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ABSTRACT

Using archival records preserved by Iowa’s community colleges, private four-year colleges, and public universities, this dissertation examines how Iowa’s established higher education institutions responded to and adjusted to the presence of new two-year colleges from 1965 to 1975. This decade was a critical period of development for Iowa two-year colleges as they were most vulnerable to and influenced by other education institutions during an economic downturn. This study also explores how the curricular tension between vocational education and liberal arts education shaped early relationships between Iowa’s new two-year colleges and other higher education institutions. Specifically, this dissertation examines six two-year colleges, seventeen private four-year colleges, and three public universities to understand how the curricular purpose, mission and identity, position in the higher education hierarchy, and reputation of each type of institution played a role in early relationship-building. Ultimately, this study sought to answer the question whether the state’s new two-year colleges developed relationships with other higher education institutions that increased educational opportunities for Iowa students.

Chapter 2 explains how officials from Merged Area I and Western Iowa Tech, two of Iowa’s two-year colleges founded as vocational-only institutions, persisted in their efforts to offer liberal arts education. Officials from neighboring private colleges resisted their efforts because they believed two-year colleges that offered liberal arts education posed a competitive threat. Chapter 3 explores how Iowa’s two-year colleges posed a financial threat, as well as a curricular threat. Part I highlights how Iowa private college officials confronted the financial threat by collaborating with the Iowa Association of Private Colleges and Universities to advocate for the Iowa Tuition Grant. Part II shows how eight private colleges responded to the
curricular threat in three distinct ways: strengthening their role as a liberal arts college, making significant institutional changes for long-term survival, and changing or creating new curricular programs. This dissertation also considers the contributions of Iowa’s three public universities, Northern Iowa, Iowa State University, and the University of Iowa. Chapter 4 explains how each university responded in a distinct way to the presence of two-year colleges.

This dissertation concludes by explaining how this study contributes to the debate between scholars about whether two-year colleges were egalitarian institutions or diversion institutions, specifically, whether two-year colleges and their relationships with other higher education institutions provided Iowa students with more educational opportunities and the path to a baccalaureate degree. I concluded that the presence of Iowa’s two-year colleges pressured private college officials to respond in ways that increased educational opportunity, and officials from Iowa’s three public universities to respond in ways that helped two-year colleges secure a stronger position in the higher education system hierarchy, which strengthened the ability of two-year colleges to provide a path to a baccalaureate degree.
PUBLIC ABSTRACT

Using archival records preserved by Iowa’s community colleges, private four-year colleges, and public universities, this dissertation examines how Iowa’s existing higher education institutions responded to the development of new two-year colleges from 1965 to 1975. Specifically, this dissertation examines six two-year colleges, seventeen private four-year colleges, and three public universities to understand how the state’s new two-year colleges developed relationships with other institutions that increased educational opportunities for Iowa students.

Chapter 2 explains how officials from private colleges opposed the inclusion of liberal arts education at two-year colleges, and how officials from two-year colleges persisted in their efforts to offer liberal arts education. Chapter 3 explores how Iowa’s two-year colleges posed a financial and curricular threat. Part I discusses how private college officials confronted the financial threat by advocating for the Iowa Tuition Grant. Part II shows how private college officials responded to the curricular threat in distinct ways that secured their long-term survival. Chapter 4 highlights the early relationships between Iowa’s three public universities and two-year colleges. Each university responded to two-year colleges in distinct ways.

This dissertation concludes by explaining how the relationships between two-year colleges and other higher education institutions affected educational opportunities for Iowa students. I concluded that the development of Iowa’s two-year colleges pressured private college and public university officials to respond in distinct ways that expanded educational opportunities and strengthened the ability of two-year colleges to provide a path to a bachelor’s degree.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

During the 1960s and early 1970s, college leaders often referred to the rapid growth of community colleges in the United States as the community college movement. In *Issues for Community College Leaders in a New Era*, George Vaughn explained that the notion of the community college movement implied that some force was moving the community college toward its manifest destiny, as the “Ellis Island of higher education holding its door open to the poorly educated, the employed and the unemployed, the capable and the not so capable.”¹ From this perspective, community colleges were to be the great democratizers of the higher education system, offering unlimited educational access and opportunity to many American citizens.² Despite its potential to offer unlimited access to education, the community college movement generated controversy and opposition as it moved across the American higher education landscape. This was also true in the state of Iowa.

In 1965, Iowa state legislation established Iowa’s system of two-year colleges. Iowa Senate File 550 declared that the state could “operate either area vocational schools or area community colleges offering to the greatest extent possible, educational opportunities and services…for the first two years of college work including pre-professional education.”³ Within eighteen months of Governor Harold Hughes signing Senate File 550, fifteen new two-year colleges arose across the state of Iowa. Each two-year college served a specific geographic location and provided educational opportunities to Iowa residents located in that service area.

---

³ Senate File 550 (1965), Archives Vertical File, Iowa Community Colleges History, Kirkwood Community College Library, Cedar Rapids, IA.
On April 24, 1967, the *Des Moines Tribune* reported that the estimated deficit for Iowa’s new state-supported community college system ranged from $3 million and $4 million, and that the fifteen new colleges were in financial trouble “mainly because some absorbed existing junior colleges.” The controversy over what the *Des Moines Tribune* referred to as Iowa’s “debt-ridden system of vocational schools and junior colleges” became a focus of the 1967 legislative session. Iowa legislators vigorously debated how to solve the problem. Some legislators wanted to increase state appropriations and to fund the growing system they had created in 1965. Other legislators felt the state had “created an educational Frankenstein,” and they wanted to cut funding. Still others wanted to solve the problem by changing the original 1965 law to prevent two-year institutions from offering liberal arts education.

Some Iowa legislators argued that the merging of Iowa’s existing junior colleges into a new comprehensive community college system had not caused all of the financial issues. Another cause was the delay in state funding payments to area vocational schools and community colleges because Iowa legislators had not expected county officials to agree so quickly on mergers to establish two-year institutions—the Iowa Department of Public Instruction had received proposals from 54 of the state’s 99 counties less than two months after the original legislative bill became law. Many Iowa legislators felt that the state of Iowa needed to fully fund the new educational institutions it had created, and if necessary, give more authority to the

---

4 Drake Mahey, “Showdown Over the New Schools,” *Des Moines Tribune*, April 24, 1967, Newspaper Clippings Binder, Des Moines Area Community College Library Archives, Ankeny, IA.

5 Ibid.


7 “Area Schools Under Attack,” *Des Moines Register*, April 17, 1967, Newspaper Clippings Binder, Des Moines Area Community College Library Archives, Ankeny, IA.
Iowa Department of Public Instruction to approve or disapprove budget proposals for two-year colleges.\textsuperscript{8}

Other Iowa legislators were frustrated by the merging of vocational and liberal arts education, claiming that the original intent of the 1965 law was to create and nurture the development of vocational-technical institutions—with much less emphasis on liberal arts education. They stressed that the financial problem was a direct result of two-year colleges “going too far too fast in the college community phase of the program.”\textsuperscript{9} A lead critic, State Senator Eugene Hill of Newton led a group of legislators in an effort to amend the law to restrict two-year colleges from offering liberal arts education. Hill argued that this would resolve the financial problem and prevent two-year institutions from “emphasizing academic college courses instead of vocational courses.”\textsuperscript{10}

The debate over the future of liberal arts education in two-year colleges continued throughout the 1967 legislative session. Bud Jensen, Kirkwood Community College’s first Board of Trustees President, recalled that many Iowa legislators fought to amend the original law to stop two-year colleges from offering liberal arts education. The original 1965 law had declared that the state could “operate either area vocational schools or area community colleges offering to the greatest extent possible, educational opportunities and services…for the first two years of college work including pre-professional education.”\textsuperscript{11} In a 1985 interview, Jensen explained that a decision to change the law would have been detrimental to Iowa community

\textsuperscript{9} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{11} Senate File 550 (1965).
colleges and their leaders who already had planned to offer both vocational and liberal arts
education:

It was an amendment which would have dehorned the whole community college idea
totally, and would have made us no more than just grade schools with a ban on the
教学 of good general education or transfer programs. Even though the law said that
that was one of the first things…to provide, transfer program opportunities. But this was
going to really make a mess of things—those that had gotten started and were carrying on
transfer programs were apparently…going to have to drop them…and like Kirkwood
where we hadn’t really gotten started…it would have decided for us without the board’s
opportunity to discuss…which way we were going to go.\(^\text{12}\)

The 1967 amendment would have supported only “six strategically located” vocational-technical
colleges and eliminated the other newly-forming institutions. Jensen said that the amendment
would have eliminated “the chance of doing the arts and sciences or any of those programs, the
transfer programs. And that chilled me. That scared me.”\(^\text{13}\)

To stop passage of the amendment, Jensen and other education leaders traveled to Des
Moines to convince Iowa legislators not to change the original law. One senator asked Jensen,
“Don’t you think we ought to separate the trades from the academics so that we have good,
strong working people?”\(^\text{14}\) Jensen recalled his response to the question:

I was really angry and I held up my big fists and they were big at that time because I was
working at the trade quite a lot…I said, these are the hands of a bricklayer. And they’re
calloused and hard but they have given both me and my family an excellent living. I’d
just heard that you would deny me, these hands, and the hands of my children and other
children throughout the state that right to the opportunity to read a good book, to read
poetry, to learn something about higher math…and I said is that the intent of
this…amendment? I’ve been told a number of times later that that was the signal point.\(^\text{15}\)

Jensen recalled that when he finished speaking, “the gallery started clapping and the lieutenant
governor gaveled and said there would be no applause in the Senate while it was in session.”

\(^\text{12}\) B.A. (Bud) Jensen to Colleen Reilly, interview, July 31, 1985, Oral History Collection, Kirkwood Community College Library, Cedar Rapids, IA, 4.


\(^\text{14}\) Ibid., 14.

\(^\text{15}\) B.A. (Bud) Jensen to Colleen Reilly.
Ultimately, the amendment was defeated and Jensen’s presentation to Iowa legislators became immortalized as the “Bricklayer Speech.” Jensen’s speech, and the work of other education leaders, persuaded legislators to vote ‘no’ on the amendment that would have designated Iowa community colleges as vocational-only institutions.  

The 1967 amendment battle illustrated the tension that developed between vocational education and liberal arts education. The tension played a significant role in shaping the relationships between Iowa’s new two-year colleges and other established higher education institutions in the state. Because a majority of Iowa’s two-year colleges intended to offer liberal arts education, private four-year college officials opposed the development and funding of two-year colleges. In the 1985 interview, Jensen recalled that neighboring private four-year colleges assessed two-year colleges as a “terrible thing.” Jensen stated, “We were going to steal their people, and they [private four-year colleges] were going to wither and die on the vine.” Iowa’s two-year colleges were a direct competitive threat to the survival of existing higher education institutions. This situation complicated relationship-building between the institutions during a time of change for Iowa’s higher education system.

**Purpose of Research Study**

This dissertation examines how the curricular tension between vocational education and liberal arts education shaped early relationships between Iowa’s new two-year colleges and Iowa’s established higher education institutions from 1965 to 1975. Specifically, this study examines the interactions of six two-year colleges, seventeen private four-year colleges, and three public universities to understand how the curricular purpose, mission and identity, position

---

16 “‘The Hands of a Bricklayer—-a Story from Kirkwood’s Early Days,’” 14.
17 B. A. (Bad) Jensen to Colleen Reilly.
in the higher education hierarchy, and reputation of each type of institution played a role in early relationship-building. This study also examines how Iowa’s system of merged service areas influenced how institutions responded to and adjusted to the presence of new two-year colleges.

Why Iowa?

In 1965, the Iowa Association of Private Colleges and Universities and the Iowa State Board of Education joined forces to study Iowa’s higher education system. The study’s Coordination and Governance Committee concluded that Iowa was distinct compared to other states in the Midwest because it had only three state-supported colleges and universities. Iowa had not adopted “the concept of regional four-year colleges or universities as found in Illinois, Nebraska, Wisconsin, Minnesota, South Dakota, and Missouri.” In addition, the study characterized Iowa as a “private college state,” having one of “the highest ratios of private colleges per capita in the nation.” In the mid-1960s, Iowa had twenty-five private four-year colleges; nineteen were coeducational, four were all-women’s colleges, and two were all-men’s colleges. Iowa’s private colleges had dominated higher education in the state, but new two-year colleges developed in areas where existing private colleges had already staked claim to their educational territory. This situation provides the opportunity to examine how Iowa’s private colleges responded to the introduction of two-year colleges to the state’s higher education system.

19 Ibid., 23; E.D. Farwell to Iowa College Presidents, memorandum, February 16, 1977, Iowa Association of Private Colleges and Universities Folder, Upper Iowa University Library Archives, Fayette, IA, 4.
20 Cooperative Study of Post High School Education, 46.
In *Iowa’s Community Colleges: A Collective History of Fifty Years of Accomplishment*, Janice Friedel et al. explained how Iowa legislators developed the state’s regional community college system. In 1959 a study of Iowa higher education concluded that the state could benefit from a system of comprehensive regional community colleges. In 1961 legislators directed the Iowa Department of Public Instruction to plan for a system of two-year colleges to ensure that all Iowans had access to educational opportunities. The plan was authorized in 1965, and by 1967 fifteen new two-year colleges, organized into fifteen merged service areas, had been established throughout the state of Iowa.\(^{21}\) Iowa’s system of two-year colleges, organized by service areas, provides a structured and organized framework to examine how Iowa’s existing higher education institutions responded to their new two-year college neighbors. Legislation in 1965 also authorized two-year colleges to develop as vocational-only institutions, or as institutions that offered both vocational and liberal arts education. The different curricular purposes allow for comparison and deeper analysis of how Iowa’s established higher education institutions responded to each type of two-year college.

In addition, the development of Iowa’s two-year colleges occurred during a pivotal economic period, 1965 to 1975. Prior to 1970, American higher education had enjoyed an era of growth and expansion, but the prosperity ended during the 1970s with a significant economic downturn.\(^{22}\) During the 1970s, American higher education institutions experienced more turbulent times, and economists warned of a possible crisis in higher education: “Colleges and universities in all sectors were overextended in their annual operating budgets and long-term endowments. They were ill-equipped to handle sustained declines in funding…there were


indications that institutions were not always informed or fluid in their responses to changing situations." Thus, Iowa private college officials had to confront the development of two-year colleges in their educational service areas during a time of economic uncertainty. This situation deserves attention to determine how economic factors played a role in how Iowa’s existing higher education institutions responded to and adjusted to the presence of two-year colleges.

From 1965 to 1975, Iowa’s higher education system experienced significant change that reshaped higher education in the state. This meant that Iowa’s private colleges, which had once dominated higher education in the state, had to share their educational territories with new two-year colleges. Iowa’s new system of merged service areas placed fifteen two-year colleges throughout the state, putting many of them in close proximity to established private colleges and public universities. In addition, economic uncertainty further complicated the changes already occurring. In combination, these factors make Iowa a good case study to examine how existing private four-year colleges and public universities responded to the sudden presence of public two-year colleges.

**Contribution to Scholarship**

In *Academia’s Golden Age*, Richard Freeland examined the growth and rising prestige of the higher education system from 1945 to 1970. Specifically, Freeland emphasized the patterns of development for eight major universities located in or around Boston, Massachusetts. The work highlighted how the institutions varied in their responsiveness to market and economic forces during a time of great change, yet retained their unique identities. Rueben Donato and Marvin Lazerson called Freeland’s work a “breakthrough contribution” and called for more

---

23 Ibid., 318.
scholarship on the “ecology of institutions,” or the ways colleges and universities develop while sharing the same geographical areas.\(^{25}\) However, historian David Levine explained that Freeland’s analysis did not include other higher education institutions such as liberal arts colleges, non-elite institutions, or community colleges. Levine emphasized, “Inclusion of these institutions would have added greater context for comparison.”\(^{26}\)

Levine’s review of Freeland’s study reminds historians that they have often ignored community colleges in favor of the research university. As a result, community colleges within state systems of higher education are understudied.\(^{27}\) Robert Church noted that the community college as an institution, with a focus on local contexts, needs to be incorporated into “the mosaic that is the development of higher education.”\(^{28}\) In 2014, Matthew Delmont noted that most published studies still either praise or critique community colleges from a national perspective rather than provide a more focused case study approach. Therefore, more focused scholarship is needed to fully understand the contributions of the community college in the development of higher education.\(^{29}\)

This study answers the call for more focused community college scholarship by examining the early development of Iowa’s two-year colleges. In addition, this study answers Donato’s and Lazerson’s call for more scholarship about the “ecology of institutions” by examining how Iowa’s two-year colleges developed while sharing the same geographical area with other higher education institutions. This study includes: two-year colleges founded as


vocational-only institutions; community colleges that offered vocational education and liberal arts education; and private four-year liberal arts colleges. The inclusion of these institutions answers Levine’s call to study different institutions in order to better understand the ecology of higher education institutions.

**Research Questions**

This study provides insight into how Iowa’s established private four-year colleges and public universities responded to and adjusted to the early development of Iowa’s two-year colleges, and the ramifications of their actions for educational opportunity in the state, from 1965 to 1975. This decade was a critical period of development for Iowa two-year colleges as they were especially vulnerable to and influenced by outside forces, which included existing higher education institutions and an economic downturn. To better understand how Iowa’s two-year colleges developed in proximity to private four-year colleges and public universities during this time, this research study focuses on the following questions:

1.) To what extent and how did private four-year colleges and public universities that shared the same geographical area with a two-year college play a role in shaping the curricular purpose, mission, and identity of the two-year college?

2.) To what extent and how did the two-year colleges’ position and reputation in the education system hierarchy play a role in developing or inhibiting cooperative relationships with private four-year colleges and public universities?

3.) To what extent and how did the relationships between two-year colleges and private four-year colleges and public universities sharing the same geographical area play a role in shaping decisions, actions, or policies that helped or hindered students from transferring to a private four-year college or public university to earn a baccalaureate degree?

Each research question highlights a central issue to examine how Iowa’s two-year colleges established or did not establish relationships with other higher education institutions. Each question is explained below.
**Research Question #1:** To what extent and how did private four-year colleges and public universities that shared the same geographical area with a two-year college play a role in shaping the curricular purpose, mission, and identity of the two-year college?

Many two-year colleges developed as comprehensive community colleges, offering both liberal arts and vocational education. Others developed as vocational-only institutions. This caused the development of ambiguous missions and identities for many two-year colleges, especially during their founding years. This study explores to what extent and how Iowa two-year colleges depended on or were influenced by neighboring higher education institutions to develop their curricular purpose, mission, and identity from 1965 to 1975. This study also examines to what extent Iowa’s new two-year colleges may have influenced the curricular purpose, mission, and identity of the state’s existing higher education institutions.

**Research Question #2:** To what extent and how did the two-year colleges’ position and reputation in the education system hierarchy play a role in developing or inhibiting cooperative relationships with private four-year colleges and public universities?

This study explores how Iowa’s two-year colleges fit into the state higher education system hierarchy and how their position affected relationship-building with other institutions. In “A System without a Plan: Emergence of an American System of Higher Education in the Twentieth Century,” David Labaree described a four-tiered structure of higher education institutions. The top tier consisted of elite Ivy League colleges and research universities, the second tier consisted of land-grant colleges, and the third tier emerged from normal schools that evolved into teachers colleges and regional state universities. Two-year colleges belonged to the fourth tier, the lowest level of the system.\(^{30}\) This resulted in a lower status and reputation for those institutions. Labaree emphasized that these hierarchies have complicated the relationships

---

between institutions. While this study explores the relationships among all institutions in the system hierarchy, it pays special attention to the relationships between Iowa’s two-year colleges and private four-year liberal arts colleges.

**Research Question #3:** To what extent and how did the relationships between two-year colleges and private four-year colleges and public universities sharing the same geographical area play a role in shaping decisions, actions, or policies that helped or hindered students from transferring to a private four-year college or public university to earn a baccalaureate degree?

Historical literature on the community college is polarized into two opposing camps. On one side of the debate are scholars who claim that community colleges have diverted socially and economically disadvantaged students away from the baccalaureate and greater educational achievement. On the other side of the debate are scholars who believe community colleges have served as the great democratizer of educational access and opportunity.\(^{31}\) In addition, Donato and Lazerson discussed how community college historiography has tended to “thrash around” trying to explain both sides of the debate.\(^{32}\) This study contributes to the debate. Specifically, this study examines the decisions, actions, and policies that helped or hindered Iowa’s two-year college students from the opportunity to achieve a baccalaureate degree during a time of change for Iowa’s higher education system. This contributes to understanding how Iowa’s higher education officials played a role in the development of Iowa’s two-year colleges as egalitarian institutions or diversion institutions.

**Definition of Terms:** To clarify terms used throughout the dissertation, see Appendix C. Terms include junior college, two-year college, community college, and vocational institutions.

---


\(^{32}\) Donato and Lazerson, “New Directions,” 11.
History of Community Colleges in the United States and Iowa

In *The Junior College Movement*, Leonard Koos explained that during the early twentieth century junior colleges were viewed as “a sort of isthmus connecting the mainland of elementary and secondary education with the peninsula of professional and advanced academic training.”

This organizational structure put the junior college between the high school and the university, creating ambiguity about its position in the education structure, and junior colleges were usually located in high schools or facilities near or on university campuses. Many university leaders across the nation believed their institutions should not be burdened with the responsibility of teaching lower-level general education, and leaders encouraged the development of junior colleges to serve as preparatory institutions that offered the first two years of undergraduate study. Therefore, the main curricular purpose of most early junior colleges was to offer the first two years of academic work that would be acceptable to four-year colleges and universities. However, many proponents of vocational education viewed the junior college as a way to expand vocational education beyond the high school. They called for junior colleges to offer vocational education in addition to academic work.

Nationally, many junior colleges struggled between two curricular missions, vocational education and academic education, which caused confusion about the institutions’ curricular purpose. In 1922, this confusion prompted the American Association of Junior Colleges (AAJC) to publish an explanation to clarify the curricular purpose of the junior college. The AAJC defined the junior college as an institution offering two years of instruction of “strictly collegiate grade.” In 1925, the AAJC modified the definition to state that “the junior college may, and is

---

33 Leonard V. Koos, *The Junior College Movement* (Ginn Publishing, 1925), 16.
35 Ibid., 19.
likely to develop a different type of curriculum suited to the larger and ever-changing civic, social, religious, and vocational needs of the entire community in which the college is located.”

In addition, the AAJC added that skill training and vocational education alone were not sufficient educational purposes for the junior college; it needed to retain the academic or general education component. AAJC’s inclusion of vocational education in the junior college curriculum reflected society’s changing views about the purpose of education.

During the early twentieth century, education reformers believed that high schools should train young people for work, and they argued that the main task of the high school was to integrate youth into the occupational structure, but they also acknowledged that the junior college could prepare students for their future vocations. Social efficiency advocates promoted vocational education at junior colleges in order to train students for the workforce, especially students who would not receive baccalaureate degrees. Social efficiency advocates viewed the junior college as the vehicle to train these students for a vocation and to produce hard-working citizens.

During this same time, Americans began to seek access to higher education to improve their social mobility—and a path to economic and social success. In local communities across the nation, junior colleges responded to the need for education beyond high school by meeting the needs of high school graduates who were not interested in further academic study, as well as meeting for students who would transfer to four-year colleges to complete a bachelor’s degree. The junior college provided affordable, geographically accessible college studies, and it soon emerged as a successful institution.
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In *Iowa’s Community Colleges: A Collective History of Fifty Years of Accomplishment*, Janice Friedel et al. explained that Iowa’s community college system was “built on the foundations of junior colleges and vocational programs established and operated by local school districts.” In 1927 Iowa passed a law authorizing the establishment of junior colleges as a part of Iowa’s public school systems. By 1930, Iowa had thirty-two junior colleges, and each had an average enrollment of 50 students. During the early twentieth century, Iowa junior colleges served similar curricular purposes as many junior colleges across the nation by offering the first two years of a baccalaureate degree program.\(^{42}\) Nationally, by 1939 there were 575 junior colleges, each with an average enrollment of 200 students, in 45 states.\(^{43}\)

In *Forty Years of Growth and Achievement: A History of Iowa’s Community Colleges*, Jeremy Varner explained that after 1930 junior college development in Iowa ended until after WWII. During the Great Depression and period of financial instability, the Iowa state legislature prohibited public school districts with a population under 20,000 residents, from adding junior college programs. In addition, Varner explained that another serious problem developed for Iowa junior colleges with the start of WWII: “The loss of students to the war effort devastated many public junior colleges and more than half were forced to close.” However, many of Iowa’s junior colleges did reopen after the war to meet the growing public demand for higher education.\(^{44}\)

The conclusion of World War II and the passage of the G.I. Bill created an unprecedented demand for higher education, as veterans enrolled in college to claim their entitlement. Many universities throughout the nation were overwhelmed and could not accommodate both veterans
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and the increasing number of high school graduates. Even the most growth-oriented universities could not accommodate all of the students who applied. After World War II, many junior colleges continued to offer the first two years of collegiate study leading to a baccalaureate degree, and this improved their standing as transfer institutions.

However, the typical junior college had developed and remained an institution with two purposes and serving two distinct constituencies: terminal vocational students and transfer students.

The dual curricular purposes of the junior college provided the foundational structure for the development of comprehensive community colleges across the nation and in Iowa. In 1947 the President’s Commission on Higher Education for American Democracy, also known as the Truman Commission, legitimized two-year colleges. The Truman Commission cited information in its report that showed most Americans were capable of completing fourteen years of education. The report emphasized that Americans needed to obtain more education due to economic changes and called for growth in the number of two-year colleges that offered “both general education for citizenship and vocational education for employment.”

Members of the Truman Commission recommended a network of locally controlled two-year colleges which would provide higher education within commuting distance of most Americans’ homes, and they used the term community college to describe these institutions. The community college became recognized as a comprehensive, publicly supported institution that offered job and vocational training, as well as liberal arts education. The two-year institutions would “give students opportunity beyond the high school to find suitable lines of educational development in a social
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environment of wide range of interests, capacities, aptitudes, and types of intelligence.”

Many existing public junior colleges took on this mission and became comprehensive community colleges.

After the Truman Commission’s recommendations, community college development accelerated around the nation, and the new institutions sought to find their place in the higher education system hierarchy. During the 1950s, community colleges “sprouted haphazardly” because many states still lacked central planning for the institutions’ locations, missions, or curriculum. Education leaders from around the nation struggled to create master plans that made “the processes of community college education…clear, consecutive, and understandable in relation to the processes of other levels or kinds of education within the state.”

However, many states soon centralized their planning of higher education systems, and plans for community colleges were “mushrooming across the nation.” By the 1960s half of the states in the nation’s commissioned studies, wrote master plans, passed legislation, and developed statewide systems of community colleges.

Earlier generations of young people who wanted to go to work directly after high school apprenticed to tradesmen or took entry-level jobs in business. Students who wanted to study the liberal arts went to four-year colleges or universities. In addition, students could now attend a community college that prepared them to earn a living or provided a path to a baccalaureate degree. By reconciling dual curricular purposes, the community college was uniquely positioned in the education system hierarchy to meet students’ educational needs.
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In Iowa, high school-based junior colleges struggled to stay open and more than half closed by the early 1950s. Friedel et al. explained that Iowa junior colleges “were plagued by public apathy, and inadequate enrollment, faculty, state direction, facilities and state financial support. Additionally, their location in low populous counties was problematic for addressing state needs in a significant way.” Following the launch of Sputnik in 1957, federal policies provided funding to support the preparation of skilled workers and vocational education. With this support, Iowa began to offer postsecondary vocational programs in fourteen public school districts and at Iowa State University. However, Friedel et al. explained local schools “proved to be inadequate vehicles for developing regional postsecondary programs.” Iowa’s school-based junior colleges and school-based postsecondary vocational education programs “were found to be ill-equipped for…surging enrollments, and not well suited to meet the growing education and training needs of the state’s economy.”

It was the inadequacy of high school-based postsecondary programs that prompted the Iowa legislature to commission a study of higher education needs and facilities in 1961. As discussed in the introduction of the chapter, the study led to the 1965 legislation that authorized the development of Iowa’s regional system of community colleges. Many officials from Iowa junior colleges and school-based vocational schools opposed the new institutions, which would likely combine liberal arts and vocational education into one comprehensive college. In A History of the First Fifteen Years of Community College in Iowa, 1965-1980, Paul Lowery explained that representatives from Iowa’s junior colleges did not believe that vocational education belonged at the postsecondary level, and they were “most emphatic in their stand that the community colleges should not be a part of a local school district.” In addition, vocational
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educators lobbied for a postsecondary statewide system of vocational-only schools, and they expressed concern that federal funds provided by the Vocational Education Act of 1963 would not be used for vocational training. Vocational educators argued that community college administrators would favor liberal arts education and use the funds accordingly. Ultimately, the legislative committee for higher education concluded that the curricular program of the community college should include both vocational and liberal arts education.

To meet the growing demand for postsecondary education in Iowa, the legislature acted on the committee’s recommendation to develop a statewide system of public two-year colleges. The 1965 legislation established that the new two-year colleges could either be a comprehensive community college or an area vocational institution, but the comprehensive community college could not function like a traditional “stand-alone junior college,” offering only a liberal arts education. This was the legislators’ way to emphasize the importance of vocational education. According to Iowa senators who later reflected on passage of the legislation, the most important feature of the legislation was merging the “college parallel” (liberal arts education) with vocational education into a single institution. Dual curricular purposes allowed two-year colleges to offer programs and services to the communities they served and to establish partnerships with other higher education institutions.

---

54 Paul J. Lowery, “A History of the First Fifteen Years of Community College in Iowa, 1965-1980” (PhD diss., Iowa State University, 1982), 78.
55 Friedel, et al., Iowa’s Community Colleges, 3.
56 Ibid., 3-4.
The American nation had enjoyed an era of economic prosperity following World War II, and higher education institutions grew and expanded during this time. But during the 1970s, higher education institutions experienced more turbulent times. Economists warned that Colleges and universities in all sectors were overextended in their annual operating budgets and long-term endowments. They were ill-equipped to handle sustained declines in funding...there were indications that institutions were not always informed or fluid in their responses to changing situations.

Economists had also coined a new term to describe the economic crisis affecting the entire nation: stagflation. Stagflation was inflation combined with stagnation, or low economic growth. The “unusual phenomenon of double-digit annual inflation coexisting with declining productivity in the national economy, translated into a situation in which college revenues were flat at the same time that prices of goods and services were increasing.” The economic challenges of the 1970s would play a role in the early development of Iowa’s two-year colleges.

Iowa’s community college system was built on the foundation of junior colleges that offered a two-year academic curriculum, but they struggled to survive during the early twentieth century. By the 1950s, a changing economy prompted Iowa officials to consider ways to offer postsecondary vocational education through local public school districts, but this proved to be an inadequate way to meet the needs of Iowa students. Iowa education officials then developed a community college system that combined vocational education with academic education. The dual curricular purposes, and the economic downturn of the 1970s, complicated relationship-building between fledgling two-year colleges and Iowa’s other higher education institutions.
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Literature Review: Historiography

Many factors determined the development of community colleges and their place in the higher education system. These factors include: the community college’s connection to the high school and vocational education, its mission and identity, its position and reputation in the higher education system, and its relationships with other higher education institutions. This literature review focuses on these influencing factors. The review reveals that there is a gap in the historiography regarding how private colleges and public universities shaped the early development of community colleges. Historians and scholars have discussed the community college and other higher education institutions, but they have provided general overviews more than specific analyses of how individual institutions responded to each other. In addition, historians have adequately examined the development of the higher education system hierarchy, but they have not fully examined the curricular tension between vocational and liberal arts education at two-year colleges. Looking more deeply at vocational and liberal arts education at two-year colleges will further illuminate how curricular tension affected other institutions in the system hierarchy.

Vocational and Academic Education: Curricular Tension

Historians have provided a framework to understand how the high school incorporated, blended, and separated vocational curriculum and academic curriculum during the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century. They have also provided historical perspective about how secondary education programs came to incorporate vocational education, how curricular tension existed with the inclusion of vocational education at the secondary level, and how the curricular tension played out in secondary schools as vocational education coexisted with academic
education. More research of this nature is needed, but especially research that shows to what extent and how vocational education coexisted with academic education at two-year colleges.

Historians have examined the changing purposes of secondary education and the inclusion of vocational education during the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century.63 In The Making of an American High School: The Credentials Market and the Central High School of Philadelphia, 1838-1939, David Labaree provided a case study about how an early American high school’s curricular purpose was altered by the introduction of vocational education. Labaree explored how the rise of industrialization and economic forces influenced and transformed the curricular practices of Central High School in Philadelphia. By 1856, Central High offered a practical course of study in order to prepare students for “the pursuits of commerce, manufactures, and the useful arts—not for college or professional careers that tended to follow from college.”64 This curricular change appealed to Central High’s middle class constituents and the high school became a vehicle for individual status attainment, elevating its prestige and reputation as an educational institution. Labaree argued that Central High was a unique, successful high school during the late-nineteenth century, and showed how the addition of vocational education to a secondary education institution caused curricular tension, yet improved the high school’s reputation.

The introduction of vocational education in secondary schools eventually became a blending and separating process. The work of historians has shed light on how curricular tension arose between established academic education and vocational education. This tension was


resolved by either blending vocational education with existing academic education or separating vocational education from academic education. In *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893-1958*, Herbert Kliebard analyzed important documents published during this time to discover if the ideas presented in the documents influenced the teaching of school subjects. For example, Kliebard discussed how the *Committee of Ten Report* in 1893 was an attempt to standardize the secondary education curriculum and to address concerns about differentiation of curricular subjects, such as the inclusion of vocational education in the curriculum. The *Committee of Ten Report* emphasized that all students should take a core of rigorous academic courses, and vocational education was not appropriate for the school curriculum. Kliebard explained that important documents on the curriculum written at the time did often lead to curriculum changes, but that the addition of vocational education to a high school curriculum became a blending process, as educators added or modified new curriculum to fit into established programs.

Jurgen Herbst’s examination of vocational education in *The Once and Future School: Three Hundred and Fifty Years of American Secondary Education* described how academic and vocational curriculum separated, instead of blending with existing curriculum. Herbst showed how the curricular tension led to distinct curricular tracks: one vocational, the other academic. Herbst discussed how the high school became one of the first educational institutions to provide vocational education, and explained how manual education prepared the way for vocational education during the last two decades of the nineteenth century. Herbst stated that “although manual education added training of the hand to training of the mind, it remained within the
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century-old conception of preparatory education as general education.”66 This tradition changed during the early twentieth century with the rise of the comprehensive high school and its inclusion of vocational education. High schools began to offer separate academic and vocational classes in the same school building.

Historians have explained how vocational education secured its place at the secondary level, and they have shown how the federal government and early twentieth century education leaders and reformers influenced and institutionalized vocational education in the high school. In “Work, Education, and Vocational Reform: The Ideological Origins of Vocational Education, 1890-1920,” Harvey Kantor discussed the significance of the 1917 Smith-Hughes Act, which provided federal funding for vocational education at the secondary level. Kantor argued, “Passage of Smith-Hughes was not an empty gesture. More important than its particular provisions or the amount of aid that it provided, the act helped to institutionalize the idea that preparation for work was a primary function of secondary education.”67 In The Failed Promise of the American High School, 1890-1995, David Angus and Jeffrey Mirel claimed that the publication of the 1918 Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education helped to secure a place for vocational education in high school general education programs.68 Created by professors, administrators, and representatives of high schools, Cardinal Principles presented subjects to be taught at the secondary level. The report included vocational education. Ultimately, the Cardinal Principles and the Smith-Hughes Act legitimized vocational education at the secondary level.
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Education reformers tried to influence the use of vocational education to differentiate curriculum and separate students for future occupations. In *Work, Youth, and Schooling: Historical Perspectives on Vocationalism in American Education*, Harvey Kantor and David Tyack explained that education reformers argued that the main task of the high school was to integrate youth into the occupational structure. Advocates of vocational education strongly believed that school was to prepare students, especially immigrants, the poor, and working-class youth, for a vocation. The high school would educate the masses and improve their economic conditions, reinforcing the need for vocational education. In *American Education and Vocationalism: A Documentary History 1870-1970*, Marvin Lazerson and Norton Grubb stated that “curricula differentiation, categorization of students by future economic roles, and the adjustment of the curriculum to the economic demands of the marketplace became the defining characteristics of public education.” Lazerson and Grubb emphasized that this process began to separate students by future occupations, raising questions about equality, educational opportunity, and the democratic nature of schools.

Despite concerns about the negative consequences of separating students by future occupations, vocational education had secured a place in secondary education, and reformers soon looked to institutionalize vocational education at two-year colleges. John Frye’s research showed how the close ties between the high school and the junior college provided national leaders with a way to promote the growth of junior colleges. In *The Vision of the Public Junior College*, Frye explained that junior colleges were initially founded as stepping-stones to university study, but after 1920 national leaders from the American Association of Junior
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Colleges promoted the terminal vocational function of the junior college.\textsuperscript{70} Due to its close connection with secondary education, junior college leaders viewed the junior college as a logical extension of the high school; therefore, junior colleges could also provide students with a terminal vocational education.

