

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



Southern Education Foundation
Atlanta, Georgia 30308

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

William T. Trent

and

Elaine J. Copeland

University of Illinois
at Urbana-Champaign

Final Report of Research
Completed for the
Southern Education Foundation, Inc.

Copyright © 1987 by the Southern Education Foundation, Atlanta, Georgia. All rights reserved. Printed in the USA.

This document is being published and distributed by the Southern Education Foundation. The interpretations and conclusions contained in this publication represent the views of the authors and not necessarily those of the Foundation.

FOREWORD

The Southern Education Foundation and the family philanthropies which preceded it have had a special and continuing interest in the education of Black Americans for more than a hundred years. The Foundation has been concerned particularly with programs aimed at increasing and improving higher education opportunities primarily for blacks in the South.

In April, 1974, the Board of Directors (renamed Board of Trustees in 1984) established a special project, the Higher Education Program, to address issues which were surfacing as a result of the then Adams v. Richardson case. Under this higher education component, the Foundation supported coalitions formed by citizens to monitor state desegregation plans, sponsored conferences and workshops, published papers, monographs and documents, and awarded general grants which focused specifically on achieving equity in higher education in the ten states originally affected by the Adams case.

In September, 1978, the Higher Education Program proposed concentrating a major portion of its allocation on a Research Task Force which was formed to plan a research agenda for the Foundation and to commission research projects. This body of six educators has commissioned over 25 studies since its inception; this document is presented as part of the Higher Education Program Research Series. Other publications which are part of the series are listed at the end of this report and are available to the public at a cost of \$5.00 each.

SEF was able to expand its Higher Education Program as a result of receiving grants from 1983 to 1986 from the Ford Foundation; the publication of this report is made possible by the grants.

A list of other Foundation publications may be obtained by writing to the Southern Education Foundation.

Thank you.

Elridge W. McMillan, President
April, 1987

SOUTHERN EDUCATION FOUNDATION
340 West Peachtree Street, N.W.
Suite 250
Atlanta, Georgia 30308
(404) 523-0001

Price: \$5.00

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
<u>Chapter 1</u>	
Introduction.	1
A Chronology of the Adams Case.	1
The Status of Black Americans in Graduate Education	4
Purpose of the Study and its Limitations.	8
<u>Chapter 2</u>	
Research Design and Methodology	11
The Data.	13
State Reports	13
<u>Chapter 3</u>	
The Responses of Arkansas, Georgia, Oklahoma, and Virginia to Adams.	17
An Overview of Enrollment and Doctoral Degree Attainment in the Selected States.	18
Reports From the Individual States	
Arkansas.	25
Florida	33
Georgia	47
Oklahoma.	58
Virginia.	71
Summary	77
<u>Chapter 4</u>	
Results	79
Summary	90
<u>Chapter 5</u>	
Recommendations	93
Financial Aid	93
Recruitment and Retention	96
Support Services.	98
Administration.	99
Conclusion.	103
References.	104
Appendices	
A. Interview Schedule.	107
B. Names of Key Informants	119
C. State Plan Commitments to Increase Black Graduate Enrollment in the Five Adams States	123
D. Degree Attainment by Race/Ethnicity in Traditionally Black and White Universities.	144
E. The Adams Case: An Annotated Chronology.	165
About the Authors	170

List of Tables & Charts

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page</u>
1	Graduate Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity in Traditionally Black and White Public Colleges, 1976-1982.	19
2	Percentage Distributions of Earned Doctorates by Race/Ethnicity in Traditionally Black and White Public College 1975-76 to 1980-81.	21
3	Black Ph.D. Degree Attainment for Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Oklahoma, and Virginia	81
4	First-Time Graduate Enrollment for Black Students in Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Oklahoma, and Virginia	83
5	Characteristics of State, Systemwide Financial Aid for Black Doctoral/Graduate Students in Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Oklahoma and Virginia	86
6	Black Full-Time Graduate Enrollment: Even years, 1972 to 1984	92
G-1	Regents' Opportunity Grants Awards Made for DOCTORAL Level Programs (Professional Programs Excluded) 1978 - 1984 . . .	51
F-1	Summary of EEO Allocations by Action Force 1974-75 to 1984-85	38,39
F-2	Student Grant-in-Aid Program Participants as Percent of Black Graduate Student Enrollment in Graduate and Professional Programs, 1981-82	41
F-3	Student Grant-in-Aid Program Participants as Percent of Black Graduate Student Enrollment in graduate and Professional Programs, 1982-83	42
OK-1	Projected First-Year Resident Graduate Enrollment by Black/White Ratio and Area of Study	61
OK-2	Revised Incremental Goals to Increase Degrees Granted by Four-Year and Graduate Institutions Expressed as Black/White Ratios	62
OK-3	Seven Years of Black Enrollments by Academic Class Level for the State System	63
OK-4	A Five-Year Comparison of the Black to White Ratio of Bachelor's and Graduate Degree Recipients in the State System	64

List of Charts

<u>Charts</u>		Page
1	Earned Doctorates by Race in Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Virginia and the Nation: 1975-76 - 1980-81.	22
2	Earned Bachelor's Degrees by Race in Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Virginia and the Nation 1975-76 - 1980-81.	23

ABSTRACT

This research examines the efforts of five states centering on increasing the production of black recipients of the doctoral degree. The five states (Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Oklahoma, and Virginia) are each states that have traditionally operated racially dual structures of postsecondary education and who, as a result of Adams vs. Richardson (1972), have been required not only to dismantle the dual structure but also to provide specific procedures to remedy past desegregation effects including an increase in black graduate level enrollment and degree attainment.

We report results from secondary analyses of national and state data as well as results from interviews with key informants in each of the five states and their respective doctorate granting universities. Our results show that little change in the number of doctorates granted to blacks has occurred between 1975-76 and 1983-84 despite the presence of state provided funds for doctoral study. First-time graduate enrollments have decreased slightly and there has been no substantial gains in black/white parity at the graduate level and considerable fluctuation from year to year.

These results suggest that new funding arrangements implemented in each state have mainly served to improve the quality of graduate and doctoral level support for the same numbers rather than to increase the size of the candidate pool. Moreover, admission procedures, recruitment strategies, and the administration of the states' and individual universities' efforts vary widely but share some common features.

Exemplary practices are identified and policy recommendations are offered where appropriate.

Chapter 1

Introduction

Central to the assessment of the access of black Americans to doctoral programs and completion of those programs is the quality of financial support available. Yet little information is available to indicate the level and quality of support black doctoral students receive from individual states. While the federal government has made some commitment to increasing access by supporting minority graduate students, the Graduate and Professional Opportunity Program (G-POP), recently renamed the Patricia Roberts Harris Program, is the single federal program designed to increase the number of minority doctoral recipients in areas where they are grossly underrepresented. Astin (1982) maintains that individual states are viewed as being primarily responsible for increasing student access at all levels of the educational system. Yet funding from states that have targeted minority students has mainly been used to support low income "undergraduate" student populations. The landmark Adams Case has substantially influenced the role of the states in providing financial aid to black students, since those states cited as having supported dual systems of higher education are legally required to provide equal educational opportunity for their residents.

A Chronology of the Adams Case

Haynes (1978) opens his presentation of the Adams chronology as follows:

"The most important legal action to affect the educational hopes and aspirations of blacks in colleges since 1954 involves decisions growing out of the Adams case. The case is important to the interests of blacks because it seeks to (1) identify an acceptable plan to implement public higher

education and (2) formulate policies to insure access and increase participation rates for black Americans at all levels of society."

Formally known as Adams vs. Richardson, the suit was filed on behalf of students attending public schools and colleges that continued to be in violation of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution and in violation of Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act which stated that schools found to segregate and discriminate on the basis of race could not receive federal financial assistance. Also included as plaintiffs were those citizens and taxpayers whose taxes were being used to support public schools and colleges that operated in violation of Title VI. Then Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, Elliot T. Richardson along with the director of the Office for Civil Rights, Stanley Pottinger, were named as defendants and Kenneth R. Adams, a student, was the first of the listed plaintiffs (Haynes, 1978). Appendix E (Haynes, 1978) provides a comprehensive chronology of the Adams Case. For our purposes, the publication of the Amended criteria (August 1977) specifying the requirements with which HEW expected the states to comply is a crucial event since it provides the guidelines by which the states included in this report are judged.

HEW initially sent letters to officials of the states of Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, and Virginia. Each state was to submit a detailed plan on how it would desegregate its dual system of higher education. By January of 1970 none of the ten states had submitted acceptable plans. In October of 1970 the Legal Defense Fund (LDF) filed a class action suit. In February of 1973 the court

ordered HEW to obtain compliance plans from the ten states or to enforce Title VI by terminating federal funds to those states not providing acceptable plans. By June of 1974 nine of the ten states had submitted plans. The original plans were not acceptable and states were asked to submit revised plans. In 1978 six Adams states (Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, Oklahoma, and Virginia) submitted statewide plans based on the Amended criteria published in the Federal Register, August 11, 1977. HEW accepted the plans of Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Oklahoma, and Virginia. North Carolina's plan was not accepted (Haynes, 1978). The Amended Criteria submitted by HEW provided a five part section entitled Elements of a Plan.

Those five broad parts are:

- I. Disestablishment of the Structure of the Dual System
- II. Desegregation of Student Enrollment
- III. Desegregation of Faculty, Administrative Staffs, Non-Academic Personnel and Governing Boards
- IV. Submission of Plans and Monitoring
- V. Definitions

Each of the four substantive parts contains subsections detailing the obligations of the states in order to be in compliance. Part II, paragraphs C and E provide the criteria for which the states included in this report are being evaluated. These criteria require (1) that equal proportions of resident black and white in-state baccalaureate recipients enroll in in-state graduate programs and (2) that the state reduce any disparity in the proportions of blacks and whites successfully completing and graduating at all degree levels (See Appendix C for criteria II C and E).

In continuing adherence to part IV of the Amended criteria, in January 1983, USOCR delivered letters of evaluation to each of the first-tier states. Those letters requested extensions of the plans through 1985-86 and also requested amendments in the existing plans.

An assessment of the relationship of the availability and quality of state financial support for black doctoral students and the level of black Ph.D. production of each state is facilitated by an examination of progress toward compliance on the part of the Adams states with accepted plans as of 1978. Since these states were required to submit plans early and because the plans of each of these states include procedures to increase access of black students to doctoral programs, they provide an important source of data on efforts and accomplishments in increasing the number of black Ph.D.'s.

The Status of Black Americans in Graduate Education

A number of researchers have examined the status of black Americans in higher education (Astin, 1982; Brown and Stent, 1977; Blackwell, 1975, 1981; Copeland, 1984; Morris, 1979; Preer, 1982; Thomas, 1981; Trent, 1984 a,b). Each of these authors discusses those factors that impede or promote access, persistence and success.

Several factors have been cited as major barriers to equal educational opportunity at both the undergraduate and graduate level: prior preparation, restrictive admission policies, low test performance, poor information/guidance and inadequate financial support (Copeland, 1984). Thomas (1981) reported that while the quality of financial aid is an important factor in increasing the access of black Americans to all levels of higher education, family

background, income, and the lack of financial aid are major impediments to black students seeking advanced graduate and professional degrees. This is due, in part, to the fact that both federal and state governments have historically provided less support for graduate than for undergraduate minority and low income students. Studies conducted by Howard University researchers (Institute for the Study of Educational Policy, 1979, 1981) indicate, however, that the negative effects of family income were much greater at the graduate and professional school levels (1979). While the financial needs of black graduate students are greater than those for their white counterparts, a report from the National Advisory Committee on Black Higher Education 1980, the National Research Council Summary Report of Doctoral Recipients from United States Universities 1982 revealed that black students were less likely than white doctoral recipients to have been supported with teaching and research assistantships and that black students have tended to rely on different sources of aid to support their graduate education compared to their white counterparts (Bruce, 1973; Morris, 1979).

