree and in some fields there are strong financial incentives for doing so. On the other hand, the quality of direct aid available could increase the number of black students who will persist to the doctorate. In that case, the first-time black graduate enrollment numbers, while not increasing, could contain a greater proportion of

aspirants for the doctorate. A third factor related to increased access is the quality of financial support.

Table 5 summarizes the states' current efforts in providing financial assistance to black doctoral students. In addition, it provides an indication of the availability of state provided funding for recruitment, and other supportive services. It is important to emphasize that the monies reported here are those state funds which are clearly designated for the support of black graduate doctoral candidates and are centrally administered. The figures in the table do not represent the total sum of support made available by individual institutions, some of which may be provided by states and may be awarded to black graduate students. The reported monies represent funds made available through legislative action in response to Adams. We note here that for Arkansas, 1985-86 was the first year of implementation of such support.

For the average size of awards (column 1), the number of students supported (column 2 - FTE) and total (column 3), there are considerable differences from one state to the next. For the average dollar amounts, Florida (1), Georgia and Oklahoma are quite comparable, offering grants of five to six thousand dollars annually. By contrast, Virginia offers an average award of ten to twelve thousand to qualified employees comparable to Florida's (2) response, the Employee Grant-in-Aid Program. As we suggested earlier, some states have made explicit their intentions to use the support of doctoral candidates as an aid to their affirmative action promotion

Table 5

Characteristics of Systemwide State Financial Aid for
Black Doctoral/Graduate Students in Selected ADAMS States

STATE	FUNDING			RECRUITMENT		SUPPORT SERVICES		
	Ave.	FTE	Total \$	Length	Additive	Funded	Centralized	Funded
Arkansas	-	-	\$175,000	N/A	Yes	-	-	-
Florida (1)	\$5,000	63	315,000	Rnwble	Yes	No	No	Yes
(2)	17,000	10	170,000	Rnwble				
Georgia	5,000	120	600,000	Rnwble	Yes	No	Yes	No
Oklahoma	6,000	20	120,000	4 years	Yes	No	No	No
Virginia	10,000- 12,000	7-10	100,000	Rnwble	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

and hiring policies. In Virginia, Florida and Oklahoma, these intentions are quite clear. The newly implemented response from Arkansas is tailored in the same fashion.

Georgia and Florida are clearly supporting the greater numbers of students, perhaps reflecting their states' black population concentrations. Such is not the case in Virginia which also has a substantial black population but currently shows the smallest dollar amount and lowest number of students supported. The stipends for Virginia and Florida (2) are attractive and do not preclude other income (see Florida Desegregation Plan in Chapter II). These employee grant programs are renewable for at least one additional year in both Virginia and Florida and each carries a reciprocity work agreement based on leave time used. Each of these awards also includes a tuition payment, further enhancing the sufficiency of the award.

For the Florida (1), Georgia and Oklahoma grant programs, their stipend quality is enhanced because they are additive, used in conjunction with other forms of aid. For Oklahoma, the "packaging" of aid has been made quite explicit (see Oklahoma Desegregation Plan, Chapter II) and the resulting aid awards can total up to \$16,000 per year. For Florida, the grant program is renewable but the emphasis is on new students with other institutional support coming into play in subsequent years. By contrast, Oklahoma has followed a consistent plan of increasing the length of time a student may hold the award, from two years at its inception to the current four years. In each of the other states, the candidates who currently hold the awards are eligible to reapply but the aid is not guaranteed. In this sense,

only in Oklahoma can the grants be considered retentive. It should be noted, however, that this plan has been proposed in Florida but to date has not been implemented.

Finally, the reader should be reminded that the total amounts reported in Table 5 are annual, not cumulative. That is, new and continuing grantees are annually competing for a fixed amount of dollars, even in Oklahoma where such funds are retentive in practice. Two outcomes are potential here. First, the grant program could have "revolving door" impact if other aid sources such as departmentally awarded assistantships and waivers of tuition are not forthcoming or are insufficient. Second, such an arrangement could encourage increased emphasis on "picking the best horse." In the first instance one long-term possibility could be that students come to view the aid as less of an opportunity and more of a risk. Certainly it could increase the stress resulting from the need for competitive performance. In the second instance, an emphasis on selection might tend to perpetuate rigid adherence to traditional admissions criteria, especially test scores. This could have the effect of not increasing the candidate pool and hence not increasing production.

In general, we find the aid programs of good quality on each of our indicators except length. It is important that states thoroughly examine the orientation taken by Oklahoma and increasingly view and structure their grant programs as retentive. Beyond that, numbers (FTE) appear low in Virginia and Oklahoma and likely low in Arkansas. In both Oklahoma and Virginia this concern is being addressed. The Oklahoma Regents have made repeated requests for increases but it has not been forthcoming. Similarly, Virginia has made repeated requests

but with somewhat greater success. Beginning in 1985-86, the Council for Higher Education will administer a new pilot program, the Graduate Fellowship Program, offering a one-time, one-year graduate fellowship totaling \$4,400 to twenty-two students. Hopefully this effort will be continued and increased.

Recruitment and Support Services

In our proposal we suggested that, in addition to direct aid to black graduate students, an effective response should entail funded recruitment and support services for these students. In general, as Table 3 shows, only one state scores well on each of these measures while one other funds support services. Here we briefly describe the nature and funding of the services.

Briefly, only Virginia directly funds their recruitment effort. Annually, the current funding is at \$100,000 and provides for two services. The first is an annual workshop for potential graduate students who are currently enrolled as juniors in the states' public colleges. These workshops are attended by the deans and other academic officials representing the state's doctorate granting institutions. A second program, the Summer Undergraduate Program and Doctoral Program for Minority Virginians, is annually held providing undergraduates the opportunity to take one graduate course and receive an orientation to graduate work during the summer.

Florida currently provides \$342,000 to fund a special summer program for new, entering graduate and professional students. Each student receives a grant ranging from \$1,300 to \$1,500 to help defray the cost of tuition and living expenses.

While differently focused, each of these efforts seems quite appropriate based on the earlier cited studies by Peterson et al. (1978) and Blackwell (1981). These recruitment and support activities serve the purpose of stimulating interest in, increasing familiarity with and communicating the interest of the state and university in the students.

Summary

In summary here, we repeat the main findings. The pattern of earned doctorates for blacks in these states is uneven with no clearly discernible trend for any one state or overall. The 1983-84 degree count is lower but virtually no different from the 1975-76 count. Using an average of four to five years for degree completion, it is reasonable to expect changes as early as 1982-83 and certainly by 1983-84 in each of these states except for Arkansas. That this is not the case raises at least two possible interpretations. First, the 1975-76 degree count level may already reflect significant increases in each of these states and, hence, looking for further increments is likely to be disappointing. This may be likely but the funding levels reported here were initiated after 1975-76 and should show some impact. This suggests a second interpretation raised earlier, that perhaps these funds are being used as replacement funds, instead of loans or work. Still, however, it will be difficult to account for these low degree count levels given the numbers being supported in Florida and Georgia. The alternative suggestion that the grants are being used disproportionately for professional students is not borne out either. In Florida, for example, of sixty-six students supported as of fall 1983, nineteen

were reported enrolled in professional programs compared to forty-seven in traditional graduate fields leading to the doctorate.

The first-time black graduate enrollment rates underscore the nature of the impact or lack thereof. The decline over the six year period from 1976 to 1982 which exists for each state and overall, is significant. Table 6 underscores the twelve year pattern of national black graduate enrollment from 1972 to 1984. As shown, both in real numbers and as a percentage of all graduate students, blacks have experienced a precipitous decrease. Indeed, since 1980 there has been a 4000 student decline. Inasmuch as the observed patterns in these Adams states correspond to national trends, it forces us to reconsider ways of increasing the candidate pool.

The quality of direct aid being supplied by the states appears adequate on all but one of our criteria; its retentiveness. It is important that students have a sense of certainty about their financial support in order to maximize their planning and pursuit of graduate training. As was repeatedly expressed by our respondents, the emphasis has been on new students, probably attributable to a concern for improving black/white parity in enrollment. Obviously both goals are important but the consequences of their current tensions could render the programs less effective.

TABLE 6
 Black Full-Time Graduate Enrollment:
 Even Years, 1972 to 1984

Fall of Year	Full-time Graduate Students*	
	Black Students (in thousands)	Blacks as a Percent of All Students
1972	21	5.3
1974	22	5.5
1976	22	5.1
1978	21	4.9
1980	22	5.0
1982	19	4.2
1984	18	3.9

*Excludes (1) unclassified students (i.e., not candidates for a degree and (2) students in U.S. Service Schools.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, School Enrollment - Social Economic Characteristics of Students, Series P-20, Nos. 222, 303, 362, and 404.

Chapter 5

Recommendations

The purpose of this research was to assess the effectiveness of state financial aid in increasing the production of Black doctoral recipients. As the quantitative assessment revealed, the efforts of the states have been meaningful but are generally not sufficient with respect to retention. In addition, our interviews with state and campus representatives identified several practices which we feel should be encouraged. Below we offer recommendations covering four areas: Financial Aid; Recruitment; Support Services; and Administration.

Financial Aid

o Improve the quantity and quality of aid.

Not surprisingly, we find the number of students assisted and the overall quality of aid offered lacking. Only two states have provisions for doctoral grants to more than twenty students (Florida [73] and Georgia [120]). Arkansas, should it follow the award pattern of the other states which average about \$5,000, could assist as many as 35 students. On the other hand it could assist no more than 10 with an average award of \$17,500. It should also be noted that those states offering the greater number of awards are not restricting the support solely to graduate students but also assist professional students. The immediate way to increase the numbers of students supported would be to treat the monies as retentive and as aid which increases enrollment. Simply stated each award should be for a specified period and the same number of awards should be given annually. Thus a current arrangement for

supporting 20 students would be cumulative to 80 in the fourth year.

o Improve the quality of aid to black graduate students.

We recommend that aid be retentive. While we appreciate the needs of these states to show increases in enrollment, we feel that such a practice could eventuate in a revolving door experience as has been true of undergraduate programs that have not attended to retention activities in a comprehensive way. We suggest that it is even more important for graduate students to be able to plan their financial support well beyond the first year. The academic reasons for this recommendation seem obvious but in the case of black graduate students there are additional reasons. Traditionally the largest pool of black graduate candidates has been those who have delayed entry well beyond the year following undergraduate graduation for any number of reasons, including cost. In order to close the black-white gap in doctorate degree attainment it will be necessary to continue to recruit from this pool. Candidates from this pool present a broader range of financial obligations and hence greater need as well as a greater need for financial stability over the graduate years.

o Improve the quality of aid by increasing/supplementing awards.

This research did not interview graduate students and therefore cannot document the sufficiency of the awards from the students' perspective. However, we are impressed by the Oklahoma plan which has improved the adequacy of its awards by requiring supplementary support from the institutions enrolling the student. As a result the ensuing tax breaks increase the net amounts received by the

graduate students. However the unclear situation regarding the taxation of graduate fellowships and assistantships as well as tuition waivers at the federal level may dilute support already being provided.

Consideration must also be given to demographical data on the black person now enrolled in doctoral programs both locally and nationally. For example, the average age of black persons completing the doctorate is 38, compared to age 33 for their white cohorts. In 1985 at the national level, 53 percent of those blacks receiving the doctorate degree were women. The level of support necessary to pursue the degree is greatly influenced by the age and circumstance of those pursuing the degree. The implication here is that these female students who are older may have greater financial obligations and be required to combine work and school.

Finally, with respect to financial aid, we recommend the following strategies:

- Target financial aid to support students in specific graduate programs in order to compete with highly attractive employment opportunities. The Committee on Institutional Cooperation (CIC) Fellowship Program implemented by the participating BIG TEN universities and the University of Chicago and the McKnight Fellowship Program recently established by the State of Florida with funds from the McKnight Foundation are two such examples where the aid is targeted for the doctorate. These programs offer relatively attractive financial support and continue support beyond the

first year. The McKnight Program has also successfully utilized industry to supplement available financial aid.

- Consider extending aid to part-time black graduate students.

We were very impressed with the successes of this effort at Old Dominion University in Virginia. Especially for those campuses located in urban areas and where evening programs are a part of the graduate curriculum, potential black graduate students might find continued pursuit of the doctorate more accessible. Urban areas contain the greatest concentrations of blacks with the academic credentials to pursue the terminal doctorate. At the same time these potential graduate students face larger financial obligations which inhibit their prospects for full-time study. We recognize that such a plan departs in substantial ways from the traditional conceptualization of doctoral study but suggest that the feasibility of such an arrangement be carefully explored. The recently established Illinois Consortium for Educational Opportunity Program (ICEOP) by the State of Illinois supports both full-time and part-time students. One possibility is to require one-year of full-time resident study at a latter stage of the doctoral program.

Recruitment and Retention

- o Improve the recruitment effort with an emphasis on expanding the pool of candidates.

Recruiting efforts must be expanded to increase the pool of students who are interested in pursuing advanced graduate degrees.

