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The purpose of this study is to present a historical account of the Dallas County Community College District and to analyze and interpret the role of the political process in the District's relations with governmental agencies and civic groups. On May 25, 1965, the voters approved a $41.5 million bond issue, established a county-wide junior college district, and appointed a seven-member Board of Trustees. Secondary accounts were consulted, but the emphasis was on such primary sources as official documents of the District, publications of the District, newspaper accounts, interviews, and relevant materials from the Office of Public Information.

This study describes the environmental context from which the District emerged. Interested citizens, civic organizations, and the Dallas Independent School District conducted surveys of the educational, business, industrial, and professional needs in Dallas County. In view of the limited educational opportunities, the availability of funding resources, and the benefits comparable urban centers
were receiving from newly established junior colleges, the civic leaders sought to enhance the Dallas image by joining the movement.

By the mid-1960's, the Dallas Independent School Board sought to establish a junior college coterminous with the School District. However, some civic leaders and Dallas County public school officials offered an opposing view, calling for a county-wide system. Subsequently, a strategy was developed that eliminated the coterminous opposition and allowed the establishment of a county-wide district.

The Dallas Chamber of Commerce was responsible for forming a steering committee assigned to establish the District. The committee successfully secured a mandate from the Dallas constituency. Within three months following the District's organization, the Board appointed Dr. Bill Priest as President of the District. Phase I began with Priest's appointment and was completed with the opening of Richland College in 1972. In 1972, after much effort, the District won narrow approval for an $85 million bond issue for the completion of Phase II. It had actually begun with the site acquisition of Brookhaven College in 1966, but it was scheduled for completion by the mid-1980's, with the opening of the last three colleges to be built, the expansion of El Centro College, and the enlargement of the other campuses.
In April, 1974, the two newly elected Board members agreed that the District was accomplishing its objectives. However, questions were raised in the campaign, indicating that a divergence of philosophy may eventually surface.

It may be concluded that the Dallas District is a recognized leader in the community college movement. A key to its success is that it is student- and community-centered. The district has experienced a rapid and tranquil growth but there may be a greater diversity of views expressed with the change in the composition of the Board.

It is recommended that the District conduct a study to determine if its original goals are being met. It should also make a comparative study of the technical-occupational and academic transfer programs. The quality of trained personnel produced should also be compared with the gifts, donations, and scholarships given to the District by the business community. The merits of constructing three new campuses should be studied in view of the general decline in college enrollment, the establishment of learning centers throughout the county as adjuncts of the District colleges, and increased television course offerings.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Education, in the minds of most Americans, is the very heartbeat of American democracy. Modern society has called upon our educational system to provide expanded opportunities extending from prekindergarten to post-doctoral studies. Historically, we are able to discern an evolution of the fundamental philosophy and function of education which is so vital to the preservation and progress of American society.

The junior college has played a significant role in the evolution of higher education. With its roots in the late nineteenth century, the junior college movement has experienced phenomenal growth. This was frequently true because junior colleges were not as academically restrictive and selective, nor as expensive as the four-year institutions.

Although the terms "junior college" and "community college" are used interchangeably, the former was used more frequently until the end of World War II. During this time, there was a greater emphasis on college transfer courses and curriculums. However, following the war the latter term came into vogue, fostering the philosophy of
a comprehensive, student-centered college, offering post-high school curriculums designed to meet the needs and interests of the community (3, p. 23).

The Dallas County Community College District (DCCCD) is an outgrowth of this national junior college movement. Following earlier unsuccessful efforts by the city of Richardson (1962) and the Dallas Independent School District (1964) to establish a junior college, the Dallas Chamber of Commerce assumed the initiative by requesting that University of Texas Professor C. C. Colvert do a feasibility study (1964). Fortified with the favorable and convincing evidence of this study, the Chamber's Steering Committee, with R. L. Thornton, Jr., as chairman, successfully won support from the electorate of Dallas County for the establishment of a community college district.

On April 3, 1965, speaking for the Steering Committee, Thornton called upon the State Board of Education to ratify the request for the establishment of the first college in the DCCCD when he said:

We of Dallas County are planning this college along the lines of a community college concept--including technical job training, vocational education, the first two years of a four-year college education, and adult evening education (1, p. 61).

El Centro College, the first of several colleges to be built in the district, began its first year of operation on September 19, 1966, for freshmen only. It had an
auspicious beginning with an enrollment of 4,047 students, which was well above the most optimistic predictions.

During the subsequent decade the District has experienced phenomenal growth. Presently there are four existing colleges with a total enrollment of 22,609. The future is equally as bright, with the planned opening of three more new campuses by 1978.

Purposes of the Study

The purpose of this study is two-fold. First, it will be designed to present a general historical account of the Dallas County Community College District during its first decade of operation. Second, it will proffer an analysis and an interpretation of the role of the political process in the Community College District's relations with local, state, and national governmental agencies and the various publics it seeks to serve.

Background and Significance of the Study

"History is an adventure" (26, p. 3). Whether it is the story of a nation, people, or institutions of higher learning, it embodies man's effort to understand, control, and shape his society. The history of a college or university is a description of one of man's noblest ventures to understand human relationships and to probe creatively beneath the surface realities, unlocking secrets which will ultimately produce desired changes in his society.
Historically, institutions of higher learning in the United States lead in ferreting out problems confronting our society and in proposing solutions to them. Whether these are social problems or problems common to higher education, each institution possesses a distinctiveness in its own difficulties and how it attempts to solve them. Therefore, each educational movement and institution has a unique place in history.

The early history of the junior college movement is well chronicled by Koos in his two major works, *The Junior College* (22) and *The Junior College Movement* (23). Another significant study is *The Junior College* (11), by Eells. Eells contends that the ideal educational organizational should follow a 6-3-3-2 pattern, while Koos argues for a 6-4-4 plan. Historical studies by Seashore (31), Bogue (5), McDowell (24), Proctor (27), Greenleaf (16), and Hillway (18) also provide additional insight into these and other issues involved in the evolution of the junior college movement.

While serving as Executive Secretary of the American Association of Junior Colleges in 1950, Bogue (4) published the first treatise setting forth the community college concept. The ideas of Bogue and others inspired the National Society for the Study of Education in Chicago to publish a historical record of the junior college movement in a junior college yearbook in 1956. In 1960, under the auspices of
the Center for the Study of Higher Education, Leland Medsker published his evaluative study, *The Junior College: Progress and Prospect* (25). Equally significant are the sociological interpretations of the role of the community college in higher education by Clark (6) and Blocker, Plummer, and Richardson (3). Additional historical studies of the community college movement of equal importance have been done by Fields (12), Henry (17), Thornton (32), Reynolds (28), and Gleazer (15).

Specialized studies of the movement have also been conducted which provide increased understanding and appreciation of its contributions to higher education. Aware of the need for some direction in exercising the political process involved in the establishment and development of community colleges, the American Association of Junior Colleges published *Principles of Legislative Action for Community Junior Colleges* (2) in 1962. Also of major importance is the discussion of the *Community Junior College Act* printed by the Council of State Governments in 1965.

Other specialized studies of the development of the junior college movement include Garrison's (13, 14) study of the role of the faculty in the community college, Collins' (7) work on the contributions of personnel programs to student welfare, Riendeau's (29) and Venn's (33) discussion of the place of occupational education in higher
education, Johnson's (21) format for organizing community colleges, and Rouche's (30) treatise on the essential and continuing need for conducting research in the community college field.

An interesting aspect of the development of the junior college movement has been "its emergence in an environment of tradition and attitude which varies" (15, p. 145) throughout the United States. Periodical publications such as the Junior College Directory, American Junior Colleges, and The Community and Junior College Journal aid significantly in acquiring and understanding of the historical diversity with which this movement has developed.

A doctoral dissertation, "An Interpretive Analysis of the Developmental Planning of Mountain View College, Dallas, Texas," by Holt (19), and a master's thesis, "The Community Junior College: A Study of the Dallas County Junior College," by Altic (1), are obviously limited in scope and do not go beyond a brief account of the initial campus openings in the District. Consequently, a broader study of the chronological and organizational development of the DCCCD would be useful. Such an investigation should be made, focusing on the political process of the District's constituent responsibilities, the diverse publics it seeks to serve, and how it must maintain the support of civic and governmental agencies. Holt, current Vice-Chancellor of the
DCCCD, has encouraged and recommended that this research be done (34). It would supplement the historical sources of the District for the administration, faculty, students, and alumni who may be interested in the origin, development, and influence of the DCCCD in its first decade of operation.

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this study, the following definition has been adopted:

Political process--As a public, tax-maintained institution, the DCCCD is responsible to and covets the support of numerous groups and agencies. Consequently, whatever comes within the jurisdiction of the process deemed feasible to win the support of such groups and agencies is considered to be within the range of this definition.

Limitations

This study will not attempt to detail the plans, policies, or procedures for the development of the physical facilities for the District offices or the four campuses established during the first decade of its existence. Neither is this investigation designed to examine the day-to-day administrative operations during that period of time.
Procedures for Collecting the Data

The historical approach is used in conducting this study. Historical research procedures are followed in the examination and use of the following sources:

Newspapers:

- Dallas Morning News
- Dallas Times Herald
- The Texas Mesquiter
- Daily Commercial Record
- Richardson Daily News
- The Suburban Tribune
- Lancaster Herald
- Oklahoma City Times
- Grand Prairie News Texan
- The Post Tribune
- Oak Cliff Tribune
- Pleasant Grove Shopping News

Publications of the DCCCD:

- Report of the Chancellor (Annually)
- Outlook (District News)
- Milestones
- Four College Brochure

Clippings, papers, correspondence, and recorded speeches retained in the Office of Public Information of the DCCCD

Official documents of the DCCCD:

- Letters, papers, and records of the Chancellor, Vice Chancellors and other administrative personnel who have served or are currently serving the District
- Agendas of the Board of Trustees
- Minutes of the Board of Trustees
- Minutes of the Presidents' Council
- Minutes of the Intercollege Council
- Minutes of the Business Officers' Meetings
- Minutes of the Steering Committee
- Policy Manual
- Minutes of the DCCCD Committees (administration, faculty, students, et al.)
- Warranty Deed Books
Reports of Southern Association of Colleges and Universities
Reports on U.S. Government Grants
Studies and Reports on Community Colleges by the U.S. Office of Education
Coordinating Board Report

Records in the Dallas County Court House

Legislation governing the establishment and operation of junior colleges in the state of Texas

Some Secondary Accounts:

The Community and Junior College Journal
Junior College Directory
American Junior Colleges
Chronicle of Higher Education
Journal of Higher Education
Publications of the Texas Education Association
Histories of education in Texas
Publications of the Texas Coordinating Board for Higher Education

As the research progresses, additional sources found to be relevant to the project are used. All sources and data are evaluated according to the highest standards of external and internal criticism.

Interviews were conducted with community leaders initiating the community college program in Dallas, current and former administrators, faculty, and others associated with the District. They were conducted at the convenience of the interviewee and tape recorded for future reference and for making a typescript. Questions were formulated prior to the interview and asked in such a manner as to elicit a frank, free, and complete response. Questions generally followed a pattern of who, what, where, when, why,
and how questions. Permission was requested for the use of a tape recorder in the interview, and it was utilized in such a manner as to eliminate any inhibitions the interviewee might have had.

The foregoing proposed data collection procedures remained flexible throughout the study. As new and appropriate procedures were required in the collection of data, appropriate modifications were instituted.

After the data were collected, they were organized and written into a historical study of the origin, growth, and continuing development of the DCCCD. Particular emphasis was given to recording, analyzing, and interpreting the political process in the establishment and development of the DCCCD. Finally, an assessment was made of the impact of the DCCCD on the community, state, and nation.
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CHAPTER II

THE ENVIRONMENTAL ORIGINS OF THE DALLAS COUNTY
JUNIOR COLLEGE DISTRICT

Education As a National Priority

A major objective inherent in American democratic society requires that all citizens should be provided with educational opportunities adequate for the development of individual potential, life fulfillment, and the social welfare. Following World War II, there was a rapidly expanding interest in obtaining the anticipated benefits of higher education. A new emphasis was exhibited in meeting increased demands for "leadership and specialized training in government, business enterprise, and labor" (15, p. 4). President Truman's Commission on Higher Education in 1947, called for a comprehensively educated citizenry, and it reported that

American Colleges and Universities . . . can no longer consider themselves merely the instrument for producing an intellectual elite; they must become the means by which every citizen, youth, and adult is enabled and encouraged to carry his education, formal and informal, as far as his native capacities permit (15, p. 4).

The Commission further stressed that higher education is an "investment in free men" and not a cost. "It is an investment
in social welfare, better living standards, better health, and less crime. It is an investment in higher production, increased income, and greater efficiency in agriculture, industry, and government" (15, p. 4).

The two succeeding decades saw increased demands that these educational objectives should be met. The successful launching of the first Russian "Sputnik" in 1957 served as a catalyst to establish these educational objectives as a national priority. Immediately, actions were set in motion to correct existing deficiencies through federal funding of programs such as the National Defense Education Act of 1958, state government subsidies, and additional millions poured into physical facilities, teacher education, and scholarships by such philanthropic institutions as the Carnegie Corporation and the Ford Foundation.

In 1960, projections indicated that pressures for collegiate matriculation would continue because the college-age population would increase and a higher percentage of that group would desire a college education. Enrollment in institutions of higher learning was expected to double by 1970 and community and junior colleges were urged to be prepared to handle up to 50 per cent of the college-age population (8, pp. 82, 83). John Gardner, consultant for the Carnegie Corporation, stressed that these institutions have a critically important role to play in American
education and it is essential that they be "given the re-
resources and moral support necessary to do the job well"
(8, pp. 90, 91). He added,

there should be roughly within commuting
distance of every high school graduate (ex-
cept in sparsely settled regions) an insti-
tution that performs the following functions:
  (a) offers two-year terminal programs
      for students not going on to a four-year
      college career.
  (b) offers transfer programs for
      students who do wish to complete a four-
      year program.
  (c) serves as a technical institute
      for the community, serving local needs for
      vocational sub-professional education.
  (d) offers continuing education to
      adults (8, pp. 90, 91).

In the 1950's and early 1960's, a large segment of the news
media kept the citizenry informed of the critical needs
at all educational levels, and called upon them to support
every effort to meet these needs (21, p. 370).

Americans had confidence that education could largely
resolve the problems facing society while preparing the
populace to capitalize on the economic opportunities avail-
able. Gardner stated it succinctly in 1961 when he said,

Those who receive the most education are going
to move into virtually all the key jobs. Thus
the question, "Who should go to college?"
translates itself into the more compelling
question "Who is going to manage the society?".

... The plain fact is that never in our
history have we stood in such desperate need
of men and women of intelligence, imagination
and courage. The challenge is there---greater
than any generation has ever faced (15, p. 5).
The public mind was convinced that people were worth more to themselves and to society if they were educated. In his 1965 annual report on manpower, President Johnson stressed that "because of the demands of modern technology, education is becoming, as never before, an essential intermediary between man and his work" (5, p. i). The response to this concern was clearly reflected in the annual number of college and university graduates reaching approximately one million a year by 1970 (9, p. 487). Consequently, higher education, in the American mind, had become, by the mid-1960's, social capital as well as personal wealth and capital (15, p. 5).

Enhancing the Dallas Image

Achieving the educational goals of American society in the mid-sixties was no less a priority for the Dallas community than it was for the nation. This concern was a part of the larger effort by the state of Texas not to be second-rate in the field of education when compared with the other forty-nine states. While John Connally was serving as President Kennedy's Assistant Secretary of the Navy, he observed that Texas was not among the leading states in receiving federal appropriations for education. Other states were receiving most of the grants.

Upon his return to Texas and subsequent election as governor, Connally appointed a Committee on Education
Beyond the High School with the charge that they were to "find areas in education beyond the high school which needed improvement in Texas" (30, p. 1). They discovered that out of 500 high school students of graduating age, 200 did not receive a diploma. Only 120 of those graduates enrolled in college and of that number a meager seventy-five students entered the sophomore year. An average of fifty students continued their junior year, with only thirty-five of the original 500 completing their bachelor's degree (30, p. 4).

The most obvious question was, "What happened to the 465 who did not graduate and the additional 200 that did not complete high school?" The committee perceptively concluded that there was an urgent need for "an extensive statewide junior college program to fill the gap between the high school level of education and the college and university offerings" (30, p. 1).

Texas was not keeping pace in meeting the educational needs of potential junior college students. Walter B. Moore, member of the Governor's Committee on Education Beyond High School, observed that "Texas lags in junior colleges" (6). There had only been an unimpressive 7 per cent increase in the number of junior colleges in Texas from 1950 to 1964, compared to 29 per cent in the United States during that same period of time. By 1964, Texas had only 31 junior
colleges functioning, compared to seventy-one in the state of California (20, pp. 8, 11). Moore further asserted that

The junior college system, which has produced a commendable record in educating Texans, is the logical institution to undertake increased responsibility in meeting growing educational needs. As part of the educational system under the Coordinating Board, junior colleges can render vastly increased service to Texans (6).

The junior college needs for metropolitan Dallas were even more critical than those of Texas. Robert L. Thornton, Jr., subsequent chairman of the proposed junior college district Steering Committee, warned Dallas County leaders and citizens,

Dallas County is at the crossroads. Before long, the Arkansas Canal will be in Tulsa. Tulsa is going to have water transportation on the north. Houston has water transportation on the south. If you think those developments cannot stymie this County, you are wrong. We must show other cities and new industries that we are moving ahead and keeping pace with modern trends. Attracting and training brainpower is one method of proving it. . . . We must actively speak for, . . . the Junior College (30, pp. 13-14).

The Dallas community had long prided itself as being one of the leading cultural and educational centers of the southwest. But, as Franklin Spafford, member of the Dallas Independent School District Board of Trustees, observed as early as 1957, " . . . it is apparent that in the matter of junior colleges we are lagging far behind. If we had kept pace with Los Angeles for example, we would already have in operation two junior colleges" (21, p. 370).
Dallas County had a population of 1.2 million in 1965, with a projection of 3 million by 1990. The Dallas Independent School District graduated 8,900 students, enrolled 14,000 in the first grade, and had 63,000 students comprising the top four grades of high school in 1964 (30, p. 6). Thornton challenged the citizenry, "With only 50 out of 500 students entering the junior year in college, isn't it better for our colleges and universities to concentrate on that 50 and let the junior college take care of those who are going to enter and drop out at the end of one or two years of college?" (30, p. 7). Awakening to these opportunities and needs for a junior college the entire Dallas community began to ask, "Why not?"

On November 11, 1964, Dallas Mayor Eric Jonsson delivered an address to the city's Rotary Club in which he sought to enhance the image of Dallas as a modern and progressive community. He called for "beautiful Big D (to) develop (a) Goals for Dallas" program (10). Among other broad objectives to be achieved through this community involvement project was the Higher Education Goal, Number Five, which urged "... the development of an outstanding junior college system. In addition to academic offerings, it must provide a two-year vocational/technical program to give students employable skills and competence in semi-professional positions" (11, p. 200).
Thornton observed that the establishment of a junior college in Dallas County was an integral part of urban planning in which "each of us (who are leaders) from time to time in building a city have their particular responsibility" (17). The immediately proposed junior college complex was expected to serve as a nucleus of broad national movement which Dallas County hoped to join in a most impressive manner. The editorial position of the *Dallas Times Herald* accentuated this intent when it boldly asserted that "Dallas needs a junior college and a good one. The best in the land. . . . (and) we can get it" (7). Yet, with a sense of remorseful embarrassment and shortly after the founding of the Junior College District, *Goals for Dallas* observed, "It is likely that Dallas area residents in the future will be astounded that it took the community so long to become aware of the needs for post-high school education of thousands of its citizens in a junior college system" (11, p. 163). The ultimate goal of the Dallas business and political leadership was to initiate the "largest educational institution ever created in the history of the world" (27).

**Educational Needs and Opportunities**

Increased demands for continued expansion of educational opportunities and facilities were being felt throughout Dallas County with each passing year. In 1962, the Dallas
Independent School District awarded diplomas to over 5,000 of the 7,812 Dallas County high school graduates. By 1964, an excess of 32,000 students were enrolled in the last four years of high school in the Dallas Independent School District. Demographers had also projected that there would be 8,963 high school graduates in Dallas County that same year. Conservative predictions clearly indicated that by 1972 Dallas County high schools would be graduating 13,000 students annually, compared to approximately 8,000 in 1962. Conservative predictions of an average annual increase of over 10 per cent in the graduating classes in Dallas County from 1957 to 1962 encouraged local leaders to realistically evaluate existing higher educational opportunities in the context of these statistics (Appendixes I, II, III). Doubtless a sizable majority of these graduates would move into higher education and into vocational/technical education (3, p. 11).

In 1964, there were two four-year colleges and two universities accessible to Dallas County residents: Southern Methodist University, University of Dallas, Bishop College, and Christian College of the Southwest, with a combined enrollment of 10,025 students. Outside of Dallas County, but within commuting distance of its students, were North Texas State University, Texas Woman's University, East Texas State University, and Arlington
State College, with a total enrollment of 28,835 students (Appendix IV).

Even though there were at least eight colleges and universities within reasonable commuting distance of Dallas graduates, these schools did not provide adequate educational opportunities for more than 35 per cent of the students wishing to enter college (Appendix V). The overcrowded conditions, especially in the freshman and sophomore years, soon caused practically all of these institutions to adopt rigid entrance requirements. Thus, the colleges endeavored to fill their vacancies with the highest qualified applicants possible. Willis Tate, President of Southern Methodist University, described the critical problems confronting higher education by saying, "The alarming projection of enrollment for colleges . . . cannot be accommodated in the present public and private institutions of higher learning without allowing these institutions to become too large, and without an enormous increase in facilities and faculties. . . . " (28). J. C. Matthews, president of North Texas State University during the mid-sixties, concurs that university enrollment was increasing at a very demanding rate. He observes that "we were growing faster than we really wanted to. Thirteen percent increase is hard to absorb in a year and that is what we had in the year 1963. . . . (We were) the fastest growing institution in the state" (16).
This student population crisis hit California first, and the state early adopted a policy stating that students could not enroll in a state college unless they ranked in the top one-third of their graduating class. Others desiring to enter a state college or university could do so only by successfully completing two years of junior college work. In 1965, Tate predicted that Southern Methodist University, along with other state and private colleges and universities, would adopt a similar "top students only" policy (30, pp. 6, 7).

Many of these students wanted to pursue a career in medicine, law, business, or education. They hoped and planned to become the leaders of the future but due to the overcrowding of area colleges they had to share limited classroom space with many who did not plan nor expect to receive a baccalaureate degree. Consequently, many academically qualified students with low grade-point averages were not permitted to matriculate even though they could afford a college education. There were others who could not enroll because of the added expense of living away from home, higher tuition rates at private colleges, or increased costs for commuting long distances (1, pp. 38, 39). Many more desired vocational/technical training at the higher educational level but none was available in the Dallas Metroplex. Consequently, as the Oak Cliff Tribune observed,
"Senior colleges and universities are not designed, and they are not intended to care for all the educational needs of the community" (24). C. C. Colvert, nationally known junior college consultant and professor at the University of Texas, stressed the compatibility of junior and senior colleges when he suggested that "the experience of some of the cities of California which have public junior colleges as well as one or more state colleges in them show that the resultant reduction in enrollment is not very great. The junior college with its vocational and technical programs draws and serves students that senior colleges do not serve" (2, p. 12). It is significant that the ostensible need for a junior college met with widespread "agreement and enthusiasm from all Dallas County experts, including many heads of private universities" (19).

A survey conducted under the auspices of the Dallas Independent School District in the spring of 1964 revealed a significant interest in the establishment of a junior college in Dallas. Approximately 5,000 parents participated in the survey. Of those responding, 60 per cent expressed a desire for their child to attend a junior college operated by the Dallas Independent School District. Eighty-eight per cent supported the establishment of a junior college even though their own child might choose to attend another institution. Nearly half of those responding believed that
the $150 per year proposed tuition rate would be fair. However, a large number preferred the minimum tuition rate of $100 per year as set by the state. Seventy-four per cent stated their firm intention to send their children to college in September, 1964 (25).

As early as 1961, John Lombardi, Chairman of American Association of Junior Colleges, said it was difficult to believe that "Dallas County has no public junior colleges. . . . Dallas certainly should have two junior colleges based on population in this metropolitan area" (13). As the Dallas constituency became cognizant of these limited opportunities and extensive needs in higher education, especially in the freshman and sophomore years, a cry went forth for the establishment of a junior college.