In a recent study, Blackwell (1982) examined the status of black Americans in selected graduate and professional fields. His study consisted of two phases, the first an analysis of survey data received from certain institutions offering advanced training for eight professional fields. The second phase involved a trend analysis of first year enrollment and graduation rates of black students for these professional schools during the 1970s. The Blackwell study examined both access and retention. He assessed the extent to which such factors as recruiting, presence and quality of

retention programs, presence and quality of financial support and the presence of special admission programs, influenced the enrollment and retention of black students in eight graduate and professional programs. In addition to documenting the underrepresentation of blacks in the professions, Blackwell's research underscores the crucial role and importance of financial support.

The American Council on Education, citing the concentration of doctoral degrees earned by blacks, reported 60% of the 1980-81 doctorates being awarded by 10% of doctoral granting institutions including Howard University, a traditionally black institution. In accounting for this institutional concentration, they cite a lack of recruitment, limited financial assistance, and restrictive admissions policies. Both the Blackwell and Peterson et al. (1978) studies show that demonstrated commitment on the part of colleges and universities in the form of special support efforts, vigorous recruitment and ample financial assistance can yield important improvements in enrollment, retention and graduation for blacks at both the undergraduate and graduate levels.

The severity of the underrepresentation of blacks at the Ph.D. level has also been addressed in recent research. Trent (1984b), using data from the Higher Education General Information Survey, reports a modest gain in earned doctorates by blacks nationally from 1975-76 to 1980-81 (from 1,169 to 1,265 or 3.4% to 3.7%) while overall there was a net decline for total number of earned doctorates for the same period. Even with that modest gain, however, blacks lost ground with respect to parity. In 1970 blacks were 5.2% of the availability pool--persons 20 to 34 years old with at least four

years of college--and by 1976 they were 5.7% of that pool. Thus the +.3% gain in their share of all earned doctorates was outdistanced by their +.5% gain as a portion of the availability pool. That research further showed the concentration of Ph.D. degrees by major field, especially for blacks, where about half of all black Ph.D.'s are earned in education.

A further indication of the severity of the problem is given by the American Council on Education (1984). In their examination of academically employed minorities with a Ph.D., they report that in 1979 about three percent of academic positions were held by native born minorities or about 5,500 out of approximately 170,000. Native-born blacks held about 2,150 of these positions.

The production of black doctorates thus continues to be a challenge of major proportions in terms of access, persistence and graduation. Each of the previously cited studies reports financial aid as a major factor in increasing or impeding access and retention. There is little available research, however, that has systematically examined the relationship of the availability of financial aid to black Ph.D. aspirants specifically. Since the Adams states examined here have had experience in developing statewide plans to rectify the past inequities of racially dual systems, an examination of these five states' financial aid efforts at the doctoral level should allow for a more informative analysis.

Purpose of the Study
and its Limitations

The purpose of this study is to examine the effectiveness of state financial aid in the production of black doctorate recipients in five states: Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Oklahoma and Virginia. In doing so we seek to identify the outcomes of these states responses to Adams and to shed light on those factors contributing to observed outcomes. We however acknowledge the limitations of this research due to between state differences in postsecondary organizational and administrative structures, institutional governance differences and the nature of the data employed in this research. These limitations are discussed below.

Because the structure of governance varied considerably among states, descriptions of programs are not always comparable. For example in Arkansas, Georgia and Oklahoma, programs are being implemented at the state level. In Virginia each institution is governed by its Board of Visitors with more recent central coordinated efforts being evident. In Georgia, Virginia, Oklahoma and Florida unique institutional programs are also in place. The level of activity varies depending on the individual institution. Our first limitation is to note that some comparisons between states are likely to be misleading and are not encouraged.

Identifying and selecting the persons to be interviewed was influenced by administrative and organizational structures both at the system and institutional levels. For example, at the institutional level Georgia State University has no graduate dean, while at both The University of Georgia and Georgia Institute of

Technology, the graduate dean is responsible for administering graduate programs including responsibility for the graduate programs created in response to Georgia's Adams Plan. The person responsible for coordinating campus activities and programs as well as the level of administrative support available also varied from one institution to another. At the University of Arkansas, the person responsible for coordinating efforts was the Director of Human Relations, while at Georgia Institute of Technology programs were administered in the graduate school but there was no single individual whose primary responsibility was to administer "Adams" programs. A person was so designated at The University of Florida. This diversity is reflected in the state analyses and account for some of the state to state variability found in this report. Our second limitation then is to acknowledge that it is likely to be misleading to overstate the benefits or hindrances of a particular administrative structure.

In addition to the above limitations which constrain our ability to generalize due to between-state and within-state institutional and administrative differences, there are further limitations due to some aspects of the data employed in this research. The Higher Education General Information Surveys (HEGIS) are institutional reports, not individual level data and hence not suitable for inferences about the quality or other characteristics of students beyond the institutions' reporting of their race, ethnicity, gender, enrollment status or degree status.

Numerical data collected from each state and each campus are used to supplement the HEGIS enrollment and degree attainment reports as well as to provide an informed appraisal of state and

institutional efforts. There are however, substantial variations in counting procedures and reporting processes which impair the data comparability across states and institutions. Unlike HEGIS data, these supplemental sources are not subject to standardized forms and are sometimes reported differently from year to year. We attempt to minimize this limitation by: (1) seeking clarification of changes in reported data from year-to-year; (2) using state-compiled, multiple year reports rather than year-to-year reports, and; (3) identifying obvious reporting departures where necessary.

Finally, this report examines just five of nineteen (19) states that are or have been impacted by Adams vs. Richardson. Although they are key states in several respects, we cannot argue from these data that more or less progress has been made in those states not covered by this research. We also make no claim that the five states included in this report are exemplars in any special sense and neither typical or atypical of progress in other states with a history of dual systems of higher education.

Chapter 2

Research Design and Methodology

The principal concerns of this research are: (1) to describe and document the level, quality, and variety of expenditures directed toward the production of doctoral degrees for blacks within selected Adams states; (2) to provide a detailed count of degree production by degree granting institution for the Adams states for the period 1975-76 to 1983-84; and (3) to provide a detailed count of enrollment by full and part-time status and post-baccalaureate degree level for each of the five Adams states for the period beginning 1976 to 1984.

This research combines a modified case approach and secondary data analysis. Interviews in the states provided a detailed description of the funding level, quality and range of activities employed in facilitating the production of black doctorates in the selected Adams states. The interviews also provide some elaboration of uniquely promising or successful practices and a composite description of progress toward the production of black doctorates. Secondary analysis of national institutional data and state reports identifies trends in black graduate enrollment and doctoral degree attainment for each state.

First, those data that are publicly available and offer counts by race and sex for each higher education institution for conferred degrees and enrollment status and level, provided an invaluable and immediately available source of trend data for each of the Adams states. The Higher Education General Information Survey (HEGIS) of Fall Enrollment and Earned Degrees contain data for each of the fifty states. In addition to these national data, of which the Adams

states and institutions are a subsample, there were two additional types of pre-collected data which are in the public domain but pertain only to the separate states. The five states (ARKANSAS, OKLAHOMA, FLORIDA, VIRGINIA, and GEORGIA) had completed their fifth year of reports to the U.S. Office for Civil Rights and had received evaluations indicating their progress toward compliance with the objectives detailed in their respective plans. These reports provide financial data, student counts and program implementation data that specifically address the desegregation-related activities of the states. These reports and supporting data were obtained from the U.S. Office for Civil Rights. Finally, each of the Adams states provided annual reports making available still another source of financial and student count/service data that specifically address the concerns of this research.

A second type of data employed in this assessment is that which identifies the quality, range and function of state initiated and administered programmatic efforts to recruit, admit, sustain, and graduate black doctoral degree candidates. These were obtained through interviews with state and campus level respondents (see Appendix A for the interview instrument).

The research design then was multi-stage using as a first stage, tabular descriptive analysis derived from the three sources of pre-collected data and a second stage of interviews, yielding data which facilitated an interpretive understanding of the desegregation efforts of selected Adams states at the post-baccalaureate degree level. Collectively these data provide a composite, quantitative description of the recent trends, and current level of activity for

these Adams' states, as well as an interpretive, data based narrative, which examines specific state efforts.

The Data

The pre-collected data available from the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) are of two types:

1) Opening Fall Enrollment Data: 1976 through 1982. These data cover full-time, part-time and first-time equivalent enrollment by race (biennially beginning in 1976) and sex, for undergraduate, graduate, unclassified, and first-professional degree students. It is institutional level data allowing for tabular presentation of enrollment trends for each state and for each institution within each state.

2) Earned Degrees Conferred: 1975-76 through 1980-81. These data cover bachelor's, master's, doctor's, and first-professional degrees conferred in major disciplines and sub-fields by race (first for 1975-76 and biennially through 1980-81 in major disciplines) and sex. This is institutional level data and provides actual counts for each state and for each institution within each state.

The pre-collected data from each state with accepted/operating programs are of two types:

3) State Evaluations:

a) USOCR Compliance Evaluation Letters are keyed to the specific requirements of accepted and operating plans. Letters of Evaluation were mailed to five states (OK, ARK, FLA, VA, and GA) that constitute our core Adams states selected for focused interviews. These letters of evaluation report progress toward each accepted

goal/objective and identifies new or changed levels of commitment.

- b) Each state has for each of the implementation years prepared an annual report detailing:
1. the racial composition of the student body at each member campus by level and for selected academic majors
 2. student retention, promotion and graduation
 3. racial composition of employees
 4. racial composition of non-institutional personnel, and
 5. special funding for desegregation activities.

In addition to supplying valuable statistical data and a history of program evaluations, the Office for Civil Rights compliance letters provide initial assessments of the progress made by the individual states. The State's Annual Reports provide both a quantitative and a state-based qualitative assessment of progress toward Plan compliance. Moreover, these reports often reveal newly planned initiatives, institutional differences and discussions of aids and barriers to the success of Plan components.

Key informants in each of the five state system offices were identified by direct mailings to the chief system official. In addition to requesting the names, addresses and telephone numbers of system-level personnel responsible for statewide coordination of the Adams Plan, the names and addresses of campus-level personnel who were responsible for their respective campus' Adams response were also requested. The resulting list of respondents appears as Appendix B. Each informant was mailed the questionnaire and was subsequently contacted by mail and telephone to arrange an interview.

In addition to yielding the specific data requested in the interview schedule, the respondents were the primary sources of system- and campus-level annual reports described above. These key informants provided the main source of data regarding the operational character of the states' efforts, the institutional responses to state plans and a general sense of state and campus commitment to the Adams effort.

As might be expected there was considerable unevenness in the interview data due largely to differences in the state and campus level responses to Adams. Diversity in plans of action are reflected in Chapter 3 where we report the state summaries describing activities in each state. In some instances we have chosen to focus mainly on the system or statewide effort (Oklahoma and Florida) while in others we have focused on the various campus-level activities (Georgia and Virginia). In important ways, this pattern of description for the states reflects the character of administration of the Adams responses. For Arkansas where 1985-86 was the first year of implementation of graduate and doctoral level commitment as indicated by state financial support, the description of the plan provided by respondents was mainly historical and gave an overview of the general response to Adams.