- State funding for recruitment activities should be implemented or increased. The plan utilized by the University of Florida which entailed the involvement of faculty and current graduate students as recruiters, along with an intense focus on the Historically Black Institutions (HBI) was the most attractive recruitment effort about which we obtained information. Historically Black Institutions generally have the largest concentrations of potential applicants and the involvement of faculty in the recruitment effort communicates a high level of commitment from the recruiting institution.
- More isolated institutions should be supported in developing cooperative programs with Historically Black Institutions whereby students from HBIs spend one or more years studying on the Historically White Institutions (HWI) campuses during the undergraduate years. Many of the non-urban campuses and those lacking either the high national visibility or culturally rich and diverse local environment viewed as conducive to blacks, report that overcoming those obstacles is quite difficult. Such an effort might serve to generate both a better known and better informed pool of black graduate students. A likely indirect effect might be early socialization into a discipline/field of concentration. Programs such as Committee on Institutional Cooperation (CIC), Summer Research Opportunity Program (SROP) and the Minority Access to Research Careers (MARC), designed to introduce research to minority undergraduates, should be

implemented or expanded. It is essential that institutions of higher learning simply not engage in competing for the same students but develop and implement programs to increase the dwindling pool.

We view these recommendations as enhancements of existing efforts focusing on current undergraduates--summer programs, special recruitment workshops, etc.--and suggest that planning is probably a key to better recruitment. For example, Virginia institutions now share a listing of current undergraduate enrollees who are potential black graduate students. This feature of their recruitment effort demonstrates the way in which existing resources can be better utilized with effective planning.

Support Services

o Improve the provision for tutorial services, counseling/advising, mentoring and socialization into the doctoral discipline or field of study.

- No state office reported specific funding for academic support beyond a summer program (Florida and Virginia). Tutorial services were either provided by the student's department or were provided through the program coordinator's office. State assistance for such services could increase both the availability and utilization of such services.
- Funding should be available to support and encourage mentoring and professional socialization. A consistent problem for minorities and women at the graduate level (and in the professional areas also) has been the availability of

mentors and a concurrent problem of identifying faculty advisors who provide academic advising and psychological support.

We are impressed with the activities of the Oklahoma regents to provide special monies to encourage mentor relationships and to support conference attendance and other special involvements for doctoral students. Obtaining the doctorate entails more than completing the formal requirements prerequisite to initiating and sustaining an academic career. It is also critical that one acquires an appreciation for the standards and traditions for work in his field and these are often acquired through effective tutelage and involvement. The involvement may come with membership and participation in regional and national professional association for the candidates substantive area.

Administration

o Improve the administration of the activities aimed at increasing the production of Black doctorates.

- We find a variety of delivery systems in place across the five states and on the individual campuses. Even where central state offices exhibit effective administration, there can be campus level breakdowns. Moreover campus level administrators each acknowledge the importance (if not the sanctity) of departmental autonomy at the doctoral level with respect to recruitment, admission and retention. Given these latter considerations, we recommend no single design as best but offer the following general and specific recommendations:

- Centralize campus-level administrative responsibility and authority. It is essential to designate a person who has clear authority to develop and implement programs. Preferably a minority administrator/academician should assume this position.
- The campus-level administrator should report to the campus chief academic/administrative officer. The second and third recommendations above are intended to amplify the need for clearly communicating the institutional intent and commitment both internally and to outside audiences. In most instance, many of these arrangements currently exist in the states examined.

- Improve the management and reporting of program data.

While the Office for Civil Rights, Department of Education, requires specific data elements, we find one omission quite glaring: the specific form and amount of aid to graduate students by race, gender and ethnicity is not required as a separate entry as is enrollment. As a consequence, such data are difficult to accumulate in sufficient quantity or quality for trend analyses or for parity comparisons. Also, while most campuses and state offices produce annual reports, they vary between states and campuses and in some (rarely) instances are inconsistent over time. Further standardizing and elaborating the report procedures for doctoral/graduate level students should enhance both the internal and external understanding of and communications about the programs.

- Communicate clearly the dimensions of the services. It is vital that all appropriate state and campus level officials know the provisions of the program. One state, for example, was not clear on whether or not out-of-state students were eligible.

Finally, on most campuses at least four positions are involved in the administrative/decision flow for these programs: the Affirmative Action Officer; Graduate Dean; Financial Aid Officer and the Graduate Admissions Officer. In most instances either the Affirmative Action Officer or Graduate Dean (or his assistant) had primary responsibility/authority for the program. However, only in two instances did we experience a campus where one officer had comprehensive data. While this may not be a critical problem, it does reflect the need for centralization and clear and regular communications. Such changes should enhance the operation and subsequent achievements of the programmatic efforts.

o Expand the availability of state supported doctoral programs at Historically Black Institutions.

This recommendation follows only indirectly from the research reported here. During the period covered in this report, only one Historically Black Institution offered the doctorate in any field (Florida A and M in Pharmacy with three (3) doctorates reported awarded in 1980-81).

Research has consistently shown that HBIS continue to award a substantial proportion of the degrees awarded to blacks at each

degree level and even more so in high demand areas like medicine, law and the biological sciences at the first professional and doctoral levels. It seems most appropriate to capitalize on this history of success and to do so under the aegis of Adams which specifically calls for the enhancement of the HBIs in these states. Even granting major consideration to avoiding program duplication does not prevent a more thorough assessment of the efficacy of expanding existing graduate level programs at HBIs to doctoral status.

The above recommendations grow out of findings in this research effort along with our sense of what the literature suggests regarding educational opportunity programs, minority graduate students and effective administration. We are not suggesting that each state and each campus must respond to each recommendation but rather that each of the states and campuses could profitably respond to one or more of the recommendations. We also recognize that our recommendations regarding financial aid are made at a time when the effects of retrenchment and Gramm-Rudmann are both exacting substantial tolls on state and campus level resources which greatly constrain responses to recommendations on the quantity and quality of aid. At the same time, those same constraints make it doubly important that the financial support of black graduate/doctoral students be enhanced. Indeed those constraints are likely to have far more serious negative consequences on the decisions of blacks to pursue doctoral studies without a clear base of adequate support.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the efforts of the five states reported here, to increase the production of Black doctorate recipients, have improved in considerable ways since their inception. Nevertheless, the net result of these programs after six years of operation has to be considered minimal if our criteria are (a) an increase in the number of Black Ph.D.'s produced or (b) an increase in first-time black graduate enrollment. In both cases the total 1983-84 counts are lower than both the 1978-79 counts and the 1975-76 counts, the latter being two years prior to plan acceptance. As is clear from national data, there has been a precipitous decline in Black participation in graduate education since the latter half of the 1970s. Even in those instances such as Adams, where legal decisions have required improvements, the evidence indicates that successes have not been forthcoming. It is imperative that efforts to bring about improvements be redoubled.

REFERENCES

- Astin, Alexander W. Minorities in American Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1982.
- Blackwell, James E. Access of Black Students to Graduate and Professional Schools. Atlanta, GA: Southern Education Foundation, 1975.
- Blackwell, James E. Mainstreaming Outsiders: The Production of Black Professionals. New York: General Hall Publishing Co., 1981.
- Boyd, William M., II. Desegregating America's Colleges: A Nationwide Survey of Black Students, 1972-73. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1974.
- Brown, Frank and Madelon D. Stent. Minorities in U.S. Institutions of Higher Education. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1977.
- Copeland, Elaine J. "Trends in Black Participation in Graduate Education: Barriers to Access, Possible Alternatives." Paper presented at the second national conference on issues facing black administrators at predominantly white colleges and universities. Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1984.
- _____ The Effects of Major Socioeconomic Factors on Black Graduate Student Enrollment: A Trend Analysis, 1967-1985, 1986, unpublished manuscript.
- Ford Foundation. "A Survey of Black American Doctorates." Ford Foundation, Office of Reports, New York, NY, 1970.

Haynes, L.L. A Critical Examination of the Adams Case: A Source Book. Washington, D.C.: Institute for Services to Education, 1978.

Haynes, L.L. (Ed.). An Analysis of the Arkansas - Georgia Statewide Desegregation Plans. Washington, D.C.: Institute for Services to Education, 1979.

Institute for the Study of Educational Policy. Equal Education Opportunity Scoreboard: The Status of Black Americans in Higher Education, 1970-79. Washington, D.C.: Howard University Press, 1981.

Mingle, James R. Black Enrollment in Higher Education: Trends in the Nation and the South. Research Report, Southern Regional Education Board, 1978.

Morris, Lorenzo, Elusive Equality. Washington, D.C.: Howard University Press, 1979.

National Advisory Committee on Black Higher Education and Black Colleges and Universities. A Loosing Battle: The Decline in Black Participation in Graduate and Professional Education. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, 1980.

National Board on Graduate Education. Minority Group Participation in Graduate Education. Washington, D.C., 1976.

National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). Higher Education General Information Survey of Earned Degrees. Washington, D.C.: Department of Education, 1975-76, 1980-81, unpublished data.

National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). Higher Education General Information Survey of Fall Enrollment in Colleges and Universities, 1976, 1978, 1980, 1982. Washington, D.C.: Department of Education, 1982, unpublished data.

National Research Council. Doctorate Recipients from United States Universities. Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Sciences, 1982.

Peterson, Marvin W., Robert T. Blackburn, Zelda F. Gamson, Carlos H. Arce, Roselle W. Davenport, and James R. Mingle. Black Students on White Campuses: The Impacts of Increased Black Enrollments. Ann Arbor, MI: The Institute for Social Research, Univ. of Michigan, 1978.

Rockefeller Foundation. "Bakke, Weber and Affirmative Action." A Rockefeller Foundation Conference, The Rockefeller Foundation, July 12-13, 1979.

Thomas, Gail. The Access and Success of Blacks and Hispanics in U.S. Graduate and Professional Education. Office of Scientific and Engineering Personnel, National Research Council, National Academy Press, Washington, D.C., 1986.

Trent, William T. "Equity Considerations in Higher Education: Race and Sex Differences in Degree Attainment and Major Field from 1975-76 through 1980-81. American Journal of Education, Vol. 92, No. 3, May 1984.

"Comparisons of Race and Gender Degree Attainment in 1975-76 and 1980-81: A Focus on Equity." Paper presented to the Annual Meeting of the Southern Sociological Society, April 1984.

Wright, Stephen J. "Redressing the Imbalance of Minority Groups in the Professions." Journal of Higher Education 93:3 (March 1972), pp. 239-248.

Appendix A
Interview Schedule

Cover Sheet

Interviewer _____

Respondent: Name _____ State _____
 Position _____
 Date _____
 Time: Begin _____ End _____

Effectiveness of State Financial Aid in the
Production of Black Doctoral Recipients

Co-Principals: Elaine Copeland
Associate Dean
Graduate College Administration
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
107 Coble Hall
(217) 333-4860

William T. Trent
Assistant Professor
Sociology of Education
Department of Educational Policy
Studies
368 Education Building
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
1310 South Sixth Street
(217) 333-6153

I'd like to begin with some basic data on what you see your state and its senior institutions accomplishing in response to the Adam's mandate regarding increasing the number of black doctoral degree holders.

- 1) Tell me about this state's response, beginning with the planning phase following acceptance of your plan by OCR. First, how many years has the effort been in effect?

- a) What state/university officials were involved in the planning and development?

- b) How many months/years did the planning phase last?

- c) What were the key issues raised during the planning phase?
i) How did you secure the cooperation of the various academic departments? Was this a major obstacle?

- ii) How did you treat the issue of departmental/campus autonomy? Was this a major obstacle?

- iii) How did you treat the issues of identifying/recruiting candidates? Was this a major obstacle?

- iv) How was the cost issue treated? How were initial estimates of cost arrived at?

- d) What were the categories of cost; what did you foresee spending money for in this effort?

- e) Please rate the success of the planning phase? 1) very unsuccessful; 2) unsuccessful; 3) successful; 4) very successful

i) Please explain your rating of the planning phase.

- 2) Please assess implementation? Would you say it was:
1) very difficult; 2) difficult; 3) smooth; 4) very smooth.

a) If 1) or 2) then what have been the key problems? Would you rank them please?

b) In the beginning, were all of your doctoral granting campuses enrolling about the same number of black graduate students?

If "no", then:

i) For those campuses that were enrolling more, were their experiences especially informative?, and, in what ways?

- c) What were the steps taken to implement the state's response (i.e., first we identified a central coordination, or, first we sent a special letter to all Deans and department chairs, and then.....etc.).
-
-

- d) Do you feel that the state is beyond the implementation phase? If not, what remains?
-

As our letter of introduction explained we are particularly concerned to identify systematic program services in an effort to help us better understand how an increase in the number of black Ph.D.'s can be successfully approached. I'd like to turn now to a discussion of specific features of your program.

