A COLLEGE FOR THE COMMUNITY?: A COMPARISON OF THE HISTORIES OF AN URBAN (SAN ANTONIO COLLEGE) AND RURAL (NAVARRO COLLEGE) COMMUNITY COLLEGE IN TEXAS

A Dissertation

Presented to

The Faculty of the Department

of History

University of Houston

In Partial Fulfillment

Of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

By

Benjamin Polk Hoffman

A COLLEGE FOR THE COMMUNITY?: A COMPARISON OF THE HISTORIES OF AN URBAN (SAN ANTONIO COLLEGE) AND RURAL (NAVARRO COLLEGE) COMMUNITY COLLEGE IN TEXAS

Benjamin Polk Hoffman

APPROVED:

Guadalupe San Miguel, Jr., Ph.D.
Committee Chair

Gerald Horne, Ph.D.

Nancy Beck Young, Ph.D.

Victoria-María MacDonald, Ed.D.
University of Maryland, College Park

Steven G. Craig, Ph.D.
Interim Dean, College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences
Department of Economics

A COLLEGE FOR THE COMMUNITY?: A COMPARISON OF THE HISTORIES OF AN URBAN (SAN ANTONIO COLLEGE) AND RURAL (NAVARRO COLLEGE) COMMUNITY COLLEGE IN TEXAS

An Abstract of a Dissertation

Presented to

The Faculty of the Department

of History

University of Houston

In Partial Fulfillment

Of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

By

Benjamin Polk Hoffman

May, 2016

ABSTRACT

This study is a historical comparison of an urban (San Antonio College) and a rural (Navarro College) community college in Texas from their establishment until 1980. Based on oral histories and archival research at each of the institutions, this comparison seeks to humanize the history of the community college through in-depth investigation of historical actors at these schools, while also searching for possible variation in development rooted in differences in local context. San Antonio College, established in 1925, is located in the center of a large city with a diverse urban economy and a sizable Mexican American population. Navarro College, established in 1946, is located in Corsicana, the county seat of Navarro County in east Texas. Navarro County is largely rural, with an economy historically tied to cattle, cotton, and oil. The findings of this study reveal that, for both schools, the impact of the government (at all levels) and the community was larger than the existing historiography of the community college suggests. For the rural campus specifically, receptiveness to the needs of the local community was key in the college's success and often drove administrative decision-making. Administrators, often portrayed as the key figure in the development of the community college in previous histories, wielded greater power at Navarro College, where the relative position of faculty was depressed in comparison to San Antonio College, and the smaller size of the institution allowed for more rapid change. This study argues that students, depicted as either the beneficiaries of access or the dupes of diversion in the historiography, faced passive obstacles to success due to the selected colleges' broadening missions and widening curriculum, but ultimately profited from the affordable and convenient opportunities these schools offered for academic and social growth. This dissertation should serve as a model for future historians seeking to strengthen the community college

historiography by comparing suggested national trends to the experience of individual institutions.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

INTRODUCTION
COMPARISONS AND COMMUNITY COLLEGES

A Story and a Study

I came into this dissertation as an outsider to the community college. Growing up in the outskirts of San Antonio, I remember playing tournaments at McFarlin Tennis Center and attending synagogue at Temple Beth-El and looking across the street at the white buildings of San Antonio College. While I had seen the school, I never considered going to San Antonio College myself. I had a general impression of what the community college did (mainly providing the first two years of undergraduate work for eventual transfer at an affordable price), but I did not see the point of going there when I had reasonable opportunities to attend a university right away after high school.

My initial scholarly interest in the community college arose three years after I finished high school, as I began my training for teacher certification as a student at Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi. I did my in-service training at a struggling high school near downtown and ended up connecting strongly with students, particularly through my time volunteering as an assistant tennis coach. One of the best tennis players on the team was also gifted academically. Standing in the top ten percent of her class, she had guaranteed acceptance to all state-funded universities in Texas.[1]

On a rainy day when practice was cancelled, I talked to her about her future plans. She discussed, in an almost embarrassed tone, her ambition to be a lawyer and to one day attend the University of Texas (UT) law school. Knowing she was a strong student, I found this plan ambitious, but attainable. It was clear to me, however, that she saw this plan as

[1] For information on the Texas Ten Percent Law see: Texas House of Representatives Higher Education Committee," Texas House Bill 588," The University of Texas Austin: Admissions Research, accessed September 4, 2015, https://www.utexas.edu/student/admissions/research/HB588Law.html.

almost impossible, and was loath to even share it in fear of being laughed at. When I asked her about how her applications were going, she revealed to me that she was planning on only applying to Del Mar College, the local community college in Corpus Christi. I suggested that going to UT may be a good option considering her ultimate goal, but she admitted to being intimidated by the school's size and academic prestige. She also wanted to stay closer to her family while attending a less expensive college since she would have to take loans out to go to school.

My initial inclination was to tell her that going to UT was the better option for her (I had been pushed to go to universities like UT my whole life). After hearing her arguments, however, I knew that she had good reasons for her decision. Community colleges are relatively inexpensive, generally closer to home, and might offer a better gateway for a student looking to transition to college life from a poorly performing high school (this latter point was beyond my experience to understand at the time). While I enjoyed my time working as an in-service teacher, I also knew that the quality of coursework at the school was fairly low, and that transitioning to a place like UT would be difficult considering her academic preparation. I ended up supporting her plan to attend Del Mar, but pushed her to work hard in order to transfer to UT so she could realize her dream to become a lawyer.

This conversation profoundly affected my future career. First, the college decision of this student was a major catalyst for why I went to graduate school in the first place. I wanted to learn more about the history of working class education in the United States. More specifically, I wanted to do my best to help working class students not talk about their future goals as ethereal dreams with little to no chance to be realized, but as goals attainable by hard work and persistence. That conversation made it clear to me that one's social and economic

background does have a profound effect on an individual's ability to reach professional goals, regardless of talent. I might have understood why going to Del Mar made sense in this case, but that did not stop me from thinking that it would be a long and hard road for my tennis pupil to get her law degree from UT.

Second, this conversation showed me that the community college is of particular importance to the educational landscape of the United States. By providing an open door and a more affordable higher education option, community colleges are instrumental in delivering on the constant refrain in the United States that education offers the talented, regardless of background, the opportunity for social mobility. For the student I talked to during my in-service teaching, the community college was the most logical option for her to realize her long-term goals to become a lawyer. She would have been the first person in her family to go to college, and I hoped that Del Mar would be able to provide the backbone to her education she would need to overcome the financial and social barriers to her goals. That said, I did not have a deep enough knowledge of community colleges to know how effective these institutions were at taking on what seems a Herculean task: preparing virtually any student with a high school education, regardless of socioeconomic background, to further their professional and academic goals (whether through transfer or terminal vocational programs).

This project is part of my attempt to gain that experience so I can better understand the development of the community college in the United States. It took only a cursory look at the sources to validate my assumption on the community college's importance within U.S. higher education. From a few schools in a small number of states in the first two decades of the twentieth century, community colleges now educate almost half of the nation's undergraduate students and makes up a key pillar of the educational platform of President

Barack Obama.[2] Furthermore, community colleges disproportionately enroll those that are historically underserved by higher education institutions, including more than half of black and Hispanic undergraduates.[3] With community colleges now established as a permanent and prominent institution in U.S. higher education, it is particularly important to understand its historical evolution and the societal function these schools have played over the course of the twentieth century.

Community colleges are a worthy subject for study because of their increasing importance in United States education, particularly for working class students.[4] Furthermore, despite their importance, the community college historiography is still in its infancy. More study is necessary to understand how these schools developed, what role they have played in American society, and how well they have served their students. Philo Hutcheson attributes the relatively weak historical treatment of the community college to their continued existence as a "marginal institution attracting little interest on the part of scholars" and the lack of records currently available at colleges from which historians can base their research.[5]

Despite the obstacles that stand in the way of historical study of the community college, there is a base of literature that I will be using for my own investigation into the

---

[2] American Association of Community Colleges, "2015 Community College Fast Facts, accessed August 26, 2015, http://www.aacc.nche.edu/AboutCC/Documents/FS_2015_2bw.pdf; President Barack Obama has consistently promoted support of community colleges as part of his education platform, particularly noting their importance as a provider of vocational education programs: "Building American Skills through Community Colleges," The White House: President Barack Obama, accessed August 26, 2015, http://www.whitehouse.gov/issues/education/higher-education/building-american-skills-through-community-colleges.

[3] American Association of Community Colleges, "Students at Community Colleges," accessed April 11, 2013, http://www.aacc.nche.edu/AboutCC/Trends/Pages/studentsatcommunitycolleges.aspx.

[4] David Karen, "The Politics of Class, Race, and Gender: Access to Higher Education in the United States, 1960-1986," *American Journal of Education* 99, no. 2 (1991), 208-237.

[5] Philo A. Hutcheson, "Reconsidering the Community College," *History of Education Quarterly* 39, no. 3 (1999): 318.

history of these schools. The bulk of the historiography thus far has been created by education scholars and sociologists. Most of the early histories of the junior/community college were authored by education researchers who were involved intimately in the junior/community college movement. Many of them worked for the American Association of Junior Colleges (AAJC).[6] While these studies contain useful survey data on the development of the community college, the organizational background of the authors leads to an almost uniformly positive portrayal of the college and its mission, particularly the goal to "democratize" higher education, as well as a clear focus on college leadership (including the AAJC) as a catalyst for institutional change.[7] Furthermore, the history contained in these works was generally only a part of a larger contemporary study of the community college movement, leading to issues of presentism.