Business, Industrial, and Professional Personnel Needs

For many years, Dallas has been recognized as one of the fastest growing urban areas in the United States. It has long been known as a center for financial, transportation, marketing, and distribution activities, and it is rapidly becoming a leading manufacturing center in the southwest. In 1964, more workers were employed in manufacturing in Dallas than in any other Texas metropolitan community (5, p. 25), even though business had grown by only 46 per cent in recent years (30). Thornton reported
to the *Dallas Morning News* in May, 1965 that this "... area's manufacturing has sky-rocketed 87 per cent" during the first five years of this decade (14). A Chamber of Commerce Education Committee manpower study reinforced these statistics by stating that

Manufacturing accounts for 22.4% of all non-farm employment in the Dallas Metropolitan area. It is one of the most significant growth and diversification factors in Dallas' economy. In terms of workers and payroll, the Dallas area's factory employment of 115,000 in July [sic] 1964 was the largest in the southern half of the United States east of Los Angeles and south of St. Louis. ... [This] growth is reflected in employment with a 106% increase in manufacturing ... " (5, p. 17).

The Chamber report further discloses the phenomenal employment growth rate in the Dallas nonfarm industries from 1950 to 1964 (Appendix VI). As a result of the rapid industrial growth, the required employment rate increase for 1964, in manufacturing alone, was estimated at 22 per cent (Appendix VII).

Obviously this pattern of industrial and technical growth and expansion in the Dallas Metroplex exercised severe demands on the employment rolls. Consequently, varied educational opportunities and training would need to be increased to meet the requirements of students expecting to fill the expanding business and industrial personnel needs. The urgent need for highly trained technicians and skilled craftsmen was voiced with increasing
incidence. There was wholesale agreement that if the existing growth rate was to be maintained or increased, the Dallas community must provide a sufficient supply of well-trained personnel to meet present and future needs. "Industry goes elsewhere when educational facilities are not available to train employees" (13).

Business and labor leaders became increasingly aware that the "maximum training of local manpower" was indispensable to the continued economic growth of the Dallas area (14). Irving Statman, official of the Dallas Region Office of the Texas Employment Commission, pointed up the seriousness of the situation by saying, "If every person looking for work through our office had a skill, we could place them immediately" (26). Paradoxically, every year Dallas County called for more technicians and skilled workers while at the same time, unemployment continued to rise. Thornton added, "To date we have not trained our working force. We have imported it. We are now faced with taking unskilled labor, training it and qualifying people to hold jobs waiting for them" (14). He emphasized the problem further by citing the following example: "... a plant recently opened here. The company needs 200 employees. It has interviewed 1,200 and has been able to hire only 100" (14).

In 1964, two labor market surveys were conducted; one by the Dallas Times Herald and another by the Dallas Chamber
of Commerce. The Times Herald questionnaires completed by seventy employment agencies and fifteen of the area's largest firms identified fifty-two specific skills that were in short supply. The Chamber's study indicated that the 1964 labor market would require 1550 designers, draftsmen, lab assistants, and other technicians (31). In a speech to the Texas Manufacturers Association Governor Connally stressed the urgency of resolving these critical manpower needs by asserting that for every scientist 368 supportive workers are required; including engineers, technicians, and skilled workers (5, p. 12).

A strong movement emerged to alleviate these dire labor shortages by establishing a junior college with a dynamic vocational and technical training program. H. D. Turman, President of the Dallas Chamber of Commerce, said that a junior college is "urgent if we are to keep the industry we already have and create new jobs for tomorrow" (14). Many high school graduates were searching for jobs but they were not qualified for the openings. It was increasingly evident that as technology advanced, more training would be required to qualify for the newly created positions. Gifford K. Johnson, President of Ling-Temco-Voght (the second largest employer in the area) and Chairman of the Chamber of Commerce Education Committee, observed,
Speaking for my industry (electronics and aerospace), a few years ago, a high school education was adequate for quite a few of the workers we hired, but now we would like them to have more training than that. I predict that, increasingly, other industries also will demand that their skilled people have technical as well as specific skill training. . . . (Another) industrialist said: It is now necessary for our plant to give 110 hours of classroom training to every supervisor. . . . A more extensive one should be given by some college in this area (31).

The problem confronting Dallas County was not a limited labor supply but the lack of adequately trained workers. Colvert saw the establishment of a junior college district as the answer. Thus, he urged Dallasites to support the establishment of a junior college because it could "train people to fill these positions" (22).

Support for the junior college movement poured in from virtually all segments and regions of the Dallas community. Southern Methodist University's President Tate said, "Our industrial economy will continue to need youth trained in technological and vocational skills. . . . The Junior College will offer a good vocational education" (22). Allan Maley, Executive Secretary of the AFL-CIO and subsequent member of the Junior College Steering Committee, enthusiastically announced labor's support for the project, and added, "Training today need not be so detailed as that of the engineer, but it must be more than a mechanic" (22). Richardson, Garland, and Grand Prairie happily favored the
founding of a Dallas County Junior College because it would "definitely help the economy . . . and will allow our students to receive two years of specialized training at minimum cost" (22). Fred McJunkin, President of Duncanville's Chamber of Commerce, stressed that his particular community was not yet experiencing an influx of industry, although such expansion was anticipated in the near future. His attitude was very representative, when he said, "Junior College facilities, offering counseling, guidance and training in technical areas, as well as formal academic training in addition to vocational courses, will meet the needs of all our citizens, giving them educational opportunities within commuting distance at low cost" (22). Other Dallas County community leaders, such as Irving Chamber of Commerce President, Phillip Reid, Ling-Temco-Voght President, Gifford K. Johnson, and Grand Prairie Mayor, C. P. Waggoner, echoed this crucial need for a junior college as a source for training critically needed technical and vocational employees for this area (31).

Professionals, such as lawyers and doctors, were clamouring for competent, technically trained, supportive personnel. Severe shortages existed in such occupations as stenographers, secretaries, bookkeepers, registered nurses, laboratory technicians, x-ray technicians, and vocational nurses. The medical profession was especially
vocal in its concern over the limited supply of nurses. One hospital administrator warned of the monthly decline of available nurses and stressed that "each major facility could use from 25 to 50 more nurses immediately. The Dallas Hospital Council reported a shortage of 550, with about a 25 per cent rise in this number per year" (14).

It was ardently asserted by leaders in hospital administration in Dallas that a strong nursing program could relieve this situation. Rod Bell, Presbyterian Hospital administrator, said, "bedside nursing care . . . has become . . . critical. . . . I do not think we as hospitals are going to solve the shortage of nurses and technical personnel without the help a junior college could give us" (1, p. 38). Milton Ramsour, subsequent member of the Steering Committee from the medical profession, went so far as to see the "Dallas County Junior College program as the major answer in solving the occupational and economic problems of the County" (22).

Occupational retraining was another role junior colleges were being called upon to fulfill. The United States Department of Labor reported in 1965 that employees may be required to change their occupational skills from four to seven times within the next thirty-five to forty years (29). The AFL-CIO locals vigorously supported the junior college movement because many employees were being automated out of work. In support of establishing a junior college,
Mrs. Richard W. Brown wrote in "People's Forum," "Who is to assume the responsibility for retraining of the displaced employees? . . . We can watch business and industry leave the area as in New England" or we can build a junior college and serve the needs of the greater Dallas community (22). A junior college embracing this philosophy would truly become a comprehensive institution, possessing the "inherent ability to meet the specific needs of the community surrounding it" (26).

Availability of Financial Resources

Enthusiasm, availability of human resources, community and individual needs, and civic involvement are indispensable ingredients in the establishment of a junior college in any community. However, in the final analysis the determination of the financial capacity and commitment of a particular community to such a project must ultimately be the deciding factor. Generally, funding for such endeavors comes from three principal sources: federal, state, and local treasuries.

Dallas and its environs have traditionally been wary and at times openly critical of federally subsidized programs. However, the three programs winning broad acceptance among Dallas citizens were "outright tuition grants to students from impoverished families, work-study grants, and insured student loans" (18). Although it was expected
that these would comprise only 5 per cent of the operating budget of the planned junior college, they would bring some relief to the local taxpayers (18).

Substantial federal funds were also available through the Vocational Education Act, which provided up to 50 per cent of the cost of constructing vocational/technical school facilities. The National Science Foundation also provided grants for equipment to help guarantee superior instruction (14).

In 1964, the state of Texas funded one-third of all junior college operating costs. This amounted to $375 for the first 350 students and $285 for each additional student. Simultaneous with the junior college movement in Dallas the state legislature was considering an appropriations bill to increase this funding to approximately $450 for the first 350 students and $285 thereafter (30). It was hoped that this would also alleviate some of the tax burden born by the local constituency.

Colvert recommended that the local funding of the remaining 56 per cent of the proposed junior college budget be paid at the rate of 29.07¢ per $100 evaluation. He expressed confidence that the tax rate would not likely be increased as the junior college grew, because expenses probably would be offset by increased property valuation (4). Evidently in an effort to prevent any unhappiness
over new taxes, he also advised that a tax rate limit of 32.0¢ be called for in the first bond election (2, p. 17). Max Goldblatt, subsequent Steering Committee member, zealously supported the junior college idea by stating that the average owner of a $20,000-assessed dwelling would pay approximately $10 per year for facilities. "This would be less than the average student now pays in one week back and forth for transportation to school in one of the adjoining counties . . ." (12).

Dallas County increased its average annual rate of assessed valuation by 9.5 per cent from 1953 through 1962. From this Colvert projected an average annual rate increase of 6 per cent (Appendix VIII). Using the $20,000 value of a home, the 22 per cent assessed valuation would be $4,400. Multiplying $4,400 by a 30¢ tax rate, the tax for one year would be a mere $13.20. Thornton and other junior college advocates forcefully asked, who "would deprive their sons, their daughters, their grandchildren, their business, the opportunities offered by this Junior College to save just a little over $1 per month?" (30, p. 11).

Civic leaders and constituents were fully convinced that Dallas County was fully capable of financing the successful establishment and sustaining of a junior college system. The remarkable growth of retail sales and effective buying power provided persuasive and conclusive evidence
that their confidence was well founded. From 1946 through 1962 retail sales and effective buying power grew 264 per cent and 290.11 per cent, respectively. This extraordinary growth in a sixteen-year span could only reassure those who had any reservations concerning the junior college movement in the Dallas Metroplex (Appendix VIII).

Summary

A junior college was needed in Dallas to utilize human and natural resources, capitalize on commercial and industrial opportunities, and provide comprehensive educational and cultural experiences for the enrichment of the entire community. Such an institution would contribute significantly to the economic growth and development of all levels of society. This would result in a higher standard of living for everyone. The realization of these goals would insure the preservation and embellishment of the "Big D" self-image as a major, modern, progressive, city of the world. Clearly, for the junior college movement in Dallas, its day had finally come.
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CHAPTER III

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE DALLAS COUNTY JUNIOR COLLEGE DISTRICT

The international tensions growing out of the Cold War in Korea, the escalating nuclear arms race, and the ominous speculations concerning the conquest of outer space created an aura of urgency to meet these challenges to our national survival in the beginning of the middle decade of this century. Historically, Americans believe that education holds the key to the problems confronting our society and in advancing its continued growth and progress. Thus, it is understandable why, at this point in time, all levels of education received extensive interest and concern, including the junior college movement. It was in this context that the initial interest in establishing a junior college began to be expressed by some Dallas County residents.

Early Unsuccessful Efforts

Periodically during the 1950's, there was a weak and passing interest in establishing a junior college in Grand Prairie. Motivated by employment needs in the aerospace industries located in the area, a few civic leaders considered the "possibility of establishing a technical
junior college . . . but the limited amount of financing which would have been available caused it to be dropped" (75).

In 1962, a concerted effort was made by the Richardson Chamber of Commerce to establish a junior college coterminous with the Richardson Independent School District. Encouraged by the interest of the Chamber of Commerce, the Richardson Board of Education, at its May 2, 1962, meeting, called for a referendum on the junior college issue and further resolved to proceed according to state-prescribed methods. It was also decided that the School Board would initially serve as trustees for the junior college, but at the same time they committed themselves to ultimately making the junior college and the public schools separate entities.

An official of the State Board of Education, in compliance with state requirements, promptly did a feasibility study. During that summer, a study commission of the Board visited Richardson, conducted public hearings, and concluded that the District had fulfilled all legal requirements for the establishment of a junior college: the potential student personnel was adequate; the projected population growth was extremely promising; and the economic potential would provide sufficient financial support (50, p. 24).

Thus, from a legal standpoint and the policies and plans formulated by the District, the State Board of Education
unanimously agreed that Richardson was fully qualified to establish a junior college.

Richardson citizens worked vigorously in the succeeding months to obtain the state-required 5 per cent of the signatures of all qualified voters to establish a junior college coterminous to the public school district. The State Board of Education received and approved the petition requesting that authority be granted to the Richardson Board of Education, calling for a public election on October 27, 1962, to approve the instituting of a junior college.

Preceding the election much civic interest was exhibited in the numerous public meetings and many newspaper articles devoted to discussions of the advantages and disadvantages of a junior college in Richardson. There were 14,000 qualified voters, but the proposal was soundly defeated by a ratio of five to one (32).

There were apparently many reasons for this failure, but five of the more significant ones were

1. Lack of understanding or acceptance, of our fourfold function of a junior college.
2. Belief that Richardson, a community of many highly trained professions, had no need for a vocationally trained work force.
3. Reluctance on the part of taxpayers of the Richardson Independent School District to support a junior college that would serve residents from throughout the county.
4. Preference to spend tax money for improvement of the existing public school system.
5. Refusal to accept as realistic the statistics and computations made by the State Board (1, p. 45).

At a Dallas Independent School District Board meeting January 23, 1957, Edwin L. Rippy, President of the Board, requested Superintendent W. T. White and his staff to conduct a study of the possibilities and benefits to be derived from the creation of a junior college district under the jurisdiction and administration of the Board of Education (52, p. 79). Preliminary investigation indicated that Los Angeles, California, and Chicago, Illinois, already had in operation junior college districts similar to the one anticipated by the Dallas Public School Board. Consequently, pursuant to the study, the Superintendent and Board Chairman, Franklin E. Spafford, visited the Los Angeles system, in which there were seven existing junior colleges. Spafford reported to the Board on October 14, 1957, that "in Los Angeles there is a separate elementary district, a separate high school district, and a separate junior college district that serves not only Los Angeles but some adjoining areas. All three districts have a separate tax levy but are all governed by one school board of seven members" (54).

Apparently Colvert had been consulted on the junior college matter the latter part of 1957, because Superintendent White wrote a letter to the Board of Education evaluating Colvert's views. He wrote,
I am not in agreement with some policy matters included in Doctor Colvert's report. . . . I would not recommend two junior college plants. . . . Furthermore, his statement that the cost of two separate plants would be no more than the cost of one plant is, in my judgment, fallacious. Both capital outlay and operation would be more expensive in two plants than one. . . . [Colvert's statement that] "a student center is vital to the modern junior college" is further evidence that two plants would cost more than one. One student center could serve the total student body, whereas two plants would require two student centers [and cafeterias, lounges, and gymnasiums].

On the whole, Doctor Colvert's report is a good guide. We can sell bonds for less than five per cent interest, which will reduce our tax rate correspondingly. More than that any formula based on so many square feet per pupil cannot be applied literally. Consequently, our own staff will need to do considerable study as to space needs before we have any concrete figures as to actual cost.

We are not planning to give any publicity to these documents. They are study guides and source materials rather than plans for action (86).

Another report of a study was made to the Board on March 26, 1958, which revealed extensive interest in a junior college for Dallas. Returned questionnaires used in the study disclosed that seniors who did not plan to enter college in September were interested in a junior college. Sixty-two per cent of the students from the high schools whose graduates represented the lowest incidence of planning for September enrollment stated a positive interest in a junior college (55, p. 454).

The initial plans of the School Board in 1958 envisioned one junior college centrally located in Dallas
with a capacity of from 4,000 to 6,000 students. The cost of constructing this facility was expected to range from ten to twelve million dollars, financed by an additional tax rate of 16¢ to 25¢ per $100 valuation. These plans had to be temporarily shelved because of desegregation litigation encountered by the District (47). Furthermore, "the outcome of those suits would have a bearing upon the admissions policy of the public junior college, operated by the Dallas Independent School District" (50, p, 25).

A Junior College for Dallas: Coterminous vs. County-wide

Renewed interest in establishing a junior college became evident in the early 1960's with informal discussions among various community leaders concerning the growing higher educational needs in Dallas. In May, 1962, L. A. Roberts, Dallas County School Superintendent, wrote a personal letter to James M. Collins, Chairman of the Education Committee of the Dallas Chamber of Commerce and President of Fidelity Union Life Insurance Company, strongly recommending that a county-wide junior college district be established. He stressed that if a junior college were built in one public school district within the county, others could be expected to follow. This would reflect no overall planning, and it would likely create complex inter-community problems, if not open conflicts (49).
The Dallas Independent School District Board also continued to informally discuss the junior college matter. Colvert had earlier suggested to them that Dallas should probably have two junior colleges, giving rise to the suggestion by some that a branch for terminal education for skilled tradesmen should be built in Oak Cliff. An immediate negative response came from a former School Board member, Van Lamm. The Oak Cliff Tribune reported Lamm as saying, "I think some large manufacturer has decided that Oak Cliff would be a convenient area in which to train skilled workers for his factory," (83). Perhaps some racial bias came through in his expressed belief that the predominantly Negro Fair Park section of the city would be a better area for such a junior college (83). Although White favored one facility, he did propose that initially the campus should be divided into technical, comprehensive, and advanced departments. He also expressed opposition to a growing sentiment for a "countywide junior college 'because of legal complications which would be automatically incumbent with crossing of school district boundaries and the problems of financing' " (83).

It seemed obvious that there were emerging two major opposing views on the proposed establishment of a junior college in Dallas: one favoring a junior college coterminous
with the Dallas Independent School District and the second supporting a countywide system. By mid-1963, some feared this potential cleavage could so divide the community that the increasing interest in a junior college might be seriously damaged.

In the latter half of 1963, the Dallas County School Board requested that the *Times Herald*, the *Dallas Morning News*, and the Dallas Chamber of Commerce survey the needs in the county for a junior college. The Chamber responded to this request and also hired Colvert to do a study for them, but it was not revealed to the Dallas Independent School District Board (64). His findings led Gifford Johnson to report to the Chamber Board of Directors that "until it [the junior college] is created, we will be handicapped in our progress potential--our industry will be handicapped--by the deficiency" (38). He insisted that the Chamber should assume the leadership in initiating the mechanics for the creation of a county-wide junior college and in selling the taxpayers on the merits of funding it (64).

Evidence seems to indicate that by early January, 1964, the findings of the Chamber study done by Colvert favoring a county-wide junior college district were being more openly discussed. On February 28, 1964, E. J. Kahn, Chairman of the College Section of the Chamber's Education Committee, sent Johnson an extensive memorandum outlining
the arguments favoring a county-wide junior college system. The Chamber presented five major reasons defending their contention that a county-wide district was the most practical to establish and administer for the Dallas area.

First, the policy of the State Board of Education regarding the standards for the creation of a public junior college in Texas stated, "The area of the proposed district shall be sufficient to provide the estimated enrollment and the necessary tax base. . . . Under normal circumstances, the minimum area should include at least one county" (23, S. 2, p. 1). James W. McGrew, research director for the Texas Research League, agreed that this was a valid position, and he observed that Dallas County could have as many as six junior college districts but recommended a maximum of one district per county, perhaps with several campuses (62). By 1964, only ten of the thirty-one junior colleges in Texas were coterminous with the independent school districts in which they were located. It should also be noted that twelve of the junior college districts were county-wide organizations, while nine junior colleges which began as coterminous operations had converted to the county-wide system. At the time of the Chamber report, only three of all of the junior colleges established in Texas following World War II were coterminous (23, S. 1, p. 1).

Second, a junior college within the Dallas Independent School District would provoke pressure for matriculation
privileges throughout Dallas County. It was estimated that one-third of the potential junior college students in Dallas County were not residents of the Dallas Independent School District. A junior college under the jurisdiction of the Dallas Independent School District system would meet only two-thirds of the obvious needs for a junior college (23, S. 1, p. 1).

Third, the Chamber argued that only a county-wide system would guarantee an equitable assessment of taxes and tuition fees for all students in Dallas County, regardless of the independent school district in which they reside. The major disadvantage of a coterminous district was that the taxpayers in the Dallas School District would bear the total costs of a junior college, while one-third of its students would be non-resident. Furthermore, if the District assessed a tuition surcharge or higher tuition rates to non-resident students, much suburban ill-will would likely result. Colvert stated that "... intensely bad community relations have been created in several instances where a Junior College imposed a tuition surcharge for non-residents, provoking suburban communities' organization of economic boycotts against businesses within the Junior College District" (23, S. 3, p. 1). Yet, if non-residents and residents were permitted to pay the same tuition rates, the District's taxpayers would have to bear
an extra tax burden. According to state law, Independent School Districts participating in tuition payments to another District would be required to establish their own junior college district, with taxing authority, for the purpose of paying the surcharge (23, S. 3, p. 1). Colvert argued further:

This city junior college system will have to educate all of the students in the entire county. . . . There is just no way to keep those outside the District from enrolling in the junior college system except by charging a very high tuition of possibly $350 to $400 instead of the suggested $200 out-of-district tuition. Such a high tuition is out of the question because the business interests of Dallas would be blamed (7, pp. 8, 13).

Typically, co-extensive Junior College Districts and Independent School Districts enter contractual agreements for the assessment and collection of taxes using the same assessment standards. Thus, a coterminous junior college in Dallas would produce a heavier annual burden on taxpayers even if non-resident students had to pay twice the tuition costs of resident students (23, S. 3, p. 1). Conversely, county-wide districts characteristically enter a contract with the County Assessor and Collector, using State and County valuations, which are more equitably and efficiently administered.

Fourth, as a leader in the development of junior colleges, California provided a well-defined pattern for examination. Initially their junior colleges were established
as adjuncts of their respective public school systems. By 1964, a majority of them had been separated from the public school system. The California higher education plan allowed only the top 12.5 per cent of the high school graduates to apply for admission to the State universities; only the top third were eligible to apply to one of the fifteen State Colleges; but all graduates were permitted to enter a junior college. Surprisingly, the junior college reported enrolling a substantial share of high school honor graduates (23).

As was previously observed, developments in post-World War II Texas indicate a similar trend in the development of junior colleges. The Chamber's position was that this trend must be accelerated in Texas by forming a county-wide junior college district in the Dallas area.

Finally, an effective junior college is not just another extension of the local high school. Not only do public school boards often find it extremely difficult to give the necessary time and attention to the problems of grades one through twelve, but when they consider junior college problems they find equally as many more decisions to be made. Amarillo, Texas, operated a junior college as an adjunct of the local school district for a number of years. However, the Board soon discovered that they rarely had sufficient time for junior college matters. By choice
they ultimately appointed a separate Board and divorced it from the public school system (23). As in all other such cases, "the college has blossomed out and done much better than it ever did under the public school system" (23).

Psychologically the high school graduate needs a new and different environment. It is generally accepted that a successful junior college must avoid all trappings of the high school image. It is essential for a junior college to challenge, stimulate, and motivate the students to respond well to broader educational opportunities at more mature levels of learning.

The Chamber, in support of Colvert's recommendations, advocated that the Dallas Junior College District begin with at least two colleges, rather than a single downtown location, and perhaps eventually expand to four campuses with at least 100 acres at each location. In contrast to a public school system, an educational program of this dimension would require different types of buildings, financing, library and laboratory facilities, faculty, and curriculum needs. The scope was too broad, the expertise was too great, and the time was too limited for a public school board to adequately administer such a system. The conclusion was that

these and similar factors explain the trend to separate from school districts' control those junior colleges which were established
as adjuncts of the public school systems. Just as there is a sharp distinction between high school and college-level students and curricula, there is also a sharp cleavage in the type of policy and administrative problems of pre-college and college level operations (23).

As Dallas rang in the New Year of 1964, the Dallas Independent School District Board was now ready to revive its latent interest in establishing a junior college. There were two primary reasons: first, the demands of the desegregation litigation were subsiding; second, the Chamber's interest in creating a county-wide organization was becoming increasingly apparent. In a January 22 resolution, the Board called for a "study, projection, and planning of such an institution" (56, p. 82). This would include a curriculum study, initial costs of construction, possible enrollment, and the expected tax rate "which will be required to expedite the bringing into being of a junior college at the earliest possible date. . . . [It is the] . . . desire of the Board to propose the calling of an election to authorize a junior college embracing the Dallas Independent School District under the General Laws of the State" (56, p. 82). Pursuant to this resolution, Colvert was engaged to update his previous study for the District, which he completed in March, 1964.

In the meantime, Superintendent White and others favoring a coterminous junior college continued to promote
their plans for it by making justifiable comparisons to the highly successful coterminous system in Los Angeles, as the result of an earlier fact-finding study. The elementary and high school enrollment in the Los Angeles district was, in 1957, almost four times larger than in the Dallas district. A fair comparison could be made by using a multiple of four as a standard average. Applying the Los Angeles ratio on a pro-rata basis to Dallas, the expected enrollment in the junior college program in Dallas would be approximately 6,500 to 7,000 (53).