Financial Assistance

A. Aid Opportunities (Use Form A for your responses please.)

1. Using the list on Form "A", please identify the specific types of state allocated aid (grants, scholarships, fellowships, loans, etc.) available to black doctoral level degree work and the date of implementation (Col. 1). What others?
2. How long (in years) are these available to each recipient (e.g., 1 year renewable, 3, 4, or 5 years, etc.). (Col. 2)
3. For each type of aid identified above give the current number of users (1983-84). (Col. 3) What will be the number of users in 1984-85? (Col. 4) How many past users have there been? (Col. 5) What is the maximum dollar amount available to a recipient each year? (Col. 6) What is the total dollar amount allocated by the state for each aid type in 1984-85? (Col. 7) Is this an increase or decrease from last year? (Col. 8) How much? (Col. 9)
4. For each type of aid identified in "1" above, please give its planned funding level for the next budget year. (Col. 10)
5. For each type of aid identified in "1" above, please indicate whether or not it can be used in conjunction with another or in conjunction with other sources of aid. (Col. 11; 1 = yes; 0 = no)
6. Please indicate for each form of aid in "1" above the limitations on residency and citizenship that govern the awards. (Col. 12 of Form A)

7. Please provide below an example(s) of typical state funded financial aid "packages" for black doctoral students.
8. Please list and give the dollar amount of non-state (private) revenues that serve as either matching or independent aid set aside for black doctoral candidates. (Use Form A, part 2)

Aid Process and Quality

B. Next let's talk about the "process" of securing and the "quality" of the aid.

First, we are aware that, in many instances, doctoral applicants usually correspond mainly with their anticipated major field department and subsequently with the graduate programs office/officer. Could you please tell me about this process in this state, especially as it pertains to Adams considerations.

1. What are the criteria for a black graduate student to be countable as a response to your Adams mission?

2. Please describe in detail the application procedure for consideration for financial aid.

- a) How are applications for aid consideration made available to potential doctoral candidates?

- b) Are applications available on request only?

c) What university/state positions review and act on applications?

3. Please describe any "formula" used in the determination of aid awards by defining formula components (e.g., income levels, dependents and any special considerations).

4. Please describe the direct and indirect education costs that state provided aid will cover (tuition, books, fees, housing, dissertation research, and stipends or conference attendance, professional association dues, etc.).

5. Can state monies be used by blacks to matriculate from private institutions at the doctoral level?

Yes _____

No _____

Recruitment

1. How are potential black doctoral candidates identified?

2. What specific practices are employed to inform blacks in four-year-only state institutions of doctoral program opportunities available in senior state colleges and universities?

3. Does the state currently provide for specifically post-baccalaureate minority recruitment efforts?

 - a) In what year was this funding initiated?

 - b) What dollar amount was available in the first year for those activities?

 - c) What is the current dollar amount available for the current year?

4. Is there an office or officer responsible for coordination or administration of recruitment activities (for black doctoral study)?

5. Do black faculty and administrators participate in the recruitment process.

6. Often there are blacks in teaching or administrative positions who do not have the terminal academic degree but who represent an immediate pool of doctoral candidates. Do these persons constitute a separate pool for recruitment?

7. What recommendations would you have for improving the recruitment activities?

8. Please describe the components of the "admission to graduate study" decision. If possible please rank these in their order of importance.

Support Services

1. Please list the range of support services designated to sustain the matriculation of black doctoral candidates.

- a) What retention activities are funded by the state for the specific purpose of sustaining the enrollment of black graduate students (i.e., pre-enrollment academic services, post-enrollment academic services, special courses, workshops or training).

i) What dollar amount is currently available for these activities?

ii) Is this an increase or decrease over prior years?

iii) In what year were these services initiated?

- b) What retention activities make use of university based services not funded as a special component of a desegregation program (i.e., writing or other skills labs, counseling, etc.).

2. Please give the number of students utilizing each of the services above for the past year.

3. Please rate the effectiveness of the support services listed above from least effective to most effective (1 2 3 4). (The criterion for effectiveness may be the level of demand for the service or an assessment based on a formal evaluation you are personally aware of. If there is a formal evaluation of any of the services, may we please have a copy of that report?)

4. Finally could I please obtain from you a copy of reports giving counts for the following:

a) Number of applicants for doctoral study by year and campus since acceptance of your plans by OCR.

b) Number of black applicants for doctoral study by year and campus since acceptance of your plans by OCR.

c) Number of acceptances for doctoral study by year and campus since acceptance of your plans by OCR.

d) Number of black acceptances for doctoral study by year and campus since acceptance of your plans by OCR.

e) Number of enrollees for doctoral study by year and campus since acceptance of your plans by OCR.

f) Number of black enrollees for doctoral study by year and campus since acceptance of your plans by OCR.

Form "A" - Please use with Items 1-8 on Pages 3 and 4

Financial Aid		Item 3					Item 4	Item 5	Item 6
Item 1	Item 2	What's the max. \$ value of this aid/yr?/std.	How many \$'s were allocated to this aid in 1984-85?	Is this an inc. over last year? 1 = yes 0 = no	How much (in \$) of an inc. or dec.	How much (in \$) is allocated for 1985-86	Can this aid be used in conjunction w/other aid	Residency and Citizenship Requirements**	
Check (✓) each type of state aid available	What is the average length of this award?	How many students receive this aid? 1984-85 1985-86 Pre-1984							
Item:	What was the date of initial funding								
Flushps									
Asseshtps									
Schlrshps									
Loan									
Grants									
Other (Specify)									

** 1 = Native of State
2 = Current Resident
3 = 1 and 2
4 = Resident & Citizen
5 = No Limitations

Form A, Pt. 2
Item 8

Non-State (Private)
Revenues for
Black Doctoral
Students (List)

1) None _____
2) _____
3) _____
4) _____

Average
Dollar
Amount

Appendix B
List of Key Informants

Persons Interviewed

Arkansas

Arkansas Department of Education

Ms. Cynthia Moten, Human Resources Coordinator

University of Arkansas

Dr. Barbara Taylor, Director of Human Relations

Georgia

Georgia Board of Regents

Dr. H. D. Propsts, Chancellor

Dr. Thomas McDonald, Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs

Georgia State University

Thomas Brewer, Vice President for Academic Affairs

Georgia Institute of Technology

Walter O. Carlson, Associate Vice President for Graduate Studies
and Research

Helen Grenga, Associate Dean for Graduate Studies

University of Georgia

Harold W. Gentry, Associate Dean of the Graduate School

Florida

State University System Office

Mr. Peter DeHaan, Assistant Director of Equal Opportunity

Florida State University

Dr. Russell Johnson, Associate Graduate Dean

University of Florida

Dr. Rod McDavis, Assistant Dean of Graduate Studies

University of South Florida

Dr. Carl Riggs, Dean of the Graduate School, Coordinator of University
Research

Dr. James Rennick, Assistant Dean, Graduate School

Oklahoma

Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education

Joe E. Hagy, State Plan Coordinator

University of Oklahoma

Walter Mason, Affirmative Action Compliance Officer

Oklahoma University Health Sciences Center

Beth Wilson, Affirmative Action Officer

Ralph Daniels, Associate Graduate Dean

Oklahoma State University

Pauline Kopecky, Affirmative Action Officer

Kenneth R. Chance, Reports Analyst

Virginia

University of Virginia

Dr. William A. Elwood
Associate Dean - Arts & Science
University of Virginia
438 Cabell Hall
Charlottesville, VA 22903

Virginia Commonwealth University

Dr. John H. McGrath
Associate Dean of the School
of Graduate Studies
Virginia Commonwealth University
Box 568, MCV Station
Richmond, VA 23298

Tyree Felder
EEO Officer

Bud Kinder
Director of Financial
Aid

Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

Dr. Roger A. Teekell
Associate Dean - Graduate School
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and
State University
100 Sandy Hall
Blacksburg, VA 24061

Old Dominion University

Dr. Lucy R. Wilson
Associate Vice President for
Academic Affairs
Old Dominion University
New Administration Building
Norfolk, VA 23508

The College of William and Mary

Dr. Rolf G. Winter
Dean of Graduate School -
Arts & Science
The College of William & Mary
Williamsburg, VA 23185

Dale Robinson
EEO Officer

Council of Higher Education

James A. McClean
Coordinator of Affirmative Action
and Student Research

Appendix C
State Wide Plans
(Planned Commitments -
Excerpts from Plans Submitted
to the Office for Civil Rights (OCR)
for
Arkansas
Florida
Georgia
Oklahoma
Virginia

Arkansas Plan Commitments

D. Entrance to graduate and first-professional study (Criterion II.C) as

1. Statement of goal or commitment

A background analysis on entrance to graduate and professional study was conducted by Arkansas. The Plan reported the results of the study:

In 1976, the proportion of Black state residents graduating from undergraduate programs at the nine public institutions in the state was 11.0%. In that same year, the proportion of Black students entering graduate and professional programs in seven of those same institutions was 6.7%.

Thus, Arkansas identified systemwide disparity at (11.0-6.7=4.3%) and uses this when it states its commitment:

The state of Arkansas will have reduced the disparity between the proportions of Black and White students enrolled in graduate and professional schools in the state system by 1981-82. Further, the current 4.3% disparity between Black and White graduates and enrollments in graduate and professional schools will have been reduced by approximately twenty five percent for the next four years. Thus, each year will expect a reduction of roughly one percentage point of the total 4.3% disparity. The reduction of one percent point per

year will be separate goals for the schools of law and medicine even though for these schools this will be a greater degree of improvement.

In addition to eliminating systemwide disparity, the state also committed to eliminating disparity for major fields of study. The disparity for Agriculture and Natural Resources, Architecture and Environmental Design, Biological Science, Business Management, Engineering, Physical Sciences and All other Fields was developed between the proportion of Black students graduating with undergraduate degrees in these major fields entering graduate programs in the respective major fields. For disparities in law and medicine, the total figures for all of the majors were used because "it is difficult to decide which undergraduate major fields all of the students will have graduated in that entered either law or medicine". The goal for major fields of study is to eliminate disparities by 1981-1982. The appropriate feeder disciplines for each major field is given in Exhibit 2.

2. Measures and assumptions

Although the State promised both to reduce the disparity between the proportion of Black and White total graduate/professional school enrollment as well as the disparity between Black/White college graduates and graduate/professional school entry of Black and White students, the State has reported progress in this area by submitting data which disclose the disparity between Black college graduates within the State and Black

graduate/professional school entry. For each academic year, the disparity for each major program (and for entrance into graduate and professional programs, as a whole) is computed using the following:

- Black baccalaureate graduates in the appropriate feeder disciplines as a percent of the total number of baccalaureate graduates in the appropriate feeder disciplines
- Black first-time enrollment in each graduate program as a percent of the total first-time enrollment in that graduate program
- Black first-year enrollment in each professional program as a percent of the total first-year enrollment in that professional program.

The disparity for the academic year shall be computed as the difference in the Black percent of baccalaureate graduates and the Black percent of first-time and first-year enrollment in graduate and professional programs, respectively. The stated goal for 1981-82 is that these disparity values have been eliminated (difference is not greater than zero).

It is assumed that appropriate feed disciplines are all undergraduate programs for those major fields not specifically addressed by Arkansas.

3. Source data and/or surrogates

The following data are required:

- Baccalaureate degrees awarded by discipline to within-state residents.

- First-year enrollment in first professional studies by discipline
- First-time enrollment in graduate studies by discipline.

4. Analysis Tables

Six tables are presented in the original report to examine the state's progress towards the stated goal. Tables II.C-1 and II.C-2 provide sufficient information for determining whether disparities have been eliminated. Tables II.C-3, II.C-4 and II.C-5 may be used if additional institutional information is required.

Table II.C-6 presents a summary of data across years. Data for 1978, 1979 and 1981 were derived from Table II.C-1 of the analysis reports for the OCR 4000, 5000 and 7000, respectively.

Florida Plan Commitments

(C) Increased Enrollments in Graduate and Professional Programs
(HEW Criterion IIC)

The State University System has adopted the following goal in support of its committee to increase Black student enrollment in its graduate and professional programs:

To enroll from the State University System Institutions first time graduate and professional students in black/white proportions which approximate the black/white proportions of students who graduate with bachelor's degrees and appropriate academic majors from institutions within the state university system. Each institution will make an equitable contribution toward meeting this goal within each of its major fields of graduate and professional studies.

Recent enrollment data indicate the State University System is very close to meeting the overall intent of Criterion II-C. The percentage of Black graduates of the State University System who enroll in graduate and professional programs within the System is at least comparable to the percentage for White students.

Black students received 6.9 percent of the black/white total for Bachelor's Degrees awarded during 1975-76 and represented 6.8 percent of the first time in graduate school enrollments by students whose last institution was within the State University System. Although the precise data are not yet available on first time enrollments of System graduates by major graduate and professional program areas, each institution will make an equitable contribution toward

increasing Black enrollments in their graduate and professional programs to maintain achievement of this goal Systemwide. In particular, each of the professional schools and major graduate areas⁵ within the System will strive to enroll Black students at no less than the proportion of Black students graduating with Baccalaureates.