Leonard V. Koos, an education scholar and the Director of Research for the AAJC, compiled an impressive amount of data about the early junior college movement in his 1924 book *The Junior College*, including insights on the core purposes of the movement.[8] He found, during the early stages of the junior college's history, that the professional literature

---

[6] Junior/community college survey texts/histories written by AAJC officials include: Leonard V. Koos, *The Junior College* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1924); Walter Crosby Eells, *The Junior College* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1931); Jesse Parker Bogue, *The Community College* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1950); Edmund J. Gleazer, *This Is the Community College* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1968); The AACC has continued to publish histories of the college including Allen A. Witt et al., *America's Community Colleges: The First Century* (Washington D.C.: The Community College Press, 1994); George B. Vaughan, *The Community College in America: A Short History* (Washington D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1985). For a history of the American Association of Junior Colleges see: Michael Brick, *Forum and Focus for the Junior College Movement: The American Association of Junior Colleges* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1964).f

[7] Many of these authors have also clearly advocated for changes in college policy in their studies. For example, Jesse Bogue spearheaded the glorification of the democratizing mission, including promoting his vision of the comprehensive community college in the early years after WWII. See: Jesse Parker Bogue, "The Community College," *Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors* 34, no. 2 (1948): 285–95, doi:10.2307/40220284.

[8] Thomas Diener, *Growth of an American Invention: A Documentary History of the Junior and Community College Movement* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1985), 93.

and college catalogs listed "popularizing higher education" as one of the core functions of the junior college.[9] His work also provides evidence that this purpose went beyond the rhetoric of college leadership by citing survey data showing that the affordability of junior colleges was the number one reason students attended these institutions, showing their early appeal to working and middle class students.[10] Walter Eells, who would later serve as the Executive Secretary for the AAJC, updated Koos's work in 1931, also citing strong evidence for the importance of the junior college in the democratization of higher education. Eells references surveys of individual colleges showing that, without the opportunities a junior college provided, a large percentage of their students would not have attended a higher education institution at all.[11]

Building off of the findings of Koos and Eells, the mid-twentieth century leadership of the AAJC continued to promote the narrative of the now rebranded community college as a democratizing institution. Jesse Parker Bogue places the community college within a larger historical trend towards greater educational opportunity in the United States (as an extension of the free public K-12 schooling that evolved over the previous decades). As Bogue puts it, "The general principle of free public education as the right and need of all youth who can profit by it, generally won in public approval for the first twelve years, is now being advocated for extension through the fourteenth year."[12] Edmund Gleazer, long-time leader of the AAJC, also portrayed the community college as the realization of democratic principles within higher education. He argues that "diversification of educational opportunity is

[9] Koos, *The Junior College*, 14.
[10] Ibid., 124.
[11] Eells, *The Junior College*, 228-229.
[12] Bogue, *The Community College*, 9.

urgently required to match a multitude of individual needs. The community college emerged to meet needs that other institutions could not or would not meet."[13] Scholars and community college leaders like Koos, Eells, Bogue, and Gleazer gathered impressive data on the explosive growth of the junior/community college over the first six decades of the twentieth century, celebrating this explosive growth as evidence of these colleges' crucial function as a democratizing agent within higher education. The growth of the community college movement that they cataloged is undeniable, but revisionist scholars began questioning the overall impact of the community college on its students during the final decades of the century.

Over the last thirty years, sociologists (most notably Steven Brint and Jerome Karabel in *The Diverted Dream*) have challenged the uniformly positive portrayal of the junior/community college put forth by these initial scholars by bringing into question the effectiveness of community colleges in offering an opportunity for social mobility for its students.[14] Furthermore, these revisionists have looked deeply at who held the power in the development of the community college. While they agree with education scholars that national and local education leaders were instrumental in the college's development, they question whether this leadership represented the will of the college's clientele: its students.[15]

---

[13] Gleazer, *This is the Community College*, 14.

[14] Steven G. Brint and Jerome Karabel, *The Diverted Dream: Community Colleges and the Promise of Educational Opportunity in America, 1900-1985* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989); Brint and Karabel 's argument has been brought up to the present in: J. M. Beach, *Gateway to Opportunity?: A History of the Community College in the United States* (Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, LLC, 2010).

[15] John H. Frye, *The Vision of the Public Junior College, 1900-1940: Professional Goals and Popular Aspirations* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1992); David F. Labaree, "The Rise of the Community College: Markets and the Limits of Educational Opportunity," in *How to Succeed in School Without Really Learning: The Credentials Race in American Education* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1997), 190–223.

Scholars including Brint and Karabel, David Labaree, and J. M. Beach have cited the mid-twentieth century shift in mission for public two-year colleges, seen in the increasing integration of terminal vocational programs, as a negative development for the social mobility aspirations of working class students (who are disproportionately represented at these schools).[16] Beach argues that an increasing focus on global competitiveness and fitting the population to occupational needs has obscured the larger goal of providing opportunities for social mobility for previously disadvantaged groups. Effectively, the community college solidified the status quo by putting lower class people into lower class jobs.[17]

The major branches of the historiography have developed contrasting narratives on the development of the community college, as either an institution to be lauded for extending higher education opportunity or an institution developed to quell opportunity through the diversion of students' social mobility aspirations. This project seeks to chronicle the history of individual colleges to provide a focused discussion on the central factors affecting the character and development of a junior/community college. The applicability of the arguments put forth in previous histories will be a constant consideration throughout this study, particularly arguments on the experience of community college students. Beyond determining the viability of proposed national community college trends at the single-institution level, this dissertation employs a comparative approach to offer new insights on the importance of local context on the development of these schools.

---

[16] Brint and Karabel, *The Diverted Dream*; David F. Labaree, "The Rise of the Community College: Markets and the Limits of Educational Opportunity," in *How to Succeed in School Without Really Learning: The Credentials Race in American Education* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1997), 190–223; Beach, *Gateway to Opportunity?*; the definition of the working class employed in the community college historiography is not always precise, but generally refers to students coming from relatively low-income families who are employed for wages, with low levels of educational attainment historically.

[17] Beach, *Gateway to Opportunity?*, 38.

This study is a comparison of the historical development of an urban and a rural community college in the state of Texas from their establishment until 1980. San Antonio College (originally named University Junior College) was established in 1925 by the University of Texas as a transfer institution, but it came under the oversight of San Antonio's public schools the following year.[18] Navarro College (then Navarro Junior College) was established in 1946 in Corsicana, Texas on an abandoned airfield previously used as a flight school by the federal government during World War II. The school was set up to capitalize on demand for college coursework by veterans utilizing the GI Bill.[19] The following section will provide some background on my approach to historical comparisons, including how I have factored the variables of time, location, and historical actors into the selection of sites and the posing of guiding questions for this study.

The Fundamentals of Historical Comparison

Unit of Analysis

On the surface, historical comparisons appear complicated and highly susceptible to reckless generalization. When looking across space and time, it is very difficult for historians to take into account all of the factors that might mar the conclusions of a comparison. In order to mitigate potential recklessness, it is important for historians to disambiguate the fundamental variables of a comparison before beginning a study and to select sites strategically to best address the questions driving the study.

[18] For a study focused on the early history of San Antonio Junior College see: Jerome Francis Weynand, *San Antonio College: In the Beginning, 1925-1956* (San Antonio, TX.: Adrome House, 2002).

[19] For a study focused on the history of Navarro College see: Tommy W. Stringer, *Dreams and Visions: The History of Navarro College* (Waco, TX: Davis Brothers Publishing Co., 1996).

The first step in a historical comparison is to identify the unit of analysis. In the social sciences, particularly when employing a comparative method, scholars have struggled to come to consensus on a clear definition of the term "unit of analysis." Sociologist Charles Ragin explains that "very little continuity exists…in discussions of units of analysis offered by comparatively oriented social scientists…Sometimes unit of analysis is used in reference to data categories....At other times, however, the term unit of analysis is used to reference theoretical categories."[20] Because comparisons typically entail multiple levels of analysis, application of the term "unit of analysis" becomes more difficult. The advice of Earl Babbie, however, helps to break down this ambiguity. He suggests that "what you call a given unit of analysis--a group, a formal organization, or a social artifact--is irrelevant. The key is to be clear about what your unit of analysis is."[21] In the case of this project, the unit of analysis, "the major entity that is being analyzed in the study," is the community college in the United States.[22] A unit of analysis does not have to be a brick and mortar institution, however. For instance, world historians have often compared empires (an institution of governance).[23]

Community colleges are an important unit of analysis for a historical comparison because so many questions still remain on their development. The questions most hotly contested in the historiography thus far include: who held the greatest power in the development of the community college?; and what impact have community colleges had on

---

[20] Charles C. Ragin, *The Comparative Method: Moving Beyond Qualitative and Quantitative Strategies* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987), 7.

[21] Earl R. Babbie, *The Practice of Social Research*, 14th ed. (Belmont, CA: Cengage Learning, 2015), 103.

[22] A. Kyrgidis and S. Triaridis, "Methods and Biostatistics: A Concise Guide for Peer Reviewers," *Hippokratia* 14, no. Suppl 1 (December 2010): 14.

[23] Examples include: Kenneth Pomeranz, *The Great Divergence: China, Europe, and the Making of the Modern World Economy* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2000); Jane Burbank and Frederick Cooper, *Empires in World History: Power and the Politics of Difference* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2010).

their students, and American society as a whole? This study will attempt to add to the discussion on these questions, while raising new questions as well. New areas of inquiry in this study include investigation of the faculty/administration relationship at community colleges and the impact of local context and time of establishment on institutional development. Considering the community college's current popularity, it is important to continue to study their history. It is troubling to think that working class students might have been relegated to institutions which serve more to "cool-out" than to launch their academic and professional ambitions.[24]

Comparison of these institutions offers an opportunity to look at what impact community colleges had on those who attend, and what forces lay behind these schools' development. Institutional histories still carry a certain stigma in the higher education historiography. As Darryl Peterkin explains, "modern historians of higher education have an unfortunate and rather nasty habit of denigrating the work of earlier institutional historians as lacking scholarly rigor and focusing too much upon individual personalities over larger educational or socio-cultural issues."[25] The concerns of modern historians are valid if institutional histories are overly insular and lack research rigor.