In the \textit{American Community College}, Cohen and Brawer extended the historical literature by showing how vocational education transitioned into two-year colleges, which resulted in a distinction between vocational education offered in high schools and vocational education offered at two-year colleges. The authors explained that during the early twentieth century two-year colleges began to offer vocational education that was more rigorous than high school vocational education.\textsuperscript{71} For example, in the 1920s and 1930s junior colleges offered training for support occupations such as radio repair, secretarial services, and laboratory technical work. The distinction between types of vocational education elevated the status of two-year colleges above high schools in the education hierarchy. Cohen and Brawer showed how vocational education at two-year colleges separated from vocational education at the secondary level, but they did not show how vocational education separated from or blended with academic education within two-year colleges.

Historians have effectively shown how the federal government and early twentieth century education leaders and reformers influenced and contributed to the institutionalization of vocational education in high schools and two-year colleges. Some historians argued that vocational education differentiated curricula and separated students into separate tracks based on assumptions about their future occupations. These developments led many scholars, such as
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Jerome Karabel and David Labaree, to criticize two-year colleges for the negative consequences that vocational education had on students and their chances of obtaining baccalaureate degrees.

In “Community Colleges and Social Stratification,” Jerome Karabel stated that two-year colleges are “generally viewed as the leading edge of an open and egalitarian system of higher education.” However, Karabel argued two-year colleges have led to class-based tracking and the diversion of students from earning baccalaureate degrees. This was a result of the vocationalizing influence of two-year colleges.72 David Labaree argued that two-year colleges’ close connection with vocational education led to their lower status compared to other higher education institutions. In “A System without a Plan,” Labaree emphasized that vocational education contributed to the lower status of two-year colleges because they provided a “vocationally-tinged, low-cost, and easy-access way” to take the first two years of college. Conversely, institutions not connected to vocational education, such as liberal arts colleges, provided an “academic, expensive, and exclusive undergraduate education.”73 Vocational education created distinct divisions among institutions in the education hierarchy.

Historians and scholars have contributed to overall understanding of vocational education at the secondary level and its initial transition into postsecondary education. However, we need to know more about how officials specifically responded to the push to institutionalize vocational education at the postsecondary level. This research would provide insight about how officials from two-year colleges and other higher education institutions helped or hindered the institutionalization of vocational education at two-year colleges. We also need to know how officials at two-year colleges made curricular decisions regarding vocational education, how

their decisions reconciled curricular tension between vocational and academic education, and how their actions and decisions affected students who sought a baccalaureate degree.

**Higher Education System Stratification and the Development of Mission and Identity**

Tension between vocational and academic education developed at the secondary level, and it extended to the postsecondary level. The literature reveals that tension persisted at two-year colleges because they struggled to reconcile their position between the high school and other higher education institutions. Historians have explained how this tension intensified as the higher education system stratified, placing two-year colleges at the bottom of the hierarchy. Historians have emphasized that the ambiguous position of two-year colleges in the education system is the cause of mission and identity confusion, and much of the literature casts a negative light on mission and identity development at two-year colleges. The literature provides a framework to understand the link between an institution’s position in the education system and the tension between vocational and academic education, but we need more focused research about the negative and the positive consequences of two-year colleges’ position in the education system. This will move historical conversations beyond generalization and instead focus on specific curricular decisions and actions that shaped mission and identity.

The development of higher education led to a stratified structure that placed two-year institutions at the bottom, signifying their lower status. In “A System without a Plan,” Labaree described a four-tiered structure of higher education institutions, ranging from the highest to the lowest. The top tier were elite Ivy League colleges that emerged during the colonial period and flagship state colleges that became elite research universities. The second tier consisted of land-grant colleges founded in the mid to late nineteenth century, and these institutions expanded
access and offered programs in agriculture and engineering, as well as the liberal arts. Third tier
institutions emerged from normal schools and evolved into teachers colleges, general purpose
state colleges, and regional state universities. Two-year institutions make up the fourth tier.

“Like the land grant colleges and normal schools, these institutions offered access to a new set of
students at a lower level of the system,”\textsuperscript{74} casting them to the bottom of the higher education
system hierarchy. Labaree emphasized that the four-tiered structure of American higher
education left out religious institutions and liberal arts colleges. Four-year liberal arts colleges
often serve as feeder systems into graduate programs in research universities. According to
Labaree, “The name ‘liberal’ is a proud assertion of their claim to academic prestige in an
educational hierarchy where academic programs rate high and vocational programs low. Thus,
liberal arts colleges have their own hierarchy.”\textsuperscript{75} This separate hierarchy has complicated
relationships between liberal arts colleges and two-year colleges by reinforcing the lower status
of two-year colleges.

Julie Rueben and Linda Perkins contributed to the literature by showing how some higher
education institutions accelerated the stratification process. In “Commemorating the Sixtieth
Anniversary of the President's Commission Report, Higher Education for Democracy,” Rueben
and Perkins explained that the Truman Commission of 1947 was in many ways an effort to
increase student enrollments “while at the same time blunting the association between
institutional status and students’ social background.”\textsuperscript{76} Members of the Commission maintained
that thirty-two percent of the population was capable of earning a bachelor’s degree and about
fifty percent could benefit from two years of higher education beyond high school. Rueben and
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Perkins explained that the Commission’s recommended policies “were designed to limit the hierarchy” that was developing in American higher education. The Commission “sought to restrict the advantage and influence of private colleges and universities” by expanding federal aid for public institutions only. However, Rueben and Perkins explained, private universities’ opposition to the report helped defeat proposals for federal aid to public institutions and “vastly accelerated the stratification of higher education and competition among institutions to establish a favorable place for themselves within this structure.”77

Historians have also informed our understanding of why two-year colleges lived in the shadow of the high school and other higher education institutions; this highlights the origin of the tension that developed in the education system hierarchy. In “From Mass to Class,” William Birenbaum explained that the ambiguous identity of the early two-year colleges originated from two different lines of thought. One was that the first two years of the undergraduate college were comparable to the last two years of secondary education in the European systems. Because two-year colleges were considered an extension of the secondary schools, “some welcomed the two-year colleges as devices to keep the university itself pure.” The second line of thought viewed the two-year colleges as “grand doorways through which Everyman would pass en route to his own realization of the American dream.”78 They were to provide educational opportunity for large numbers of Americans. The dual purpose frustrated “any serious negotiation” between two-year colleges and senior colleges, and it subverted “treaty making between the lower and higher, undergraduate and graduate, and academic and nonacademic sectors of education.”79
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The lack of a clear mission and identity often prevented two-year colleges from being taken seriously by other higher education institutions.

Other historians have explained how community colleges struggled to develop a clear mission and identity. In *The Academic Revolution*, Christopher Jencks and David Riesman explained that some community colleges of the 1960s were little more than an upward extension of the high school, adding that faculty and administrators of community colleges tried to emphasize the “college” part of their label. However, they still had to be many things to many people. Community colleges were to offer “college-style” academic courses for those who planned to transfer to a four-year college, general education programs for those wanting only two years of education beyond high school, and vocational programs for those who would soon enter the work force. Jencks and Riesman explained that the many curricular purposes caused community colleges to develop with “little sense of distinctive institutional purpose,” and the lack of institutional purpose meant that the community college could not live up to the standards of university scholarship.  

Robert Pederson, Kevin Dougherty, and J.M. Beach shed light on the ambiguous predicament of two-year colleges as they struggled to develop their missions and identity in the system hierarchy. In “Value Conflict on the Community College Campus,” Pedersen explained that the community college culture had become a “mixture of values, traditions, and practices borrowed from the public schools, the university…all without apparent rhyme or reason.” This was caused by its dependence on these institutions for its day-to-day survival. Many community colleges were financed and governed like a high school, and their instructors were often “indistinguishable” from high school teachers. However, community college officials tried to

---

81 Pedersen, “Value Conflict on the Community College Campus,” 500.
describe themselves in the language of higher education. Pedersen further explained that this “inevitably” occurs in any institution that “derives its core values from other institutions but then fails to integrate and marry these values” into the structure of the education system. This identity confusion led to more ambiguity about where and how the community college fit into the larger education system.

In *The Contradictory College: The Conflicting Origins, Impacts, and Futures of the Community College*, Dougherty claimed that the community college had been shaped by a wide variety of groups such as students, businesses, and government officials. As a consequence, the community college became a hybrid institution with different and contradictory purposes. Beach noted in *Gateway to Opportunity?: A History of the Community College in the United States* that scholars have continued to use terms like contradictory, conflicting, ambiguous, and paradoxical to describe the mission of community colleges. This caused mission confusion as community colleges tried to be “everything to everyone.” Therefore, the community college has been vulnerable to its environment, and it is shaped by many influencing forces. Beach concluded that “the ambiguity of and the conflict over the diverse community college mission seems to have itself become institutionalized, subtly enshrining the institution with a new moniker: the contradictory college.”

While historians have effectively shown the link between position in the education system hierarchy and mission and identity development, two scholars have made important contributions to our understanding about how vocational and academic education were
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reconciled during mission and identity development. David Levine and John Frye showed how
the tension between vocational and academic education directly affected mission development,
and they highlighted that the tension was reconciled in favor of academic education. In The
American College, Levine emphasized that as the vocational nature of two-year colleges gained
support and officials continued to discuss the “schizophrenic nature” of the two-year college’s
identity, the preparatory academic function remained the central mission of two-year
institutions.86 In The Vision of the Public Junior College, Frye explained that the “onset of the
junior college was accompanied by no clear mission, set of criteria, nor theoretical framework,”
and mission confusion “still exists and has affected contemporary two-year-colleges.”87 By 1940
many books, articles, and speeches promoted vocational education, but Frye stressed that the
academic transfer function remained dominant. Both historians’ conclusion that academic
education gained prominence generates questions to consider: What circumstances determined a
vocational mission? What circumstances determined a vocational and academic mission? What
determined a vocational and academic mission, favoring one over the other?

As explained in The American Community College, community college advocates
believed that the two-year institutions held an advantage over other higher education institutions
due to unestablished, predetermined missions. Cohen and Brawer stated, “The community
colleges thrived on the new responsibilities because they had no traditions to defend, no alumni
to question their role, no autonomous professional staff to be moved aside, no statements of
philosophy that would militate against their taking on responsibility for everything.”88 The
authors emphasized that the lack of traditions allowed two-year colleges to adapt and meet the
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needs of society. The ability of the two-year colleges to adapt deserves much more attention in the historical literature, specifically how two-year colleges developed and adapted their curricular missions and identities without established traditions. However, historians must also pay more attention to how other institutions, with established traditions, adapted their curricular purposes and identities in response to two-year colleges.

**Status, Reputation, and Relationships with Four-Year Colleges and Universities**

The two-year college’s position in the education system hierarchy and the ambiguous nature of its missions resulted in a lower status and reputation. Historians and scholars have explained that two-year colleges were often not taken seriously by other higher education institutions due to their close connection to the high school and the type of students attending their institutions. The research builds a foundation to begin analysis of how four-year colleges and universities interacted, cooperated, and developed relationships with two-year colleges. However, there is a gap in the literature on how the reputation and position of the two-year college in the higher education system affected relationship-building and cooperation among other institutions, especially during the founding years of two-year colleges. In addition, the historical literature provides glimpses of how the lower status and reputation of two-year colleges hindered their relationships with higher education institutions, but we need to know more about how other higher education institutions may have helped two-year colleges.

As two-year colleges struggled to establish their position in the higher education system, many university officials did not consider them legitimate institutions because of historical links to the high school. Laurence Veysey studied the development of elite universities and concluded
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that by the early twentieth century the structure of the university had stabilized, and a period of innovation in higher education had ended. In *The Emergence of the American University*, Veysey stated, “Few new ideas have been advanced on the purpose of higher education since 1900, and there have also been few deviations in its basic pattern of organization.” Veysey’s use of the word “deviations” is important to understanding how university officials perceived two-year colleges. Veysey explained that the widespread growth of junior and community colleges after World War II seemed like an innovation of the higher education system. However, Veysey emphasized that the growth and development of two-year colleges was not so significant because the new institutions were “so closely related to the public school system,” and it could be “questioned whether they are part of ‘higher education’ in more than a nominal sense.”

In *In the Words of the Faculty*, Earl Seidman explained that the community college has held an ambiguous and lower position between high school and other higher education institutions due to its divided curriculum—vocational education versus liberal arts education. Seidman stated, “There is no ambiguity concerning their status in the hierarchy of higher education…there is a nagging, pervasive sense, for both faculty and students, that being in a community college means being near the bottom of the higher education totem pole.” In *The Vision of the Public Junior College*, Frye discussed how two-year colleges have always struggled to improve their status in the higher education system, stating, “The question of a place for the junior college within the educational system is a central one in its history, because it defines the relationship of the junior college to higher education, the bachelor’s degree, and all that was coming to stand for in the early twentieth century.” In the education system hierarchy, the junior college held a position between the high school and the university. Frye stressed that junior
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colleges depended upon the secondary system for their teaching personnel and financial support, as well as community support. Therefore, it was difficult for junior colleges to gain favor at the university level.  

Historians and scholars have discussed how the characteristics of students attending two-year colleges contributed to and compounded the lower status of the institutions. In *The American College*, Levine explained that the prestige of institutions corresponded to the major curriculum responsibilities and the socioeconomic composition of their student bodies. Frye emphasized in *The Vision of the Public Junior College* that the hierarchical nature of the system allowed four-year colleges and universities to maintain their higher prestige by controlling and critiquing the lower-level junior college curriculum. This provided a way for officials from four-year colleges and universities to monitor the curriculum and the type of students entering their institutions through transfer programs. In “The Transfer Function,” Dorothy Knoell explained that junior colleges provided more opportunities for higher education for students who were “academically unprepared for baccalaureate-level work” and vocational-terminal programs for students who were “unfit” for promotion to a four-year institution. Cohen and Brawer added that many students attending two-year colleges were lower-middle class or poor students. The authors stressed in *The American Community College* that when junior colleges began to emphasize terminal vocational education, they failed to enroll students who were capable of
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baccalaureate work. Capable students did not want to lose the opportunity to earn a baccalaureate degree, so they did not attend two-year colleges.97

During the early twentieth century, four-year college officials and liberal arts educators were divided about whether the growth of junior colleges threatened their own existence.98 This affected relationships with two-year colleges. In “The Origins and Development of the Early Public Junior College: 1900-1940,” Robert P. Pedersen discussed the “divided response” of state universities and private colleges to the development of junior colleges. Pedersen emphasized that early histories of the junior college acknowledged the support of university presidents and deans, but Pedersen claimed that university presidents of this era were also guarded in their support for junior colleges. Many university presidents supported junior colleges, but they did so in the best interest of their own university. In contrast, presidents of liberal arts colleges were “virtually unanimous in their condemnation of this educational innovation.” Leaders of liberal arts colleges viewed the public junior college as “a serious threat to the viability of their institutions…which had endured decades of small, uncertain enrollments, irregular community support, and ill-prepared students.” Presidents of private colleges “saw no reason to welcome a new institution allied closely with the public high school and subsidized by local taxpayers.”99 Pedersen’s analysis provided a foundation to understand why universities and four-year institutions responded differently to two-year colleges.

Edmund Gleazer noted in This is the Community College that community college development during the 1950s and 1960s did not always receive an “enthusiastic reception” from existing colleges and universities. Gleazer explained that many four-year college and university
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officials raised concerns, and they were especially concerned about state financial support to
two-year colleges and how this affected institutions in the established educational family. “In
states where appropriations were based only upon the number of students enrolled, anxiety was
especially evident” because the elimination of freshmen and sophomore work at senior
institutions could significantly reduce institutional funding. Gleazer also highlighted other
concerns that cast a shadow on two-year colleges as they struggled to find their place in the
education system, including the quality of the new two-year institutions, the quality of transfer
students, and the connection to vocational education. Four-year colleges and university officials
speculated whether two-year colleges could attract competent staff, meet regional accreditation,
or have high enough standards. They also believed this would affect the quality of students
transferring to their institutions.100

The transfer function is a major link between two-year colleges and other higher education
institutions. Bruce Keith examined legislation in the forty-eight contiguous states and concluded
that the structure of community college systems determines transfer opportunities for students
seeking baccalaureate degrees. In “The Context of Educational Opportunity: States and the
Legislative Organization of Community College Systems,” Keith stated, “Following the
recognition of two-year colleges as a system, a state is able to define its future direction relative
to other institutions of higher education through subsequent legislative acts,” constructing an
organizational system to provide for the smooth flow of credit transfers.101 The transfer function
plays a critical role in how well higher education institutions cooperate and work together, and it
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allows many community college students the opportunity to transfer to a four-year institution or university to obtain a four-year degree.

Other scholars have determined that many community colleges focused on moving students into the labor market and weakened students’ opportunities to transfer to a four-year institution or university to achieve a baccalaureate degree. For example, Kevin Dougherty argued that there is evidence that four-year colleges and universities are less willing to take community college transfers “than to pass on their own native students.”102 In addition, two-year college officials often present barriers for their own students who want to transfer to another higher education institution. In “Strengthening Transfer Programs,” Alexander Astin added that many community college officials have not always fully supported transfer programs, and their lack of support contributed to the rise in dropout rates for transfer students.103 In “The ‘Cooling-Out’ Function in Higher Education,” Burton Clark emphasized that an expanded education system diverted many students from four-year institutions and into two-year institutions, which “cooled out” their plans to obtain a baccalaureate degree.104 In The Diverted Dream: Community Colleges and the Promise of Educational Opportunity in America, 1900-1985, Steven Brint and Jerome Karabel explained that the popular demand for education contributed to the growth of a differentiated education system that included vocational and liberal arts education. They argued that the vocational nature of the community college, and its subordinate position in the higher education system, diverted students from realizing their dream of achieving a baccalaureate
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degree. These scholars have reminded historians to further examine the cooperation and relationship-building among higher education institutions in order to illuminate how the transfer function contributes to our understanding of vocational and liberal arts tension, as well as how higher education officials helped or hindered transfer students and their opportunity to achieve a baccalaureate degree.

**Community College Case Studies**

Historian Matthew Delmont noted that most published studies still either praise or critique community colleges from a national perspective rather than provide the more localized, in-depth look of a case study. Delmont cited various sources, including many unpublished dissertations, which have presented more local and community-focused research. I examined many of these unpublished dissertations in an attempt to find more scholarship about community colleges and their early relationships with four-year institutions and universities. The dissertations add to the scholarship and provide insight into the development of community colleges in various states. The dissertations that I reviewed fall into the following categories: leadership and decision making, influencing factors, and regional differences. While the dissertations contribute to community college historiography, they do not consider or do not focus on how community colleges developed relationships with other higher education institutions.

Many local community college case studies are institutional histories that focus on leadership and decision making, which includes the role of institution leaders such as presidents.
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members of the board of trustees, and other influential individuals. These studies highlighted how leaders and the decisions they made influenced the growth and development of their new institutions. The studies provide a foundation to further analyze how community college leaders developed the mission and identity of their institutions and secured a place for their institutions in the education system hierarchy. But more research is needed about how leaders from four-year colleges and universities responded to the efforts of community college leaders as they developed the early missions of their institutions. This will provide an opportunity to analyze relationship-building between higher education institutions during the early development of community colleges.

The work of the historians discussed in this paragraph illustrate the strong focus on leadership and decision making. Joseph Barwick identified and analyzed the historical decision making of key leaders at Piedmont Community College in Texas. The study identified five key historical decisions that shaped the direction and identity of the college, which included the selection of the founding president, location of the campus site, and defining the instructional and philosophical identity of the institution. Michael Crudder examined the five college presidential administrations of Glendale Community College in Arizona from 1963 to 1996. The study focused on how leaders responded to the institutions’ philosophy, policies, and organizational structure. Other historians examined leaders’ accomplishments and how that played a role in the overall development and success of two-year institutions.
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Localized community college case studies have also brought more attention to the many influencing factors that have shaped community college development, such as community factions, business and industry, and public demand for education. Several of the studies discussed curricular changes and the development of transfer programs to universities. These studies create a framework to further explore the tension between vocational and academic education, especially how the influencing factors shaped the curricular purposes of community colleges.

Diane Schulman discussed the many ‘factions’ in the community that affected and shaped the mission and identity of the institution. In her analysis of Erie Community College in New York, Shulman explained that during the 1940s local business and industry “enthusiastically” welcomed the addition of the two-year institution. However, as the institution transformed from a technical institute into a community college, many community factions shaped the college's mission, “making its development a complex effort to serve them all.” The college was being pulled in many directions, seeking to meet the needs of the community. This battle among factions continued into the 1960s as the college was transformed into a comprehensive community college, offering curricular programs for university transfer.

Laura Tordenti conducted the first formal institutional history of the Green River Community College in Washington. Similar to other studies, Tordenti discussed the leaders and events that shaped the institution. In addition, Tordenti explained the legislation that separated the two-year institutions from the local secondary school systems, and the development of a
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transfer program with the University of Washington. Both events altered the curricular purpose of Green River Community College.\textsuperscript{113} Michael Manor described how North Central Michigan College served its local community by adding and deleting courses to meet public demand, noting the strength of the institution was its ability to respond quickly to public demand.\textsuperscript{114} Fern Rocklin wrote an institutional history of Western Iowa Tech Community College, which was founded as a vocational-only institution. Rocklin emphasized that the community college provided educational opportunities that served an “unserved” student population.\textsuperscript{115}

Other historians have documented the growth of comprehensive community colleges and vocational institutions. Some of these studies discuss the education system hierarchy, but do not fully explore the tension and relationships among higher education institutions. Vaughn Crowl showed the evolution of the Hagerstown Junior College in Maryland from its connection to a local high school to a comprehensive community college, receiving accreditation for its transfer curriculum and occupational programs. The junior college struggled to separate from the high school and to establish its own identity, with Crowl calling this time period the “Identity Decade.”\textsuperscript{116} Janet Byrne focused on community efforts to secure a comprehensive community college and not a “glorified high school” during the establishment of Roane State Community College in Tennessee. A comprehensive curriculum, including both vocational training and liberal arts education, was necessary to increase student enrollments. Byrne emphasized that Roane’s proximity to a nearby larger community led to the growth of the community college.\textsuperscript{117}
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In addition, historians have started to analyze how regional differences affect the development of higher education institutions. However, the studies do not focus on how two-year colleges developed in close proximity to other higher education institutions. In particular, we need to know more about how established higher education institutions responded to new two-year colleges as they developed in specific geographical areas. The studies in this category discussed the regional influence on community college development, focusing on differences between rural and urban community colleges. Donna Burgraff focused on the regional influence on Southern West Virginia Community College, an institution located in a rural region of the Appalachian Mountains. Burgraff described how the institution adapted to the culture of the area in order to provide higher education to many students for the first time. Reine Thomas explained how a rural community college in Oregon defined itself through a regional lens, and reciprocal relationships benefitted both the college and communities. Thomas stressed that urban and rural studies are important to fully understand the regional influence of an area. For example, Benjamin Hoffman compared the history of an urban and rural community college in Texas and discovered that leaders in rural colleges wielded more freedom to make changes more quickly. Mike Rudibaugh explained the importance of building networks to secure financial resources, regardless of an urban or rural setting. Regional location in urban or rural settings mattered for two-year institutions during their early development.
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The dissertations discussed in this section greatly contribute to community college historiography in the areas of leadership and decision making, influencing factors, and regional differences. Scholars have begun to move historical conversations beyond generalization, and they have provided more local and in-depth analysis of community colleges. My research study contributes to these historical conversations, but I extend the conversations by analyzing relationship-building between community colleges and other higher education institutions, which fills a gap in the literature.

**Methodology**

In *A History of American Higher Education*, John Thelin included discussion and analysis of familiar and understudied higher education institutions. He stated, “These campuses, whether familiar or understudied, are all part of what I call ‘vertical history’ because they are the familiar landmarks that stand upright in our institutional consciousness.” Thelin later reflected that a focus on vertical history, or the history of individual colleges and universities, created a “peculiar stigmatism” that “overlooks the more complete ecology” of higher education. Thelin emphasized that historians also need to analyze higher education by using “horizontal history,” which he defined as “the founding and influence of institutions and agencies that cut horizontally across the higher-education landscape.” Thelin explained that higher education institutions examined through the lens of “horizontal history” can be more substantive and analytical. Horizontal history is a way to analyze “the complex array of organizations that
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cut across the educational landscape both to provide services and impose constraints on colleges and universities.’Thelin explained that historians and scholars have tended to overlook the ecology of higher education that includes the roles of foundations, consortia, associations, accrediting bodies, state bureaus, and federal agencies.127 Although Thelin did not include other colleges and universities, they should be a part of this list because they supported and constrained each other across the educational landscape. Therefore, I used Thelin’s horizontal approach as a framework to develop this study, with a focus on Iowa’s system of merged service areas that developed across the state.

To answer this study’s research questions, I examined the interplay of twenty-six higher education institutions in six of Iowa’s fifteen community college merged service areas. The institutions included six public community colleges, seventeen private colleges and universities, and three public universities. (See Appendix A for a map of the merged areas, and see Appendix B for a list of institutions used in this study.) To select the merged service areas and the higher education institutions, I used a map delineating the fifteen merged areas of Iowa’s community college system. Four of Iowa’s community colleges were founded in the 1960s as vocational-only institutions, and later achieved community college status. Community college status allowed the two-year colleges to offer vocational and liberal arts education. Because this study explores the curricular tension between vocational and liberal arts education, I selected the four Iowa community colleges founded as vocational-only institutions: Northeast Iowa Community College (Merged Area I), Hawkeye Community College (Merged Area VII), Northwest Iowa Community College (Merged Area IV), and Western Iowa Tech Community College (Merged
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Area XII). Next, I included all private, not-for-profit four-year colleges and universities located in those four merged service areas.

I also included Iowa’s three public universities due to their distinct historical origins and place in the state’s higher education system hierarchy. Therefore, I included the three Iowa community colleges that shared a merged service area with one of Iowa’s three public universities: Hawkeye Community College, Kirkwood Community College, and Des Moines Area Community College. Hawkeye Community College (Merged Area VII) is in the list of community colleges founded as a vocational-only institution, and it shares its merged area with the University of Northern Iowa. Kirkwood Community College (Merged Area X) shares its merged area with the University of Iowa, and Des Moines Area Community College (Merged Area XI) shares its merged area with Iowa State University. Both Kirkwood Community College and Des Moines Area Community College were founded as comprehensive community colleges that offered both vocational and liberal arts education. I then included all private, not-for-profit four-year colleges and universities located in these merged service areas. Using horizontal history and this group of twenty-six institutions, which are organized into merged service areas, provided an organized way to examine the interplay of different types of higher education institutions.

**Examination and Coding of Archival Documents**

This study relied heavily upon the archival records preserved by Iowa community colleges, private four-year colleges, and public universities. For efficiency and to make the most of my time in the archives, I used the tunneling method to search for archival documents that could answer the research questions. The tunneling method involves “finding a run of documents—a specific set of dates…and then examining the documents from beginning to
end.”

For this study, I mostly searched for documents from 1965 to 1975, but I also searched for documents from 1960 to 1965 and from 1976 to 1989 to discover any relevant documents. During my visits to the archives, I reviewed documents and photographed relevant information with an iPad, including the title of the document, date, and other publication information. I also took notes on any other information that would help me remember the relevance of the document, such as where to find the document or the document’s significance to this research study. I then organized the documents in folders and saved them on an iPad.

After document collection, I examined the archival information for authenticity. To determine authenticity, I followed the examination process described by historian Gilbert Garraghan. In *A Guide to Historical Method*, Garraghan explained the process historians must use in order to successfully appraise “the nature and evidential value” of historical documents. The process involves the consideration and close examination of when, where, by whom, and in what form a historical document was produced. According to Garraghan, historians determine the genuineness or authenticity of a document by confirming the date, place of composition, and authorship. When confirmed, these factors signal that the document is credible. For this study, the date and authorship of documents were very important factors to determine authenticity, and most documents were dated, signed, or labeled. In addition, localization, or where the documents were created, proved to be the most important factor to confirm the authenticity of the documents. A majority of the archival documents used in this study were created, used, and archived at the institutions in which I found them.
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After authenticity has been determined, historians can focus on the significance of the information found in the sources or documents. In *From Reliable Sources: An Introduction to Historical Methods*, Martha Howell and Walter Prevenier stated, “In order for a source to be used as evidence in historical argument, certain basic matters about its form and content must be settled.” Howell and Prevenier listed questions to determine a document’s significance: “What kind of institution or individual produced the source, with what authority, under what circumstances? What surrounding events gave the date or the place special meaning?” These questions guided my analysis to determine the relevance and significance of the following archival documents: 1) board of trustees meeting agendas and minutes; 2) college and university presidents’ papers and documents; 3) academic deans’ reports and papers; 4) faculty meeting agendas and minutes; 5) archived college and university newspapers; and 6) miscellaneous documents that included institutional self-studies and accreditation reports.

I then printed and coded each document that passed the authenticity and significance examination. For example, I coded the institutions in Merged Area XII in the following manner: Western Iowa Tech Community College (WIT); Morningside College (MORN); and Briar Cliff University (BC). I arranged and numbered the documents in chronological order. I then coded and categorized each document according to the research question(s) that it answered, or whether it contributed to the overall context of the question. For example, if an archival document discussed the early curricular mission of the community college and answered research question one, I marked the document #1. If the document discussed the development of a transfer program between a community college and university, I marked the document #2 and #3 because it answered research questions two and three.

Next, I organized the documents by research questions and then sorted by themes. The following themes emerged: 1) opposition to liberal arts education; 2) involvement of the Iowa Association of Public Colleges and Universities to support private four-year colleges; 3) the financial concerns of private college officials; 4) curricular changes at private colleges to increase student enrollment; and 5) how public university officials responded to two-year colleges. I then analyzed the documents for similarities and differences in order to determine dissertation chapters. This provided the initial framework to develop the arguments of each chapter and to think about what the entire dissertation means to the history of American higher education.

**Challenges in Research**

In “Reconsidering the Community College,” Philo Hutcheson explained a major challenge for conducting archival research at community colleges: “The community college does not exist as text. Its history for professional historians is not even buried; it was destroyed, since little care to archival records of these institutions, such as those records existed, has ever been taken.” Hutcheson explained that universities survive historically because of their impressive archival records. However, other institutions, such as community colleges, fail to survive historically due to a lack of extensive and preserved archival records. Conducting archival research at some Iowa community colleges was challenging. Some of the community colleges lacked formal archives, and their preserved historical documents were not always cataloged or easily located. To overcome this challenge, I spent many hours searching through uncatalogued folders and boxes in order to possibly locate documents useful to this study.
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Another challenge was the inconsistency of information available in archival documents. During preliminary research, I discovered that one community college had renovated their main library years earlier, and archival documents were sent to a satellite center. While there, some of the archival materials were accidentally discarded. At another community college, archival documents were saved on a rudimentary digitized system that housed information about the early history of the institution, but access to more relevant documents was limited. For example, the digitized system housed only seven institutional self-studies, and only one self-study was relevant to the time period of this study. Inconsistencies also existed at some of the private four-year colleges. For example, Board of Trustees meeting minutes from many private colleges provided great insight into whether college officials discussed the founding of Iowa’s two-year colleges and how that affected their institutions. However, one private college had accidentally destroyed its Board meeting minutes from 1965 to 1975. Another private college had a policy that restricted the public from viewing its Board meeting minutes, including minutes from the 1960s.

Despite weaknesses in documentation at particular institutions, the collection of archival documents from all institutions provided adequate information to answer the research questions. For example, examination of Kirkwood Community College archival documents revealed information that was very relevant and useful, but the quantity of information was limited. But archival research at the University of Iowa, Mount Mercy University, and Coe College provided additional information to fully understand the early relationships between the institutions. For example, the University of Iowa archives contained the Office of Community College Affairs newsletters that explained how the university worked with Kirkwood to develop a transfer program. The archives at Mount Mercy University contained faculty senate meeting minutes
from the early 1970s that documented ongoing conversations with community colleges to increase student enrollment at Mount Mercy. In addition, Coe College archives contained articles from the Coe College campus newspaper that documented how Coe faculty opposed working with Kirkwood during the early 1970s.

Hutcheson reminded historians that community colleges fail to survive historically due to a lack of extensive and preserved archival records. This study helped preserve the history of Iowa’s community colleges by relying on the more extensive archives of Iowa’s private four-year colleges and public universities.

Organization of Chapters

One of this study’s research questions focused on the early development of two-year colleges in Iowa and how other institutions influenced and shaped their curricular purposes. Iowa’s private four-year colleges did influence the curricular purposes of two-year colleges, especially two-year colleges originally founded as vocational institutions. Private college officials actively opposed liberal arts education at two-year vocational colleges, which prevented those institutions from including liberal arts education. At the same time, this study revealed more about the history of how Iowa’s private four-year colleges and public universities responded to the presence of new two-year colleges. More specifically, the presence of two-year colleges influenced changes at private colleges that both helped and hindered educational opportunity for Iowa students. In addition, public universities responded to two-year colleges in ways that strengthened and improved the standing and position of two-year colleges in the state’s higher education system.
Chapter 2 explains how officials from Merged Area I and Western Iowa Tech, two of Iowa’s two-year colleges founded as vocational-only institutions, persisted in their efforts to offer liberal arts education. While Merged Area I and Western Iowa Tech officials fought to include liberal arts education at their institutions, officials from neighboring private colleges resisted their efforts. Private college officials believed two-year colleges that offered liberal arts education posed a competitive threat, and they worked to oppose the introduction of liberal arts education at neighboring two-year vocational colleges. From 1965 to 1975, private college officials were successful in their efforts to stop two-year vocational colleges from expanding their curricular purposes to include both vocational education and liberal arts education. This action limited educational opportunities for students who attended two-year vocational colleges.

The presence of Iowa’s two-year colleges forced change at several of the state’s private four-year colleges. Chapter 3 has two parts that explain how Iowa’s two-year colleges posed a financial threat, as well as a curricular threat. Part I highlights how Iowa private college officials confronted the financial threat by collaborating with the Iowa Association of Private Colleges and Universities to advocate for the Iowa Tuition Grant. This provided financial assistance to students who attended, or wanted to attend, private four-year colleges. Part II explores how private college officials confronted the curricular threat. The section highlights how eight private colleges responded to the curricular threat in three distinct ways: strengthening their role as a liberal arts college, making significant institutional changes for long-term survival, and changing or creating new curricular programs. Overall, most of these changes provided more educational opportunity for Iowa students to achieve a baccalaureate degree.

Although Iowa’s three public universities lacked state coordination regarding their role in the early development of the state’s new two-year colleges, each university responded in a
distinct way that helped two-year colleges secure and strengthen their place in Iowa’s higher education system. Chapter 4 highlights the contributions of officials from the University of Northern Iowa, Iowa State University, and the University of Iowa. Founded as a state normal school, officials from the University of Northern Iowa worked to develop teacher training programs for two-year college instructors. Iowa State University, founded as a land-grant institution, had developed a vocational-technical program prior to the development of Iowa’s community college system. Iowa State eventually delegated its role to two-year colleges, which contributed to the institutionalization of vocational education at two-year colleges. Through the Office of Community College Affairs, University of Iowa officials worked diligently to nurture and strengthen the transfer function between two-year colleges and baccalaureate-degree granting institutions.

Chapter 5 concludes the dissertation with a discussion of how this study contributes to the debate between scholars about whether two-year colleges were egalitarian institutions or diversion institutions, specifically, whether two-year colleges and their relationships with other higher education institutions provided Iowa students with more educational opportunities and the path to a baccalaureate degree. I argue that the presence of Iowa’s two-year colleges pressured private college officials to respond in ways that increased educational opportunity, and officials from Iowa’s three public universities helped two-year colleges establish their place in the state’s higher education system. This meant that the new institutions were in a stronger position to provide a path to a baccalaureate degree. The chapter concludes with a discussion of future research that builds upon the findings of this research study.
CHAPTER 2

STOPPING A COMPETITIVE THREAT: HOW OFFICIALS FROM IOWA’S PRIVATE FOUR-YEAR COLLEGES OPPOSED LIBERAL ARTS EDUCATION AT NEIGHBORING PUBLIC TWO-YEAR VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL COLLEGES

By 1967, Iowa had established eleven new two-year colleges that offered vocational-technical education and liberal arts education, and four two-year colleges offered strictly vocational-technical education. The rapid development of fifteen two-year colleges prompted the *Des Moines Register* to publish a series of articles entitled “The Dilemma of Iowa Private Colleges.” The series focused on how Iowa’s two-year colleges affected the private four-year colleges in the state and emphasized, “New things can hold threat as well as promise. One of the most promising developments in Iowa education, the new area community colleges, poses a terrible threat to some of the state’s established liberal arts colleges.”