The Los Angeles Report also issued a word of caution against a literal comparison of the Los Angeles and the Dallas districts. It was observed that the Los Angeles board and staff were plagued with chaotic working conditions and considerable inefficiency in administration. In view of these conditions, relative costs based on the Los Angeles system would clearly indicate a more than adequate capability of the Dallas District to establish a junior college. It was in this context that a cautious and conservative prediction was proffered (see Table I).

It was evident from the figures in Table I that the cost of establishing a junior college in Dallas was well within reach. National, state, and local surveys indicated private colleges were at capacity enrollment and unable to expand, most state colleges had reached a maximum size
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Figure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students (1/4 of Los Angeles enrollment)</td>
<td>6,500 to 7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers and administrators (1/4 of Los Angeles total)</td>
<td>288.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax rate—Los Angeles rate of $.23 is about 7-1/2% of their total school rate of $2.9580, 7-1/2% of our rate would be less than</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond service</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles total district per capita average is $347.92. Our per capita for entire district is $236.33. Assume our Junior College per capita cost to likewise be $100 above average would furnish a Junior College per capita cost of approximately</td>
<td>$336.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of physical plant. Los Angeles plants do not meet standards of construction set for the Dallas District, nor are their plants complete. Based on present Dallas High School costs complete plant for 6,500 to 7,000 students would be approximately</td>
<td>$6,000,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


and capacity, with little hope of increase, and elementary and high school enrollments continued to rise. Although Dallas had long prided itself as a leading cultural and
educational center, the Los Angeles Report readily acknowledged that Dallas was "lagging far behind" in establishing a junior college (53). However, "the present cost of operation of this school district indicates strongly that this district can establish and operate a junior college at considerably less cost than any private or state institution" (53).

In keeping with the progressive educational philosophy of the Dallas School District, the Board believed that it should rise to meet the junior college challenge because "(1) the only solution possible is through tax supported agencies, and (2) the local school board is closer at hand than the legislature in Austin which meets only every two years, and (3) the specter of Federal Education will be standing in the wings awaiting its cue" (53). The aggressive policies and plans of the Dallas School District had traditionally kept the school system prepared to meet the demands of the tremendous increase in student enrollment. Consequently, this proven leadership and experience vindicated the contention that the establishment and operation of a junior college could be more quickly and successfully executed by the Dallas Independent School District than by any other agency.

The two conflicting views became more pronounced as the interest in a junior college for the Dallas Metroplex
increased. The controversy potentially threatened to destroy the ultimate objective both sides sought. B. W. Musgraves, Assistant Commissioner of Education, stressed that the Dallas area needed a good public junior but hastened to warn, "The State Board of Education would consider any conflict over whether the junior college should be a county-wide institution a local matter . . . but they would want the conflict reconciled before local backers sought the board's approval" (76). Writing for the Dallas Morning News, Carlos Conde described the cross current of issues as an "impasse" and observed that the conflict between the School Board and the Chamber of Commerce must be resolved (8). He quoted one Dallas School official as saying, "My experience has been that voters won't vote for a bond election if even the slightest opposition is expressed, particularly when it means raising their taxes . . ." (8). A hint of doubt was expressed by another Board member, who said "that if the junior college district became too big and complex to handle, the board would probably agree to turn it over to the county" (8). However, White continued to press for a junior college district election in the fall of 1964. While the School District was continuing to study "plans, sites and a plan of action," he did emphasize that the leaders of the two opposing groups were meeting to try "to work out their differences" (11).
Fearing a serious conflict over the issue, with the total community being the loser, the *Dallas Morning News* editorialized: "... Consultation and a spirit of compromise can reach conclusions that will best serve the public interest. No one wants a head-butting showdown fight on junior colleges for Dallas. ... A meeting of minds must be reached without the heat of controversy or a conflict of personalities" (21).

By June, 1964, the studies had been completed and the opposing views had been aired. Unofficially the position of the Dallas School Board and school administrators continued to be that the school district could set up a junior college quicker and administer it better than the county. They contended that they already had the personnel, administration, and the resources to have a successful junior college. However, some board members stated "that they would be willing to agree to anything which will set up the junior college as soon as possible regardless of who administers it" (22). This suggests that the entire board was not absolutely committed to a junior college operated by the school district.

At this juncture consultant Colvert's recommendation favoring a county-wide college was published by the *Dallas Morning News* (10). The *Dallas Times Herald* editorially supported the county-wide position (5), and at approximately the same time, White and some of the board members
were being "urged privately by various community and business leaders to consider backing a county-wide junior college" (44). Thus, it is not surprising that on June 24, 1964, the Dallas School Board adopted the following resolution:

A great deal of interest has been evidenced in a Junior College to be established on a county-wide basis. In order that all the citizens of Dallas County may have an opportunity to take part in the establishment of a Junior College, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Education that its intention to call an election to authorize a Junior College District embracing the Dallas Independent School District be rescinded (57, pp. 289-290).

Subsequently, Robert S. Folsom, School Board President, commented that "the board is very much in favor of the proposed junior college, but we won't participate in establishing one because it's a county deal now. . . . We can support it as individuals but personally I would be against any action whatsoever by the board itself" (74). This led to a resolution of the issue and opened the way for the Chamber to proceed with its plans for the establishment of a junior college district in Dallas County.

In subsequent reviews of this period of the development of the junior college district this conflict has been minimized, if not denied. In an interview on March 11, 1974, Thornton stated,

the Dallas Independent School District thought it would be far better to have a full county-wide, and they pulled out and said we will hold off. And if it can be done county-wide we think that would be better than each of the
independent school districts having one of these. There was no cleavage. In fact Dr. White was, I guess as staunch an advocate of this and a pillar of strength all the way through . . . for the county [system] (37).

In a succeeding interview with White, now a retired school Superintendent of Dallas, he concurred with Thornton's recollection of these apparent problems in the formative days of the junior college district (86). Whether their views reflect the reconciling influences of the passing of time, or whether those involved are simply unable to recollect those conflicts remains open to question. Or, perhaps those supporting the junior college movement fear that the image of united "Big D" supporting the project would be tarnished by the admission of a conflict.

The reflections of others are somewhat contradictory to the views of Thornton and White. J. C. Matthews, President Emeritus of North Texas State University (34), Robert H. Power, Irving Councilman in 1964 (36), and Alan Maley, Executive Secretary of the AFL-CIO (33), all agree that there was a major conflict over the junior college issue.

The political strategy of the county-wide junior college leaders was significant in that it not only eliminated all important opposition but ultimately won the support of most of their erstwhile critics. The proposal for a county-wide district began with the Dallas County School Board and Superintendent, with support for the concept soon extending to Consultant Colvert, the powerful Chamber of Commerce,
State Education and Research agencies, the major Dallas newspapers, many business and community leaders representing most strata of Dallas society, open sympathizers on the Dallas Public School Board, and Franklin Spafford (soon to be elected a charter member of the Junior College Board of Trustees), former member of the Dallas Public School Board. Maley perceptively summed up the situation by saying, "If we hadn't... had him boxed in to where he knew it was not popular, because then, obviously, Dr. W. T. White... was very much opposed to it. As a matter of fact, Skyline (High School) was to be his answer to there not being a need for a junior college system" (33). With virtually all organized opposition removed, the Education Committee of the Chamber of Commerce took up the county-wide junior college torch and set in motion the machinery to accomplish the fact.

Steering Committee: Its Purpose and Function

Complying with state requirements in establishing a junior college district the Chamber planned to promptly appoint the chairman of a Steering Committee and six additional members, "... representing a cross-section of the population of the county..." (75). The committee's purpose and function would essentially be twofold: first, to elicit wholesale public support for the project, and second, to serve as a vehicle for coordinating all procedures
and actions necessary for compliance with state, county, and local regulations.

After several weeks of screening prospective civic leaders, Chamber of Commerce President Robert Cullum announced the appointment of R. L. Thornton, Jr., as chairman of the Steering Committee. Thornton was highly respected in the community, a very successful businessman (Vice-President and subsequently President of the Mercantile National Bank of Dallas), and an outstanding civic leader, having served as the "successful campaign chairman for the Community Chest, the Red Cross, the Highland Park Methodist Church, in the YMCA . . . [with an] aptitude and organization in the raising of money" (37). Although, the selection of the other committee members was deferred until October, Cullum announced that the "Chamber will serve a supporting role rather than acting as the agency to implement the college. The Chamber's part in this particular job is complete and from now on, the action agency will be a citizens committee representative of all of Dallas County . . . " (12).

During the interim of these appointments the Chamber began contacting influential citizens and organizations throughout Dallas County, informing them of the proposed plans and soliciting their support. Various news media began conducting county surveys and regularly informing people of the history, function, and rapid expansion of the
junior college movement in modern American society; they stressed that Texas was not keeping pace with such states as California and Florida in establishing junior colleges; and major emphasis was given to delineating the extensive needs for a junior college in the Dallas community.

On October 8, 1964, Thornton announced the appointment of, not six, but twenty-two civic leaders to the Dallas County Junior College Steering Committee, representing every prominent facet of the community (see Appendix IX). However, it was decided that the size of the committee would not be limited in number, which was a stroke of political astuteness. This not only encouraged but insured broad participation from the very outset. Every identifiable interest group that could be found was encouraged to appoint a representative to the Steering Committee. Thornton said, "I went to every Chamber of Commerce in the county and asked them to furnish me a person, . . . the school districts . . . , the Parent Teachers Association and ask them. I went to the legal society, the medical society, the hospital society and asked them--the Negro Chamber of Commerce" (37). Alan Maley recalled that "there must have been something like two thousand people that indicated that they wanted to be members of the Steering Committee by the time of the election" (33). The Chairman also predicted that petitions would be circulated sometime after January 1, 1965, to allow
county voters to decide whether they wanted an election to create a junior college district (27).

The State Board of Education had prescribed the following responsibilities for the Steering Committee:

1. To serve as the liaison function between the local area and the State Board of Education.
2. To be responsible for a survey of the needs and potential of the area for a junior college district.
3. To be responsible for an informative program of the nature and the purpose of a public junior college.
4. To summarize and evaluate the results of the survey, to formulate conclusions and submit them to the Commissioner of Education.
5. To be responsible for the preparation and circulation of the petition when such action has been deemed feasible by the committee.
6. To present the petition to the County Board, or Boards of Education, Commissioners' Court, or Courts in Counties having no Board of Education, for action in compliance with Article 2815h, Section 18, as amended (1, pp. 52, 53).

At the December committee meeting the chairman informed them that he had received state approval for Colvert to complete his report on establishing a junior college in the area. He added, "Dr. Colvert . . . will be the agent (as required by Book II, Chapter 126 of the Education Code) for the junior college commission which will submit the application to the state" (26).

As Maley observed, most of the actual strategy and execution of the plans for the petition drive and election were exercised behind the scenes by Thornton and those
Committee members that he designated for specified assignments. The formal Committee meetings were almost entirely promotional in nature (33). For example, Thornton appointed Juvenile Court Judge Lewis Russell to head a subcommittee to select seven names from a list of some seventy persons to be named trustees of the college. "The Committee will approve the seven persons" at the January 5, 1965, meeting, Thornton stated (27). It was at this meeting that the Committee also approved the tax rate for the bonds and the amount of bonds that would be sold to build the junior college. He added that Ross Ramsey, member of the Committee and President of the Dallas Junior Chamber of Commerce, would direct the forthcoming petition drive calling for an election (40).

Also as the election drew near, Thornton wrote a letter to the precinct captains urging them to attend the May 17 Committee meeting saying that success would be "in direct proportion to the effectiveness of the precinct captain's ability and dedication to supply inspiration and leadership in each precinct" (64).

Thornton, asked John Stemmons his long time friend, wealthy business developer, and civic leader, to help raise an estimated $85,000 for the campaign to inform the public of the needs for a junior college and for soliciting petition signatures calling for an election to create a junior college district. The need for a public relations
firm to reach these objectives was evident. Consequently, the Chairman suggested to the Committee that

"all of us have known Ted Maloy and we know that he is well accepted and has got a lot of good ideas and do you think we might interview Ted to see if he will handle this? They said, 'Fine'. . . . partner Van Cronkhite showed up which I had never seen. . . . John [Van Cronkhite] had a lot of experience in Austin. . . . so we hired them to do it" (37).

Colvert's report had called for ultimately establishing four 100-acre campuses at an estimated cost of $41.5 million which would be raised by selling bonds. Thornton's previous bond experience led him to search out legal bonding advice from Hobby McCall to insure that there would be no legal entanglements in the event the electorate approved that portion of the ballot. McCall drew up the petition for the creation of the district and for levying the taxes to secure the bonds to be sold (37).

Once this was approved by the Committee, they then went back to the same districts and organizations that had appointed members to the Steering Committee, asking them for a nominee to the proposed Board of Trustees. Judge Russell and his nominating subcommittee recommended for approval by the voters seven leading citizens widely accepted in the various sections of the County which they represented. Their names and their credentials reflect astute planning and selection as nominees for charter membership on the Board of Trustees (see Appendix X).
The Committee was advised at their January 15, 1965, meeting that on January 18 the petition-signing campaign, under the direction of Dallas Junior Chamber of Commerce President Ross Ramsey, would get under way. If it was successful, the election date would be set, asking voters to approve the establishment of a junior college district, a $41,500,000 bond issue to build the four campuses, the tax levy to finance it, and a Board of Trustees to direct it.

Pre-Election Strategies and Procedures

The Committee believed that the degree of success in the forthcoming petition drive would be indicative of the support they might expect in the subsequent election for the creation of the new junior college district. State law required that 10 per cent of the tax paying electorate must sign a petition favoring such an election. Ben Gentle, Dallas County Tax-Assessor-Collector, ruled that 17,000 names would be required to conduct the election (9). Only 2 per cent of the taxpayers' signatures were needed to sign a petition for the election of members to the Board of Trustees (37). However, Thornton stressed that voters should be informed that signing the petition was not a vote for or against the junior college district, but it was simply approving the request of the Steering Committee for a referendum on the matter (9).
The petition drive was officially launched on February 10, 1965, by Mayor pro-tem Carie Welch at a luncheon in the Adolphus Hotel. He warned that Dallas County could not afford to squander such educational opportunities any longer. He told his listeners:

A junior college program would offer two years of training in a diversified list of skills, and credits that would be transferred to any institution of still higher learning. It would enhance opportunity for our youth and adults alike.

There is no waste so great as wasted opportunity. Studies that have been made show clearly the junior college program would be the most economical way to meet a problem that exists now and must be solved (40).

On the opening day of the drive, Max Goldblatt, a committee member from Pleasant Grove, turned in 500 names as a result of some preliminary canvassing. He and other junior college enthusiasts from his area ultimately secured the largest number of signatures. Hundreds of workers all over the county joined in the "person-to-person--door-to-door, store-to-store--Operation Junior Colleges" (65). Petitions were placed in downtown Dallas businesses, office buildings, banks, and in all Wyatt Cafeterias, Mr. M stores, Evans stores, and all Tom Thumb supermarkets throughout the city. Signatures were also secured through canvasses made by Parent-Teacher Associations, the League of Women Voters, Junior Chambers of Commerce, and members of numerous other civic organizations. Many labor union
leaders, hospital administrators, employers, and business executives cooperated in soliciting names on the petitions.

Perhaps the hardest work was done by those outside the city of Dallas. The Dallas County Jaycees coordinated the petition drive in the outlying communities. Jaycees Chairman Buddy Ragley was instrumental in getting the Chambers of Commerce, the League of Women Voters, and the Parent-Teacher Associations to "show 'solid interest' in all areas of the county" (65). He also enlisted more than 150 members of his own organization in a canvass of the Dallas County business and service organizations (65). Thornton recognized the possible motivation from the surrounding communities when he commented that

the chambers in each of the county towns realize that the plans envision establishment of four separate campuses with the probability one of the four will be in an area such as their own, thereby providing easy accessibility to people of their area (69).

A significant effort was made by the Kiwanis-sponsored high school Key Clubs. Some 800 high school students worked to secure over 6,000 names for the proposed junior college (48). Capitalizing on this impressive work Thornton said, "because young people are showing the way in this program for excellence in education, the rest of us have no choice except to back them up and to get out the vote in May . . . " (78).
The petition drive continued to gain momentum, with over 12,000 signers having been secured by February 12, 1965. This number was more than doubled by March 9. Now having at least 8,000 more names than required, the Steering Committee was ready to present the first of their petitions completed to the Dallas County Clerk's Office for certification. When Thornton presented the petitions to the County Clerk, he expressed confidence that over 50,000 taxpayers would sign petitions before the drive ended because workers were still receiving calls from people requesting to be an "original signer" of the junior college proposition (82). The list of signatures had reached 31,000 by March 14, (6) and by March 15, over 45,000 had signed the petitions turned in to the County Clerk's office (67). Thornton's prediction was correct, and, commending the petition workers, Gentle said, "I know of no other petition drive in Dallas County that even approaches this figure" (67). The Committee Chairman stated, "More people signed the petition than have voted in the last three bond elections" (17). He added, "The great interest shown in the proposal for a Junior College by Dallas County citizens is the realization by educators and well-informed citizens that the Junior College is fast becoming an integral part of higher education throughout the country" (28).

Following procedures outlined by the state, the Committee tentatively set the election for May 25, pending
certification of the signatures by the County Clerk. It was then necessary to present the petitions to the Dallas County School Board at their March 23 meeting for certification of the scholastic population in the county and the need for a junior college district. These procedures had to be completed and the County School Board had to send the materials to the State Board of Education for their approval by their April 3 meeting if the election was to be held May 25. Such an election could not be held in less than twenty days after nor more than thirty days following the State Board of Education's approval (37).

Having more signatures than was required for the approval of the State Board of Education, Thornton journeyed to Austin on March 24 to deliver all of the prepared documents to J. W. Edgar, Commissioner of Education for the Texas Education Agency, for review prior to their April 3rd meeting (80). Although there were over 50,000 signers of the petition, Gentle certified only 26,900, "since we only needed 17,000 signers anyway" (73). The Tax Assessor-Collector also certified the county's properties' assessed valuation at $1,600,000,000; the County School Board verified and the Superintendent certified the need for the creation of a County Junior College District; and the Superintendent produced the necessary scholastic certification that 260,000 students were enrolled in all grades
throughout the County, while 63,000 of these comprised grades nine through twelve (73).

Upon his return to Dallas, Thornton wrote the State Board of Education:

In order to schedule the election in May so as to give the electorate the maximum amount of time to consider the proposition, W. C. Graves [a former state Senator of Dallas] will move the suspension of the rules of your Board to permit scheduling the election at your April 3rd meeting.

... we request your careful consideration of the motion to be made by Mr. Graves and welcome your comments and suggestions (63).

He also observed that Dallas could depend on Governor Connally's support because "this whole deal was following right down the line the [Governor's] Higher Education Committee," whose recommendations had largely been enacted into law (37). He continued,

We went down and did our own lobbying down there. Our Senators, our Representatives; we took delegations of plane loads down and met them on the floor, in their offices.

... The State Board of Education: this is the biggest thing that had happened to them down there and they wanted to see it come into effect. Of course this is the first major city to follow the Community College concept as brought forth by Governor Connally's Committee. This was not coming down there pushing them to do something. Here was the largest in the state coming down saying, "We are ready to help" (37).

The State Board of Education's policies required that credentials received from a proposed junior college district steering committee would be reviewed by a Board committee
for thirty days. If the Dallas proposal could receive a favorable recommendation by the Committee and a sanction by the Board in early May, it was hoped that the Commissioner's court would immediately call for an election, preferably for May 25 (73).

When the April 3 Board meeting date arrived, forty-four Dallas County supporters chartered two commercial airliners, while others travelled in automobiles to Austin to express support for the Dallas Junior College project. Thornton recalled, "We had the Committee, plus we had two plane loads, I believe, from [sic] outstanding citizens from all the towns, school districts, politicians, bankers, insurance executives; the whole deal that anybody that had any influence with anybody in Austin, to say that we were sincere. That's what they were interested in" (37).

There was some funding anxiety on the part of the Dallas people for fear the oil companies were going to fight the request to establish a Junior College District. Thornton went to them to determine their position on the matter. They charged that other areas of the state had wanted to establish a junior college to provide more job opportunities in those areas, with the oil companies funding the project, since few other industries and businesses existed to help carry the tax load. But they agreed not to oppose the Dallas proposal, since the need was so great and the taxing
base was to be equitably distributed among a much larger taxpaying constituency (37).

When the Education Board convened, the Dallas delegation was recognized. Thornton introduced each member of the Dallas delegation and then addressed the Board:

The citizens of Dallas County have asked me to present their petition for an election regarding the Dallas County Junior College proposal to the State Board of Education members, and the Dallas County voters request you to approve their petition with all possible speed.

More than 50,000 county property owners and voters signed this petition, but we only needed 19,000 to call the election.

Throughout the County, as we canvassed the County speaking for the Junior College, citizens have asked us not "why a Junior College, but how soon can we get one?"

Within this representative group are city mayors, civic leaders and professional businessmen who have come today from every area of our county to ask you members of the State Board of Education to approve this petition for an election of the Junior College establishment.

We need this college to train the thousands of high school students and other citizens who need education beyond the high school level.

Out of 500 Texas 18-year olds, only 30 will graduate from college. Two hundred of them will never even graduate from high school and will drop out. We must educate and train the other 465 who need some higher education and who will not have, or need a college degree.

We of Dallas County are planning this college along the lines of a community college concept--including technical job training, vocational education, the first two years of a four-year college education, and adult evening education.

The proposed college would admit students on an "open door" policy, which entitles any
Dallas County citizen over 18 years old to enroll in the college. Tuition would be approximately $100 per year (1, pp. 60-61).

W. W. Jackson of San Antonio, and Chairman of the Board of Education, praised the Dallas venture as visionary: "Your long range planning indicates that you are not doing this piece-meal. The multiple-campus plan which you propose for Dallas has unlimited possibilities" (68).

When the Education Board began its deliberations W. C. Graves "... moved the Board of Education suspend its usual procedure [the thirty-day examination of credentials], and... give immediate approval for the Dallas County Junior College election" (45). The motion to suspend the rules was approved, with only Carl E. Morgan of Jasper voting "no" (79).

The only other potential problem that arose concerned a possible invalidation of future bond issues offered by the Dallas Junior College District because the thirty-day rule had been suspended. Houston State Board member Jack Binion had consulted appropriate bond authorities and was reassured that all future bond issues would be valid. One reason for his interest in this question stemmed from the fact that he was supporting a similar project in the Spring Branch section of Houston whose situation was quite comparable to the Dallas request (68).

The Committee returned to Dallas, optimistic and confident that an immediate request to the County Commissioners
Court for the May 25 election would be granted. They petitioned the court to include their request on the agenda for their next meeting, scheduled for April 29 (51). The Court complied, and with the court room filled to capacity with Junior College supporters, the Committee's bond attorney, Hobby McCall, discussed the propositions requested to appear on the ballot (37). They were four in number:

1. The establishment of a junior college district.
2. Setting of a property tax ceiling of sixteen cents for operation of the system.
3. Creation of a $41.5 million bond issue to finance building and maintenance of the college's four campuses.

He explained that if the election results were favorable, the Board of Trustees would determine the tax levy and provide for maintenance and bond retirement taxes. He informed them that the Board nominees were aware that a fifty-cent bond retirement tax and a maximum sixteen-cent maintenance tax were permitted by state law (13).

Thornton reassured the court that "the creation of a junior college system will make it possible for every boy and girl in Dallas County to receive two years of college education if they so desire. This will be the first time in Dallas County that any student who has the desire and ability can stay at home and get an education" (13). The
court unanimously approved the requests and promptly set
the election for May 25 for ratification of the Junior
College proposals (19).

The Election: Campaign and Results

Preparations were initiated immediately for the May 25, 1965, Dallas County Junior College election. County Clerk Tom Ellis announced that absentee balloting would be scheduled for May 6 to 21, and he predicted that an estimated 50,000 voters would cast ballots in the election (29).

It is axiomatic that currying the favor of the news media is desirable in any type of political campaign. With this in mind the Steering Committee and numerous other civic minded individuals worked to get the message before all of Dallas County. Thornton reported that there were no secrets. We had the press in on everything we did. I was told that nine chances out of ten some of them will double cross me. I said, "I don't believe they will." And in sessions in here in our planning deal we said, "Now if any one of you papers break this right now it'll hurt us." . . . The press wrote beautiful articles. The papers, the TV, the radio, were disseminating information (37).

The merits of the junior college movement and the need for Dallas to be a participant in it were regularly proclaimed in the local newspapers. Ruth Eyre of the Dallas Times Herald wrote,
Last fall the junior college enrollment in the U. S. passed the one million mark—representing one-fifth of all students of higher education.

. . . community colleges and two-year technical institutes, have attempted to meet the needs for technical and semi-professional manpower that can no longer be met by high school education and training only (26).

The popularity of junior colleges is "due to campuses located within community range . . . [and the] low cost of higher education" (26). The success stories of such schools as Miami Dade Junior College [it opened with 1300 students in 1960 but increased to 14,000 students in 1964] and the St. Louis Community College District [it began in 1963 with 2,000 students and in the fall of 1964, 5,000 students were enrolled] were constantly kept before Dallas citizens (26).