(E) Achievement of Educational Goals

(HEW Criterion IIE)

The State University System reaffirms its commitment to one of the basic objectives of the 1974 Plan: To achieve equality of opportunity for all citizens beyond high school from beginning student through the doctoral, professional, and continuing educational levels. Implicit in this objective is the assurance that all students be provided effective personal and academic support to ensure achievement of educational goals.

In support of this objective, Florida makes the following commitment in accordance with Criterion II-E:

For those students seeking degrees or certificates, Florida will examine the proportion of black and white students completing and graduating from public community colleges and universities, if any disparity exists, Florida will take reasonable steps required to reduce this disparity.

⁵Major Graduate and Professional Programs include: Dentistry, Medicine, Law, Veterinary Medicine, Pharmacy, Architecture, Nursing, Engineering, Graduate Health Programs in addition to other graduate programs, including Teacher Education and Business Administration.

All institutions have implemented various types and forms of special supportive programs to address the special needs of students. Increased emphasis will be given to continued development and refinement of these programs in order to more adequately assist students to overcome any real or perceived academic deficiencies. Counseling, tutorial assistance, special orientation activities and financial aid are among the student services which have been developed to aid in the retention of Black students. The ultimate objective of reducing any disparity between the proportion of Black students and the proportion of white students seeking and earning degrees at all levels shall be a priority for all higher education institutions within the State University System.

Georgia Plan Commitments

D. Entrance to graduate and first professional study (Criterion II.C)

1. Statement of goal or commitment

In the Plan, per Criterion II.C, Georgia states that "at least equal proportions of Black and White state resident graduates from undergraduate institutions enter and graduate from state system graduate schools."

However, Georgia continued to state that "a detailed review...reveals that a real and pervasive desegregation problem is concealed by these overall statistics."

Detailed data "reveal that the preponderance of bachelors degrees received by Blacks are in the fields of business, education, and social science" while "a similar, but somewhat less pronounced, distribution of degrees awarded to Blacks, is noted at the masters level."

Specific numerical goals for entrance into graduate or professional studies by program were not provided in the Plan document.

The March 8, 1978 Letter provided clarifying material in support of the Plan document. Page 10 of this letter states:

The Board of Regents adopts as a goal the continued parity of Black and White state residents who graduate from undergraduate

institutions and enter graduate or professional schools in the University System.

Also contained in the March 8, 1978 Letter was a table showing graduate and first professional enrollment projections from 1976 through 1982 for several major fields of study.

However, these enrollment projections were for total enrollment, not just entering enrollment. Therefore, the projected enrollments do not address directly the commitment made by Georgia.

2. Measures and assumptions

As stated in the March 8, 1978 Letter, the following measures will directly relate to the Georgia commitment:

- proportion of baccalaureate degrees granted to Black and White state residents in the immediately preceding year ;
- proportion of Black and White students entering each graduate/professional program in the current academic year.

It is assumed that appropriate feeder disciplines, for each graduate/professional program, are all undergraduate programs, i.e., all undergraduate degrees will be used as a baseline.

It should be noted that feeder programs are suggested by the table in the March 8, 1978 Letter. However, the precise definition of the undergraduate feeder programs is lacking in the plan documents.

3. Source data and/or surrogates

Evaluating progress towards "parity" will require the following:

- Baccalaureate degrees granted to within-state residents

The OCR 7000 2300 2.1 (Earned Degrees) Supplement contains the data for baccalaureate degrees granted to state residents in academic year 1980-81.

- First-year enrollment in first-professional studies by discipline

The OCR 7000 2300 2.3 (Fall Enrollment) Supplement contains the data for both full-time and part-time enrollment.

- First-time enrollment in graduate studies by discipline

These data come from the 1981-82 ED (NCES) 2300-2.3 (Fall Enrollment) form lines 12 (full-time) and 26 (part-time).

- First-time within-state professional enrollment

The OCR 7000 B1 form provides the data on lines 27, 30 and 33.

- First-time within-state graduate enrollment

The OCR 7000 B1 form provides the data on lines 54, 57 and 60.

4. Analysis tables

Six tables are presented to examine Georgia's progress per Criterion II.C. Table II.C-1 provides the statewide

summary with regards to total graduate and professional enrollment. Table II.C-2 provides information for graduate programs by major field of study. Table II.C-3 provides information on entrance into professional institutions.

Tables II.C-4 and II.C-5 present 1981-82 entering graduate and professional enrollment for within-state residents only. Table II.C-4 presents a statewide summary, while Table II.C-5 presents institutional detail. Table II.C-6 presents a summary of data across years for within-state residents.

E. Proportion of White students at traditionally Black institutions (Criterion II.D)

1. Statement of goal or commitment

In the Plan, Georgia provided numerical goals for "other" student enrollment at the three traditionally Black institutions. These were subsequently withdrawn in the December 15, 1977 Letter. Therefore, Georgia will be examined as per Criterion II.D which states:

Adopt the goal of increasing the total proportion of White students attending traditionally Black institutions.

2. Measures and assumptions

With respect to the language of the Criteria, a measure of the proportion of White students attending the three traditionally Black institutions of the Georgia University System is relevant.

It is assumed that unclassified students should be included and that graduate and first-professional data are to be included if relevant.

3. Source data and/or surrogates

Summary enrollment data will come from the 1981-82 ED (NCES) 2300-2.3 (Fall Enrollment) form - summary page (with major field code 9999). Undergraduate enrollment data are on lines 1 (full-time) and 15 (part-time); post-baccalaureate enrollment are on lines 10 and 11 (full-time) and 24 and 25 (part-time); unclassified students are on lines 8 and 9 (full-time) and 22 and 23 (part-time).

4. Analysis tables

Three tables are presented to analyze White student enrollment at traditionally Black institutions. Table II.D-1 provides the statewide summary for the White student enrollment at the traditionally Black institutions, taken as a whole. Table II.D-2 provides student enrollment at each of the Black institutions. Table II.D-3 presents a summary of progress across years. Data for 1978, 1979 and 1981 were derived from Table II.D-1 of the analysis reports for the OCR 4000, 5000 and 7000, respectively.

Oklahoma Plan Commitments

D. Entrance to graduate and first professional study (Criterion II.C)

1. Statement of goal or commitment

Supplement II states:

It is the goal of the State Regents that the proportion of Black state residents, who graduate from undergraduate institutions in the State System and enter graduate study or professional schools in the State System, shall be at least equal to the proportion of White state residents who graduate from undergraduate institutions in the State System and enter such school.

When the Revised State Plan was submitted (in September 1977), "one of 3.76 Black baccalaureates in Oklahoma continued on to graduate school as compared to a ratio of one out of five White baccalaureate degrees. At the same time, only one in 57 Blacks pursued professional education as compared to one of 13.7 White baccalaureate graduates. The State of Oklahoma...must strive to (1) maintain its present level of accomplishment while (2) attempting to equalize the distribution across fields."
(Revised State Plan)

2. Measures and assumptions

As stated in Supplement II, and as illustrated in the 1980 Annual Report, "...numerical goals will be based upon a comparison of the racial proportions of students earning baccalaureate degrees, with the racial proportions of students entering graduate or professional programs." Therefore, the following measures will directly relate to the stated goal:

- ratio of Black baccalaureate degree within state graduates to White baccalaureate degree within state graduates for the immediately preceding year
- ratio of Black within state students entering graduate/professional programs to White within state students entering graduate/professional programs.

In the first ratio is less than or equal to the latter ratio, then Oklahoma can be said to have achieved its stated goal. The ratios shall be for graduate and professional programs, taken as a whole, as well as for individual major fields of study.

In addition, the 1979 Annual Report provided revised numerical projections of Black resident students in each professional school's entering class. (Appendix L, pages 152-154 of 1979 Annual Report.) These projections are shown in Exhibit 3. The goals for first-year graduate enrollment by area of study were provided in Table One of the Goals for Graduate and Professional Students.

F. Completion of higher education studies (Criterion II.E)

1. State of goal or commitment

The Revised State Plan states:

The Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education are committed to an absolute reduction of any disparity between the population of Black and White students graduating with baccalaureate, master's, and doctoral degrees. The reflection of this commitment is made in Table Three which realistically details the progression of increasing numbers of Black students through the various degree levels.

Table Three, page 26 of the Revised State Plan, was subsequently revised. Firstly, the variance figures of plus or minus 25 percent were withdrawn by Oklahoma (Supplement I to the Revised State Plan, page 9).

Secondly, the incremental goals to increase degrees granted were updated. In the 1979 Annual Report, as stated in page 17 of the 1979 Annual Report, "...these new projections bring the goals closer to a more probable reality and are based on unit data that has a higher degree of accuracy and reliability than the aggregate data used in the original projections."

The numerical goals from page 90 of the 1979 Annual Report are shown in Exhibit 6. The numerical goals of Exhibit 6 were based on enrollment figures given in

Exhibit 7 (1979 Annual Report, page 91) for 1980-81 academic year.

2. Measures and assumptions

The goals for Bachelor's, Master's and Doctoral degrees as given in Exhibit 6 were developed using the model that:

- the Black/White ratio of Bachelor's degrees awarded should resemble the Black/White ratio of the beginning college senior class of the same year
- the Black/White ratio of the Master's degrees awarded should resemble the Black/White ratio of the Bachelor's degrees awarded two years previously
- the Black/White ratio of the Doctor's degrees awarded should resemble the Black/White ratio of the Master's degrees awarded three years previously.

The methodology presented in Exhibit 6 will be used to determine the applicable goals rather than using the specific goals given in Exhibit 6.

Virginia Plan Commitments

D. Entrance to graduate and first professional study (Criterion II.C)

1. State of goal or commitment

In the Revised State Plan (page 64), Virginia states:

The Commonwealth of Virginia is committed to take all reasonable steps to eliminate by major fields of study whatever disparity exists between the proportion of Black and White State residents who graduate from undergraduate institutions in the State system and enter graduate study or professional schools in the State system.

Interim objectives were presented on page 66 of the Revised State Plan. These "indicate the tentative percentage increases the Commonwealth will strive to achieve by 1982-83. The objectives will be revised periodically to reflect improved data and changes in graduation rates" (Revised State Plan, page 67). The interim objectives are reproduced in Exhibit 3.

It should be noted that in computing entrance rates (for the system as a whole as well as by major fields of study), Virginia used total baccalaureate degrees granted to state residents. The state did not distinguish among undergraduate feeder programs.

2. Measures and assumptions

The following measures will directly relate to the stated goal:

- the percent of Black baccalaureate degree graduates who enter graduate or professional studies
- the percent of White baccalaureate degree graduates who enter graduate or professional studies.

If the first percentage is greater than or equal to the second, Virginia can be said to have achieved its stated goal. The percentages shall be for graduate and professional programs, taken as a whole, as well as for individual major fields of study. The appropriate baseline to be used is total baccalaureate degrees granted to state residents in the immediately preceding year.

3. Source data and/or surrogates

The following data elements are required:

- a. Baccalaureate degrees granted by Virginia to state residents

The OCR 7000 2300 2.1 Supplement contains the data for baccalaureate degrees granted in academic year 1980-81 to state residents.

F. Completion of higher education studies (Criterion II.E)

1. Statement of goal or commitment

The Revised State Plan (page 69) specifies the goal as follows:

Through the efforts of the Council of Higher Education and the individual institutions, the State will take all reasonable steps to identify and then reduce any disparity that is found to exist between the proportion

of Black and White students completing and graduating from the two-year, four-year, and graduate state-supported institutions of higher education.

Virginia has completed a study related to Criterion II.E which tracks cohorts of students (Comparison of Retention and Completion Rates of Black and White Freshmen Who Enrolled in Virginia State-Supported Institutions of Higher Education in Fall 1975).

However, this study of cohorts cannot be replicated using data from the OCR forms. The analysis methodology shown in this section is another way of examining the issue.

2. Measures and assumptions

In order to calculate retention/completion rates, the methodology must use data over a given time period. The retention rates for White students and for Black students are computed and compared. Then the difference in the retention rates are computed for an indication of the disparity between completion rates for Black and White students.

The retention/completion rate is defined as:

- the number of students in a given class standing divided into the number of students who progress to the next class standing within a year's time.

As an example, the number of Black freshmen in 1980-81 divided into the number of Black second-year undergraduate students in 1981-82 gives a retention rate

for progression from freshmen to second-year class standing for Black students. It should be noted that for some class standings (e.g. seniors) the logical progression is a degree (e.g. Baccalaureate degree) at the end of the academic year.

It is assumed that only data for full-time students are to be used; full-time students would be expected to progress to the next class standing in a year's time.