During this time, most private college presidents viewed the new two-year colleges as a threat, especially those that offered liberal arts education. Arend Lubbers, President of Central College, expressed his concern, “If they remain vocational colleges, there will be no problem. If they push for a liberal arts curriculum, we are in trouble. Iowa is in danger of having more college space than it needs.” Sister Mary Agnes, President of Mount Mercy College, explained that community colleges would become a “serious threat to private liberal arts colleges,” especially if they “stress a junior college program.” Westmar College President Harry Kalas stated, “If area community colleges relate to the 50 percent of our people who need vocational education, this will help us greatly in helping people...however, it should be obvious that Iowa does not need ‘more of the same’ in terms of liberal arts education.”

---


133 Ibid.
Private college presidents had reason for concern. The addition of the new state system of two-year community colleges and vocational-technical colleges dramatically increased the competition for students between two-year colleges and private four-year colleges. In 1966, the year most of Iowa’s two-year colleges were established, their combined enrollment reached 10,790 students, and enrollment in liberal arts courses exceeded enrollment in vocational-technical education courses by a two-to-one margin. State education officials projected that two-year college enrollment would increase to 16,300 students by 1970, and exceed 27,000 students by 1980. Two-year colleges, especially those that offered liberal arts education, threatened Iowa’s private four-year colleges.\textsuperscript{134}

This chapter explains how officials from three of Iowa’s four two-year vocational colleges which were originally founded as strictly vocational institutions, fought to achieve community college status. Community college status allowed vocational colleges to expand their curricular programs to include liberal arts education. Two-year vocational college officials argued that liberal arts education programs: 1) met the growing student demand for more academic coursework; 2) provided educational opportunities to students who could not afford other types of post-secondary education; and 3) provided students with the opportunity to take college-parallel coursework for the first-two years of a baccalaureate degree. Despite their efforts to serve students and to provide a path to a baccalaureate degree, vocational college officials met fierce criticism and opposition.

Officials from neighboring private colleges argued that liberal arts education at vocational colleges duplicated educational programs already offered at their institutions. If allowed, vocational colleges would be a competitive threat, forcing private colleges to compete
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for students seeking liberal arts education. In an attempt to eliminate the competitive threat, private college officials worked to oppose the addition of liberal arts education at two-year vocational colleges. Private college officials received support from state legislators, local media, private citizens, and other groups who opposed liberal arts education at vocational colleges. In addition, the Iowa Association of Private Colleges and Universities worked with private college officials to provide leadership and guidance to oppose the threat.

This chapter highlights how vocational college officials persisted in their efforts to achieve community college status, and it also shows how private college officials resisted their efforts. The persistence of vocational college officials and the opposition of private college officials defined the early relationships between the institutions. Ultimately, the opposition prevented or delayed two-year vocational colleges from expanding their curricular missions to include both vocational education and liberal arts education. This inhibited educational opportunities for students seeking a liberal arts education, and it also created a barrier for two-year college students who sought academic work leading to a baccalaureate degree.

**Merged Area I (Northeast Iowa)**

Merged Area I Vocational-Technical School, now known as the Northeast Iowa Community College, was founded in 1966. From its founding, the new institution remained focused on its vocational and technical curricular mission. But after 1970, Area I Vocational-Technical School officials considered a recommendation to offer more academic coursework that would meet the education demands of students in the Area I service area. Specifically, Area I officials sought to achieve community college status in order to begin an Adult Evening College, which would provide an opportunity for adults to earn a two-year Associate of Arts degree.
Officials from neighboring private colleges had supported Area I as a vocational institution, but they opposed Area I’s plan to gain community college status because it posed a competitive threat to their efforts to recruit students who sought a liberal arts education. In their efforts to stop the threat, officials from private colleges located in the merged service area collectively and successfully resisted Area I’s attempts to achieve community college status. The private college officials thus played a role in preventing the establishment of more educational opportunities for two-year vocational college students, which included a possible path to a baccalaureate degree. (See Appendix A for the location of Merged Area I.)

On July 6, 1965, Richard L. Hansen, the County Superintendent for Chickasaw and Fayette Counties in northeast Iowa, reached out to Luther College President Elwin Farwell to inform Farwell that planning had begun for a six-county Northeast Iowa area vocational-technical program. Hansen wanted to know “the college’s reactions to such a program,” and wanted Farwell to forward a statement to him regarding Luther’s position on the new institution. Hansen also informed Farwell that the planning committee was “considering only the establishment of a vocational program and not a community college program.”¹³⁵ Farwell scribbled some hand-written notes on the bottom of the letter and passed it on to the Luther College Academic Dean John Linnell who responded to County Superintendent Hansen on behalf of Farwell, “We support enthusiastically the development of a vocational-technical program...we are willing to discuss various ways in which we could support a vocational-
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technical program in northeast Iowa.” Luther officials supported the proposal, and they offered to cooperate with officials from the new institution.

In 1966, the Iowa State Board of Public Instruction approved the proposal to establish the Merged Area I Vocational-Technical School in the northeast Iowa town of Calmar. The new two-year college would provide educational services for the citizens of Allamakee, Winneshiek, Howard, Chickasaw, Fayette, and Clayton counties. Area I’s geographical service area originally included two established private four-year colleges: Luther College in Decorah and Upper Iowa College in Fayette. In July 1970, Area I’s service area expanded to include Dubuque and Delaware counties. This created an enlarged service area that included 200,000 people, 35 high schools, and 4,500 high school graduates. The expansion of Area I from 6 to 8 counties created a need for an additional attendance center in the south part of the service area. This attendance center would be located in close proximity to Dubuque’s three established private institutions: University of Dubuque, Loras College, and Clarke College.

To determine the educational program needs of the service area, Area I officials relied on student surveys, area employer surveys, and advisory committee recommendations. In addition, employers in the surrounding area submitted letters to Area I officials indicating their needs and the skills needed by their future employees. After a review of the information, Area I officials determined that the college’s curricular purpose would be to provide vocational-technical education that included accounting, automotive mechanics, bookkeeping, carpentry, farm management, general clerical, interior decorating, nursing, secretarial, and welding. During the
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1967-1968 school year, Area I offered twelve full-time vocational-technical programs and enrolled approximately 180 students, 69% of whom had “ranked in the bottom half” of their high school graduating class. The Area I 1967-1968 Self-Study Report emphasized that the Area I Vocational-Technical School was “serving individuals who would not normally enter a collegiate program.”

In the fall of 1970, the North Central Association (NCA) of Colleges and Secondary Schools examined Area I’s educational programs to provide guidance for improvement. The final examination report noted that the “only major weakness in curriculum is in the insufficient number of general education courses.” The report explained that several Area I students were critical of the institution due to the lack of liberal arts, humanities, and general education courses. The NCA Report acknowledged that Area I’s curricular mission had been to develop quality vocational and technical programs, but also pointed out that a survey of 400 to 500 high school graduates in the service area revealed that students had a strong interest in taking traditional general education courses. The NCA Report emphasized that the time was right to consider a general education program because “a progressive philosophy of general education” was held by Area I administrators and instructional staff. The authors of the report encouraged Area I officials to act.

In a response to the NCA Report, Max Clark, the first superintendent of Area I Vocational-Technical School, informed NCA officials that Area I had emphasized vocational-technical education since its founding, and it was the only institution providing those education programs in the area. Clark further commented that the NCA Report was an accurate analysis of the Area I Vocational-Technical School, and he recognized “the changing times and demands of
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society.” He assured NCA officials that Area I officials had already considered offering general education electives “in all technical programs to provide more flexible alternatives for students.” In addition, Clark explained that planning was underway to develop an Adult Evening College that would offer general education for the first two years of college-parallel work.\footnote{Max Clark to Thomas Gillis of the North Central Association, 18 March 1971, NECCA, 2.}

In May 1972, Clark sent a formal request to Paul Johnston, the Superintendent of the Iowa Department of Public Instruction, to change the status of Area I Vocational-Technical School to “Area Community College.” A change in status to “community college” would allow Area I to offer liberal arts education programs in addition to vocational and technical programs. Clark explained that the new curriculum would be limited to an Adult Evening College on the Calmar campus, and the main objective of the program would be to provide an opportunity for adults to earn a two-year Associate of Arts degree. The Adult Evening College would be an affordable educational program that was “not now available within a 50-mile radius of Calmar.”\footnote{Max Clark to Paul Johnston, 27 May 1972, Five N.E. Iowa Colleges—Area One Vocational-Technical School 1967-1977 Folder, Box 1, Office of the Dean Continuing Education Program 1964-1983, LUCA, 1.}

At the time when they submitted their request to the State Board of Public Instruction for the authority to start an Adult Evening College, Area I officials had experienced opposition from neighboring private college officials who resisted their efforts to offer liberal arts education. Area I’s request to achieve community college status provided motivation for private college officials in the Merged Area I service area to unite in their efforts to stop a competitive threat. Their actions denied Area I students the opportunity to take liberal arts coursework to complete an Associate of Arts degree, which could have possibly led to the completion of a baccalaureate degree.
Opposition to Liberal Arts Education at Area I Vocational-Technical School

While Area I officials worked to meet the needs of students in their service area, private college officials recognized the competitive threat that vocational-technical institutions would pose if they were authorized to offer liberal arts education. All five private colleges located in the Area I service area worked to stop Area I Vocational-Technical School from achieving community college status and offering liberal arts education. The University of Dubuque, Clarke College, and Loras College officials used their established Tri-College Cooperative Effort to coordinate efforts against Area I. Upper Iowa College and Luther College joined the Tri-College group, uniting officials from all five private colleges with the common goal to prevent Area I from achieving community college status. In addition, the Iowa Association of Private Colleges and Universities supported and encouraged the efforts of the private college officials. Their collective actions prevented Area I’s attempt to achieve community college status, which meant that students in the merged service area would not have access to liberal arts education at Area I.

In early 1965, the Iowa Association of Private Colleges and Universities (IAPCU) monitored the Iowa legislature for any official act that would signal its intent to establish new two-year colleges throughout the state. Irwin Lubbers, President of IAPCU, wrote to Clarke College President Sister Mary Benedict to inform her that action by the IAPCU may be necessary. Lubbers was concerned that the development of a system of public two-year institutions would be “associated with the concept of community colleges,” which allowed for the inclusion of liberal arts education. Lubbers explained that “it may be a little too early for our Association to come out openly with a clearly defined policy” to oppose the community colleges. In his letter, Lubbers also included information that highlighted the United States labor force would need 50% of its workers to obtain a two-year degree through a community college,
technical institute, or other educational institution. The educational needs of the country and the state had changed, creating a demand for two-year colleges that would be hard to stop.¹⁴⁴

Lubbers, on behalf of IAPCU, continued to monitor the situation after the Iowa legislature did finally approve the establishment of community colleges and vocational-technical colleges. In a letter to Clarke College President Sister Mary Benedict, Lubbers explained that representatives of the Iowa Department of Public Instruction “reported that they would find it necessary to approve the establishment of a number of area community colleges…because of the pressure of the local communities and the mandate of the last legislature.” Lubbers asked Sister Mary Benedict to let him know if there had been “any activity directed toward establishing a new Community College or Technical School” in the Dubuque area.¹⁴⁵ In her response, Sister Mary Benedict explained that there had been discussion about the development of a vocational college, and that she had already discussed “the problem of Community Colleges vs. Vocational Schools” with local leaders, who agreed that there was “no need of a Community College in the Dubuque area.”¹⁴⁶

In September 1965, Gaylord Couchman, President of the University of Dubuque, expressed his support for vocational education. Couchman emphasized that the educational mission of a vocational college could not be “sufficiently fulfilled by the good liberal arts colleges so numerous in this community. Indeed, the fact of a quality vocational school in this area would complement and strengthen the total educational effort in which some of us have
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been vigorously involved for many years.”\textsuperscript{147} Although there was support for a vocational college, many private college officials and local citizens in the Dubuque area held beliefs similar to those of John Knox Coit, the Acting Dean for the University of Dubuque. Coit stated that a new two-year college in Dubuque, “especially one which offers liberal arts programs…would be disastrous…”\textsuperscript{148} There was support for a two-year vocational college in the Dubuque area, as long as it did not offer liberal arts education.

The correspondence signaled that Dubuque-area private college officials were very concerned about the competitive threat posed by Area I if the institution were allowed to offer liberal arts education programs, which prompted private college officials to strengthen an existing cooperative alliance. During the late 1960s, the changing demand for education in Iowa and the introduction of two-year colleges across the state had already prompted Dubuque-area private college officials to build cooperative relationships with neighboring private colleges. This led to a cooperative arrangement called the Tri-College Cooperative Effort, an agreement between the three Dubuque-area institutions: University of Dubuque, Loras College, and Clarke College. This agreement had been established to find mutual ways to share education programs and activities. The agreement took on a new importance as it provided private colleges officials with a cooperative foundation to collectively work together to stop Area I’s curricular expansion. Officials from the three institutions built upon the pre-existing relationship to strengthen their efforts to oppose Area I’s attempt to offer liberal arts education.
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Dubuque Private Colleges and the Tri-College Cooperative Effort

During the fall of 1967, two of Dubuque’s private institutions welcomed new presidents, and both new presidents prepared their institutions for future educational changes. Monsignor Justin Driscoll, Loras College President, vowed to continue “the community concept of the institution,” in order to reach out and build relationships. William Chalmers, University of Dubuque President, highlighted the changing nature of society, the increase in college enrollment, and the need for colleges and universities to remain relevant. Chalmers added, “We live at a special time in the history of education in our country…It is a time of change, a time of facing problems we cannot escape.” To confront the challenges of educational change, Chalmers stressed that the University of Dubuque would seek to “turn the potentials of cooperation” between the University of Dubuque and other local colleges “into a fuller reality, so that we can offer present and future students the best possible education right here in Dubuque.”

In 1968, the renewed spirit of cooperation led to the formation of a new cooperative effort, uniting Dubuque’s three private colleges. According to the “Report of The Dubuque Colleges, 1968-1971,” the three colleges had cooperated “more or less informally for a number of years,” but this changed in 1968 when the three institutions obtained a $200,000 federal grant for the study of inter-institutional cooperation and for the employment of a full-time coordinator to manage the project. This led to a formal, legal partnership known as the Tri-College Cooperative Effort of Dubuque. The three founding presidents of the Tri-College Cooperative Effort, Driscoll, Chalmers, and President Sister Mary Benedict Phelan of Clarke College,
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dreamed of “some sort of Oxford-on-the-Mississippi,” and their passion and efforts brought the three institutions closer together, leading to several inter-institutional cooperative initiatives.\textsuperscript{152} Their cooperative work increased opportunities for Dubuque residents through planned complementary programs at all three institutions that included coordinated academic calendars and schedules, cross-registration for certain courses, transportation between campuses, and many jointly-planned social and entertainment events.\textsuperscript{153}

Despite the initial success of the Tri-College Cooperative Effort, the three Dubuque private colleges began “to encounter critical financial problems” caused by declining enrollments and increasing costs. This changed the nature of cooperation among the three institutions. The “Report of The Dubuque Colleges, 1968-1971” explained that the financial pressures on the Dubuque institutions diverted attention away from cooperative programs, as college officials engaged in “a struggle for survival.”\textsuperscript{154} Furthermore, the grants the Tri-College Cooperative Effort received from the federal government “dwindled each year, reflecting greater demand from an increasing number of colleges” experiencing similar financial hardships. Ultimately, the U.S. Office of Education ended the federal grant for the Dubuque Colleges; funding would not be available for the 1971-1972 school year. The report concluded that “under the converged weight” of the financial challenges, the Tri-College Cooperative Effort programs “withered on the vine.”\textsuperscript{155}

In 1972, the Tri-College Cooperative institutions employed a consultant, Dr. Herbert Kells from the Commission on Higher Education of the Middle States Association, to study

\textsuperscript{153} The Dubuque Colleges News Bureau Press Release, 2 Oct. 1969, Tri-College Folders, Box R11, Vertical Files, UDA.
\textsuperscript{155} ibid., 2; Clarke College Board of Trustees Executive Committee Meeting Minutes, 4 June 1971, Clarke College Board of Trustees 1970 and 1971 Minutes of the Meetings Binder, Board of Trustees Minutes, 1972-1983, CUA.
cooperation efforts and make suggestions for improvement. Kells published his findings in a summative report entitled “Developing Synergism at the Dubuque Colleges,” and he included a section entitled “The Problem in Dubuque.” The “Kells Report,” as it was known, explained that the problem in Dubuque was “more serious than the lack of adequate, effective and complementary intercollegiate cooperation.” Substantial problems included “an unfortunate and severe downward trend in enrollment and financial viability” that could cause a merger or the closing of one or more of the institutions. Despite prior successful cooperative efforts among the three institutions, the current circumstances now caused a lack of “willingness to participate in tri-college cooperative efforts” and led to “a serious decline in morale, mutual trust, and accomplishment,” especially among faculty and students.

The Kells Report offered several recommendations to improve inter-institutional cooperation. One was to create a two-year program that would fulfill the needs of “hidden students” in the Dubuque area. The hidden students were those individuals who were not enrolled in or not interested in the educational programs currently offered at four-year colleges and universities. The report encouraged officials from the Dubuque institutions to address this need by providing community college-like services and programs. Tri-College Cooperative officials established a steering committee of representatives from all three colleges to examine the report’s final recommendations. Although officials from the three institutions disagreed with some parts of the report, they agreed that the colleges needed each other. The Loras College newspaper, the Lorian, explained the seriousness of the need for cooperation, stating that the
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three colleges “must hang together to at least some extent,” or all would eventually “hang separately.”

The Kells Report reminded Tri-College officials that they needed each other to survive, and it was the common threat of the Area I Vocational-Technical School that spurred Tri-College officials to action. In June 1972, Clarke College President Robert Giroux wrote a letter to his predecessor, Sister Mary Benedict Phelan. Giroux shared his disappointment with the Tri-College Cooperative Effort and loss of funding but explained that he was encouraged by a recent event that seemed to reinvigorate the spirit of the Tri-College group. He wrote, “As a psychologist, I know you realize that when a common threat appears a group of people begin to come together for a reaction or response. The Area One situation has done more for Tri-College during the past week than any other single element in the past two years. Thus, there really exists some blessing in disguise!” The “blessing in disguise” was Area I Vocational-Technical School’s attempt to change its institutional status to community college. In addition, Area I had a master plan for a South Attendance Center, which included “the purchase of acreage in Dubuque and the ultimate construction of a full-fledged campus.”

This development brought the Tri-College presidents together in order to prevent Area I from receiving community college status. The three college presidents drafted and signed a four-page document to explain why they opposed the establishment of a community college. The presidents acknowledged the need for vocational-technical education in the Dubuque area, but they expressed their concern about another institution offering liberal arts education. The presidents wrote, “The development of another liberal arts curriculum and program in our midst
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is a questionable educational endeavor since the liberal arts already exist in abundant array in the City of Dubuque.”162 The document also quoted a section of Iowa Code, Chapter 28A. 23 in which the presidents underlined one section that stated: “the curriculum being offered by an area school does not duplicate programs provided by existing public or private facilities in the area.” Tri-College officials argued that Area I would violate Iowa law by duplicating their programs.163

As a direct competitive threat, Area I’s proposal for a new attendance center in the Dubuque area quickly reinvigorated the cooperative spirit among the three private Dubuque institutions. The three private colleges needed each other to ensure their long-term survival. Having been reminded of their financial vulnerability by the Kells Report, Dubuque college officials put aside their own misgivings about each other to stop a common competitive threat. The threat was Area I’s possible growth and expansion as a public two-year college with the authority to offer liberal arts education. This possibility not only had the attention of the Dubuque-area private college officials, but it also raised concern for two other private colleges in the Merged Area I service area—Upper Iowa College and Luther College.

**Upper Iowa and Luther Officials Oppose Liberal Arts Education at Area I**

This section shows how Area I officials persisted in their efforts to provide Area I students with expanded educational opportunities, and how they actively sought to cooperate with neighboring private colleges in the area. Through cooperative efforts with Upper Iowa College and Luther College, Area I officials had contracted instructional services for their adult education program as a way to eventually achieve community college status. However, once
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Upper Iowa President Aldrich Paul and Luther President Elwin Farwell suspected that Area I’s true motivation to cooperate was to achieve community college status, Upper Iowa and Luther ended their support for Area I. Fearing the expansion of liberal arts education in their shared service area and the competitive threat it posed, Paul and Farwell eventually joined the Dubuque institutions in an effort to stop Area I’s quest to achieve community college status.

In May 1972, Upper Iowa College President Aldrich Paul confirmed Upper Iowa’s willingness to provide instructional services for Area I’s Adult Evening College. In a letter to Area I Superintendent Clark, Paul stated that “we are very interested in this type of cooperation, and we would do our upmost in making this kind of arrangement beneficial to both Area I and Upper Iowa College.” But on June 14, 1972, Paul withdrew his support for Area I, claiming that he had not known of Area I’s intention to achieve community college status. Paul had understood that Upper Iowa was to provide instructional services for adult evening classes only. In July 1972, Paul submitted a prepared statement entitled the “Calmar Position Statement” for WMT-TV in Cedar Rapids. Paul commented that Iowa legislators and education officials continually requested that private colleges “cooperate and work with, not against, our two year institutions.” He also explained that many people in Northeast Iowa were concerned about Area I Vocational-Technical School at Calmar becoming a two-year liberal arts college: “We at Upper Iowa can understand this concern—very much. Our life blood depends on students interested in the liberal arts.” Paul then justified his initial decision to cooperate with Area I, explaining he supported Area I’s “adult education nighttime classes only,” in order to
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“safeguard our daytime liberal arts students.” If Area I’s request for community college status “opened the door” for daytime liberal arts classes at Area I, Upper Iowa College would oppose the plan.167

In October 1973, Luther College President Farwell thanked Area I Superintendent Clark for his support and cooperation on a recent cooperative endeavor. Farwell mentioned in a letter that the Academic Deans from both institutions had been working together to develop procedures for Luther faculty to participate in a cooperative adult education program.168 But opposition to the cooperative program soon developed. On January 24, 1974, an editorial appeared in the Decorah Journal, the paper for the town in which Luther was located. The editorial addressed Area I’s continued attempts to achieve community college status and made it clear that many residents in the Decorah area “opposed any change in status for Area I.” The editorial argued that Area I was “doing an excellent job in the vocational-technical field for which it was founded,” and the institution’s “effectiveness in this vital phase of education would be diluted with any branching into the liberal arts field.”169 The editorial stated that community college status would threaten the private colleges in northeast Iowa, and Area I’s continued efforts to develop an Adult Education Program, which would award Associate degrees, was a deceptive way to gain community college status:

We don’t think it’s necessary, and we resent Area I’s trying for this “promotion” in a devious manner. Now Dubuque has apparently become the “back door” where the attempt is being made, and Dubuque, with three struggling private colleges, can stand educational competition from the public sector even less than this area can…we can see where many areas of Iowa not adequately served by private or public colleges are in need of community colleges, and most have them, but this area is unique and well served without such an additional institution.170
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The editorial concluded that many Decorah-area residents believed that Area I officials went “underground” in an attempt to achieve community college status through its Adult Education Program.

On March 19, 1974, Luther College President Farwell wrote Area I Superintendent Clark to gain clarification about the “working relationship we have with your institution for adult education programs.” He continued, “I do not believe that any further negotiation should be made until we have reached an agreement between the two institutions.”

Farwell instructed his Academic Dean to draft guidelines for a cooperative Adult Education Program between Luther College and Area I Vocational-Technical School. The agreement noted that the program would not lead to “community college status” for Area I, and officials from both institutions agreed to continue to develop the program. But in September 1974, Farwell contacted Glenn Nelson, Luther College Academic Dean, and instructed him to address an issue regarding the agreement. On September 30, 1974, Nelson sent a memorandum to Area I Director of Adult and Continuing Education Gene Gardner to express Luther’s concern:

> It was our understanding that the specifics of this agreement would serve to regularize the relationship between our institutions and assure both of us that we could work cooperatively to our mutual benefit. What is most troublesome about the current state of affairs is that it does not appear that there has been a consistent effort to live up to the spirit of that agreement.

Nelson then addressed the issues that caused friction between the two institutions. Luther officials were upset that the publicity and publications did not bear the title “The Adult Education Program” or “The Decorah Adult Education Program.” In addition, Area I officials
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did not list Luther College as a co-sponsor of the program or mention Luther faculty, who would teach one-fourth of the courses for the Adult Education Program. This incident had angered Farwell and created more suspicion about Area I’s motivation to develop an Adult Education Program at their institution.¹⁷⁴

Upper Iowa and Luther officials suspected that Area I officials were motivated to achieve community college status. Area I officials had reached out to officials at Upper Iowa and Luther to contract instructional services for their adult education programs. When Upper Iowa and Luther officials determined that this could ultimately provide Area I with a path to community college status, officials from both Upper Iowa and Luther teamed up with the University of Dubuque, Clarke, and Loras to oppose the competitive threat.

All Five Northeast Iowa Private Colleges Oppose Liberal Arts Education at Area I

During the fall of 1974, the five private colleges in the Merged Area I service area—Upper Iowa, Luther, University of Dubuque, Clarke, and Loras—began to work closely to oppose Area I’s efforts to achieve community college status. By the start of the 1975-1976 school year, the collective power and influence of the five institutions prevented Area I officials from expanding liberal arts education. Their combined resistance forced Area I officials to abandon their attempt to achieve community college status, which meant that vocational education would remain the curricular focus of Area I.

The April 1974 Clarke College Board of Trustees meeting minutes showed that the Tri-College Cooperative Executive Board had met in Des Moines the previous month. The Executive Board met with northeast Iowa legislators to discuss the possibility of the Dubuque
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Colleges providing liberal arts courses for Area I Vocational-Technical School. If the Dubuque Colleges offered liberal arts courses, Area I would not obtain community college status. The Tri-College Executive Board members expressed their concern that Area I would duplicate facilities and academic courses already available in the Dubuque area. The meeting minutes also stated that representatives from all five northeast Iowa private colleges located in the Merged Area I service area met with the Area I Vocational-Technical School Board of Directors. Representatives of the five colleges presented a plan “to offer the liberal arts and sciences under a program contract.” Clarke College Board of Trustees minutes noted that the Chairman of the Area I Board agreed to appoint a committee to further study the plan.

On November 25, 1974, representatives from the five northeast Iowa private colleges met with Area I representatives to further discuss the possibility of an agreement to allow the five private colleges to contract liberal arts courses for Area I students seeking an Associate Degree. As the representative of Area I, Dr. Robert Benton facilitated discussion of whether it was possible that such a plan would provide more educational access for northeast Iowa students. According to meeting minutes, Benton “was quite emphatic on the point that he was not prepared to bargain away the two year degree,” which he viewed as a “prerogative” of the Area I Vocational-Technical School. Additionally, he mentioned that “Area I would need community college status” before entering an agreement about contracting liberal arts education.
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with other higher education institutions. The minutes also revealed that all five northeast Iowa private colleges would be given the opportunity to contract instructional services with Area I, noting that Luther College and Area I had already started a cooperative arrangement for Luther faculty to teach Adult Education Program courses.

In a memorandum dated November 27, 1974, Luther Academic Dean Nelson explained the highlights of the November 25 meeting to Luther President Farwell, who did not attend the meeting. In regard to the proposed contractual arrangement, Nelson explained that he “pressed very hard on the question where the initiative now resided.” Nelson then revealed what he thought was Area I’s true motivation to cooperate with the five private colleges:

It became clear to me that the administration of Area I is dragging its heels on the proposal offered by the five colleges. I would judge that their strategy at this time is to overtly give the appearance of cooperativeness with the hope in mind that the five colleges cannot come up with a program which is feasible. In that eventuality I believe they would charge the five colleges with the inability to meet the educational needs for Associate of Arts level education in northeast Iowa and move to elevate Area I to community college status.

Nelson also stated that “the chief spokesman for Area I,” Robert Benton, is “apparently strongly committed to the community college movement and will press very hard for community college status for Area I. He is also, I would judge, hostile towards private education.” Nelson further explained that the representatives had planned to meet again in December and that Benton “resisted the idea of the five colleges meeting.”

On February 14, 1975, Robert Holz, an attorney representing the five northeast Iowa private colleges, sent a multi-page letter to University of Dubuque President Walter Peterson. The group of five had requested a legal opinion on the matter of entering into a contract with
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Area I to offer an Associate of Arts degree. The main legal concern was whether Area I had to establish “community college status” before entering such an agreement with private colleges. In reviewing the Iowa Code and other legal precedents, Holz discovered that there was “a definite link” between the college parallel curriculum, the Associate of Arts/Science degree, and community college status:

The requirement for the degree is the same as the factor which definitionally distinguishes the community college from the vocational school, i.e., the first two years of a baccalaureate program. Taking the statute as a whole then, if the vocational school could offer the two-year college parallel program and confer the Associate of Arts/Science degree, there would remain no distinction between the two types of area schools…It is apparent that in the statutory framework a distinction is drawn between the vocational school and the community college.  

Holz concluded that Area I Vocational-Technical School would need community college status to offer any two-year college parallel program with the five private colleges; and if Area I wanted to upgrade to community college status in the future, Iowa Code established that the vocational school would have to cooperate with existing liberal arts colleges in the area.

Officials from the five private colleges then pursued a legislative solution to prevent Area I from receiving community college status. During the “Meeting of the Five Northeast Iowa Colleges” held on March 18, 1975, representatives discussed the possibility of introducing special legislation at an upcoming session of that the Iowa Legislature. The special legislation would “prevent community colleges from moving into the area of liberal arts type offerings.” The group recognized “the questionable level of support that such a proposal would have at the local level,” and they agreed that the legislation “would probably never stand on its own.
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merits.” However, Clarke College President Giroux reported that Iowa Representative Robert Kreamer had introduced Senate File 180 in an attempt “to indicate his total disagreement with the area schools entering into the arts and sciences.” Giroux also explained that Kreamer sponsored this bill “virtually every year to indicate to the area schools that he is watching them.”

Eventually, the collective opposition to liberal arts education at two-year colleges forced Area I officials to end their attempt to achieve community college status. During the 1975-1976 school year, Area I welcomed a new superintendent to the institution, Charles Joss. Having faced strong opposition since 1972, the Area I Board of Directors used the leadership change to renew its focus on the vocational and technical mission of the institution, and the members of the Board set a goal “to become recognized as a leading Vocational-Technical Training School and to become fully accredited as a Vocational-Technical School.” The Area I Board also used the change of leadership to reestablish cooperative relationships with the five Merged Area I private colleges by acknowledging their curricular responsibility of as liberal arts institutions.

The Area I Board approved a formal resolution to recognize the five private colleges in the Area I region and to renew its willingness to cooperate on any action that involved liberal arts and sciences education programs. On January 22, 1976, Area I officials shared a resolution with representatives from the Tri-College Executive Board, Luther College, and Upper Iowa College, which stated:

The Board recognizes the long established presence of five private colleges in Area One with broad arts and science offerings. Consequently, the Board and Administration manifests a willingness to investigate the feasibility of offerings in arts and sciences, as requested by the five colleges, possibly on a contract basis, through one or all of the five
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private colleges of Area One. Wherefore, the Board reaffirms its position of cooperation with the five private college. 

Area I officials knew that their path to community college status would require mutual cooperation, and they tried to establish the groundwork for this to occur in the future. Area I would not achieve community college status until 1989.

In 1977, a NCA Accreditation Report noted that Area I remained “one of two Iowa merged areas which does not include in its purpose the offering of arts and science courses as a community college.” The NCA visiting team noted in its report that some of its members had “sensed that there was some concern that the local politics” prevented Area I from becoming a comprehensive community college. The NCA team further explained that private colleges in the area felt that “a community college providing Liberal Arts courses would compete for their enrollment.” This tension slowed the process for Area I to secure funding from the Iowa legislature to build a new south attendance center near the Dubuque area, creating access barriers for non-traditional learners. The NCA team stated, “In the midst of this conflict there exists an entire population of citizens who are not served by the Area One Vocational-Technical School nor the universities.”

Officials from the five private colleges in Merged Area I succeeded in their attempts to prevent liberal arts education at Area I, and in the process they also created a barrier to expanded educational opportunities for students in the Merged Area I service area. Students who could not attend private liberal arts colleges were denied the opportunity to complete liberal arts coursework at Area I. This prevented Area I students from completing coursework necessary for
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an Associate’s of Arts degree, which meant that the students did not have a path to achieve a baccalaureate degree at a four-year college or university.

**Merged Area XII (Northwest Iowa)**

In 1966 Merged Area XII Vocational School, located in Sioux City, was founded and quickly renamed Western Iowa Tech; it is now known as Western Iowa Tech Community College. From its founding, the institution’s curricular mission was to improve existing vocational education training in the service area, as well as to develop new vocational education opportunities. As early as 1968, Western Iowa Tech Superintendent Robert Kiser and the Board of Directors discussed the idea of offering liberal arts education programs, but the leaders remained focused on vocational education until 1970. In 1970, Western Iowa Tech officials considered purchasing a defunct liberal arts college in Denison, which was located in the Merged Area XII service area. Western Iowa Tech officials wanted to offer academic coursework that would also allow students to complete the first two years of a baccalaureate degree, but their efforts were met with resistance from private college officials and private college advocates. Opposition delayed the addition of liberal arts coursework, but Western Iowa Tech officials persisted in their efforts to provide expanded educational opportunities for their students. In 1976, Western Iowa Tech finally received approval to offer an Associate of Arts degree at the Denison location. (See Appendix A for the location of Merged Area XII.)

In the fall of 1965, the *Sioux City Journal* explained that due to loss of farm employment, new state-supported vocational institutions were needed in northwest Iowa to provide necessary training for individuals from rural sections of the area. The *Journal* also explained that Sioux
City offered some job training programs, but there was still “a definite lack of training.”\textsuperscript{194} In 1966, Merged Area XII Vocational School was established to meet the vocational training needs of the area, which included the counties of Ida, Monona, Plymouth, and Woodbury. Merged Area XII’s “sole purpose” was to maintain, extend, and improve existing programs of vocational education and to develop new vocational programs.\textsuperscript{195} Three established private colleges were located within Merged Area XII’s service area: Briar Cliff College and Morningside College in Sioux City, and Westmar College in LeMars. (Westmar College permanently closed in November 1997.)

In the spring of 1967, Western Iowa Tech (WIT) held its first graduation. During the graduation ceremony, Director of Vocational and Technical Education Wayne Kyle, shared information with the audience about the graduates. Kyle explained that WIT had been authorized by the Department of Public Instruction to grant Associate degrees in applied science, and “some of the men” who received the degrees had originally enrolled at WIT “because their interest did not lie with a college-type curriculum.” Kyle emphasized that before enrolling at WIT, some of the graduates found it difficult to find employment because they lacked vocational and technical skills, while other graduates had once believed they could not have completed a formal education program due to personal economic problems. Kyle also mentioned that WIT was looking to expand its educational programs.\textsuperscript{196}

At the January 1968 meeting of the WIT Board of Directors, WIT Superintendent Robert Kiser reported that most of Iowa’s new two-year colleges had already approved, or would be


\textsuperscript{195} County Boards of Education, “Application for an Area Vocational School,” 1965, Miscellaneous Reports, WITA.

considering, the addition of liberal arts programs. In addition to community college status, two-year institutions that offered liberal arts programs could “receive accreditation which could not be achieved with a curriculum limited to the vocational technical area.” The WIT Board discussed offering liberal arts programs and determined that WIT should “continue to remain vocational technical to fulfill the intent of the Legislature which provided for area schools.” The meeting minutes stated that the Board wanted to continue to provide quality training in the vocational technical field, and “to do it well.”

By 1970, WIT officials reconsidered the idea of offering a liberal arts program at the “defunct Midwestern College” in Denison, which was located 75 miles from Sioux City. An editorial in the *Sioux City Journal* expressed that the idea of an arts and sciences program at WIT had merit, even though it caused “nervous reaction” and “outright opposition” in the community. The editorial stated that the acquisition of the “now idled community college facilities at Denison” would be a positive move that would not “supersede the industrial training purposes for which the area school was established.” On March 1, 1971, the WIT Board of Directors agreed to further study the financial and institutional ramifications of acquiring the Denison facilities. The Board also assigned members of the WIT staff to join with members of the State Department of Public Instruction to prepare a feasibility study.

While the Board waited for the completion of the feasibility study, WIT officials actively sought more information to determine how many people would attend a two-year college in Denison. Superintendent Kiser developed a letter that defined the purpose of a two-year community college, and he explained that a community college “gives attention to serious-
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minded students who don’t qualify for existing financial aid or who may have marginal or deficient qualifications for admission to a traditional four-year college.”

Kiser further explained the community college concept and attached a “market survey” to the letter. WIT officials sent copies of Kiser’s letter and survey to nine high schools in a thirty-five mile radius of Denison, as well as to residents in WIT’s service area to determine possible enrollment at a Denison branch campus. After the survey results were collected, WIT officials concluded that students in the Denison area were not being served by other types of post-secondary education. WIT officials used this information to begin building support for a branch campus in Denison.