Finally, it must be noted here that the key informants were extremely cooperative. While the questionnaire, except where it requested numbers and dollars, was interpreted more as a stimulus for comment than as a request for a specific response, we have not interpreted that to be an indication of reluctance to comment. Rather, we view that as (1) a weakness of the instrument itself, and

(2) as an indication of the changes over time in state and campus level personnel having responsibility for the program. In many instances informants were just too recent in their positions to be able to respond to our questions relating to the early planning phase, to implementation, to problems with initial implementation or key issues during planning and implementation. Nonetheless, these respondents provided the data requested where it was available, gave willingly of their time (interviews in person or by telephone averaged nearly ninety minutes) and expressed genuine interest in the success and the results of the research.

Chapter 3

The Responses of Arkansas, Georgia, Oklahoma, and Virginia to Adams

Our research design included conducting interviews in each of the five states. We identified key personnel in the state higher education agency offices and the key persons responsible for the administration and coordination of the Adams effort on each doctoral degree granting campus in each state. The co-principal investigators personally conducted face-to-face interviews in each state except Arkansas (See Appendix A for the interview schedule). Our initial contact with Arkansas informed us that their efforts to increase the production of Black doctorate recipients were still in planning. As a result we conducted our Arkansas interviews by telephone and obtained other documentary data by mail.

As stated earlier, there is noticeable unevenness in the state reports. In part, this reflects the quantity of information available from our respondents and in other ways it is a reflection of our decisions about what was useful to report. In all instances we have given primary attention to the interview data collected from state higher education agency officials. Generally we have chosen to report only those campus level activities that merit special attention and hence not every campus level interview is reported. The discussion of each state proceeds in alphabetical order beginning with Arkansas following a summary of the systemwide enrollment and earned degree data for the five states.

An Overview of Enrollment and Degree Attainment in Arkansas, Florida,
Georgia, Oklahoma and Virginia

The purpose of this section is to contextualize the role played by the postsecondary public institutions in these five states based on their contributions to black enrollment and black degree attainment. Tables 1 and 2 which follow are a digest of graduate enrollment data and doctoral degree attainment data presented in tables D.1 through D.10 and tables D.11 through D.20 respectively of Appendix D for the five states included in this report.

Table 1 presents the statistics for full-time graduate enrollment by race, ethnicity, and college race for 1976, 1978, 1980, and 1982. In 1982 approximately 19,000 blacks were enrolled full-time at the graduate level nationally (see Table 6). Full-time black enrollment at the graduate level totaled 1,345 for the public colleges in these five states or about 7% of the national full-time enrollment. The corresponding figures for 1976 were 24,000 black full-time graduate students and 1783 full-time black graduate students enrolled in the public colleges in these five states, or about 8% of the national black full-time graduate enrollment. A meaningful contrast to note is that at the undergraduate level, public institutions in these states accounted for 22% and 24% of national black full-time undergraduate enrollment in 1976 and 1982 respectively. It is perhaps inappropriate to argue that the graduate enrollment percentages should correspond

TABLE 1

PERCENTAGES
Graduate Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity in Traditionally
Black and White Public Colleges
1976-1982

Year	1976			1978			1980			1982		
Enrollment Status Race/Ethnicity	TBI	TWI	TOTAL	TBI	TWI	TOTAL	TBI	TWI	TOTAL	TBI	TWI	TOTAL
ARKANSAS												
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.		1.27	1.27		.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
FLORIDA												
Full-time Graduate												
1 Non-Resident Alien	0	8.10	8.01	4.92	8.26	8.34		9.91	9.87	6.82	14.42	14.34
2 Black	73.03	3.71	4.49	61.92	4.13	4.70	67.74	9.46	4.70	12.73	3.90	4.71
3 American Indian	0	.12	.11	0	.17	.17	0	.20	.20	0	.14	.13
4 Asian Pacific Isl.	1.12	2.61	.57	1.64	.88	.89	3.23	13.50	1.25	1.14	.99	.92
5 Hispanic	0	.07	2.58	0	3.18	3.16	3.23	3.57	3.57	0	2.77	2.75
6 White	25.84	84.70	84.24	14.75	83.34	82.85	25.81	80.63	80.42	18.18	77.85	77.15
TOTAL	89	7,824	7,913	61	7,830	7,891	31	8,157	8,188	88	7,404	7,492
GEORGIA												
Full-time Graduate												
1 Non-Resident Alien	2.06	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	.01	.01	0	.20	.20
4 Asian Pacific Isl.	0	.43	.43	0	.69	.69	0	.83	.83	0	1.99	1.99
5 Hispanic	0	.32	.32	0	.45	.45	0	.65	.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
OKLAHOMA												
Full-time Graduate												
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
VIRGINIA												
Full-time Graduate												
1 Non-Resident Alien	.9	4.2	4.1	.8	5.9	5.6	7.7	7.9	7.9	9.5	11.7	11.6
2 Black	68.6	3.7	5.7	74.6	3.1	6.5	62.5	3.8	5.7	53.7	2.7	4.1
3 American Indian		.08	.08		.09	.09		.33	.31		.10	.10
4 Asian Pacific Isl.	1.7	.9	.98	2.1	1.0	1.14	1.0	1.8	1.8	3.1	.98	1.0
5 Hispanic		.25	.24		.35	.33	.35	.70	.69	.39	.46	.46
6 White	28.6	71.5	88.8	22.3	89.3	86.1	28.2	85.3	83.4	33.06	84.0	82.5
TOTAL	223	7,183	7,406	371	7,291	7,662	283	8,170	8,453	251	8,364	8,615

directly to the undergraduate percentages since each of these states contain one or more Traditionally Black Institutions (TBIs) which would account for some increase in out-of-state undergraduate students. Also, our full-time undergraduate count includes two- and four-year colleges. At the graduate level it is clear from Table 1 that the TBIs in these states do not contribute as greatly to black graduate enrollment. The important issues here, however, are that: these five states collectively represent a substantial source of potential black graduate students--up to 24% in 1982, and; these five states represent a smaller but substantial source of potential doctoral candidates--up to 8% in 1982. It is also important that despite overall declines in black full-time enrollment at the national level, the public institutions in these states increased their shares of black full-time enrollment at each level.

Table 2 provides the summary statistics for doctoral degree attainment by race and ethnicity for each of the five states and for these states collectively for 1975-76, 1976-77, 1978-79 and 1980-81.

The bottom panel of Table 2 presents the summary data for earned doctorates in these states. Overall, there has been very little fluctuation in total doctorates awarded. A total of 47 doctorate degrees separate the lowest and highest yearly totals--2081 vs. 2128--while the 1975-76 and 1980-81 counts differ by only 8--2128 in 1975-76 compared to 2120 for 1980-81.

The overall consistency in the doctoral degree count masks the rather distinct distributions across race groups. In these states for

TABLE 2

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF EARNED DOCTORATES BY RACE/ETHNICITY IN TRADITIONALLY
BLACK AND WHITE PUBLIC COLLEGES,
1975-76 TO 1980-81

Race/Ethnicity College Racial Heritage	1975-76			1976-77			1978-79			1980-81		
	TBI	TWI	TOTAL	TBI	TWI	TOTAL	TBI	TWI	TOTAL	TBI	TWI	TOTAL
ARKANSAS												
1 Non Resident Alien		.88	.88		48	48		58	58		158	158
2 Black		48	48		38	38		48	48		38	38
3 American Indian		.88	.88									
4 Asian Pacific Isl.		48	48		28	28		58	58			
5 Hispanic					38	38		18	18			
6 White		908	908		898	898		848	848		828	828
TOTAL		120	120		106	106		93	93		105	105
FLORIDA												
1 Non Resident Alien		68	68		138	138		128	128		108	108
2 Black		58	58		68	68		48	48		58	58
3 American Indian		.38	.38		.38	.38		.38	.38		.38	.38
4 Asian Pacific Isl.		38	38		.48	.48		28	28		.38	.38
5 Hispanic		28	28		18	18		.18	.18		28	28
6 White		848	848		798	798		808	808		828	828
TOTAL		693	693		695	695		713	713		697	697
GEORGIA												
1 Non Resident Alien		.48	.48					138	138		138	138
2 Black		48	48		2.38	2.38		58	58		58	58
3 American Indian		.48	.48		.28	.28		.58	.58			
4 Asian Pacific Isl.		.98	.98		1.38	1.38		1.28	1.28		.78	.78
5 Hispanic		.98	.98		.28	.28		.28	.28		.28	.28
6 White		93.38	93.38		968	968		808	808		818	818
TOTAL		445	445		440	440		413	413		436	436
OKLAHOMA												
1 Non Resident Alien		118	118		138	138		168	168		238	238
2 Black		28	28		28	28		68	68		38	38
3 American Indian		.88	.88		18	18		.78	.78		18	18
4 Asian Pacific Isl.		.38	.38		.58	.58		18	18		28	28
5 Hispanic		.88	.88		18	18		.58	.58		.58	.58
6 White		858	858		82.38	82.38		768	768		708	708
TOTAL		395	395		373	373		395	395		353	353
VIRGINIA												
1 Non Resident Alien		3.48	3.48		6.28	6.28		8.08	8.08		11.08	11.08
2 Black		4.08	4.08		3.98	3.98		5.48	5.48		3.68	3.68
3 American Indian		1.58	1.58		1.18	1.18		2.08	2.08		.28	.28
4 Asian Pacific Isl.		.28	.28		.28	.28						
5 Hispanic		90.98	90.98		88.78	88.78		84.68	84.68		85.18	85.18
6 White		475	475		467	467		499	499		529	529
TOTAL												
SUMMARY												
1 Non Resident Alien		N	5.08		N	8.28		N	11.88		N	13.48
2 Black		107	4.08		171	3.78		250	4.88		91	4.38
3 American Indian		86	.48		78	.48		101	.38		8	.48
4 Asian Pacific Isl.		8	1.78		8	.98		7	1.88		14	.78
5 Hispanic		36	1.08		18	.98		37	.98		15	.78
6 White		21	87.98		19	85.98		18	80.58		15	80.68
TOTAL		1870	2128		1787	2081		1700	2113		1708	2120

the reported time period, the proportion of doctorates earned by whites declined steadily from 87.9% to 80.6%. The proportion of the awarded doctorates earned by blacks increased only slightly from 4% to 4.3% with a high of 4.8% in 1978-79, the first year of full response to the Adams criteria. Most noticeable is the steadily increasing share of doctorates awarded to Non-Resident Aliens. As Table 2 shows their share of doctorates increased from about 5% in 1975-76 to 13.4% by 1980-81, a 265% increase.

Still another indication of the contribution of the public colleges in these states to earned doctorates is their share of all doctorates awarded overall. Using figures for 1975-76 and 1980-81 the following chart shows the relevant comparisons.

Chart 1: Earned Doctorates by Race in Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Oklahoma, Virginia and the Nation: 1975-76 and 1980-81

	1975-76			1980-81		
	Adams	National	% of National	Adams	National	% of National
Black	86	1169	7.4%	91	1265	7.2%
White	1870	26,644	7.0%	1708	25,908	6.6%
Total	2128	34,334	6.2%	2120	33,941	6.2

National data are from Trent, 1984(b)

Chart 1 shows that overall these five states experienced no change in their share of all awarded doctorates; a slight decrease in the share of doctorates awarded to blacks although the actual count of doctorates earned by blacks increased somewhat (86 to 91 in these states, a 5.8% gain; and 1169 to 1265 nationally an 8.2% gain) at both levels, and; a somewhat larger decrease in the share of

doctorates awarded to whites--about .4%--an actual decline of 736 doctoral degrees.