The Richardson Daily News warned its readers of losing a "Golden Opportunity" if the Junior College District was not established. It observed that

the Junior College complex is the nucleus of a general National trend which Dallas County may join in its mightiest form. The Junior College fills a special gap in the sequence of American learning. Richardson with its vast aero space, electronics and research facilities, should be especially interested in one of the key functions of the Junior College, to turn out technicians in every field.

The Daily News reiterates its support of the referendum and urges also the support of the citizenry (31).
Junior College leaders were cognizant that the success of their entire project would be severely limited without minority group support. A major avenue for influence in the black community was the Negro Chamber of Commerce. J. H. Glenn, president of the Chamber and member of the Junior College Steering Committee, was influential throughout the black community. Other organizations such as the Association of Negro Teachers and the Ladies Auxiliary of the Chamber fully supported the Junior College effort.

Thornton recalled,

We were all down in there. Let me tell you they were pretty staunch with me. Some of those girls one day did everything but turn me inside-out. Their questions were smart and they were penetrating. Here was the thing that they talked to me about. "You talk about integration. Is the school gonna be integrated?" By law, "Yes." "What about the faculty? What about the administration?" "Yes." . . . "Is this gonna be another deal where the white people get the white collar courses and the Negro gets the blue collar ones?" And they didn't take ifs, ands, or buts. They wanted it straight. Here for the first time in the south ("I believe it was the first time in the United States.") that the higher level educational institution started integrated. . . . The opening day, they came in in the same proportion as there were people in Dallas. Here was the opportunity for the first time for the blacks to have a full higher education institution under their door (37).

Such efforts were rewarding because the Negro newspaper, The Post Tribune, with a subtitle, "154,262 Negroes in Dallas spend $3,006, 284 every week," gave its support to
the forthcoming Junior College election. They urged that "such a college would fill a great need in our community, and would be especially beneficial to our group. Many of our students who would not otherwise be able to go to college, could attend a Junior College right at home. Vote for the Proposed College!" (72).

The Mexican community was equally interested in the prospect of improving higher education opportunities for their citizens in Dallas County. The Dallas Americano wrote,

Dallas County desperately needs a public junior college, and it will have one if county voters pass the four Dallas County Junior College propositions on Tuesday's ballot. Directly or indirectly, all of us will benefit from the proposed two-year college. This means that college is within reach of any young person who wants it, at a cost anyone can afford (18).

In the Dallas Daily Commercial Record, the legal, real estate, insurance, and financial professionals voiced their support for the Junior College by saying, "We wish to add our endorsement . . . and strongly urge our readers to vote 'yes' Tuesday on the four Dallas County Junior College propositions (16).

Many suburban community newspapers, such as the Grand Prairie News Texan, Texas Mesquiter, Pleasant Grove Shopping News, Garland Daily News, and the Lancaster Herald, called upon their readers to go to the polls and vote for the
Junior College. The latter pleaded, "All voters are urged to go to the polls and vote on this important issue. We wish to add our endorsement to theirs and strongly urge our readers to vote 'yes'..." (41).

The two publications with the greatest potential impact throughout Dallas County were the Dallas Morning News and the Dallas Times Herald. Both of these daily newspapers early sanctioned the Junior College endeavor. They wrote,

With the setting of Tuesday May 25 as the date for election of a Dallas County Junior College, the educational hopes and dreams of thousands of local families move a step nearer to realization. The Commissioners' Court has authorized the vote as the last of a series of preliminary moves, all of which have been made so far with unprecedented popular enthusiasm. . . .

Since the proposed Dallas Junior College has already been approved by state educational agencies, it will automatically derive 33 per cent of its cost from state school funds. The yearly tuition of $100 paid by county students will cover another 11 per cent of the cost. The remaining 56 per cent of the cost will be borne by county taxpayers, with a tax not expected to exceed 30 cents on each $100 of assessed valuation.

In view of the thorough and convincing studies of the great need for the public-supported junior college, its vital importance in the development of the Dallas area and the sound financing and operation proposed for it, the News is convinced that a public, tax-supported junior college system in Dallas County is vitally needed in a day when so much depends on academic, professional and technical instruction.

More young people need advanced education for their development and that of this metropolitan community--and too high a percentage is not getting it. The case for a junior college is that simple and urgent (39).
The title "junior" college is misleading, for it implies a subordinate position. Today the junior college has its own useful roll [sic] in the advanced education picture. It is not an extension of high school and is not a preliminary to college. The junior college has its own place. It fills a gap in the education spectrum which particularly suits metropolitan area needs. . . .

There are many incentives about a junior college--its low cost, the chance for students to live at home, be married or hold a job while going to school--which are a great weapon against dropouts, and it is a higher but tangible goal for the student who is tempted to give up on education before finishing high school.

It is for these reasons the Times Herald urges Dallas County voters to vote FOR the proposed $41.5 million Dallas County Junior College bond issue Tuesday (43).

Many organizations and individuals campaigned in support of the Junior College District. Speaking as Chairman of the Dallas Hospital Council, Rod Bell told the Dallas Morning News that "Dallas will have an opportunity on May 25 to vote for establishing a junior college that could help meet our critical needs. The Dallas Hospital Council and the Dallas County Medical Society strongly urge a 'yes' vote for the new junior college system" (15).

The Dallas Allied Printing Trades Council also favored the Junior College program. They called upon their members to vote for the Junior College May 25 because it would help reduce unemployment by training the unskilled and raise the average level of education; this would produce
greater purchasing power and expand the County's human resources (71). In like manner, M. C. Cole, a powerful figure in Garland and President of the Garland Builders and Developers Association, welcomed "a motion for a resolution putting the builders on record as supporting the junior college . . . " (3). Another powerful group, the labor unions, voiced strong approval of the Junior College. Local officials of the AFL-CIO, including President Wallace C. Reilly, Vice-President Dave Keeler, and Secretary-Treasurer Allan Maley, as well as union members, urged a "yes" vote May 25 for a junior college.

Hank Rabun, Area Director for United Steelworkers of America, said, "The junior college bond election on May 25 is the most important election, I believe, in Dallas history" (20). He argued that the Dallas County Junior College would give workers the opportunity of sending their children to college at a cost they could afford. It was needed because "a worker without skills or education" could no longer find a job. It would provide "retraining to keep pace with modern technology" (20). In Duncanville nine civic, governmental, and service organizations also urged "yes" on May 25 election day (42). Finally, on May 20 the Dallas Morning News reported that all the county mayors or their representatives joined in a proclamation designating May 25, Dallas County Junior College Day (14).
The campaign ostensibly reached its grand climax at a propitious point in time. Despite ominous forecasts of inclement weather, excitement, anticipation, and confidence ran high among the campaign workers. On election morning, May 25, 1965, the Dallas Morning News wrote this last editorial in support of the Junior College proposals:

The best investment the local voter may make in the future of Greater Dallas is to cast his ballot today for the Dallas County Junior College System. . . . The News hopes that far more than the 25,000 citizens who signed the petitions for this election will take time out Tuesday to vote at their respective polling places. A majority vote to create the junior college district is essential.

Without such favorable vote the twenty-eight incorporated towns and cities of Dallas County stand to suffer in the Texas of tomorrow. Only voter apathy or misunderstanding could defeat this crucial step forward in the unfolding destiny of the community (85).

In that same issue the Morning News reported Thornton as making one last plea to Dallas County voters by warning, "I would feel much better about it if 60,000 came out. [County Clerk, Tom Ellis, had just revised his projected 50,000 votes downward to approximately 40,000 votes.] The future of Dallas is at stake. We cannot afford to stay home. The Dallas County Junior College is in your grasp." He continued, "... All four propositions must pass by a simple majority" (24). At the closing of the polls optimism continued to run high. An above-average number
of voters (over 35,000) had cast their ballots, which was partially due to the fact that the Junior College proposals shared the ballot with each of the public school districts that were holding their election the same day.

The following morning the Dallas Morning News described the victory with the caption, "Junior College approved by a 3-1 Margin." Thornton's post election comments were that

No civic drive, no political campaign in Dallas County has ever witnessed so many dedicated organizations and individual citizens devoting such great efforts to bring about a successful election.

With the establishment of the county junior colleges, our entire county community is the real victor.

Our children and their children for generations to come will be indebted to those who worked with such dedicated purpose to make this dream come true (77).

Every proposition won handily, since there was no organized opposition to the Junior College proposal. Of the 214 precincts in Dallas County, only four voted against the propositions. They were precinct 171 in Irving, precinct 202 in Sachse, precinct 203 in Garland, and precinct 317 in Lisbon. While other areas such as Rowlett, Coppell, Seagoville, and Oak Cliff also "had a somewhat troublesome time," at least one Negro precinct (number 226) balloted "for the school proposals as much as 89-0" (84). Two days after the election the Dallas Times Herald said, "Dallas County's enthusiastic voting support of a junior college bond issue shows that the need for such a system is great
enough to be realized at all levels of the community. . . .

Dallas needs a junior college, and a good one. The best in the land. Starting as we have, we can get it" (66) (see Appendix XI for election results).

Following the ratification of the Junior College District, the first official meeting of the Board of Trustees was held on May 27, 1965. On this historic occasion Dallas County Judge, W. L. Sterrett certified the election results and administered the oath of office to each of the seven charter members of the Board of Trustees, charging them with the responsibility of establishing and guiding the Junior College District on a successful course.

Initial Organization

The Board of Trustees began to plan, organize, and establish what they hoped would become one of the largest and best Junior College Districts in the United States or the world (70). They believed that the initial objectives set, the basic educational philosophies embraced, and the earliest plans adopted usually forms the mold in which the future of a college is cast. Therefore, they felt that they must work cautiously, wisely, and yet, with all deliberate speed.

The Board of Trustees elected R. L. Thornton, Jr., as their first President. In view of his past leadership, it seemed that he was the logical choice to direct the
establishment of the Junior College District. Mrs. Eugene McDermott was elected Vice-President and Franklin E. Spafford was elected Secretary of the Board at their first official meeting on May 27, 1965. The members of the Board agreed that ultimately each person elected to the Board would serve a six-year term. However, for the sake of continuity, wisdom required that they would be alternating terms. The new Trustees drew names for their length of term and the results were as follows: Thornton, McDermott, and Welch each received six-year terms; Sutton and Altick each drew four-year terms; and Leake and Spafford both received two-year terms (37).

In the interim of the first two Board meetings Thornton developed guidelines under which the new Board would function efficiently. On May 31, he presented an outline recommending their procedures, duties, responsibilities, and assignments, charging them:

We have been elected by people from all walks of life and from all parts of the County. When we took our oath, we assumed an obligation to represent all of them to the best of our ability. We must set aside friendships and prejudices. We must not be swayed by pressure from business associates, clients, and neighbors. Every act and thought in our capacity as trustees must be: "Is it in the best interest of the Junior College?"

We are Trustees and policy makers. We are not personnel experts, college administrators, nor educators. We must set the policy, see that the schools are operated within the framework of the policy but must not, as individual trustees, interfere in the running of the schools.
We should adopt a set of by-laws and establish a policy file. This I do not feel we should attempt until we have hired the president and secured advice from recognized experts in the junior college field.

Until such time as we have adopted a formal set of by-laws and policies, I would like to recommend we operate under the following policy:

We operate through committees. No action should be taken by the Board except through committee reports. If we operate under this policy, we shall have time to investigate, analyze, and reflect on any problem. We shall not make spur-of-the-moment decisions nor be stampeded into decisions we might later regret. The committee report will be in writing, signed by the committee chairman, and the president... and the administrator of the section involved. Reports involving the payment of funds will designate from which funds authorization for payment will be made.

Formal board meetings should follow an agenda. Nothing should be placed on the agenda after it is mailed to the trustees. Only those things on the agenda will be acted upon. The agenda and all committee reports to be acted upon at the next meeting will be mailed to each trustee five days in advance of the meeting...

While probably the most important thing to the citizenry as a whole is the location of the four sites, the most important and immediate job of the Trustees is the selection of the executive to be the head of the colleges. It is this person who will shape the image of the colleges for years to come. It is the deans, the faculty, and the administrators with which he surrounds himself, the policies he adopts, his ability to lead, and his acceptance by the students, faculty, trustees, and the public that can make these schools great.

In addition to picking the head of the school, the trustees have the responsibility of setting policy, selecting the locations, naming them, selecting an outside auditor, bond attorney, fiscal agent, treasurer, tax collector and assessor, and determining the time and place of monthly meetings.
In these formative days we must have a place in which to operate, personnel to run it, and supplies and equipment with which to work. . . . Since we all need all the advice we can get, I suggest we have Dr. C. C. Colvert meet with us as soon as possible and give us his expert advice and guidance (1, pp. 80-81).

The Board approved the President's recommendations and the Committee appointments were made (see Appendix XII). With Thornton as an ex-officio member of all committees, committee meetings were open to the other Trustees but no minutes were to be recorded. However, all committee members were expected to sign a written committee report which was to be submitted to the entire Board and acted upon in public session. All work was to be conducted through the committee approach except on rare and urgent matters (58).

It was also decided that an agenda would be followed at all Board meetings, which were scheduled for every first and third Tuesday of each month. The members agreed to meet for a one-hour private work session before each of these 8:00 p.m. public meetings. This seemed to be indispensable when delicate and controversial issues such as site selections for the four campuses would be under consideration (58).

An integral part of the political process involved in the effective management and operation of any public institution is the maintenance of good community relations. In the judgment of the Board of Trustees, the public relations firm of Van Cronkhite and Maloy had made an outstanding
contribution in the petition campaign and election for the establishment of the Junior College District. Consequently, they were retained to manage community relations, issue press releases, and serve as the source for general public information for the District in its formative days. The Board also issued a temporary appointment to Mrs. Harold Hoffman, a Van Cronkhite employee who had been a key figure in their management of the Junior College campaign, as office manager for the purpose of assembling a staff to handle the burgeoning business affairs of the District (60).

Another major decision was the appointment of an auditor for the District. The Finance Committee nominated O. K. Thornton (no relation to President Thornton) because of his expertise in school accounting, and the Board made the appointment (37). The Finance Committee subsequently outlined his responsibilities and recommended a remuneration for his services. Upon their recommendations the Trustees also decided that it would be wise to delay levying any taxes until January, 1966, following the first bond sale (59).

Attorney McCall had earlier rendered assistance to the Steering Committee concerning bonding laws during the election campaign. Thornton readily recommended that his services again be secured in preparation for the forthcoming bond sale. The Board agreed to employ him, pending the completion of contractual arrangements (37).
Leake, Chairman of the Curriculum Committee, reported that catalogs and brochures were being secured from many similar institutions across the country. They provided important insight, direction, and innovative ideas for the development of a relevant and academically sound curriculum for Dallas County Junior Colleges (60).

The new Board had made many decisions but they had no facility in which to operate until R. W. Baxter, Sr., President of the Rio Grande Life Insurance Company, offered temporary offices on two floors in their building, free of charge (81). Also, Southwestern Life had just moved into their new facilities, and as Thornton said, "We went down there and bought for a pittance all of their executive equipment and for about every piece we bought they threw in some. This was their way of helping us out" (37).

At first the Trustees decided they should avoid establishing definite plans and procedures. They felt they should immediately move to employ the finest college administrator available. He would then be free to hire his own team of experts and formulate the philosophy, policies, plans, and procedures that would make this District a leader in higher education throughout the United States. However, upon some strong advice from various sources they soon realized that fundamental decisions must be made in all of these areas, not allowing them the luxury of that kind
of delay. It was also suggested that they should act promptly because a new president would not likely be that well oriented to Dallas County and its needs and existing opportunities.

Consequently, the Board began an intensive search for a president who would bring into being the hopes and dreams of the Board and of Dallas County citizens. They said,

[the] first logical step is to talk with presidents and chief executive officers of the successful junior colleges in operation in the United States. . . . This is giving us the benefit of the best experience, the best brains and the clearest thinking possible. . . . We feel some of these presidents . . . may well be presidential timber of our college (46).

This project was begun by Thornton's obtaining the recommendation from Dr. Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., executive head of the Junior Colleges of America in Washington, D. C., that the Board secure a copy of an article written by Dr. Bill J. Priest, then President of the American River Junior College in California, entitled "The Selection of a President."

Thornton recalled,

We read it. It brought out that we should bring in a number of outstanding heads of schools on a stipend and expenses, and let them tell you what the Board of Trustees should be looking for; and what questions to ask; and what kind of answers you should be looking for. . . . and what price should we offer. . . . Then we went back to Mr. Gleazer and said, "can you give us a list of outstanding men" (37).
The Trustees then invited ten to twelve outstanding Presidents and Chancellors for consultations and interviews. This group provided an educational experience for the Board, enlightening them as to the type of chief administrator they probably wanted to hire. Some of those meeting with the Board expressed the desire to provide information and advice but made it very clear that they were happy in their present positions. However, there were many applications for the position, including high school principals, junior college professors, professors of senior colleges, junior college presidents, plus many others. Thornton added,

We in turn invited in a list [of applicants] that we began to compile . . . and we began to interview. After we had interviewed about the third or fourth [we knew what we had been told was true because we began to] . . . get answers, . . . philosophy, . . . background. When we got all through, there were four or five that just stood out so far above anybody; also, that if we got any one of the four or five, we thought we'd be happy. . . . The two that stood out in our opinion; number one was Dr. Priest, . . . number two was Dr. Rushman. [He soon became President of Tarrant County Junior College.] . . . So Dallas and Fort Worth had, in our opinion, the one-two that was available (37).

On August 4, 1965, the Board of Trustees tendered a five-year contract to Dr. Bill J. Priest of Sacramento, California, to become the first President and Chief Executive Officer of Dallas County Junior College.
Sanctioning the recommendation of the Committee of the Whole, the Board approved the following resolution:

We have combed the nation to find the most outstanding and best qualified community college leader and we have found him. Our intensive, nationwide search pointed, conclusively, to one man as a super administrator and educator. He is an educator of great experience, commanding the admiration and respect of those in the forefront of the nation's community college movement.

The Committee of the Whole unanimously recommends that Dr. Bill J. Priest be made President and Chief Executive Officer of the Dallas County Junior College at a salary of $35,000 per annum for a period of five years.

The man, the position and the salary are commensurate with the institution of highest excellence being planned for Dallas County (61).

Priest gave a prompt response, accepting the appointment. He said,

It is a very great honor to be invited to serve as first administrator of your junior college district. I anticipate that the challenge will be exciting and satisfying. The trustees have communicated to me their expectation of excellence. I concur completely with this quest for quality, and I shall work diligently in obtaining it.

With public support every evident in Dallas, I have every confidence we shall be able to develop the Dallas County Junior College system into one of the finest in the nation.

Nowhere in all of education is there more dynamism than in the Junior College field. The relatively recent ascendancy of the Junior College in American higher education may be attributed to its demonstrated capacity to solve or alleviate so many of our most complex contemporary problems (1, p. 88) (See Appendix XIII).
The *Dallas Morning News* gave the Board and Priest a vote of confidence by saying, "President R. L. Thornton, Jr., and the other members of the board deserve the praise of all who will benefit. . . . They have wisely decided that, when the education of our youth is concerned, we can settle for nothing less than the best" (30).

It was mutually understood that Priest was given full authority and responsibility to proceed with the building of the four-campus Junior College District. This would involve working closely with the Trustees in securing properties, planning physical facilities, recruiting administrators, instructors, and staff, and developing a comprehensive curriculum relevant to the needs in Dallas County.

Summary

Dallas was not the first major city to establish a Junior College and it did experience difficulty in deciding whether a coterminous or a county-wide system would be more desirable. After considerable delay, but upon the advice of outside consultants, the latter approach was judged the best. The county-wide plan was inaugurated with significant community interest and financial commitment. The Junior College supporters hoped that it would become a leader in the multi-campus Community College movement. This objective was to be accomplished by applying the same successful methods its founders had used in its establishment. This was
to be realized through enlightened planning, preserving community support, and selecting outstanding administrators, faculty, and classified personnel to guide the District in its development. The college administration planned to adopt progressive academic, vocational/technical, and community service curriculums in its quest to meet the total educational and cultural needs of the community.
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CHAPTER IV

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE DALLAS COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

The development of the Dallas County Community College District can best be divided into two phases. When completed, the multi-campus district will be composed of one urban and six suburban campuses. Phase I began August 4, 1965, with the appointment of the District's Chief Executive Officer and President, Dr. Bill J. Priest, and reached completion with the opening of Richland College in September, 1972, the fourth college to be established.

Early in Phase I plans for Phase II were initiated. They began to be developed in August, 1966, with the site acquisition for Brookhaven College, the last of the final three campuses to become operational in 1978, during Phase II. The completion of this multi-campus project will place Dallas among the largest community college districts and, in the minds of some, make it an outstanding leader of the community college movement in this country (1, pp. 6-12).

Phase I: The Opening of El Centro

The Board of Trustees met continually and sought to get preliminary work done prior to Priest's arrival. The
Sites Committee was actively formulating criteria for site selection, conducting public meetings with representatives of the Metroplex Chambers of Commerce for suggestions of campus locations, and securing the advice of junior college consultants (55). At one such meeting in Oak Cliff, guidelines were drawn up for communities, organizations, and individuals submitting site recommendations for Board consideration. "It was determined to set a 90-day limit for the submission of recommendations, and it was decided to look for a 200-acre site rather than a 100-acre site" (56). Welch, Chairman of the Sites Committee, said that the sites under consideration included several offers of land gifts, land available for less than market value, and other parcels that might meet the District's needs (56). The Committee desired to facilitate and expedite its work by deciding that the legal requirements for land purchase and site analysis and evaluation must be programmed. Consequently, Attorney Henry P. Kucera was retained as counsel for all the District's legal matters and the Marvin Springer Consultant Firm was employed to study such factors as developing population trends, access ways, zoning, availability of utilities, and to do mapping and aerial mapping of prospective campus properties (57).

Before the Board could proceed with the execution of their plans, it was necessary to begin translating the $41.5
million bond approval of the voters into real money for the management of the District's business affairs. In accordance with Article 2815h of the Revised Civil Statutes of Texas, as amended, the Board adopted the tax rolls of Dallas County and entered into a contract with County Assessor-Collector, Ben Gentle, for the collection of tax monies for the District. The Board authorized Thornton to advertise the sale of $15,000,000 of General Obligation Bonds in local newspapers and elsewhere, inviting bids from banks wishing to become paying agents for paying interest and maturities of the bonds, the last maturing in 1987 (58). These bonds were "for the purpose of construction and equipment of school buildings and acquisition of sites . . . " (58). The sealed bids were opened at a public hearing in the District office on November 11, 1965, with the low bid of 3.38714 per cent by, Harris Trust and Savings Bank, Chicago, and Associates receiving, the contract (60).

Feeling a sense of urgency, the Board believed it was imperative to open the first college as soon as possible. Priest was beginning to assemble his administrative team, but he informed the Trustees that "there would be no chance of building and opening a new campus before September, 1968, if proper planning is done" (59). He expressed hope that two campuses would be operational by 1969, a third in 1970, and a fourth in 1971 (59). However, he did confer with
Rod Bell, Chairman of the Dallas Hospital Council, concerning the nursing needs in Dallas and the shortage of instructional personnel in the nursing field. Priest pledged to make a determined effort to cooperate with Dallas hospitals in beginning some programs in September, 1966, using hospital facilities (59).

Consistent with the District's philosophy that "a community college, being a community institution, must be sensitive to changing community needs and adapt readily to those needs," Priest altered his earlier position and committed the District to opening an interim campus by September, 1966 (79, p. 1.1). He took this action because of the need and because the hospitals, the YMCA, and other civic organizations were ready to cooperate, by making their facilities available to expedite the opening of a new college.

In view of the rapidity with which decisions and the initiation of actions were required, the Board decided to review the working relationship between them, the President, and the Board Committees. As subsequently incorporated in the Policies and Procedures Manual, it was decided that Priest would act as the "executive officer of the Board . . . exercising discretionary authority in carrying out [the] responsibilities of the position," (79, p. 37), and "a consensus supporting [the] perpetuation of the committee framework was reached" (59).
Once a commitment was made to have the interim campus operational by September, 1966, it obviously meant that a new plant could not be built that quickly and that an existing structure(s) must be found to house the new operation. The Union Railroad Station and adjacent properties were first considered, but negotiations were too complex and lengthy and were abandoned (47). In a memorandum to the Trustees on March 11, 1966, Priest suggested that

the Sanger-Harris Building [Main and Elm Streets in Dallas] and adjacent lot are the facilities which seem to offer the best solution to the immediate problem. Negotiations have been carried out with O. L. Nelms and the district has before it an offer at 2.3 million. There may be a bit more "give" to the price. Since time is of the essence, Nelms is being invited to negotiate directly with the Board and President... It is hoped that a meeting of minds can be reached, since we must select a facility if we are to keep our September commitment (47).