In April 1971, the feasibility study committee concluded that there was a void of higher education opportunities in Western Iowa:

This section of the State lagged behind in local support for what were formerly liberal arts oriented junior colleges. As a result, a few of the area schools in this part of the State are also lagging behind in the development of strong arts and science programs. To encourage this needed growth, the Committee recommends that the Department of Public Instruction be authorized to aid selected area community colleges in Western Iowa so they will be able to strengthen their two-year arts and science programs.

The committee included a recommendation to offer educational programs at WIT’s “South Campus” at Denison. The proposed curriculum centered on a general studies core that would provide “terminal career preparation at a college-parallel level,” emphasizing work-oriented education. The inclusion of the arts and sciences offerings “could permit students to complete the first two years of a baccalaureate degree program” for occupations that required a four-year

---

200 Robert Kiser to the Local Community, survey letter, 29 March 1971, Liberal Arts at W.I.T Correspondence, 1971-1978 Folder, Box 1, Presidents Correspondence 1962-2004, Briar Cliff University Library Archives, Sioux City, IA (hereafter BCA).
201 Ibid., 2-3; “Minutes of the Meeting of the Representatives of Briar Cliff, Morningside, Westmar and Western Iowa Tech.” 16 Sept. 1971, Liberal Arts at W.I.T Correspondence, 1971-1978 Folder, Box 1, Presidents Correspondence 1962-2004, BCA. 2.
202 Preliminary Report: A Study to Determine the Feasibility for Western Iowa Tech to Operate a Branch Campus at Denison, Report, 1971, Miscellaneous Reports, WITA, 2-5.
degree. This type of curricular change would benefit programs such as pre-business administration, pre-teacher education, pre-pharmacy, pre-engineering, and pre-nursing.\textsuperscript{203}

On May 3, 1971, the WIT Board of Directors gave its approval to “proceed with the development of an Arts and Science Division and submit an application to the State Board of Public Instruction for approval to establish an attendance center at Denison.” The WIT Board voted 5 to 2 in favor of submitting the plan for the Denison location.\textsuperscript{204} Although the Board’s intent was to provide more educational opportunities for students in western Iowa, its decision was met with criticism and opposition. Opposition came from private college officials in the surrounding area, as well as from other groups who supported private colleges.

**Opposition to Liberal Arts Education at WIT**

As early as 1967, Briar Cliff and Morningside College officials speculated that WIT officials would want to expand their curricular offerings to include liberal arts education. Officials from both institutions understood that if WIT offered liberal arts programs, Briar Cliff and Morningside would need to compete with WIT for students seeking a liberal arts education in their service area. When WIT did decide to offer liberal arts education in 1971, private college officials were joined in protest by Iowa state representatives, local media, members of the State Board of Public Instruction, private citizens, the IAPCU, and even a member of the WIT Board of Directors. There was much criticism and opposition to WIT’s proposal to offer liberal arts education at the Denison location.

\textsuperscript{203} Suggested Educational Program for the Proposed Western Iowa Tech South Campus, Fall 1971, Liberal Arts at W.I.T Correspondence, 1971-1978 Folder, Box 1, Presidents Correspondence 1962-2004, BCA, 1-2.
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In 1966, Briar Cliff College became a coeducational institution and remained committed to offering a strong liberal arts education. Briar Cliff officials acknowledged their responsibility to work with other colleges to meet the future needs of students, but they also recognized the competitive forces affecting the institution’s future enrollment.\textsuperscript{205} President Sister Mary Jordan explained that Briar Cliff’s competition would come from the state’s community colleges, other Catholic institutions changing to coeducation, and Morningside College’s “expected intensification of recruitment of commuter students.”\textsuperscript{206}

In December 1967, Morningside President Richard Palmer wrote to Jordan to encourage her to write to the members of the WIT Board of Directors to “stymie any growth toward a liberal arts institution in the Western Iowa Tech Program.” Palmer included a copy of the letter he intended to send to each WIT Board member. The letter presented arguments why the new vocational school should not be allowed to offer liberal arts curriculum:

> It is extremely disturbing to learn that the fifteen area schools, which were sold to the general public and the legislature as technical training centers…are moving in the direction of liberal arts colleges…There is no evidence to indicate that we need more liberal arts colleges in Iowa…and it poses a serious threat to the existence of already established and very highly qualified institutions of higher education in the state of Iowa.\textsuperscript{207}

Palmer explained how he hoped that the WIT Board of Directors would be cognizant of the “unnecessary duplication” of curricular programs among the institutions. He reminded them that private colleges such as Morningside, Briar Cliff, and Westmar already provided liberal arts

\textsuperscript{205} “Blueprint Committee Report to Trustees: Supplementary Report on Coeducation and Supporting Data,” March 1965, Box 1, Board of Trustees Minutes, 1936-1968, BCA, 1-3.
\textsuperscript{206} “Briar Cliff College Report to the Board Of Trustees on the College’s Operations For The 1967-68 Academic Year,” 20 Nov. 1968, Board of Trustees Nov. 1968 Folder, Box 1, Board of Trustee Minutes, 1936-1968, BCA, 4.
\textsuperscript{207} Richard Palmer to Sister Mary Jordan, 22 Dec. 1967, Liberal Arts at W.I.T Correspondence, 1971-1978 Folder, Box 1, Presidents Correspondence 1962-2004, BCA.
education. Palmer concluded that if this was the plan of WIT, then he and others would “make a rigorous public protest.”

Private college officials in the WIT service area did not “make a rigorous public protest” until May 1971, when WIT officials proposed the addition of liberal arts education at the Denison location. Private college officials were not alone in their protest of WIT’s decision to offer academic coursework to develop a college-parallel education program. On May 5, 1971, Leonard Andersen, the Iowa State Representative for Woodbury County, sent a letter to the Department of Public Instruction to express his displeasure that WIT made a move to establish liberal arts education programs in Denison. He wrote:

This was a white elephant, and I want to call to your attention that the vast majority of people in the area are opposed to this move. The feeling is that we should spend our resources building and developing a strong vocational and technical school and not branch out in the area of unneeded liberal arts.

Andersen concluded the letter by noting that it was in everyone’s best interest to vote ‘no’ on the Denison proposal, and he reminded the Department of Public Instruction that there were “already too many junior colleges” in the state. Andersen then sent a copy of his letter to the private college presidents in the area. Jordan sent Andersen a short note of appreciation for his efforts on their behalf and commended him for his “leadership in communicating to the Department of Public Instruction the convictions held by many persons in the area.”

Criticism also came quickly from KCAU-TV in Sioux City. On May 6, 1971, KCAU-TV, the local television station, issued an editorial about WIT’s expansion of a branch campus at Denison. The editorial praised WIT officials for their work in the development as “one of the
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finest” colleges in Iowa, reminding WIT officials that KCAU had always supported the vocational-technical mission of the institution. But this time, KCAU was critical of the move to offer liberal arts education and called it “a serious mistake,” noting that WIT should keep its “concentration on vocational skills.” The editorial then explained that KCAU had always opposed the development of a state-supported college or university in western Iowa because of the private liberal arts colleges already located in northwest Iowa. KCAU concluded the editorial by reminding its viewers that WIT would be using tax dollars for this educational endeavor during a time of financial uncertainty and possible limited state resources.211

On May 14, 1971, Morningside President Thomas Thompson dispatched a letter to William Baley, Associate Superintendent of the State Department of Public Instruction. Thompson addressed “the movement taking place in Northwest Iowa,” and WIT’s expansion into the liberal arts field. First, Thompson explained that he had discussed the issue with Lloyd Watkins, President of the Iowa Association of Private Colleges and Universities (IAPCU). IAPCU officials had determined that there were a “number of vacancies” at the private colleges in the area, so the addition of another liberal arts institution was not warranted. Thompson argued that WIT needed to stay committed to its founding mission to offer vocational-technical education. Otherwise, the Department of Public Instruction’s endorsement of this proposal “would greatly jeopardize and weaken a select group of geographically located colleges in our state.”212

On May 21, 1971, WIT officials presented their proposal to the Iowa State Board of Public Instruction and requested permission to establish a branch campus at Denison. Members
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of the State Board of Public Instruction discussed several concerns and issues after the presentation. The first issue was that the state of Iowa had once considered Denison as a location for a state college or university, so members of the State Board discussed whether to seek more information from legislators on the matter. The second issue was a concern about Iowa’s overall financial situation and how WIT would get the necessary funding for the expansion, or if taxpayers would even support such a proposal. The purchase of land and buildings at the Denison location would cost $100,000, and an additional $168,000 would be needed for the first year’s operating budget. The State Board of Public Instruction wanted to gather more information on these concerns and did not render a decision.  

The concerns noted by the State Board of Public Instruction were also expressed by Iowa citizens who had closely monitored the Denison situation. Marvin Klass, an attorney from the Stewart, Hatfield & Klass Law Office in Sioux City, sent a letter to the State Board of Public Instruction explaining that the Denison expansion was “totally unnecessary” and an unnecessary expenditure for the state of Iowa:

The expansion of Western Iowa Tech into the area of Liberal Arts and Sciences would directly compete with a large number of small private colleges in this area of the State of Iowa. These small colleges are now facing financial crises, and in my opinion it would not be conducive to good higher education for new tax-supported institutions to compete with the present private colleges. Unless Western Iowa Tech can show that there is a shortage of opportunity for higher education in this part of the State, the proposed expansion should be avoided and the existing tax load should not be increased.

Klass sent copies of the letter to four state legislators and Iowa Governor Robert Ray.

The IAPCU also worked hard to stop the Denison expansion proposal. On July 6, 1971, IAPCU President Lloyd Watkins sent a letter to member presidents to explain that the Iowa Department of Public Instruction would soon make the final decision on the Denison project.
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Watkins encouraged all private college presidents “to let Dr. Paul Johnston, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, know how you feel concerning this matter.” Watkins reminded the group that WIT’s initial feasibility study ignored the private sector, and “no efforts were made to consult with the presidents in the northwest part of the state.” On July, 21, 1971, Watkins sent another letter to State Superintendent Johnston to express his disappointment that the WIT feasibility study was “done without consulting the presidents of the three private colleges in Area XII.” The letter also emphasized that the three private institutions in the area had “accommodated 417 lower-division liberal arts students last fall,” and the institutions had room for more students. Watkins concluded that this information made it illogical for WIT to create another institution offering liberal arts education.

State Superintendent Johnston responded to Watkins with a follow-up letter inquiring how private colleges in western Iowa were meeting the needs of economically disadvantaged students. IAPCU’s Watkins then dispatched a letter to the private college presidents in the WIT service area to gather information about how their institutions were meeting the needs of all students. Watkins included the following excerpt from State Superintendent Johnston’s letter in which Johnston questioned if the private colleges were serving, or could serve, economically disadvantaged students:

…I would like to know how many of the economically disadvantaged young people in this particular area are being served by the three institutions. You also indicated that these institutions could handle the population of this area, providing liberal arts opportunities and that they are ready and willing to serve the area. I am wondering what specific plans they have in reality to meet the needs of those who have the capabilities for liberal arts programs who are so economically disadvantaged that the opportunity for attendance at these institutions may be denied.
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In his letter to the presidents, Watkins explained that the nature of Johnston’s questions led him to believe that WIT planned to argue that the private institutions in Area XII are “too expensive for the clientele WIT proposes to serve.” In addition, Watkins conceded:

I realize we may be on the horns of a dilemma here. We have promoted the Iowa Tuition Grant Program as a way to make our facilities available to needy young Iowans. This presupposes that there are those who cannot attend because of cost. If we deny this absolutely, we deny to some extent the need for future increases in the Tuition Grant Program.218

Watkins concluded, “I do believe we can give him [Johnston] some idea of our specific plans to assist low income students.”

On September 9, 1971, an article entitled “Fight Plan for College at Denison” appeared in the Des Moines Register. The article explained how private colleges and some Iowa legislators had “launched a fight against plans” to establish a two-year college at Denison, noting that the branch campus would draw students away from their institutions and contribute to “sagging enrollments.” The article quoted IAPCU President Watkins’s claims that the three private colleges in the WIT service area already had “vacancies for about 400 students in their classrooms” and that the Denison plan was “detrimental to private colleges in the area.” In addition, that article reported that State Representative Robert Kreamer contended that the two-year college-parallel program at Denison “would go against the intentions of the Legislature, which in 1970, decided against establishing a state college in western Iowa.”219

Opposition to the Denison proposal also came from within WIT’s own ranks. In a letter dated September 10, 1971, Gaylord Smith, the President of the WIT Board of Directors, had

218 Ibid.; In May 1969, the Iowa legislature approved the Iowa Tuition Grant Program. The new program provided financial support to students who wanted to attend private colleges, and it helped to level the playing field between Iowa’s public and private higher education institutions as they competed for students. This will be discussed in Chapter 3.

written a letter to the Iowa State Board of Public Instruction to oppose WIT’s Denison expansion proposal. Smith began his letter, “I am writing this as a private citizen, not as President of Western Iowa Tech, but with the knowledge and understanding gained through service on the Board of Western Iowa Tech.” Smith explained that the WIT Board’s decision to submit the Denison proposal to the State was not unanimous, and he wanted to make sure the “minority views” were presented. Smith made two points against the Denison proposal. One was that WIT should not expand its two-year programs for community college status, but should only teach any arts and sciences courses necessary to complement existing vocational and technical programs. The other point was that WIT should not use its own funds or special state allocations to purchase the Denison property. Smith also made it clear that WIT should retain its focus on becoming an excellent vocational and technical training school.²²⁰

WIT officials faced an array of opponents, from private college officials to local media and citizens. In addition, the IAPCU provided guidance and support to private college officials in Merged Area XII, and WIT officials were confronted by internal challenges to the decision to offer liberal arts education at the Denison location. The culmination of opposition finally forced a meeting between Merged Area XII private college officials and WIT officials. It was an attempt to cooperate and reconcile the curricular roles and responsibilities of the institutions in Merged Area XII. Although WIT officials initially cooperated with their neighboring private institutions, they persisted in their efforts to offer liberal arts education to their students.

WIT Officials Persist in Their Efforts to Offer Liberal Arts Education

Criticism and opposition to the Denison proposal finally forced a meeting of representatives from all four institutions located in Merged Area XII—Morningside, Briar Cliff, Westmar, and WIT. On September 16, 1971, representatives met to further discuss the Denison proposal, the rationale behind the project, and why a meeting with area private colleges had not occurred earlier. WIT Superintendent Kiser noted that the Denison proposal was rushed due to short notification of application deadlines for requesting community college status. Kiser explained that he was meeting now “to effect cooperation and coordination between Western Iowa Tech and the area colleges.” The meeting minutes revealed that the State Board of Public Instruction had decided to take the Denison proposal off its agenda for the September meeting, leaving an impression with many that the Denison proposal would not pass in the future. Therefore, the meeting of representatives from the four institutions of Area XII was the start of a cooperative effort to resolve their differences over the inclusion of liberal arts education at WIT.221

During a Briar Cliff College Board of Trustees meeting on October 6, 1971, President Sister Mary Jordan reported that the three private college presidents met with WIT Superintendent Kiser and reached agreement to further study the Denison expansion. She informed her Board that the four leaders agreed to further study cooperative efforts, before the State Board of Public Instruction added the Denison proposal to a future meeting agenda. Jordan, acting on behalf of the group, sent a letter to State Superintendent Johnston of the Department of Public Instruction. Jordan wrote, “The other three chief executive officers and I believe it would be of benefit to all parties concerned to delay for the present the inclusion of

WIT’s request on the monthly meeting agenda.” A third meeting of the four college leaders and their academic officers had been scheduled for October 19, and Jordan anticipated “that the conclusions reached through the series of conferences now in progress could be reported to your office before the end of the calendar year.”222 She sent the postponement request to Johnston on October 1, 1971, and meeting minutes noted that she did not receive a reply.223

However, the cooperative efforts of officials from Morningside, Briar Cliff, Westmar, and WIT did not delay a decision regarding the Denison proposal. On October 21, 1971, the State Board of Public Instruction denied WIT’s request to open the branch campus at Denison in a 5 to 3 ‘no’ vote. One of the State Board members who voted ‘no’ claimed that there was “no need” for another community college when the focus should remain on career and vocational education. The Board member continued, “If, by creating more of these schools, we force the private schools to close, we are creating a one-track system where students won’t have a choice about the kind of education they want.” A State Board member voting for the Denison proposal stated that vocational-technical students should be able “to transfer any credits to college if they decide they want more education.”224

After the State Board’s decision, some believed that the private colleges in the WIT service area played a role in defeating the Denison expansion plan. In response to the State Board’s decision, an editorial in the Des Moines Register claimed that “by opposing a community college program in Sioux City, these institutions have helped deny students in their region an option for higher education.” The editorial also emphasized the influential role of the

222 Sister Mary Jordan to Paul Johnston, 1 Oct. 1971, Liberal Arts at W.I.T Correspondence, 1971-1978 Folder, Box 1, Presidents Correspondence 1962-2004, BCA.
Iowa Association of Private Colleges and Universities to help defeat the Denison plan. In addition, WIT Superintendent Kiser commented that the State Board turned down the Denison proposal because the private colleges in the area were opposed. However, this did not stop Kiser from continuing his efforts to achieve community college status, and he convinced the WIT Board of Directors to continue their fight for additional educational opportunities for WIT students.

On November 1, 1971, the WIT Board of Directors voted to resubmit the plan for the Denison expansion. In a 4 to 3 vote, the Board decided to ask the State Board of Public Instruction to reconsider its proposal to make WIT a comprehensive community college and to approve the purchase of the Denison site. The rebuke came swiftly from KCAU-TV, the local television news station in Sioux City:

When the Iowa State Board of Public Instruction reached a decision recently that Western Iowa Tech should not expand into the liberal arts field, we thought the matter had been finally decided. We expected that the Western Iowa Tech Board and Administration would decide to devote its time and attention from here on into the field that the school was established for, namely vocational and technical training. Obviously we were too optimistic. Last night the Western Iowa Tech Board...decided to try again...to expand into the arts and science field...We can only deplore such action.

In addition, IAPCU President Lloyd Watkins, dispatched a letter to Mrs. Richard Cole, a member of the State Board of Public Instruction whom Watkins had referred to as “our chief friend on the Board of Public Instruction” in previous letters to private college officials. Watkins began by explaining WIT’s 4 to 3 vote to resubmit its proposal and how “arguments on these points have
been presented over and over during the past several months…the facts have not changed.” Watkins concluded that the State Board’s “decision was a wise one and should be re-affirmed if necessary.”

In late November 1971, Watkins sent a letter to the presidents of Morningside, Briar Cliff, and Westmar. Watkins confirmed that WIT Superintendent Kiser had intended to resubmit the proposal and was able to get the support of four of his Board members, but Watkins informed the group that he confirmed with some of the members of the State Board that the “re-introduction of the WIT request backfired rather badly.” Dave Bechtel of the Iowa Department of Public Instruction told Watkins that he believed the decision on the Denison request would carry over into the next year. Watkins explained to the presidents that the State Board was unaware of their cooperative work with WIT that began earlier that fall. He warned the presidents that they needed to continue to meet with Kiser to reach a cooperative contractual arrangement to offer liberal arts education to WIT students, instead of allowing WIT to begin a liberal arts program. He stressed, “If there is no progress, he [Kiser] will press ahead on this and claim that ‘efforts to find cooperative areas of agreement’ have failed.” This would give Kiser more reason to continue to move forward with the Denison expansion.

WIT’s Kiser continued to build a case for the Denison expansion. In a follow-up meeting with the three private colleges, Kiser and WIT Academic Dean Wayne Kyle discussed the Denison proposal and community college status. Meeting minutes noted that Kiser had information that prevented the group from entering into cooperative contractual agreements. Kiser stated that he had been advised by Paul Johnston of the State Board of Public Instruction
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“that WIT currently does not have a basis to enter into contractual relations with the private liberal arts colleges until WIT has been granted community college status and thereby officially given a responsibility to serve unmet needs.” Kiser noted that his information showed that the institutions were not meeting the needs of approximately 1,700 students in the service area. He concluded that WIT could serve these students “as a community college,” and he intended to pursue their plan for expansion.\(^{232}\)

In December 1973, the Iowa Department of Public Instruction finally granted WIT “partial” community college status. WIT was not authorized to offer a liberal arts program at its Denison location, but WIT would be allowed to offer “college transfer courses only within the Adult Education Division.”\(^{233}\) In 1976, an Associate of Arts degree was approved for the Denison location, and the first classes in the degree program were scheduled for the 1976-1977 school year.\(^{234}\) In December 1979, a WIT Self-Study Report explained improvements for college-parallel work and articulation efforts with four-year colleges and state universities. For example, the report mentioned that Morningside College and Briar Cliff College had been cooperative and worked to accept transfer credits, even in areas such as accounting and business. The report noted that “effectiveness in achieving institutional goals and purposes is best measured by the type of policies and procedures that have been established to enable the college-parallel program to function effectively,” and is “further strengthened by the increasing acceptance of transferring students’ credits by baccalaureate degree-granting institutions.”\(^{235}\)


\(^{235}\) Comprehensive Self-Study, Dec. 1979, Comprehensive Self Studies, WITA, 57, 65.
Collective opposition had converged against WIT’s Denison expansion proposal, disrupting and delaying the efforts of WIT officials to begin a liberal arts program and reach full community college status. Despite the success of the opposition, WIT officials persisted to meet the educational needs of students in the service area. In 1973, WIT officials achieved their own success, and the institution was granted partial community college status for its adult education program. In 1976, WIT was finally approved to offer an Associate of Arts degree for the Denison location—providing additional educational opportunities and a path to a baccalaureate degree for Merged Area XII students.

Merged Area IV (Northwest Iowa)

Merged Area IV Vocational School was founded in 1966 and renamed the Northwest Iowa Vocational School. Today, it is known as Northwest Iowa Community College. Although Northwest Iowa Vocational School had high hopes to quickly become more than a vocational institution, it remained committed to its vocational curricular mission until 1973. Northwest Iowa Vocational School’s attempt to achieve community college status unfolded differently than those of the two other vocational colleges discussed in this chapter. Without opposition, the institution received approval for a “limited” liberal arts program for military veterans to complete college-transfer coursework. Although limited in scope, the program provided military veterans with the opportunity to complete liberal arts coursework that would transfer to a baccalaureate degree-granting institution. In 1980, the program was discontinued, and the curricular purpose of the institution remained vocational education. (See Appendix A for the location of Merged Area IV.)
The strong foundation for the Northwest Iowa Vocational School in Sheldon began in 1959 when thirteen local school districts worked together to start a vocational education program for area high school students. In 1963, an advisory committee for an Iowa Department of Public Instruction selected the Sheldon program to pilot an “experimental” vocational high school and authorized the Sheldon Community School to oversee the new program. The Iowa Department of Public Instruction provided state and federal funds for the vocational school, which funded 75% of the costs for the first two years. Classes were offered for three hours daily during the school year, and high school students spent the rest of their school day in their home school districts to study academic subjects. The Sheldon site was one of two pilot programs in the state of Iowa. If the programs were successful, it meant the future development of a state-wide area vocational school system, “filling a very long-felt need” for Iowa’s young citizens. It was a success, and the vocational program grew.

In 1966, officials from the Sheldon program submitted the paperwork to become a college-level vocational institution, as allowed by the 1965 Iowa State Legislature. The “pilot” vocational school officially joined the state-wide system of vocational schools and community colleges it helped to establish. It became Merged Area IV and served the counties of Lyon, O’Brien, Osceola, Sioux, and part of Cherokee county. The merged service area included two established private colleges: Northwestern College in Orange City, and Dordt College in Sioux Center.

On April 27, 1966, the Merged Area IV Board of Directors held its organizational meeting to plan the future of the institution. From the very first meeting, Board members
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worked to expand the institution’s curricular purpose and mission. Board Director Carpenter stated, “The board will eventually wish to expand operations and make the school a Community College—not just a Vocational School.” Carpenter continued:

This should not be just a continuation of a high school program, and it should not replace a vocational program in the high schools. The State intends to make certain that high schools strengthen and improve their vocational programs and not attempt to transfer all responsibility for vocational education to the area school. The area school has a responsibility for post high school and adult education.  

Board members further discussed purchasing 80 to 120 acres in order to develop the new institution. Meeting minutes documented that some Board members thought that “enrollment could be as much as 5000.” This enrollment figure included high school students enrolled part-time, high school drop-outs and graduates, adults of all ages, and “junior college students taking the first two years of a four-year academic program.” The minutes reflected an excitement about future possibilities for the new institution, and Merged Area IV officials intended to keep their sights high and not “lose sight of philosophy in trying to build prestige,” and “try to plan a program to serve all who wish to attend.”  

At its next organizational meeting on April 30, 1966, the Board changed the name of Merged Area IV to Northwest Iowa Vocational School.

Northwest Iowa Vocational School retained its strong curricular focus on vocational and technical education until March 14, 1973. Board meeting minutes on that date showed that the Board of Directors approved a plan to submit a request for community college status to the State Board of Public Instruction. The Northwest Iowa Vocational School Board sought approval to provide a “limited” arts and science program “in an evening college format…specifically to veterans returning from Viet Nam.”  

The Iowa State Board of Public Instruction approved the
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program. On June 18, 1975, the Northwest Iowa Vocational School Board of Directors changed
the institution’s name to Northwest Iowa Technical College. Meeting minutes explained the
name change reflected “both the roots of the college in vocational education, and also the new
focus on college transfer curriculum.”\textsuperscript{242} However, Northwest Iowa Technical College
discontinued its arts and sciences in 1980 after peak veteran enrollment passed, and the
institution remained committed to vocational education.\textsuperscript{243}

During the late 1960s and early 1970s, Northwest Iowa Technical College officials
remained focused on the vocational purpose of their institution, but they did develop a liberal arts
program to provide an educational service for military veterans. Because Northwest Iowa
Technical College officials did not seek to provide liberal arts education to other students in the
merged service area, the two-year vocational college did not pose a serious competitive threat to
neighboring private colleges. In contrast to Area I and WIT, Northwest Iowa Technical College
provided a limited liberal arts program without opposition. This situation changed during the
late 1980s.\textsuperscript{244}

\textbf{Conclusion}

This chapter showed how opposition to liberal arts education at two-year vocational
institutions prevented or delayed additional educational opportunities for Iowa students. Private
college officials, with the support of the IAPCU and other private college advocates, successfully
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prevented liberal arts education at Merged Area I (Area I), and delayed liberal arts education at Merged Area XII (WIT). From 1965 to 1975, private college officials recognized that liberal arts education at neighboring two-year colleges posed a serious threat to the survival of their own institutions, and they needed to stop the competitive threat—two-year colleges that sought to achieve community college status and the authority to offer liberal arts education.

The common threat united private college officials in Merged Area I (Area I) and Merged Area XII (WIT), and they cooperated to stop the inclusion of liberal arts education at neighboring two-year vocational colleges. This led to the development of a relationship between private colleges and both vocational colleges that was defined by opposition and persistence. Private college officials and their allies staunchly opposed liberal arts at two-year colleges, while officials from Area I and WIT persisted in their efforts to fight for liberal arts. For Area I and WIT officials, liberal arts education meant increased educational opportunities for their students. More specifically, liberal arts education provided a path to a baccalaureate degree.
CHAPTER 3
SECURING THEIR PLACE IN IOWA’S EDUCATION SYSTEM: HOW PRIVATE FOUR-YEAR COLLEGES OVERCAME THE FINANCIAL AND CURRICULAR THREAT CAUSED BY PUBLIC TWO-YEAR COLLEGES

In 1967, Iowa legislators tried to amend the 1965 law that allowed two-year colleges the authority to offer vocational education and liberal arts education. The intent of the 1967 amendment would have created vocational-only institutions. As explained in Chapter 1, the amendment was defeated, and two-year colleges secured their place in Iowa’s education system. All fifteen two-year colleges remained state-supported institutions, and they retained the authority to offer vocational education and liberal arts education. However, the victory for two-year colleges meant that they remained a financial, as well as a curricular, threat to Iowa’s private four-year colleges. Private college officials had to confront both threats to secure the survival of their institutions in the state’s higher education system.

This chapter discusses how the presence of two-year colleges increased educational opportunities for Iowa students who attended or hoped to attend private four-year colleges in the state. Part I highlights how officials from Iowa private colleges combined their efforts to combat the financial threat, collaborating with representatives from the Iowa Association of Private Colleges and Universities. Both groups worked together to advocate for a tuition equalization program, later known as the Iowa Tuition Grant. The program allowed private colleges to remain competitive, easing the financial threat caused by public two-year colleges. In addition, the Iowa Tuition Grant provided financial assistance to students seeking to attend private four-year colleges and an opportunity to earn a baccalaureate degree. Part II explains how Iowa’s private college officials confronted the curricular threat. Two-year colleges’ authority to offer liberal arts education created uncertainty for many private college officials, and prompted them
to re-examine their curricular missions and identities. Officials from eight private colleges responded to the threat in three distinct ways, which included strengthening their institutions’ liberal arts identity, making significant institutional changes, and changing curricular programs to serve transfer students.

In their efforts to confront the competitive threat, private college officials played a role in the development of a statewide tuition equalization program, as well as the development of new curricular programs at their own institutions. Both developments increased educational opportunities for Iowa students who wanted to attend a private four-year college.

Part I: The Financial Threat

In October 1967, Iowa had twenty-six private four-year colleges and universities, and most offered liberal arts education. According to the Des Moines Register, there were signs that many private colleges had started to experience financial difficulty:

Some colleges which a few years ago boasted high entrance requirements quietly have begun accepting students who flunked out of other schools. Tuition charges to students are rising sharply, much faster than the state universities. Although several of the colleges are filled to capacity this fall, most are not…Higher education is in a financial pinch which is being felt most strongly by the private colleges. Nationally, many of the private, four-year colleges are expected to fold.245

The article emphasized that Iowa’s higher education system could become a “one track system” of financially supported public institutions, if private colleges failed to remain financially viable option for students. Private colleges were in direct competition with Iowa’s public institutions and financially disadvantaged when competing for students. The article also compared student tuition costs at private colleges and state-supported institutions. In 1967, the average student at a
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private college paid $1,097 a year for tuition. This amount was $724 more than the average Iowa student paid at one of the three state universities. The gap between private and public tuition had significantly increased.\(^\text{246}\)

Several of Iowa’s private college presidents were interviewed for the article, and they shared their concerns about tuition costs. Wartburg College President John Bachman stated, “We need either new sources of income or increased income from present sources. Otherwise the future would not be bright.” Joseph McCabe, President of Coe College, commented that without state support “a decline from excellence would be inevitable.” And Rev. F.J. McMahan of St. Ambrose College explained that without new funding sources for private colleges there would be “a slow decrease in enrollment, faculty, and quality of education until all programs would be discontinued.” Private college presidents understood the seriousness of the financial challenges and what they meant to the survival of their institutions—they, as well as Iowa students, would need help.\(^\text{247}\)

In addition, a study by the Iowa Association of Private Colleges and Universities, the State Board of Public Instruction, and the State Board of Regents reached a similar conclusion. The study revealed that “private institutions face a major problem in financing,” and if student fees were “to remain within the ability of most students to pay, state and federal money, in some manner, will undoubtedly be necessary” to maintain private colleges as an option for higher education in Iowa.\(^\text{248}\) Private college officials feared that as costs for their institutions increased,

\(^{246}\) Ibid., 13.
\(^{247}\) Ibid., 13.
\(^{248}\) Ibid., 20.
more middle-income students would choose “tax-supported junior colleges.” Two-year colleges posed an immediate threat to the survival of private colleges in the state.

This situation dramatically increased the urgency for private college proponents to pressure Iowa state legislators to pass a tuition equalization program. Private college officials and the Iowa Association of Private Colleges and Universities worked together to build a case against two-year colleges, and for a tuition equalization program. In May 1969, private college proponents were rewarded for their efforts with the passage of the Iowa Tuition Grant Program. The new program provided financial support to students who wanted to attend private colleges, and it also helped to level the playing field between Iowa’s public and private institutions as they competed for students.

**Private College Officials Build Support for Tuition Grant Program**

In the April 1966 Report of the President, Upper Iowa University President Eugene Garbee called on each member of his Board to help monitor the many higher education issues that challenged the future of private colleges, especially financial issues. Garbee explained that public education at all levels was “receiving vast sums of tax money for all kinds of educational endeavors,” but private education was “hard put to even try to keep pace with our fellow institutions.” This meant that private colleges would have to compete for students. Garbee feared that if Iowa students did not receive financial support from the state, they would soon be “forced to attend tax supported institutions and especially the recently created
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community colleges…” However, Garbee was hopeful about the possible passage of the Iowa Tuition Grant Program, and he referred to the state-wide program as “the most promising for students who are attending private colleges.”

In the fall of 1967, Loras College President Monsignor Justin Driscoll explained the need to defend private education against competitive forces. Driscoll emphasized that he supported United States Chamber of Commerce proposals that encouraged universities and educational associations to sponsor symposiums “to explore the advantages, appropriate procedures, and possible pitfalls of establishing educational competition.” Driscoll stressed the need to continue the support for Iowa private colleges that enrolled approximately 38,000 students during the 1966-1967 school year, as compared to the approximately 40,000 students enrolled at Iowa’s three public state institutions. State of Iowa officials could no longer afford to ignore private institutions, or circumstances would “make it economically and educationally impossible for the students to attend these institutions.”

In the May 1967 Wartburg College President’s Report, Director of Admissions Victor Pinke explained the increased competition and how many new two-year colleges had started to offer students the first two years of a four-year degree “near their homes at moderate cost.” This meant Wartburg admission staff had to spend much time and effort trying to lure students away from “tax-supported colleges,” as well as other private colleges. Pinke noted that tax-supported colleges were “tough competition,” and many students attended state-supported institutions to avoid becoming “heavily indebted for their education.” Wartburg College officials stressed that the gap had begun to widen between tuition at Iowa’s private colleges and tuition at tax-
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supported public institutions, and they understood how important the tuition grant program was to their ability to successfully compete for students. In his annual report to the Wartburg Board of Directors, President John Bachman stated, “Unless the state legislature passes the tuition grant program to assist students who elect to attend private colleges, we will be at a serious disadvantage when competing with tax-supported colleges for students.” Iowa students had already begun to choose public higher education, and Bachman informed his Board that the application cancellations were “running ahead of last year.” Several applicants indicated to Wartburg financial aid staff that the offers were “not as good as that received elsewhere.” The financial issues and the tuition gap had become a major challenge for private college officials.255

In the 1967-1968 Annual Report to the Board, Simpson College President Ralph John wrote that private institutions “find a serious competition with public higher education—universities, junior and community colleges.” The report discussed how the competitive nature of higher education had increased the need to pass the proposed state tuition grant, which meant that a student would have “free choice in selecting private or public colleges.” John explained that other states had passed similar legislation, and he hoped Iowa would soon do the same, noting the Iowa plan would be similar to tuition programs already “established in Illinois, Michigan, New Jersey, and elsewhere.” These programs “brought new strength to the private institutions” in the states where they had been established, and the cost to the taxpayers was lower than it would be if all students enrolled in public institutions.256

Private college presidents also educated and informed their faculties about competition between public and private institutions, as well as the need for the tuition grant program. For  
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example, in the fall of 1970, Upper Iowa’s new President Aldrich Paul introduced the year’s theme on “accountability,” and “putting our own house in order” to the faculty and staff.\textsuperscript{257} He explained that Upper Iowa was like a ship lost at sea during a storm. In the midst of the storm, the ship sprang a few leaks. Paul continued:

\begin{quote}
Now, there are several things the ship can do…let the damn thing sink…or patch up the ship and head for the nearest port…In a sense this is the story of Upper Iowa. We are making an effort to patch up the leaks; we are trying to chart a course through the fog of tomorrow. It is a little difficult to see what the dawn will bring.\textsuperscript{258}
\end{quote}

Paul then presented financial information about Upper Iowa and the difficulties facing the institution during its “stormy” ride at sea. He emphasized that Upper Iowa’s “leaks” were the institution’s financial debt, declining enrollment, and outside factors. The outside factor of “great concern” was the competition caused by Iowa’s new public two-year colleges.\textsuperscript{259}

Private college officials worked diligently to build support for a tuition grant program, while also building a case against two-year colleges as a competitive financial threat. In addition, the Iowa Association of Private Colleges and Universities provided coordination and support for private college officials in their efforts to fight for passage of a tuition grant program that had the potential to increase student enrollment and to improve the financial security at Iowa’s private colleges.

\textit{The Role of the Iowa Association of Private Colleges and Universities (IAPCU)}

Originally known as the Association of Independent Non-Tax Supported Colleges and Universities of Iowa, the IAPCU had advocated for member institutions since 1962. Member institutions included church-affiliated and non-sectarian liberal arts institutions. According to
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the Articles of Incorporation, the purpose of IAPCU was “to foster the growth and development of non-tax supported colleges and universities of higher education in Iowa…to provide a means for cooperative endeavors in all areas of higher education…and to improve educational opportunities for the students in Iowa.”