However, while this study focuses on only two colleges out of the many that exist in the United States, this narrow scope allows me to look more deeply at the schools I have

[24] The idea of the community college as an institution used to "cool out" was popularized by Burton Clark, who described the college as "the proper place for the potential dropout" (p. 159-160) due to its open door admission policy: Burton R. Clark, *The Open Door College: A Case Study.* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960).

[25] Darryl L. Peterkin, "'Within these Walls': Reading and Writing Institutional Histories" in *The History of U.S. Higher Education: Methods for Understanding the Past*, ed. Marybeth Gasman (New York: Routledge, 2010), 13.

chosen and to see how the arguments made by previous scholars about the community college hold up at the local level (addressing historiographical concerns about both rigor and general applicability). Theda Skocpol, a sociologist and political scientist who often employs historical methods, argues that "both single-case studies and comparative studies…stress the portrayal of given times and places in much of their rich complexity, and they pay attention to the orientations of the actors as well as to the institutional and cultural contexts in which they operate. Consequently, interpretive works can seem extraordinarily vivid and full, like a good Flaubert novel."[26] Trends that I unearth through this comparison will help to humanize the history of the community college by providing a fuller picture of the development of specific institutions. Critics of this approach will point out, correctly, that the history of two schools does not represent the development of the community college movement across the nation. This study provides a starting point for the local investigation of suggested national trends, but the application of this method at other institutions in future histories will lead to a richer understanding of the history of the community college in the United States. The creation of a base of narrow comparisons and institutional studies, in active discussion about their results, would represent a healthy development for the historiography.

Differences that arise between these two colleges, while not providing definitive proof, will bring up questions for scholars attempting to create a general narrative of the community college movement (thus presupposing some level of uniformity across these schools). Education historian Carl Kaestle, in his article on "Standards of Evidence in Historical Research," discusses the development of the historical literature on

[26] Theda Skocpol, ed., *Vision and Method in Historical Sociology* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 371.

industrialization as a commendable example of historiographical evolution. Two of the characteristics of this historiography that Kaestle finds laudable, "the dialog between local and national studies," and the use of comparison to see if trends in development were replicable in different contexts, have informed the construction of this study.[27] I am approaching this institutional comparison with the arguments of national histories front-and-center in my analysis. I seek to see how well generalizations on the community college movement nationally hold up at the level of a single institution, and within different socioeconomic contexts.

Selection of sites to study for a comparison should be a deliberate process, keeping in mind the major questions guiding a study. Scholarly discussion on comparative methodology was a hot topic in the social sciences, particularly political science, from the 1960s to the 1980s.[28] In this study, I followed the advice of Arend Ljiphart, a political scientist at the center of this discussion. Ljiphart offers both a useful definition of what a comparison is, as well as sound advice on setting up these studies: "The comparative method can now be defined as the method of testing hypothesized empirical relationships among variables on the basis of the same logic that guides the statistical method, but in which the cases are selected in such a way as to maximize the variance of the independent variables and to minimize the variance of the control variables." Having identified a unit of analysis, the next step when setting up this study was to consider the fundamental variables of a historical comparison: location, time, and historical actors. Within these fundamental variables, as Ljiphart advises,

[27] Carl F. Kaestle, "Standards of Evidence in Historical Research: How Do We Know When We Know?," *History of Education Quarterly* 32, no. 3 (1992): 365, doi:10.2307/368550.

[28] Collier, David, "The Comparative Method," in *Political Science: The State of the Discipline II*, ed. Ada W. Finifter (Washington, DC: American Political Science Association, 1993).

I selected sites that demonstrated clear differences in sub-variables that were relevant to central questions guiding my study, increasing the possibility that these sub-variables related to observed variation in the schools' development. On the other hand, I tried to control other sub-variables that would potentially complicate my analysis, and make identification of the core factors at the root of the differences between the two community colleges difficult, if not impossible. The following sections will outline the major questions I hope to address in relation to each of the fundamental variables of historical comparison (location, time, and historical actors), as well as an explanation of how these questions guided the selection of sites for this study.

Location

When approaching each of these fundamental factors, my first goal was to identify any specific questions of interest related to that variable. Because the *community* college is, in theory, supposed to reflect its local community, it seems inevitable that local variation would be high. In spite of this logic, most of the popular studies on the community college attempt to generalize the school's experience at the national level, at times with reference to the community college movement in individual states. One of the central questions I hope to address in this study is: how much does local context impact the development of a community college?

While popular presses are understandably attracted to national studies making more universal arguments, there are some historiographical exceptions to this general trend which

shed some light on this question.[29] Declaiming the "Great Man Theory" of historical research that has dominated the community college historiography, James L. Ratcliff sought to understand the factors leading to the creation of public junior colleges in the early twentieth century by looking at the establishment of three institutions spread across the United States. In his study, he found that without state government infrastructure in place, and with the junior college movement in its early stages, the actions of individuals in the communities where these schools were located led to their establishment, not the imposition of an outside force.[30]

Ratcliff's pioneering work suggests that comparisons of a limited number of institutions can lead to the discovery of patterns in college development that are not easily apparent in national datasets, like the impact of local communities on the establishment of junior colleges. While Ratcliff's choice to select colleges in different states gave his study a larger basis for generalizability, this broad geographic scope increases the complexity of the comparison by adding state governance as a complicating variable in each school's establishment. This problem was somewhat mitigated in Ratcliff's study due to the lack of state intervention in junior college establishment at that time, but this issue becomes more serious when looking at junior/community colleges later in the twentieth century, as I intend to do in this study (see my later discussion on "time").

Because I want to control differences in state governance as a complicating factor, I chose sites within the same state: Texas. I will still consider how the state government in

---

[29] Most exceptions to this trend are seen in dissertations and theses, primarily from students in education departments.

[30] James L. Ratcliff, "'First' Public Junior Colleges in an Age of Reform," *Journal of Higher Education* 58, no. 2 (1987): 151–80.

Texas impacted each of the selected schools, but by choosing schools within one state I will not have to consider how differences in state policy might have contributed to observed similarities and differences at the community colleges I study (beyond state policy that contains some type of bias which favors one of the institutions over the other).[31]

Instead of emphasizing geographic variation across states, I chose sites with noticeable differences in terms of local economy and demographics. San Antonio College (SAC) is located at the heart of a city with a large Mexican American population. The local economy is very diverse, leaning on military installations, tourism, and increasingly medicine.[32] Navarro College (NC), on the other hand, is located in Corsicana, Texas, the county seat of a largely rural area. Navarro County traditionally has had a sizable African American minority with a local economy relying on cotton, cattle, and oil.[33] In order to ensure that the two areas were discrete economically, I made sure to choose sites from different parts of the state. San Antonio is in south Texas, while Corsicana is in east-central Texas, an hour outside of Dallas.

By choosing distinct areas within the state, I have increased the chance that local differences would lead to noticeable inconsistencies in the ways the two schools developed. Throughout this study, I will consider how the local community, and the needs of the local

---

[31] For an excellent history of the junior/community college movement in Texas see: Sue Johnson Blair, "The Emergence and Development of the Community/Junior College in Texas" (Ph.D. Diss, Texas Tech University, 1991).

[32] For local histories of San Antonio see: T. R Fehrenbach, *The San Antonio Story: A Pictorial and Entertaining Commentary on the Growth and Development of San Antonio, Texas* (Tulsa, OK: Continental Heritage, 1978); Char Miller, *Deep in the Heart of San Antonio: Land and Life in South Texas* (San Antonio, TX: Trinity University Press, 2012).

[33] For local histories of Navarro County see: Annie Carpenter Love, *History of Navarro County* (Dallas, TX.: Southwest Press, 1933); Wyvonne Putnam and Navarro County Historical Society, *Navarro County History* (Quanah, TX: Nortex Press, 1975); Tommy W. Stringer, *Corsicana* (Charleston, SC: Arcadia, 2010).

economy, have factored into the policies of the school, the demographics of the faculty, administration, and students, and the college's curriculum.

I found that despite differences in locale, both colleges showed similar trends in growth of enrollment and integration of terminal/vocational programs. Major differences arose between the two schools in terms of support of the local community, funding and scrutiny of the federal government, faculty and administration's power on campus, student culture, and the content of the curriculum (particularly in terminal programs). The magnitude of these differences suggests that previous histories attempting to present generalized findings on a national community college movement need to recognize that beneath surface structural similarities, the unique nature of a college's locale has large effects on the character of its development.

Time

Time is an important variable for comparison since wide variation in temporal context opens up a myriad of complicating dynamics when trying to isolate possible causative factors for differences in development between studied institutions. Sociologists James Mahoney and Dietrick Rueschemeyer outline the core importance of time in historical comparison when they explain that "comparative historical researchers explicitly analyze historical sequences and take seriously the unfolding of processes over time...comparative historical analysts incorporate considerations of the temporal structure of events in their

explanations."[34] When something occurred, the pace of change, and the duration of events, matters in historical comparison.

Going back to my earlier reference to comparisons of world empires, it is difficult to assess why differences arose in the development of the Roman Empire and the British Empire when they operated millennia apart. The world changed substantially over the intervening years in terms of technology, population, economy, religion, governance, and social structure. It is challenging to take into account all of these changes when trying to understand differences between these two empires. Postmodernists correctly point out the hazards of historians trying to understand the past when the reclamation of historical context is nearly impossible.[35] This does not mean that the study of the past is a fruitless endeavor, but it does mean that time must always be on the mind in any historical study, and more so in a comparison.