Assuming that the foregoing plans would materialize, Priest informed the Board that Spafford and his Building Committee had decided that an architect must be selected no later than March 18. The President added,

Please bear in mind that the approach being proposed for use of the Sanger-Harris Building involves an absolute minimum expenditure consistent with safety and educational adequacy. The time factor and financial controls are such that Frank Lloyd Wright couldn't do much with this problem. The solace must be derived from the knowledge that the facility is to be used in its initially remodeled form from 3-5
years after which it will be sold, razed or made a part of an expanded facility. In short we need an architect who can do a rapid craftsmanlike job of remodeling the interior of this edifice. Some aesthetic appeal can result from color patterns, but latitude for structural artistic manifestations will . . . be pretty limited (47).

On March 12, 1966, in a letter to Nelms, Priest requested a short written statement indicating agreement with the proposed $2,150,000 payment by the Dallas County Junior College District for two city blocks and buildings owned by Nelms and associates. Nelms was informed that the Board would receive this recommendation at their March 15 meeting. Priest said, "Since I serve as administrator for a political subdivision, it is essential that the Board of Trustees officially approve the sale and purchase agreement which I have negotiated for the District" (84). Nelms wrote Priest on March 14, confirming the expected consumation of the Sanger-Harris property transaction but he cautioned him:

I must advise you that there exists in our co-ownership arrangement an option under which the minority owners may, within a 10-day period, buy out the majority owners if a contemplated sale price is not acceptable to the minority owners. . . . [However] I have no doubt but that our sale agreement will be officially approved by my associates . . . (84).

The purchase of the two city blocks, bounded by Main, Lamar, Elm, and Market streets, was consumated by the Board on March 15, 1966. Priest observed, following the next meeting of the Trustees, "the public reaction to the purchase of
[the] Sanger-Harris property has been very good and the Board is anxious to continue to merit favorable public support. They want to continue conscientious use of public funds" (63).

The Trustees immediately initiated the selection process for employing an architectural firm to plan the remodeling of their newly acquired properties. Fortunately, as early as November, 1965, the Building Committee had done some preliminary planning on this matter. The criteria and the evaluation and rating procedures they developed were also expected to serve as a reference for future District construction projects. They decided to compile a list of architects from professional sources of information, acquaintances of the Board members, and those asking for consideration. It was agreed that the list would be narrowed to four to eight firms that would be invited for an interview with the Board. No names were to be announced until the final selection had been made (6). The basic District criteria for evaluating architectural firms were

1. Technical competence in school architecture as would fit the needs and problems in Dallas County.
2. Ability to work cooperatively with all school personnel.
3. Reliability and integrity.
4. Professional maturity.
5. Evidence of artistic talent above and beyond the minimum required for economic success in the field of architecture.
6. Ability to work within the budget.
7. Evidence of willingness and ability to give personal attention in line with demands of the project.
8. Capacity to handle 1 or more District jobs in time available.
9. Imagination and ingenuity—design, functionality and cost.
10. Incentive likely to be generated by projects of this type (5).

Enslie O. Oglesby, Jr., was awarded the architectural contract on April 4, 1966. The Trustees expressed confidence that his organization would give the work top priority and would maintain continuous on-location contact with the work (64).

In addition to the $2,150,000 purchase price of the Sanger-Harris Building, the Board decided that the District would ultimately need six additional sites instead of four and that the six suburban campuses would require a minimum of 200 acres of land rather than the 100 acres previously suggested (56). Some citizens expressed fears that taxes for the "college will skyrocket." But Board President Thornton responded, "This won't happen" (2). Editorializing in support of Thornton, the Dallas Morning News commented, "His statement is a defensive one, naturally, because the Trustees have been the focal point of a good deal of public apprehension. The trouble seems to stem from the Junior College plans that the voters bought and the plans that now exist" (2). Thornton contended that their plans had been too small and that it was better to go first
class and invest one dollar now rather than ten to twenty dollars in future years. He reminded readers that this type of error is evident at Love Field, City Hall, and Memorial Auditorium. "Planning big can sometimes be costly, but not nearly so expensive in the long run as planning small" (2).

The fears of some citizens never received enough support to result in any organized opposition. Conversely, Dr. Donald T. Rippey, Dean of Dallas County Junior College, observed that there was significant interest in the new college and that "fifty-six high schools in Dallas County contacted to explain to them the programs to be offered this fall . . . indicated interest and enthusiasm. . . . Twenty five hundred applications have been distributed to these high schools" (64).

Despite the fact that plans for the interim campus were developing rapidly, it was still a nameless institution. Consequently, the College Affairs Committee, chaired by Margaret McDermott, recommended that the Board select any one of the three names which they had agreed upon: Crossroads College, Nimitz College, or Cibola College (67). Sybil Hamilton, Public Information Director for the District, recalled,

At the Board Meeting [May 3, 1966] when the name issue was raised for discussion, Hatti Belle Hoffman, a Van Cronkhite employee still working for the District, spoke up and said,
"Why don't you name it, El Centro?" All the Board liked it, and they did so name it. Margaret [McDermott] was away at the time and when she came back and found out the name had been decided the feathers just flew. But there was no backing down by the rest of the Board (39).

Simultaneous to these developments the Curriculum Committee of the Board was outlining the basic assumptions underlying the curriculum needs for the new college. The Trustees approved the Committee's following recommendations.

1. School will operate on the semester basis.
2. The requirements of State Laws and of Senior Institutions will be observed and adhered to in establishing the curriculum of the college.
3. No sophomore courses will be offered the first year.
4. Physical education facilities will be provided for course work.
5. Technical/vocational courses will be offered.
6. Maximum enrollment will be 2,000 students.
7. ACT tests will be needed for guidance, counseling, and transfer requirements.
8. Remedial and guidance study classes will be offered (62).

Having already been granted "correspondent status" by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, Dallas County Junior College was now eligible for federal subventions. Priest reported to the Board in December, 1965 that applications to the federal government for $223,900 in student loans, work-study grants, and educational opportunity grants had been made (61). Priest was pleased to report to the Trustees on April 19, 1966, that he had
received a telegram from Graham Purcell, U. S. Congressman, 13th District of Texas, stating that Dallas County Junior College was being awarded a $55,130 Education Opportunity Grant (65).

Other matters in this area of development were being administered by Dr. A. M. Philips, Vice-President of the college. He early secured Board approval for a competitive faculty salary schedule, providing a minimum salary of $6,000 for an instructor holding an AB degree and no previous experience, while an instructor holding a doctorate and fifteen years of experience would receive a salary of $12,000 per school year (63).

Philips also sought advice from the District's Counsel, H. P. Kucera, regarding the Trustee's "right to give preference to residents of Dallas County for attendance as students" at Dallas County Junior College. Kucera replied that the College "is a governmental agency, [and] . . . under the law residents of Dallas County are entitled to preference" (45). He continued, " . . . I believe it is required by law to charge the non-residents a larger tuition fee than . . . the residents" (45). This conclusion was drawn from the State Supreme Court Case of Love v. City of Dallas regarding these same issues involving the Dallas Independent School District. Problems such as these were continuing to be resolved sufficiently to allow
Philips to inform the Board by the first of May that faculty employment was about 50 per cent complete and the El Centro Admissions Office had received 300 student applications, indicating an anticipated enrollment of 1500-2000 by the beginning of classes in September (67).

By the middle of May, Oglesby had completed the architectural plans for remodeling El Centro and contractors were preparing their bids for submission to the Trustees on May 5, 1966. The Committee of the Whole soon met for some ten hours . . . going over the recommendations pertaining to contractors and bids on the remodeling project for El Centro College. On the assurance of the contractor that it could be done and would be done [within the prescribed 100 days], the Committee . . . recommended [and the Board approved] that the . . . T. C. Bateson Construction Company be awarded the $3,017,400 contract (12).

Drolly commenting on these developments, Priest said,

The project is a very typical one and is certain to involve a liberal quota of frayed nerves among all persons associated with this crusade for an "instant campus." The office down here is really jumping and the wild expressions developing on the faces of some of the "hired help" bespeak the gravity of the situation! In short, things are normal (48).

A project of this magnitude involves various local governmental agencies which may or may not expedite the completion of a project on schedule. Architect Oglesby wrote the Board that many problems had been encountered in the El Centro remodeling project, but "we feel that you
would be interested in knowing that this project has received a great deal of special attention from all municipal offices having jurisdiction, particularly from the Fire Department . . . and the Building Inspection Department" (44).

The Bateson Construction Company, on the other hand, was not as cooperative as the city officials. By mid-July, college officials were arguing that construction was twenty-one days behind schedule, the allocation of manpower was inadequate to complete the work on schedule, and the contractor was attempting to substitute lower quality material. These problems were creating tensions between the contractor, architect, the college, and others. Priest stressed the need to "continue very close cooperation on and surveillance of these vital matters so that the completion schedule will be consistent with the educational commitments of the district" (27). Bateson informed the Board that there were approximately 300 workers on the day shift and seventy-five on the night shift. The College denied this and charged that an investigation revealed that there were "actually only approximately 160 to 180 workers on the day shift and approximately 30 to 60 on the night shift" (70). Subsequently, Bateson employed a new job superintendent and assigned more personnel to the project, resulting in improved relations and more rapid progress. The work was not completed
for the opening of school but enough was completed to allow construction and classes to operate concurrently (50). Although Bateson ultimately finished the project, the Board was continuing to apply pressure as late as November 2, 1966. Speaking for the Board, Thornton critically observed,

Construction, which was supposed to be completed September 1, might go on another 100 days or even 200. There is no apparent effort to finish the building by Christmas or by next year. . . . The administration has been tearing its hair out trying to get him to finish what he promised to deliver 100 days ago (89).

Despite the many difficulties and pressure of time encountered, El Centro became operational as scheduled, with a total enrollment of 4,318 credit and non-credit students (71). This was so impressive that it inspired the Galveston News in Galveston, Texas, to urge its readers to support plans for "bigger enrollments" than the newspaper's surveys had indicated (23). Similarly, the Houston Chronicle in Houston, Texas, solicited community support for Houston's junior college effort by observing that other Dallas area colleges were not adversely affected by El Centro's capacity enrollment (25).

Major factors contributing to the burgeoning enrollment at El Centro were the recommendations from community advisory groups, individual counsel, the Chamber of Commerce, the Texas Employment Commission, and consultation with the State Vocational Department of Education (15). These
advisory groups helped cultivate lines of communication between the college and the community. This aided the college in adapting its educational efforts to meet community needs, and through committee advice, remain flexible and responsive to meeting those needs. The committees generally fell into two categories:

The first is an industry-wide or service-wide consulting committee, whose members have a broad understanding of the employment needs and trends of the area they represent. This type of committee serves to select occupations which should receive priority attention for consideration in program selection and development. The second category is the committee whose members are working at or dealing with the occupation for which the training program is being designed. The work of this committee is to advise of the desirable skills and proficiency levels for job entry so the curriculum may include the most effective training (74).

The college also added balance to its total curriculum by accepting the request of the Grand Prairie Independent School District that it assume the administrative responsibility for the federally funded Manpower Development program. Priest said, "... the fact that it is possible for the junior college to assume responsibility for these programs which have been operated by the Grand Prairie School District is an example of the close cooperation between the college's county-wide district and one individual school district" (82).

Soon after the District was established, several citizens and concerned groups indicated that they were
interested in providing gifts and scholarships for students (54). This necessitated the formulation of policies for receiving and managing funds other than tax monies allocated for District operations. The Board established a basic policy on financial aid gifts, donations, and bequests, which would provide some guidelines for the future. They provided that

1. Philanthropic activity from individuals and corporate concerns should be encouraged.

2. All potential donors should seek advice and approval from the President and, if necessary, legal counsel of Dallas County Junior College prior to completing arrangements for making a gift.

3. General categories for gifts should be established. For example:
   a. Loans, with emphasis based on need.
   b. Scholarships, with emphasis based on scholastic ability.
   c. Grants, with emphasis based on talent.

4. Student eligibility for aid under any category should be established by the District.

5. Donors should be encouraged to make unrestricted gifts but other provisions should be made (65).

In the area of government loans and grants, the Board entered an agreement with the Texas College Coordinating Board in order to receive student loans from state funds. The agreement read,

Both parties agree to comply with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 which states: "No person in the United States shall on grounds of race, color, national origin, be excluded from participating in, be denied the
benefits of, or be subject to discrimination under any program or activity receiving federal assistance" (68).

The trustees further resolved that Priest was authorized to represent the District in applying for state and federal funds, and "when such funds are received . . . it shall be his responsibility to see that such funds are properly utilized for the purposes intended by law" (68).

El Centro College became operational on September 19, 1966, and for the Board, administration, faculty, staff, and students it was considered a major accomplishment for Dallas County and the fulfillment of a promise. As Priest took note of his first anniversary with the District he reflected upon the District's progress. Priest said the " . . . selection of the District's first administration and faculty, selection of suburban campus sites, and the opening of El Centro College to more than 4,000 students preceded by a major team effort in the planning and remodeling stages were major accomplishments" (73). He said it had been a tremendously rewarding, exhilarating, and challenging year for him personally and professionally. He expressed his appreciation to the Board for their support and cooperation and assured them that he would continue striving to build a superior junior college to serve Dallas County (73).
Phase I: Mountain View, Eastfield, and Richland Colleges Become Operational

Bringing El Centro College to an operational level by September 19, 1966, occupied most of the attention and efforts of District personnel. This was crucial because El Centro would not only be involved in the actual educational process itself, but it would also serve as a base for planning and developing the other three campuses which were to be built for the completion of Phase I.

In the spring of 1966, Priest appointed W. S. Miller as purchasing agent for the District to initiate the campus site acquisition project. Priest and Miller worked closely with the Trustees in dividing the county into six zones (A-F as seen in Appendix XIV) where they hoped to purchase campus sites with the greatest accessibility to the citizenry, fulfilling another promise made in the first bond election a year earlier. An extensive review of all available parcels of land, including those offered as gifts, or those for sale, were evaluated and rated for desirability on the basis of criteria established by the Board.

As early as April, 1966, Miller began to investigate the possibilities of purchasing the most desired locations in each zone. Upon an investigation of the desired property in zone C, it was learned that the Dallas Independent School District had just purchased it for the subsequent construction
of Skyline High School (38). Max Goldblatt, a former Steering Committee member, and numerous other citizens interested in having a campus located in the Mesquite-Pleasant Grove area, were urging the Board to consider another site available which was adjacent to the Buckner Children's Home. The group did stress, however, that the specific property was not crucial, but having a college in their area was (38). Consequently, due to the zoning laws and the accompanying developmental problems of this and other sites, Miller, in conjunction with special Planning Consultant Frank Schroeter, recommended that an attractive offer for their third-ranked site (ultimately named Eastfield College) be given immediate consideration (66). At the time, this property was used by a golf club, making it more conducive for development as a college campus. The location seemed to be very desirable, being bounded on the south by Interstate Highway 30, on the west by La Prada, on the north by Oates Drive, and on the east by Harvey Drive (86). A purchase agreement on this property was signed for approximately $973,000 for 245 acres of land.

Throughout the months of July and August, Miller, Schroeter, and Deon Holt, Director of Planning and Research continued to negotiate the purchase for campus sites. The purchase of the A area site, subsequently named Brookhaven
and located at the northeast corner of Valley View and Marsh Lane, posed no significant problems. The accomplishment of the purchase of the 205-acre tract at approximately $1,470,000 (86) was delayed until early September because of some tax benefits open to the property owner (49). However, after Brookhaven was purchased, a delegation of city officials and interested citizens from Farmers Branch urged the Trustees to relocate this campus because the city's master plan called for the development of "very fine residential subdivisions on this property . . . " (75). Priest later observed that this involved the construction of a street and the laying of a major sewer line through the proposed campus.

We said "no, you can't do that. You'll foul it up." They said, "Well, we'll do it anyway." We said, "okay, we'll see you in court." Well, we didn't hear anymore about it. . . . We just felt that the court would have to decide where the public welfare lies because we were not willing to have our long range planning and anticipation torpedoed. . . . We had no master plan on that campus and we weren't about to pop a sewer line across the center and slap an encumbrance against the flexibility that a master planner would have. So you get flack like that. It's built in. But its been minimal (36).

Other than two threatened lawsuits by real estate agents seeking commissions (52), site B (soon to become Richland College) was purchased without any difficulties. City officials from Garland and Richardson supported the
location of this campus at the southeast corner of Lawler and Abrams Road because it was easily accessible to citizens in both communities (49). The Richland campus of approximately 259 acres was purchased at an approximate cost of $1,177,000 (86). It is significant to note that by September 6, 1966, the Board had negotiated the purchase of three campus sites: Brookhaven, Richland, and Eastfield.

Purchasing the property in zone D (subsequently named Mountain View College), located on the northwest corner of Illinois Avenue and Knoxville Road, was the most difficult to negotiate when compared with the acquisition of the other campus sites. This 200-acre parcel was owned by the Lone Star Cement Company of New York City, New York. Their apparent reluctance to sell and the early evidence of inertia in handling the District's offer of $3,500 per acre led Miller and Priest to inform the Board on July 29, 1966: "We had a July 29 response requested in the offer so we can go the eminent domain route anytime the Board decides" (49). Lone Star continued to ignore the District's request and their offer. Consequently, the Board initiated the eminent domain process, resolving on October 4, 1966, that the "District's attorney, Mr. Henry Kucera, be authorized to bring condemnation proceedings to obtain the fee simple title to . . . be not accepted within 5 days from the receipt of such offer by the land
owner" (72). After a year of bargaining, the court case was dropped by the District, because District officials successfully negotiated the right for a highway to eventually be constructed across the northern boundary of the Mountain View property, which joined a portion of the property retained by the Lone Star Cement Company. The purchase contract was ultimately signed for $769,786 (31).

The Cedar Valley and North Lake sites were purchased with minimal difficulty. Cedar Valley, located at the intersection of State Highway 342 and Wintergreen Road, was purchased November 15, 1966, for $697,929, and included 344 acres. The Board was informed that the total acreage of this property is greater than that originally deemed necessary for campus sites; however, it is necessary to acquire this amount in order to give an acceptable configuration to the site because of the multiple ownerships involved. Also, it is anticipated that there may be a need for an agricultural program in the district which would demand a college operated farm, and this acreage would meet such need (28).

The North Lake property, consisting of approximately 277 acres and located in Irving near the Las Colinas Country Club, was finally purchased from the Belknap family on December 20, 1966, for the sum of $962,181. This was the completion of the land-purchasing project for the development of six suburban campuses. With this hurdle negotiated, valuable time and energy could be directed toward
the development of each college and the multi-campus district concept.

From this point on, the policies and procedures adopted by the District generally provided uniform standards for all four campuses in their development. The few variations were usually unique courses offered on a particular campus. Such offerings were considered appropriate for the segment of the Dallas constituency the individual campus served. For example, at Mountain View, a student could study avionics technology; at Eastfield, automotive technology; at El Centro, nursing; and at Richland, ornamental horticulture (18).

An examination of some of the policies and the execution of them indicates why authorities such as the United States Office of Education predicted that El Centro College "would become 'the most successful urban college in the nation'. . . . The . . . 'visionary leadership' . . . 'combined with the educational vacuum in 2-year institutions in the area and the generous commitment of resources on the part of the Dallas community, give promise to a fine future for this district' " (1). The report concluded, " . . . the Dallas District will surely be one of the most effective in the country" (34). Studying the process for the execution of those policies provides some understanding of how the District attempted to complete Phase I and fulfill those predictions.
Priest appointed a planning staff, composed of faculty, outside consultants, and administrators, to outline the direction the new colleges should take in their development (51). These advisors visited several junior colleges from New York to California in drawing up their recommendations for educational specifications. Outside consultants submitted recommendations for such programs as library automation, technical-occupational courses, theater planning, and physical education courses. The planning staff also provided the architects with a collection of data vital to the planning of each campus (29).

A master plan was developed for each college based on the educational philosophy that "the curriculum, the administrative organization, and the design and relationship of buildings must have service to students as their principal objective" (29). An effort was made to escape the traditional combining of service and learning areas on a campus by adapting the core curriculum approach to the "cluster" facility design as utilized in the "educational village" concept at Eastfield College (14). As plans progressed, trends evolved emphasizing the functional rather than the conventional development of the future colleges.

In recent years "mass" higher education has been criticized for becoming too large, unwieldy, and impersonal. An objective of the modern junior college has been to give
the individual student a sense of identity and belonging rather than a Social Security or IBM number. The planning staff wanted to see the District break down the "rigid distinctions between instructional areas, administrative areas, and 'communal' areas; i.e., meeting places or activity points such as eating, studying, lounge, and recreation areas" (29). Accepting the recommendations of these planners an effort was made to decentralize or departmentalize the operations of each college. An effort was made to develop physical designs which would encourage communication between students, faculty, and administrators by integrating various functions of the college such as counseling, learning resources center, food service, lounge and recreation areas, and the like. When Eastfield became operational in the fall of 1970, the administration announced that "students will share responsibilities with faculty members and administrators in recommending policies for every area of campus life. . . . Eastfield is committed to work as a team in generating and utilizing new ideas . . . " (19). Each of the campuses attempted to effect these concepts by planning satellite lounge-study areas which included limited learning resource materials, study carrels, and eating spaces served by vending machines.

Consistent with this student- and community-centered approach to education, concern for the physical appearance
of the campuses was expressed by students and interested citizens. Trustee Margaret McDermott responded that

early in the planning phase, the DCJC trustees concluded that as a great city must be beautiful, an outstanding college shall also be beautiful. They set out to create environments which will attract students, enrich their college experiences and upgrade the quality of public structures in the entire county (26).

The college administration recommended that the Board adopt a general policy statement expressing its concern for developments in areas surrounding the campuses. They expressed the wish to "create the most desirable environment for the colleges" (80). Furthermore, the "district administrative staff and . . . architects are authorized to work with city and county officials and land developers to influence insofar as possible the achievement of this objective" (80). It was suggested that "in general, any good quality residential development, either single or multiple family, [would] . . . be the most desirable neighborhood . . . " (80).

The purpose of establishing these colleges was to provide a junior college education for all who desired it. Thus, the Board stated that "THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE [as of January 1, 1972, the Board of Trustees, resolved to change the name of Dallas County Junior College District to Dallas County Community College District] HAS a fundamental responsibility of providing leadership to the community in educational and cultural matters" (79, p. 1.1). A major
emphasis was placed on the "individualization and personalization of instruction according to the needs of the students" (8, p. 32). An effort was made by the District to coordinate its instructional programs and yet to encourage decentralization for the purpose of stimulating innovation on each campus. In this "student-oriented" atmosphere, faculty members on each campus were assisted in their efforts to utilize "individualized instruction through instructor-student contact for learning goals, programmed and packaged materials, and modular instructional units" (11, p. 17). It was believed that the freedom of creativity and innovation expressed in these approaches to community college education were major advantages provided by a multi-campus district (11, p. 17).

In the development of technical-occupational programs much valuable assistance was provided by hundreds of citizens from business, industry, social service agencies, and others from the community, serving on advisory committees to the District. The colleges have desired to "be sensitive to changing community needs and adapt readily to those needs" (79, p. 1.1). However, Priest observed that one of the continuing problems facing the colleges was the disinclination of students to enroll in these programs (7, p. 27). Another effort was made to increase enrollment in this area by holding an open house at El Centro, called
Technorama. Its purpose was to call to the attention of high school students, counselors, and parents the "vast opportunities . . . in . . . business, industrial, and health-service fields" (22). They also wanted to inform people of new fields that were opening up and of the opportunities available at El Centro. Subsequently the other colleges planned to provide training in other areas qualifying students to find employment in those areas. By 1972, the District, with the advice of the advisory committees, offered sixteen new programs, increasing the total offerings to fifty-eight in the technical-occupational curriculum (11) (see Appendix XV). In 1968, "out-reach" programs, such as Career Advancement Now (CAN) placed educationally handicapped students from the lower socio-economic sections of Dallas on a job to work half a day and attend college the other half (78). The following year the URBAN PROGRESS (UP) WITH EDUCATION program "aimed at providing counseling and advisement services for interested persons in their own neighborhoods" was established (8, p. 50).

Other community organizations participated with the District in an effort to solve the local manpower needs were the Coordinating Committee for Career Development, the Cooperative Area Manpower Planning System (CAMPS), and two organizations within Goals for Dallas. The District and the Dallas Independent School District had formulated
independent and uncoordinated plans for meeting the vocational-technical needs of the Metroplex. Deploring this fact the Texas College Coordinating Board said, "Without coordination, some duplication of expensive facilities and programs seems inevitable" (10, p. 5).

The Dallas Coordinating Committee was formed in 1970, and was composed of administrators from the District and the Dallas Independent School District. They began to work on identifying the area's manpower needs, and tried to avoid duplication in their programs wherever possible. The Goals for Dallas office also organized the Council on Continuing Education, which was comprised of representatives from public and private colleges involved in technical-occupational programs. Its objective was to eliminate further duplication and unnecessary competition (10, p. 5).