In the summer of 1968, the IAPCU conducted an extensive data collection project to discover the economic and financial needs of Iowans wishing to access higher education. The final report concluded that high percentages of Iowans believed that a lack of financial resources and scholarships prevented students from attending institutions of higher learning. In August 1968, IAPCU officials mailed the results from the final report to private college presidents so they could distribute the information to their Board of Directors, faculty, community members, and anyone else who could help build a “grass roots” movement to persuade legislators to support the Iowa Tuition Grant.

In a memorandum to his Board, faculty, and administrative council, Morningside President Richard Palmer attached a copy of the report and noted that the document was “one of the most important documents which will come to you from my office this year…read it carefully, and at every opportunity, spread the word and enlist support from friends.” Palmer concluded, “In my opinion, nothing which will come before the legislature will be more important than the proposed plan for a State Tuition Grant program.” In March 1969, Palmer sent a letter to alumni, friends of the college, and parents of Morningside students, pleading for assistance to support the tuition grant program that legislators would soon be voting for or
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against. Palmer encouraged the recipients of the letter to write or call their legislators, concluding: “WE NEED YOUR SUPPORT NOW!”

IAPCU President Gaylord Couchman provided consistent information and talking points to make sure all private college officials would “sing out of the same hymnbook.” Couchman explained that if private college officials did not present a consistent message, the “opposition could gain greatly by demonstrating that different colleges had different interpretations of our program, or differed as to the amount of money that should be appropriated.” In a February 6, 1969 memorandum to IAPCU member presidents, Couchman stated that he felt that they had established support for the tuition grant program, but cautioned members that the legislation was not “in the bag” and they needed to maintain their consistent efforts. Couchman concluded, “Our work is far from done…If we continue to stay together and ‘keep our cool’ in the face of inevitable problems…and if we communicate well both internally and externally, we appear to have an excellent chance to succeed in this long term effort.” IAPCU’s communication and coordination helped to unify the state’s private college officials. IAPCU leaders understood that private college officials needed accurate information and consistent talking points to highlight the financial threat posed by new public two-year colleges. The coordinated efforts of both groups pressured Iowa legislators to seriously consider a tuition grant program.

**Iowa Tuition Grant Program Established**

The collaborative efforts of private college officials and the IAPCU in support of the Iowa Tuition Grant contributed to its passage in May 1969. Many Iowa private colleges had
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begun to experience declines in enrollment, which ultimately led to financial instability for the institutions. In addition, the rapid development of Iowa’s two-year colleges from 1966 to 1967 provided students with more educational options at cost-effective public institutions. The presence of two-year colleges had a direct effect on student enrollment at private colleges, and private college officials dramatically increased their efforts to compete for students. So, passage of the Iowa Tuition Grant relieved some of the financial pressure for private colleges; however, private college officials continued to advocate for additional funding in subsequent years.

In the December 1968 President’s Report, Drake College President Paul Sharp called attention to the IAPCU’s work to advocate for the passage of the tuition grant program. Sharp informed the Drake Board of Directors that the IAPCU had been publicizing the need for the proposed law, and there was “clearly a considerable sentiment supporting tuition grants for students attending private institutions.” In addition, Sharp was pleased with the election of Iowa’s new governor, Robert Ray, stating that the election of Ray “places a Drake alumnus and strong friend of the tuition grants program in the Governor’s Office, and we have been assured of his warm and vigorous support.”

Governor Ray’s support and the efforts of the IAPCU resulted in the passage of the Iowa Tuition Grant Program in May 1969. Many private college advocates had high hopes for the new tuition program and the financial support it would provide. In a memorandum to Iowa College Presidents, E.D. Farwell explained the purpose of the Iowa Tuition Grant:

A basic premise was that each student attending a private college/university should first pay tuition equivalent to the average tuition at the three state universities. Beyond that, the difference between that tuition and the tuition at a private college/university, but not
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exceeding the cost of undergraduate instruction at the state universities, should be granted
to each Iowa resident attending an independent college/university on a full-time basis.267

Despite their relief that the new program had passed, most officials recognized that it would be
impossible to get an appropriation of approximately 20 million dollars to meet the financial
needs of all Iowa students wishing to attend private colleges. Instead, due to financial
constraints, the first appropriations established support only for students with the most financial
need. In 1969, the Iowa legislature approved appropriations for 1.5 million.268

In May 1970 Wartburg College President Bachman reported, “It is fortunate, indeed that
the Iowa Tuition Grant Plan is in effect. For 1970-71, Wartburg students are being offered
$225,000 from this source. I dread to think what we would be facing without this assistance, and
the continuation, or better, expansion of the Plan is crucial.”269 Bachman went on to note that
because of the financial support, Wartburg’s enrollment would remain steady, matching the
previous year’s enrollment of 1,300 students. But in a June 1970 letter that began “Dear Friend
of Wartburg College,” Bachman asked for additional support to confront the institution’s
financial challenges. The letter stated, “Through careful fiscal planning and with the continuing
support of loyal friends, Wartburg has been one of very few colleges with a modest operating
balance. This year, however, inflation is taking its toll and we will have an operating deficit
unless we receive additional assistance by July 1.”270 Although the Iowa legislature approved
the Iowa Tuition Grant Program, private college officials still had to advocate for additional
financial support.
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In October 1971, President Bachman continued to acknowledge the importance of the Iowa Tuition Grant Program. He noted that Wartburg students were receiving more tuition grant money than students at any other Iowa institution, except Drake University. During the 1971-1972 school year, Wartburg would receive 278 Iowa Tuition Grants that totaled $270,000.

Bachman further explained:

The Iowa Tuition Grant plan has helped...to stabilize our enrollment. Some of us work very hard to insure [sic] the favorable decision of the legislature, but adoption of the appropriation would not have been enough without diligent work by our financial aids and admissions officers, urging, reminding, assisting students to submit applications.271

The March 1972 Wartburg Admissions Report summarized the actions taken by admissions staff to remind students of the tuition grant opportunity. The report noted that Wartburg had increased its mailings and phone calls to encourage students to apply for the Iowa Tuition Grant, and ultimately to use the funds to attend Wartburg. The admissions report stated that “competition for students today is so great that we must find new and better techniques each year just to stay even.” The report continued, “Competition becomes increasingly severe for Iowa students as all of the colleges in Iowa would like to have a larger share of the Tuition Grant funds.” In addition, private colleges were also losing students to vocational training institutions.272

Morningside College President Thomas Thompson also continued to fight for expansion of the Iowa Tuition Grant Program. In his October 1974 Report to the Board of Directors, Thompson explained the need to expand funding for the Iowa Tuition Grant Program, noting that the tuition gap between private and public higher education institutions still existed. Thompson wrote that “private higher education is in a position like that of a successful business which
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suddenly faces a worthy competitor which is subsidized by government and is able to sell its product at one-fourth of cost.” This situation had established the need for more private sector funding to provide Iowa students with a choice to attend a private institution of higher learning. Thompson acknowledged that Iowa had “already come a long way” through the current Iowa Tuition Grant Program, but more needed to be done.273

IAPCU remained active through the mid-1970s in its support of the Iowa Tuition Grant Program. Clarke College Board of Trustees meeting minutes in 1975 showed that the IAPCU encouraged private college officials to advocate for full-funding of the Iowa Tuition Grant. The minutes stated that a basic grant to every Iowa student attending a private college in Iowa could lessen the tax burden on the public sector and keep Iowa students enrolled in private college institutions. By 1977, the state allocation for the Iowa Tuition Grant Program had reached $10,000,000.274 Private college officials and the IAPCU were persistent in their advocacy of the Iowa Tuition Grant program, and their actions helped to lessen the financial threat caused by Iowa’s fifteen state-supported two-year colleges. In addition, their actions provided more educational opportunities for Iowa students. The Iowa Tuition Grant provided financial support to students who already attended private colleges, two-year college students who wanted to transfer to a private college, and students who would not otherwise have considered a private college as an option for higher education.
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Part II: The Curricular Threat

In September 1975, John Phillips, the Acting Deputy Commissioner for Post-Secondary Education for the United States Office of Education Department, addressed attendees at the Annual Meeting of the Association of Iowa College Presidents. Phillips had studied the growth cycle of higher education from the late fifties to the early seventies, and he had outlined the changes that had “overtaken post-secondary education.” Phillips summarized the challenges that confronted many higher education institutions:

“It is clear enough that higher educational institutions…are faced with an immediate imperative to adjust their orientation, their programs, their services, and yes, even their course offerings, to achieve far better linkages between education and employment…We must all actively and creatively pursue that slippery notion of career education in opening up the opportunities for jobs and careers and earning power in the economic marketplace.”

Phillips reminded higher education officials that society had changed—and private education institutions must do the same. In response to Iowa’s two-year colleges offering both vocational and liberal art education, private college officials had already heeded the warning and had begun to examine their curricular purposes and mission. Many private college officials around the state of Iowa were seeking an answer to the question articulated by Luther College President Elwin Farwell, “Will new institutions and major innovations in state universities push the complacent private liberal arts college into obsolescence?”

Officials from Iowa’s private colleges considered liberal arts education and their baccalaureate degree programs as “the heart” of their institutions, but the curricular threat posed by Iowa’s two-year colleges played a role in forcing private colleges to further define their curricular purposes and responsibilities. In 1966, preliminary committee work of the Post High
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School Cooperative Study showed that many of Iowa’s private colleges had been “more exclusively devoted to traditional disciplines…withdrawing from those curricula” which were more “occupationally oriented.” Other private colleges continued to emphasize traditional liberal arts, but they responded to area business needs in their communities and had assumed “additional responsibilities related to the philosophy of the institution and its role in the geographical area.” However, the rapid development of fifteen new public two-year colleges during the late 1960s pressurred Iowa’s private college officials to re-evaluate and re-examine their institutions’ curricular purposes and missions, which led to education program changes at Iowa’s private colleges during the late 1960s and early 1970s.

The remainder of this chapter highlights how private college officials from eight institutions responded to the curricular threat posed by two-year colleges in one of three distinct ways: 1) by retaining the original mission and purpose of a liberal arts institution and seeking to strengthen their identity and reputation in the higher education system; 2) by making significant changes that altered the original mission of the institution, yet secured the long-term survival of each institution; and 3) by modifying or creating new curricular programs that blended liberal arts and vocational education in order to attract transfer students from two-year colleges. These three responses either limited or increased educational opportunities for Iowa students who wanted to attend a private four-year college. Overall, the responses of the eight institutions increased educational opportunities, which included a path to a baccalaureate degree.

Iowa Private Colleges That Strengthened Their Liberal Arts Identity

This section explains how officials from Coe, Cornell, and Drake further defined a liberal arts identity, which hindered or lessened the opportunities for Iowa’s two-year college students seeking upper levels of education or a path to a baccalaureate degree at one of the three institutions. During the late 1960s and the early 1970s, officials from Coe College, Cornell College, and Drake University sought to retain their strong reputations as liberal arts institutions. Coe College faculty resisted working with an “inferior” community college, Cornell College sought cooperative agreements—but only with other reputable liberal arts colleges, and Drake University sought to separate itself from the “community college movement,” while creating new academic programs. Faculty and administrators from each of these three private institutions adapted to the presence of Iowa’s two-year colleges by strengthening and clarifying their role as liberal arts institutions in the state’s higher education system.

**Coe College**

Coe College faculty, led by Professor Murray, resisted a cooperative summer education program with neighboring Kirkwood Community College. Coe faculty feared that working with institutions, such as Kirkwood, would damage the private college’s reputation. Faculty resistance showed how Coe College separated itself from two-year colleges—in an attempt to protect Coe’s identity as a liberal arts institution with high academic standards.

During the 1971-1972 school year, a Community Task Force convened to find ways to provide more comprehensive higher education programs in the Cedar Rapids area. The goal of the Task Force was “to design a cooperative summer school program that would reduce duplicative instructional efforts throughout the area and at the same time offer a wide range of
educational opportunities.” The Task Force consisted of representatives from Kirkwood Community College, Coe College, and Mt. Mercy College. After many meetings and hours of collaborative work, Task Force representatives agreed to a joint three-session summer school program for the summer of 1972 in which Coe and Mt. Mercy would teach upper division courses and Kirkwood would teach lower division courses. On February 1, 1972, Coe College Academic Dean Carson Veach presented a tentative schedule and course information to the Coe faculty in order to provide an opportunity for them to indicate what courses they would prefer to teach during the summer session.\(^{278}\)

At the March 16, 1972 meeting of the Coe faculty, one of the items of business was the “Adoption of the Cooperative Summer School Program.” Academic Dean Veach explained that the summer program was the result of a year-long effort by Coe, Kirkwood, and Mt. Mercy to cooperate and “to serve the community more effectively.”\(^{279}\) Coe College President Leo Nussbaum also spoke to the faculty, trying to appeal to their sense of loyalty to serve the community and to present reasons why Coe needed to be a part of the cooperative program:

Prior to the establishment of Kirkwood Community College…Coe had in many ways fulfilled the function of a community college. The subsequent rapid expansion of Kirkwood into the area of arts and sciences has had the effect of diminishing the Coe night school in particular almost to the point of takeover (although Coe daytime classes have not been much affected). This has added fuel to the community college lobby’s contention that private colleges are not really interested in serving the community. It has become necessary for Coe to do something to counteract this image, without sacrificing the College’s objectives or its essential uniqueness.\(^{280}\)

Discussion followed Nussbaum’s plea to approve the cooperative agreement, and the meeting minutes indicated that the discussion was “mostly adverse.” The meeting minutes noted:

\(^{278}\) Carson Veach to All Coe Faculty, memorandum, “Cooperative Summer School Program,” 1 Feb. 1972, Coe College Faculty Meeting Minutes, Coe College Library Archives, Cedar Rapids, IA (hereafter CCA).

\(^{279}\) Minutes of the Faculty Meeting, 16 March 1972, Coe College Faculty Meeting Minutes, CCA, 2.

\(^{280}\) Ibid., 1-2.
The association of Coe with a public community college in this type of venture could be damaging to Coe’s image and long-range academic program, with little or no compensating benefit to the College. Public relations may be too heavily involved, at the expense of important academic considerations. On reply, it was stated that it ought to be possible under such circumstances to effect some type of useful cooperation without undesirable side effects.  

The other points of contention included “insufficient consultation” with the Coe faculty regarding the planning of the program, and a lack of overall communication. Ultimately, Coe withdrew from the cooperative agreement due to lack of faculty support. A faculty vote revealed a 31 to 26 decision against the cooperative program with Kirkwood and Mt. Mercy.

On March 17, 1972, the Cedar Rapids Gazette reported on the Coe faculty meeting and highlighted Coe’s withdrawal from the joint summer program. The headline in the Gazette read, “Coe Faculty Scuttles Joint Three-College Summer School,” and the opening line of the article stated, “The Coe faculty in a surprise move Thursday torpedoed a proposal for cooperative summer school program involving Coe, Mt. Mercy and Kirkwood colleges.” The article noted that Coe College President Nussbaum had been instrumental in the discussions between the three institutions. The article quoted Nussbaum as stating, “I’m probably the most embarrassed person of all this morning because of my initial roll [sic] in the venture,” but also adding that “the nature of higher education for the next several years literally compels us to find ways of cooperating in public and private sectors.” The article also quoted Academic Dean Veach, the chairman of the Task Force that planned the joint summer program. Veach was surprised by the faculty vote, and he explained that a major concern for the faculty “seemed to be with an arrangement which would have allowed lower division courses—those taught in the first two years—to be
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administered through Kirkwood.” Veach added, “They were afraid someone outside of Coe would choose the instructor to teach a Coe course,” and some of the faculty “felt uncomfortable that a Coe course could be staffed by someone outside Coe.”

On March 23, 1972, the Coe College newspaper, *The Coe Cosmos*, reported on the objections to the agreement for the joint summer school program with Kirkwood and Mt. Mercy:

Major objections to the summer school co-op, as voiced during the faculty meeting debate were association with schools of lesser reputation, lack of appeal to Coe students, lack of departmental mesh between colleges, and the delay in seeking faculty approval.

The *Coe Cosmos* explained that Dr. John Murray of the history department questioned the benefits Coe would receive by working with Kirkwood and Mt. Mercy and stated controversially, “If you go to sleep with a skunk, he doesn’t end up smelling like you, you end up smelling like him.”

On March 26, 1972, Professor Murray further elaborated on the situation in an editorial in the *Cedar Rapids Gazette*. Murray explained that the Coe faculty who opposed working with Kirkwood did so for “mainly academic” reasons, and that faculty were concerned with “maintaining the name that Coe now enjoys in the world of learning and teaching.” Murray noted that Kirkwood’s course and credits did not automatically transfer to Coe or other institutions because Kirkwood’s courses were “oriented toward the program of a two-year community technical school.” This meant that the courses differed in “depth and breadth from courses in an institution like Coe.” Murray further explained his and the faculty’s concerns:

Furthermore, the students at Coe and Kirkwood are not interchangeable. Admittedly some students are so intelligent they do well anywhere, but Coe’s student body is selected on the basis of test scores and position in class. On the other hand, Kirkwood has an open enrollment. Such a policy is socially laudable, but a mixture of Coe-
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Kirkwood students can only lead to the projecting of instruction to the “average,” which would be considerably below Coe standards. There is a place for both the public and private institutions, but each should do its own thing.”

Murray also noted that many Coe faculty believed that working with less reputable institutions would jeopardize what Coe worked decades to achieve.

News of the professor’s skunk analogy spread. On March 30, 1972, the *Des Moines Register* published an article entitled, “Coe Prof’s Skunk Analogy Embarrassing to Officials,” which reported:

Murray said Wednesday he had been quoted accurately but ‘out of context’ in the skunk statement. He said the point he was making was that for Coe to join such a venture could only lessen Coe’s academic reputation. “Academically we are a great deal better, which is a fact that no one seems to want to face,” Murray said. He said trying to mix Coe and Kirkwood is like trying to mix oil and water, though he insisted there are worthy roles for both schools to play. “If you have two things together, the lesser one always pulls the other down.”

The *Des Moines Register* stressed that Coe President Nussbaum sent letters to the leaders of Mt. Mercy and Kirkwood to make it clear that “Murray spoke only for himself and that Coe’s official position is to push for cooperative programs.” The *Des Moines Register* also explained that Kirkwood Associate Superintendent Vernon Pickett “rejected Murray’s seeming contention that Coe students might have their education compromised by association with Kirkwood students,” and he was confident that Murray’s views were not the views of most Coe officials and faculty.

Coe faculty resisted working with “inferior” institutions such as Kirkwood and Mt. Mercy. This action inhibited the development of a cooperative relationship with neighboring institutions that could have provided students with an opportunity to obtain upper-level education.

---

288 ibid.
289 William Simbro, “Coe Prof’s Skunk Analogy Embarrassing to Officials,” *Des Moines Register*, March 30, 1972, Newspaper Clippings Binder, MMA.
290 ibid.
and to more easily transfer from Kirkwood to a private four-year college such as Coe or Mt. Mercy. Although Coe did not develop a cooperative relationship with Kirkwood and Mt. Mercy, Coe officials did work with a neighboring institution known for its strong liberal arts education programs—Cornell College.

Cornell College

By the 1960s, Cornell College, located in Mt. Vernon, had developed a reputation as a strong liberal arts college, and it was known for “its friendly intellectual atmosphere.” During the early 1970s, Cornell College faced enrollment and financial challenges. To overcome the challenges, Cornell officials chose to cooperate with neighboring Coe College, and to increase student enrollment. The cooperative relationship between Cornell and Coe strengthened each institution’s identity as a liberal arts institution. In addition, Cornell’s attempt to attract more highly qualified students did not include the possibility of recruiting students from two-year colleges. This decision hindered the opportunity for Iowa’s two-year college students to attend a baccalaureate degree-granting institution.

During the 1970-1971 school year, Cornell officials began to reexamine their purpose and mission. Cornell College President Samuel Stumpf remarked at a March 1971 faculty meeting that the time had come for the college “to undertake clarification of the distinctive contribution it has to make to education,” and to “sharpen” their conception of the institution’s mission and goals. The renewed focus was initiated by “the general uncertainty of the goals of higher education,” and according to Stumpf, the Cornell College community needed to undertake

291 Cornell College Institutional Profile, Oct. 1972, Box 2, Institutional Profile, Cornell College Library Archives, Mount Vernon, IA (hereafter COCA), 1-2.
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a “continuous examination of its own curriculum and purposes.” The first step in the process was to appoint a committee of students, faculty, and administrators—called the Commission of the Future of Cornell College.293

The main goal of the Commission was to assist Cornell officials in their efforts to increase student enrollment and to improve the institution’s financial standing. The 1972 Cornell College Institutional Profile Report stated the institution’s financial situation remained serious. Financial limitations had complicated Cornell’s ability to attract higher quality faculty and to improve its facilities. Cornell officials understood that the situation could be remedied if the institution increased its student enrollment to 1000 or more students, which would be an increase of 40-50 students.294 This put pressure on Cornell’s admissions staff, and the Director of Admissions further explained the challenges:

Our challenge in these times…is to reach new student enrollment objectives despite intense competition for students among the colleges and universities, and when private college costs have been rising for the last two decades making the cost gap between public and private higher education continually wider, and when there are changing values among the nation’s youth in regard to the need and usefulness of traditional liberal arts education.295

In an attempt to reach new students, Cornell admission officials did not waver on their objective to “recruit the best qualified students for curriculum and degree programs offered at the College.” The Director of Admissions also reported that Cornell College did maintain contact with secondary schools and two-year colleges to recruit new students, but noted that “there is no indication that…two-year college graduates offer any significant enrollment potential for us.”296
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Due to the decrease in enrollment and financial status of the institution, Cornell College worked to establish a cooperative relationship with Coe College, located 12 miles away in Cedar Rapids. The purpose of the cooperative relationship was to share resources that included faculty and courses. In February 1974, Cornell and Coe entered into an agreement that allowed students at each institution to take courses offered at the other institution. The agreement provided students from both institutions with the opportunity to take upper-level courses not available at their home institution. Additionally, the agreement would “promote an exchange of ideas and information” which would benefit students from both schools.\(^{297}\) In March 1974, the Presidents of the two colleges issued a joint press release to announce the sharing agreement, effective for the 1974-1975 school year. Thirty-three Coe and Cornell students enrolled in the cross-registration program during the 1974 fall semester.\(^{298}\)

In 1975, Cornell and Coe officials also received a joint grant of $169,000 for a three-year period to further study ways the two institutions could “cooperate more closely to avoid increased costs, while at the same time maintaining or enhancing diversified, high-quality academic programs.”\(^{299}\) The study was an attempt to discover “whether two traditional liberal arts colleges of comparable history and quality” could find ways “to increase their productivity.”\(^{300}\) The “long-time rivals” had become cooperative partners, and the partnership led to the sharing of library resources, faculty, fine arts and cultural events, joint off-campus
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study opportunities, and a bookstore manager. Cornell and Coe also established regular bus routes between the two campuses…provided for by two eight-passenger vans.” The vans were called the Coe/Cornell Cooperation vans—signifying their new cooperative relationship.

The new cooperative relationship also signified how two private four-year liberal arts institutions were willing to share resources and students. When Cornell officials needed to secure help to combat its enrollment and financial challenges, they reached out to another private college with a similar mission and reputation. Cornell officials did not view two-year college graduates as a significant group from which to recruit. Instead, Cornell officials worked with Coe to ensure that Cornell could retain highly-qualified students, faculty, and education programs. In addition, Coe was a perfect partner—as Coe faculty had resisted working with other institutions for the sake of maintaining its own reputation as a quality liberal arts institution. The cooperative relationship between Cornell and Coe signaled the unwillingness of Cornell to develop a relationship with two-year colleges, which decreased opportunities for two-year college students to attend Cornell.

**Drake University**

As the community college movement gained popularity in Iowa, Drake officials re-evaluated their own community college program, seeking to retain the institution’s reputation and to develop as a contemporary university. Drake officials worked to separate from the community college movement by creating new and more prestigious education programs and recruiting “high caliber students” from a neighboring private junior college, Grand View Junior
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College. These actions strengthened Drake’s identity as a private liberal arts institution, but decreased educational opportunities for public two-year college students who may have sought to enroll at Drake University.

In 1946, Drake University, a private university in Des Moines, started its own community college program known as the Drake University Community College. The Community College included adult education classes offered mostly in the late afternoon and night on the Drake campus and “about 30 centers” across Iowa. By 1960, the three major areas of study offered by the on-campus evening programs were Business Administration, Education, and Liberal Arts. Courses included accounting, secretarial science, education, English, mathematics, psychology, and sociology. The community college program was a non-degree granting program within the university, but the university did develop certificate programs to “to help meet the needs for a goal after thirty or sixty hours of work, and for specified vocationally useful learning.” Certificates included Junior Collegiate, Accounting, Advertising and Marketing, Basic Engineering, Business Management, Industrial Relations, and Personnel Management.

But in December 1960, Drake officials decided to change the name of their community college program to remain distinct from two-year community colleges that had developed across the nation. The Dean of the Community College, Alfred Schwartz, recommended a name change from Drake University Community College to the “University Collegiate of Drake University,” explaining that the change would avoid confusion with the “growing community college movement,” and that similar name changes at other “prominent universities” had been successful. In early January 1962, Drake President Henry Harmon announced the name change.
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change for the program as recommended by Schwartz. Harmon explained that the name change was made “because its present programs, and those being proposed, encompass much more than that found in the community colleges of the United States…to avoid confusion with these colleges, we have deemed it wise to effect a change in name.”

In the spring of 1962, the University College had enrolled a total of 1,582 part-time students in all of its adult education courses. From 1962 to 1965, University College enrollment grew to 2,608 students in the fall of 1966. However, the 1966 fall enrollment was a decline of 422 students from the 1965 fall enrollment. The decline was due to fewer class offerings, teacher availability, and the development of the state’s two-year colleges. New Drake President Paul Sharp noted that “this very serious reduction in the number of part-time students in University College had given us great concern.” Due to the decline in University College enrollment and the need to separate the institution from the “community college movement,” Sharp made an effort to create new and innovative programs for University College, reaching out to a reputable private college in northwest Iowa. Sharp explained one of the new programs in his June 1967 Board of Directors Report:

Through the University College and the Graduate Division, we have established a graduate center on the Buena Vista College campus. This is an experiment to develop “off-campus courses” on the campus of a Liberal Arts college, rather than in scattered high schools or public buildings throughout the State. Indeed, we are substantially reducing our “off-campus” commitments because of their low quality. Instead we are hoping to place the remaining programs on Liberal Arts campuses where library facilities and an academic atmosphere are available. Eventually, we believe that this type of University College program will replace all of our “off-campus courses.”

Sharp’s emphasis on “off-campus courses” signaled that the University College would continue, but it would take on a new meaning while raising the quality of the programs. This was an
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attempt to end University College’s less prestigious community college-like offerings and shift to more prestigious graduate programs.

In the June 1968 Report of the President, Sharp explained Drake’s effort to become a “unique and contemporary university in this age when so much in education is new and when so many established institutions appear too proud to adjust to the times.”309 The new outlook and direction prompted Drake officials to consider another cooperative arrangement, this time with Grand View Junior College in Des Moines. This was another attempt “to strengthen significantly Drake’s opportunity to attract high caliber students into its advanced programs.”310

On behalf of Sharp, Drake administrator David Brown directed College of Liberal Arts Dean, Elsworth Woods, “to negotiate with Grand View as soon as possible” to implement a cooperative program that would begin during the fall of 1969. Brown stressed that “it seems entirely logical and appropriate that we should enter into such programs with the state’s colleges and junior colleges…such cooperative programs can be a valuable source to students who can benefit from our advanced programs.”311

Grand View College officials had encouraged Drake University officials to participate in a cooperative program that included the three state universities in Iowa: University of Iowa, Iowa State University, and State College of Iowa. Grand View President Ernest Nielsen reached out to Drake officials to illicit a response about joining the group. Neilsen wrote, “I do not in any way wish to rush you or your colleagues. However, the students who are interested in the three year program and might like to select Drake University would be greatly helped” if Drake gave
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their assurance that they would participate in the program.\footnote{Ernest Nielsen to Elsworth Woods, 7 March 1969, Grandview Cooperative Program 1966-1969 Folder, President’s Papers: SHARP Subseries: External Correspondence, DUA.} Drake officials enthusiastically agreed to participate “for the vitality of American higher education and university education,” which was “highly dependent upon successful transfer between junior colleges and universities.”\footnote{David Brown to President Paul Sharp, memorandum, 19 March 1969, Grandview Cooperative Program 1966-1969 Folder, President’s Papers: SHARP Subseries: External Correspondence, DUA.} In a letter dated March 26, 1969, Drake President Sharp explained to Nielsen that he was “delighted to confirm Drake’s interest in joining with Grand View College and Iowa’s three public universities in your ‘Three-Year Program for the Superior Student.’ This is a logical partnership between geographically proximate, private institutions that will strengthen both schools.”\footnote{Paul Sharp to Ernest Nielsen, 26 March 1969, Grandview Cooperative Program 1966-1969 Folder, President’s Papers: SHARP Subseries: External Correspondence, DUA.}

During this time of change, Drake officials also understood the need to maintain enrollment and acknowledged the importance of working with state universities and junior colleges, but Drake officials sought to maintain a higher standard that reflected Drake’s reputation as a quality liberal arts institution. This meant that they would work with an established junior college known for attracting quality students—neighboring Grand View Junior College. Drake would join Grand View in the effort to create the “Three-Year Program for the Superior Student.” Drake officials wanted to cooperate with other institutions, but distinguished between two-year colleges—selecting a private junior college that could send them “superior” students. As Drake officials separated the institution from the community college movement, they did create different educational opportunities for students, including graduate education programs for “off campus” students, and a cooperative program with a neighboring junior college. However, these educational opportunities moved the institution toward serving different...
student populations, which included graduate students and “superior” students from a neighboring private junior college. This action lessened the opportunity for students from Iowa’s new public two-year colleges to attend Drake.

**Iowa Private Colleges That Made Significant Institutional Changes**

While some Iowa private colleges re-established their identities as liberal arts institutions, others made more significant changes. Private colleges such as Grand View University and Mt. Mercy University made institutional changes that altered the identity and mission of each institution. Both colleges were founded as private junior colleges and developed into four-year colleges, so change was not a new phenomenon for the institutions. The presence of state supported two-year colleges forced Grand View and Mt. Mercy to make additional significant institutional changes to secure their long-term survival in the state’s higher education system. Grand View set itself apart as a private junior college, which accelerated its development as a four-year baccalaureate degree-granting institution. Mt. Mercy changed from a Catholic women’s college to a coeducational institution. These actions provided additional curricular programs at each institution, and more importantly, provided the opportunity for more Iowa students to earn a baccalaureate degree.

**Grand View College**

As one of the largest private junior colleges in Iowa, Grand View College had developed a close relationship with Iowa’s three public universities. Since the early 1960s the three public universities approved college-level work from Grand View due to the “quality of work being done” at the institution. The early relationship eventually led to the development of the “Three-
Year Program for the Superior Student” in 1968. Participating students completed three years at Grand View College, and then could be admitted as a senior at one of the three state universities to complete an additional year to earn a Bachelor’s degree, or complete two additional years to earn a Master’s degree. Grand View promoted the cooperative program as the “only program of its kind in Iowa” and urged students to participate to become part of a “unique and challenging educational adventure.” The distinct program helped to later redefine Grand View’s identity and position in Iowa’s higher education system, and Grand View officials used the program as a foundation to achieve full accreditation as a four-year institution.

By 1973, Grand View College President Karl Langrock told the Board of Directors that Grand View was “an almost obsolete” private junior college, and was slowly slipping out of the mainstream of American higher education. Langrock then brought attention to the “crisis of identity” that had confronted other private colleges and universities around the nation, by quoting Dr. James Davis’s explanation of the crisis of identity in the North Central Association Quarterly:

> Of the 2,500 institutions of higher education in America, nearly half have enrollments under 2,000…the small college still touches the lives of significant numbers of American youth. The small college has played an important role in the history of American higher education and is today an important outpost of experimentation and innovation. Yet the small colleges today are facing a severe crisis. Although the crisis may first manifest itself in declining enrollments, budget deficits, departures of talented faculty, or less of traditional sources of support, the underlying crisis is a crisis of identity.

Davis pointed out that small colleges once identified themselves as liberal arts institutions, “providing a strong general education program…what was once a clear sense of identity and
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purpose in now being challenged both in theory and practice.” The “crisis of identity” prompted Langrock to initiate an “in-depth self-study and possible redefinition of the purposes of Grand View College.” He appointed a special “Committee on the Future” to begin conversations about what made Grand View distinct and possible new directions for the college. The Committee was charged to examine if there was an identity crisis at Grand View, and to search for a “special purpose identity” for the institution.319

On September 18, 1973, the Grand View Board of Directors authorized the development of a baccalaureate degree program. This major decision was “a logical culmination to the planning process” that began with the work of the Committee on the Future. Grand View officials and faculty had determined that there was “a definite need in central Iowa for a baccalaureate degree in nursing.” Due to Grand View’s Lutheran affiliation and close relationship with the Iowa Lutheran Hospital in Des Moines, Grand View officials recommended the baccalaureate program. The development of the new degree program marked a turning point for the college, “changing Grand View’s historic position as a two-year transfer institution.”320

The Three-Year Program for the Superior Student had already added a third year of study for students who wanted to transfer to a state university as a senior. Therefore, Grand View was “in the unique position of having the capability” to add other degree programs “using the present academic base.” In addition, the “initiation of a baccalaureate program would tend to increase the prestige of the institution…and put Grand View in a more favorable competitive position when it seeks financial support from the community of program support from foundations.”321
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The 1974 Grand View Self Study Report further addressed the connection between the recommendation for more baccalaureate degree programs and its future relationship with other higher education institutions in the Des Moines area. The report noted that “another major reason” for the expansion was to minimize the competition for students in the Des Moines area and to maximize the possibilities for greater cooperation between currently competing institutions. “One of Grand View’s growing problems is that, as a two-year institution, it is engaged in competition for students with the relatively new Des Moines Community College, which is publicly supported.” The report further explained:

While program emphasis at the two institutions so far has been somewhat different (the Community College emphasizing vocational/technical oriented programs and Grand View the basic liberal arts), this gap is slowly being narrowed as the Community College begins to initiate programs in the liberal arts. A new college transfer (liberal arts) building is now nearing completion on the Community College campus. So far, Grand View has not suffered heavily as it might have because of its reputation and the quality of its academic programs but, with time, this situation will undoubtedly change.322

The report also emphasized that if Grand View expanded its baccalaureate programs, it would no longer be in direct competition with Des Moines Area Community College (DMACC). The two institutions could then work cooperatively to design programs at a reasonable cost for students transferring from the community college. The final work of the Committee for the Future and other self-study reports convinced the Board of Directors to chart a new direction—leading the institution to full accreditation as a four-year institution in 1975.

Grand View officials had already established an academic foundation with its Three-Year Program for the Superior Student, so baccalaureate degree programs provided a way to further shape a new identity and minimize competition with other two-year colleges. In an attempt to avoid direct competition with DMACC, which had initiated programs in liberal arts education,
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Grand View re-examined its identity and charted a new direction as a baccalaureate degree-granting institution. This decision elevated Grand View to a new position in the higher education system and redefined Grand View’s cooperative relationship with DMACC. The change also provided area community colleges students in the Des Moines and surrounding area with expanded educational opportunities. Instead of sending its students to other baccalaureate degree-granting institutions, Grand View could provide students with the opportunity to complete a baccalaureate degree on the Grand View campus.

**Mt. Mercy College**

Mt. Mercy College was founded as a private Catholic junior college for women in 1928. It became an accredited four-year institution in 1960, and remained a women’s college. In the late 1960s, Mt. Mercy officials were concerned about the institution’s future, and Mt. Mercy President Sister Mary Agnes prepared the institution for change. This meant that Mt. Mercy’s traditional mission as an all-women’s college would end, and the institution would begin a new mission as a coeducational college. This was a significant change that ensured the survival of Mt. Mercy by increasing educational opportunities for male students from two-year colleges, and eventually for all two-year college transfer students. Male students from neighboring Kirkwood Community College were the first beneficiaries of the change, but Mt. Mercy officials soon realized the potential of actively recruiting all two-year college students from across Iowa.

In November 1968, Sister Mary Agnes informed the faculty that the Mt. Mercy Board of Directors would be restructured as a lay governing board due to the “many factors in higher education, at the present time, and looking to the future.” Sister Mary Agnes explained that colleges had become like big businesses and the experience of laymen was needed to make the
necessary changes, such as securing public funding and other financial resources. In December 1968, Sister Mary Agnes and the faculty reviewed the results of an institutional self-study report. The work had begun during the fall, and the faculty now had to consider recommendations for change. As noted in the meeting minutes, the group reviewed the following three statements to guide discussion:

1) The college must capitalize more on the resources it possesses because of its location.
2) The college must have 600 full-time students in the near future in order to maintain its present programs.
3) Should Mt. Mercy remain a college for women? Or should it become coeducational?