Luckily, for this study, the public junior/community college has only been in existence since the early twentieth century. I will not have to consider differences in human development over the course of millennia, but that does not mean that issues of time are any less important for this project. Because of the community college's relative youth, the general historiographical trend has been to try to look at the community college over the

[34] James Mahoney and Dietrich Rueschemeyer, *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 12.

[35] For a short overview of postmoderist historical theory see: Norman J. Wilson, *History in Crisis?: Recent Directions in Historiography*, 2nd ed. (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc., 2005), 126-137.

entire course of its development. Books from both the democratizing and the revisionist branches of the historiography have followed this pattern.[36]

The tendency to look at the junior/community college's history holistically is understandable because of the potential value of developing arguments that are comprehensive and directly relatable to the status of the college in the present. That said, this holistic treatment has also led to some weaknesses in the historiography. First, an author conducting historical studies that stretch to the present runs the risk that a presentist perspective might distort his/her interpretation of the past. It is important to consider historical sources within the context of their own time period, but when historians try to make these sources answer contemporary questions it is possible that context is compromised for argumentative convenience.

Second, looking at the community college over its whole development has led to a lack of clear periodization in the historiography. Generally, larger studies have divided the history of public two-year colleges into two eras: the junior college era, when these schools focused on transferring students to universities; and the community college era, when the college's mission widened to encompass vocational/technical coursework, terminal programs, and adult and continuing education. The chronological division of these two eras is a little murky, with the shift occurring sometime between the end of World War II and the 1960s.[37] The current state of the community college historiography in terms of time led me to

[36] The definitive works in both branches of the historiography adhere to this trend: Brint and Karabel, *The Diverted Dream*; Witt et al., *America's Community College*.

[37] *America's Community College* has done the best job of providing a decade-by-decade chronology of the community college movement, but the overall periodization of the college remains nebulous: Witt et al., *America's Community Colleges*.

two major questions which inform this study: how does time of establishment affect the development of a community college?; and are there similarities in the chronological development of the two schools which suggest the possibility of generalizable periodization for the community college movement?

Similar to my discussion of "location," there are some historiographical aberrations which set a precedent for taking a new approach to studying the junior/community college's history chronologically. Foregoing a comprehensive approach, John H. Frye's *The Vision of the Public Junior College, 1900-1940* seeks to portray the state of the college in its early decades of development. This includes a discussion of who attended these schools, what they wanted, and how well the wishes of students were mirrored in the administrative decisions of the college's leaders. Frye's more focused study portrays a college in search of an identity in its early years, with middle class students seeking to transfer, faculty members hoping to fashion an environment comparable to senior universities, and administrators promoting vocational programs despite the wishes of students and faculty. Frye's work reveals that the seeds of the shift to a more comprehensive college mission arose early on in the school's development. His narrow focus shows that this early era was more complex than originally depicted when looking deeper at the motivations of the major denizens of the schools.[38]

While Frye's book sets an important precedent, the time period he studied did not traverse the larger shift in the college's mission when the junior college was transformed into the comprehensive community college. For this study, I hoped to fashion my comparison to highlight the impact of this shift by choosing colleges with different times of establishment:

[38] Frye, *The Vision of the Public Junior College, 1900-1940.*

one before and one after World War II. If public two-year colleges were increasingly pressured to become more comprehensive in their mission after World War II (particularly after the publication of the Truman Commission on Higher Education's report, "Higher Education for American Democracy," in 1947), it seems possible that schools established around this time would be more likely to imbibe this call for change.[39] On the other hand, schools established before World War II, as junior colleges, might remain tied to their transfer curriculum, incorporating vocational/technical coursework more slowly.

Surprisingly, when looking at the content of the curriculum of the colleges chosen for this study, the proportion of terminal versus transfer programs at both schools remained close to the same over the course of the time period studied. San Antonio College (established in 1925) was able to adapt its curriculum at roughly the same rate as Navarro College (established in 1946).[40] Navarro Junior College's curriculum did include a greater proportion of terminal coursework than SAC's at its time of its establishment, but this disparity soon dissipated. Possible reasons for the curricular flexibility of San Antonio College include: the demand for terminal programs in a city where university education was already available; and the high participation of San Antonio College faculty and administrators in national organizations endorsing the shift in the mission of the college. Inversely, Navarro College

[39] The Truman Commission was created in 1946 by the president and tasked with finding solutions to expand higher education opportunity and diversify college curricula in the years after World War II. The community college figured prominently into the Commission's recommendations because of its potential to increase higher education access through its open door admissions and affordability. For a discussion on the role of the community college within the recommendations of the Truman Commission see: Philo A. Hutcheson, "The Truman Commission's Vision of the Future," *Thought & Action: The NEA Higher Education Journal*, Fall 2007, 107–15. For a digital version of Truman's letter laying out the major aims of the Commission see: Harry S. Truman, "Letter Appointing Members to the National Commission on Higher Education," The American Presidency Project, University of California-Santa Barbara, July 13, 1946, accessed April 19, 2016, http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=12452.

[40] Please see Chapter Seven for a thorough curriculum comparison of the two schools based off of course listings in their respective catalogs.

was the only higher education institution in the county, and its ability to offer transferrable coursework for local students was prized by the community (particularly since many students preferred to stay close to home for financial and social reasons).

Beyond the effect of time of establishment, I also wanted to let the sources guide me to a natural periodization for this study. Beginning at the time of establishment was necessary for me since that is a sub-variable I wanted to consider in my comparison, but the end point of the study, and divisions within the larger scope, were still unclear. I did not want to take this study up to the present because I wanted to provide an organic periodization based on what I found at the schools to avoid presentism, and I realized earlier on that properly contextualizing very recent events was nearly impossible.

I decided to end my study in 1980. This terminus was chosen for two reasons. First, the large increase in enrollment and rapid change in terms of curriculum which began roughly in the early 1960s had reached its crest by 1980. Second, an unexpected trend, the presence of large numbers of international students, reached a crisis point at both institutions in the late 1970s in the form of large-scale protests by Iranian students on campus on the eve of the Iranian Revolution. The actions of Iranian students, and the reactions of college leadership at NC and SAC, will be discussed in detail in the body of this study, but this was an unexpected similarity between the two institutions, and a potential trend I had not seen explored in other histories of the community college.[41]

I have also chosen to divide this study into two major eras for each institution: an era of establishment (1925-1955 at San Antonio Junior College (SAJC), 1946-1955 at Navarro

[41] Iranian student protests on both campuses will be a major subject of Chapter Six.

Junior College (NJC)) and an era of expansion (1955-1980 at both colleges). During the era of establishment, both schools focused on upgrading their physical plant, attaining support from the local community, and gaining accreditation from the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. After the mid-1950s, SAC and NJC had moved to new campuses, gained accreditation, and sought to expand rapidly in terms of enrollment, curriculum, and funding.[42] Differences in the duration of the time periods for the era of establishment at each school reflect the impact of macro factors on SAJC's early development (Great Depression and World War II), as well as micro factors (governing structure of the institution and support of the community). A more thorough comparison of the roads to establishment for the two schools will be included in the first section of this study.

Historical Actors

While location and time are important considerations when setting up a historical comparison, the majority of historians' arguments revolve around the impact of historical actors on events or institutions (assuming that they are doing a human, and not a natural, history). When setting up a comparison, it should be a given that human actors exist within the institutions chosen for study, but the key for historians is confirming that the necessary sources are available to represent the voices of these historical actors. As the previously

[42] The name that I use to refer to each school will be chronologically consistent with the time period I am discussing. Thus, I will use the name "Navarro Junior College" or "NJC" when referring to events occurring at that school before 1974, the year that the name change was implemented. Similarly, I will use the name "San Antonio Junior College" or "SAJC" when referring to events at this institution before 1948 (when the name was changed at that college). If I am talking about each school generally (without specifying a time period) I will use the names "Navarro College" and "San Antonio College."

referenced article by Philo Hutcheson detailed, record-keeping at community colleges has a poor track record, and likely has contributed to the relative weakness of the historiography.[43]

The major actors at the community college are the administration, faculty, students, community, and government (local, state, and national). The major question previous histories have posed, and I will also discuss, is which actors at the community college had the greatest influence on how these schools developed? Previous historians have argued that community college leadership held the ultimate power in guiding the development of the community college (even against the will of its students at times). This argument can be seen most clearly in Brint and Karabel's *The Diverted Dream*. They argue that "anticipatory subordination" was the cause of the increasing strength of the vocational track in the college. As they explain, "the community colleges found themselves in a situation of structured subordination with respect to both other higher education institutions and business. Within the constraints of this dual subordination, the vocationalization project was a means of striking the best available bargain. We refer…to this deference to the perceived needs of more powerful institutions--even when such institutions made no conscious efforts to control their affairs--as anticipatory subordination."[44] Brint and Karabel claim that community college leaders, faced with a school lacking a clear identity, sought to appease business leaders by promoting vocational education, even when business leaders and students were not actively calling for this shift.

Furthermore, it has been argued that leadership developed the community college as a "cooling-out" institution within the higher education landscape. This argument, popularized

[43] Hutcheson, "Reconsidering the Community College," 318.
[44] Brint and Karabel, *The Diverted Dream*, location 344.

by educational sociologist Burton Clark, has been mirrored in class-based university histories.[45] These histories describe the higher education hierarchy in the United States as a means to maintain class structure, with the community college being instrumental in the appeasement of working class aspirations.[46]

It is possible that this top-down argument has more to do with the expansive geographic and chronological scopes used in these studies (in which sources representing community college leadership are easier to generalize) than actual events at individual colleges. The voices of the community college student and faculty have generally been little more than a whisper in these histories, represented by broad statistics and second-hand commentary. In contrast to previous histories, the impact of the community, the government, and the student body have been instrumental in the development of the two colleges selected for this study. The community was particularly important in the establishment and early growth of each institution, with the state and federal government becoming more influential in the later expansion of the schools. I suspect that the importance of the government, the community, and students is not unique to the two colleges studied here, but is easier to spot in studies with limited subjects that allow for greater depth in assessing the relative impact of these groups.