Finally, when we contrast bachelor degree contributions with doctorate contributions, paralleling our undergraduate and graduate enrollment comparisons, the degree differences are not as disparate as are the enrollment differences. Chart 2 below presents the bachelor degree comparisons.

Chart 2: Earned Bachelor's Degrees in Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Virginia and in the Nation 1975-76, 1980-81

	1975-76			1980-81		
	Adams	National	% of National	Adams	National	% of National
Black	5379	58,253	9.2%	5619	60,673	9.3%
White	57,790	802,799	7.2%	47,459	807,334	7.1%
Total	65,177	922,507	7.1%	66,885	935,161	7.2%
National Totals are From Trent 1984(a)						

Comparing charts 1 and 2 for blacks only, we see that these five states contribute nearly as well at the doctorate degree level as they do at the bachelor degree level and that for both levels their degree shares were fairly consistent from 1975-76 to 1980-81. The degree data are in sharp contrast however to the enrollment data where black undergraduate enrollment exceeds comparable graduate enrollment by about 3 to 1.

These descriptive data show that collectively, the five states included in this report are an important and vital source of graduate level educational opportunity. First, the public colleges in these states enrolled over 20% of black full-time undergraduates, the primary pool from which subsequent graduate enrollment would come.

Second, public colleges in these five states enrolled at least 7% of full-time graduate students during the time period covered. Third, the earned degree data demonstrate that the public colleges in these states contributed at least 9% of bachelor degrees--the actual availability pool--and more than 7% of the doctorates earned by blacks for the period covered. For these three reasons, it is very important that we better understand operational responses to Adams at the state and campus level. We turn next to a description of each state.

Arkansas

System Structure

The State of Arkansas has one major institution which offers the doctorate, The University of Arkansas - Fayetteville. Other four year institutions are: Arkansas State University (ASU), Arkansas Technical University (ATU), Henderson State University (HSU), Southern Arkansas University (SAU), University of Arkansas at Little Rock (UALR), University of Arkansas at Monticello (UAM), University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff (UAPB), University of Arkansas Medical Center (UAMC), University of Central Arkansas (CA), and Arkansas State University at Beebe (ASUB).

At the system level there is the Arkansas Department of Higher Education located in the state capital of Little Rock. Therefore programs designed to aid in the retention of black graduates at the doctoral level are expected to be developed either at the Arkansas State Department of Education or at the University of Arkansas, Fayetteville. Coordinated efforts to assist black undergraduates in applying to graduate school have been implemented. Institutions who offer graduate degrees identify black students who expect to graduate with the baccalaureate and encourage them to pursue graduate study. Individual institutions also host Graduate and Professional School Days for their students. A review of the 1984 plan submitted to the U.S. Department of Education reveals that most of the efforts to eliminate the dual system has been primarily at the undergraduate level. Efforts have also focused on the hiring of black faculty and administrators throughout the state.

One major effort aimed at increasing the number of minority persons with doctorates was initiated in 1985. The state funded Faculty/Administrators Development Fellows Program was designed to assist minority faculty members employed in higher education settings in returning to school to pursue doctoral study. The Program is coordinated at the state level.

Historical Background

In January 1969, the Governor of the State of Arkansas was notified that compliance reviews conducted by the U.S. Office for Civil Rights indicated that Arkansas and nine other states were operating systems of higher education that were racially segregated on a statewide basis and were in violation of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The Governor charged the Arkansas Department of Higher Education (ADHE) with the responsibility for development of a plan which would eliminate the dual system of higher education in Arkansas. During the next six months, state officials prepared and submitted a plan.

No further word was received from the Office for Civil Rights until the spring of 1973 when the Governor was notified that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (DHEW) was required by order of the U.S. District Court in the District of Columbia to, ". . . commence enforcement proceedings by administrative notice of hearings, or utilize any other means authorized by law, to affect compliance with Title VI. . ." of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 by the ten states which had been previously identified as operating dual systems of higher education. The state was requested to prepare another plan which was eventually approved by the Office for Civil

Rights in June 1974 due to the cooperative efforts of ADHE, the Office of the Governor, and the state colleges and universities.

During the period between June 1974 and the spring of 1977, the various elements of the plan were implemented and considerable progress was made. In the spring of 1977, the Governor was notified that new guidelines for the development of state desegregation plans were being prepared by DHEW and that new plans would be requested from the states once the guidelines were complete. The guidelines were completed and received by the state in July 1977. Upon receipt of the guidelines, ADHE promptly began work on preparation of a new plan which would respond to these guidelines.

The first step taken in preparing a new plan was to form an Advisory Committee to work with staff members of ADHE. This committee consisted of forty (40) members with half being institutional employees designated by the presidents and chancellors and the other half non-institutional representatives residing throughout the state. The makeup of the committee was representative of each geographic section of the state and its racial composition was 47.5% black and 52.5% white.

The revised plan was accepted by DHEW as meeting the requirements of Title VI and the amended criteria of the DHEW in February 1978. However, the State of Arkansas was required to submit additional information before the plan could receive final approval. With the submission of a program duplication study, employment goals for non-academic employees, a labor market analysis, revised institutional role and scope statements, institutional measures, a letter from the Governor, and an addendum to the plan which included

a letter from the Chairman of the State Board of Higher Education, the Arkansas Desegregation Plan (ADP) received unconditional approval from DHEW in May 1979.

Arkansas colleges and universities immediately began implementation of the measures to achieve the objectives included with the plan. Special attention was placed on the recruitment and retention of black students and faculty. Black student enrollment was a concern because the proportion of black students enrolled at traditionally white institutions had declined each year since 1976. Since plan implementation, modest gains have been made in the employment of black faculty and staff. Arkansas colleges' and universities' ability to attract and retain black faculty is the most difficult goal to comply with. All plan goals were to be accomplished by academic year 1982-83 and although significant progress has been made, much remains for the goals of the ADP to be achieved.

In January 1983, the Governor was notified by the Department of Education (DOE; formerly the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare) that vestiges of racial segregation that gave rise to Arkansas' obligation to develop a statewide higher education desegregation plan continued to exist and that further action had to be taken to eliminate these vestiges. The DOE requested that the State of Arkansas agree to extend its Plan through the 1985-86 academic year and to develop additional programs, activities, and measures that hold the promise of achieving full compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act as soon as possible, but in any event no later than the end of the 1985-86 academic year. The State

of Arkansas prepared and submitted an addendum to the plan in the summer of 1983 which was approved by the DOE in October 1983. The addendum addresses enhancement of programs and facilities at the University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff (UAPB) and recruitment and retention of black students and faculty at traditionally white institutions.

The ADHE prepares an assessment of institutional progress each year. The ADHE also visits selected institutions to monitor implementation of the Plan.

The guidelines developed by the Office for Civil Rights (OCR) included only one specific criterion on which states were to be evaluated in terms of their progress made in increasing the number of blacks pursuing graduate and professional study. Specifically, Section VI.C mandated that states were to adopt the goals 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 schools (Criterion II.C, p. 23). (See Appendix C).

Only those who enter graduate school in the year after graduating from an Arkansas undergraduate state institution are reported in the OCR data and used for comparisons in assessing overall gains. For example, the 1983 response from the OCR to the State of Arkansas indicated that in 1976 the proportion of black state residents graduating from the nine public four-year institutions was eleven (11) percent. In the fall of that year,

however, the proportion of black students entering graduate and professional programs in seven institutions was 6.7%; therefore, Arkansas was 4.3% below the expected goal.

Financial Support for Graduate Study

In March of 1985, the Arkansas General Assembly authorized the only financial assistance program targeted specifically for doctoral students. Act 229 of 1985 authorized the establishment of a faculty/administrator development fellows program. The program was developed to "assist state institutions of higher education in increasing the academic qualifications, of minority faculty, administrators, other employees and alumni and prepare them for higher levels of faculty and administrative responsibility." A total of \$175,000 was approved to support the program. The "Faculty/Administrator Development Fellows Program" is to be administered by the Arkansas Department of Higher Education (ADHE). The ADHE is to provide matching funds to assist state institutions in funding selected faculty, administrators and other employees who are members of racial minority groups and who pursue full-time in residence doctoral study at other institutions. During this fellowship period the Fellow is to remain a full-time employee of the institution and therefore be eligible to receive salary and other fringe benefits provided by the institution. Stipulations of the fellowship indicate that fellows must have been employed by the sponsoring institution for at least two years prior to beginning graduate study and are under contract to return to the sponsoring institution as full-time employees for three academic years immediately upon the completion of study under the Program. The

Faculty/Administrator Development Fellow is responsible for tuition fees and all other costs related to his or her program of study.*

Arkansas is unique among the five states included in this report, having just one doctoral degree granting institution. Also, for these five states Arkansas is the only state whose response to increasing the number of black doctoral recipients is only recently funded and implemented (1984-85). Nonetheless, one feature of the Arkansas program is clear: it is constructed as an affirmative action employment vehicle while still responding to the mandate to increase the number of black doctoral recipients. Critical in its construction is the candidate pool which is drawn from current employees who have been with their host institutions for at least two years. This criterion has the effect of not expanding the availability pool of black doctoral candidates. In effect, the Arkansas response is not likely to generate, stimulate or encourage the doctoral ambitions or aspirations of black undergraduates in the states institutions.

It is obviously not possible to assess the quality of the Arkansas response at this time and the concerns raised above, regarding expanding and encouraging a larger black doctoral availability pool are at best anticipatory. Moreover, given the limitations of funding, it may be inappropriate to promote

*From summaries provided by Cynthia Moten, Arkansas Department of Higher Education and Barbara Taylor, University of Arkansas.

competition between current employees and current or recent graduates from in-state baccalaureate programs. We note, however, that this effort may not impact or strictly comply with criterion II-C of the Adams guidelines calling for black-white parity in first-time, full-time graduate enrollment. Arkansas must carefully monitor their results.

Florida

Historical Background

The State University System of Florida (SUSF) submitted no non-discrimination statement to comply with Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act until 1970. In June 1974 Florida's Plan for Equalizing Educational Opportunity in Public Higher Education in Florida was approved by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (now the Department of Education). Commensurate with the revised guidelines for compliance issued by DHEW in July 1977, the Florida system plan, complete with specified goals, actions and timetables was resubmitted in Fall 1977. In February 1978 the plan was approved and accepted for implementation.

Initially the Florida response to Adams addressed only the State University System (four-year campuses) but was revised (1977) to include the two-year institutions. In 1977 there were four Florida institutions offering graduate programs at the doctorate level in selected fields (University of Florida, University of South Florida, Florida Atlantic University, and Florida State University) with three institutions offering professional degree programs. Each of the nine four-year institutions within the state system offers a range of graduate degree programs at the master's level. Also Florida has one traditionally black institution, Florida Agricultural and Mechanical, which at the time of approval of the Revised Plan (1977) offered no degree beyond the master's level.

Florida's response to the HEW guidelines addressed three broad areas:

- 1) mission and enhancement of the traditionally black institutions;

- 2) enrollment and progression of black students from first-time-in-college through graduate and professional schools;
- 3) the representation of blacks on governing boards and on the faculties and staffs of universities and governing boards.

For this report, we focus solely on the second of these broad areas and specifically on the enrollment and progression of blacks at the graduate level.

In response to HEW (DOE) criterion IIC (Increased Enrollments in Graduate and Professional Programs) SUSF adopted the following goal:

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.

In addition, SUSF provided six (6) "Special Affirmations and Actions in Support of Student Goals," the first four of which are of special merit here as they specifically address graduate training.