The review and discussion of the three statements resulted in the development of a Coeducational Task Force. The first goal of the Task Force was to survey students from Area X (Kirkwood) Community College to discover how many male students would consider attending Mt. Mercy College if it became a coeducational institution. In the fall of 1968, 106 Kirkwood men completed the survey, and the results revealed that sixteen men from Kirkwood considered Mt. Mercy as one of their top transfer institutions. An additional thirty men had a considerable interest in Mt. Mercy. In February 1969, the Mt. Mercy faculty voted to recommend coeducation, and male students enrolled for the first time in the fall of 1970.

In the spring of 1971, Mt. Mercy approved “the blanket acceptance of Kirkwood students with Associate of Arts or Associate of Science degrees.” One year later, Mt. Mercy Academic Dean Ron Van Ryswyk noted the success of this transfer program, and he sought to expand Mt. Mercy’s agreements to other Iowa community colleges. This led to transfer agreements with
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fifteen junior and community colleges across Iowa. An article in the *Cedar Rapids Gazette* explained how Mt. Mercy was making the transfer process as simple as possible:

Graduates of an increasing number of area community and private junior colleges are finding transfer to Mt. Mercy College to be a much more simplified task. Being able to transfer course work has long been a problem for junior college students...Dr. Van Ryswyk...said ‘It’s time that junior colleges be given credit for the outstanding work they’re doing and time that four-year colleges stop quibbling over the small differences that exist during the first two years of a student’s college life; whether he attends a junior college, four-year college, or a university.’

Kirkwood students and transfer students from around the state of Iowa helped to boost Mt. Mercy’s overall student enrollment by 13 percent during the fall of 1972. The 1971-1972 President’s Report indicated the success of Associate of Arts transfer students and noted their “above average work” at Mt. Mercy. The report also stated that there had been a “considerable increase in the enrollments in the upper division.” This prompted Mt. Mercy officials to re-examine the institution’s core curriculum courses and to study the possibility of expanding its course offerings to include more liberal arts education programs.

Mt. Mercy’s record enrollments caught the attention of the media. In March 1972, the *Cedar Rapids Gazette* highlighted the growth of Mt. Mercy with the headline, “See Mt. Mercy Growth in Two-Year College Link.” The article reported that Mt. Mercy’s enrollment had grown from 397 students in 1969 to 611 in 1972, and Mt. Mercy Academic Dean Ron Van Ryswyk said that “much of the growth has come because of community college transfers.” Van Ryswyk went on to praise the growth of community colleges and their role in saving four-year colleges such as Mt. Mercy:
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We have established an open door policy to community colleges in the same way community colleges established an open door to high schools and others in the community. In the next five to ten years articulation is going to happen between two and four-year schools. It has to for the four-year schools to survive...community colleges create a market for four-year schools that we never had before.331

Van Ryswyk also explained that two-year college students enrolling at Mt. Mercy were more serious, mature, dedicated, and goal-oriented than many of the students enrolling directly from high school, which meant that four-year colleges would have to adjust to this new type of student by changing the way they did business. Van Ryswyk stressed that change should not be viewed as a threat, but instead as an exciting new possibility that allows institutions to “rethink” education and the education system.332

Mt. Mercy officials did “rethink” their traditional mission as an all-women’s college in order to increase student enrollment and to secure the institution’s future. Mt. Mercy officials initially sought to recruit male students who were interested in obtaining baccalaureate degrees from neighboring Kirkwood Community College. But Mt. Mercy officials soon realized that all of Iowa’s two-year colleges provided a pipeline of transfer students, and they developed cooperative relationships with two-year colleges across the state. This action secured Mt. Mercy’s future as a higher education institution and increased opportunities for Iowa students to transfer to a baccalaureate degree-granting institution.

Iowa Private Colleges That Changed or Created New Curricular Programs

The state’s changing higher education system required private college officials to more actively compete for students, and to thwart the curricular threat posed by two-year colleges. Officials from several private colleges responded to the challenge by modifying existing
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academic programs or creating new programs. Many private college officials realized that their curricular offerings could entice two-year college transfer students to their institutions to take upper-level courses or to earn a baccalaureate degree. This section explains how Upper Iowa University, Dordt College, and Morningside College re-examined and adjusted their curricular programs. To accomplish this, private college officials considered and implemented ways in which liberal arts education could coexist with vocational and career education. The reconciliation between liberal arts and vocational education helped to provide two-year college transfer students with more educational opportunities that matched their needs and interests, providing additional ways for students to achieve a baccalaureate degree in various fields of study.

**Upper Iowa College**

During a faculty meeting on October 6, 1970, Upper Iowa College President Aldrich Paul noted that 7 million U.S. students were attending college in 1970, and predictions claimed that 50 percent of the students who enter college will enroll in two-year institutions. Paul further explained that over two-thirds of the students entering two-year colleges were expected to transfer to four-year institutions, and these students would experience difficulty transferring for the following reasons: 1) the quality of their high school records and lack of guidance in high school; 2) lack of accreditation; and 3) the general distrust on the part of four-year institutions of the quality of education offered at community and vocational colleges. Paul acknowledged that these reasons explained “why we are frightened to allow them carte blanche admission to a dignified B.A. Program,” but he stressed that changes in Upper Iowa’s transfer admissions policy were overdue, as “the winds of change are already touching all four-year colleges…instead of
adjusting grudgingly to these changes we should get off our duff and move.” The “winds of change” prompted Upper Iowa officials to examine how to meet the needs of students who would be transferring to their institution. To accommodate transfer students, Upper Iowa officials developed new curricular programs that blended liberal arts education with more vocational and career-oriented education.

At the October 6, 1970 faculty meeting, Paul asked the faculty for their support to endorse a third degree at Upper Iowa College. Paul explained that it would be known as a B.G.S. (Bachelor of General Studies), and it would be a solution for students “who need general education before being dumped on the job market.” Paul commented that these students would be 18-22 years old, and “some do not want or are really capable of earning a B.A. degree.” The new degree program would provide a way to “purify our B.A., B.S., and Honors Program, as Upper Iowa counselors could screen out the average student and place them in the B.G.S. Program so our B.A. and B.S. will be truly quality B.A. and B.S. degree.” In a follow-up memorandum to the Upper Iowa faculty, Academic Dean Charles Clark noted that the Upper Iowa faculty “voted overwhelmingly” to offer a new Bachelor of General Studies Program. Clark concluded his memorandum by stating that the new degree was “perhaps a large part…of the solution this College must adopt and implement in order to survive.”

In the fall of 1971, Academic Dean Charles Clark continued to monitor and analyze how the new Bachelor of General Studies (B.G.S.) degree would affect Upper Iowa students, specifically transfer students. Clark noted that “few freshmen, transfer students, or upperclassmen have shown much interest in the B.G.S. to date,” and he mentioned that the new degree
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should have drawing power for transfer students from junior colleges “since it cuts the specific liberal arts requirements in half.” Clark went on to discuss the difference between a transfer student from a junior college or community college versus a vocational-technical school:

The fact of the matter is that any junior college or community college graduate who has taken the liberal arts curriculum has no difficulty in transferring to Upper Iowa College and completing a regular B.A. or B.S. degree on schedule. The rub comes with the graduate of a vocational-technical school. He has little to transfer and would fit into the B.G.S. program better than the B.A. or B.S program. Upper Iowa College must recruit with a hard-sell approach in the junior colleges.337

The Upper Iowa Admissions personnel had already put this philosophy into practice. They had recruited heavily from two-year institutions that had achieved community college status, but admissions personnel were disappointed by the decline in the number of applications from prospective students. Reasons for the decline in applications included the cost to attend private colleges like Upper Iowa versus state-supported community colleges and universities, and the decision of some top-ability high school students to enroll in two-year vocational schools instead of more expensive private colleges. The cost-effectiveness of community colleges and vocational schools remained one of the causes of Upper Iowa’s enrollment problems, which also caused a decline in overall revenue.338

On January 4, 1972, President Paul pleaded with the Upper Iowa faculty to act immediately to address the financial and enrollment issues. Paul seemed convinced that Upper Iowa could combat declining enrollment by making changes to the institution’s education programs. He stated that “the best recruiting tool at this time is a curriculum that can compete with other colleges in Iowa.”339 Paul was emphatic that the entire Upper Iowa community
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needed to work together to change degree requirements to make them relevant to a changing society and a changing student population. There were no easy solutions, and there was more than one way for students to receive a liberal arts education. He concluded with a quote from the Association of American Colleges 1971 Annual Report: “For all of higher education, and for the viability of liberal learning in the face of mounting vocationalism, we must bend our united efforts.” Paul then asked the faculty “to bend” to make the necessary changes.\(^{340}\)

Indeed, President Paul was one of the first “to bend” during a time of great change. In 1973, Paul presented a document entitled “Long Range Intentions of Upper Iowa University.” The document displayed purposeful effort to bridge liberal arts education with career education. The opening paragraph stated: “Upper Iowa University offers a basic education in the humanities, the social sciences, and the natural sciences, and mathematics—an education generally termed liberal arts, but an education also oriented toward career pursuits.” Regarding future curricular changes, the document stated that a “continuing emphasis will be placed on blending the traditional liberal arts program with career goals.”\(^{341}\)

At a President’s Associates Dinner in December 1973, President Paul again mentioned how liberal arts was being challenged by junior and community colleges. Paul acknowledged that “the biggest shock for a liberal arts faculty and administration has been the changing role of the liberal arts approach. It has been difficult to shift toward occupational and career training rather than pure liberal education.” Paul also quipped, “The quicker we can face this reality, and the quicker we can shift our goals, the quicker we can recover,” emphasizing that Upper Iowa needed to find a compromise between the pure liberal arts and a career orientation.\(^{342}\)

\(^{340}\) Report of the President, 2 April 1971, 5.
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To move forward with long-range plans to incorporate more career-oriented programs, Upper Iowa collaborated with officials from Area I Vocational-Technical School in Calmar and from Hawkeye Institute of Vocational Technology in Waterloo to develop “new markets for extension courses and new projects of cooperation.” By June of 1974, Upper Iowa officials advertised that they had developed “articulated programs…with junior and community colleges plus vocational technical schools.” A promotional public relations document noted that these programs “attract students…for their third and fourth years, to receive established Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Science Degrees.” In addition, Upper Iowa highlighted its “unique, exciting new major course studies, including the exclusive Small Business Major, a Business Cooperative Program, a Chamber of Commerce/Related Organization Major, plus a Recreation Major.”

In the midst of changing times, Upper Iowa re-evaluated its curricular purpose and made necessary changes. Upper Iowa officials accepted that they would have to enroll transfer students to increase student enrollment and overall revenue for the institution. To accommodate this type of student, officials created a less prestigious baccalaureate degree—the Bachelor of General Studies. At the direction of Upper Iowa’s president, faculty and administration also searched for other ways to modify existing education programs or to develop new programs. Upper Iowa officials came to terms with finding ways to blend liberal arts education with more career-oriented education, as well as to develop cooperative relationships with neighboring two-year colleges. The two-year college, one of the main causes for Upper Iowa’s struggle to survive, became part of the solution. Upper Iowa officials worked, albeit reluctantly, to develop
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cooperative relationships with two-year colleges that benefitted Iowa’s transfer students who could now pursue new vocational and career-related baccalaureate degrees at Upper Iowa.

**Dordt College**

In 1955, Dordt College was founded as a Christian Reformed junior college known as the Midwest Christian Junior College. The institution, located in Sioux Center, was renamed Dordt College one year later because of plans to expand as a four-year college. As a junior college, Dordt’s education programs had provided a pre-professional curriculum to train teachers for state accreditation. As a four-year private college, Dordt intended to expand its pre-professional programs to meet “the changing demands” of technology and society in order to prepare students for “Christian leadership wherever we can.”345 In the fall of 1969, Dordt introduced majors in business administration and business education.346 During the early 1970s, Dordt officials seemed less concerned about enrollment and more concerned about letting future students know that their institution was more than a teacher college. According to Dordt President Reverend B. J. Haan, Dordt had “to change its image from…a teacher education college to that of being a college with a wide variety of respectable, attractive, relevant career-oriented programs.”347 Dordt officials accepted the challenge to change the institution’s image, and they embraced the responsibility to expand vocational education options for students, while also working to maintain the institution’s reputation as a strong liberal arts college.

In the 1973 President’s Report, Haan explained changes to Dordt’s curricular programs and how the institution planned to offer an Associate of Arts degree for secretarial training. In addition, he reported, “The whole area of vocational education with possibilities in agri-business, practical nursing, mechanics, building trades, etc., is under study.” Dordt officials emphasized that such curricular changes must not jeopardize the standards and reputation of their “reputable academic, Christian liberal arts college.”348 Haan conceded to the need to consider more vocational programs as long as Christian values remained central to the mission of the college:

Dordt does exist for the purpose of meeting changing needs within the Kingdom and since career-oriented programs, including vocational programs, are becoming more and more the concern of higher educational institutions, Dordt should also be prepared to train covenant youth in such areas in the light of our distinctive Christian principles.349

The 1975 Dordt College President’s Report highlighted increased student enrollment, and Haan stated, “We are very thankful to the Lord for the 1974 fall enrollment—387 freshmen, total enrollment of 985, records in both areas.” While other private colleges in the area were “embarrassed by sharply declining enrollments,” Haan expressed his thankfulness for Dordt’s good fortune. He further explained reasons for declining enrollment at other institutions that included high costs of education, declining student interest in a college education, and a “growing interest in vocational education.” Haan stated that Dordt must be prepared to “take the necessary steps to adjust” to the interest in vocational education—noting the work of Dordt officials to continue preparation for an agri-business program, which would begin as soon as the “present appointee” accepted the position.350 During the 1977-1978 school year, enrollment
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increased by an additional 100 students, justifying the expansion of more vocational education programs and personnel.\textsuperscript{351}

Dordt officials wanted to retain the institution’s identity as a liberal arts college, but they also understood that Dordt needed to adjust to the changing demands of society and the vocational training needs of its students. Therefore, Dordt officials initiated programs such as secretarial training, agri-business and business administration; and they also considered expansion in the areas of nursing, mechanics, and building trades. By accepting and considering both vocational and liberal arts education, Dordt officials increased student enrollment. In addition, the decision to embrace vocational education programs more fully than other private liberal arts colleges did, sustained Dordt during a time of uncertainty. Their actions to develop a variety of vocational and career education programs provided students with more opportunities to earn baccalaureate degrees in their chosen fields of study. This also meant that Iowa’s two-year vocational college students had more opportunities to pursue advanced degrees in programs offered at Dordt.

\textit{Morningside College}

In 1965, Morningside College officials began to re-evaluate the institution’s purpose and mission. The President’s April Report to the Board of Trustees listed several items that needed attention, the first of which was to gather feedback from faculty in order to re-examine and discuss the curricular mission of the college. The goal was to determine if Morningside should remain a strictly liberal arts institution, should become a multipurpose institution, or should become a combination of both. According to information gathered by a survey team, faculty

held three different opinions about how Morningside should modify its purpose and mission: 1) increase vocational service functions and course offerings; 2) limit curricular offerings to strictly a liberal arts focus; and 3) seek a balance between “present service or vocational functions and strengthening the liberal arts core...” The faculty and Board of Trustees favored seeking a balance by providing all students with a strong liberal arts background, “regardless of what vocational objectives” the student may consider. The Board’s decision to seek a balance between liberal arts and “vocational objectives” signaled that the curricular purposes of the institution would soon evolve to meet the needs of future Morningside students.

In the April 1969 President’s Report, President Richard Palmer explained how higher education had dramatically changed over the years, noting the development of new four-year institutions and the competitive nature among higher education institutions. Palmer specifically noted the increase in the number of two-year colleges in Iowa, and he mentioned that there had been a “tremendous growth both in numbers and in liberal arts courses offered.” Palmer used this information to advocate for a graduate program to promote enrollment growth:

In the event that some prophets prove themselves to be right in foretelling that the first two years of work now being done in the regular four-year college, may well be taken over by the increasing number of junior colleges. This would leave for colleges like ours to provide the last two years of college level work and the fifth year, which is now becoming almost as mandatory as a baccalaureate degree was a few years ago. In the event this happens, we will at least be ready.

Palmer’s concern about how to confront changes in Iowa’s higher education system did not end at the conclusion of his tenure in 1969. New Morningside President Thomas Thompson also recognized the need to address the future curricular purpose and mission of the institution.
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In his April 1971 convocation address, Thompson took time to discuss the change and the mission of Morningside College. Thompson discussed how “human institutions are marvelously resistant to change, to self-renewal; and educational institutions are, by definition, conservators of the past,” and the current financial circumstances were an incentive for “a realistic reappraisal of traditional assumptions and practices in higher education.”\textsuperscript{354} Thompson explained how many colleges would “be threatened with extinction” if they continued to offer conventional and outmoded educational programs.\textsuperscript{355} These institutions had “no clear conception of their own particular purposes and goals,” or their roles in the larger education system.\textsuperscript{356} Thompson did not want Morningside to become extinct because officials refused to examine the future direction of the institution.

By the 1973-1974 school year, Morningside began several new majors and minors “to strengthen the appeal for new students” and “to enrich the academic offerings for the students as an incentive for retention. Some of the changes included: 1) a new four-year nursing program leading to a Bachelor of Science degree; 2) a minor in computer science for math and business majors; 3) a new major and minor in English to emphasize effective communication; 4) a new major in social work to provide better job opportunities; 5) strengthening the business administration program to benefit local businesses; and 6) a new criminal justice major for students who wanted to pursue law enforcement.\textsuperscript{357} These curricular changes eventually led to the creation of a new baccalaureate degree program. In the fall of 1979, Morningside officials developed the Bachelor of Liberal Studies. The rationale for the development of the new degree
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was to make an “alternative baccalaureate degree program available to persons whose previous training/education would not otherwise be transferable to Morningside College’s traditional degree programs.” The degree would provide transfer students from two-year vocational and community colleges with an opportunity to obtain a four-year degree. This would also ensure that Morningside’s upper level liberal arts courses would increase in enrollment.358

Under the direction of President Thompson, Morningside College officials made curricular changes to avoid the possibility of becoming “extinct.” The changes ranged from a new baccalaureate degree in nursing to new majors in business and criminal justice. The changes reflected a more vocational and career focus in order to attract students to Morningside College, but Morningside also actively worked to retain and support its existing baccalaureate degree programs. To accommodate the needs of transfer students, Morningside officials developed an additional Bachelor of Liberal Arts, which also increased enrollment in their upper-level courses. Morningside officials had committed to the idea of blending liberal arts education with vocational and career education, and they worked to achieve that goal. Their actions increased educational opportunities for two-year college students who wanted to pursue baccalaureate degrees in vocational and career education programs or more traditional liberal arts education programs.

Conclusion

This chapter showed how Iowa’s private four-year colleges confronted the financial and curricular threats that jeopardized their long-term survival. Iowa’s fifteen public two-year colleges disrupted the state’s higher education system, presenting private colleges with major
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challenges. These challenges defined and shaped the relationships between public two-year colleges and private four-year colleges.

To overcome the financial threat, private college officials joined forces with the Iowa Association of Private Colleges and Universities to advocate for a tuition equalization program. Their work resulted in the Iowa Tuition Grant Program, which lessened the competitive threat posed by increasing enrollment at publicly-funded two-year colleges. The Iowa Tuition Grant provided funding to students who wanted to attend private colleges. Private college officials hoped that the Iowa Tuition Grant would reverse the trend of declining private college enrollment, and they continued to fight for increased funding for the program. This provided Iowa students with more opportunities to attend a private four-year colleges.

In addition to posing a financial threat, two-year colleges quickly developed liberal arts education programs, posing an additional threat to private colleges. This forced private colleges to respond to the curricular threat in distinct ways in an effort to establish, or re-establish, their place in a changing higher education system. Some private colleges remained focused on liberal arts education, some reconciled their liberal arts education programs with vocational education, and others made significant institutional changes in the hopes to survive as a higher education institution. While some of the changes at private colleges hindered educational opportunity for Iowa’s growing two-year college student population, other private colleges made curricular and institutional changes that provided students with additional education programs—many of which provided a path to a baccalaureate degree. Ultimately, the financial and curricular challenges that plagued officials at private four-year colleges benefitted Iowa students through increased financial support and increased educational opportunities for transfer students.
In a letter dated August 18, 1958, President James Maucker of the State College of Iowa (now known as the University of Northern Iowa) summarized a Presidents and Provosts Meeting held in Cedar Falls, Iowa on August 15, 1958 at which the presidents and provosts from Iowa’s three state universities discussed common issues and concerns. One agenda item Maucker highlighted was the possibility of a Higher Education Study to be conducted by the state of Iowa. The group agreed that the project was of “crucial importance,” and that if the Iowa legislature did not fund the effort, officials from the three state universities would need to accomplish the task themselves. The need for more vocational education in Iowa and the question of whether Iowa legislators should change the state’s higher education structure required thorough examination and study. The results would provide valuable information and data that the presidents and provosts could use to make recommendations to the State Board of Regents.359

In 1959, the Iowa Legislative Research Bureau hired a consultant, Dr. Raymond Gibson, to conduct the study and to determine the higher education needs of the state.360 Gibson, a professor of higher education studies at Indiana University, presented his findings to state officials in the fall of 1960. The final report, known as the Gibson Report, recommended “a statewide system of junior colleges to be set up to provide more ‘local-type’ training.” An article in the *Ames Daily Tribune* further explained the report:

The entire educational system of the state should be aimed at filling the present and future manpower needs of Iowa. It said the state is no longer an agricultural community,
but one in which business and industry dominates…He [Gibson] said Iowa could continue to provide more jobs for its young people by providing them now with training in industrial skills.361

According to the Gibson Report, the addition of a junior college system would fill “the most serious gap in the entire educational system in Iowa,” and it would provide educational opportunity to thousands of Iowa students who did not attend four-year colleges. The report also stated that “the liberal arts programs should have a strong position and should constantly be revised to meet the changing society,” allowing Iowa students to receive vocational education or to transfer to four-year colleges and universities.362

The presidents and provosts of Iowa’s three state universities, as well as other education officials, had advocated further study of Iowa’s higher education system, while the recommendations of the Gibson Report accelerated the development of two-year colleges. Influenced by the Gibson Report, the 1961 Iowa Legislature authorized the state’s Department of Public Instruction to develop a plan to establish a statewide system of community colleges that would include vocational and technical education. By the summer of 1962, the Department of Public Instruction had completed its tentative plan.363 The quick development of a statewide proposal to establish sixteen two-year colleges across the state posed a challenge for university leaders. Representatives from the state’s three universities, which included administrators and faculty, expressed their concern “as to the need, or wisdom of, establishing the proposed system of community colleges, and they had neither the time nor the data to hammer out consensus” on a complex matter.364 University officials believed they needed additional time to fully study the
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consequences of a major change to the education system, especially how the change would affect established higher education institutions in Iowa.

In October 1964, the State Board of Regents appointed a committee to study the addition of public two-year colleges to Iowa’s higher education system. The committee, consisting of the three state university presidents and representatives of the Board of Regents, was tasked to examine the possible consequences of how the change would affect the entire higher education system. As noted in a committee report, members of the committee generated many more questions than answers, including:

1) Shall there be an officially recognized planning mechanism to make long-range plans to coordinate the operations of all institutions of higher education in the State of Iowa?

2) If there is to be a state board governing the two-year institutions, ought it be a separate board for that purpose or should such a responsibility remain with the State Board of Public Instruction?

3) Should the two-year colleges be thought of and operated as a part of the basic elementary and secondary school system or should they be a part of the basic system of education beyond the high school?

4) Should the need for two-year institutions be met by establishing independent two-year community colleges…or should this need be met by establishing two-year branches of the four-year institutions?

5) Shall the two-year institutions be comprehensive institutions offering both the first two years of the usual college program and terminal courses of technical and vocational nature or shall there be two separate two-year colleges to handle two kinds of assignments separately?

After considering the questions, the committee concluded it was “imperative that Iowa develop a ‘system’ of higher education” which would “assure efficient, effective educational opportunities
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of good quality to all qualified youth of college age.” 367 Iowa was not unique in its efforts and struggles to develop a coordinated master plan to ensure the success of two-year colleges. Education leaders from other states also struggled to create master plans that made “the processes of community college education…clear, consecutive, and understandable in relation to the processes of other levels or kinds of education within the state.” 368

During the November 1964 Board of Regents meeting, a committee representative reported their findings and emphasized:

The people of Iowa face an unprecedented crisis in higher education. Opportunity must be provided for greatly increased numbers of young people who want and need education beyond high school. The number of young Iowans seeking higher education will at least double within the next ten or fifteen years. Moreover, to stimulate and sustain economic progress of the state, as we adjust to ongoing technological changes, a vast expansion of both technical and general higher education will be required. 369

For these reasons, the committee strongly encouraged the Board of Regents to support the development of community colleges and area vocational schools to meet the educational needs of Iowans. However, before acting upon the recommendation of the committee, the Board of Regents decided to undertake an additional study to determine the role of the three state universities in the “total system of higher education, public and private in the state of Iowa.” 370

As representatives of the Board of Regents and other university officials continued to study how a change would affect the entire higher education system, the Iowa legislature passed Senate File 550 in May 1965. By the end of 1966, nine of Iowa’s new two-year colleges had been established throughout the state.
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University officials were not prepared for the sudden appearance of Iowa’s two-year colleges. In an absence of a coordinated plan that would have defined the role and relationship of universities to two-year colleges, university officials defined their own roles and relationships with community colleges and vocational institutions. This chapter highlights how the Iowa Board of Regents defined its involvement in the governance of the new institutions, and how Iowa’s three university presidents participated in the development of standards for community colleges and vocational institutions. The Board of Regents and each university president wanted to ensure the success of Iowa’s new two-year institutions—especially those founded as community colleges, which would transfer students to the state’s public universities. Ultimately, university officials from the University of Northern Iowa, Iowa State University, and the University of Iowa established separate and distinct relationships with two-year colleges that provided more educational opportunities for Iowa students. Their responses either strengthened the position of two-year colleges in the state’s higher education system, or provided students with opportunities to achieve a baccalaureate degree.

Iowa Board of Regents and Public University Presidents

From 1964 to 1968, the Iowa Board of Regents and the state’s three public university presidents continued to discuss and debate how community colleges fit into the higher education system. The Board of Regents sought to define its role in the governance of community colleges as they offered liberal arts education and a path to a baccalaureate degree. The Board included the university presidents in the discussion and planning process to establish standards for the new institutions. While they worked to define and clarify standards, university presidents wanted to elevate the status of Iowa’s community colleges, but their efforts were complicated by the strong
connection between the community college and secondary education. This caused uncertainty for the Board and the university presidents about where and how community colleges fit into the higher education system. The uncertainty further delayed action by the Board of Regents and university officials to create a coordinated plan to define the role and relationship between Iowa’s three universities and two-year colleges. In combination, the uncertainty and the lack of a coordinated plan eventually forced officials from each of Iowa’s three public universities to define their own relationships with the state’s two-year colleges.

During the summer of 1966, the Board of Regents began a process to review standards for two-year institutions, and the state’s three university presidents agreed to provide assistance. One of the presidents’ first tasks was to review and respond to a document prepared by the Department of Public Instruction entitled, “Area Vocational Schools and Community Colleges: Approval Standards and Guidelines for Their Interpretation,” which addressed the following areas: accreditation, administration, curriculum, faculty, finances, and facilities. The feedback and comments of the university presidents would be included as discussion points for an upcoming meeting between the Board of Regents and the Department of Public Instruction.371

The document explained that the vocational institutions and community colleges should be subject to the same approval standards, but vocational schools would not adhere to the standards that addressed college and pre-professional education. The document also emphasized that vocational schools “may operate without an academic transfer program, but an area community college must include at least five vocational-technical fields to be designated for federal funding purposes as an area vocational school.”372 The question of how to direct the
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combination of vocational and liberal arts education in one institution perplexed the Board of Regents and the university presidents. The feedback and comments provided by the university presidents highlighted that two-year colleges occupied an awkward position in the state’s higher education system. However, the university presidents firmly believed that two-year colleges should be developed as higher education institutions—not as an extension of secondary education. This would allow two-year colleges to provide quality postsecondary educational programs.

In June 1966, Iowa State University President Robert Parks submitted a four-page response regarding his review of “Area Vocational Schools and Community Colleges: Approval Standards and Guidelines for Their Interpretation.” Parks noted his concern about the challenges of determining the administrative responsibilities of the Board of Regents and the Department of Public Instruction:

In considering the document, it might be well to restate the somewhat difficult legal situation in which the Board of Regents is expected to operate…Approval of standards for community colleges must be jointly adopted by the State Board of Public Instruction and the State Board of Regents. However, standards for area vocational schools are the sole responsibility of the State Board of Public Instruction. Further, as is explained…area community colleges and area vocational schools are closely related institutions and will often be combined in one institution.373

Parks highlighted how the two-year institutions occupied an awkward position in the higher education system—caught between a Board of higher education and a Board that primarily had been concerned about elementary and secondary education. The position of community colleges and vocational institutions in the higher education system prevented a clear break from their connection to secondary education. Parks stressed, “I am sure that all of us who are connected
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with the Board of Regents look forward to the time when the junior colleges will begin to look more like colleges and less like high schools.” 374

Parks then commented about the standards and guidelines, “For my own personal taste, these standards sound a great deal too much like the old elementary and secondary standards put out by the State Department [Iowa Department of Public Instruction].” He considered the standards too restrictive and suggested allowing more discretion for two-year college leaders to make decisions. This would allow the boards of community colleges to “choose a capable man to be superintendent (or president),” and the superintendent, together with the board, would determine their own standards in an unrestricted manner. Parks emphasized, “This is essentially the manner of operation followed by the Board of Regents and its institutional heads [the three university presidents].” 375

Although Parks wanted community colleges to one day function as independent higher education institutions, he acknowledged that the community college movement in Iowa had not evolved “to the point where it can wisely be granted as complete a discretion as we might like to see.” He added, “Therefore, at this particular stage in the evolution of the community college movement, there may indeed be some useful protection in the spelling out of standards which are more specific and restrictive than we would eventually like to see.” 376 Parks stated:

I honestly feel that many of our junior colleges have not yet advanced to the point where they can be trusted to ‘go it alone.’ I am aware, also, that these new institutions are not strictly ‘higher education’ and cannot be considered as small universities. A continuing basic function of these emerging institutions will be to provide non-collegiate post high school educational opportunities, and perhaps the requirements in the latter area need to be more prescriptive. Therefore, I would conclude, somewhat reluctantly, that restrictive standards of the type suggested in this document may be advisable in the immediate
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future development of the area community colleges. We need to remember that these emerging institutions are just that—‘emerging’—and perhaps need some guidelines.\textsuperscript{377} Parks understood that the fledgling two-year colleges required guidance and oversight in order to grow as quality institutions in the state’s higher education system.

The University of Iowa President Howard Bowen also submitted written comments to the Board of Regents in June 1966. In his opening lines, Bowen stated that he hoped that the new two-year colleges would become “an important part of the higher educational system of Iowa, making higher education readily available to all young people.”\textsuperscript{378} Bowen further commented:

The first requirement of the guidelines is that the new institutions should be organized as part of higher education, not as part of the elementary and secondary system. The terminology, the administrative organization, the role of faculty, the intellectual level, and the general atmosphere should be related to higher education, not to the public schools. They should be oriented toward such concepts as academic freedom, institutional autonomy, concern for ideas, cosmopolitanism. Students should be treated as adults rather than children…In other words, these institutions should be colleges, not high schools.\textsuperscript{379}

In addition, Bowen emphasized that some of the new community colleges “may well become…four-year colleges or even universities,” and he was concerned that the local control of community colleges, combined with the influence of local industries, may narrow the focus of what was possible for community colleges. Having high hopes and expectations about what was possible, Bowen questioned, “Why shouldn’t the colleges prepare students for the world at large rather than the local community?”\textsuperscript{380}

Bowen concluded his review of the standards by addressing the role of a chief administrator of a community college, who Bowen believed should be an intellectual with a
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Ph.D. and have the title of “president” instead of “superintendent.” The title of superintendent would connect the community college leader to the public school system, instead of the higher education system. Bowen emphasized that community college leaders must have high intellectual ability and be subject to high standards. High standards would ensure that Iowa’s community college leaders would develop quality education programs to prepare all students for the world, with less focus on a narrow local community approach. This type of higher education leader could develop intellectual and cultural centers for all areas across Iowa. Bowen agreed with Parks that if Iowa’s two-year colleges were held to high standards, they could emerge as quality higher education institutions.

State College of Iowa President James Maucker shared similar beliefs about two-year colleges as his university counterparts. In a letter dated June 30, 1966, Maucker recommended revisions to the standards document because he felt some of the standards were “too confining or too limited or set at an inappropriate level.” Maucker also recommended a flexible three-year review process to allow for changes as the new institutions matured, adapted, and found their appropriate place in Iowa’s higher education system. This flexibility would provide alternatives that did “not shackle competent people in their efforts to develop good quality institutions.” Maucker also expressed concern about “the whole question of the appropriateness of detailed standards with a ‘high school flavor’ as a means of assuring a reasonable degree of effectiveness in the community colleges.” Maucker felt that the link between community colleges and secondary education existed because community colleges offered programs for high school dropouts, adult education, and vocational education. Therefore, Maucker believed it was the
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responsibility of the Board of Regents and the three university presidents to ensure that community colleges offered high quality college-level work for students who would transfer to four-year colleges and universities.\textsuperscript{384} College-level work for transfer students would help to distinguish community colleges from the high school and secondary education.

The role of the Board of Regents in the governance of community colleges went unresolved for several more months. In April 1967, President Bowen sent a memorandum to President Maucker and President Parks regarding the Iowa legislators’ increasing concern about community colleges. Legislators were worried that new community colleges were too numerous, too costly, and emphasized liberal arts rather than vocational subjects. Bowen noted that the legislature had introduced a “recent bill to create a super-board for all of education,” and it was “an attempt to deal with what the Legislature regards as a problem.” Bowen was now writing to his two colleagues to get their advice about encouraging the Board of Regents to take over supervision of two-year colleges by employing “a fourth president to serve as coordinator of these institutions.” Bowen explained that the public higher education system would then be controlled by a single board, as the new president would answer to the Board of Regents. The Board of Regents would then govern all public higher education institutions, and the Department of Public Instruction would focus only on primary and secondary education.\textsuperscript{385}

The March 1968 Board of Regents meeting minutes suggested that the Board attempted to seek feedback about the option of a fourth president to oversee public two-year colleges. The minutes noted that officials of two-year colleges resisted the idea of a new governance structure, and they wanted to retain the governance structure established by law in 1965.\textsuperscript{386}
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from two-year college officials and the perplexity of understanding the role of two-year colleges in the state’s higher education system prompted the Board of Regents and university presidents to shift their attention from governance of two-year colleges to influencing their education programs. This meant that the Board of Regents would remain involved in the establishment of curricular standards to ensure the quality of general education transfer courses. The Board of Regents wanted to retain the joint responsibility with the Department of Public Instruction to oversee the approval of standards for community colleges in order to maintain some control of the overall quality of liberal arts education and transfer programs.387

By 1968, fifteen new community colleges and vocational institutions had developed across the state, and the Board of Regents and the university presidents still had not taken formal action to establish a collective plan that defined their roles and relationships with the new institutions. The Board of Regents’ ongoing indecision about their role and relationship with Iowa’s community colleges and vocational institutions meant that officials from Iowa’s three public universities did not have formal guidance about how to respond, adjust, or adapt to the new institutions. Therefore, officials from the state’s three public universities established their own distinct relationships with Iowa’s two-year colleges.

Officials from Iowa’s Three State Universities Defined Their Early Relationships with Community Colleges and Vocational Institutions

Without a coordinated plan about how to respond to the new institutions, officials from the University of Northern Iowa, Iowa State University, and the University of Iowa had to reconcile their own roles and responsibilities with two-year colleges in a rapidly changing system of higher education. Each university defined its own distinct relationship with the
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community colleges and vocational institutions. Officials from the University of Northern Iowa prepared teachers for Iowa’s two-year vocational colleges, Iowa State University officials allowed two-year colleges to assume more responsibility for vocational education in the state, and officials from the University of Iowa established the Office of Community College Affairs to provide leadership during the early development of Iowa’s community colleges. The actions taken by officials from each public university helped to strengthen the position of two-year colleges in the state’s higher education system and to increase educational opportunities for Iowa students.