The District was attempting to adapt its curriculum to community needs by adding courses prospective students needed or in which they were interested. However, Priest stated that adaptation also implies the elimination or reduction of programs when participation does not merit their preservation. In 1969, studies revealed the need to reduce the scope of licensed vocational nursing, data processing operator, and office supervision courses (8, 50). Priest also believed that "the actual 'proof of the pudding' must be ascertained by a survey of students after
they transfer to senior institutions or after they have obtained employment in industry or business" (7, 42).

Priest commended the news media for supporting the District's efforts to make its total curriculum responsive and responsible to the needs and interests of the community. He said,

The mass news media . . . have been extremely generous in their coverage of newsworthy events ever since the district was first conceived and established. Their treatment of specific programs, particularly the technical and occupational programs, has done much to acquaint the community with the kinds of educational opportunity offered by the district. The public's attitude toward the efforts of the district has done much to create firm community-district relationships which are mutually beneficial (7, p. 45).

On another occasion, he wrote to the Dallas Morning News:

"it is appealing to us to note that the [U. S. Office of Education] research report and your synopsis stress the point that the headway made at El Centro is the result of the joint efforts of not only the board and professional staff, but also the community itself" (21).

In the fiscal year, 1970-71, the District augmented its efforts to maintain and improve community support by adding the office of Public Information (9, p. 4). Sibyl Hamilton was appointed Director of Public Information and charged with the responsibilities of keeping the public informed of District developments. This included maintaining
a liaison with all news media, operating a District public information center, coordinating District and college publications, and maintaining a liaison with the college presidents on public information matters (9, p. 4).

Community support was also demonstrated by contributions of equipment and the use of facilities by business and industry. Their willingness to participate in cooperative programs and their scholarship and loan fund contributions were also indicative of community interest and support (7, p. 45). In keeping with Board policies the Chancellor periodically reported gifts and donations received by the District (79, p. 7.18). By 1970, cash donations had totaled more than $28,000, several thousands of dollars in cash and equipment had been contributed to specific divisions of the college, general scholarship donations had increased to more than $34,000, and restricted scholarship donations had exceeded $19,000 (88). The Zale, Hogg, and other Foundations made large and continuing grants in support of such programs as CAN. Grants from the Texas Education Agency and the U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for special educational programs, purchasing equipment, and construction of campus facilities ran into the millions of dollars.

Another area vital to the preservation of good student-college-community relations was the need to assist students
in securing part-time jobs while enrolled in college, and full-time employment after graduation (79, p. 6.23). The District sought to meet this need by establishing a Financial Aid and Placement Office on each campus. Follow-up studies and questionnaires were regularly mailed to students and employers to determine the needs of the students and employers, the quality of college training provided, and how the colleges could aid the students and employers in coming together in a fulfilling and profitable relationship (33).

Community service offerings were introduced and designed to bring the community and the college together. A variety of non-credit courses of varying duration was introduced at each campus. They were designed to provide opportunities for all citizens to form classes or groups, and they were intended to provide students with improved job skills, to aid students to learn a new occupation, or to provide students with cultural enrichment (10, p. 4). By 1972, more than 50,000 people had enrolled in one of these courses, ranging all the way from "Cartooning for Fun and Profit" to "Modern Math for Muddled Mothers" (10, p. 4).

Essential to the development of District colleges was the relationship between the Board of Trustees and the Dallas County constituency. The voters expressed their confidence in the Board when the District was established,
and Board membership changed by only one Trustee until 1974. The *Dallas Morning News* observed that the people "can be assured that their confidence was not misplaced. . . . His [Priest's] leadership and the determination of Thornton and the DCJC trustees to provide Dallas with a first-class educational facility are major factors in developing a community project in which Dallas can take great pride . . . " (76). Priest also recognized the significance of the role of the Board in building good rapport with all segments of Dallas County society. He said,

> The Board is responsible, to a large extent, for the mutually beneficial relationships which exist between the District and its constituents. Functioning as a barometer and interpreter of community opinion and needs, the Board has advised the professional staff of the District on many matters of educational concern. Similarly, the Board has been of assistance in interpreting the educational functioning of the district to the community. Both of these communication channels must permit a free flow of information if the district is to maximize its services to its constituency (7, p. 7).

Government and community college relations were an integral part of the political process involved in the development of the District. In studying this relationship it is convenient to divide it into three categories: securing favorable legislation, obtaining appropriations from government agencies, and interacting pragmatically with government agencies. These three areas of interaction are evident at the federal, state, and local levels.
An individual district or community college may actively concern itself with federal legislation, or it may attempt to accomplish its objectives in concert with the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. In attempting to respond to local needs, the college should also keep in contact with its federal representatives. The Congressmen and the institution represent the same constituency; therefore, it is essential that they cooperate in serving the best interests of that constituency.

The Dallas County Community College District employed Robert Leo in 1968 as a Special Assistant to the President for the purpose of managing the government-District relations. Prior to joining the District, Leo had done an internship in Washington, D.C. in the U.S. Office of Education. Therefore, he knew the personnel in the Dallas Regional Office,

plus a number of people in the federal office, plus a lot of people on the Hill including legislative assistants who do a tremendous amount of the staff work: In fact, they complete papers and put them in the hands of the guy [Congressman] and say, "Say this. This is what you think. . . . " and every Congressman or Senator needs competent staffing to do a lot of his thinking and decision making; Subject to his approval and willingness to proceed with it. . . . Bob knew many of those people and their leadership in education and we have maintained that rapport . . . (35).

The first year Priest headed the Dallas Junior College District, he also served as President of the American
Association of Junior Colleges. After this term ended, he continued to actively participate in the Association's work and maintained a liaison with government officials through his acquaintances who were officials of the Association (36). Subsequently, Leo was appointed to the Association's Legislation Commission, which was instrumental in getting legislation approved by Congress allowing junior colleges to try to gain their "fair share" of federal funds. Leo recalled,

In January, 1969, Senator Harrison Williams, head of the Labor Public Welfare Committee brought a group of us together to talk about junior colleges and how Congress could respond. Out of that came the Community College Bill, 5659. And out of that bill came, what is now called Title X of the Higher Education Amendments in 1972 (37).

On the state level the District, in 1967, wanted the Coordinating Board of the Texas College and University System to permit any officially recognized separate branch campus of any junior college district to apply for grants under Title I, Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, and Title VI, Higher Education Act of 1965, provided that such separate branch campus applications must be submitted through the central administrative unit of the district. . . . (30).

This resulted in Dallas receiving more than twice as much money under this federal grant program between 1967 and 1971 than would have been true under the old policy (30).
A successful effort was launched by the District in January, 1969, in compliance with Article 2746c R. S. Texas, to enter contractual agreements with each Independent School District within Dallas County to simultaneously conduct the District's Board of Trustees and the Public School Board membership elections. This was done, and it proved to be a significant monetary savings to all parties concerned (87).

There were occasions when the District acted to defeat legislation, as well as to support it. Later that same year the District adopted a "Resolution Concerning [Texas] House Bill 137" calling upon the state Senate to defeat House Bill 137. The District contended that "creating a Texas system of vocational-technical post-secondary schools would duplicate, at higher cost, programs which existing junior colleges are designed to handle . . ." (85). The Bill was altered to only allow the state to "develop programs within a public junior college district, if it is established that the public junior college district is unable to operate a program" (32).

Successful efforts such as these suggest that continued contact with Congressmen and legislators was essential. Frequently, institutions only contact their representatives when they are in need of help, but the Dallas District tried to keep its governmental representatives informed of
continuing developments, thereby cultivating a meaningful relationship. The Chancellor, his Special Assistant, the Trustees, and other college officials communicated frequently with their congressional and legislative representatives. Priest observed that a number of state officials assisted the District in various ways. He said, "I work with Bill Brackline, Fred Agnich, and many other legislators... Dick Gieger did work with us, Oscar Mauzy did work with us. Mike McKool did a great deal of fine work for us. We have had good rapport from the delegation. They have been quite supportive" (36).

For example, in March, 1969, Senator Oscar Mauzy introduced a Reclamation of Monies Bill (Senate Bill 407), seeking a $719,475 supplemental appropriation to the District for allocations they had not received in 1966 because El Centro did not become operational until September of that year. The bill was reported favorably out of committee on April 22, 1969, but it did not come to the floor for a vote (32).

The Chancellor's Special Assistant, and the Vice Chancellors also worked with the Texas Education Agency and the Coordinating Board on program approval, course approval, teacher approval, reimbursements, and similar areas of concern. Another major area of interaction, involving appropriations, was the state legislature.
The District initially depended on the Texas Junior College Association legislative representative to lobby for its interests in Austin. Believing that this area of activity needed more attention in behalf of the District, it joined with the Dallas Chamber of Commerce and employed Joe Golman, a former Dallas City Councilman, to lobby for their mutual interests at the state capital (41).

On the national level, Leo worked to get the candidate elected who would provide the greatest measure of support for the District. He also contended that

if you give them a good fight and keep it clean it doesn't matter which side you are on. I work just as well with [Republican Senator] John Tower's people as I do with [Democratic Senator] Lloyd Bentsen's people in Washington. . . . [Republican Representative] Alan Steelman's people, [Democratic Representative] Milford's people. . . . The District as a whole is apolitical but personally they know where I stand. It doesn't affect our relationship (37).

Local agencies and officials have been credited with being exceptional in their support of District plans and policies. Priest observed,

They are very cooperative. The city has always been almost paternalistic in their treatment of us. . . . They have gone as far as the law allows in helping us in anyway they can. . . . The individuals, the policy makers . . . [City Managers] George Schroeter, Scott McDonald, [Mayors] Eric [Jonsson] . . . Wes Wise . . . they're very supportive (36).

Priest and Leo agreed that the secret to making things happen the way one wants ultimately depends on maintaining
good personal relationships with constituents and legislators alike.

The acquisition of government funds was a major interest of the District. This is understandable in view of the demands for more educational services, while available public and private funds continued to decrease. This seemed to require greater government involvement, and that involvement required greater college-government relations. Speaking for the District, Leo said,

You see, I have a belief that you are not going to get funding for special projects unless you work on the legislation and make sure that the community colleges get their piece of the action. So consequently, I am deeply involved in writing legislation at the federal level and writing regulations and reviewing grants (37).

Accepting federal funds for public entities and agencies in Dallas has occurred only within the last ten years. "Up until that time they were a 'no, no' " (37). When District officials became aware of dollars being available, they worked diligently to secure them. They were confident that if they did not obtain the funds some other institution would receive them.

Also, the fact that there was a change in leadership several years ago ... where people had been in control ... paid personnel that had been in control. For example, the Dallas Independent School District, W. T. White, he left. And they brought in Nolan Estes. I think that cracked the dam, so to speak (37).
District philosophy required the pursuit of federal funds based upon a definite need or purpose. Pursuant to those needs during Phase I, the District received approximately $4.5 million of the $63 million spent in getting four campuses operational (36). The solicitation of government funds was exercised for the construction of facilities, to encourage creativity and effectiveness in instruction, and for student personnel services. In 1969 the District, under the direction of the Chancellor's Special Services Assistant, Robert Leo, applied for and received a $50,000 grant to initiate the URBAN PROGRESS (UP) WITH EDUCATION program.

The primary objective of this experimental project is to try to identify talented youth who might profit from more education but who, for whatever reason, have chosen not to do so. Vocational guidance (career planning) for those who will not receive formal training beyond high school is also envisaged. The project staff will attempt to achieve its objective through activities such as counseling, dissemination of information, acquiring financial aid to continue training, and assisting in the placement of youth in training stations, either in school or on the job. . . . Mobility will be a primary dimension. . . . In order to carry out this mobility, plans call for the purchase (or rental) of a van . . . (81).

The District also received other federal grants, such as Work-Study, Career Advancement Now, Library Grants, NDEA Projects, Med-Vet Project, Municipal Workers Project, Equal Opportunity Grants, National Science Foundation, and Allied Health Professions Project (9, pp. 18-22).
Additional funds were received for similar projects such as the development of TV courses. In 1972, $75,000 was used in developing a government course for TV, and it was so successful that $600,000 was subsequently allocated for the development and expansion of a TV curriculum. "I would think that would be a classic example of something that started on a modest basis and is now burgeoning. Probably in five years from now we will have 15,000 to 20,000 enrolled and quite a staff for production . . . ." Priest said (36).

A $6,000 project, called the Response System, was not as successful as the TV venture. It was intended to provide immediate electronic response from the student to the lecturer. The System was impractical and was never used (36). The latter type of experiences have tended to be more infrequent than most of the District's funded projects during the development of the District.

State funds received by the District were largely appropriations, dispersed according to an enrollment formula prescribed by state law. The state allocations total approximately 40 per cent of the District's budget, compared to about 2 to 4 per cent federal funds. However, there are some state funds available for special projects. In 1970, "an initial 9-month grant of $10,271.50 has been received from the Texas Education Agency for the planning
and development of a program to train paraprofessionals to serve the deaf. This is the only program of its kind in the nation" (17). By 1973 the state agency had increased its grant to $14,173 (90).

The pragmatic, or day-to-day, interaction between the District and governmental agencies contributed to the image the former had within the community it served. It frequently served the interests of its constituency in unusual ways. In the first year of operation, the District hired a part-time tuba virtuoso, who was a member of the Dallas Symphony Orchestra, for $12.50 per hour to teach private lessons. He taught for three hours and the District owed him $37.50. A prerequisite to receiving his pay was his signature to standardized forms which included an oath of loyalty to the United States. He refused to sign the forms, in order to bring a test case in Texas concerning the constitutionality of the loyalty oath. This loyalty oath requirement for school employees had been declared unconstitutional in several other states. The District informed the gentleman that state law would not allow payment without his signature on the prescribed form even though District administrators agreed with his position regarding the oath. He was a member of an organization that was opposed to loyalty oaths, and at their urging, he contested the matter in court (36). Priest said he consulted
the District's legal counsel, and then, with tongue in cheek, said,

... We haven't got any ground under our feet. This law is clearly unconstitutional. Why don't we just pay the guy and let them arrest us for illegally paying him because we know the court's position on this? It's been demonstrated a whole flock of times. 

... So we went to pay him and the guy wouldn't take the money. He said, "No, No! We want to have a court case." So we went to the court and said, "We agree with the plaintiff. He's right and we're wrong and we're going to pay him." And the judge said ... "No, you can't pay him." ... (He didn't say this, but inherent in it was, "I want to write a famous decision") ... and so he wrote a glowing court decision immortalizing man's role in the universe, and against tyranny and for motherhood. ... So that's the story as far as we are concerned from our tunnel vision on how we were the culprits whose tyranny brought about a reform in the laws of the state of Texas (36).

In the late 1960's and early 1970's, there was widespread concern for securing and protecting the civil rights of minority groups in our society. Many institutions of higher learning throughout the United States heard the voices of these groups seeking to acquire the democratic benefits of due process for all segments of American society.

Perhaps because the District, in its conception, was committed to social and civil equality for all students, it did not experience the severe tensions that were evident on some other college campuses. However, it too underwent some trying moments. In April, 1970, two black students
were suspended because they played a major role in leading a near-riot on the El Centro campus. It was fashionable at that time, and the allegation of the two black students was the abridgement of freedom of speech. Priest recalled,

Well freedom of speech was, "all you black faces come on over here and we're gonna get these white sons of bitches" . . . Well this wasn't really our idea of freedom of speech. . . . It was very near a riot when our Dean acted very courageously . . . and broke the thing up. And the students were handled with great due process detail and they were expelled for a cause (36).

The Dallas Legal Services Project immediately filed suit against the Trustees, demanding reinstatement in the college, which the judge denied on two occasions (35). Even though the case was never settled in the courts, the students did return to school, and one of them "became a very good friend of El Centro" (36). The District had continually showed great concern for minority rights, exercised initiative, and opened up opportunities for equality of participation and treatment. This served the District well defensively, although this was not the motive for its actions. Priest observed, "We did it because philosophically that is what we were committed to do" (36).

It was essential for the Board, Administration, and faculty to remain cognizant at all times of their responsibilities to the various constituencies they served. The
numerous facets of the political process were utilized and political principles were applied in the successful fulfillment of the objectives of Phase I.

Phase II

Phase I was considered to be complete when Richland, the fourth college in the District to be established, became fully operational, with the addition of the sophomore curriculum in the fall of 1973. Phase II was instituted early in Phase I with the acquisition of the campus sites for the last three colleges scheduled to be built. The Board of Trustees purchased the Brookhaven site in August, 1966, the Cedar Valley site in November, 1966, and the North Lake site in December, 1966 (53).

In July, 1972 the Board and District Administration decided to go to the voters on September 28, 1972, for an additional $85 million needed for the completion of Phase II (20). These plans included the construction of the last three colleges in the District, remodeling and expanding El Centro College, and possibly the expansion of the campuses to accommodate 6,000 full time equivalent students in the District (11). Of that $85 million in bonds to be requested by the Board, $39.5 million was designated for the construction of the new colleges, $10.2 for new and improved facilities at El Centro College, and $32.6 for expansion as needed by the District between 1978 and 1982 (13).
The question in the minds of District officials was, "would their Dallas County constituency withdraw their support because of the property tax increase its passage would require or because of the general inflationary spiral facing the country?" In an effort to stem the tide of any potential opposition, the District again employed the public relations services of Van Cronkhite and Maloy to help organize and conduct the campaign for the bond election (3). Priest appointed Sibyl Hamilton, Director of Public Information for the District, as the liaison between Van Cronkhite and the District.

Work began on campaign strategy to win voter approval in July, 1972. There were two major objectives in the campaign plans to win approval of the bond issue: identification of opportunities for dissemination of information and outlining arguments in support of the bond election (3). John Van Cronkhite recommended that the District send a copy of the Chancellor's Report, scheduled for release August 31, 1972, to all members of the press, and that from that a tabloid be made, which the Dallas Times Herald planned to print in its Sunday, September 3, newspaper (3). Plans also called for a voter registration drive, particularly appealing to the newly enfranchised 18-21-year-old voters who would probably have a personal interest in such educational opportunities (83). News media were to be informed
of Board meetings, particularly those meetings which would involve discussion of the bond election and subsequent plans subject to voter approval. Fact sheets containing vital campaign information were to be mailed to those media people not at the Board meetings (3). It was agreed that the District should establish a Citizens Information Committee composed of citizens interested in the campaign and in promoting the general welfare of the community colleges. Van Cronkhite recommended that a copy of a bond election issue of Outlook, which was a report on District affairs, be mailed to every student and alumnus, and to all the mayors and council members in the twenty-seven county towns. This mailing included a reply card which gave the recipient an opportunity to indicate how he would like to be involved in the campaign. It was further agreed that mailings should go to the various sections of the county, being designed to appeal to the socio-economic level of the citizens within that portion of the county. The District's public information film was also an avenue employed in communicating the issues of the campaign. Appropriate District officials and Board members were asked to be available to the District's Speaker's Bureau to fill requests from organizations and groups to discuss the bond election issues (24). Finally, it was decided that "if inquiries come in from the press---the party line will be---the Chancellor feels strongly that
the Board should hear recommendations before releasing to the press" (3).

Once the avenues for dissemination of campaign information had been identified, it was then essential to develop arguments justifying voter ratification of the $85 million bond program. If the orderly economical expansion of the District was to be continued, the administration believed that action should be taken immediately, if people were not to be denied educational opportunities in the future (3).

In the District's view, the need for skilled labor and the strengthening of the Dallas County economy was served well by the community colleges' providing low tuition rates and financial assistance to their students. It was felt that a more highly trained and educated work force would be less susceptible to unemployment in times of economic difficulties. With the opening of the last three campuses, it was estimated that by 1980, the District would be the primary source of skilled labor in the Dallas Metroplex (3).

It was further argued that estimates indicated that 80 per cent of those enrolled in District colleges would not have gone to college. A drop was anticipated in this percentage in District enrollment as community college education acquired more prestige and as more students
selected a community college within the competitive context of other colleges. Consequently, projections had convinced the administration that by 1980 approximately 75 per cent of Dallas County's high school graduates would choose to attend one of the local community colleges (3).

The news media stressed support for the bond issue because the Board of Trustees had lived up to their responsibilities and deserved continued support from Dallas County taxpayers (13). Four campuses were already operational, nearly 30,000 full and part-time students were enrolled, and Chancellor Priest and the District had received national acclaim for their contribution to the field of higher education (13). The District also provided economical educational opportunities for minority and low-income groups (83). With the completion of all seven campuses no student would be more than fifteen minutes away from a college, and "an educated electorate's easy to govern, but impossible to enslave" (92). Thornton argued that "a student can stay at home, hold a job while he is attending school and have a salable skill when he completes his training" (40). It would also provide the opportunity for those "students who simply don't want to plunge immediately into the hurly-burly of today's gargantuan universities" (4).

Statistical evidence indicated that by 1985, Dallas County's population would reach 2.3 million, compared to
1.3 million in 1970. Consequently, potential student enrollment would require additional educational facilities (20).

There had not been a tax increase to benefit the District since its establishment in 1965, and this bond issue would only require a ten cents per $100 valuation boost in the District's tax rate, increasing the levy to forty cents per $100 valuation. Compared to the Dallas County school districts and to Tarrant County Community College District, the Dallas District's tax rate would continue to be the lowest (20). This meant that a $25,000 homeowner would be paying $6.25 more a year in taxes.

There was no evidence of organized opposition to the bond election, and the limited individual reluctance evidently had little influence on the election results. Criticism was made that the existing system could "adequately fulfill the community's need and any further expansion will be subject to diminishing returns and over-saturation of educational facilities" (91). In anticipation of such an argument, Thornton had said, "If some unforeseen growth develops, it could increase faster, and if the University of Texas at Dallas begins taking freshmen and sophomore students, it wouldn't increase so fast. We won't use the funds if we don't need them, although they are available" (40). It was also argued that the expansion of the District
would threaten the existence of private colleges in the Dallas area, thereby, "initiating unnecessary competition" (91). This would result in a greater tax burden on the citizens of Dallas County (91).

The bond issue was narrowly approved by Dallas County voters on September 23. Out of only 31,638 votes cast, the bonds were approved by only 2,486 votes. Analysis of the results revealed that the proposal would not have passed "if a pair of strange political bedfellows--eight [largely white] suburbs in the northern part of the county and the city's 55 predominantly black precincts--hadn't given the bonds an overwhelming margin, the election could have failed" (42).

It was observed that the closeness of this election could have cast some doubt over future municipal bond requests. Dallas voters had approved $172 million in municipal bonds three months earlier; this might have had a negative effect on the District's bond election. A further analysis of the election results indicated that middle-income voters opposed the proposal, while the area with the lowest per capita income approved the bond proposal by 63 per cent. Perhaps the light voter turn-out was partially due to the low-keyed campaign conducted by the supporters of the bond issue. Voters may have also been somewhat too preoccupied by national politics to become deeply involved in local affairs, regardless of their importance (42).
But considering it was the biggest community college bond total ever approved nationally and that it came during a period when bond issues are failing everywhere nationwide, there is more cause for rejoicing than despair (42).

Dan B. Majors, Chairman of the Citizens Information Committee, observed that

the confidence and optimism with which Bob Thornton, Bill Priest and the board of trustees, after thorough homework and planning, submitted the ambitious proposal to the voter.

The conviction and loyalty with which many individuals and companies, including yours, contributed money and personal effort to make certain that citizens were informed before the election on precisely what was at stake.

And the pride in and optimism about Dallas with which 17,062 Dallas County voters, in a special election over a relatively un-emotional issue, went to the polls and said this is a good investment for our youth and in the future soundness of our county (16).

Prior to April 9, 1974, the Board of Trustees included five of its original seven members. Mildren Montgomery, President of Garland Foods, Inc., and the only black to serve on the Board, was appointed on November 2, 1971, to succeed the deceased Franklin Spafford. In 1969, Jim Scoggins, an Irving architect, defeated charter Board member Dr. Frank Altick for a place on the Board. Comparable to previous elections, candidates in the 1974 election seemed to agree that the campaign was largely a personal popularity contest. Their strategy for getting votes was primarily a matter of "talking to friends, who have friends, who have friends" (46).
The 1974 Trustee campaign showed some signs of "a few issues . . . slowly surfacing in the little-publicized election" which occurred on April 6, 1974 (46). In his bid for re-election Montgomery said that he saw no major issues in the campaign and that he was "running on the record of the current board, to which he was appointed in 1971" (46). He was opposed by Patty Powell, a North Dallas housewife, who was complimentary of the District and the Chancellor but added that improvement is always possible. Expanding this idea, she said, "Quality education to all segments of the community, strong counseling program, excellence in faculty, basic curriculum strength in both academic and technical areas and broad educational options are indispensable to any outstanding community college district" (46).