Each Action Form states a specific action to be taken, the steps to achieving the action, and designates responsibility--system and institutional--by position for achievement of the action along with a time schedule. Action Form One, for example, described "Plans to Increase Black Student Enrollment at All Levels," specifying that:

". . . each of the professional schools and major graduate areas will strive to enroll Black students at least approximating the same proportion of Black students graduating with Bachelor's Degrees with appropriate majors within the State University System."

In addition, the fourth 'Technique' reads as follows:

Graduate student: Each University will fully describe efforts to increase Black student enrollment in graduate and professional programs giving due consideration to increasing black enrollments in academic programs where Black students are few in number. The plan should delineate the liaison activities of graduate programs with appropriate undergraduate feeder programs throughout the System and identify potential sources of students.

For this Action Form, the SUSF central office's responsibility was ". . . to insure that all potential applicants to the SUSF will be at least equally informed, and to assist institutions with recruitment efforts," which they accomplished by developing a single recruitment brochure promoting academic programs and the uniqueness of each institution. It is Action Forms Two and Three, however, which are central to this research as they constitute the core of the SUSF response.

Action Form Two: Program to Increase Black
Graduate Students Within the
State University System

Action

To the extent appropriated by the Legislature, educational grants will be provided to increase the number of Black graduate students in the State University System and to encourage the recruitment of these Black graduate students into disciplines and professional programs of high demand where the number of Blacks is extremely low. Each University may nominate recipients for this award, in accordance with a Systemwide analysis of academic programs where Blacks are few in number, or not enrolled. Students may be nominated by institutions not having advanced graduate programs in the chosen discipline but who have been admitted to another State University system institution.

Action Form Three: Board of Regents Special
Summer Program for Black
Graduate and Professional
Students

Action

Upon funding by the Legislature, implementation of a special summer program at the University of Florida designed to increase the enrollment of Black graduate and professional students in the State University system. The program is designed as a pre-start retention program to introduce participants to the career options and requirements in their chosen field of study, while advising and assisting the participants on a one-to-one basis in overcoming academic deficiencies during the summer quarter. Priority for participation will be given to State University System graduates.

In May 1983 the SUS of Florida submitted an addendum to the Office for Civil Rights of the U.S. Department of Education in response to a letter of evaluation from that office in January 1983 and April 1983. That correspondence requested more specifically articulated policies and activities to improve progress toward goal achievement and monitoring of such progress. Further, a March 1983 order from the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, the OCR, requested that Florida extend the State Plan through the fall of 1985. That addendum "restates the System's intention and details additional specificity of action, rate of implementation, and reporting and monitoring procedures which will be undertaken. . . ." Below we examine some evidence on the execution of these action forms and the renewed commitments. Table F1 reports the summary of state expenditures for each Action Form from 1975-76 through 1984-85.

The Florida State University System (SUS) response to these specific requirements for graduate study has been mainly in the form

of two Grant-in-Aid programs (Table F1, line #8), and a Special Summer Program (Table F1, line #3). The Grant-in-Aid program for graduate students was implemented in 1975-76 (originally this was named the Regents Grant for black graduate students) with funding for approximately twenty-three (23) grants, each with a value of \$4,500 and a total dollar value of \$103,500. This funding level remained constant through the 1982-83 academic year. Sixty-six (66) students received aid in the 1983-84 school year with each grant valued at \$5,000 (for a total of \$315,000). From its inception the Grants-in-Aid program has been available to both graduate and professional students, with some special emphasis on selected graduate programs but not a state mandated preference for designated fields.

The anticipated budget increase for 1984-85 is \$125,000, all of which is expected to go to the Grant-in-Aid Program for students, increasing the number of grants by twenty-five (25).

The Grant-in-Aid Program can be supplemented with other funds from both public and private sources but the SUS office does not participate in the additional/supplemental aid decisions which are made at the campus level. The Grant-in-Aid may be kept or continued with satisfactory progress and they are not based solely on merit or need. While the Grant-in-Aid may be continued, the original intent of the program was to increase black graduate and professional student enrollment and hence the first direction of the program established that the priority would be for new students with the students' institution picking up the cost in subsequent years.

TABLE F-1

Summary of EEO Allocations by Action Form
1974-75 to 1984-85

ACTION FORM	1975-76	1976-77	1977-78	1978-79	1979-80	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84	1984-85	Total
1 - Procedures for Determining Impact of Specific Actions (program continued in Monitoring and Measuring Activities)	7,223	1,000	5,000	5,000	10,243	--	--	--	--	--	28,466
2 - Establishment of a Viable Role, FAMU* (commitment incorporated in Cooperative Programs and primarily continued in regular SUS legislative budget)	501,343	304,891	206,394	107,000	40,000	124,200**	61,000***	45,000	52,581	55,917	1,498,326
3 - Resources (deleted) New Action Form 3: BOR Special Summer Program	--	--	--	12,500	162,786	36,500	256,040	235,555	282,393	342,000	1,327,774
4 - Incentive Grant Program, FAMU (commitment continued through program phase out)	165,000	290,500	339,501	223,300	107,670	32,200	--	--	--	--	1,158,171
5 - Visiting Scholars Program, FAMU (deleted)	30,000	30,000	30,000	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	90,000
6 - Renovation of FAMU (program commitment continued)							FUNDED THROUGH FCO				--
7 - Coordinated Recruitment of Students (continued at institutional level)	--	8,000	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	8,000
8 - Grants-In-Aid--Faculty, Students and Staff (continued)	190,840	193,266	194,933	267,066	256,998	262,000	263,700	273,350	485,600	485,600	2,873,253

*Excludes funding in an amount exceeding one million dollars above the formula-generated base for new program implementation. Since 1981, Florida A&M University has been maintained at a higher level than that which would have been realized based on actual enrollments.
**Includes \$10,000 to facilitate academic programs transfer.
***Includes \$16,000 for Health Careers Opportunity Program.

Source: State University System Annual Report: 1984.

TABLE F-1

Summary of EEO Allocations by Action Form
1974 - 75 to 1984 - 85
(Continued)

ACTION FORM	1975-76	1976-77	1977-78	1978-79	1979-80	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84	1984-85	Total
9 - Coordinator of Financial Aid (deleted)	3,000	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	3,000
10 - System Attrition Study (continued)	9,250	1,500	10,400	10,000	15,000	15,000	65,857	70,000	40,000	44,000	281,007
11 - Retention Programs (continued)	15,000	37,000	270,000	351,000	382,716	439,000	478,179	480,179	495,179	502,179	3,450,432
12 - Sensitizing Workshops (deleted)	60,000	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	60,000
13 - Recruitment of Faculty (continued in central office budget)	57,868	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	57,868
14 - Voluntary Transfer Program (deleted)	--	46,582	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	46,582
15 - Faculty Retraining (program partially incorporated in Grants-in-Aid Program for Faculty)	12,000	9,000	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	21,000
16 - Monitoring and Measuring of Progress (continued)	34,751	96,597	42,523	51,412	112,640	136,100	65,604	83,691	121,922	76,979	822,219
17 - Establishment of Employee Goals (continued)	29,800	18,000	44,139	120,279	111,947	155,000	35,000	50,000	60,000	51,000	675,165
18 - Numerical Goals, Student (continued in Monitoring and Measuring Activities)	12,800	0,000	4,600	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	17,900
19 - Community Discrimination (deleted)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
-- Institute of Education Precollegiate Program (part of the 1983 Extended Plan)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	100,000	100,000	200,000
TOTAL	1,128,875	1,036,836	1,147,490	1,147,557	1,209,099	1,200,000	1,225,380	1,237,675	1,637,675	1,657,675	12,619,161

PdeH/jw/7
12/83

Tables F-2 and F-3 show the 1981-82 and 1983-84 distribution of the participants in the graduate Grant-in-Aid program.

A second effort, the Employee Grant-in-Aid Program, was implemented initially to assist blacks in obtaining the terminal degree. The Employee Grant-in-Aid Program now includes other minorities and women who may be academic faculty, professionals or other administrative and career service staff. This program was implemented under Action Form Nine which called for an increase in the number of blacks qualified for advancement in any one of the four employment areas. The Employee Grant-in-Aid Program currently assists women and other minorities with the stipulation that each recipient remains employed within the SUSF for a period of at least twice the length of the educational leave time given to the employee.

The program was initially funded in 1979 at approximately \$170,000 annually. These funds are used as "replacement" monies to assist the recipients' institution in replacing her/him during the educational leave period. Each recipient receives one (1) year of leave with salary and a contribution from the Employee Grant-in-Aid. The recipients' institution receives a maximum of \$17,200; \$16,000 is for temporary replacement of the person on leave and \$1,200 goes to the recipient to defray her/his educational expenses.

One hundred fourteen SUSF employees have received educational leave since the program's inception in 1979 as Grant-in-Aid recipients. The SUS office reports that through academic year 1983-84 the total funding level has reached \$689,198. Also, the SUS

Table F-2

Student Grant-in-Aid Program Participants
as Percent of Black Student Enrollment
in Graduate and Professional Programs
Fall, 1981

Discipline	SUS Black Enrollment	Percent Black of Total Enrollment	Participants as Percent of Black Enrollment in SUS	
			#	%
<u>First Professional</u>				
Pharmacy	22	57.8	2	9.1
Law	66	4.4	3	4.5
Medicine	50	7.5	4	8.0
Veterinary Medicine	3	1.0	2	66.7
<u>Graduate Programs</u>				
Psychology	48	6.1	4	8.3
Business Administration	39	3.8	2	5.1
Public Administration	47	13.1	2	4.3
Allied Health Services	30	5.0	1	3.3
Music	6	4.0	2	33.3
Computer Science	5	3.7	1	20.0
Overall Representation in First Professional Programs	*150	5.5	11	7.3
Overall Representation in Graduate Programs	*807	5.5	12	1.5
Total Representation in Graduate Study	*957	5.5	23	2.4

*Represents Fall Semester enrollment, only.

Source: Annual Report of Progress 1981-82 Board of Regents, Office for Equal Opportunity Programs. State University System of Florida, Tallahassee, Florida p. 36.

Table F-3

Graduate Student Grants-in-Aid Program Participants
as a Percentage of Black Student Enrollment
in Graduate and Professional Programs
Fall 1983

Discipline	SUS Black Enrollment	Percent Black of Total Enrollment	Participants as Percent of Black Enrollment in SUS*	
			#	%
<u>First Professional</u>				
Pharmacy	30	75.0	3	10.0
Law	80	5.3	4	5.0
Dentistry	11	3.7	3	27.3
Medicine	50	6.1	8	16.0
Veterinary Medicine	4	1.3	1	25.0
<u>Graduate Programs</u>				
Psychology	45	5.6	7	15.5
Business and Management	87	2.9	12	13.7
Education	342	6.7	15	4.3
Other	244	8.7	13	5.3
Overall Black Representation in First Professional Programs	175	5.8	19	10.9
Overall Black Representation in Graduate Programs	718	4.1	47	6.5
Total Black Representation in Graduate and Professional Study	893	4.3	66	7.3

*Universities' 1983-84 annual reports

Source: Annual Report of Progress 1982-83 Board of Regents, Office for Equal Opportunity Programs. State University System of Florida, Tallahassee, Florida, p. 36.

office reports that about thirty-six (36) recipients, or 32%, have completed their educational programs and that twenty-five (25) of those completing their programs have been promoted within the state system.

The third initiative undertaken by Florida for the support of graduate level students is the Special Summer Program which began in 1978-79 funded at \$12,500. The program in 1984 was funded at \$342,000. The SUSF Special Summer Program is for new, entering graduate and professional students each of whom receives a grant ranging from \$1,300 to \$1,500 to help defray the cost of tuition and living expenses. Students are enrolled full-time during the regular academic year. For the summer of 1983 there were 101 pre-law and pre-graduate students enrolled in this special summer transitional program on the university campuses. This represented an increase on five (5) students over the summer 1982 total.