Because acquiring sources which represent the principle actors at community colleges can be difficult, I prioritized choosing colleges with strong document bases when setting up

---

[45] Clark, *The Open Door College*.

[46] Broader higher education studies making this argument include: David O. Levine, *The American College and the Culture of Aspiration, 1915-1940* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1986); Clyde W. Barrow, *Universities and the Capitalist State: Corporate Liberalism and the Reconstruction of American Higher Education, 1894-1928* (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1990).

my study. Both San Antonio College and Navarro College maintain archives/special collections which include school catalogs, yearbooks, budget information, local and student newspapers, and copies of accreditation reports. These sources have given me an in-depth look at the experience of different groups of historical actors at the colleges.

In an attempt to capitalize on the inherent advantages of the limited scope of an institutional history, I have also prioritized oral histories to add greater depth to the narrative of these schools' development. Education historians like Paul Thompson and William Cutler have made compelling cases for the importance of oral histories as a way to fill in the gaps in the written record.[47] For this study, I found it difficult to consistently access the perspective of faulty members at San Antonio College and students at Navarro College through documents, so I prioritized interviewing members of these groups to ensure the proper representation of their perspective in the history of these schools.

Oral history also provided me with an avenue to redirect the sometimes impersonal analysis of the community college in the existing historiography. By the twentieth century, as famed historian Marc Bloch explains, "we are much better prepared to admit that a scholarly discipline [such as history] may pretend to the dignity of a science without insisting upon Euclidian demonstrations of immutable laws of repetition. We find it far easier to regard certainty and universality as questions of degree."[48] The use of oral histories comes with obvious difficulties regarding authenticity of memory and potential bias on the part of

[47] Paul Thompson, *The Voice of the Past: Oral History* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2000), 7; William W. Cutler, "Oral History: Its Nature and Uses for Educational History," *History of Education Quarterly* 11, no. 2 (1971): 186, doi:10.2307/367594.

[48] Marc Bloch, *The Historian's Craft*, trans. Peter Putnam (Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 1954), 17.

interviewer and interviewee (making oral history a less than scientific source), but these imperfections do not overcome their potential value. The key is to embrace the human element that oral histories contribute to a study, while placing interviewee testimony in context by comparing their perspective with documentary sources from the time and the recollections of others.[49] The combination of documentary and oral sources has helped me to look through the eyes of different members of the campus when viewing major events like the establishment of the colleges, the upgrading of the campus, integration, and the Iranian student protests.

Beyond broadly studying the relative influence of different groups in the development of the college holistically, I also spent time looking specifically at the administration/faculty relationship at the studied community colleges. This theme, the balance of power between faculty and administration, has been studied extensively in histories of universities, but has been largely neglected in the community college historiography. Historical studies of the university, such as Laurence Verysey's *The Emergence of the American University* and John Thelin's *A History of American Higher Education*, discuss the relative weakness of faculty influence in the United States relative to the British system of university governance.[50] At the same time, the implementation of the tenure system and the power of the American Association of University Professors helped to protect academic freedom as a balance against administrative power. In the post-World War II literature, historians like Michael Katz and

[49] For discussions on the importance of this "human element" see: Irving Seidman, *Interviewing as Qualitative Research: A Guide for Researchers in Education and the Social Sciences* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1998), 7–8; Thompson, *The Voice of the Past: Oral History*, 3.

[50] Laurence R. Veysey, *The Emergence of the American University* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965); John R. Thelin, *A History of American Higher Education*, 2nd ed. (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2011). Veysey in particular holds up entrepreneurial administrators in the early twentieth century as the driving force for the creation of the modern university in the US.

Rebecca Lowen highlight the growing importance of the government/administration relationship, and the possibility of compromised faculty freedom on campus that this trend risks.[51]

I hope to work off of the wider higher education literature to take an in-depth look at the faculty/administration relationship at the two schools I am comparing here. What I found was a weaker position for community college faculty at their institutions when compared to their university peers. Navarro College never developed a tenure policy (and has not to this day), and it was not until the faculty senate became a force on campus in the 1970s that tenure was secured at San Antonio College. While faculty members I interviewed did not feel their academic freedom was compromised in the classroom, their descriptions of the governing structure of the schools they worked at, particularly at Navarro College, more closely resembled a secondary school than a university. The importance of faculty members as teachers was clear at both schools, but administration's almost unbridled control over hiring and firing, and their power to set the agenda for the larger direction of the college, limited the influence of faculty outside of the classroom.

The quality of the sources at these two colleges has given me an opportunity to look in-depth at subjects that have been over-generalized or outright neglected in the community college historiography. Building off of this history, I hope future researchers will continue to study the influence of government and the community on the community college, the process of integration at these schools, and the balance of power between faculty and administration

[51] Michael B. Katz, *Reconstructing American Education* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1987); Rebecca S. Lowen, *Creating the Cold War University: The Transformation of Stanford* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997).

on campus. While my comparison opens up a dialogue, future studies citing the history of different colleges will contribute to a more general understanding of these issues at the community college.

Organization: Analytical Structure versus Artistic Vision

I also took into account each of the major variables of comparison when choosing how to organize my study. Although I considered giving location preeminent importance by dividing this history into two major sections, with a dedicated section giving a chronological narrative for each college, I decided to forego this plan. A location-based organizational scheme would have made the eventual comparison of the schools disjointed since their histories would be divided for the majority of the study. Location will be a constant consideration throughout this history, and will be factored in through divisions within chapters, but time and historical actors are the variables which dictated how I divided this study into major sections and chapters.

As mentioned previously, I have divided the history of each of the schools into two chronological eras: an era of establishment (from each school's establishment until the mid-1950s) and an era of expansion (from the mid-1950s until 1980). Each of these eras will be a major section of this study. At the beginning of these sections, I will give a short introduction that includes a brief chronological narrative on each school's development during those years. This narrative will provide broader context for the more focused comparisons, centered on specific historical actors at each school, which will make up the chapters of this study.

Within a section, each chapter will discuss the influence of one or more groups at the college. There will be chapters highlighting the actions of the community/government (Chapters One and Four), the administration/faculty (Chapters Two and Five), and students (Chapters Three and Six) within each era. Community and government have been grouped together because they are the primary external influences on the development of these colleges, and understanding the attitudes of the community oftentimes is related to trends in local government (such as votes on bond issues). The administration and faculty will also be treated in the same chapter since one of the major themes I hope to develop in this study is the faculty/administration relationship.

The final chapter of this study, Chapter Seven, will consist of a curriculum comparison of the two schools over the course of the studied period. Looking at how the curriculum changed over time, and relating these changes to the qualitative evidence, will give the reader a better idea of how much the ideas of different groups translated into real change in the content of the college's courses. The curriculum comparison of the schools was done by counting the number of course offerings by subject in the college's catalogs for each year. I then coded each subject as transfer, terminal, or mixed based on degrees offered at senior universities, and then calculated the relative proportion of transfer versus terminal coursework over time at each of the schools. The proportion of transfer versus terminal coursework acts as a barometer for the influence of different groups at the college by seeing how much the curriculum reflects the advocacy of a particular group. Looking broadly at course offerings by subject, and differences in classes held at each school, will allow me to assess how much local context affected school development (differences in course offerings may relate to differences in student needs related to locale).

Although the organization of this study might be more analytical than artistic, I hope that the initial passion that drove me to study this subject, and to go to graduate school in the first place, is apparent in the body of this text. Conducting the research for this dissertation has only increased my conviction that in order to understand working class education in the United States in the twentieth, and now the twenty-first, century, understanding the impact of the community college is a necessity. When speaking to former community college students, one of the constant themes that arose was that without a community college they were unlikely to attend any higher education institution. When speaking to faculty members, they reflected most warmly on memories of helping first-generation college students realize that their dreams were possible. Weighing the historical legacy of the community college requires balancing these institutions' importance in higher education in terms of *access* against their struggle to maintain high quality standards under the burden of potential *excess*, in terms of curriculum and admissions (as an open door institution). The body of this dissertation will reveal why I feel that, within the era I studied (1926-1980), the benefits of access trumped the complications of excess.

While both of the colleges offered increasingly varied opportunities over the course of my study, that does not mean they always provided the best opportunity for their students. The history of each school includes trials and triumphs. Studying what factors shaped the character of these colleges, and the experience of those who led, taught, and learned there, has given me a better understanding of the historical legacy of the community college. And, perhaps, next time a pupil of mine approaches me with a plan to attend a community college, I will feel a little more comfortable offering advice. I will give my opinions on the past and present state of the community college in the conclusion of this study, but I hope that the

presentation of my research in the body of this paper will help you to come to your own conclusion.

SECTION I
THE ERA OF ESTABLISHMENT (1925-1955)

The first section of this study will focus on the Era of Establishment at each school. This era runs from the creation of each college until the mid-1950s. Over this period, both schools moved to new campuses, gained accreditation, and built a base for later expansion. Before providing a brief chronological narrative of each school's development in this period, however, this section introduction provides broader context on the progress of the junior/community college movement across the nation during this era, and more specifically within the state of Texas.

San Antonio College is "the oldest public two-year college still in operation" in the state of Texas, but the public junior college movement began over two decades before its establishment.[1] Joliet Junior College is generally regarded as the first public junior college to operate in the United States. It was created in 1901 through an agreement between the town's public schools and University of Chicago president William Rainey Harper.[2] Harper and other pioneers of the junior college, including Alexis Lange at the University of California, envisioned the junior college as an institution that could lessen the instructional burden on universities by diverting underclassmen to dedicated schools.[3] Harper sought to create a system of university-affiliated two-year colleges that "would take over the training of freshmen and sophomores, allowing the university to concentrate on advanced studies and research."[4] This occurred at the same time universities in the United States were aggressively

---

[1] Reference formatted as requested by TSHA website: "San Antonio College," *Handbook of Texas Online* (http://www.thsaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/ksc04), accessed October 01, 2015. Uploaded on June 15, 2010. Published by the Texas State Historical Association.