Appendix D
Degree Attainment by Race/Ethnicity in Traditionally
Black and White Adams Public Colleges
Tables

Table 7

GRADUATE ENROLLMENT BY RACE/ETHNICITY IN TRADITIONALLY
BLACK AND WHITE ADAMS PUBLIC COLLEGES
1976-1982

State: ARKANSAS Year	1976			1978			1980			1982		
	Enrollment Status Race/Ethnicity		College Race	1976		1978	1980		1982	1982		TOTAL
	TBI	TWI		TBI	TWI		TBI	TWI		TBI	TWI	
<u>Full-time Graduate</u>												
1 Non-Resident Alien	0	137		0	179	179	0	199	199	0	184	184
2 Black	0	135		0	142	142	0	131	131	0	87	87
3 American Indian	0	9		0	21	21	0	26	26	0	11	11
4 Asian Pacific Isl.	0	26		0	17	17	0	30	30	0	21	21
5 Hispanic	0	7		0	15	15	0	17	17	0	8	8
6 White	0	1788		0	1740	1740	0	1985	1985	0	1367	1367
TOTAL	0	2102		0	2114	2114	0	2388	2388	0	1678	1678
<u>Part-time Graduate</u>												
1 Non-Resident Alien	0	23		0	27	27	0	40	40	0	94	94
2 Black	0	271		0	275	275	0	352	352	0	285	285
3 American Indian	0	13		0	17	17	0	22	22	0	26	26
4 Asian Pacific Isl.	0	17		0	21	21	0	19	19	0	30	30
5 Hispanic	0	7		0	4	4	0	7	7	0	14	14
6 White	0	2765		0	3120	3120	0	3307	3307	0	3312	3312
TOTAL	0	3096		0	3464	3464	0	3747	3747	0	3761	3761
<u>First Professional</u>												
1 Non-Resident Alien	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2 Black	0	39		0	53	53	0	61	61	0	48	48
3 American Indian	0	5		0	6	6	0	4	4	0	9	9
4 Asian Pacific Isl.	0	10		0	13	13	0	15	15	0	7	7
5 Hispanic	0	3		0	4	4	0	4	4	0	3	3
6 White	0	993		0	1131	1131	0	1160	1160	0	1129	1129
TOTAL	0	1050		0	1207	1207	0	1244	1244	0	1196	1196

Table 8

PERCENTAGES
GRADUATE ENROLLMENT BY RACE/ETHNICITY IN TRADITIONALLY
BLACK AND WHITE ADAMS PUBLIC COLLEGES
1976-1982

State: ARKANSAS		1976			1978			1980			1982		
Enrollment Status Race/Ethnicity College Race	Year			TOTAL			TOTAL			TOTAL			TOTAL
		TBI	TWI		TBI	TWI		TBI	TWI		TBI	TWI	
Full-time Graduate													
1 Non-Resident Alien			6.52	6.52		8.47	8.47		8.33	8.33		10.97	10.97
2 Black			6.42	6.42		6.72	6.72		5.57	5.57		5.19	5.19
3 American Indian			.43	.43		.99	.99		1.09	1.09		.66	.66
4 Asian Pacific Isl.			1.24	1.24		.80	.80		1.26	1.26		1.25	1.25
5 Hispanic			.33	.33		.71	.71		3.22	3.22		.98	.98
6 White			85.06	85.06		82.31	82.31		83.12	83.12		81.47	81.47
TOTAL			2,102	2,102		2,114	2,114		2,388	2,388		1,678	1,678
Part-time Graduate													
1 Non-Resident Alien			.74	.74		.78	.78		1.07	1.07		2.50	2.50
2 Black			8.75	8.74		7.94	7.94		.09	.09		7.58	7.58
3 American Indian			.42	.42		.49	.49		.59	.59		.64	.64
4 Asian Pacific Isl.			.55	.55		.61	.61		.51	.51		.80	.80
5 Hispanic			.23	.23		.12	.12		.19	.19		.37	.37
6 White			89.02	89.02		90.07	90.07		88.26	88.26		88.06	88.06
TOTAL			3,096	3,096		3,464	3,464		3,747	3,747		3,761	3,761
First Professional													
1 Non-Resident Alien			0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0
2 Black			3.69	3.69		4.39	4.39		4.90	4.90		4.01	4.01
3 American Indian			.48	.48		.50	.50		.32	.32		.75	.75
4 Asian Pacific Isl.			.95	.95		1.08	1.08		1.21	1.21		.59	.59
5 Hispanic			.29	.27		.33	.33		.32	.32		.25	.25
6 White			94.57	94.57		93.70	93.70		93.25	93.25		94.40	94.40
TOTAL			1,050	1,050		1,207	1,207		1,244	1,244		1,196	1,196

Table 9

GRADUATE ENROLLMENT BY RACE/ETHNICITY IN TRADITIONALLY
BLACK AND WHITE ADAMS PUBLIC COLLEGES
1976-1982

State: FLORIDA Year	1976			1978			1980			1982		
	TBI	TWI	TOTAL	TBI	TWI	TOTAL	TBI	TWI	TOTAL	TBI	TWI	TOTAL
<u>Enrollment Status</u>												
<u>Race/Ethnicity</u>												
<u>College Race</u>												
<u>Full-time Graduate</u>												
1 Non-Resident Alien	0	634	634	3	667	650	0	808	808	6	1068	1074
2 Black	65	290	355	48	323	371	21	364	385	64	289	353
3 American Indian	0	9	9	0	13	13	0	16	16	0	10	10
4 Asian Pacific Isl.	1	44	45	1	69	70	1	101	102	1	68	69
5 Hispanic	0	204	204	0	249	249	1	291	292	1	205	206
6 White	23	6643	6666	9	6529	6538	8	6577	6585	16	5764	5780
TOTAL	89	7824	7913	61	7830	7891	31	8157	8188	88	7404	7492
<u>Part-time Graduate</u>												
1 Non-Resident Alien	0	139	139	4	160	164	0	221	221	1	351	352
2 Black	40	310	350	390	318	708	60	373	433	51	423	474
3 American Indian	0	10	10	0	11	11	0	11	11	0	16	16
4 Asian Pacific Isl.	3	38	41	1	40	41	0	47	47	1	66	67
5 Hispanic	1	193	194	1	194	195	0	285	285	1	407	408
6 White	7	5759	5766	201	6079	6180	21	6927	6948	42	8343	8385
TOTAL	51	6449	6500	597	6802	7399	81	7864	7945	96	9606	9702
<u>First Professional</u>												
1 Non-Resident Alien	0	6	6	0	2	2	0	7	7	0	8	8
2 Black	0	121	121	0	132	132	14	108	122	14	136	150
3 American Indian	0	7	7	0	6	6	0	2	2	0	3	3
4 Asian Pacific Isl.	0	4	4	0	9	9	0	11	11	0	29	29
5 Hispanic	0	62	62	0	104	104	0	110	110	0	128	128
6 White	0	2047	2047	0	2374	2374	2	2562	2564	0	2627	2627
TOTAL	0	2247	2247	0	2627	2627	16	2800	2816	0	2831	2845

Table 11

GRADUATE ENROLLMENT BY RACE/ETHNICITY IN TRADITIONALLY
BLACK AND WHITE ADAMS PUBLIC COLLEGES
1976-1982

State: GEORGIA Enrollment Status Race/Ethnicity College Race	1976			1978			1980			1982		
	TBI	TWI	TOTAL	TBI	TWI	TOTAL	TBI	TWI	TOTAL	TBI	TWI	TOTAL
Full-time Graduate												
1 Non-Resident Alien	1	432	433	0	513	513	0	732	732	0	886	886
2 Black	32	664	696	26	727	753	8	423	431	11	405	416
3 American Indian	0	22	22	0	7	7	0	5	5	0	15	15
4 Asian Pacific Isl.	0	34	34	0	51	51	0	56	56	0	146	146
5 Hispanic	0	25	25	0	33	33	0	44	44	0	95	95
6 White	2	6650	6652	11	6035	6046	13	5506	5519	4	5791	5795
TOTAL	35	7827	7862	37	7366	7403	21	6766	6787	15	7338	7353
Part-time Graduate												
1 Non-Resident Alien	3	212	215	1	309	310	0	269	269	2	168	170
2 Black	221	1127	1348	106	1194	1300	66	1147	1213	154	881	1035
3 American Indian	0	31	31	0	19	19	0	13	13	0	17	17
4 Asian Pacific Isl.	2	47	49	2	58	60	0	60	60	2	78	80
5 Hispanic	1	15	16	0	20	20	0	63	63	2	54	56
6 White	262	8806	9068	115	9648	9763	36	9921	9957	108	8588	8696
TOTAL	489	10238	10727	224	11248	11472	102	11473	11575	268	9786	10054
First Professional												
1 Non-Resident Alien	0	2	2	0	1	1	0	12	12	0	6	6
2 Black	0	53	53	0	68	68	0	97	97	0	123	123
3 American Indian	0	5	5	0	6	6	0	7	7	0	1	1
4 Asian Pacific Isl.	0	7	7	0	7	7	0	9	9	0	20	20
5 Hispanic	0	8	8	0	11	11	0	14	14	0	22	22
6 White	0	1709	1709	0	1762	1762	0	1821	1821	0	1945	1945
TOTAL	0	1784	1784	0	1855	1855	0	1960	1960	0	2117	2117

Table 12

PERCENTAGES
GRADUATE ENROLLMENT BY RACE/ETHNICITY IN TRADITIONALLY
BLACK AND WHITE ADAMS PUBLIC COLLEGES
1976-1982

State: GEORGIA Year	1976			1978			1980			1982		
	TBI	TWI	TOTAL	TBI	TWI	TOTAL	TBI	TWI	TOTAL	TBI	TWI	TOTAL
Enrollment Status												
Race/Ethnicity												
College Race												
Full-time Graduate												
1 Non-Resident Alien	2.86	5.52	5.51	0	6.96	6.93	0	10.82	10.79	0	12.07	12.05
2 Black	91.43	8.48	8.85	70.27	9.81	10.16	38.10	6.25	6.35	73.33	5.52	5.66
3 American Indian	0	.28	.28	0	.10	.10	0	.83	.01	0	.20	.20
4 Asian Pacific Isl.	0	.43	.43	0	.69	.69	0	.65	.83	0	1.99	1.99
5 Hispanic	0	.32	.32	0	.45	.45	0	.81.38	.65	0	1.30	1.29
6 White	5.71	84.96	84.61	29.73	81.93	81.67	61.91	81.38	81.32	26.67	78.92	78.81
TOTAL	35	7,827	7,862	37	7,366	7,403	21	6,766	6,787	15	7,338	7,353
Part-time Graduate												
1 Non-Resident Alien	.61	2.07	2.00	.45	2.75	2.70	0	2.35	2.32	.75	1.72	1.69
2 Black	45.19	11.01	12.57	47.32	10.62	11.33	64.71	10.00	10.48	57.46	9.00	10.29
3 American Indian	0	.30	.29	0	.17	.16	0	.11	.11	0	.17	.17
4 Asian Pacific Isl.	.41	.46	.46	.89	.52	.52	0	.52	.52	.75	.80	.80
5 Hispanic	.21	.15	.15	0	.18	.17	0	.55	.54	.75	.55	.56
6 White	53.58	86.01	84.53	21.34	85.78	84.10	35.29	86.41	86.02	40.30	87.76	86.49
TOTAL	4.89	10,238	10,727	224	11,248	11,472	102	11,413	11,575	268	9,786	10,054
First Professional												
1 Non-Resident Alien	.11	.11	.11	.05	.05	.05		.61	.61		.28	.28
2 Black	3.10	3.10	3.10	3.67	3.67	3.67		4.95	4.95		5.81	5.81
3 American Indian	.32	.32	.32	.32	.32	.32		.36	.36		.05	.05
4 Asian Pacific Isl.	.39	.39	.39	.38	.38	.38		.46	.46		.95	.95
5 Hispanic	.45	.45	.45	.59	.59	.59		.71	.71		1.04	1.04
6 White	95.80	95.80	95.80	94.99	94.99	94.99		92.91	92.91		91.88	91.88
TOTAL	1,784	1,784	1,780	1,855	1,855	1,855		1,960	1,960		2,117	2,117

Table 13

GRADUATE ENROLLMENT BY RACE/ETHNICITY IN TRADITIONALLY
BLACK AND WHITE ADAMS PUBLIC COLLEGES
1976-1982

State: OKLAHOMA Year	1976			1978			1980			1982		
	TBI	TWI	TOTAL	TBI	TWI	TOTAL	TBI	TWI	TOTAL	TBI	TWI	TOTAL
<u>Full-time Graduate</u>												
1 Non-Resident Alien	0	861	861	0	1041	1041	0	1053	1053	0	1127	1127
2 Black	0	174	174	0	135	135	0	149	149	0	128	128
3 American Indian	0	103	103	0	103	103	0	122	122	0	111	111
4 Asian Pacific Isl.	0	49	49	0	33	33	0	74	74	0	62	62
5 Hispanic	0	24	24	0	27	27	0	63	63	0	33	33
6 White	0	3246	3246	0	2753	2753	0	2688	2688	0	2667	2667
TOTAL	0	4457	4457	0	4092	4092	0	4149	4149	0	4128	4128
<u>Part-time Graduate</u>												
1 Non-Resident Alien	0	478	478	0	362	362	0	379	379	0	518	518
2 Black	0	442	442	0	311	311	0	301	301	0	418	418
3 American Indian	0	210	210	0	220	220	0	276	276	0	275	275
4 Asian Pacific Isl.	0	50	50	0	36	36	0	73	73	0	57	57
5 Hispanic	0	35	35	0	35	35	0	52	52	0	58	58
6 White	0	7207	7207	0	6341	6341	0	7451	7451	0	7884	7884
TOTAL	0	8422	8422	0	7305	7305	0	8532	8532	0	9210	9210
<u>First Professional</u>												
1 Non-Resident Alien	0	0	0	0	4	4	0	4	4	0	2	2
2 Black	0	19	19	0	31	31	0	35	35	0	37	37
3 American Indian	0	42	42	0	51	51	0	47	47	0	56	56
4 Asian Pacific Isl.	0	7	7	0	22	22	0	22	22	0	28	28
5 Hispanic	0	11	11	0	20	20	0	25	25	0	30	30
6 White	0	1615	1615	0	1933	1933	0	1963	1963	0	1944	1944
TOTAL	0	1694	1694	0	2061	2061	0	2096	2096	0	2097	2097