Recruitment

The State University System does not provide direct financial support for the recruitment of minority graduate students. The individual campuses use a variety of strategies in the recruitment of minority students for graduate study. By far the most elaborate recruitment strategies are those of the University of Florida where faculty and students participate in a well-conceived recruitment program which entails university financed, pre-arranged visits to selected campuses--especially historically black institutions--where substantial numbers of minority students are enrolled. Faculty members are invited to volunteer for two- to three-day visits, are accompanied by minority graduate students, are trained prior to the

scheduled visit and are supplied with well-designed informational packets to be distributed to students during their visits. The office of the director of the program (Acting Assistant Dean for Graduate Studies) administers this recruitment program including all details of initial institution contacts, scheduling, travel and accommodations, packet preparation and training.

The University of South Florida, partly in response to the OCR letter of January 1983 to Governor Graham, has initiated or planned the implementation of many of the same recruitment practices. These initiatives also correspond to the appointment of an Assistant Dean for Graduate Studies with primary responsibility for the administration of the minority graduate student commitments.

Support Services

The SUS of Florida does not provide direct funding for special support services to minority graduate students beyond the special summer program for pre-graduate and professional students. Those support services which are available on the different campuses reflect the individual campus and departmental responses to the needs of their students.

The support services identified by respondents include: Minority Graduate and Professional Student Organization; Minority Graduate Student faculty advisors; periodic meetings with graduate school staff; the Ad Hoc Minority Graduate Student Recruitment and Advisory Committee; the traditional on-campus counseling service; and departmental tutors.

Florida offers both a well conceived statewide plan and at least one well conceived campus based initiative. The states' response in

terms of funding for black doctoral candidates is both affirmative with respect to employees and generative with respect to expanding the availability pool of black doctoral candidates. The Florida plan has also been responsive to supporting certain special services as evidenced by the Board of Regents Summer Program. The financial support provided by Florida is not retentive however, although it is renewable. The emphasis in Florida has been on black-white parity in graduate enrollment based on in-state black-white baccalaureate degree rates. Such an emphasis is in direct compliance with Criterion II-C of Adams but the non-retentiveness of the financial aid could contribute to some instability for students planning their graduate careers, or what we refer to as "revolving door programs" at the undergraduate level. We found no direct evidence of this phenomena in our interviews nor in the state and campus based reports but administrators at each level were sensitive to this potentiality.

There was considerable variability among Florida's campuses both in the administrative structure and the comprehensiveness of services. While each of the doctoral granting institutions is participating in the state funded programs, the plan and its administration is most visible at the University of Florida. The recruitment activities of the University of Florida are of special merit in that they involve university faculty and graduate students and they also focus on historically black colleges, the location of the largest pool of potential black graduate students.

It is also important to note that Florida's Plan supports approximately 75 black doctoral candidates when the employee and student grant-in-aid funds are combined. Both programs have been

available since 1979 but the annual number of black doctoral recipients since that time has remained fairly stable. It is important for Florida to investigate those factors associated with the difficulty of increasing its number of doctoral recipients given its level of support.

Georgia

System Structure

There are thirty-three (33) institutions in the public higher education system of Georgia, fifteen two-year institutions and eighteen four-year institutions. Three of the four-year public institutions are historically black institutions. They are: Fort Valley State College, Albany State College and Savannah State College. Four of the four-year institutions, the University of Georgia, Georgia State University, Georgia Institute of Technology, and the Georgia Medical School, have doctoral programs.

The university system is governed by a fifteen-member Board of Regents. These members are appointed by the Governor. There are ten members each of which represents one of the ten congressional districts. Five members are appointed from the state at large.

In the state of Georgia both the system and individual institutions have programs to encourage black undergraduate students to pursue graduate degrees. Funding provided to students may be awarded from the state or at some institutions from internal non state funds.

Historical Background - Desegregation Plan

The initial state plan was developed during the period from 1969-1973 but was not accepted until early 1973. Commitment and pressure from the general administration was instrumental in obtaining cooperation at the graduate department level. The plan was revised in 1977 and amendments were prepared in 1983 and 1984. In the March 1978 plan, the Board of Regents adopted as a goal the continued parity of black and white state residents who graduate from

undergraduate institutions and enter graduate institutions in the Georgia system. While the black enrollment in graduate programs in 1977 exceeded the proportionate graduate rates for blacks at the bachelors levels, it was found that blacks were underrepresented in certain disciplines. In the 1978 plan, enrollment goals were established for twenty-three disciplines through 1982.

In the 1977 plan the commitment was made to seek legislation and state funding of \$500,000 for 100 scholarships to support "economically disadvantaged graduate and professional students." This program was initiated in 1978. A subcommittee from the Regents Office was also appointed. One of the key issues was whether to merge Armstrong Southern College, a predominantly white institution and Savannah State College, a historically black institution. There was also some concern regarding how best to integrate faculty, whether faculty should be transferred and how the transfer would affect tenure considerations and regulations.

Recruitment

Several activities have been coordinated at the system level to recruit students to graduate programs. The Regents' Opportunity Scholarship Program was funded in 1978 at a level of \$500,000. The program provides fellowship support to selected black students who are pursuing advanced graduate and professional degrees. The appropriation of \$500,000 remained the same through the 1983-84 year. This amount was increased to \$600,000 in academic year 1985. Other activities include:

- (a) a computerized identification system initiated in fall 1983.

Academically promising minority undergraduates with a grade

- point average of 2.75 (4.00 scale) or higher attending any of the state institutions are identified early and encouraged to pursue graduate or professional study;
- (b) the development of special graduate recruitment materials for each state institution offering graduate and professional programs; and
 - (c) minority recruitment seminars held annually. The seminars for minority students are held at each of the thirteen undergraduate state institutions. They include: Albany State College, Armstrong State College, Columbus College, Fort Valley State College, Georgia College (Arts & Sciences), Georgia College (School of Medicine), Georgia Institute of Technology, Georgia Southern College, Georgia Southwestern College, Georgia State University, North Georgia College, Savannah State College, University of Georgia, Valdosta State College, and West Georgia College. Deans or other representatives of the graduate schools are available to discuss graduate study opportunities at a particular institution.

The system also provides support for some black faculty and administrators employed at state institutions to pursue terminal graduate degrees. The award includes a maximum of three years with pay. Faculty and administrators must return to the institution and remain employed there for the equivalent of each year of leave. (See Appendix C for summary provided in the 1983 Admended Plan). As indicated below, efforts are also decentralized and vary at the campus level. Descriptions of institutional efforts follow.

Georgia State University

Efforts to increase the number of black students enrolled in graduate programs at Georgia State University are decentralized. There is no dean of the Graduate School. There are three colleges, Education, Liberal Arts and Sciences, and Business, that offer the doctoral degree. Recruiting efforts are coordinated by the colleges. Institutional funds have not been set aside to support doctoral students. Students enrolled at Georgia State are eligible to apply for the Regent's Educational Opportunity Grant, a program funded at the system level and since 1978 have received most of the awards made to doctoral level students (see Table G-1). Because of the location, Georgia State University has a number of part-time students pursuing graduate degrees. Many of these students are employed while enrolled. The size of the black population in Atlanta, and the fact that the doctorate is awarded in most fields of education, contribute to the number of black students pursuing advanced degrees.

Admission Criteria

The most competitive programs are psychology in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences and Counseling and Psychological Services in the College of Education. Business ranks third. Some of the admission requirements are dictated by the system for those pursuing degrees in Education. The Miller Analogies Test is required for all applicants and minimum grade point averages are also required.

TABLE G-1

REGENTS' OPPORTUNITY GRANTS

Awards Made for DOCTORAL Level Programs
(Professional Programs Excluded)

1978 - 1984

GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY		GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY		MEDICAL COLLEGE OF GEORGIA		University of Georgia	
Phd		PhD, DBA, EdD		PhD		PhD, DPA, EdD	
Mathematics	- 1	Psychology	- 9	Biology	- 1	Public Admin.	- 1
Information-Computer Science	1	Information Systems	- 2			Special Education	- 1
Chemistry	2	Land Economics	- 2			Psychology	- 5
Management	1	School Psychology	- 1			Early Childhood Education	- 1
Biology	1	Economics	- 2			Education	- 2
Nuclear Engineering	1	Political Science	- 1			Accounting	- 1
		Accounting	- 1			Romance Language	- 1
		Curriculum Dev.	- 1			Education Psy.	- 1
		Education Admin.	- 1			Sociology	- 2
		Early Childhood Ed.	- 2				
		Ed. Foundations	- 1				
		Special Education	- 1				
		Curriculum & Institution Education	- 1				
		Ed. Leadership	- 2				
		Counseling and Psychology Services	- 1				

The University of Georgia

The most comprehensive doctorate degree granting institution in the state is the University of Georgia. The Doctor of Philosophy is awarded in fifty-one (51) different disciplines. The Doctorate of Education is offered in thirty (30) different fields and the Doctor of Musical Arts and Public Administration are also awarded. Because of the comprehensive nature of the institution one would expect that the number of black students attending graduate programs at the University of Georgia would be higher than both the Georgia Institute of Technology and Georgia State University, but, as shown in Table G-1, this is not the case.

Recruitment

The University of Georgia participates in the statewide activities to recruit minority students. Approximately 800 letters per year are mailed to all minority juniors with G.P.A.'s of 2.74 (4.00 - A). Materials which describe sources of financial support and graduate school information are included with the letter from the dean of the graduate school.

Institutional funds are also allocated to support masters and doctoral level students. In 1984-85, twenty-one (21) non-teaching assistantships were provided. The assistantship is one-third FTE (13 hours per week). Masters level students receive \$5,356 per year. Doctoral level students (those who have completed 45 hours) receive a salary of \$5,712 per year. All awardees pay in-state tuition. In 1985-86, twenty-four (24) awards were made. Master's students will receive \$5,731 and doctoral students will receive \$6,113 for a nine-month appointment and \$7,642 to \$8,150 for a twelve-month

appointment. There is a yearly competition and students are eligible to be funded for up to three years. Presently the majority of the students supported are at the masters level.

Georgia Institute of Technology

Georgia Institute of Technology offers advanced degrees in engineering, science, management, architecture, and city planning. There are four colleges in which graduate degrees are offered. The largest is the College of Engineering. The College of Science and Liberal Studies (COSALS) has such disciplines as biology, applied biology, chemistry, physics, mathematics, information computer science, physical sciences and psychology. Clinical psychology is also offered. The College of Management offers three undergraduate programs leading to a bachelor of science in management, in management science, and in economics. Graduate work in the College leads to the Master of Science and the Doctor of Philosophy in Management. The doctoral program has low enrollment. The College of Architecture was recently authorized to offer the doctorate. There have been no degrees awarded. The first professional degree in architecture is the masters degree. No doctorate is offered in the speciality of City Planning. Because of the technical and quantitative emphasis of the programs offered, as well as employment opportunities for students with bachelors degrees, enrollment of black students at the doctoral level is small.

Recruitment and Admission Procedures

Georgia Institute of Technology has a unique mission. It has the only comprehensive engineering program in the state. Through the centralized minority identification program, all black undergraduate juniors and seniors with a 3.00 grade point average who are pursuing science programs are contacted directly. Personal letters and graduate college information are sent to each student. The students

are also informed of the date when representatives from Georgia Tech will visit their campus to interview students.