[2] "History," Joliet Junior College, accessed October 1, 2015, http://www.jjc.edu/college-info/Pages/history.aspx.

[3] John R. Thelin, *A History of American Higher Education*, 2nd ed. (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2011), 249; Michael Brick, *Forum and Focus for the Junior College Movement: The American Association of Junior Colleges.* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1964), 20.

[4] Allen A. Witt et al., *America's Community Colleges: The First Century* (Washington D.C.: The Community College Press, 1994), 15.

implementing the German model of higher education, focusing increasingly on research and graduate studies. The junior college was meant to roughly emulate the German gymnasium by extending secondary education for two more years to prepare students for more advanced study. From the beginning, however, junior college leaders (notably Alexis Lange) saw the junior college mission as more than providing coursework for eventual transfer. They also sought to integrate terminal education programs in "semi-professions" for students not continuing on to more advanced work.[5]

Despite the wishes of Harper and Lange, the idea of the public two-year college operating as a dedicated "junior" college to senior universities did not take deep root. While research was increasingly prized in the early twentieth century, financial necessities made the continued enrollment of underclassmen essential for universities. As John Thelin explains in his overview of the reformation of the California higher education structure at mid-century, "designation as a doctoral-degree-granting campus hardly precluded commitment to the bachelor's degree programs. Even an institution that prided itself on research and graduate programs could not survive without the tuition and subsidies provided by undergraduate enrollments."[6]

The continued offering of coursework for underclassmen at universities left the mission of the junior college in limbo before World War II. Many junior college leaders, including those in the newly formed American Association of Junior Colleges, looked to

---

[5] E. A. Gallagher, "Jordan and Lange: The California Junior College's Role as Protector of Teaching," *Michigan Academician* 27, no. 1 (1995): 1–12; Brick, *Forum and Focus for the Junior College Movement*, 22; Leonard Koos defines semi-professions as a type of occupation falling between "trades" (which only require a high school education) and professions (which require a four-year degree): Leonard Vincent Koos, *The Junior College* (Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota, 1924), 18.

[6] Thelin, *A History of American Higher Education*, 289.

vocational education as a way of staking a concrete identity for junior colleges.[7] These leaders provided a base of arguments upon which the shift to the comprehensive community college would later be based, but up until the 1940s junior colleges remained largely middle class institutions providing coursework for eventual transfer to four-year colleges and universities.[8]

The junior college movement began to shift in the 1940s, spurred on by the intervention of the federal government. First, the passing of the GI Bill increased opportunities for educational attainment for returning veterans. Giving voice to this increased demand, the Truman Commission on Higher Education called on public two-year colleges to become more comprehensive by providing programs for nontraditional students, including more terminal programs.[9] Junior college leaders embraced these mid-century changes and began to rebrand their institutions as community colleges, reflecting a greater community emphasis through the introduction of more diverse and community-responsive curricula (extending beyond transfer coursework).[10] By the 1950s, government intervention and structural realities in higher education led to the adjustment of the original junior college mission. The transfer origins of the college, however, left an indelible mark, and it was not until the 1960s (the Era of Expansion) that the comprehensive mission rose to general prominence.

---

[7] Walter Crosby Eells is the AAJC leader most often associated with these arguments: Walter Crosby Eells, *Why Junior College Terminal Education?* (Washington D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1941).

[8] For information on the socioeconomic background of early junior college students see: Leonard V. Koos, *The Community College Student* (Gainesville, FL: University of Florida Press, 1970), 284; John H. Frye, *The Vision of the Public Junior College, 1900-1940: Professional Goals and Popular Aspirations* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1992), 100–104.

[9] Philo A. Hutcheson, "The Truman Commission's Vision of the Future," *Thought & Action: The NEA Higher Education Journal*, Fall 2007, 107–15.

[10] Jesse Parker Bogue, "The Community College," *Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors* 34, no. 2 (1948): 285–95, doi:10.2307/40220284.

The state of Texas has generally been considered a leader within the junior college movement based off on the high number of institutions established in the state. Texas's public junior colleges had the second highest enrollment for any state by 1930, trailing only California.[11] Despite this claim to leadership based on numbers, Sue Blair argues that "Texas has consistently lagged in terms of state recognition, coordination and funding of public community/junior colleges."[12] The sluggishness of the state legislature to establish policies and funding for the junior college lends credence to her words.

Beyond recognizing teacher training certificates from junior colleges in 1916, the state legislature did not regulate public two-year colleges until 1929.[13] The 1929 Texas Junior College Law "gave local districts specific junior college taxing powers" and provided parameters for establishing new colleges based on the size and "minimum taxable valuation" of the area the school would serve.[14] Direct funding for junior colleges by the state did not occur until 1941 (almost two decades after the first public junior college opened in the state). The law called for the state to pay "$50 per full-time Fall-enrolled student."[15] The amount of state funding accelerated noticeably after World War II, and by 1951 the state was paying $175 per full-time student, with "state appropriations account[ing] for an average of twenty

---

[11] Witt et al., *America's Community Colleges*, 55.

[12] Sue Johnson Blair, "The Emergence and Development of the Community/Junior College in Texas" (Ph.D. Diss, Texas Tech University, 1991), iii.

[13] The first public junior college was established in Wichita Falls in 1922: H. Stanton Tuttle, "Junior-College Movement," *Handbook of Texas Online (*http://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/kdj02), accessed February 09, 2016. Uploaded on June 15, 2010. Published by the Texas State Historical Association. For a discussion on the reasons for the delayed funding of Texas junior colleges see: William C. Morsch, *State Community College Systems: Their Role and Operation in Seven States* (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1971); Blair, "The Emergence and Development of the Community/Junior College in Texas," 54–55.

[14] Morsch, *State Community College Systems: Their Role and Operation in Seven States*, 22; Blair, "The Emergence and Development of the Community/Junior College in Texas," 71.

[15] Morsch, *State Community College Systems: Their Role and Operation in Seven States*, 122; Blair, "The Emergence and Development of the Community/Junior College in Texas," 81.

percent of the total income of all junior colleges."[16] Similar to Ratcliff's findings on the role of the community in the establishment of junior colleges, the sluggishness of states to regulate and support public two-year colleges made community advocacy a major factor in the early junior college movement in Texas.[17]

The impact of the community is evident in the development of both campuses selected for this study, though the government (the state government in the case of SAJC, and the federal government in the case of NJC) also played a pivotal role in the establishment of each school. San Antonio College has sported three different names over the course of its history. It was originally established as the University Junior College in 1925. The college was administered by the University of Texas (UT)-Austin (with faculty members and salaries provided by UT) as a way to increase the school's outreach to San Antonio, with facilities provided by the San Antonio public school system. This arrangement, however, only lasted one year. The Texas attorney general ordered UT to cease its affiliation with the fledgling institution by claiming that it had overstepped its mandate by establishing a new campus without state approval. In 1926, the University Junior College became San Antonio Junior College (SAJC), operated by the San Antonio Independent School District (SAISD).[18]

In many ways, San Antonio Junior College was viewed as the unwanted step-child of the San Antonio public school system for the first two decades of its existence. After 1926, the school operated out of a poorly maintained campus that formerly was used as a private

---

[16] Blair, "The Emergence and Development of the Community/Junior College in Texas," 98–99.

[17] James L. Ratcliff, "'First' Public Junior Colleges in an Age of Reform," *The Journal of Higher Education* 58, no. 2 (1987), 151–80.

[18] For background on the early years of San Antonio Junior College's Development see: Jerome Francis Weynand, *San Antonio College: In the Beginning, 1925-1956* (San Antonio, TX: Adrome House, 2002); Alamo Colleges, "History," San Antonio College, accessed September 18, 2015, http://www.alamo.edu/mainwide.aspx?id=2146.

German-English school in the nineteenth century (later acquired by SAISD). Updates to the campus were largely cosmetic, and the general disrepair of the school resulted in SAJC not receiving accreditation from the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools until it moved to a new campus in the 1950s.[19] The student newspaper, *The Junior Ranger*, explained that "the refusal of the Southern Association of Colleges to recognize Junior College has proved that new buildings are a necessity if Junior College is to continue in operation in San Antonio."[20] While the school did continue to operate, forward momentum did not occur until the reorganization of SAJC into the San Antonio Union Junior College District (alongside the all-black St. Philip's College) in 1946. This change set up a dedicated board of trustees for the city's junior colleges, allowed the district to levy a property tax, and freed SAJC from the control of the local public schools.[21]

San Antonio Junior College often struggled to get support from an already beleaguered public school system before World War II. This struggle for funds was magnified by the Great Depression. San Antonio taxpayers were often reticent to put money towards a new institution, even going so far as to block the initial application to create the San Antonio Union Junior College District (with taxing powers) in 1941 (not approving it until after World War II).[22] In the improving economic conditions of the 1950s, the college's

---

[19] Jerome F. Weynand and Paul R. Culwell, *San Antonio College Self-Study Report, 1973-1975* (San Antonio, TX: San Antonio College, 1975), 2, McAllister Collection, San Antonio College Library, San Antonio, TX.

[20] "A Better School," *The Junior Ranger* (San Antonio, TX), February 19, 1932, 2. Digitized versions of the school newspaper can be found at: San Antonio College Library, "The Ranger Image Collection," accessed February 9, 2016, http://sacweb03.sac.alamo.edu/eLibrary/RangerImageCollection.aspx.

[21] Alamo Colleges, "History," San Antonio College, accessed September 18, 2015, http://www.alamo.edu/mainwide.aspx?id=2146.