Table 14

GRADUATE ENROLLMENT BY RACE/ETHNICITY IN TRADITIONALLY
BLACK AND WHITE ADAMS PUBLIC COLLEGES
1976-1982

State: OKLAHOMA	Year	1976			1978			1980			1982		
		TBI	TWI	TOTAL	TBI	TWI	TOTAL	TBI	TWI	TOTAL	TBI	TWI	TOTAL
<u>Enrollment Status</u>													
<u>Race/Ethnicity</u>													
<u>College Race</u>													
<u>Full-time Graduate</u>													
1 Non-Resident Alien			19.3%	19.3%		25.4%	25.4%		25.4%	25.4%		27.3%	27.3%
2 Black			3.9%	3.9%		3.3%	3.3%		3.6%	3.6%		3.1%	3.1%
3 American Indian			2.3%	2.3%		2.5%	2.5%		2.9%	2.9%		2.7%	2.7%
4 Asian Pacific Isl.			1.1%	1.1%		.8%	.8%		1.8%	1.8%		1.5%	1.5%
5 Hispanic			.5%	.5%		.7%	.7%		1.5%	1.5%		.8%	.8%
6 White			72.8	72.8%		67.3%	67.3%		64.8%	64.8%		64.6%	64.6%
TOTAL			4,457	4,457		4,092	4,092		4,149	4,149		4,128	4,128
<u>Part-time Graduate</u>													
1 Non-Resident Alien			5.7%	5.7%		5.0%	5.0%		4.4%	4.4%		5.6%	5.6%
2 Black			5.2%	5.2%		4.3%	4.3%		3.5	3.5		4.5	4.5
3 American Indian			2.5%	2.5%		3.0	3.0		3.2	3.2		3.0	3.0
4 Asian Pacific Isl.			.6%	.6%		.5	.5		.9	.9		.6	.6
5 Hispanic			.4%	.4%		.5	.5		.6	.6		.6	.6
6 White			85.6%	85.6%		86.8	86.8		87.3	87.3		85.6	85.6
TOTAL			8,422	8,422		7,305	7,305		8,532	8,532		9,210	9,210
<u>First Professional</u>													
1 Non-Resident Alien						.2%	.2		.2	.2		.1	.1
2 Black		1.1	1.1	1.1		1.5	1.5		1.7	1.7		1.8	1.8
3 American Indian		2.5	2.5	2.5		2.5	2.5		2.2	2.2		2.7	2.7
4 Asian Pacific Isl.		.4	.4	.4		1.1	1.1		1.0	1.0		1.3	1.3
5 Hispanic		.6	.6	.6		1.0	1.0		1.2	1.2		1.4	1.4
6 White		95.3	95.3	95.3		93.8	93.8		98.7	98.7		92.7	92.7
TOTAL		1,694	1,694	1,694		2,061	2,061		2,096	2,096		2,097	2,097

Table 15

GRADUATE ENROLLMENT BY RACE/ETHNICITY IN TRADITIONALLY
BLACK AND WHITE ADAMS PUBLIC COLLEGES
1976-1982

State: VIRGINIA Enrollment Status Race/Ethnicity College Race	1976			1978			1980			1982		
	TBI	TWI	TOTAL	TBI	TWI	TOTAL	TBI	TWI	TOTAL	TBI	TWI	TOTAL
Full-time Graduate												
1 Non-Resident Alien	2	306	308	3	433	436	22	646	668	24	981	1005
2 Black	153	270	423	277	277	504	177	313	490	135	226	361
3 American Indian	0	6	6	0	7	7	0	27	27	0	9	9
4 Asian Pacific Isl.	4	69	73	8	80	88	3	155	158	8	82	90
5 Hispanic	0	18	18	0	26	26	1	58	59	1	39	40
6 White	64	6514	6578	83	6518	6601	80	6971	7051	83	7027	7110
TOTAL	223	7183	7406	371	7291	7662	283	8170	8453	251	8364	8615
Part-time Graduate												
1 Non-Resident Alien	0	98	98	0	98	98	1	157	158	25	215	240
2 Black	382	481	863	525	579	1104	358	848	1206	355	446	801
3 American Indian	1	15	16	2	17	19	0	30	30	1	22	23
4 Asian Pacific Isl.	1	42	43	8	73	81	6	90	96	10	94	104
5 Hispanic	2	23	25	3	36	39	3	64	67	0	49	49
6 White	139	8364	8503	161	9239	9400	126	10654	10780	105	8052	8157
TOTAL	525	9023	9548	699	10042	10741	494	11843	12337	496	8878	9374
First Professional												
1 Non-Resident Alien	0	8	8	0	14	14	0	8	8	0	19	19
2 Black	0	123	123	0	121	121	0	137	137	0	146	146
3 American Indian	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	2	0	8	8
4 Asian Pacific Isl.	0	18	18	0	29	29	0	52	52	0	85	85
5 Hispanic	0	7	7	0	10	10	0	15	15	0	24	24
6 White	0	2909	2909	0	2970	2970	0	3290	3290	0	3448	3448
TOTAL	0	3065	3065	0	3145	3145	0	3504	3504	0	3730	3730

Table 16

GRADUATE ENROLLMENT BY RACE/ETHNICITY IN TRADITIONALLY
BLACK AND WHITE ADAMS PUBLIC COLLEGES
1976-1982

State: VIRGINIA Year	1976		1978		1980		1982	
	TBI	TWI	TBI	TWI	TBI	TWI	TBI	TWI
Enrollment Status Race/Ethnicity College Race	TBI	TWI	TBI	TWI	TBI	TWI	TBI	TWI
Full-time Graduate								
1 Non-Resident Alien	.9	4.2	.80	5.9	5.6	7.9	9.5	11.7
2 Black	68.6	3.7	74.6	3.1	6.5	3.8	53.7	2.7
3 American Indian		.08		.09	.09	.33		.10
4 Asian Pacific Isl.	1.7	.9	2.1	1.0	1.14	1.8	3.1	.98
5 Hispanic		.25		.35	.33	.70	.39	.46
6 White	28.6	71.5	22.3	89.3	86.1	85.3	33.06	84.0
TOTAL	223	7,183	371	7,291	7,662	8,170	251	8364
Part-time Graduate								
1 Non-Resident Alien		1.08		.97	.91	1.27	5.04	2.42
2 Black	72.7	5.3	75.1	5.76	10.2	6.8	71.5	5.02
3 American Indian	.19	.16	.28	.16	.17	.24	.20	.24
4 Asian Pacific Isl.	.19	.46	1.1	.72	.75	.72	2.0	1.0
5 Hispanic	.38	.25	.42	.35	.36	.51		.55
6 White	26.4	92.6	23.0	92.0	87.5	86.3	21.1	90.6
TOTAL	525	9,023	699	10,042	10,741	11,843	496	8,878
First Professional								
1 Non-Resident Alien		.26		.44	.44	.22		.50
2 Black		4.0		3.8	3.8	3.9		3.9
3 American Indian		.03		.03	.03	.05		.21
4 Asian Pacific Isl.		.58	.9	.92	.92	1.4		2.2
5 Hispanic		.22		.31	.31	.42		.64
6 White		94.9		94.4	94.4	93.8		92.4
TOTAL		3,065		3,145	3,145	3504		3730

Table 17

DEGREE ATTAINMENT BY RACE/ETHNICITY IN TRADITIONALLY
BLACK AND WHITE ADAMS PUBLIC COLLEGES,
1975-76 TO 1980-81

1975-76 TO 1980-81

State ARKANSAS	Year	1975-76			1976-77			1978-79			1980-81		
		TBI	TWI	TOTAL	TBI	TWI	TOTAL	TBI	TWI	TOTAL	TBI	TWI	TOTAL
Degree Level Race/Ethnicity College Racial Heritage													
Bachelors													
1 Non Resident Alien	3	9	12	21	5	11	16	16	26	42	22	40	62
2 Black	281	325	606	926	313	292	605	341	352	693	315	395	710
3 American Indian	0	13	13	26	0	5	5	0	11	11	0	13	13
4 Asian Pacific Isl.	0	8	8	16	0	13	13	0	35	35	0	12	12
5 Hispanic	0	9	9	18	0	4	4	0	8	8	0	8	8
6 White	26	4772	4798	4824	24	4489	4513	28	4475	4503	15	4727	4742
TOTAL	310	5136	5446	10582	342	4814	5156	385	4907	5292	352	5195	5547
Masters													
1 Non Resident Alien	0	10	10	20	0	25	25	0	41	41	0	44	44
2 Black	0	117	117	234	0	154	154	0	168	168	0	167	167
3 American Indian	0	4	4	8	0	6	6	0	5	5	0	14	14
4 Asian Pacific Isl.	0	11	11	22	0	19	19	0	30	30	0	8	8
5 Hispanic	0	4	4	8	0	7	7	0	11	11	0	6	6
6 White	0	1416	1416	2832	0	1507	1507	0	1365	1365	0	1484	1484
TOTAL	0	1562	1562	3124	0	1718	1718	0	1620	1620	0	1723	1723
Doctorate													
1 Non Resident Alien	0	1	1	2	0	4	4	0	5	5	0	16	16
2 Black	0	5	5	10	0	3	3	0	4	4	0	3	3
3 American Indian	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4 Asian Pacific Isl.	0	5	5	10	0	2	2	0	5	5	0	0	0
5 Hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	1	1	0	0	0
6 White	0	108	108	216	0	94	94	0	78	78	0	86	86
TOTAL	0	120	120	240	0	106	106	0	93	93	0	105	105
Professional													
1 Non Resident Alien	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2 Black	0	11	11	22	0	12	12	0	9	9	0	8	8
3 American Indian	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	0	1	1
4 Asian Pacific Isl.	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	3	3	0	1	1
5 Hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1
6 White	0	288	288	576	0	313	313	0	360	360	0	380	380
TOTAL	0	299	299	598	0	327	327	0	379	379	0	391	391

Table 19

DEGREE ATTAINMENT BY RACE/ETHNICITY IN TRADITIONALLY
BLACK AND WHITE ADAMS PUBLIC COLLEGES,
1975-76 TO 1980-81

State FLORIDA		Year	1975-76			1976-77			1978-79			1980-81		
			TBI	TWI	TOTAL	TBI	TWI	TOTAL	TBI	TWI	TOTAL	TBI	TWI	TOTAL
Degree Level Race/Ethnicity College Racial Heritage														
Bachelors														
1	Non Resident Alien	1	154	155	0	299	299	0	191	191	22	427	449	
2	Black	558	754	1312	620	853	1473	615	1036	1651	587	1044	1631	
3	American Indian	25	43	68	0	39	39	0	23	23	0	19	19	
4	Asian Pacific Isl.	1	71	72	7	81	88	9	158	167	9	212	221	
5	Hispanic	4	721	725	1	760	761	3	1005	1008	1	1086	1087	
6	White	23	18024	18047	55	17850	17905	85	17094	17179	59	17552	17611	
	TOTAL	612	19767	20379	683	19882	20565	712	19507	20219	678	20340	21018	
Masters														
1	Non Resident Alien	0	115	115	0	231	231	0	225	225	0	270	270	
2	Black	193	280	473	177	342	519	145	236	381	46	228	274	
3	American Indian	0	9	9	0	8	8	0	5	5	0	8	8	
4	Asian Pacific Isl.	0	39	39	2	31	33	4	44	48	1	46	47	
5	Hispanic	1	154	155	1	169	170	0	139	139	0	157	157	
6	White	23	5279	5302	23	4950	4973	27	4479	4506	7	4304	4311	
	TOTAL	217	5876	6093	203	5731	5934	176	5128	5304	54	5013	5067	
Doctorate														
1	Non Resident Alien	0	43	43	0	89	89	0	89	89	0	73	73	
2	Black	0	36	36	0	41	41	0	28	28	0	38	38	
3	American Indian	0	2	2	0	2	2	0	2	2	0	2	2	
4	Asian Pacific Isl.	0	19	19	0	3	3	0	12	12	0	2	2	
5	Hispanic	0	13	13	0	10	10	0	14	14	0	12	12	
6	White	0	580	580	0	550	550	0	568	568	0	570	570	
	TOTAL	0	693	693	0	695	695	0	713	713	0	697	697	
Professional														
1	Non Resident Alien	0	2	2	0	4	4	0	0	0	0	3	3	
2	Black	0	34	34	0	33	33	0	36	36	0	34	34	
3	American Indian	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	2	2	0	0	0	
4	Asian Pacific Isl.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	0	3	3	
5	Hispanic	0	11	11	0	14	14	0	44	44	0	33	33	
6	White	0	626	626	0	672	672	0	663	663	0	848	848	
	TOTAL	0	674	674	0	726	726	0	751	751	0	921	921	