Loncy L. Leake, an incumbent from Mesquite, said he was also running for re-election on the record of the current Board. He observed that he was "having 'particular trouble' in establishing what he . . . [called] the major issue of the campaign" (46). He did stress, however, that if his opponent, Attorney Robert Power of Irving, were elected, this would give Irving and west Dallas County two representatives on the seven-member Board. Leake contended that this imbalance would not be in the best interests of all the citizens of Dallas County nor the Community College District.
Unlike the other candidates, Power believed that there were issues which should be discussed in the campaign. He solicited voter's support because of my concern as to whether the District is effectively meeting the goals set by all of us at the time of the District's creation, because of my concern as to whether the District is truly offering an opportunity of quality education rather than an emphasis on impressive campuses and physical facilities, because of my concern over the growing tax burden this District is placing on each of us (77).

More specifically, he recommended that the District hire an outside consulting firm to do a cost-benefit study and determine if the District's original goals were being met. He said that the taxpayers should know if the community college graduates were earning at least $2500 more per year, if the colleges were helping to attract new industry, and if retail sales were increasing, all of which had been claimed as benefits of the community colleges when they were founded. Power further questioned the merits of having 600 instructors to 400 administrators, and asked about the academic performance of the District's students transferring to other institutions of higher learning (46). In defense of his being a second Irving citizen on the Board of Trustees, Power said he would be a "county-wide representative, rather than just an Irving trustee" (46). He added that the "administrators apparently are doing a fine job, but the board really
hasn't asked them enough questions to know for sure what their success is" (46).

The two candidates contesting the incumbents' re-election won a reasonable majority of votes out of the meager 10,000 votes cast throughout the District. Powell and Power won largely because of a heavier turnout at the polls in the Irving and Richardson areas (43). Immediately upon the installation of the new Trustees, speculation was expressed that "the tempo of the junior college board may soon pick up" (43). Scoggins observed that the new composition of the Board would produce a greater openness for discussing the District's business in the coming months, and that he believed Priest would bring more points of view on proposals before the Board than had been done previously. Scoggins was said to have been conspicuously the only dissenting voice on the Board, and, in his view, he had "provided the only contrasting opinion to the board majority on many actions, including the investment of DCCCD funds in new college campuses" (43).

Priest observed that it would take a while for the new Board to "shake down as a team." The old Board knew what he thought and he knew what they thought. That group looked at the general policies and plans, while the new members might have some particular interest or need they wanted the District to implement (36).
There may be a tendency to want to espouse that thing they have thought a lot about and believed in a lot. This can often run counter to the generalist Board that says, "Let's do well everywhere but not single out for special emphasis at the expense possibly of others." So you can get into some philosophic pushing and pulling there which is in no sense any evidence of lack of dedication or integrity on the part of anybody. It's just a different level of view toward the role of the board member (36).

If there were divergent views between the four Trustees who have helped guide the District from its beginning and the three new Trustees, they have not been clearly defined. The passing of time, the capacity for accommodation, and the hard work of decision making in guiding a multi-campus District will cause differences over philosophies, policies, and the process of implementation to come into sharper focus.

Phase II has been under development for two years and will be only partially completed when the last three colleges are operational: Cedar Valley College in 1976, North Lake in 1977, and Brookhaven in 1978. It will also include the expansion of El Centro College, and the expansion of other campuses only when a study reveals the need for such construction. As Priest and other District administrators unofficially observe, Phase II may reach well into the decade of the 80's before completion.
Summary

The political process played a vital role in the successful evolution and completion of Phases I and II in the development of the Dallas County Community College District. It drew together diverse entities and interests into a cooperative effort to provide educational opportunities and services to the citizens of Dallas County. Good relations between the District and government agencies as well as between the District and the community were essential for the community colleges to realize the fulfillment of their objectives.

Whether it involved the complexities of campus site purchase, advancing community college interests in general before federal, state, or local government entities, appealing to these same groups on behalf of the District, preserving public support through the dissemination of District information, or resolving an issue before the courts of law, the functioning of the political process played a major role in the District's reaching some of its objectives. District officials agreed that continuous contact with Congress, the state legislature, local government bodies, and federal, state, and local agencies should be maintained to insure the continued growth and development of the Dallas County Community College District.
CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY


18. "Eastfield, El Centro, Mountain View, Richland," Dallas County Community College District, brochure with no date, Office of Public Information, Dallas, Texas.


29. "Information Report No. 1," to Board of Trustees, Dallas County Junior College District, August 1, 1967.

30. "Information Report No. 2," to Board of Trustees, Dallas County Junior College District, August 1, 1967.


34. "Information Report No. 4," to Board of Trustees, Dallas County Junior College District, October 7, 1969.

35. "Information Report No. 2," to Board of Trustees, Dallas County Junior College District, April 7, 1970.

36. Interview with Bill J. Priest, Chancellor, Dallas County Community College District, Dallas, Texas, July 10 and 16, 1974.

37. Interview with Robert Leo, Director of Special Services, Dallas County Community College District, Dallas, Texas, July 11, 1974.

38. Interview with Robert L. Thornton, Jr., President, Board of Trustees, Dallas County Community College District, Dallas, Texas, March 11, 1974.

39. Interview with Sibyl Hamilton, Director of Public Information, Dallas County Community College District, Dallas, Texas, June 24, 1974.


44. "Letter from Enslie Oglesby, Architect, to the Board of Trustees," Dallas County Junior College District Office, Dallas, Texas, June 7, 1966.

45. "Letter from H. P. Kucera, Attorney at Law, to A. M. Philips, Vice-President, Dallas County Junior College," Dallas County Junior College District Office, Dallas, Texas, March 14, 1966.


47. Memo to DCJC Board Members from Bill J. Priest, President, Dallas County Junior College District Office, March 11, 1966.

48. Memo to DCJC Board Members from Bill J. Priest, President, Dallas County Junior College District Office, Dallas, Texas, May 13, 1966.

49. Memo to DCJC Board Members from Bill J. Priest, President, Dallas County Junior College District Office, July 29, 1966.

50. Memo to DCJC Board Members from Bill J. Priest, President, Dallas County Junior College District Office, August 12, 1966.

51. Memo to El Centro Faculty from Bill J. Priest, President, Dallas County Junior College District, October 24, 1966.

52. Memo to DCJC Board Members from Bill J. Priest, President, Dallas County Junior College District Office, November 11, 1966.

53. "Milestones," Dallas County Community College District, Office of Public Information, no date.

54. Minutes of Meeting, Board of Trustees, Dallas County Junior College District, July 6, 1965.

55. Minutes of Meeting, Board of Trustees, Dallas County Junior College District, July 20, 1965.
56. Minutes of Meeting, Board of Trustees, Dallas County Junior College District, August 4, 1965.
57. Minutes of Meeting, Board of Trustees, Dallas County Junior College District, September 7, 1965.
58. Minutes of Meeting, Board of Trustees, Dallas County Junior College District, September 29, 1965.
59. Minutes of Meeting, Board of Trustees, Dallas County Junior College District, November 2, 1965.
60. Minutes of Meeting, Board of Trustees, Dallas County Junior College District, November 11, 1965.
61. Minutes of Meeting, Board of Trustees, Dallas County Junior College District, December 21, 1965.
62. Minutes of Meeting, Board of Trustees, Dallas County Junior College District, February 15, 1966.
63. Minutes of Meeting, Board of Trustees, Dallas County Junior College District, March 18, 1966.
64. Minutes of Meeting, Board of Trustees, Dallas County Junior College District, April 5, 1966.
65. Minutes of Meeting, Board of Trustees, Dallas County Junior College District, April 19, 1966.
66. Minutes of Meeting, Board of Trustees, Dallas County Junior College District, April 27, 1966.
67. Minutes of Meeting, Board of Trustees, Dallas County Junior College District, May 3, 1966.
68. Minutes of Meeting, Board of Trustees, Dallas County Junior College District, June 7, 1966.
69. Minutes of Meeting, Board of Trustees, Dallas County Junior College District, July 6, 1966.
70. Minutes of Meeting, Board of Trustees, Dallas County Junior College District, July 19, 1966.
71. Minutes of Meeting, Board of Trustees, Dallas County Junior College District, September 20, 1966.
72. Minutes of Meeting, Board of Trustees, Dallas County Junior College District, October 4, 1966.
73. Minutes of Meeting, Board of Trustees, Dallas County Junior College District, October 18, 1966.
74. Minutes of Meeting, Board of Trustees, Dallas County Junior College District, October 24, 1966.
75. Minutes of Meeting, Board of Trustees, Dallas County Junior College District, December 6, 1966.
77. "Paid Political Advertisement" for Robert Power for Place 2 on Board of Trustees, Dallas County Community College District, April 5, 1974.
85. "Resolution Concerning House Bill 137," Board of Trustees, Dallas County Community College District, April 8, 1969.
86. "Site Committee Report No. 1," to Board of Trustees, Dallas County Junior College District, August 12, 1966.


92. Weiser, Dan, "Weiser Words," Oak Cliff Tribune, September 6, 1972.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

An analysis of the research allows one to draw some pertinent conclusions regarding the Dallas County Community College District in its first decade of operation. It is a recognized leader in the junior and community college movement because, upon the completion of its seventh campus in 1978, it will become one of the largest multi-campus districts in the country (12). This leadership is further evidenced by its membership in the forty-four-college National League for Innovation. Chancellor Priest has served as President of the American Association of Junior Colleges (1966), President of the League for Innovation (1974), and in an official capacity in other professional organizations.

The District has received many commendations from outstanding educators. For example, representatives of the U. S. Office of Education described the District as giving "promise of a fine future" (2). B. Lamar Johnson, Professor of Higher Education at UCLA, also saw it as being "one of the most innovative junior colleges anywhere"
(14), and Edmund Gleazer, President of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, expressed confidence that the Dallas District has some of the best community colleges in the nation, equipped to offer the community educational opportunities for a lifetime (1).

The people of Dallas County have supported the District from its beginning. The two major Dallas newspapers expressed the sentiments of a number of Dallas citizens by commending the District for its positive contributions to the community. With the opening of El Centro, the Dallas Times Herald wrote that R. L. Thornton, Jr., the other trustees, Chancellor Priest, and "all others connected with this project deserve our heartiest plaudits and congratulations" (8). Again in 1971, they editorialized that "the DCJC has something for everybody . . . and we congratulate its board and administration for a job well done" (4). The Dallas Morning News joined in the commendations for the District by writing, "It [the District] has a proved record of success recognized not only locally but nationally" (5). "In just seven years, the Dallas County Community College District has become one of the most respected in the nation" (15).

The successful passage of the bond proposals in 1965 and 1972 is significant evidence of community approval. Complementing that endorsement has been the granting of
accreditation to all the District colleges by the Southern Association of Schools and Colleges. This professional accomplishment elicits support from the community and approval from professional educators.

Perhaps the strongest evidence of community support comes from the students. "In less than a decade, more than 200,000 students have enrolled for credit and non-credit courses in the Dallas County Community College District" (7). One of this group said,

Without El Centro I'd have been washed up educationally. I didn't try at A & M. I did at El Centro. I had more individual help from the teachers here. There was 20 to a class at El Centro, while at A & M there were classes with 200 to 300 students.

From his start on probation the young man wound up on El Centro's honor roll. More than ever he wants to become a psychologist. I've been reinstated at A & M for the fall. . . . I'm going back with full junior standing (9).

Another student wrote, "I took Auto Body Repair at Eastfield. I knew nothing about auto body before. I have since become automotive manager at a Sears shop and have opened a small body shop of my own which provides considerable income to me" (3, p. 2).

The District colleges are community-centered. A conscious effort is made to meet the needs of all segments of Dallas society. Such programs as CAN, UP, Co-operative education programs, education for Dallas County Jail inmates, course offerings at selected Dallas public libraries,
courses offered in conjunction with the Dallas Independent School District, and the Hamilton Park Center established as an extension of Richland College leave little doubt of the District's concern for the Dallas community (16).

Although the community was united, there were criticisms regarding inadequate communication of transferability of certain courses and conflicts between part-time and evening students over student activity programs (16). Other criticisms of inadequate preparation for academic work in senior institutions continue to be made, but no thorough and adequately documented studies have been done to substantiate the claim that the community college transferees do slightly better than students who initially enrolled in the senior institutions.

This study has also revealed widespread community appreciation and approval of the Board of Trustees. In the Trustee election of 1974, community approval was a major justification for the local news media endorsing incumbents Montgomery and Leake. The Dallas Morning News wrote that it supported Montgomery and Leake because their years on the Board "have been years of dynamic expansion for the Community College system. As the system goes on expanding it will need more than ever the experience of the men and women who have nurtured it through the formative stages" (6). It is safe to conclude that Priest agreed with this assessment. He expressed his feelings for the Board by saying,
The Board has been the single greatest source of thrust in this whole operation. We got an unusual Board. It was not appointed but it was constructed by a broadly based Steering Committee of citizens who went out and tapped seven people on the shoulder and said, "We want you to make yourself available to get this thing off the ground." The people were not soliciting Board posts. The Steering Committee was soliciting power houses to serve on the Board. And they got a "Beaut!" This group had prestige, followership, integrity, ability, vision, and they were most uncommon. They were quite selfless. Nobody was trying to showboat and use it as a launching pad for something along the line. Rather, they came in to get the job done. And the job as defined was to build superior community colleges. . . . The Board had a good relationship with the press. The flow of information from the press was fantastic. So, any person who is chronicling the evolution of this District would come, I think, to the unmistakable conclusion that the Board was the single most important factor in what was historically just very rapid progress (10).

It must also be concluded that with the original Board members outnumbering the more recently elected Trustees by only one, the solidarity of the first decade will be difficult to preserve. Evidence indicates that there will be a greater degree of openness, questioning, challenging, and expression of divergent views regarding District philosophy, policies, plans, and actions. Whether that will be good or divisive depends on the effective refinements of the political process as applied to the innermost circles of the District.

Chancellor Priest, who is recognized as a leader in the field of community college education, feels that his
most appreciated praise comes from his peers and the community he serves (10). Recalling the selection of a Chief Administrator for the District, Board Chairman Thornton said, "Priest stood out head and shoulders above anyone we interviewed, and when the decision was made, the trustees were convinced they had the best junior college administrator in the country" (2, p. 8). Thornton attributed the smooth administration of the District to mutual respect between the board and Priest. "When you have an administration you have great respect for, you don't have any thorny problems." Thornton also regards Priest as a man who "analyzes problems and comes up with logical solutions."

"As long as a man is playing fair and honest and making decisions impartially for the best of the school, people respect him for the manner in which he made the decision, even if they don't agree with him . . . " (2, p. 10).

One may conclude that the Chancellor has the confidence, respect, and support of the community, faculty, staff, and Board members, working with them in reaching their common goals. One instructor commended the Chancellor by saying,

I've always been very critical of administrators, . . . but he's just top-notch. He's been more than fair in all our dealings with him. . . .

A lot of the more liberal faculty members have wondered how this oasis has lasted in conservative Dallas . . . (2, p. 9).

Educational innovation and creativity is encouraged by Priest and his administrative team, and the freedom
to experiment seems to be well appreciated by the faculty (2, p. 10).

The first decade of the existence of the Dallas County Community College District has been eventful and historic. The Dallas County constituency has approved two bond issues totaling $126.5 million. There was no public junior or community college in operation in Dallas County prior to September, 1966, but District officials expect to have seven campuses open by September, 1978. The District has grown from a non-existent budget in 1965 to a $24.3 million budget for 1974 (16). Student enrollment in the District reached 19,990 and the total professional personnel numbered 512 in September, 1972 (see Appendices XVI and XVII).

Consequently, it seems apparent that these and many other events in the course of the establishment and development of the District took place with remarkable community solidarity, efficiency, and speed. The political process was an integral part of the consumation of the district's objectives, whether the task was winning community support for a county-wide District, or moving a city water tower from the Mountain View Campus, or relocating a sewer line in Farmers Branch, or resolving civil rights problems, or securing congressional and legislator accommodations, or winning citizens' support for an $85 million bond issue. The art, skills, and methods utilized in the application
of the political process as evidenced in the successful establishment and development of the Dallas County Community College District should be examined by serious students of the politics of education and those interested in the community college movement.

Recommendations

In her campaign for a position on the Board of Trustees, Patty Powell correctly stated, "We have a fine system, but there's always room for improvement" (13). Some of those improvements should involve the testing of the valid goals the District established at its inception. An appropriate method to accomplish this, as Power suggested, would be to employ an independent consulting agency to conduct such a study. The study should determine if District graduates are increasing their real income an average of $2500 per year, and if, compared to the decade prior to the establishment of the District, retail sales and new industry increased in Dallas significantly above the previous decade.

Evidence is abundant that the District is almost exclusively concerned with the career and technical-occupational programs. In candor, it is stated that "the community college is here to meet the community's labor market needs" (11). This is supported by the journalistic copy space given to these programs. An examination of all
issues of the District publication Outlook reveals that 61 per cent of the articles regarding instruction emphasize technical-occupational and career programs. It is also stressed that in the District's nine-year history, over 1,000 citizens from various Dallas businesses and industries have served on advisory committees for these programs (7).

It seems inconsistent that 60 per cent of the students in the District are enrolled in the academic transfer programs, 60 per cent of the instructional budget is allocated for academic transfer courses, and so little emphasis is communicated to the public concerning innovations and developments in the academic area. There is no indication of any community advisory committees for these programs even though there is an abundance of resource personnel available. In view of this philosophy a thorough study of the academic performance of District students who transfer to senior institutions should be done.

A study has not been done, and the appropriate classification of private funds donated to the District has not been made so that an accurate assessment of this significant source of income could be made. In light of the District's interest in providing Dallas business and industry with well trained and competent employees, it
would seem justifiable to expect a comparable expression of generosity in gifts and donations to the educational programs of the District.

The District's services to the community in humanitarian ventures by bringing educational opportunities to deprived sections of the county are commendable. However, some issues should be confronted. An objective of the District was to have a college within a fifteen- to thirty-minute distance from each citizen's home. Courses are now being offered in public libraries, in public school buildings, in church buildings, on TV, and elsewhere in the community. The Dallas community colleges have established centers in several neighborhoods. In view of the expected expansion of this program, one may justifiably question the validity of spending the taxpayer's money for the construction of three new campuses. However, there is also a philosophic dilemma to the center approach. The Learning Resources Center has been acclaimed as the heart of the college campus. The validity and quality of an educational program that is inaccessible to the campus Learning Resources Center should establish the academic feasibility of the center approach.

These and many other questions will challenge the Board and administration in the future. However, it is safe to conclude that so long as the best interests of
Dallas County citizens are served, those of the District should also be met, because they are synonymous. An indispensable element in achieving that worthy goal is the responsible and effective execution of the political process by all those associated with the Dallas County Community College District.
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APPENDIX I

TABLE II\textsuperscript{a}


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>High School Graduates Dallas County</th>
<th>Per Cent Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955-56</td>
<td>4,361**</td>
<td>. . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956-57</td>
<td>4,569</td>
<td>4.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957-58</td>
<td>5,241</td>
<td>14.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958-59</td>
<td>5,733</td>
<td>9.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959-60</td>
<td>6,547</td>
<td>14.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960-61</td>
<td>7,474</td>
<td>14.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961-62</td>
<td>7,812</td>
<td>4.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Projected</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962-63</td>
<td>8,388</td>
<td>. . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963-64</td>
<td>8,963</td>
<td>. . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964-65</td>
<td>9,538</td>
<td>. . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965-66</td>
<td>10,113</td>
<td>. . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966-67</td>
<td>10,688</td>
<td>. . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967-68</td>
<td>11,264</td>
<td>. . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968-69</td>
<td>11,839</td>
<td>. . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969-70</td>
<td>12,414</td>
<td>. . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-71</td>
<td>12,988</td>
<td>. . .</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX I--Continued

**The above figures are based on the number who would go to the Junior College, if they should go to college. Many other students would go elsewhere.

***Annual average increase of 13.19 per cent.

---

APPENDIX II

TABLE III*

ACTUAL WHITE ENROLLMENT BY GRADES IN THE DALLAS INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT FROM 1956-57 THROUGH 1963-64**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9711</td>
<td>9879</td>
<td>10154</td>
<td>10721</td>
<td>10682</td>
<td>10337</td>
<td>10802</td>
<td>10093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10302</td>
<td>10346</td>
<td>10502</td>
<td>10918</td>
<td>11080</td>
<td>11016</td>
<td>10740</td>
<td>10567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10244</td>
<td>10330</td>
<td>10146</td>
<td>10373</td>
<td>10644</td>
<td>10788</td>
<td>10903</td>
<td>10003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10684</td>
<td>10141</td>
<td>10014</td>
<td>10055</td>
<td>10065</td>
<td>10452</td>
<td>10738</td>
<td>10288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8399</td>
<td>10557</td>
<td>10031</td>
<td>10019</td>
<td>9338</td>
<td>9902</td>
<td>10377</td>
<td>10147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7465</td>
<td>8230</td>
<td>10245</td>
<td>10110</td>
<td>9759</td>
<td>9673</td>
<td>9840</td>
<td>9748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7489</td>
<td>7490</td>
<td>8269</td>
<td>10299</td>
<td>9731</td>
<td>9665</td>
<td>9559</td>
<td>9409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>7138</td>
<td>7394</td>
<td>7328</td>
<td>8314</td>
<td>9898</td>
<td>9564</td>
<td>9633</td>
<td>9143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>6433</td>
<td>6956</td>
<td>7085</td>
<td>7410</td>
<td>8267</td>
<td>10026</td>
<td>9722</td>
<td>9449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5326</td>
<td>5917</td>
<td>6420</td>
<td>6552</td>
<td>6757</td>
<td>7584</td>
<td>9209</td>
<td>8614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4158</td>
<td>4526</td>
<td>5143</td>
<td>5667</td>
<td>5800</td>
<td>5918</td>
<td>6687</td>
<td>8275</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX II--Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3543</td>
<td>3804</td>
<td>4121</td>
<td>4543</td>
<td>5102</td>
<td>5260</td>
<td>5499</td>
<td>5810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad.</td>
<td>2893</td>
<td>3096</td>
<td>3455</td>
<td>3984</td>
<td>4543</td>
<td>4524</td>
<td>4775</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**These data were originally taken from "A Study of a Junior College for Dallas County," C. C. Colvert, 1963, Table I.
APPENDIX III

TABLE IV*

ACTUAL NEGRO ENROLLMENT BY GRADES IN THE DALLAS INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT FROM 1956-57 THROUGH 1963-64**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2487</td>
<td>2672</td>
<td>2757</td>
<td>2974</td>
<td>3215</td>
<td>3373</td>
<td>3692</td>
<td>4064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2240</td>
<td>2518</td>
<td>2712</td>
<td>2761</td>
<td>3032</td>
<td>3278</td>
<td>3395</td>
<td>3775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2259</td>
<td>2295</td>
<td>2527</td>
<td>2735</td>
<td>2841</td>
<td>3032</td>
<td>3335</td>
<td>3522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2155</td>
<td>2292</td>
<td>2387</td>
<td>2578</td>
<td>2793</td>
<td>2884</td>
<td>3041</td>
<td>3404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1669</td>
<td>2152</td>
<td>2286</td>
<td>2326</td>
<td>2638</td>
<td>2799</td>
<td>2882</td>
<td>3062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>1667</td>
<td>2133</td>
<td>2355</td>
<td>2366</td>
<td>2616</td>
<td>2774</td>
<td>2885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1578</td>
<td>1620</td>
<td>1638</td>
<td>2127</td>
<td>2346</td>
<td>2408</td>
<td>2613</td>
<td>2827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1576</td>
<td>1569</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>1654</td>
<td>2077</td>
<td>2323</td>
<td>2370</td>
<td>2589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1514</td>
<td>1602</td>
<td>1590</td>
<td>1618</td>
<td>1588</td>
<td>2089</td>
<td>2324</td>
<td>2564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1051</td>
<td>1086</td>
<td>1215</td>
<td>1245</td>
<td>1239</td>
<td>1303</td>
<td>1779</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>916</td>
<td>969</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>1390</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX III--Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>782</td>
<td>888</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad.</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**These data were originally taken from "A Study of a Junior College for Dallas County," C. C. Colvert, 1963, Table III."
### APPENDIX IV

#### TABLE Va

THE ENROLLMENT PICTURE FOR COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES IN THE DALLAS METROPOLITAN AREA AND IN TEXAS WITH SUBSTANTIAL NUMBERS OF DALLAS AREA RESIDENTS IN ATTENDANCE*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>1955</th>
<th>1958</th>
<th>1961</th>
<th>1964</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arlington State College</td>
<td>2,250**</td>
<td>4,561</td>
<td>7,444</td>
<td>10,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop College</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Texas State University</td>
<td>2,290</td>
<td>2,423</td>
<td>3,065</td>
<td>4,502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Texas State University</td>
<td>5,742</td>
<td>5,885</td>
<td>8,835</td>
<td>10,802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Methodist University</td>
<td>2,839</td>
<td>3,263</td>
<td>5,462</td>
<td>6,973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A &amp; M University</td>
<td>6,699</td>
<td>7,968</td>
<td>7,627</td>
<td>8,174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Technological College</td>
<td>7,429</td>
<td>9,524</td>
<td>13,600</td>
<td>16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Woman's University</td>
<td>2,218</td>
<td>2,319</td>
<td>2,766</td>
<td>3,506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Dallas</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas</td>
<td>16,084</td>
<td>16,985</td>
<td>20,396</td>
<td>26,249</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX IV--Continued