[22] One of the major reasons for the defeat of the initial plan for creating the Junior College District was the opposition of the Taxpayers' Defense League: Taxpayers Defense League, "No Junior College," *San Antonio Light*, November 13, 1941, in *San Antonio College Scrapbook C, 1940-1949*, McAllister Collection, San Antonio College Library, San Antonio, TX.

board was able to purchase a new campus site (which opened in 1951), increase tax rates twice, and raise tuition, without the kind of backlash that these moves would have created in the 1930s and early 1940s.[23] Updated facilities and greater financial flexibility allowed the school to begin to expand its mission, increase enrollment, and offer a larger and more diverse curriculum by the mid-1950s.

The establishment of Navarro Junior College (NJC) was noticeably different than the aforementioned University Junior College in San Antonio. While public junior colleges were typically incorporated into local school systems in the 1920s (when SAJC was established), the independent junior college district had become the administrative norm for these schools by the 1940s.[24] Instead of operating under the governance of a university or a public school system, NJC was established as an independent entity with its own board of trustees and taxing powers. Navarro Junior College opened its doors in 1946, only a year after the conclusion of World War II.[25] This timing was not coincidental. Student demand from returning veterans, benefitting from the new GI Bill, was a major reason the idea of a junior college in Corsicana took root. Furthermore, the initial college campus was located at an abandoned flight school, leased from the federal government.[26] The majority of the school's

---

[23] "S.A. College Moves Soon," *San Antonio Light*, August 6, 1950 in *San Antonio College Scrapbook D, 1950-1952*; "S.A. College Tax Rate Doubled," c. 1952-53 [newspaper not indicated], *San Antonio College Scrapbook E, 1952-53*, McAllister Collection, San Antonio College Library, San Antonio, TX.

[24] Witt et al., *America's Community College*, 48.

[25] For a brief history on the establishment of the college see: Navarro Junior College Faculty and Administration, *"*Report of Self Study of Navarro Junior College*"* (Corsicana, TX: Navarro Junior College, 1963), 1–2, Box B12-a, Pearce Museum Archives at Navarro College, Corsicana, TX. The years immediately after World War II saw a flurry of activity in Texas's junior/community colleges, seen in the establishment of 10 institutions in the years from 1946 to 1949: Blair, "The Emergence and Development of the Community/Junior College in Texas," 94.

[26] For a discussion of Texas during World War II see Chapter 15 of Randolph Campbell's history of the state: Randolph B. Campbell, *Gone to Texas: A History of the Lone Star State* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003), 396-437. During these years, Texas was a center for military training and 750,000 Texans served during the war, contributing to the expansion of the state's junior/community colleges because of increasing demand from veterans with GI Bill benefits. The war also led to increasing economic prosperity in the state, though enjoyed disproportionately by cities. The economy of the state diversified, seen in the

students were veterans, many of whom were looking for terminal, not transfer, programs. As the college yearbook explained, "the aim of the Vocational Division is to assist veterans and others in becoming established…in gainful employment."[27]

Navarro Junior College enjoyed greater community support in its early years than San Antonio Junior College. Established during a time of economic recovery, the local climate for investment in higher education was better in the late 1940s and early 1950s than it had been in the late 1920s and early 1930s at SAJC. Navarro Junior College was able to gain consistent support from the community, seen in the healthy initial enrollments at the school, the passing of bonds, and the quick updating of the physical plant (culminating in the move to a new campus in 1951).[28] The actions of the federal government in the fallout from World War II also benefitted NJC. The site of the original campus, the impetus for the school's initial enrollment (the GI Bill), and even the acquisition of early supplies for the school (from government surplus), can all be traced back to the federal government. The college also benefitted from being the only higher education institution in the county. While San Antonio also had private universities to provide higher education opportunities, though at a higher cost, for residents during the Era of Establishment (St. Mary's University, Trinity University, The Incarnate Word), Navarro Junior College operated without local competition.

All of these factors led to Navarro Junior College developing much more rapidly than San Antonio Junior College in terms of physical plant and accreditation. Despite SAJC's

---

expansion of manufacturing. The agricultural economy shifted substantially, with farm land increasingly consolidated leading to a drop in numbers of farms during the 1940s. The impact of this shift on Navarro County will be discussed in Chapter 1.

[27] Students of Navarro Junior College, *El Navarro, 1948* (Corsicana, TX: Navarro Junior College, 1948), Box 1-B15-b, Pearce Museum Archives at Navarro College, Corsicana, TX.

[28] "Tax Increases Voted," *Dallas Morning News*, July 23, 1947, 3; "Junior College Prepares to Sell $540,000 Bonds," *Dallas Morning News*, October 1, 1949, 8.

twenty year head start, both schools moved to updated campuses and gained accreditation from the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools at almost the same time.

As the following chapters will show, each school was marked by the unique circumstances of its establishment. San Antonio Junior College's original affiliation with UT led to a consistent emphasis on transfer work throughout the Era of Establishment, with a slight shift to a more diverse curriculum near the end of the period. It also led to a more equitable faculty/administration relationship than was seen at Navarro Junior College. The post-World War II origins of Navarro Junior College led to a greater initial emphasis on terminal/vocational programs to serve the needs of returning veterans, though still secondary to transfer coursework. The lack of university influence on the initial operation of the campus, coupled with the higher community investment from the county, led to NJC mirroring the operation of a secondary school, as opposed to a higher education institution, in its early years. Early administrators and faculty members were generally recruited from local public schools, and administrative power (similar to a high school system) was stronger at NJC than at SAJC.

The following section will show that time of establishment had a noticeable impact on each school's development, not just because of the changing tone of leaders in the community college movement over the intervening years, but because of the wider political and economic climate in Texas and the country. My discussion will also show that, at least at the schools chosen for this study, community support, student demand, and government policy were influential in both colleges' early development, contrasting with the historiographies current emphasis on the impact of community college leaders (particularly

the American Association of Junior Colleges). Unsurprisingly, at the single-institution level, simple explanations of power-dynamics begin to break down.

CHAPTER 1
CONSIDERING CONTEXT: COMMUNITY AND GOVERNMENT DURING THE ERA OF ESTABLISHMENT

Because I limited this project to a comparison of two institutions, allowing me to study denizens of the schools in depth, I expected the sources of differences and similarities at each school to depend on the approaches of individual historical actors on campus. While the people who worked and studied in these colleges certainly contributed to the character of the schools, I was struck at how much the early development of San Antonio Junior College and Navarro Junior College was shaped by outside forces.

Perhaps other historians would find this conclusion less surprising. From high school history teachers to college professors, the importance of "context" is emphasized in historical interpretation. I would argue that the meaning of "context" has oftentimes been distorted in historical teaching to serve as a catch-all term to decry the lack of detail in student answers, but conducting this study has given me a new appreciation for the importance of considering how outside forces, operating concurrently with studied events, impact individual and institutional actions.

An understanding of the influence of outside actors on individual colleges is not foreign to the junior/community college historiography. My findings, however, are at odds with the previous arguments that center on the American Association of Junior Colleges as the consequential outside influence on junior college development during these years.[1]

[1] Walter Crosby Eells, *The Junior College* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1931); Jesse Parker Bogue, *The Community College* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1950); Michael Brick, *Forum and Focus for the Junior College Movement: The American Association of Junior Colleges.* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1964); Allen A. Witt et al., *America's Community Colleges: The First Century* (Washington D.C., The Community College Press, 1994).

Instead, my research on SAJC and NJC points to the government and the local community as the major forces, outside the institution, which helped shape their early history.

In this study, the community includes individuals residing in the area the college served, who were not directly affiliated with the school as a student, teacher, staff member, or administrator. Assessing the impact of the community on each campus's development will encompass looking at the general socioeconomic climate of the area the college served, local votes on the governing structure of the school, bond issues, and board members, and local newspaper articles offering insight on the attitudes of non-affiliated individuals on campus events. There is some necessary overlap between government and community here (seen in the use of local votes as an indicator of community attitudes), which is why these two external factors on campus development are treated in the same chapter.

State and federal government policy impacted each school's establishment, and the availability of funds over subsequent years limited the advancement of the campus's physical plant. Local funding and the administrative structure of the colleges depended heavily on community support since rates of taxation and the scope of district jurisdiction were decided at the ballot box. Overall, Navarro Junior College enjoyed greater community support during the Era of Establishment for two reasons. First, NJC was established in the relatively healthy economic climate of the late 1940s, with Texas largely recovered from the Great Depression, leading to a community more willing to invest tax dollars in higher education. SAJC, conversely, was established on the cusp of the Depression and struggled to gain sufficient community support to upgrade its campus in a time of economic struggle. Second, NJC was located in an area free of competition from other higher education institutions. Its proximity advantage for Navarro County residents was more pronounced than SAJC since San Antonio

was also home to St. Mary's University, Trinity University, and the University of the Incarnate Word. As the only show in town, Navarro College served a unique function in the community.

As the discussion above reveals, time is crucial to understanding how each of these schools developed. The broader political and economic context of the time each school was established had profound effects on their history.

San Antonio (Junior) College

Since I have identified context as a central theme of this chapter, it is only appropriate to begin my discussion on the role of the community and the government in SAJC's development by providing some background information on San Antonio during these years. The establishment of the University Junior College in 1925 correlates with a time of economic diversification in the city. Over the course of the 1910s, San Antonio saw its population swell due to immigration caused by the Mexican Revolution, leading to the city boasting the highest population in the state (161,379) in 1920.[2] Char Miller explains that, in the 1920s, San Antonio's "economy expanded beyond its original agricultural and ranching base to include military spending (the city was then home to three major army bases), banking, some oil refining, and an emerging tourist trade" to accommodate this large population.[3]

[2] T. R. Fehrenbach, "San Antonio, TX," *Handbook of Texas Online*, http://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/hds02, accessed October 28, 2015, uploaded on June 15, 2010, published by the Texas State Historical Association.