Table 20

PERCENTAGES
DEGREE ATTAINMENT BY RACE/ETHNICITY IN TRADITIONALLY
BLACK AND WHITE ADAMS PUBLIC COLLEGES,
1975-76 TO 1980-81

State FLORIDA	Year	1975-76			1976-77			1978-79			1980-81		
		TBI	TWI	TOTAL	TBI	TWI	TOTAL	TBI	TWI	TOTAL	TBI	TWI	TOTAL
Degree Level Race/Ethnicity College Racial Heritage													
<u>Bachelors</u>													
1 Non Resident Alien	.2%	.8%	.8%	0%	2%	1%	0%	.9%	3%	2%	2%	2%	2%
2 Black	91%	4%	6%	91%	4%	7%	86%	8%	87%	5%	5%	5%	.09%
3 American Indian	.4%	.2%	.3%	0%	.2%	.2%	0%	.1%	0%	.8%	.8%	1%	1%
4 Asian Pacific Isl.	.2%	.4%	.4%	1%	.4%	.4%	.4%	.5%	.4%	5%	5%	.1%	5%
5 Hispanic	.7%	4%	4%	.1%	4%	4%	.4%	8%	12%	88%	9%	86%	84%
6 White	4%	91%	89%	8%	90%	87%	712	19,507	678	20,219	20340	92%	82%
TOTAL	612	19,767	20,379	683	19,882	20,565	712	19,507	678	20,219	20340	92%	82%
<u>Masters</u>													
1 Non Resident Alien	0%	2%	2%	0%	4%	4%	0%	4%	0%	4%	4%	0%	5%
2 Black	89%	5%	8%	87%	6%	9%	82%	5%	7%	5%	5%	5%	5%
3 American Indian	0%	2%	.1%	0%	.1%	.1%	0%	.09%	0%	.09%	.2%	.2%	.2%
4 Asian Pacific Isl.	0%	.7%	.6%	1%	.5%	.6%	2%	.9%	.2%	.9%	.9%	.9%	.9%
5 Hispanic	.5%	3%	3%	.5%	3%	3%	0%	87%	13%	85%	86%	3%	3%
6 White	11%	90%	87%	11%	86%	84%	15%	5128	54	5304	5013	82%	85%
TOTAL	217	5876	6093	203	5731	5934	176	5128	54	5304	5013	92%	85%
<u>Doctorate</u>													
1 Non Resident Alien		6%	6%		13%	13%		12%	10%	12%	10%	10%	10%
2 Black		5%	5%		6%	6%		4%	5%	4%	5%	5%	5%
3 American Indian		.3%	.3%		.3%	.3%		.3%	.3%	.3%	.3%	.3%	.3%
4 Asian Pacific Isl.		3%	3%		.4%	.4%		2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%
5 Hispanic		2%	2%		1%	1%		.1%	2%	.1%	2%	2%	2%
6 White		84%	84%		79%	79%		80%	82%	80%	82%	82%	82%
TOTAL		693	693		695	695		713	697	713	697	697	697
<u>Professional</u>													
1 Non Resident Alien		.3%	.3%	0%	.6%	.6%	0%	0%	.3%	0%	.3%	.3%	.3%
2 Black		5%	5%		5%	5%		5%	5%	5%	4%	4%	4%
3 American Indian		1%	1%		.1%	.1%		.3%	.3%	.3%	.3%	.3%	.3%
4 Asian Pacific Isl.		0%	0%		0%	0%		.8%	.8%	.8%	.8%	.8%	.8%
5 Hispanic		2%	2%		2%	2%		6%	6%	6%	6%	6%	6%
6 White		93%	93%		93%	93%		88%	88%	88%	92%	92%	92%
TOTAL		674	674		724	724		751	921	751	921	921	921

Table 21

DEGREE ATTAINMENT BY RACE/ETHNICITY IN TRADITIONALLY
BLACK AND WHITE ADAMS PUBLIC COLLEGES,
1975-76 TO 1980-81

State GEORGIA		Year		1975-76			1976-77			1978-79			1980-81		
		TBI	TWI	TOTAL	TBI	TWI	TOTAL	TBI	TWI	TOTAL	TBI	TWI	TOTAL		
Degree Level Race/Ethnicity		College Racial Heritage													
<u>Bachelors</u>															
1 Non Resident Alien	2	60	62	5	28	33	30	160	190	18	249	267			
2 Black	743	562	1305	654	572	1226	536	672	1208	472	733	1205			
3 American Indian	1	16	17	0	17	17	0	16	16	0	22	22			
4 Asian Pacific Isl.	3	36	39	0	45	45	1	46	47	0	69	69			
5 Hispanic	0	35	35	0	52	52	0	49	49	1	71	72			
6 White	16	11663	11679	23	11184	11207	17	10621	10638	38	11011	11049			
TOTAL	765	12372	13137	682	11898	12580	584	11564	12148	529	12155	12684			
<u>Masters</u>															
1 Non Resident Alien	0	23	23	3	3	6	2	248	250	8	328	336			
2 Black	61	709	770	125	674	799	66	541	601	33	362	395			
3 American Indian	0	13	13	0	13	13	0	6	6	0	3	3			
4 Asian Pacific Isl.	0	46	46	0	21	21	0	33	33	0	17	17			
5 Hispanic	0	14	14	0	16	16	0	15	15	0	24	24			
6 White	1	6232	6233	62	6300	6362	76	5172	5248	15	4565	4580			
TOTAL	62	7037	7099	190	7027	7217	144	6015	6159	56	5299	5355			
<u>Doctorate</u>															
1 Non Resident Alien	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	53	53	0	57	57			
2 Black	0	18	18	0	10	10	0	20	20	0	20	20			
3 American Indian	0	2	2	0	1	1	0	2	2	0	0	0			
4 Asian Pacific Isl.	0	4	4	0	6	6	0	5	5	0	3	3			
5 Hispanic	0	4	4	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1			
6 White	0	415	415	0	422	422	0	332	332	0	355	355			
TOTAL	0	445	445	0	440	440	0	413	413	0	436	436			
<u>Professional</u>															
1 Non Resident Alien	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1			
2 Black	0	17	17	0	17	17	0	20	20	0	22	22			
3 American Indian	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	1	1			
4 Asian Pacific Isl.	0	5	5	0	2	2	0	2	2	0	3	3			
5 Hispanic	0	1	1	0	2	2	0	2	2	0	6	6			
6 White	0	507	507	0	459	459	0	479	479	0	500	500			
TOTAL	0	530	530	0	483	483	0	501	501	0	533	533			

Table 22

DEGREE ATTAINMENT BY RACE/ETHNICITY IN TRADITIONALLY
BLACK AND WHITE ADAMS PUBLIC COLLEGES,
1975-76 TO 1980-81

State		GEORGIA	Year			1975-76			1976-77			1978-79			1980-81		
Degree Level		Race/Ethnicity	College Racial Heritage			TBI	TWI	TOTAL	TBI	TWI	TOTAL	TBI	TWI	TOTAL	TBI	TWI	TOTAL
<u>Bachelors</u>																	
1	Non Resident Alien		.3	.5	.5	1	.2	.2	5	1.3	1.5	3.4	2	2			
2	Black		97.1	4.5	10	96	5	10	92	6	10	89.2	6	10			
3	American Indian		.1	.1	.1		.1	.1	.1	.1	.1		.1	.1			
4	Asian Pacific Isl.		.4	.3	.3		.3	.3	.1	.3	.3	.2	.5	.5			
5	Hispanic			.3	.3		.4	.4		.4	.4	.2	.5	.5			
6	White		2.1	94.3	89	3	94	89	2.9	92	88	7.2	91	87			
	TOTAL		765	12372	13,137	682	11898	12,580	584	11564	12148	529	12155	12684			
<u>Masters</u>																	
1	Non Resident Alien			.3	.3	1			1	4.1	4	14	6.2	6			
2	Black		98	10	11	66	9.5	11	46	9	10	59	7	7.3			
3	American Indian		.1	.1	.1		.1	.2		.5	.5		.3	.3			
4	Asian Pacific Isl.			.6	.6		.2	.3		.2	.2		.4	.4			
5	Hispanic			.1	.1		.2	.2		.2	.2		.86	.86			
6	White		2	89	88	33	90	88	53	86	85.2	27	86	86			
	TOTAL		62	7037	7099	190	7027	7217	144	6015	6159	56	5299	5355			
<u>Doctorate</u>																	
1	Non Resident Alien			.4	.4		2.3	2.3		13	13		13	13			
2	Black			.4	.4		.2	.2		5	5		5	5			
3	American Indian			.4	.4		.2	.2		.5	.5						
4	Asian Pacific Isl.			.9	.9		1.3	1.3		1.2	1.2		.7	.7			
5	Hispanic			.9	.9		.2	.2		.2	.2		.2	.2			
6	White			93.3	96	93.3	96	96		80	80		81	81			
	TOTAL			445	445		440	440		413	413		436	436			
<u>Professional</u>																	
1	Non Resident Alien			3.2	3.2		3.5	3.5		4	4		.2	.2			
2	Black				.6		.6	.6					4	4			
3	American Indian			.4	.4		.4	.4		.4	.4		.2	.2			
4	Asian Pacific Isl.			.4	.4		.4	.4		.6	.6		.6	.6			
5	Hispanic			.2	.2		.4	.4		.1	.1		1	1			
6	White			95.6	95.6		95.6	95		95.6	95.6		94	94			
	TOTAL			530	530		483	483		501	501		533	533			

Table 23

DEGREE ATTAINMENT BY RACE/ETHNICITY IN TRADITIONALLY
BLACK AND WHITE ADAMS PUBLIC COLLEGES,
1975-76 TO 1980-81

State OKLAHOMA		Year		1975-76			1976-77			1978-79			1980-81		
Degree Level Race/Ethnicity	College Racial Heritage	TBI	TWI	TOTAL	TBI	TWI	TOTAL	TBI	TWI	TOTAL	TBI	TWI	TOTAL		
Bachelor															
1 Non Resident Alien	5	232	237	237	1	257	258	7	368	375	42	617	659		
2 Black	163	355	518	518	176	323	499	77	356	433	65	380	445		
3 American Indian	0	274	274	274	0	259	259	0	325	325	0	301	301		
4 Asian Pacific Isl.	0	43	43	43	0	48	48	0	61	61	0	93	93		
5 Hispanic	0	38	38	38	0	31	31	0	9037	9037	14	8939	8953		
6 White	0	9633	9633	9633	1	9095	9096	0	10209	10293	121	10402	10523		
TOTAL	168	10575	10743	10743	178	10013	10191	84	10209	10293	121	10402	10523		
Masters															
1 Non Resident Alien	0	311	311	311	0	404	404	0	417	417	0	427	427		
2 Black	0	124	124	124	0	126	126	0	131	131	0	102	102		
3 American Indian	0	83	83	83	0	56	56	0	90	90	0	77	77		
4 Asian Pacific Isl.	0	31	31	31	0	23	23	0	17	17	0	31	31		
5 Hispanic	0	9	9	9	0	7	7	0	15	15	0	30	30		
6 White	0	3060	3060	3060	0	2908	2908	0	2491	2491	0	2371	2371		
TOTAL	0	3618	3618	3618	0	3524	3524	0	3089	3089	0	3038	3038		
Doctorate															
1 Non Resident Alien	0	45	45	45	0	49	49	0	63	63	0	80	80		
2 Black	0	8	8	8	0	6	6	0	22	22	0	11	11		
3 American Indian	0	3	3	3	0	5	5	0	3	3	0	5	5		
4 Asian Pacific Isl.	0	1	1	1	0	2	2	0	5	5	0	8	8		
5 Hispanic	0	3	3	3	0	4	4	0	2	2	0	2	2		
6 White	0	335	335	335	0	307	307	0	300	300	0	247	247		
TOTAL	0	395	395	395	0	373	373	0	395	395	0	353	353		
Professional															
1 Non Resident Alien	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	6		
2 Black	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	5	5	0	8	8		
3 American Indian	0	12	12	12	0	12	12	0	2	2	0	4	4		
4 Asian Pacific Isl.	0	2	2	2	0	2	2	0	2	2	0	9	9		
5 Hispanic	0	4	4	4	0	5	5	0	15	15	0	11	11		
6 White	0	376	376	376	0	394	394	0	480	480	0	533	533		
TOTAL	0	395	395	395	0	414	414	0	504	504	0	571	571		