University of Northern Iowa

Today, the University of Northern Iowa, located in Cedar Falls, is a public university that offers both graduate and undergraduate studies, enrolling approximately 11,000 students.\(^{388}\) The University of Northern Iowa was founded in 1876 as the Iowa State Normal School, and its original purpose and mission was to train public school teachers. In 1909, the institution changed its name to the Iowa State Teachers College. In 1961, the Iowa State Teachers College began offering liberal arts courses for non-teaching majors, which prompted another name change to the State College of Iowa. And finally in 1967, the State College of Iowa became the University of Northern Iowa. The progression of name changes was common for normal schools as the teacher training institutions attempted to gain status and collegiate stature among higher education institutions.\(^{389}\)
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Even though the University of Northern Iowa developed as a comprehensive institution of higher education during the 1960s, university officials remained true to their historic mission of teacher education. The institution’s founding purpose and mission as a state normal school provided officials with a framework to respond to the addition of fifteen community colleges and vocational institutions to Iowa’s higher education system. University officials initially contemplated the development of their own vocational institute, but due to the rapid development of Iowa’s two-year colleges, officials determined that their role was to train teachers for Iowa’s vocational institutions. This role contributed to strengthening the position of two-year vocational colleges in the state’s higher education system by supporting the preparation of two-year college instructors.

Officials at State College of Iowa had contemplated the development of a vocational institute in 1963, two years before the establishment the state’s community colleges and vocational institutions. In May 1963, President James Maucker sent a memorandum to the Iowa State Board of Regents that discussed the need to meet the state’s demand for more industrial and technical education. Maucker presented a recommendation to add courses in electricity, electronics, and automotives to the college’s existing industrial arts program.\(^{390}\) By early 1964, Maucker and other State College officials began to discuss the possibility of developing a technical institute to meet the growing demand for vocational-technical education. Dean of Instruction William Lang informed the institution’s Faculty Senate that the Curriculum Committee would soon consider a proposal for a technical institute, and he presented four major reasons why State College needed a technical institute: 1) the population of Iowa had changed rapidly from rural to urban, and more people were seeking job opportunities no longer available
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on Iowa farms; 2) state and city leaders were searching for and recruiting new industries to come to Iowa, and this required a skilled labor force to attract industrial growth in the state; 3) the rise of the space, technology, and automation age required workers to have more technological knowledge and skill; and 4) the successful experience of Iowa State University with its technical institute demonstrated the need for more technicians in Iowa.  

In February 1964, President Maucker communicated with David Bechtel, Administrative Assistant at the Iowa Department of Public Instruction, about how to meet the demand for vocational and technical education in Iowa. Bechtel highlighted the employment needs in the semi-skilled, skilled, and technical fields, but he questioned the type of education system that would prepare Iowans for employment in the vocational-technical field:

I do feel that there are people in Iowa who need educational opportunities that they are not presently able to receive. I also feel that high schools and colleges will not, nor should not, ‘change their stripes’ to try and meet this need. We need them to do what they were created for, but our needs for means to educate people have gone beyond what can be done in a high school or a four-year school.

Maucker continued to seek information and advice about how to meet the demand, and he arranged a meeting in May 1964 to discuss how the State College of Iowa could organize and begin its own technical institute program. Maucker invited eight other individuals who wanted to explore ways to best serve Iowa students by establishing quality vocational and technical education. The group soon discovered that there were many challenges to establishing their own technical institute at State College, which included types of programs, program standards, entrance requirements, duplication of vocational programs run by the neighboring
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Waterloo Public School, and finding qualified college instructors to teach vocational education.\textsuperscript{394} Because of the many challenges, President Maucker and other State College officials decided instead to return to what they did best—train teachers. The need for qualified technical teachers shifted their focus from the development of a technical institute to the preparation of teachers for the new two-year institutions.

In June 1964, President Maucker prepared the Board of Regents for the possibility that State College officials would begin to focus on the preparation of vocational-technical teachers:

> The administrators and faculty at SCI [State College of Iowa] intend to continue to make the preparation of teachers and school service personnel the institution’s primary function. We know, however, that there will be a gradual increase in the portion of our student body enrolled in programs in the liberal and vocational arts. To provide an adequate program for these students we may have to develop some courses that would not ordinarily be taken by prospective teachers...We feel the responsibility to prepare teachers for technical institutes that are so urgently needed in Iowa.\textsuperscript{395}

By early 1965, State College officials began to prepare a proposal for an educational program to train technical institute teachers.\textsuperscript{396}

Maucker’s efforts to advocate for vocational-technical education and teacher training in Iowa did not go unnoticed. In January 1965, Iowa Governor Harold Hughes asked Maucker for guidance on “ways in which vocational-technical schools should be established, located and controlled.”\textsuperscript{397} In a letter dated January 21, 1965, Maucker presented the Governor with four points he considered to be “paramount.” The following excerpts show Maucker’s support of vocational-technical education:
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1) The major inadequacy in the total provision of educational opportunity in Iowa at the present time lies in a shadow area between the traditional high school and the traditional college or university. It is largely, but not solely, vocational in nature.

2) The new institutions developed to fill this gap should be a part of the regular educational system—not a separate competing program. Close working relationships with existing high schools and colleges are vital.

3) Provisions must be made for flexibility so that programs may evolve with experience. Things are changing so rapidly, especially in the vocational fields, that we simply do not know enough about the amounts and kind of training and retraining which will be needed in the next ten years to justify setting up highly specialized, narrowly defined institutions and programs.

4) One of the major functions of such institutions is to provide an opportunity for young people to try out various programs. The institution is partially a sorting device, providing assistance to youth and young adults in finding their place in the economy...This means a close tie-in between the institution offering the first two years of regular college work and institution offering vocational-technical programs. The ideal setup would probably be the comprehensive community college offering both academic and vocational programs.  

Maucker also emphasized that officials from the three state institutions should stay involved in the development of two-year institutions: “Representatives of the Regents institutions can make vital contributions in the definition of standards and the coordination of the new institutions with the state colleges and universities.”

Maucker was determined to continue to advocate for the success of Iowa’s changing higher education system.

In addition to advising Governor Hughes, Maucker contributed to the success of two-year institutions with his work as Chairman of the Cooperative Study of Post High School Education. Maucker’s role as Chairman of the Cooperative Study provided him with additional insight into the need to train teachers for Iowa’s new community colleges and vocational-technical institutes.

In 1965, the Board of Regents joined the Iowa Association of Private Colleges and Universities and the Iowa State Board of Public Instruction in a cooperative effort to further study higher education.
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education in Iowa. A recommendation of the cooperative study concluded that the three state universities would continue to provide “a sizable share” of the public undergraduate, graduate, and professional programs, but that Iowa’s education system should also include area community colleges and vocational-technical schools. The addition of the two-year institutions meant an increased demand for faculty to teach at the new institutions, and the study called for college teaching programs in the state of Iowa to be created or strengthened to meet a demand for 1,230 two-year college faculty by 1980. This would be a dramatic increase from the 314 two-year college faculty in 1965.

Having once considered starting their own technical institute, Maucker and State College officials confirmed their intent to prepare vocational-technical teachers. Howard Reed, the Head of the Department of Industrial Arts, enthusiastically proclaimed:

If these schools [two-year vocational institutions] are destined to accept technical teachers and administrators who are not fully qualified to teach in technical institutes, it would seem that those institutions of higher learning in the State who are able to assist in improving and upgrading this type of teacher, should do so immediately. Since the State College of Iowa has the only program designed for the specific purpose of training teachers for technical institutes, it seems that this college should accept the responsibility to offer courses which may be of assistance…and to implement ways to help future teachers that would enter this professional field.

State College of Iowa officials intended to fulfill the institution’s purpose and mission by training teachers for two-year vocational colleges.

In July 1965, Maucker replied to a letter from Perry Grier, Superintendent of Waterloo Public Schools. Grier was involved in the early planning for Hawkeye Institute of Technology, and he was seeking confirmation that Maucker and State College of Iowa officials approved of
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the plan to develop the new vocational institution in the Cedar Falls-Waterloo area. Maucker responded, “I am writing to indicate formally to you and your associates that, as President of the State College of Iowa, I would be glad to see an area vocational school established in this vicinity.” Maucker added that he felt there was a strong need for a vocational education in the area, and the communities would provide a tax base and “a substantial clientele for the vocational programs contemplated.”

I see no conflict between the area vocational school and the program we carry on at the State College of Iowa—on the contrary, I think the establishment of such a school would materially increase our ability to provide teachers for such programs through the use of the area vocational schools as a facility in which to carry on various laboratory experiences including student teaching for our students.

Maucker viewed the establishment of the Hawkeye Technical Institute as an opportunity to fully develop State College’s technical institute teacher education program. State College students would have an opportunity to work with Hawkeye Technical Institute instructors and train in their facilities.

In December of 1965, State College officials were still working to develop their vocational-technical teacher education program and seeking approval from the Department of Public Instruction. O. H. Beatty, a State Consultant from the Department of Public Instruction, requested more specific details about the vocational-technical training program. Beatty stated, “We are aware of the need for further expansion of the teacher education program. It remains for us to reach a conclusion as to what type of training to give and to serve the greatest number of needs in the time that is available for selecting and training teachers for the new program.”

Beatty confirmed that State College’s teacher education program would “be a major assistance in
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providing for the long-range need for technical institute teachers,” but would have “little or no impact on the immediate needs of the next 3-4 years.” Department of Public Instruction officials had not anticipated how quickly Iowa’s two-year colleges would develop, creating an immediate need for technical institute teachers. Officials from new two-year colleges had to recruit vocational-technical teachers directly from industry and trade, as well as from public school industrial arts education programs. In order to more fully prepare qualified vocational-technical education teachers, the Department of Public Instruction supported and encouraged State College officials to continue their efforts to develop programs to train two-year college teachers.

Maucker and State College officials had already recognized the great need and began making changes to their Industrial Arts program by reorganizing existing course offerings and adding courses in technology. State College officials discovered that “there was somewhat a weakness in the applied aspects of our technology programs,” and they thought that the course changes would correct this weakness and strengthen the program to meet the growing vocational-technical training needs. The additional courses would include first-hand experiences to provide future technical teachers with the knowledge to advise and place future vocational-technical students. New courses proposed for the Industrial Arts Department included: Applied Hydraulics and Pneumatics, Automotive Electrical and Fuel Systems, Technical Illustration, and Co-operative Technology.
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In addition to new vocational-technical courses, Maucker and State College officials planned to create special summer programs that would begin during the 1966 summer session. The training programs would target individuals already skilled in business or industry but who did not have teaching experience, or for individuals who had not attended college. Howard Reed, Head of the Industrial Arts Department, took the lead to develop the summer course entitled “Philosophy and Techniques of Technical Institute Education.” The two-credit course curriculum included the following major topics: philosophy and understanding of the role of technical education, the role of a technical institute in higher education, identifying and distinguishing between the many forms of vocational-technical education, development of course content, and methods of teaching. The course proposal presented to the State College Curriculum Committee clarified that the course would strengthen participants’ understanding of technical education in order “to explain this type of education to potential students, to high school counselors, to industries which hire the graduates and to the general public who must support this type of education.” The course was officially approved by the Curriculum Committee on March 8, 1966.

Determining vocational-technical education training needs was challenging for State College officials due to the uncertainty about curricular offerings at Iowa’s newly-developing community colleges and vocational institutions. Maucker and State College officials had learned through the Post High School Cooperative Study that most community colleges had plans to offer vocational-technical education programs—but would do so in response to local demands.
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and interests in their assigned geographical area.\footnote{413} Because the new two-year colleges would rely on local demands and interests to determine their curricular offerings, State College officials faced their own uncertainty when planning curriculum for vocational-technical teachers. The preliminary report compiled for the Post High School Cooperative Study explained that it was “obvious from the reports that a great deal of specific thinking has not gone into the planning of many of these institutions.”\footnote{414} The reliance on local demands and a lack of planning complicated curriculum development for new vocational-technical teacher education courses or programs.

The reliance on local demands meant that State College officials had to revise and upgrade the summer training programs from year to year. By the summer of 1967, the training program expanded to six-weeks and six semester hours of credit, instead of the two-credit course taught the previous summer. The revised 1967 summer program included more time on methods of teaching and program improvement. The published course description also noted that students in the course would visit local industries and existing two-year vocational colleges to observe and evaluate students currently training in vocational and technical fields.\footnote{415} State College officials worked to ensure that Iowa’s two-year vocational colleges would not be “staffed with inadequately qualified personnel,” like other technical institutes throughout the country.\footnote{416}

While State College officials met the immediate needs of vocational-technical education teachers through their summer programs, they continued to develop long-term programs through their existing Industrial Arts Department. In a June 1967 memorandum to the Board of Regents, President Maucker explained, “The education of teachers for vocational-technical schools is just
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beginning to emerge as an important task for SCI [State College of Iowa].”

Maucker explained that he was requesting that the Board of Regents approve new course offerings in the Industrial Arts and Business Education Departments. These departments had been meeting the training needs of vocational-technical teachers by expanding curricular offerings and “increasing the potential of the institution in the preparation of teachers for Vocational-Technical schools.”

By 1968, State College officials had developed a Bachelor of Technology Degree for future teachers of two-year vocational colleges. In 1969, The State College Curriculum Committee received proposals from the Industrial Arts Department to clarify and update its existing vocational-technical teacher education programs. The proposal listed three majors: Technical Institute, Trade and Industrial Education, and Industrial Technology. Several new courses were also listed for discussion and approval. They included Machine Tool Technology, Electronic Communication, Problems in Power Trains and Suspensions, Building Construction, and Industrial Plastics. In addition, State College continued to offer a summer workshop course entitled “History and Philosophy of Vocational-Technical Education,” which had begun during the summer of 1966. A promotional pamphlet explained that the course was one course in a sequence for the Vocational Trade and Technical Teacher Education Program. The course was “intended primarily to serve vocational-technical teachers meeting requirements for state certification.”
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As State College officials realized the challenges of starting their own vocational institution, they instead focused on the best ways to respond to Iowa’s changing higher education system. Maucker and State College officials understood the growing demand for teachers at Iowa’s new two-year colleges, and they took the lead to develop teacher education programs to meet the demand. In keeping with the historic purpose and mission of State College, Maucker and other college officials added courses to their existing Industrial Arts curriculum, developing summer teacher training institutes, and establishing vocational-technical teacher education programs. Their actions strengthened the position of two-year colleges in the state’s higher education system by providing opportunities for two-year college instructors to learn and improve their teaching skills, which contributed to the success of Iowa’s two-year colleges.

**Iowa State University**

Iowa State University, located in Ames, was founded in 1858 as the Iowa State Agricultural College for the purpose of improving the agricultural interests of the state. Iowa State College, as it was commonly known, later benefitted from the Morrill Act of 1862, which provided federal land grants to states for the purpose of establishing colleges and universities that included economically useful fields such as agriculture, science, technology, and engineering. In addition, the Morrill Act “gave states broad encouragement” to allow their land-grant institutions to offer liberal arts education. Iowa State College took advantage of the opportunity and developed liberal arts education programs that contributed to its rapid growth as an institution. In 1959, the institution changed its name to Iowa State University of Science and Technology.

---

now known as Iowa State University. Today, Iowa State University serves as a public research university, and it enrolls nearly 35,000 students—making it the state’s largest university.423

During the late 1950s and early 1960s, Iowa State College officials sought to meet the growing demand for the useful and practical education needs of Iowa citizens through active involvement in the development of vocational-technical training for the state’s changing workforce. Iowa State officials took the lead to meet the challenges of the time by establishing the Iowa State University Technical Institute in 1960, which reflected the university’s purpose and mission to further develop the useful and practical fields of education. However, the development of Iowa’s two-year colleges in 1965 prompted Iowa State University officials to reconsider the institution’s vocational-technical programs that did not lead to a four-year baccalaureate degree. Iowa State officials eventually decided to abandon two-year vocational-technical education programs. In doing so, the university helped to institutionalize vocational-technical education at Iowa’s two-year colleges, which strengthened their position in the state’s higher education system. Two-year colleges would not have to compete with a major university for students seeking two-year vocational-technical education, while Iowa State officials could redefine their role in the development of vocational-technical education programs.

In a memorandum to the State Board of Regents dated April 4, 1960, State College of Iowa President Maucker presented a document that explained and clarified the future missions of Iowa’s three state institutions. The memorandum outlined how each institution would serve the state as a whole and what each one would contribute to higher education in Iowa. The goal of the Board of Regents was to maintain three separate and distinct institutions. Maucker’s
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document detailed the unique features of each institution, but included a paragraph that reflected the changing nature of higher education during this time:

There may be developed at one, two, or all three institutions additional offerings of a terminal, technical nature to help meet the need for post high school education of less than degree level. Some programs of this kind have been offered at all three institutions at various times; the technical institute programs at Ames represent a pilot effort to assess the need for such programs in specific areas.\textsuperscript{424}

Iowa education officials had contemplated the need for vocational-technical education in the state, and by 1960, the three presidents had been actively involved in studying Iowa’s higher education system and the role of vocational-technical education.

In Ames, Iowa State College officials had discussed the need to create a technical institute in the state as early as December 1957. During an Iowa State College Engineering Advisory Council meeting, the group agreed that if a technical institute were created, “there should be some control of such an Institute by Iowa State College, since it is the Land Grant College set up to handle agriculture and mechanic arts.”\textsuperscript{425} Iowa State College officials understood the growing demand for skilled technicians, and they had studied the needs in Iowa. Surveys indicated that Iowa industries would need “twice as many technicians in 1970,” and Iowa industrial employers “frequently expressed their urgent need” for this skilled labor force.\textsuperscript{426}

In early 1960, the Ames institution, which had become Iowa State University, submitted a plan to the State Department of Public Instruction to create a technical institute as part of its College of Engineering. Iowa State University (ISU) officials explained the program:

The program of the technical institute...is designed to prepare the student to take his place in industry immediately upon the completion of his two years in the institute. The emphasis in all excepting a few of the courses is on how to do a job rather than on

\textsuperscript{424} J.W. Maucker to State Board of Regents, memorandum, 4 April 1960, Curriculum Report to Senate and Regents Folder, Box 1, Administrative Files Vice-President and Provost, 1957-1986, UNIA, 3.
sophisticated scientific principles. The technical institute program is not designed to prepare its graduates to continue toward a baccalaureate degree in engineering. The technical institute program may be characterized as a ‘terminal’ program. Experience in other schools has shown that relatively few graduates wish to continue toward a baccalaureate degree.\textsuperscript{427}

ISU officials proposed that the technical institute would begin with three programs: construction technology, electronics technology, and mechanical technology. They also proposed that the institute should be located on the ISU campus in Ames; but they recognized that future needs and growth may result in the development of branch locations.

On May 26, 1960, J.C. Wright of the Department of Public Instruction notified ISU officials that their request to establish a vocational-technical institute was approved, and the institute was entitled to receive federal support under Title VIII of the National Defense Education Act of 1958. Wright added, “You will recall…our tentative agreement…was that federal funds would be available for the support of the program…for at least the next year or so.”\textsuperscript{428} Wright emphasized that the public school systems of the state were the first priority, so the local school districts would receive funding before the university. On May 31, 1960, a Des Moines Register article noted that the Davenport, Des Moines, and Waterloo public school districts had already requested approval for their vocational education departments to be designated as area vocational schools, and the Department of Public Instruction had approved the requests.\textsuperscript{429} This meant that funding for ISU’s Technical Institute could be reduced or eliminated in the near future.

\textsuperscript{427} Ibid., 2.
\textsuperscript{428} J.C. Wright to George Town, 26 May 1960, Technical Institute Approval 1959–1960 Folder, Box 6, ISU Technical Institute Reports, ISUA, 1-2.
\textsuperscript{429} “Iowa’s Vocational Training,” Des Moines Register, May 31 1960, Historical File 1960-1967 Folder, Box 4, ISU Technical Institute Reports, ISUA.
In a 1965 interview for the *Ames Daily Tribune*, Harold Ellis, Head of the ISU Technical Institute, celebrated and promoted the success of the Institute. Ellis explained that American society had become more dependent on technological developments, and untrained members of society had fewer job opportunities:

There is a growing realization among educators and government that greater emphasis and effort must be made to encourage and foster ‘occupationally-oriented’ education. Education programs must be patterned to prepare young people to be useful, productive citizens when they go out into industry in order that they can compete and earn their livelihood.  

Ellis highlighted that the Technical Institute’s programs were occupationally-oriented and designed for individuals who wanted to enter the workforce after a earning a two-year Associate in Applied Science degree. In its five-year history, the Technical Institute expanded enrollment from 64 students in three programs to 300 students in four programs. The Institute was a success and gaining the attention of students and citizens around the state.

In an August 1965 letter to a professor at the Oregon State Technical Institute, George Town, the Dean of the ISU College of Engineering, explained the development and success of ISU’s Technical Institute. At the end of his letter, Town expressed concern that there was no assurance of future funding for the Technical Institute through the Iowa State Department of Public Instruction: “As a matter of fact, I am quite certain that when some of the so-called ‘vocational-technical’ programs are established in Iowa, the State Department will channel these funds to such schools rather than us.”  

Two months earlier, Governor Hughes had signed Senate File 550, which created Iowa’s system of two-year vocational schools and community colleges. Town recognized that the Governor’s action would soon affect the ISU Technical
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Institute and Iowa’s higher education system. Town’s reference to Iowa’s future “so-called vocational-technical programs” reflected the negative perceptions held by some ISU officials about the state’s new vocational institutions.

In an interoffice communication to Town on March 11, 1967, Ellis referenced the “ivory towers” that existed at ISU. Ellis chided, “Anyone who would say he doesn’t ‘care a whit what other universities are doing’ (a quote from a prominent ISU staff member) has in my view retreated to his private ivory tower.” Ellis referred to how some faculty failed to recognize the graduates of two-year programs, “whether they have studied here or elsewhere.” This was a call for the university to recognize and respond to how higher education was changing and the future role of two-year programs and institutions in Iowa:

This attitude seems to derive from an academic disdain for the junior college effort. There are some among us who would wish that junior colleges were never invented and strongly believe that they do no good. But this is to ignore the explosion that is occurring across the land in the development of educational programs which are very close to the want of the people. The demand for such programs is clearly evident, and in fact has existed for many years. American industry and American parents are creating this demand and are agreeing that a high school education is not sufficient. Parents are pressuring, cajoling, even bribing their children to continue their education and achieve the next level after high school. The government is applying its financial resources to make it possible for youth to continue its education. Industry is closing its employment offices to the person with no more than a high school diploma.

Ellis called attention to the historical mission of Iowa State University and the possible role it could play to influence the changes occurring in higher education. He noted that most high school students would be seeking some type of education beyond high school—and not all students could be served by four-year college programs. Therefore, the universities, especially ISU, needed to take an active role. Ellis stated, “…should the universities (particularly the land-
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grant institutions that really stimulated the entire movement) continue to select out those that they want and totally ignore the remainder? I think not!” It was time to acknowledge the community college movement. 435

Ellis then made the case for two-year institutions and two-year degrees. He explained the decline in the prestige of a Bachelor’s degree due to the great demand, “The great clamor for the bachelor degree has given rise to diploma mills even within respectable universities and this is causing real damage.” The solution would be to help the higher education system create a lower-level degree “to which the multitude might aspire and which would be well within their grasp” rather than to try to stop the movement with “oratory delivered from an ivory tower.” Ellis described what he believed should be the future role of the institution:

If this land-grant institution is to maintain as its primary goal, service to the people of Iowa, I believe we should strive to stay in the forefront of the fast moving educational developments and seek ways and means of establishing the associate degree as a respectable and desirable educational objective for everyone. A movement in this direction can only lead to the elevation of the bachelor degree to a status about the lowest level of academic achievement which it has held for so many years. To resist the present trend will surely lead to a continuing and probably irreparable degradation of the bachelor degree. 436

It was the institution’s responsibility to assist with the “on-rushing expansion” of two-year colleges in Iowa and to develop a philosophy to accommodate the fast growing trend. Ellis stated, “To do otherwise will clearly be a retreat to an ivory tower to meditate on the sins of the community college movement.” Instead, ISU needed to assist Iowa’s two-year colleges while the new institutions were still in their “embryonic form” and were “disorganized” and “actually asking for guidance and help.” 437 It was time for ISU to provide leadership.
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Ellis developed a proposal for ISU to provide leadership and guidance for Iowa’s new system of two-year colleges. He proposed that ISU establish a seventh college to be known as the Iowa State Junior College and Technical Institute. Ellis documented that the seventh college would meet the following four objectives:

1) Engage in Junior and Community College curriculum research so as to assist the area community colleges in establishing worthwhile programs.

2) Take responsibility for the instruction of freshmen and sophomore subjects for student who intend to continue on into the university to pursue a baccalaureate program. This suggests that all students that enter a baccalaureate program of a senior college would be holders of an associate degree from an approved junior of community college and presumably above a certain minimum standing of their class.

3) Engage in instruction of technology subjects for students who aspire to careers for which two years of collegiate level instruction are essential for success.

4) Operate a community college extension service to advise and assist the state’s community colleges in the improvement of their curriculums, their faculties, the facilities and their administrative methods.\textsuperscript{438}

In an interoffice communication dated March 14, 1967, ISU Dean of the College of Engineering George Town responded to Ellis’ proposal. Town agreed with the suggestion to emphasize the value and prestige of the associate’s degree and to make it respectable, but he stressed that it may be too late to accomplish. Town claimed the Iowa Board of Regents “had only itself to blame” for failing to take the lead to develop “a good junior college system.” In addition, ISU was “far behind the University of Iowa and the State College of Iowa” because both had already started to provide extension services to two-year colleges. Town concluded his comments by noting that the idea for their own junior college and technical institute was an

\textsuperscript{438} Ibid., 3.
interesting approach, and he would send the proposal to other administrators in the College of Engineering for their input.\textsuperscript{439}

Ellis also communicated with R. H. Unger, a veteran professor of electronics technology, about his proposal to take a leadership role in the development of Iowa’s two-year colleges. In March 1967, Unger responded to the idea for a seventh college, and he began his interoffice communication to Ellis by stating, “History is repeating itself.”\textsuperscript{440} Unger explained that during the late 1950s and early 1960s, local technical programs began to develop in Iowa locations such as Davenport, Sioux City, and Burlington. At that time, education leaders asked ISU was “for suggestions and guidance, but ignored the whole situation.” Unger expressed frustration with ISU’s lack of response:

Rather, we sat back and watched with passive concern as everyone seemed to charge off in all directions at once. In 1960 when we complicated the issue by selecting our own direction and probably alienated a lot of local directors and staff members who were trying to answer a real need, but perhaps without the capability…Had this not been the case it is possible that this State might now be blanketed by well organized, coordinated and complimentary group of technical institutes serving the whole geographic, economic and academic spectrum of need in technology with the measuring stick for the whole effort housed in the ‘bureau of standards’ at Iowa State University.\textsuperscript{441}

Unger emphasized that ISU had missed an opportunity to develop a state-wide system with high standards because it was distracted by its own effort to create a Technical Institute on its own campus in 1960. He commented that ISU was once again missing the opportunity to act as “a coordinating force” to improve and guide the current system of two-year colleges. He concluded, “I don’t believe Iowa can afford to have us miss the boat a second time. As a taxpayer I begin to wonder if we are an asset or a liability to the State.”\textsuperscript{442}
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In a letter dated August 8, 1968, Iowa Senator Vern Lisle of Clarinda indicated that he would like to take Ellis up on his many invitations to visit the Technical Institute in Ames. Lisle wanted to discuss “the problems of the Technical School at Ames and the rest of them around the state,” which needed guidance and help. Lisle wanted to discuss accreditation of the community college system, and he did not want the institutions to become a two-year extension of the high school. In addition, Lisle wanted to make sure that students attending two-year vocational schools could limit their studies to just vocational-technical education in order to enter the job market. If these students later decided to expand their education to four years, it would be important to establish accreditation standards to allow for the transfer of credits between institutions.\(^{443}\)

In his response to Lisle’s letter, Ellis thanked him for his vote of confidence in his work at the Technical Institute. Ellis emphasized that he enjoyed the challenge of convincing his colleagues at ISU “that the graduates of quality two-year technical programs such as we offer are not some sort of ‘grubby little half-wit’ whose education must terminate.”\(^{444}\) Ellis’ advocacy for two-year programs and their graduates reflected his concern that Iowa’s current higher education system had not yet met the demands of a changing society, and the system was not producing enough technically competent people for leadership or support. Ellis expressed that “the old, existing institutions have not been meeting the needs of all the people,” and ISU was not fully living up to its mission as a land-grant institution—“to serve the total educational needs of the industrial classes of society.” Many land-grant colleges, like ISU, were once referred to as “people’s colleges,” but had evolved into universities “for the above-average learner.” This


caused a gap in the higher education system that was now being replaced by a new and popular institution—the community college.\footnote{Harold Ellis to Senator Vern Lisle, 17 Feb. 1969, Senator Vernon Lisle 1962-1969 Folder, Box 15, ISU Technical Reports, ISUA, 1-2.}

Although Ellis advocated for the institution to return to its founding principle as a land-grant institution, the presence of two-year colleges in the state prompted Iowa State officials to redefine the institution’s role in vocational-technical education. On August 6, 1971, an article in the \textit{Ames Daily Tribune} announced the phasing out of two-year technical programs at Iowa State University. In explaining the change, ISU officials cited declining enrollment, a “tight financial situation,” and the establishment of similar programs at area community colleges. Ellis explained that although enrollment in construction, electronics, and mechanical programs was still rising, the programs would nevertheless be terminated.\footnote{Jerry Dickinson, “ISU phasing out technical institutes,” \textit{Ames Daily Tribune}, Aug. 6, 1971, Newspaper Clippings 1959-1970 Folder, Box 4, ISU Technical Institute Reports, Iowa State University Library Archives, Ames, Iowa; “Faculty Newsletter,” Weekly ISU Communications, 17 Sept. 1971, Newspaper Clippings 1959-1970 Folder, Box 4, ISU Technical Institute Reports, ISUA.}

The article included Associate Dean of Engineering Paul Morgan’s explanation that Iowa law had allowed for the development of community colleges, which would offer vocational training programs. He explained that the Iowa State program began in 1960 with the intention to serve as a model for other institutions, but the university would now only provide advisory assistance to aid community colleges in technical program development because ISU’s first responsibility was to its own baccalaureate program.\footnote{“ISU recommends dropping of E Tech program,” \textit{Ames Daily Tribune}, Aug. 1971, Newspaper Clippings 1959-1970 Folder, Box 4, ISU Technical Institute Reports, ISUA.}

Morgan’s comments echoed the comments of Iowa State University President Robert Parks. Parks explained that the Technical Institute program was cut due to budgetary constraints, but it also made sense to discontinue “a non-collegiate technical program,” especially at an institution with a mission of collegiate-level instruction.\footnote{“Faculty Newsletter,” Weekly ISU Communications, 17 Sept. 1971.} Parks stated that the state of Iowa
had established a system of two-year colleges that would continue to offer needed programs. At the request of ISU officials, the State Board of Regents officially ended the university’s Technical Institute at their meeting in October 1971. This decision allowed ISU officials to concentrate on collegiate programs that were more worthy of a major university, and it also highlighted how ISU officials tried to separate their vocational-technical programs from the programs offered at two-year vocational institutions. This separation defined the early relationships between ISU and Iowa’s new two-year institutions, all of which offered various types of vocational education programs.

Despite pleas from Head of the ISU Technical Institute Harold Ellis for the university to assume a leadership role for the development of the state’s new vocational programs, ISU leaders chose to redefine the institution’s role in vocational-technical education. As a land-grant institution, ISU had initially stayed true to its founding mission and developed a technical institute to meet the “useful and practical” education needs of Iowa citizens. But as Iowa’s higher education system expanded, ISU instead chose to bolster its own collegiate reputation and stature by providing students with additional opportunities to achieve a baccalaureate degree. The decision to end the vocational institute program at ISU and to delegate lower-level vocational-technical education to Iowa’s new two-year colleges more clearly defined the curricular missions of two-year colleges in Iowa. This action affirmed and strengthened the position of two-year colleges in the state’s higher education system.
The University of Iowa

The University of Iowa is a public research university located in Iowa City, enrolling approximately 33,000 students. The University of Iowa was founded in 1847 as the first university west of the Mississippi River. Known as the State University of Iowa until 1964, the University of Iowa has pursued its purpose and mission as a flagship public research university. The university has historically excelled in the areas of law, medicine, dentistry, educational testing, and space exploration. During the mid-1960s, the University of Iowa also contributed to the development of higher education in the state of Iowa, especially to the development of the state’s community colleges.

University of Iowa officials embraced the opportunity to provide leadership for Iowa’s growing higher education system. In 1965, a year before most Iowa community colleges were founded, officials established the Office of Community College Affairs (OCCA). The OCCA was developed to provide leadership by establishing and nurturing working relationships between the University of Iowa and all community colleges in the state. University officials provided guidance and training for community college administrators and faculty in the areas of curriculum and professional development. Their work expanded to the development of articulation agreements, providing community college students with an option to transfer to four-year colleges or universities. The ability for Iowa students to more easily transfer from two-year colleges to four-year colleges and universities provided the state’s students with more educational opportunities and a path to a baccalaureate degree.

Officials at the University of Iowa recognized that they could provide leadership for the development of community colleges in Iowa. In 1965, University officials hired Duane
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Anderson, the first director of the newly-created OCCA. Anderson, a former community college administrator, came to the University of Iowa “with the explicit reason of setting up a liaison between the University and the community colleges.” This position was unique for an Iowa college or university. Neither Iowa State University nor the University of Northern Iowa had an office similar to the OCCA or a person designated to serve the same role as Anderson. Anderson explained, “Neither of them have exactly the same structure we have. They do have people within either their admissions departments or within their colleges of education that have links with the community college.” Anderson also emphasized that the OCCA had quickly established cooperative relationships with all fifteen community colleges and vocational institutions in the state, and included all of them in activities such as workshops, institutes, and training faculty.

The growth of the OCCA paralleled the growth of the new two-year institutions, and Anderson and the OCCA became a guiding force with direct involvement with community colleges. In the December 1967 OCCA Newsletter, Anderson explained that OCCA would become “a central location for the collection of information relating to issues of mutual concern,” and he made it very clear that the University of Iowa wanted to lead the process to build cooperative working relationships with everyone involved in the development of community colleges:

It will be the responsibility of the Office of Community College Affairs to establish and maintain close relations with the area colleges, to collect pertinent information concerning enrollment, staffing needs, and curriculum needs, to research problems facing the two-year institutions, and to disseminate information to all concerned…Information will be made available to staff members of the various departments of the University that accept transfer students from two-year institutions, or that are preparing college instructors, who may be looking to the two-year college as a source of employment.
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Anderson also discussed important areas of research that OCCA would coordinate, specifically information concerning transfer students, their progress and problems, and “curriculum developments at the University of Iowa which have implications for program development at the two-year institutions.” Anderson and the OCCA also established the University Committee on Community College Relationships to accomplish the goals of the OCCA.454

From the beginning, Anderson and the Office of Community College Affairs had the support of University of Iowa President Howard Bowen. In a letter dated June 20, 1966, Anderson wrote President Bowen thanking him for his participation in a Community College Workshop and for supporting the work of the OCCA:

Although I am disappointed in the direction that the two-year college system seems to be headed in the state, I still feel that we are in a position to encourage its development along sound lines if we take an active part at the state as well as at the local level. The lack of informed leadership, which is aware of and committed to the Comprehensive Community College, is a problem that now can only be overcome by providing for it through programs at the State Universities.455

The letter showed that the University of Iowa leadership was committed to working with community colleges during the initial phases of development.