**All figures are as of June of the year given.

APPENDIX V

TABLE VI*

THE NUMBER OF HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATES BY QUARTERS AND THE PER CENT OF TOTAL GRADUATES IN EACH QUARTER WHO ENTERED COLLEGE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of Grads Who Entered College</th>
<th>% of Grads Who Entered College</th>
<th>% of Grads Who Entered College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number graduated in first quarter in June 1962</td>
<td>1158</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>. . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number who entered college</td>
<td>891</td>
<td>76.94</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>66.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number who graduated in second quarter in June 1962</td>
<td>1145</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>. . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number who entered college</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>69.43</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>33.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number graduated in third quarter in June 1962</td>
<td>1138</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>. . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number who entered college</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>60.98</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>28.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Numbers rounded to nearest whole number. Percentages may not add up due to rounding.
** Includes all students who entered college within 12 months of graduation.
APPENDIX V--Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of Grads Who Entered College</th>
<th>Negro Total</th>
<th>% of Grads Who Entered College</th>
<th>White Total</th>
<th>% of Grads Who Entered College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number graduated in fourth</td>
<td>1085</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>. .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quarter in June 1962</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number who entered college</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>47.74</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>19.71</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>54.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**These data were originally taken from "A Study of a Junior College for Dallas County," C. C. Colvert, 1963, compiled from Tables 5 and 6.
## APPENDIX VI*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dallas Standard Metropolitan Area</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1950 Number Employed</td>
<td>1960 Number Employed</td>
<td>1964 Number Employed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>313,652</td>
<td>452,390</td>
<td>519,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Nonagricultural</td>
<td>297,159</td>
<td>437,190</td>
<td>509,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing, Total</td>
<td>55,784</td>
<td>95,720</td>
<td>115,050</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture, Lumber and Wood Products</td>
<td>3,038</td>
<td>3,760</td>
<td>4,270</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabricated Metal Products</td>
<td>2,908</td>
<td>5,700</td>
<td>7,130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machinery (Except Electric)</td>
<td>4,754</td>
<td>9,210</td>
<td>11,150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Machinery and Equipment</td>
<td>1,387</td>
<td>15,330</td>
<td>25,710</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Equipment</td>
<td>7,923</td>
<td>12,990</td>
<td>11,990</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food and Kindred Products</td>
<td>8,143</td>
<td>14,110</td>
<td>14,790</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apparel and Finished Products</td>
<td>8,234</td>
<td>11,070</td>
<td>12,990</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing and Publishing</td>
<td>5,826</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>8,850</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical and Allied Products</td>
<td>2,398</td>
<td>2,740</td>
<td>3,450</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other Manufacturing</td>
<td>11,173</td>
<td>12,810</td>
<td>14,720</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonmanufacturing, Total</td>
<td>241,375</td>
<td>341,470</td>
<td>394,550</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>3,363</td>
<td>8,540</td>
<td>8,540</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>29,473</td>
<td>30,800</td>
<td>35,120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>17,123</td>
<td>23,170</td>
<td>25,910</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX VI--Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1950</th>
<th>1960</th>
<th>1964</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>6,449</td>
<td>7,250</td>
<td>6,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities (Private)</td>
<td>3,624</td>
<td>5,400</td>
<td>5,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade</td>
<td>17,502</td>
<td>42,860</td>
<td>50,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>60,005</td>
<td>78,820</td>
<td>90,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance, Insurance, Real Estate</td>
<td>19,592</td>
<td>33,710</td>
<td>40,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and Personal Services</td>
<td>27,408</td>
<td>36,330</td>
<td>42,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td>17,127</td>
<td>22,970</td>
<td>30,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government (Including Public Education)</td>
<td>21,453</td>
<td>36,180</td>
<td>41,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Households and Miscellaneous</td>
<td>18,256</td>
<td>15,440</td>
<td>16,030</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Including self-employed and unpaid family workers.


*These data were taken from "A Study of Dallas' Vocational Education Needs," Dallas Chamber of Commerce, Dallas, Texas, 1965.
APPENDIX VII*

The Dallas Chamber of Commerce Education Committee manpower report gives the figures in the following tables, based on information supplied by 129 employers in the four-county Dallas Standard Metropolitan Area with employer-estimated total work force of 113,195, a 23.4 per cent sampling of metropolitan area nonfarm employment of 483,710 (TEC estimate of April 1963).

Estimated Recruitment, 1963-64, by Categories (in the 31 Selected Occupations Only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Present Total Employment</th>
<th>For Replacement</th>
<th>For Expansion</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% Current Employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturers</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>50,150</td>
<td>6,799</td>
<td>4,264</td>
<td>11,063</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petroleum</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3,288</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation/Communications</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8,088</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale/Retail Trade</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11,780</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>1,287</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance/Insurance</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7,243</td>
<td>1,608</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>1,819</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32,646</td>
<td>1,268</td>
<td>814</td>
<td>2,082</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>129</td>
<td>113,195</td>
<td>10,722</td>
<td>6,029</td>
<td>16,751</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Note: "Other" includes business and professional services, construction, government, hospital, school public utilities (electric power, gas), and those not elsewhere classified.

Estimated Hiring-Recruitment Direct from Colleges and Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Level</th>
<th>1963-64</th>
<th>1965-70</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total College Degrees (BA/BS, MA/MS, Ph.D)</td>
<td>5,819</td>
<td>10,696</td>
<td>16,515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postdoctoral</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Colleges, Academic</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>1,040</td>
<td>1,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Colleges, Technical</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>791</td>
<td>1,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Schools, General</td>
<td>5,395</td>
<td>19,363</td>
<td>24,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Schools, Technical</td>
<td>1,454</td>
<td>4,771</td>
<td>6,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Schools</td>
<td>1,805</td>
<td>4,767</td>
<td>6,572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>15,041</td>
<td>42,231</td>
<td>57,272</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX VIII*

Scholastic Population. In the last ten years, the scholastic population of Dallas County as a whole has grown faster than in the Dallas Independent School District.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1953-54</th>
<th>1963-64</th>
<th>% Gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DISD</td>
<td>90,491</td>
<td>161,144</td>
<td>78.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other Dallas county school districts</td>
<td>28,762</td>
<td>86,840</td>
<td>201.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISD as % of total</td>
<td>75.9</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources--officials of the respective school districts.

Retail Sales and Effective Buying Power. Total retail sales and effective buying power from 1946 through 1962 increased 264% and 290.11% respectively--a phenomenal growth for this 16-year period.

Growth in Total Retail Sales and Effective Buying Income in Dallas County from 1946 Through 1963 According to the Years Indicated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Retail Sales$</th>
<th>Per Cent Increase</th>
<th>Effective Buying Power$</th>
<th>Per Cent Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>$ 463,480,000</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>$ 705,325,000</td>
<td>. . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>793,005,000</td>
<td>71.10$^{c}$</td>
<td>1,070,810,000</td>
<td>51.82$^{c}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>1,033,463,000</td>
<td>30.32$^{c}$</td>
<td>1,484,440,000</td>
<td>38.63$^{c}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>1,690,553,000</td>
<td>63.58$^{d}$</td>
<td>2,751,544,000</td>
<td>85.36$^{d}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a--Percentage increase from 1946 to 1962 in retail sales is 264.75.
b--Percentage increase from 1946 to 1962 in effective buying power is 290.11.
c--For a four-year period.
d--For an eight-year period.
Assessed Valuation. The basis of assessed valuation of the Dallas Independent School District was increased in 1960. Hence, the increase for the years 1960 through 1963 was used to project the future estimates. This increase was an average of 4.295% per year, slightly less than the average increase of 6% per year for the years 1954-59.

From 1953 through 1962 the assessed valuation for Dallas County increased at an annual average rate of 9.5%. Dr. Colvert used an average annual increase rate of 6% in projecting the increase in assessed valuations of the county.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>DISDb</th>
<th>Dallas Countyc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>1,010,832,660</td>
<td>824,102,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>1,095,466,100</td>
<td>888,193,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>1,181,081,300</td>
<td>994,101,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>1,247,378,330</td>
<td>1,044,083,635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>1,307,976,300</td>
<td>1,099,069,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>1,370,630,991d</td>
<td>1,159,852,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>2,251,917,827d</td>
<td>1,257,704,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>2,342,565,307</td>
<td>1,335,307,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>2,425,088,218</td>
<td>1,416,592,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>2,542,141,175</td>
<td>1,516,399,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>2,735,620,979e</td>
<td>1,788,415,961f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>3,122,577,056</td>
<td>2,257,832,860</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1971  3,219,190,847  2,393,304,229
1975  3,509,372,753  3,021,491,412

b. 42.1% of market value of property.
c. 20.0% of market value of property.
d. Basis for valuation increased from 65% to 100% of 1941-42 market value.
e. 3.1% per year rate of increase used.
f. 6.0% per year rate of increase used.

Annexation. Annexation has been responsible for some of the growth in the Dallas Independent School District valuation. In the period beginning from 1945 to 1964 a total of 160.52 miles were annexed to the District, and 7.68 miles disannexed, or a net annexation of 152.84 square miles. Some annexation is anticipated in the future and will increase which will increase assessed valuations and enrollment of the Dallas Independent School District. (The most recent, August 13, 1964, is a portion of the Seagoville school district that is in Dallas County.)

Enrollment. One of the criteria for the establishment of a junior college is that the district have at least 400 students enrolled in the upper four grades of the secondary schools. The Dallas Independent School District, with 5,179 graduates in 1961 and an estimated 9,026 graduates in 1974-75, easily meets the criterion for either a DISd or a County junior college.

A projected junior college enrollment in the DISD must include those from outside the school district, but still in Dallas County. Those outside the DISD would be charged a higher tuition. (See Appendix VI and Appendix VII)

The Projected Number of High School Graduates for the Previous Two Years for the College Years 1966-67 Through 1975-76
The Index for Each Year and the Projected Enrollment in the Junior College for Each of the Years Indicated in the Dallas Independent School District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No. H.S. Grads. Prev. Two Years</th>
<th>Index&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Projected Enroll. City of Dallas</th>
<th>Projected Enroll. from Outside City</th>
<th>Total Projected Enroll.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1966-67</td>
<td>15,262</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2,275&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1,225</td>
<td>3,500&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967-68</td>
<td>16,249</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>3,120</td>
<td>1,680</td>
<td>4,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968-69</td>
<td>16,453</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>3,965</td>
<td>2,578</td>
<td>6,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969-70</td>
<td>16,415</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>4,726</td>
<td>3,374</td>
<td>8,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-71</td>
<td>16,787</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>6,714</td>
<td>3,586</td>
<td>10,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### APPENDIX IX

#### TABLE VIIa

THE DALLAS COUNTY JUNIOR COLLEGE STEERING COMMITTEE*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. R. L. Thornton, Jr., Chairman</td>
<td>Dallas C. of C.***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Dr. Frank J. Altick</td>
<td>North Dallas C. of C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Tom L. Beauchamp, Jr.</td>
<td>White Rock C. of C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Dr. Emmett J. Conrad</td>
<td>Negro Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Dr. William B. Dean</td>
<td>Oak Cliff C. of C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Rev. Ernest Estell</td>
<td>St. John's Baptist Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. E. G. Gatlin</td>
<td>Richardson C. of C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Max B. Goldblatt</td>
<td>Pleasant Grove C. of C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. C. W. Grantham, Jr.</td>
<td>Grand Prairie C. of C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Dr. David E. Krebs</td>
<td>Lancaster C. of C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Allen Maley</td>
<td>Sec.-Tr. Dallas AFL-CIO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Bernard P. Park</td>
<td>Duncanville C. of C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. E. A. Pledger, Jr.</td>
<td>Carrollton C. of C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Mrs. Russell Pollard</td>
<td>Pres., PTA Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Dr. Joe Pritchett</td>
<td>Mesquite C. of C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. J. Milton Ramsour</td>
<td>Dallas City Hosp. Ass'n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Judge Lewis Russell</td>
<td>Southeast Dallas C. of C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. W. H. Smith</td>
<td>Dallas East C. of C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. James Wilcox</td>
<td>Irving C. of C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Mrs. Ralph Bubis**</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. J. H. Glenn**</td>
<td>Dallas Negro C. of C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Mrs. Ralph Henderson**</td>
<td>Dallas League of Women Voters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Edmund J. Kahn**</td>
<td>Dallas C. of C.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**These names were later added to replace Estell and Pledger who could not serve and to increase the number of Committee members to twenty-five.
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***Chamber of Commerce.

---

R. L. Thornton, Jr.  Respected community leader, successful businessman, Vice-President of the Mercantile National Bank of Dallas, past chairman of the Community Chest, chairman of Red Cross, member of Highland Park Methodist Church, chairman of YMCA fund raising campaign, and numerous other activities and honors.

Loncy L. Leake  North East Dallas area—"Head of North Texas Water Board, he's an attorney, former president of a school board, endorsed by Pleasant Mound, Pleasant Grove, Mesquite, . . . and was well liked over in Garland."

Dr. Frank J. Altick  North Dallas area—"In addition to being a medical doctor, with a clinic out on Forrest Lane . . . , owned a hospital in Richardson, he was a part owner of a hospital in Farmer's Branch, and his mother taught school in Irving."

Mrs. Eugene M. McDermott  "We needed a lady and we needed entry into big business. . . . In . . . Margaret we had a lady that was well known for her interest in art, music, science. A very generous lady. Her husband, Eugene McDermott, and Margaret had given about as much as anyone around town. And her husband was the original founder of TI. . . . Mrs. McDermott was from Highland Park."
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Durwood A. Sutton

Grand Prairie-Irving area--Sutton was "past president of the Chamber of Commerce [Grand Prairie], president of a bank, [member of] Lions club, Rotarian, Scottish Rite Mason, known all through that area."

Carie E. Welch

Oak Cliff area--"Mr. Carie Welch was just finishing his term as Mayor pro tem., [Dallas]. He was well known in Oak Cliff; everybody loved ole Carie and we asked Carie if he would come in because all the facets, and there are a lot of facets out in there."

Franklin E. Spafford

"Here is something some few know. That's when we went to Dr. White. Said, 'Dr. White, you have been kind of - you have been very interested in this. Will you make a recommendation of someone you think will be acceptable to all the independent school districts?' He said, . . . Franklin Spafford, who is a former President of our School Board and is the attorney for the Dallas School District."

*Biographical information was supplied by R. L. Thornton, Jr. in an interview, March 11, 1974.
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TABLE VIIIa

VOTE TABULATIONS FOR THE DALLAS COUNTY JUNIOR COLLEGE ELECTION*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The Proposition to Create the District</td>
<td>For 27,286 Against 8,032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The Proposition to Set a Maintenance Tax</td>
<td>For 24,668 Against 8,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The Proposition to Issue Bonds and a Retirement Tax</td>
<td>For 24,391 Against 8,012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The Board of Trustees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Dr. Frank J. Altick</td>
<td>For 26,607 Against ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Loncy L. Leake</td>
<td>For 26,300 Against ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Mrs. Eugene McDermott</td>
<td>For 26,572 Against ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Franklin E. Spafford</td>
<td>For 26,107 Against ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Durwood A. Sutton</td>
<td>For 26,250 Against ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Robert L. Thornton, Jr.</td>
<td>For 27,800 Against ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Carie W. Welch</td>
<td>For 26,710 Against ...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Building Committee--charged with the responsibility of recommending to the Board anything pertaining to the construction and maintenance of the building, exclusive of equipping them which will come under the Supply (Purchasing) Committee;

Franklin E. Spafford, Chairman
Mrs. Eugene McDermott, Member
Carie E. Welch, Member

Sites Committee--make recommendations to the Board as to the location of the schools or offices;

Carie E. Welch, Chairman
Dr. Frank J. Altick, Member
Loncy L. Leake, Member

Finance Committee--make recommendations to having outside auditor, preparing budgets, securing bond attorney, fiscal agent if needed, treasurer, tax collector and assessor, investing funds, selling bonds, setting tax, and procuring operating funds;

Durwood A. Sutton, Chairman
Carie E. Welch, Member
Franklin E. Spafford, Member

Curriculum Committee--make recommendations as to courses, faculty, deans, and other related matters;

Loncy L. Leake, Chairman
Mrs Eugene McDermott, Member
Durwood A. Sutton, Member

Supplies Committee (name later changed to Purchasing Committee)--make recommendations to the Board on all purchase of supplies, equipment and materials;

Dr. Frank J. Altick, Chairman
Franklin E. Spafford, Member
Loncy L. Leake, Member
Welfare Committee (name later changed to College Affairs Committee)—make recommendations pertaining to the welfare of the students, faculty, and employees, and scholarships and community relations; naming the schools, determining mottoes, crest, song, dedication ceremonies, and community relations;

Mrs. Eugene McDermott, Chairman  
Dr. Frank J. Altick, Member  
Durwood A. Sutton, Member

Committee of the Whole—examining budgets, hire president, and anything which needs study by all Board members;

R. L. Thornton, Jr., Chairman  
Dr. Frank J. Altick, Member  
Loncy L. Leake, Member  
Mrs. Eugene McDermott, Member  
Franklin E. Spafford, Member  
Durwood A. Sutton, Member  
Carie W. Welch, Member

*Source: Minutes of the Meeting, Board of Trustees, Dallas County Junior College District, May 31, 1965, pp. 1-2.
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BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH*

of

Dr. Bill J. Priest, Chancellor
Dallas County Community College District

Dr. Priest was born and educated in California. He received his Bachelor's, Master's, and Doctorate degrees at the University of California and did post-doctoral work at Columbia University. During World War II, he was in naval intelligence in the Far East, and was a member of the advance intelligence party which entered Hiroshima shortly after an atomic bomb obliterated that city. He now holds the rank of Captain (Ret.) in the Naval Reserve. He was a professional baseball player with the Philadelphia Athletics in 1938, and since then has held various teaching positions, supervisorships, superintendent, and dean's posts. Before his appointment at Dallas, he was head of the 22,000 student Los Rios Junior College at Sacramento, California. He is currently the president of the American Association of Junior Colleges, which helps to draw national attention to the Dallas project. In addition, he is widely sought as a lecturer and speaker on the junior college movement in general and now, on Dallas County Junior College.

APPENDIX XIV

Dallas County Community College District

EL CENTRO COLLEGE
BROOKHAVEN COLLEGE
NORTH LAKE COLLEGE
MOUNTAIN VIEW COLLEGE
APPENDIX XIV--Continued

* Brookhaven College (1978) 204-acre site in Farmers Branch at the intersection of Valley View Lane and Marsh Lane.

* Cedar Valley College (1976) 353 acres in South Dallas County on a site bounded by Lancaster, Wintergreen, and Bonnie View Roads.

* Eastfield College (1970) 244-acre site in Mesquite, on Interstate 30 at Motley Drive.

* El Centro College (1966) situated in Downtown Dallas on a two-square block area bounded by Main, Lamar, Elm and Market Streets.

* Mountain View College (1970) 203-acre site in Oak Cliff bounded by Illinois Ave., Knoxville Street and Duncanville Road.

* North Lake College (1977) 276 acres in Irving bounded by Story Road and the proposed extension of MacArthur Blvd.

* Richland College (1972) 259-acre site in North Dallas at the intersection of Walnut Street and Abrams Road.
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### TABLE IX

**COMPARISON OF ENROLLMENT IN TECHNICAL-OCCUPATIONAL PROGRAMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Fall 1971</th>
<th>Fall 1972</th>
<th>Number Change</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounting Technician</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>+110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Conditioning &amp; Refrigeration Technology</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>- 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Conditioning &amp; Refrigeration Certificate</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apparel Design</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>- 14</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Technology</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>- 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Body</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>- 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automotive Technology</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>+ 41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avionics Technology</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>+ 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Development Associate</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>+ 35</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Development Assistant</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Management &amp; Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Processing Operator</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>- 38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Processing Programmer</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>- 49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dental Assisting Technology</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>- 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dental Assisting Certificate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diesal Mechanic</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>- 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Electronics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>+ 68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drafting &amp; Design Technology</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>+ 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drafting &amp; Design Technology (Co-op)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>+ 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electro-Mechanical Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*September*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Fall 1971</th>
<th>Fall 1972</th>
<th>Number Change</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electronics Technology</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>- 99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Protection Technology</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>- 47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluid Power Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Service--Operations</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>+ 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Service--Dietetic Technician</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>+ 17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphic Arts</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>+ 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horticulture--Landscape-Nurseryman</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Design</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>+ 26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Technical Assistant</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>- 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machine Shop</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>+ 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Assisting Technology</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>+ 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Laboratory Technician</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>+ 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Transcriptionist</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>+ 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Management</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>+194</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing--Associate Degree</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>+ 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing--Licensed Vocational</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>+ 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Room Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pattern Design (Drafting and Draping)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>- 5</td>
<td>Delete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plastics Management and Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plastics Technology</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>- 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Science</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>+114</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Control Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radiologic Technology</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>+ 27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational Leadership</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>- 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respiratory Therapy--1-Year Certificate</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>+ 23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respiratory Therapy Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretarial Science (1 Year)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>+ 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX XV--Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Fall 1971</th>
<th>Fall 1972</th>
<th>Number Change</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secretarial Science (2 Year)</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>+ 54</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services for the Deaf (1 Year)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services for the Deaf (2 Year)</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television and Radio Electronics</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>+ 17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Technology</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>+ 19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welding, Industrial</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>+ 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aviation Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilot Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horology Technology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Office Occupations</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Services Specialist</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Aide</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,802</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,641</strong></td>
<td><strong>+839</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CB-008 Report (Headcount Enrollment by Approved Occupational Program) submitted to Coordinating Board

*Table IX was taken from "The Chancellor's Report," Dallas County Community College District, Dallas Texas, August 31, 1973.
## APPENDIX XVI

### TABLE X*

**ENROLLMENT, FALL, 1972**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Profile</th>
<th>Eastfield</th>
<th>El Centro</th>
<th>Mt. View</th>
<th>Richland</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Headcount</td>
<td>6,214</td>
<td>6,101</td>
<td>4,165</td>
<td>3,510</td>
<td>19,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4,066</td>
<td>3,502</td>
<td>2,866</td>
<td>1,973</td>
<td>12,407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2,148</td>
<td>2,599</td>
<td>1,299</td>
<td>1,537</td>
<td>7,583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Year</td>
<td>4,662</td>
<td>4,396</td>
<td>3,345</td>
<td>3,294</td>
<td>15,697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Year</td>
<td>1,308</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>3,363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>3,403</td>
<td>4,001</td>
<td>2,265</td>
<td>2,141</td>
<td>11,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full time</td>
<td>2,811</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>1,369</td>
<td>8,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-District</td>
<td>5,982</td>
<td>5,577</td>
<td>4,048</td>
<td>3,210</td>
<td>18,817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-District</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-State</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day Students</td>
<td>3,322</td>
<td>3,097</td>
<td>2,424</td>
<td>2,052</td>
<td>10,895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night Students</td>
<td>2,232</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>1,530</td>
<td>1,255</td>
<td>7,617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day/Night</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>1,478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Credit Hours</td>
<td>62,111</td>
<td>53,473</td>
<td>41,480</td>
<td>32,045</td>
<td>189,109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>4,141</td>
<td>3,565</td>
<td>2,765</td>
<td>2,136</td>
<td>12,607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Profile</td>
<td>Eastfield</td>
<td>El Centro</td>
<td>Mt. View</td>
<td>Richland</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical-Occup. Transfer/Undecided</td>
<td>1,239</td>
<td>2,304</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>4,618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4,975</td>
<td>3,797</td>
<td>3,606</td>
<td>2,994</td>
<td>15,372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20</td>
<td>2,516</td>
<td>1,152</td>
<td>1,501</td>
<td>1,402</td>
<td>6,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 25</td>
<td>1,535</td>
<td>1,826</td>
<td>956</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>4,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 30</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>1,060</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>2,674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 35</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>1,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 - 40</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 45</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 - 50</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 or over</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to Calculate</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>2,418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Student Age</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: "The Chancellor's Report," Dallas County Community College District, Dallas, Texas, August 31, 1973."
## APPENDIX XVII

### TABLE XI*

DISTRIBUTION OF 1972-73 FULL TIME PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL SALARY SCHEDULE CLASSIFICATION--ALL COLLEGES
(SEPTEMBER 1, 1972)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps on Salary Sched.</th>
<th>I Degree BA or Equiv.</th>
<th>II Degree MA or Equiv.</th>
<th>III MA Degree + 24 s.h.</th>
<th>IV MA Degree + 48 s.h.</th>
<th>V Earned Doctorate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steps on Salary Sched.</td>
<td>I BA Degree or Equiv.</td>
<td>II MA Degree or Equiv.</td>
<td>III MA Degree + 24 s.h.</td>
<td>IV MA Degree + 48 s.h.</td>
<td>V Earned Doctorate</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>512</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PERCENTAGES** 8.98 48.04 15.82 16.01 11.13
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