Table 24

DEGREE ATTAINMENT BY RACE/ETHNICITY IN TRADITIONALLY
BLACK AND WHITE ADAMS PUBLIC COLLEGES,
1975-76 TO 1980-81

State OKLAHOMA		Year	1975-76			1976-77			1978-79			1980-81		
Degree Level Race/Ethnicity	College Racial Heritage	TBI	TWI	TOTAL	TBI	TWI	TOTAL	TBI	TWI	TOTAL	TBI	TWI	TOTAL	
<u>Bachelors</u>														
1 Non Resident Alien		3	2	2	.5	2	2.5	8	4	3	35	6	6	
2 Black		97	3	5	99	3	5	92	3	4	54	4	4	
3 American Indian			3	3		3	2.5			3		3	3	
4 Asian Pacific Isl.			.4	.3		.5	.5	1	1	1	.8	.8	1	
5 Hispanic		1	.4	.3		.3	.3	1	1	1	.6	.6	1	
6 White			91	89.6	.5	91	89.2		88	88	11	86	85	
TOTAL		168	10,575	10,743	178	10,013	10,191	84	10,209	10,293	121	10,402	10,523	
<u>Masters</u>														
1 Non Resident Alien			9	9		11	11		13	13		14	14	
2 Black			3	3		4	4		4	4		3	3	
3 American Indian			2	2		2	2		3	3		3	3	
4 Asian Pacific Isl.			1	1		1	1		.5	.5		1	1	
5 Hispanic			.2	.2		.2	.2		.5	.5		1	1	
6 White			85	85		82	82		80	80		78	78	
TOTAL			3618	3618		3524	3524		3089	3089		3038	3038	
<u>Doctorate</u>														
1 Non Resident Alien			11	11		13	13		16	16		23	23	
2 Black			2	2		2	2		6	6		3	3	
3 American Indian			.8	.8		1	1		.7	.7		1	1	
4 Asian Pacific Isl.			.3	.3		.5	.5		1	1		2	2	
5 Hispanic			.8	.8		1	1		.5	.5		.5	.5	
6 White			85	85		82.3	82.3		76	76		70	70	
TOTAL			395	395		373	373		395	395		353	353	
<u>Professional</u>														
1 Non Resident Alien			.3	.3		.2	.2		1	1		1	1	
2 Black			3	3		.5	.5		.4	.4		1	1	
3 American Indian			.5	.5		.5	.5		.4	.4		2	2	
4 Asian Pacific Isl.			1	1		1	1		3	3		2	2	
5 Hispanic			95	95		95	95		95.2	95.2		93	93	
6 White			395	395		414	414		504	504		571	571	
TOTAL				395			414			504			571	

Table 25

DEGREE ATTAINMENT BY RACE/ETHNICITY IN TRADITIONALLY
BLACK AND WHITE ADAMS PUBLIC COLLEGES,
1975-76 TO 1980-81

1975-76 TO 1980-81

State VIRGINIA	Year	1975-76			1976-77			1978-79			1980-81		
		TBI	TWI	TOTAL	TBI	TWI	TOTAL	TBI	TWI	TOTAL	TBI	TWI	TOTAL
<u>Bachelors</u>													
College Racial Heritage													
1 Non Resident Alien		0	59	59	35	74	109	19	86	105	43	106	149
2 Black		1272	366	1638	1211	422	1633	1196	527	1723	949	679	1628
3 American Indian		1	20	21	0	21	21	0	20	20	1	25	26
4 Asian Pacific Isl.		8	58	66	15	55	70	1	104	105	1	129	130
5 Hispanic		0	55	55	0	89	89	0	79	79	1	75	76
6 White		73	13560	13633	71	13639	13710	33	14646	14679	29	16089	15104
TOTAL		1354	14118	15472	1332	14300	15632	1249	15462	16711	1024	16089	17113
<u>Masters</u>													
1 Non Resident Alien		0	67	67	4	84	88	1	136	137	14	193	207
2 Black		189	178	367	194	226	420	195	213	408	149	244	393
3 American Indian		0	8	8	0	8	8	0	2	2	1	9	10
4 Asian Pacific Isl.		2	32	34	8	22	30	1	40	41	2	25	27
5 Hispanic		0	15	15	0	16	16	10	18	28	1	16	17
6 White		104	4220	4324	103	4225	4328	50	4135	4185	68	4411	4479
TOTAL		295	4520	4815	309	4581	4890	257	4544	4801	235	4898	5133
<u>Doctorate</u>													
1 Non Resident Alien		0	16	16	0	29	29	0	40	40	0	58	58
2 Black		0	19	19	0	18	18	0	27	27	0	19	19
3 American Indian		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
4 Asian Pacific Isl.		0	7	7	0	5	5	0	10	10	0	1	1
5 Hispanic		0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
6 White		0	432	432	0	414	414	0	422	422	0	450	450
TOTAL		0	475	475	0	467	467	0	499	499	0	529	529
<u>Professional</u>													
1 Non Resident Alien		0	0	0	0	1	1	0	6	6	0	1	1
2 Black		0	23	23	0	30	30	0	29	29	0	42	42
3 American Indian		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
4 Asian Pacific Isl.		0	1	1	0	3	3	0	5	5	0	8	8
5 Hispanic		0	2	2	0	1	1	0	4	4	0	4	4
6 White		0	824	824	0	808	808	0	850	850	0	1231	1231
TOTAL		0	850	850	0	843	843	0	894	894	0	1288	1288

Appendix E

The Adams Case: An Annotated Chronology

The Adams Case: An Annotated Chronology

January 1969

HEW concludes that ten southern and border states were operating and maintaining dual systems of higher education in violation of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

October 1970

A class action omnibus suit attacking federal support of segregated public schools as colleges and universities is filed against HEW by attorneys for the NAACP Legal Defense Fund in behalf of all federal taxpayers. The suit, known as Adams v. Richardson, is filed in U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, Judge John H. Pratt presiding.

June 1971

Judge Pratt denies HEW's motion for dismissal of the suit.

February 1973

Judge Pratt finds that HEW had failed to execute its responsibilities under Title VI and that time permitted for voluntary compliance had "long since passed." HEW appeals the decision.

April 1973

United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia considers HEW's appeal. Before the court is an amicus curiae brief, filed by the National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education

(NAFEO), stating that black colleges should not bear the full brunt of any desegregation effort.

June 1973

Judge Pratt's decision is unanimously affirmed (per curiam) by the appeals court. The appeals court in its opinion notes the significant contributions of black colleges. The appeals court gives HEW until June 1974 as the deadline for receiving acceptable plans.

November 1973

HEW provides criteria for states to follow in revising their plans.

June 1974

HEW receives nine final desegregation plans. Louisiana refuses to respond, and the Justice Department files suit against Louisiana. The Office for Civil Rights (OCR) of HEW accepts eight of the nine plans. Mississippi's plan is partially accepted and, thus, referred to the Justice Department for legal action.

August 1975

LDF files a motion for further relief in Judge Pratt's court alleging that HEW by accepting inadequate plans for desegregation of eight statewide systems had not fulfilled obligations of the court order.

September 1975

The Justice Department files a motion on behalf of HEW, claiming LDF's motion is improper because HEW has properly exercised its discretion under Title VI.

December 1975

The Director of OCR notifies Maryland's Governor Mandel that enforcement action is being initiated against the state's system of higher education for failure to implement its plan to desegregate its higher education system. Maryland then sues HEW and wins an injunction. HEW appeals to Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals, Richmond, Virginia.

March 1976

NAFEO files an annexed amicus brief opposing LDF's motion for further relief.

April 1976

Pennsylvania intervenes as a party defendant in the Adams case. The state claims that HEW is not adequately representing its interest.

January 1977

The deposition of former OCR Director Martin Gerry admits in U.S. District Court in the District of Columbia that HEW was derelict in its duty to seek effective desegregation plans. Judge Pratt grants LDF's motion with regard to six states' systems: Virginia, Arkansas, Oklahoma, Georgia, Florida, North Carolina.

April 1977

Judge Pratt issues a supplemental order requiring HEW to draw up new guidelines for the six states to follow in submitting their statewide plans for desegregation. Judge Pratt also releases along with his order an annexed statement filed by NAFEO as a policy guide for preparing new desegregation guides. The final decision directs that the new criteria not overlook the special educational needs of blacks and black colleges, nor should a disproportionate share of the implementation be placed upon public black colleges.

July 1977

HEW's new criteria are submitted to Judge Pratt. These are criteria that the six states must follow.

August 1977

Amended criteria appear in The Federal Register, August 11, 1977. Amendments state 1981-82 as the date for complete implementation. Mandel vs. HEW decided by Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals. Court directs HEW to submit new guidelines for Maryland's desegregation plan to follow. The court halts HEW from initiating enforcement proceedings against Maryland.

January 1978

All plans should be submitted and approved by HEW at this date.

1981 - 1982

All statewide desegregation plans should be implemented.

Haynes 1978

Authors' Biography

William T. Trent is an Assistant Professor of Educational Policy Studies/Sociology at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. He received the Ph.D. in sociology from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Before joining the faculty at the University of Illinois, he was a Research Fellow at the Johns Hopkins University Center for Social Organization of Schools. Prior to going to Johns Hopkins he was a research associate at the Center for Educational Policy Studies and Public Affairs, Duke University. His research focuses on the education of minorities. His recent publications include:

"Equity Considerations in Higher Education: Race and Sex Differences in Degree Attainment and Major Field from 1976 through 1981." American Journal of Education, May 1984.

"Sociology of Education: A Focus on Education as an Institution" with R.H. Braddock and R. Henderson. Review of Research in Education, V. 12, 1985.

Elaine J. Copeland is Associate Dean of the Graduate College and Assistant Professor in the Department of Educational Psychology at the University of Illinois. She received a Ph.D. in Counseling from Oregon State University where she was a psychological counselor involved in coordinating counseling programs for minority students. In her position at Illinois she is concerned with increasing access of underrepresented minority students to graduate study. Her

research interests include cross-cultural counseling and educational policy related to minorities in higher education. Recent publications include:

Trends in Black Participation in Graduate Education Proceeding,
The Second National Conference on Issues Facing Black
Administrators at Predominantly White Colleges and Universities,
Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts,
1984.

Effective Counseling of Minority Students, American Speech and
Hearing Association Reports, V. 16, Chapter 3, 12-16, 1987.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION PROGRAM RESEARCH SERIES

- *A Study of Title III Impact on Historically Black Institutions*,
(Dr. Cameron Fincher, Institute of Higher Education,
University of Georgia, Athens)
- *Recent College and University Enrollment Patterns of Black Students in States Affected By ADAMS-CALIFANO Litigation*,
(Dr. William Brazziel, University of Connecticut, and
Marian Brazziel, Mansfield Center, Connecticut)
- *Access, Retention and Progression of Black Students Through the Two-Tier Florida Higher Education System*,
(Dr. Charles Grigg, Florida State University, Institute of
Social Research)
- *Black Employees in Traditionally White Institutions in the ADAMS States: 1975 to 1977*,
(Dr. Anne S. Pruitt, Ohio State University)
- *Determining the College Destination of Black Students*,
(Dr. Gail E. Thomas and Dr. Jomills Henry Braddock II,
Center for Social Organization of Schools, Johns Hopkins
University)
- *Factors Related to the Postbaccalaureate Careers of Black Graduates of Selected Four-Year Institutions in Alabama*,
(Dr. Rhoda B. Johnson, Tuskegee University)
- *Coping Strategies: Retaining Black Students in College*
(Dr. Yvonne Abatso, Langston Urban Center, Tulsa, Oklahoma)
- *Networking and Mentoring: A Study of Cross-Generational Experiences of Blacks in Graduate and Professional Schools*,
(Dr. James E. Blackwell, University of Massachusetts/Boston)
- *Black College Students and Factors Influencing Their Major Field Choice*
(Dr. Gail E. Thomas, Center for Social Organization of Schools,
Johns Hopkins University)
- *Institutional Effectiveness in the Production of Black Baccalaureates*
(Dr. Philip S. Hart, College of Public and Community Service,
University of Massachusetts/Boston)
- *Educational and Occupational Aspirations and Early Attainment of Black Males and Females*,
(Dr. Edgar G. Epps, University of Chicago, and Dr. Kenneth W.
Jackson, University of Houston Downtown Campus)

- *Financial Assistance to Black Doctoral Students in Two ADAMS States: A Policy Analysis,*
(Dr. James N. Upton and Anne S. Pruitt, Ohio State University)
- *The Decline of Teacher Production in Louisiana (1976-83) and Attitudes Toward the Profession,*
(Dr. Antoine Garibaldi, Xavier University, Louisiana)
- *Gender and Campus Race Differences in Black Student Academic Performance, Racial Attitudes and College Satisfaction,*
(Dr. Walter Allen, University of Michigan at Ann Arbor)