Anderson and the OCCA also gained support from University of Iowa’s Dean of Academic Affairs, Phillip Hubbard. Hubbard stressed the importance of a quality student transfer program:

It is expected that the OCCA will provide an important function in maintaining continuous communications between the University of Iowa and the community colleges. Our functions are complementary, because we expect many graduates of these colleges to transfer to the University for upper class work…The major beneficiaries, of course, are the young men and women of Iowa who find that their needs for higher education can be met best by entering a community college and then transferring to this and similar

455 Duane Anderson to Howard Bowen, 20 June 1966, Folder 25, Box 25, University of Iowa President Howard Bowen Correspondence, UIA.
institutions for their remaining studies. We have an obligation to these students and their parents to see that the quality of education is maintained at a high level.\textsuperscript{456}

Hubbard, Anderson, and other leaders further explained that a quality transfer program should provide students with a clear path to higher levels of education. One of the first general policies of the University of Iowa was to accept at full value all credits earned from any public or private community college in order to lessen or eliminate any difficulty with the transfer process.\textsuperscript{457}

The OCCA actively publicized and promoted its purpose and mission. In March 1969, the University of Iowa News Service released a three-part series explaining the OCCA’s relationship to Iowa’s new community college system. Part I explained that the OCCA developed because of the increasing numbers of high school graduates attending two-year colleges, and OCCA’s purpose was “to help coordinate the thinking and action going on in the two-year and four-year schools.” The OCCA had provided guidance for administrators, teachers, and counselors in both two-year and four-year institutions as education officials developed and implemented policies in their institutions.\textsuperscript{458}

Hubbard stressed that the OCCA was not designed to “impose our ideas on the two-year colleges,” but to provide ongoing assistance in the following ways:

1) Keeping track of transfer student grades, as well as attrition and graduation rates.
2) Promoting articulation between two-year college programs and four-year schools, so students learn subject matter and study methods relevant to bachelor degree programs.
3) Preparing and placing teachers and administrators in community colleges.
4) Serving as a clearinghouse for information about two-year colleges such as enrollment, costs of instruction, curriculum development, and faculty.
5) Publishing a newsletter which reports about topics of interest for community college and university officials.\textsuperscript{459}
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Part I also noted that the OCCA planned workshops and seminars for community college teachers and counselors and hoped to expand its services to many Iowa’s community colleges, even though the OCCA was a “one-man office” led by OCCA Director Anderson.\textsuperscript{460}

Part II of the news series emphasized the importance of the OCCA due to the rapid expansion of community colleges, as well as their increasing student enrollments. The article explained how OCCA Director Anderson traveled across Iowa during the fall of 1968, visiting fourteen of the fifteen new community colleges. As a member of the Board of Regents Committee on Educational Relations, Anderson played a role in the evaluation of each community college in order to advise the State Board of Public Instruction and the Board of Regents on improvement. The evaluation of community colleges was necessary because nearly 17,000 Iowa students had enrolled in two-year institutions during the fall of 1968. 10,756 students were enrolled in liberal arts programs, and 6,018 students enrolled in vocational-technical programs.\textsuperscript{461} Anderson noted that he was a strong advocate for community colleges because the institutions provided both types of curricula. He stated that the “genius of community college is that you have options,” and the same institution offers a variety of courses in order to serve different interests and abilities, which provided more educational opportunities for students.\textsuperscript{462}

Part III of the news series discussed community college transfer students and the “transfer shock” they experienced, emphasizing that the OCCA worked with other college officials to find ways to minimize transfer shock. Anderson stated that he believed “the best way to avoid the shock is for the four-year and two-year colleges to work together closely.”\textsuperscript{463}
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III further explained how transfer students had trouble adjusting to life on a university campus with nearly 20,000 students, as well adjusting to the increased financial responsibility. Anderson noted that this often prevented transfer students from graduating with a baccalaureate, and he stated that it was the responsibility of the OCCA to help transfer students achieve a Bachelor’s degree. This would be accomplished if community colleges and the university continued to strengthen their cooperative efforts.\footnote{ibid., 4.}

Cooperation defined early relationships between the University of Iowa and community colleges. Anderson’s objective was to work closely with all of Iowa’s new two-year institutions in a cooperative manner to avoid any unnecessary rivalry or competition between institutions. In a 1985 interview, Anderson reflected on his efforts:

…I believe that we have formed a unique relationship with the community colleges. The reason I came to the University of Iowa in 1965 was to foster and establish that relationship and what we have done on a voluntary basis is to agree to the terms of articulation—students who come to the University of Iowa unlike other situations in other states, have already met all of the general education requirements…that relationship I think is evidence of a cooperative rather than competitive nature. The University does not attempt to do those things that the community colleges do well…They each have a unique function to perform and they perform them…side by side without a great deal of animosity.\footnote{Duane Anderson to Charlene E. DeHoet, interview, 9 May 1985, 1.}

Anderson’s work to build cooperation began with the university’s closest community college neighbor, Kirkwood Community College located in nearby Cedar Rapids, Iowa. This relationship provided greater access for students seeking baccalaureate degrees. Anderson reminisced about the university’s special relationship with Kirkwood Community College:

Kirkwood being the one in closest proximity obviously gets a great deal of special attention because of the different activities that we work with Kirkwood in developing. My task at the University…is designed to assist the community college transfer students in their endeavors to move from the AA degree into the BA at the University of Iowa. We
follow those transfer students from the time they transfer from Kirkwood until they graduate from the University.466

The relationship established between the University of Iowa and Kirkwood Community College highlighted how Anderson and the OCCA tried to work with all of Iowa’s community colleges. In addition, Anderson worked with University of Iowa faculty to develop conferences, workshops, and seminars to foster quality teaching at community colleges, as well as to improve the transfer experience for students intending to enroll at the University of Iowa or other baccalaureate degree-granting institutions.

The idea for a “Transfer Student Conference” held in December 1967 grew out of conversations between personnel from community colleges, the OCCA, and the University of Iowa. A newsletter article noted that “it seemed as though many problems existed because of the limitations of the printed word and the absence of channels for personal communication. The time was right for a meeting between student personnel workers in Iowa’s two-year colleges and officials from the University.” Transfer students were also invited to attend the conference.467 Feedback from all conference attendees resulted in recommendations on how college and university officials could minimize the difficulty of transferring from a community college to a baccalaureate degree-granting institution, summarized in the April 1968 OCCA Newsletter:

The students recommended a visit to the University during the spring prior to fall enrollment. They advised making an appointment with the University Admissions Office and talking with counselors in that office. If necessary, departmental representatives could be contacted by the Admissions Office to make certain the student is properly advised regarding his courses in the fall. This way the student is virtually assured of no mixups at the time of registration. A second suggestion was to use the time on campus to talk with friends who had recently transferred from the community college. Advice from the peer group carries an impact not held by advice given by an adult counselor. With the ‘word’ straight from a student friend, the future transfer student knows what to expect when he arrives at the University.468
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Other advice included to let future transfer students know that the university had higher expectations, tougher competition, “harder tests covering longer stretches of material,” and an expectation that students would be more independent. Increased communication and cooperation among all those involved in the transfer process would minimize transfer shock.\footnote{Ibid., 2.}

University of Iowa officials closely monitored the academic progress of community college transfer students. In the fall of 1968, the OCCA published an article that noted that a total of 465 community college students had transferred to the university during the fall of 1967. These transfer students had an average GPA of 2.65, but at the end of their first semester, the average community college student GPA was 2.02.\footnote{“U of I Transfer Follow-Up Study for 2nd Semester of 1967-68 School Year,” Oct. 1968, Office of Community College Affairs Newsletters, UIA, 3.} This prompted university officials to search for ways to help transfer students beyond the recommendations from the student transfer conference, focusing on issues such as student housing. Officials acknowledged that housing costs prevented many transfer students from living on campus and experiencing college life as a traditional university student, which contributed to the transfer shock.

While we as educators cannot, and perhaps should not, buffer the transfer student from all factors that may contribute some discomfort to their particular transition, we can offer ‘pre-shock’ information that should assist them to absorb a certain percentage of, or be more resilient to, some of the components resulting in ‘transfer shock.’\footnote{“Housing Against ‘Transfer Shock,’” Jan. 1969, Office of Community College Affairs Newsletters, UIA, 4.}

University officials began to strongly encourage transfer students to live in the residence halls in order to experience a more conducive learning environment. Living on campus would put transfer students in closer proximity to university officials and resources. Their attention to the housing issue is an example of how the OCCA and other University of Iowa officials worked
hard to develop and establish an effective transfer program for community college students who transferred to their institution.

OCCA newsletters from 1968 highlighted how University of Iowa faculty assisted in the development of quality transfer programs by emphasizing cooperation and collaboration. For example, one newsletter reported that Rhetoric Program Consultant Robert Omick coordinated and hosted a joint conference with English department leaders from Iowa’s community colleges to meet and discuss mutual concerns. The purpose of the two-day event was to “complement and extend the work in articulation and understanding among English programs in the state.” According to newsletters, participants focused on procedures that would strengthen cooperation efforts between the University of Iowa and community colleges.472 Participants felt the conference sessions and discussions were of great value and worth continuing, and OCCA officials agreed to offer future meetings for the group.473

Other 1968 OCCA newsletters explained how University of Iowa faculty members advocated for relationship-building with community colleges. Professor Frederick Wezeman, Head of the School of Library Science Program, stated, “We feel the community college is one of the growing areas of community service and we want to participate in this.” Wezeman had developed a special program that included an additional six semester hours of studies for those planning to serve in community college libraries. The April 1968 OCCA Newsletter highlighted that two or three students from the University of Iowa were participating in the program and had been “negotiating with different community colleges for future positions as librarians.”474 In addition, Laura Dustan, Dean of the College of Nursing, coordinated efforts to develop a two-

---

472 “Rhetoric Teachers to Meet at The University of Iowa,” Feb. 1968, Office of Community College Affairs Newsletters, UIA, 1-2.
474 “School of Library Science Cooperates With Area Community College Program,” April 1968, Office of Community College Affairs Newsletters, UIA, 1, 6.
year nursing transfer program with area community colleges. Dustan explained that the nursing profession had been “plagued by a disarticulated educational system,” and strong articulation with community colleges would change that. The basic idea of the new cooperative program was to “provide an academic transfer curriculum which would furnish prerequisites required for the nursing major at the University of Iowa.” The articulated transfer program streamlined and simplified the transfer process and better prepared community colleges students for academic coursework when transferring to the University of Iowa.

According to the February 1968 edition of the OCCA Newsletter, Robert Oehmke, Chairman of the University of Iowa Mathematics Department, worked to collaborate with Iowa community college math teachers, stating that “we are interested in dialogue which would be mutually helpful.” Oehmke made it clear that his department did not want “to act as Big Brother” to the community colleges, but he understood the advantages of institutional cooperation on issues regarding curriculum revision and the teaching of mathematics. The teaching effectiveness of community college instructors received increased attention because community colleges would function as teaching institutions. A June 1969 OCCA newsletter article explained the need to prepare “10,000 new teachers a year until well into the 1970s.” The newsletter further explained that four-year colleges and universities had a major stake in these institutions since many upper-division and graduate students would “be a product of the instruction offered in community colleges.” This meant that major universities needed to take

475 “College of Nursing Develops Cooperative Training Program,” June 1968, Office of Community College Affairs Newsletters, UIA, 2.
478 “U of I Departments Engage in Faculty Development Programs for Community College Teachers,” June 1969, Office of Community College Affairs Newsletters, UIA, 3.
479 “U of I Departments Engage in Faculty Development Programs for Community College Teachers,” June 1969, 3.
the lead to ensure proper training for future instructors across the nation. In November 1970, the OCCA issued the following statement about the importance of its role in the process:

We in the office firmly believe that the future of the community college rests with its ability to attract and retain well-qualified faculty members who are dedicated to the concept of the community college, enjoy—and are skilled in—the practice of teaching, and are well prepared in their academic and occupational fields. Each of these three areas constitutes fertile ground for workshops, inservice training projects, and courses and programs designed specifically for community college faculty members.480

In addition to summer training workshops, several University of Iowa departments engaged in programs to prepare community college faculty. Academic Dean Hubbard highlighted the work of several university departments, including English, French, and Men’s Physical Education. The departments had federally funded fellowship programs designed specifically to prepare community college teachers in their respective areas. In addition, the university’s math department had investigated the possibility of a summer institute to address the concerns about the training of “junior college teachers.”481

The University of Iowa, with leadership from Duane Anderson of the OCCA, developed an effective transfer program in a very short time, from 1965 to 1969. The OCCA and several faculty members at the University of Iowa made transfer programs and transfer students a priority, which provided community college students with a path to a baccalaureate degree. Their dedication to the success of the transfer program ensured that students would have an opportunity to successfully complete a four-year degree. The OCCA played an important role in establishing relationships with community colleges, and cooperation between the institutions nurtured a transfer program that provided greater educational opportunity for many Iowa students.

481 “U of I Departments Engage in Faculty Development Programs for Community College Teachers,” June 1969, 1.
Conclusion

This chapter showed how the Iowa Board of Regents and the three university presidents discussed and debated how community colleges and vocational institutions would fit into Iowa’s higher education system. Their ongoing discussion and debate contributed to the delay of a coordinated plan that would have defined the roles and relationships between the three state public universities and the new two-year college system. Therefore, officials from Iowa’s three universities had to define their own roles and relationships with the new institutions. This resulted in officials from each university responding in distinct ways that strengthened the role and position of two-year colleges in the higher education system, and provided more educational opportunities for Iowa students.

Officials from the University of Northern Iowa relied on the institution’s founding mission as a state normal school and prepared teachers for Iowa’s two-year vocational colleges, contributing to the success of the new institutions. As a land-grant institution, Iowa State University had initially stayed true to its founding mission and developed a technical institute to meet the “useful and practical” education needs of Iowa citizens. But as Iowa’s higher education system expanded, ISU officials moved to separate their institution from two-year vocational programs, which allowed two-year colleges to assume more responsibility to meet the vocational education needs of the state. This strengthened the position of two-year colleges in the state’s higher education system. And the University of Iowa established the Office of Community College Affairs that provided much-needed leadership during the initial phases of community college development. Officials from the university made transfer programs a priority and helped to provide community college transfer students with an easier path to a baccalaureate degree. This increased educational opportunities for Iowa’s two-year college students.
CHAPTER 5
CONCLUSION AND EPILOGUE

In “Strangers to Our Shores,” Howard London explained the role of community colleges in the 1960s-1970s debate about the kind of society America wanted to create. The debate questioned education at all levels: “In its barest form, the educational debate concerned whether schools fostered equality or inequality of opportunity.” London noted that the debate was simply between the promise of the American dream and the illusion of the American dream. Whether liberal arts education led to upward mobility or not, it was linked to the American dream. For some students, “the very act of enrolling in a liberal arts curriculum was a statement of white-collar aspiration,” which placed the social function of the community college in the middle of the debate.482

Critics have argued that the community college system contributed to social and economic inequality.483 In The Diverted Dream: Community Colleges and the Promise of Educational Opportunity in America, 1900-1985, Steven Brint and Jerome Karabel explained that the popular demand for education contributed to the growth of a differentiated education system.484 The authors argued that “since the turn of the twentieth century junior colleges and community colleges have had “a complex, and at times uneasy, relationship with a public that has looked to the educational system for the realization of the American dream.”485 A complex and uneasy relationship resulted when experiences at junior and community colleges thwarted

---

484 Brint and Karabel, The Diverted Dream, 7.
485 Ibid., 205.
the dreams of many socially and economically disadvantaged individuals. In “The ‘Cooling-Out’ Function in Higher Education,” Burton Clark emphasized that an expanded education system diverted many students from four-year institutions and into two-year institutions, which “cooled out” their plans to obtain a baccalaureate degree.486

The debate about the role of the community college and whether it offers educational opportunity and a path to a baccalaureate degree is polarized into two opposing camps.487 On one side of the debate are scholars who claim that community colleges divert socially and economically disadvantaged students away from the baccalaureate degree. On the other side of the debate are scholars who believe community colleges are the great democratizer of educational access and opportunity.488 Donato and Lazerson discussed how community college historiography has tended to “thrash around” trying to explain both sides of the debate.489 This research study showed how Iowa’s established private colleges and public universities responded to the presence of the state’s new public two-year colleges. Their responses both helped and hindered Iowa students as they sought educational opportunity and a path to an advanced degree. Thus, this study adds to the “thrashing around” by contributing to both sides of the debate.

As discussed in the review of literature, historians and scholars have contributed to our overall understanding of vocational education at the secondary level and its initial transition into postsecondary education.490 I concluded that we needed to know more about how officials at two-year colleges made curricular decisions regarding vocational education, how their decisions

486 Clark, “The “Cooling-Out” Function; Brint and Karabel, The Diverted Dream.
488 Scholars who present the diversion argument include Brint and Karabel, The Diverted Dream; Clark, “The Cooling Out Function”; Dougherty, The Contradictory College; and Karabel, “Community Colleges and Social Stratification”; scholars who present the democratization argument include Gleazer, This is the Community College; Medsker, The Junior College: Promise and Prospect; Parnell, The Neglected Majority; and Vaughan, The Community College in America.
489 Donato and Lazerson, “New Directions,” 11.
reconciled curricular tension between vocational and liberal arts education, and how their actions and decisions affected students who sought a baccalaureate degree. This study contributes to the literature in these areas, but it reveals more about how Iowa’s private college and public university officials responded to liberal arts education at Iowa’s two-year colleges—especially how officials from the state’s established higher education institutions reconciled the presence of new public two-year colleges that were authorized to offer vocational and liberal arts education.

The tension between vocational education and liberal arts education shaped and influenced the early relationships between Iowa’s two-year vocational colleges and private four-year colleges. As discussed in Chapter 2, officials from private colleges opposed the introduction of liberal arts education programs at neighboring two-year vocational colleges, specifically Merged Area I Vocational-Technical School (Area I) and Western Iowa Tech (WIT). Opposition to liberal arts education at these institutions hindered potential educational opportunities for Iowa students seeking to complete coursework that would transfer to a baccalaureate degree-granting institution. In “Community Colleges and Social Stratification,” Karabel argued that two-year colleges diverted students from earning baccalaureate degrees due to the vocationalizing influence of the institutions. This was true for Area I and WIT because of their original vocational-only curricular purpose, which contributed to the diversion of students from an opportunity to complete liberal arts coursework to pursue a baccalaureate degree. In addition, when Area I and WIT officials attempted to include liberal arts education to their institutions’ curricular missions, they met resistance and opposition from private college officials and supporters. Therefore, the founding of Area I and WIT as vocational institutions,

---

combined with coordinated opposition, diverted Iowa students from the educational opportunities to earn an advanced degree.

While private college officials worked to oppose liberal arts education at Iowa’s two-year vocational colleges, Area I and WIT officials persisted in their efforts to expand their curricular programs to include liberal arts education. Their goal was to achieve community college status to meet the needs of students located in their merged service areas. Community college status allowed for liberal arts coursework that contributed to existing vocational programs, or allowed students the opportunity to complete coursework that met requirements for the first two years of a baccalaureate degree. Therefore, this study also contributes to the work of other historians who provided a foundation to analyze how community college leaders worked to develop their institutions’ missions and identities.492

In *The Diverted Dream*, Brint and Karabel argued that community colleges diverted students from a baccalaureate degree and greater education achievement.493 This study provides some support for Brint and Karabel’s argument, but it provides more evidence about how the presence of Iowa’s community colleges pressured private college officials to respond in ways that increased educational opportunity for students. In Iowa, eleven two-year colleges were founded as community colleges with the authority to offer both vocational education and liberal arts education. Liberal arts education at these institutions posed a financial and curricular competitive threat to existing private institutions in the state’s higher education system. As explained in Chapter 3, private college officials responded to the competitive threat in ways that

493 Brint and Karabel, *The Diverted Dream*. 
resulted in tuition assistance for students and new curricular programs, which included a path to a baccalaureate degree.

Three of Iowa’s private colleges, Coe, Cornell, and Drake, responded to the curricular threat by working to retain and strengthen their identity as liberal arts institutions. Their responses support Brint and Karabel’s argument that attending a community college diverted students away from baccalaureate degree-granting institutions. For example, Coe faculty resisted working with “inferior” institutions such as Kirkwood Community College, and their actions inhibited the opportunity for community college students to obtain upper-level education courses. Cornell officials did not view community college graduates as a significant group to recruit; instead, Cornell officials worked with other private colleges to maintain its reputation as a quality liberal arts institution by recruiting students who enhanced its “intellectual atmosphere.” In addition, Drake tried to pull away from the community college movement—seeking to serve different student populations that included graduate students and “superior” students from a neighboring private junior college. These three private colleges contributed to the diversion of community college students from their institutions.

Conversely, five other private colleges responded to the presence of two-year colleges in ways that increased the likelihood that two-year college students could have the opportunity to achieve a baccalaureate degree. Originally founded as private junior colleges, Grand View and Mt. Mercy made significant institutional changes that secured their long-term survival and accelerated their development as baccalaureate degree-granting institutions. Their actions improved the likelihood that two-year college students would attend their institutions to earn baccalaureate degrees. Grand View strengthened its relationship with Des Moines Area Community College, and Mt. Mercy reached out to neighboring Kirkwood Community College.
and other community colleges around the state to recruit new students. Meanwhile, Upper Iowa, Dordt, and Morningside changed many of their existing curricular programs to entice two-year college transfer students to their institutions to take upper-level courses. These three institutions adjusted their curricular purposes to reconcile vocational and career education with existing liberal arts programs. Officials from these five private colleges initiated curricular changes to attract two-year college transfer students to their campuses—instead of diverting them from the opportunity to achieve a baccalaureate degree.

As discussed in Chapter 1, two-year colleges developed in the shadows of other higher education institutions. In “A System without a Plan,” Labaree reminded historians that the development of higher education led to a stratified structure that cast two-year colleges to the bottom of the structure.\(^{494}\) For the most part, historical conversations have cast a negative light on two-year colleges and their position in the higher education system, and the literature provides glimpses of how the lower status and reputation of two-year colleges hindered relationships with other higher education institutions.\(^{495}\) This has resulted in a gap in historical literature regarding how higher education institutions may have helped two-year colleges through positive relationships. This research study adds to historical conversations to further understand how established higher education institutions interacted, cooperated, and developed relationships that helped two-year colleges during their founding years.

Officials from Iowa’s three public universities responded in positive ways that strengthened and institutionalized the position of two-year colleges in the state’s higher education system. In “The Origins and Development of the Early Public Junior College: 1900-
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1940,” Robert P. Pedersen explained how presidents of state universities and private colleges responded to junior colleges during the early years of their development. Pedersen emphasized that many university presidents favored junior colleges to advance the interests of their institutions, but most private college presidents viewed the junior college as a “serious threat to the viability of their institutions.” 496 This study confirmed that private college officials did view two-year colleges as a competitive threat, and it also explains how Iowa’s three public-university presidents and officials worked to increase the likelihood of success for the state’s new two-year public colleges. Their advocacy for Iowa’s new public two-year colleges became evident as university officials responded to the presence of the new institutions.

University of Northern Iowa (UNI) officials initially contemplated the development of their own vocational institute, but officials determined that their role was to train teachers for Iowa’s two-year vocational colleges. By supporting the preparation of two-year college teachers, President Maucker and other UNI officials contributed to strengthening the position of two-year vocational colleges in the state’s higher education system. As a land-grant institution, Iowa State University (ISU) had initiated vocational education programs prior to the state’s introduction of the state’s new system of two-year colleges in 1965. But after the establishment of two-year colleges, ISU deferred lower-level vocational training to Iowa’s two-year colleges. ISU’s response strengthened the position of two-year colleges in the higher education system by institutionalizing lower-level vocational education at two-year colleges. In addition, officials from the University of Iowa provided leadership that supported the state’s system of community colleges. Through the university’s Office of Community College Affairs, officials provided support and guidance to develop transfer programs that allowed two-year college students to

more easily transfer to four-year colleges and universities throughout Iowa. The work of officials from all three universities helped two-year colleges to establish their place in the state’s higher education system. This meant that two-year colleges were in a stronger position to provide more opportunities for students to achieve a baccalaureate degree. Overall, Iowa’s public university officials responded to the presence of two-year colleges in ways that increased educational opportunity for Iowa students.

**Future Research**

This study has revealed important factors that inhibited or, especially, contributed to educational opportunities in Iowa during community colleges’ early development and relationship-building with other higher education institutions. However, opposition to liberal arts education deserves much more attention. Historians should continue to examine institutional relationships between 1965 and 1975, as well during subsequent time periods. This research will further illuminate how private colleges and public universities continued to respond to the inclusion of liberal arts education at two-year colleges, further clarifying how educational opportunities developed, or did not develop, for two-year college students who sought to achieve a baccalaureate degree. In at least one instance, more than twenty years after most two-year colleges were founded in Iowa, two-year college officials still experienced opposition to the inclusion of liberal arts education.

**Opposition to Liberal Arts Education at Northwest Iowa Technical College**

Chapter 2 discussed how Northwest Iowa Vocational School (NIVS) received approval in 1973 for a “limited” liberal arts education program for military veterans, which warranted a
name change to Northwest Iowa Technical College (NITC). In 1973, NITC officials did not experience opposition to their limited liberal arts education program. But in 1987, NITC officials decided to request full community college status to provide students in western Iowa with greater access liberal arts education and a path to earn a baccalaureate degree. Even though the institution had once received limited community college status, this attempt proved to be controversial. NITC officials met resistance that resembled the successful opposition to liberal arts education at Merged Area I and Western Iowa Tech during the late 1960s and 1970s.

In 1987, NITC officials began the process to achieve full status as a comprehensive community college. NITC officials stated that many northwest Iowans did not have “access to baccalaureate opportunities” due to a lack of state-supported institutions in western Iowa. NITC officials acknowledged that there were two private colleges in the service area, Northwestern College in Orange City and Dordt College in Sioux Center. Both had “national reputations of being among the best of liberal arts colleges,” but “access to these colleges is not really available.” In 1987, NITC officials began to argue that access to the private colleges was limited because the price of tuition—ranging from $5,600 to $5,900 per year even with a $2,300 state tuition grant—was prohibitive for many residents in northwest Iowa. In addition, NITC officials explained that thirty-nine percent of population in their merged service area did not have a high school diploma. NITC could provide this opportunity, giving more students the chance to eventually enroll in a private college or state university. NITC officials believed that NITC could serve economically disadvantaged students, and it should be granted full community college status.497

On September 1, 1987, Dordt College President John Hulst sent a letter to the Director of the Area Schools Division at the Iowa Department of Education. Hulst informed the Director that NITC President Frank Adams had met with him and the presidents of Northwestern College and Westmar College, and that during the meeting, Adams had explained NITC’s intent to offer liberal arts education to meet the “un-met needs of the northwest Iowa community.” Hulst informed the Director at the Iowa Department of Education that he and the other two private college presidents later discussed NITC’s plan to offer a liberal arts curriculum. The private college presidents determined that they were “not in a position to make a public statement concerning the advisability or necessity of adding liberal arts courses to the curriculum of NITC.” In addition, Hulst stated that the private college presidents were “not excited about the prospect,” and that all three would be writing a letter to Adams to express their feelings about “this rather delicate issue.”

The letters sent to NITC President Adams from the private college presidents revealed consistent themes. Each private college president listed three steps that he would take after receiving notification that NITC intended to pursue community college status: 1) he would not make any public statement regarding NITC’s request for community college status; 2) he would continue working with NITC on any current transfer credit programs; and 3) his institution would still actively promote its own liberal arts education program and wide array of course offerings. In addition, Northwestern College President James Bultman added a fourth item to
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his list: “It is in the best interest of all area institutions to respect each other’s strengths and work together in a spirit of cooperation which best serves the needs of students.”\textsuperscript{500}

The letters sent to Adams reflected a tone of indifference to NITC’s request to obtain community college status and to offer liberal arts education. In a letter dated December 29, 1987, Dordt President Hulst wrote to the Chairman of the Subcommittee of the Iowa Coordinating Council, Dino Curris. Chairman Curris and the committee would soon consider NITC’s request for community college status and a college-parallel program. Hulst explained the intent of the letters sent by the private college presidents to Adams:

You should know…that when the letters from the presidents were written it was assumed that N.I.T.C. already had the authority to offer the proposed liberal arts courses, N.I.T.C. intended to proceed with the expansion of their program, and that the four year liberal arts colleges in the area were simply being asked to give their public endorsement. All three of the presidents refused to provide a public endorsement, and made it clear that their respective colleges intended to continue promoting their academic programs…”

Hulst further explained that now that the private college presidents were fully aware that NITC did not already have the authority to offer liberal arts courses, they wanted the committee to know that they were “opposed to the request” because the private colleges in the area already provided “excellent liberal arts programs.” NITC had also been established as a technical college, so Hulst questioned the quality of the liberal arts courses that it would offer. Hulst concluded the letter by stating that he could not approve or promote a program which he believed was “unnecessary, educationally inferior, and a threat to programs which already exist.”\textsuperscript{501}

Northwestern President Bultman also expressed his concerns about NITC’s plan to become a comprehensive community college. In a letter to Dordt President Hulst, Bultman provided his reasons why he opposed NITC’s request:

\textsuperscript{500} James Bultman to Frank Adams, 8 Sept. 1987.
From the very beginning, I have been concerned that the personnel at NITC have not been totally forthright in their intentions about this curriculum change. From their initial efforts disguised as attempts to assess needs of communities, to comments that the expansion would serve a different group of students...I have grown increasingly uneasy about their intentions. It is now obvious to me that what they want to offer is a program which competes with the freshman and sophomore offerings at area 4-year colleges.

Bultman also stated that he found it difficult “to believe NITC could compete” with the neighboring private colleges. In addition, Bultman argued that “unsuspecting students and their families” may not recognize how colleges differ by “quality and nature,” and he stressed that public funds should not be used to finance “obviously inferior academic programs.”

Despite opposition from private college officials, NITC President Adams was proactive in his fight for the citizens of northwest Iowa who were “being denied access to higher education because they fall through the ‘cracks’ of the higher education platform.” Adams expressed his resolve to Chairman Curris of the Iowa Coordinating Council: “As president of this college and as a public servant to these people, it is my intention to press forward to serve that need. Should the State Board deny our request, I will pursue other alternatives.” One of these alternatives was to invite comprehensive community colleges contiguous to Merged Area IV to offer liberal arts courses on the NITC campus or through an extension system. Adams concluded by stating that if NITC received community college status, he would work with the private colleges in Merged Area IV to make sure the change benefitted all of the area institutions.

On February 11, 1988, the State Board of Education approved NITC’s request for full community college status. In the approval letter, Charles Moench, the Chief of the Bureau of Area Schools, explained that NITC’s request was approved, but the Iowa Coordinating Council

---

wanted NITC to consider some of its concerns before NITC established a liberal arts program and subsequent Associate degrees. The concerns included: the quality of the liberal arts programs to be offered, the possible de-emphasis of the institution’s current vocational and technical mission, and the need “to pursue opportunities for cooperative programming among the post-secondary educational institutions in the Merged Area.” Moench emphasized that the Iowa Department of Education would request periodic reports from the institution indicating how officials were responding to the concerns noted in the approval letter.504

Following approval of NITC’s request, the presidents of both Northwestern and Dordt sent a letter to William Lepley, the Director the Iowa Department of Education. Northwestern President Bultman wrote, “I am sorry that my first communication with you is one in which I object strongly to the action taken,” and he expressed his “considerable disappointment over the action taken.” He stressed that cooperation with NITC had become difficult in light of past events and a loss of trust.505 Dordt President Hulst also expressed displeasure about NITC’s approval for community college status and began his letter by questioning the wisdom of the Board’s decision that allowed for the duplication of liberal arts education in the merged service area.506 Even though the private college leaders disagreed with the decision, they were still willing to work together. On March 21, 1988, Hulst notified Director Lepley of the Department of Education that the leaders of Dordt, Northwestern, and NITC would like to meet with him “to discuss post-high school education in Merged Area IV.”507

504 Charles Moench to Frank Adams, 16 Feb. 1988, Records of John B. Hulst, Subject Files: Northwest Iowa Community College, 1987-1994 Folder, Box 57, Office of the President, John B. Hulst: Subject Files: No-Pa, DCA.
505 James Bultman to William Lepley, 22 Feb. 1988, Records of John B. Hulst, Subject Files: Northwest Iowa Community College, 1987-1994 Folder, Box 57, Office of the President, John B. Hulst: Subject Files: No-Pa, DCA.
507 John Hulst to William Lepley, 21 March 1988, Records of John B. Hulst, Subject Files: Northwest Iowa Community College, 1987-1994 Folder, Box 57, Office of the President, John B. Hulst: Subject Files: No-Pa, DCA.
Although NITC’s quest to achieve full community college status did not begin until 1987, NITC officials still met opposition from neighboring private colleges. Private college officials worked together to stop the competitive threat by questioning the quality of a liberal arts program at an institution founded as a vocational college. Private college officials generated enough doubt about NITC’s curricular change that the State Board of Education vowed to monitor NITC’s progress during the transition from a strictly vocational college to a comprehensive community college. Despite the efforts of private college officials, NITC officials persisted in their efforts to achieve community college status for their institution.

NITC’s efforts to achieve community college status signals that historians need to pay more attention to two-year colleges and their attempts to provide additional educational opportunities for their students. Did other two-year colleges in Iowa and throughout the nation experience similar responses from private college officials? When did the opposition begin and end? How did other higher education institutions cooperate with two-year colleges that offered liberal arts education? Answering these questions will contribute greatly to our understanding of how relationships among institutions helped or hindered educational opportunity and the path to a baccalaureate degree. Additional research may lessen the “thrashing around” regarding the debate about whether community colleges have functioned as egalitarian institutions, or if they have functioned as diversion institutions.
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Western Iowa Tech Community College Archives
Board of Directors Meeting Minutes
Comprehensive Self-Study Reports
Miscellaneous Reports
Newspaper Clippings

Waverly, IA

Wartburg College Archives
John W. Bachman Correspondence
Office of the President Annual Reports
President’s Report to the Board of Regents
Secondary Sources


**Community College Case Studies**

Weaver, Benjamin. “Bringing the Colleges to the Communities: An Historical Analysis of the Siting of the State University of New York Community Colleges.” PhD dissertation, State University of New York at Albany, 2008.
Appendix A: Merged Service Areas and Institutions Used for Research Study

Merged Area IV
15 - Northwest Iowa CC
16 - Northwestern College
17 - Dordt College

Merged Area XI
21 - Des Moines Area CC
22 - Iowa State University
23 - Drake University
24 - Grand View University
25 - Central College
26 - Simpson College

Merged Area XII
18 - Western Iowa Tech CC
19 - Briar Cliff University
20 - Morningside College

Merged Area VII
7 - Hawkeye CC
8 - University of Northern Iowa
9 - Wartburg College

Merged Area X
10 - Kirkwood CC
11 - University of Iowa
12 - Mount Mercy College
13 - Coe College
14 - Cornell College

Merged Area I
1 - Northeast Iowa CC
2 - University of Dubuque
3 - Loras College
4 - Clarke University
5 - Luther College
6 - Upper Iowa College
APPENDIX B

MERGED SERVICE AREAS AND INSTITUTIONS USED FOR RESEARCH STUDY

Merged Area I (Northeast Iowa)

Community Colleges:
  Northeast Iowa Community College; Location: Calmar; Founded 1967 (vocational)
Public University:
  No public university in this region.
Private Colleges and Universities:
  University of Dubuque; Location: Dubuque; Founded 1852
  Loras College; Location: Dubuque; Founded 1839
  Clarke University; Location: Dubuque; Founded 1843
  Luther College; Location: Decorah; Founded 1861
  Upper Iowa University; Location: Fayette; Founded 1857

Merged Area IV (Northwest Iowa)

Community College:
  Northwest Iowa Community College; Location: Sheldon; Founded 1966 (vocational)
Public University:
  No public university in this region.
Private Colleges and Universities:
  Northwestern College; Location: Orange City; Founded 1882
  Dordt College; Location: Sioux Center; Founded 1955

Merged Area VII (Northeast Iowa)

Community College:
  Hawkeye Community College; Location: Waterloo; Founded 1966 (vocational)
Public University:
  University of Northern Iowa; Location: Cedar Falls; Founded 1876 (normal school)
Private Colleges and Universities:
  Wartburg College; Location: Waverly; Founded 1852

Merged Area XII (Northwest Iowa)

Community College:
  Western Iowa Tech Comm. College; Location: Sioux City; Founded 1966 (vocational)
Public University:
  No public university in this region.
Private Colleges/Universities:
  Briar Cliff University; Location: Sioux City; Founded 1930
  Morningside College; Location: Sioux City; Founded 1894
Merged Area X (Southeast Iowa)

Community College:
   Kirkwood Community College; Location: Cedar Rapids; Founded 1966
Public University:
   University of Iowa; Location: Iowa City; Founded 1847 (research university)
Private Colleges and Universities:
   Mount Mercy University; Location: Cedar Rapids; Founded 1928
   Coe College; Location: Cedar Rapids; Founded 1851
   Cornell College; Location: Mt. Vernon; Founded 1853

Merged Area XI (Central Iowa)

Community College:
   Des Moines Area Community College; Location: Ankeny (main campus); Founded 1966
Public University:
   Iowa State University; Location: Ames; Founded 1858 (land grant institution)
Private Colleges and Universities:
   Drake University; Location: Des Moines; Founded 1881
   Grand View University; Location: Des Moines; Founded 1896
   Central College; Location: Pella; Founded 1853
   Simpson College; Location: Indianola; Founded 1860
APPENDIX C

DEFINITION OF TERMS

**community college**: This term refers to institutions that were authorized to offer both vocational education and liberal arts education.

**junior college**: The early curricular purpose of the junior college was to provide the first two years of coursework for a baccalaureate degree. By the 1940s, many junior colleges served two constituencies: terminal education students and transfer students. These institutions provided the foundation for the rapid growth and expansion of community colleges.

**two-year colleges**: For this study, two-year colleges refers to vocational-only institutions and community colleges that offered both vocational and liberal arts education programs.

**vocational education, vocational-technical education**: During the time period of this study, these terms were often used interchangeably to describe terminal education that provided students with training-for-work education programs. This included, but not limited to, curricular programs such as automotive mechanics, bookkeeping, carpentry, drafting, farm management, general clerical, radio repair, secretarial, and welding.

**vocational institutes or institutions**: This term refers to two-year colleges that offered only vocational or vocational-technical education programs.