Most recruiting is done, if at all, at the department level. Admission decisions are also decentralized and are made at the school level. Schools at Georgia Institute of Technology are similar to graduate departments at most graduate institutions.

The number of black students pursuing graduate study in management is small. Students have the choice of pursuing Business Administration at both Georgia State University and at the University of Georgia. The management programs at Georgia Institute of Technology are highly quantitative and technically oriented. Those students who are more interested in careers in business and industry rather than in academic settings may choose to pursue the terminal Masters of Business Administration rather than either of the two doctorates offered there.

Financial Assistance

As a major technically-oriented research university, Georgia Institute of Technology receives approximately only twenty percent of its revenue from the state. Most doctoral students are supported by graduate research assistantships. The minimum level of funding is \$4,000 for a nine-month appointment, one-third FTE and \$8,600 maximum. Tuition and fees are waived. The salary range varies by College. Georgia Institute has previously received funding from the U.S. Department of Education through the Graduate and Professional Opportunity Program (G-POP) fellowship but was not funded for the 1984-85 school year.

Perhaps one of its major contributions to increasing the number of black students pursuing the baccalaureate in engineering has been the establishment of the joint programs with several Historically Black Institutions located in Atlanta. As is the case in most technical graduate programs nationally, similar gains have not occurred at the graduate level.

Georgia administers the largest program of any of the states included in this report with a total dollar value of \$600,000, accounting for approximately 120 graduate students. These monies are not constructed to be retentive, but while students must reapply annually, the states commitment is very positive.

Georgia's plan is clearly articulated to be more supportive of black students in particular major fields with target goals stated for each of 23 disciplines. These targets however are not prohibitive of students' choices.

As is true in each of the states except Arkansas, Georgia's campuses show considerable variability in the execution of the state's plan. Perhaps primarily due to differences in the offerings on each of three doctoral granting campuses, there are substantial differences in numbers of candidates. Georgia State University, for example, has a broad array of doctoral level offerings making its graduate program quite attractive. This campus also offers part-time opportunities. As a result, Georgia State University far outdistanced its more visible sister institutions--Georgia Institute of Technology and the University of Georgia--in the utilization of Regents Opportunity Grants, The University of Georgia has the most

comprehensive doctoral offerings of all the states' public institutions.

By contrast Georgia Institute of Technology has a very unique mission and its degree of specialization probably limits its role. Nonetheless, the national efforts of engineering and the technical sciences have made these fields quite attractive to minorities and contributes to their access and success in these fields. In this latter light, the black graduate numbers at the Georgia Institute of Technology appear small.

The early identification features of the recruitment activities on the part of Georgia's universities are commendable. The maintenance and distribution of minority students names and addresses is particularly useful in a state that has access to three (3) public supported, historically black colleges. Nonetheless, our figures show that for the time-period covered here, these Georgia institutions have been unable to increase the number of black doctoral recipients or to increase black graduate enrollment. Indeed, both the number of black doctorates awarded and the numbers enrolled have declined.

Oklahoma
System Structure

The Oklahoma State System of Higher Education is composed of thirty (30) institutions located throughout the state. There are four institutions that grant professional and higher degrees: Oklahoma University Health Sciences Center, Oklahoma State, Northeastern Oklahoma State University, and the University of Oklahoma. Black students accounted for 6.4% of the total enrollment in 1983 and 1984. In 1981 and 1982, Black students accounted for 6.2% and 6.3% of the total enrollment at Oklahoma's traditionally white institutions. Black enrollment has been within one percentage point of this level in the past six years (1984 Annual Report).

Black students are enrolled in all schools throughout the Oklahoma University System. There are, however, four institutions where the level of Black student enrollment has been more concentrated over the years. These are Roe State College (13.2%), Central State University (8.9%), Tulsa Junior College (6.3%), and Langston University (51.0%). Langston University is Oklahoma's only traditionally Black institution. Its enrollment is divided among three locations: the main campus, Tulsa, and Oklahoma City. Langston University presently is not a professional degree granting institution, nor does it offer any doctoral programs. In 1984, Langston did submit a request to the Oklahoma State Board of Regents to add two professional schools (Chiropractic and Podiatric Medicine); however, the request was deferred due to budget constraints (1984 Annual Report).

Historical Background

The Oklahoma State Plan for Compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was initially submitted prior to 1973. A revised version of this plan was given approval in 1974 by the U.S. Office for Civil Rights. Plans initially approved in 1974, however, were found lacking pursuant to the Adams guidelines published in January 1977. Oklahoma further revised their PLAN and this was approved as of September 1977, to be fully implemented by academic year 1981-82.

We focus on Oklahoma's response to criterion II.C and II.E of the Adams' guidelines calling for increases in black degree attainment at each degree level (II.E). (See Appendix C)

Oklahoma's response to Criterion II.C and II.E are as follows:

C. Graduate and Professional School Enrollment

Plan Commitment

"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 schools." The State also said that the "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." (Revised State Plan, Supplement II, January 17, 1978, p. 6).

E. Retention and Graduation Parity

Plan Commitment

"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, doctor's degrees." (Revised State Plan, September 5, 1977, p. 25).

Tables OK-1 and OK-2 provide the projections for Black first-time graduate enrollment (1978-1982) and Black degree attainment (1979-1986), respectively, expressed as black-white ratios. These projections are based on parity in black-white proportions for enrollment and degree attainment. Tables OK-3 and OK-4 provide the actual achievements in black first-time graduate enrollment and black degree attainment for 1978 through 1984 for enrollment and 1979-80 through 1983-84 for bachelor and graduate degree attainment.

Table OK-3 shows unevenness across the major field combinations but, in general, for 1982, 1983, and 1984, Oklahoma fell short of its projected enrollment ratios for black first-time graduate students. Table 3a, giving actual numbers of black first-time graduate enrollment, clearly demonstrates the year-to-year fluctuations. It is important to point out, however, that in 1981, Oklahoma's black first-time graduate enrollment met or exceeded parity in nineteen (19) of the twenty-four (24) fields listed.

Turning next to degree attainment parity, when we contrast Tables 2 and 4 we can see that black-white actual degree attainment at the doctoral level has not matched the projections. Indeed, the 1979-80 projections and actual ratios (1:24.7 vs. 1:37.6) are closer than the ratio for the most recent year for which data were available (1983-84, 1:14.1 vs. 1:46.2). Each of the interim year comparisons are much closer. It is not clear what the source of this most recent departure is.

TABLE OK-1

Projected First-Year Resident Graduate Enrollment
by Black/White Ratio and Area of Study

MAJOR AREA OF STUDY	FALL 1978		FALL 1979		FALL 1980		FALL 1981		FALL 1982	
	RATIO	DECIMAL	RATIO	DECIMAL	RATIO	DECIMAL	RATIO	DECIMAL	RATIO	DECIMAL
AGRICULTURE AND NATURAL RESOURCES	1:100	.010	1:90 ^a	.011	1:80 ^a	.012	1:76	.013	1:70	.014
ARCHITECTURE & ENVIRON. DESIGN	1:32	.031	1:25	.040	1:25 ^a	.040	1:18	.056	1:17	.059
BIOLOGICAL STUDIES	1:31	.032	1:28	.036	1:28	.036	1:16	.063	1:16	.063
BUSINESS AND MANAGEMENT	1:17	.059	1:15	.067	1:13	.077	1:10	.100	1:9	.111
COMMUNICATIONS	1:12	.083	1:12 ^a	.083	1:12 ^a	.083	1:6	.167	1:6	.167
COMPUTER & INFORMATIONAL SCIENCE	1:11	.091	1:8	.125	1:8	.125	1:3	.333	1:3	.333
EDUCATION	1:10	.100	1:10 ^a	.100	1:10	.100	1:7	.143	1:7	.143
ENGINEERING	1:67	.015	1:41	.024	1:23	.043	1:17	.059	1:17	.059
FINE & APPLIED ARTS	1:9	.111	1:9 ^a	.111	1:9 ^a	.111	1:9	.111	1:9	.111
FOREIGN LANGUAGES	1:30	.033	1:15	.067	1:15 ^a	.067	1:10	.100	1:8	.125
HEALTH PROFESSIONS	1:21	.048	1:16	.063	1:11	.091	1:6	.167	1:6	.167
HOME ECONOMICS	1:18	.056	1:12	.083	1:10	.100	1:10	.100	1:9	.111
LETTERS	1:24	.042	1:24	.042	1:14	.071	1:8	.125	1:6	.167
LIBRARY SCIENCE	1:10	.100	1:8	.125	1:5	.200	1:5	.200	1:5	.200
MATHEMATICS	1:15	.067	1:13	.077	1:13 ^a	.077	1:10	.100	1:8	.125
PHYSICAL SCIENCE	1:52	.019	1:32	.031	1:24	.042	1:20	.050	1:15	.067
PSYCHOLOGY	1:15	.067	1:14	.071	1:14 ^a	.071	1:10	.100	1:9	.111
PUBLIC AFFAIRS & SERVICE	1:17	.059	1:10	.100	1:10	.100	1:10	.100	1:10	.100
SOCIAL SCIENCE	1:10	.100	1:10	.100	1:8	.125	1:6	.167	1:5	.200
ALL AREAS	1:15	.067	1:15	.067	1:12	.083	1:9	.111	1:9	.111

*1977-78 UNDERGRADUATE PARTICIPATION RATIOS AT THESE LEVELS ARE BELOW THESE
PROJECTED RATIOS. THESE AREAS WILL BE TARGETED FOR SPECIAL RECRUITMENT
THE YEAR PRIOR TO THAT FALL.

SOURCE: GOALS FOR GRADUATE AND PROFESSIONAL SCHOOLS, TABLE ONE.

Source: Final Analysis for the State of Oklahoma, Exhibit 4, September 1983.

TABLE OK-2

Revised Incremental Goals to Increase Degrees
Granted by Four-Year and Graduate Institutions
Expressed as Black/White Ratios^a

<u>Degree Year</u>	<u>Bachelor's Degree</u>	<u>Master's^b Degree</u>	<u>Doctor's^c Degree</u>
1979	1:15.6	1:20.9	1:29
1980	1:14.1	1:18.6	1:24.7
1981	1:12.1	1:15.6	1:20.9
1982	1:10.0	1:14.1	1:18.6
1983	1:10.0	1:12.1	1:15.6
1984	1:9.6	1:10.0	1:14.1
1985	1:9.3	1:10.0	1:12.1
1986	1:9.0	1:9.6	1:10.0

^aExtrapolated from 9999 Summary of OE 2300 - 2.3 (1978) and the 1977-78 Enrollment Report by Race from the State Department of Education dated January 5, 1978.

^bRepresents a two-year delay in equal ratios from the baccalaureate degree year.

^cRepresents a three-year delay in equal ratios from the master's degree year.

Source: Final Analysis for the State of Oklahoma, Exhibit 6, September 1983.

TABLE OK-3

Seven Years of Black Enrollments by Academic Class
Level for the State System

Classification	Fall 1978	Fall 1979	Fall 1980	Fall 1981	Fall 1982	Fall 1983	Fall 1984
First-time Freshmen	2139	2257	2397	2168	2326	2326	2091
Other Freshmen	2102	2089	2161	2081	1916	2195	2108
Sophomores	1969	1771	1828	1805	1909	1976	2033
Juniors	833	828	884	803	946	1009	838
Seniors	796	801	815	863	865	1011	990
First-time Graduates	95	90	123	120	119	137	145
Other Graduates	351	365	327	392	424	447	478
Professional	31	36	38	38	40	42	52
Unclassified	304	337	265	534	743	699	760
TOTAL	8620	8574	8838	8804	9288	9842	9495

Source: OE 2300-2.3 Fall 1978-1984

Source: Compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act; Oklahoma
State Regents for Higher Education Annual Report, 1985,
Table 3.

TABLE OK-4

A Five-Year Comparison of the Black to White Ratio of
Bachelor's and Graduate Degree Recipients in the State System

Year	Bachelor's*	Master's	Doctor's
1983-84	1:19.0	1:22.8	1:46.2
1982-83	1:18.2	1:21.8	1:21.0
1981-82	1:19.9	1:23.6	1:22.6
1980-81	1:20.1	1:23.2	1:22.5
1979-80	1:20.6	1:24.5	1:37.6

Source: OE 2300-2.3 (for 1979-80 through 1983-84)
Tables Four, Five, and Six

*The TBI contribution is included in these ratios

Source: Compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act; Oklahoma
State Regents for Higher Education Annual Report, 1985,
Table 8.

The primary vehicle designed as an Adams response to increase the production of black Ph.D.'s from Oklahoma universities has been the Doctoral Study Grant Program, financial aid initiated to sustain Criterion II.E. We turn next to a discussion of that program.

Financial Aid at the Doctoral Level

The Doctoral Study Grant Program (DSGP) was initiated in January 1975 as the statewide system response to increasing the number of doctorate recipients who were black. It is the only source of financial assistance designated by the state for this purpose and since its inception has been administered by the Oklahoma Board of Regents. Since its first year of implementation, the DSGP has grown in five ways:

- (1) expanded to cover dissertation;
- (2) the number of years the award could be received has been extended three times (from 2 to 2 1/2 years; from 2 1/2 years to 3 years; and from 3 to 4 years;
- (3) increased in dollar value; from \$5,000/year to \$6,000 per year;
- (4) augmented by requiring a fee waiver;
- (5) augmented by requiring a graduate assistantship or an apprenticeship.

These five refinements of the DSGP have occurred at different times throughout the existence of the program. In 1978 the award was approved and expanded to cover dissertation (2 1/2 years). The fee waiver requirement (the fee waiver is state money, but is not a hard money transfer in its year of use but is reflected in the host university's next budget year), worth from six to seven hundred dollars for in-state students and up to \$1,600 for out-of-state students, depending on which university they enter, was added in

1980-81. An additional year of award was added in both 1983-84 and 1984-85. Also in 1984-85 the state added the assistantship/apprenticeship requirement and increased the dollar value of the basic DSGP award from \$5,000 to \$6,000. The net result of these extensions, expansions and additions has been to increase the value of the award from \$5,000 a year in 1975 to its current maximum value of approximately \$16,000. The funding level for the basic DSGP has increased from \$50,000 (10 FTE's) to its current level of \$120,000 (20 FTE's).

The DSGP is not solely need-based in the traditional financial aid sense but was also based, in part, on the needs of the universities and colleges in Oklahoma. In this way the program is consistent with the stated operational purpose of the effort which is to create faculty and staff for the Oklahoma State University System. Recipients are not required to stop work and it is clear, from the evolving financial aid package approach reflected in the new requirements, that the DSGP is viewed as additive and is complemented by monies from a variety of sources. Cumulatively the DSGP is worth from \$40,000 to \$64,000 for each recipient. The coordinator for the program estimates its total dollar value at approximately \$270,000. It should also be noted that the required add-ons (fee waivers, assistantships/apprenticeships) are not actually enforceable but are cooperatively negotiated with the individual campuses. Only the basic DSGP monies are completely administered at the state system level. Importantly, however, by requiring the fee waiver and other add-ons in the aid package, the total package is tax-exempt. Finally, the award is structured as a twelve-month award.

Eligibility for the program is governed by fairly flexible criteria with respect to major fields of study, allowing the selection group to change their eligibility criteria based on the job market and institutional listings. Beyond that, the candidate should predict graduation and provide evidence of staying in Oklahoma following graduation (not a requirement of an enforceable stipulation). First preference goes to Oklahoma students with Master's degree or currently enrolled in an Oklahoma university. The DSGP is portable, meaning a student can take it out of state and out-of-state students can be recipients. The coordinator recognizes that in-state preference may be counterproductive in the sense that the Oklahoma's major universities frown on inbreeding--hiring their own---and also have considerable rivalries which mitigates against hiring one another's graduates. The system reports roughly a sixty percent retention/success rate measured by retaining graduates.

The Oklahoma Plan's financial aid package for doctoral support to blacks, while substantially smaller in basic FTE's than Florida's, has several features that recommend it as a quality approach. First, the overall flexibility is commendable. Secondly, the level of support, with the required add-ons, is quite good, tax-free and does not rule out work. Moreover, the expanded number of years for which the support is available (four years) is very good. Our key measures then, the level and length of support, the Oklahoma financial aid response is one of quality.

Admissions and Selection

When the DSGP was initiated in 1975 the admission and award process was totally in the hands of the selection committee of the

Regents with veto power held by the chancellor and the Regents themselves. At that time applicants applied directly to the State Regent's Office providing a complete set of credentials. The graduate deans on the campuses where they intended to matriculate simply verified that they were graduate students in good standing, or admitted.

The current procedures (see Exhibit OK-1, Appendix D) place more control in the hands of the graduate deans. This is consistent with the philosophical approach taken by Oklahoma which emphasizes institutionalization. In effect, procedures have changed in an effort to encourage the institutions to "own" the students and the Adams effort. The graduate deans now select their candidates and send a prioritized listing to the Regents Office. The Regents office reaches agreements with the graduate deans based on market manpower demands for certain fields. The ability to prioritize the selections, and know in advance how many slots they have, is felt to allow the deans to make firm commitments to students and use it (the DSGP) as a recruitment device. Moreover, these procedures are viewed as putting actual policy control in the hands of the graduate deans. Finally, the Regent's Office feels that this maximizes the academicians input in the administration of the program, especially with regard to selection. The payment system and certification procedures are still bureaucratic and "odious," however.

Support Services

In addition to the DSGP there are other more indirect sources of support to doctoral students, funded by the state. Three new programs provide support to students through their institutions: the

DSG Incentive Award; the Minority Graduate Incentive Grant; and, the Doctoral Scholars Award.

The DSG Incentive Award provides \$1,000 to an institution for each new student recruited. For 1985, there were thirteen (13) new DSG recipients and the \$13,000 was shared by three institutions. These monies can be used for recruitment, retention, direct payment to students or for other support services for the program. It is stipulated that the money must be applied to the graduate student(s).

The Minority Graduate Incentive Grant is funded at \$14,000 and is divided among all graduate colleges based on their increase in minority enrollment and these monies also are to be used for recruitment, retention and support services.

A new effort for the 1984-85 year is the Doctoral Scholars Program. Five thousand dollars has been designated to be awarded to five doctoral candidates chosen by the graduate deans. There are no constraints on these monies and they are awarded on the basis of academic merit, over and above any other aid. The five doctoral scholars will participate in a scholar-leadership program and a seminar.

The coordinator of the DSGP for the Regents' office volunteers that the program does not get a consistent group of applicants each year in terms of academic quality. There is also, he reports, too much variability in recruitment, retention and graduation. He specifically recommends that funding for the DSGP be increased (more FTE's), that the institutional academic structure be granted more control over the selection process, that the program be extended to

cover five years of support and that funding for recruitment be made more systematic.

The overall quality of the Oklahoma Plan's aid to black doctoral candidates is quite good. The aid package is retentive; it is long-term, and; it is augmented with additional monies which increases its sufficiency. Further aspects of its quality are the potential support for socialization into the profession and for the encouragement of mentoring relationships. These special features add to the attractiveness of the financial aid plan in Oklahoma and should be encouraged in other states.

The most obvious problem with the Oklahoma Plan is the limited numbers of students it can support. Our data show, however, that while the actual number of doctorates awarded to blacks was only 5 in 1983-84, the enrollment of first time, full-time black graduate students had increased by 65 from 1982 to 1983 and by 8 from 1983 to 1984. (Oklahoma is one of two of the five states showing a consistent increase in black graduate enrollment since 1982). We expect, based on these data, that the quality of the aid package will produce increases in earned doctorates.

Virginia
System Structure

There are thirty-nine state-supported institutions of higher education of which six (6) are doctoral granting universities, nine (9) are senior colleges, twenty-three (23) are community colleges and one, (1) a two-year liberal arts college. Each institution is governed by its own independent Board of Visitors, except for Clinch Valley College (governed by the University of Virginia Board of Visitors). All two-year community colleges are governed by the State Board of Community Colleges. The State Council of Higher Education was created in 1956 by the General Assembly of Virginia and serves to coordinate the activities of the individual institutions but has no governing authority over them.

Historical Background

The State of Virginia began its discussions of Compliance with the Civil Rights Act of 1964 with OCR in 1969 and submitted the first version of a PLAN in 1970. A revised plan was submitted and approved in 1974 following the February 1973 correspondence from U.S. OCR. That plan was implemented and operated until the Spring of 1977 when the new Adams' guidelines were published. The second version of the Revised Virginia Plan was accepted in 1978. In January of 1983, OCR requested an extension and amendments in the Revised Plan. The central actors in the development and implementation of "The Virginia Plan for Equal Opportunity in State Supported Institutions of Higher Education" have been Virginia's governors and staff members of the Council of Higher Education.

For this research, the respondents are representatives of the six doctoral granting institutions and the Council of Higher Education. The six institutions are: The University of Virginia, The College of William and Mary, The Virginia Polytechnical Institute and State University, Virginia Commonwealth University, George Mason University, and Old Dominion University. In our description below George Mason University is not treated as it has only recently (1983) become a doctorate granting institution.

Virginia has the greatest number of Ph.D. granting institutions and offers the greatest variety of university settings and hence some unique institutional level responses. Virginia also reflects the greatest amount of administrative decentralization, especially at the campus level and this has some clear implications for their Adams response. Especially with regard to the locational differences among the campuses and their respective adaptation, there are both advantages and disadvantages for the different campuses. We begin with a discussion of the system level response and then identify some campus differences.

Virginia's response to Criterion II-C of the revised guidelines (see Appendix C) currently has four components: The Doctoral Program for Minority Virginians begun in 1977; The Summer Undergraduate Program begun in 1977; Conference for Potential Graduate Students, 1983; and the Graduate Fellowship Program, pilot year 1985-86. Each of these programs is administered by the Council.

Financial Aid

The Doctoral Program for Minority Virginians is for employees of the publicly supported institutions in Virginia. Annually since 1977 the program has supported from seven (7) to nine (9) students. Created through funding from the Virginia General Assembly in 1976, the program has provided stipends ranging between five and eight thousand dollars in 1977 to as much as \$9,000 in 1984-85. In addition a stipend of up to \$1,300 has been provided for tuition, fees and books. In the initial guidelines the funds were available for one-year of full-time study for qualified minorities. The program, presented in the revised PLANS (1978) was clearly perceived as a key component of the State's Affirmative Action Employment effort (pp. 79-80, Revised State Plans, 1978).

Beginning in 1985-86 the Council will administer a Graduate Fellowship Program targeted for approximately 20 students, each receiving \$4,400 fellowships. It is not clear whether this program will continue.

Recruitment and Support Services

The Summer Undergraduate Program, also begun in 1977 is designed to provide an enrichment opportunity for outstanding minority students who are potential candidates for doctoral studies. The students attend a five-week summer program which includes enrollment in one graduate level course, an orientation seminar for careers and issues in higher education and issues related to graduate study. A follow-up conference (The Conference for Potential Graduate Students) is held in the following fall, attended by the prior summer participants, potential students for the following summer and other