[3] Char Miller, *Deep in the Heart of San Antonio Land and Life in South Texas* (San Antonio: Trinity University Press, 2012), 11.

The University of Texas's decision to establish a junior college in San Antonio reflects UT's interest in outreach to the city's growing population and the emergence of a middle and working class seeking affordable educational opportunities for professional jobs.[4] The University of Texas's choice to set up a junior college in San Antonio might have shown entrepreneurial spirit by reacting quickly to perceived demand for public education opportunities, but the university failed to go through the proper process to set up a new state institution. The Texas Attorney General's order for UT to cease its affiliation with the University Junior College, citing lack of legislative approval, left the future of the school largely in the hands of the local government, and by extension the community.[5] While the state of Texas had still not passed basic legislation regulating the establishment or funding of junior colleges (this would come in 1929), the state still left a profound mark on the early history of what would soon become San Antonio Junior College.

Within the relative prosperity of the mid-1920s, the San Antonio Independent School District took over full responsibility for the renamed San Antonio Junior College. A fiscally conservative locale, however, made the future of the campus tenuous, even before the stock market crash in 1929. The *San Antonio Evening News* reported that the inability of the school

---

[4] Richard A. Garcia, *Rise of the Mexican American Middle Class: San Antonio, 1929-1941* (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 1991); the considerable number of students who took outside employment while at SAC in a 1931 survey gives some indication of the class background of the student population: "20 Per Cent of Junior College Students Dividing Time Between Work and Their Classrooms," c. 1931 [newspaper not indicated], in *San Antonio College Scrapbook A, 1925-1931,* McAllister Collection, San Antonio College Library, San Antonio, TX.; the intentions of the University of Texas in setting up University Junior College are delineated in a letter from UT President W. M. W. Splawn to San Antonio Public Schools Superintendent Marshall Johnston. The letter specifically highlights the importance of setting up the institution as a more affordable public education option for San Antonio residents. The letter was quoted in its entirety in a thesis on the early development of San Antonio Junior College: Hugh Ellsworth Ralson, "History of the San Antonio Junior College," (Master's Thesis, University of Texas-Austin, 1993), 2-3, McAllister Collection, San Antonio College Library, San Antonio, TX.

[5] Ralson, "History of the San Antonio Junior College," 7; For background on the early years of San Antonio Junior College's Development see: Jerome Francis Weynand, *San Antonio College: In the Beginning, 1925-1956* (San Antonio, TX: Adrome House, 2002); Alamo Colleges, "History," San Antonio College, accessed September 18, 2015, http://www.alamo.edu/mainwide.aspx?id=2146.

to function as a self-supporting institution based on tuition revenue, costing $18,000 to operate for the 1928-29 school year, led the school board to seriously consider shutting SAJC down.[6] The early survival of the campus depended on Chamber of Commerce support, seen in the funding of a library for the campus and a later letter of support drafted when the school faced increased pressure to justify the city's investment.[7]

The first priority of the city was to operate SAJC at a low cost. Reflecting this goal, San Antonio Junior College, beginning in 1926, operated on a previously vacant campus in severe need of updating. As a later accreditation report explains, "a group of buildings on South Alamo Street, constructed to house the historic German-English School prior to the Civil War, was assigned to the College for use. The obvious inadequacies of these buildings with their pot-bellied stoves and outdoor restrooms prevented any serious consideration by the Southern Association."[8] San Antonio Junior College failed to gain accreditation from the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) upon its initial review in 1932, and did not meet SACS standards until the school moved to a new campus in the 1950s.[9]

The state of the school buildings was a constant source of frustration for its students and teachers. A slew of articles over the course of the 1930s described the deplorable state of the campus, including a student appeal for renovation citing that SAJC was "situated next to a garage on one side, a parking lot on the other, and a boxing hall across the street. These

---

[6] "School Bond Unmentioned at Meeting," *San Antonio Express*, June 5, 1929 in *San Antonio College Scrapbook A, 1925-1931*.

[7] *El Alamo, 1932* (San Antonio, TX: San Antonio Junior College, 1932); "C. of C. Offers College Boost," *San Antonio Express*, September 11, 1931 in *San Antonio College Scrapbook B, 1931-1940*, McAllister Collection, San Antonio College Library, San Antonio, TX.

[8] Jerome F. Weynand and Paul R. Culwell, "San Antonio College Self-Study Report, 1973-1975" (San Antonio, TX: San Antonio College, 1975), 2, McAllister Collection, San Antonio College Library, San Antonio, TX.

[9] "No Wonder Junior College is Barred by S.A.C.S.," *San Antonio Express*, February 15, 1932 in *San Antonio Scrapbook B, 1931-1940*.

certainly aren't conducive to study! Our buildings are old and rickety."[10] The deplorable state of the campus was also a major subject of an April Fool's Issue of the school newspaper in 1932. Students joked that the school board offered SAJC "12 boards, 34 nails, and 4 tacks to build a new coal storage shack that can also house a class…The Board plans to use this shack temporarily, until a good third-hand tent can be obtained for use as a classroom."[11]

Of course, updates to the campus would take funds, but improving the premises for the use of around 300 students (the average enrollment in SAJC's early years) was not deemed worthy of putting strain on an already tight budget. Initiatives to increase tuition to free up the school's finances were met with fierce resistance from students living in a city struggling during the Depression. T. R. Fehrenbach explains that "in the great debacle of the national Depression, a long period of relative stagnation set in [within San Antonio]. As the surrounding agrarian countryside suffered, business declined; military spending was cut back drastically."[12] The severity of the Depression nationally is well chronicled, but San Antonio was hit particularly hard. "Whereas at the beginning of the Great Depression the nation was chastened to learn that one-third of Americans were, in President Franklin Roosevelt's words, ill-fed, ill-clothed, and ill-housed, in San Antonio of the late 1930s that figure amounted to more than half the local population; close to 40,000 families lived in dire straits."[13] Faced with these conditions, momentum for increased funding for SAJC through student tuition, taxation, or making the college a higher budget priority grounded to a halt.

---

[10] William Sinkin, "Growth and Worth of San Antonio Junior College," [newspaper not specified], June 12, 1931 in *San Antonio Scrapbook A, 1925-1931*.

[11] "New Shacks by Coal Pile Promised J.C.," *The Junior Ranger*, April 1, 1932, 1, San Antonio College Library, "The Ranger Image Collection," accessed February 9, 2016, http://sacweb03.sac.alamo.edu/eLibrary/RangerImageCollection.aspx.

[12] T. R Fehrenbach, *The San Antonio Story: A Pictorial and Entertaining Commentary on the Growth and Development of San Antonio, Texas*, Kindle edition (Tulsa, OK: Continental Heritage, 1978), Location 1890.

[13] Miller, *Deep in the Heart of San Antonio: Land and Life in South Texas*, 120.

By the early 1940s, the United States' material support of the Allies during World War II began to turn the sour national economy around (unemployment dropped below 10 percent for the first time in over a decade in 1941), and freed up the state government to begin funding Texas's junior colleges. The state provided SAJC with $15,000 in 1941, a much needed boost for an ailing school.[14]

San Antonio's economy in particular improved quickly as the United States began preparing for war because of the strong military presence in the city (San Antonio was home to three military bases before World War II and was the site of five permanent bases after the war).[15] Hoping to build off of this momentum, the city proposed the creation of an independent junior college district in 1941 which would have set up a dedicated board of trustees and granted taxing powers to the city's two junior colleges (SAJC and St. Philip's). This proposal was an important step for SAJC since the reluctant association of the San Antonio Independent School District with the school had hampered the college's development. Despite a strong start to the campaign to create the district (including support from local newspapers and the submission of a petition with 20,000 signatures), the fiscal conservatism of segments of the population led to the district plan being narrowly defeated by less than 100 votes.[16] The primary opposition to the measure came from a local organization called the Taxpayers' Defense League which ran ads in the paper claiming that the higher taxation for an independent district would divert much needed funds away from

---

[14] "Junior College Gets $15,000 in State Aid," *San Antonio Express*, June 31, 1941 in *San Antonio Scrapbook C, 1940-1949*, McAllister Collection, San Antonio College Library, San Antonio, TX.

[15] T. R. Fehrenbach, "San Antonio, TX," *Handbook of Texas Online*, http://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/hds02.

[16] "Junior College Plan Officially Defeated," *San Antonio Express*, November 26, 1941 in *San Antonio Scrapbook C, 1940-1949*.

"national defense."[17] Their arguments gained traction with the rural segment of the electorate leading to the defeat of the district plan.

Arguments about the use of city funds exclusively for national defense (a somewhat dubious claim even in the middle months of 1941) lost their appeal by 1945 when city voters finally approved the creation of the San Antonio Union Junior College District. The new district began operation in 1946, bringing San Antonio College ("junior" was dropped from the name shortly after the creation of the district) and St. Philip's College (previously a "private Episcopal Institution" serving black students until affiliating with SAISD in 1942) under joint administration.[18] As I will discuss in more detail in Chapter Two, the joining of SAC and St. Philip's into one district impacted the development of both campuses and led to turbulence for the schools related to the issue of integration.

The 1950s saw the ascension of the Good Government League in San Antonio to reform the city government. Postwar growth in San Antonio had begun to strain the city's infrastructure, and the Good Government League's pro-business reforms offered an alternative to the previous Democratic machine in the city which had failed to keep up with changes in San Antonio. The League put local and federal funds to work in order to revitalize the commercial city center and improve the infrastructure for emerging northern suburban neighborhoods.[19]

Within this more progressive community environment, and capitalizing on improved finances, San Antonio College finally began to advance, both in enrollment and physical

---

[17] "Reason Ignored in Appeal to Electorate," [newspaper not indicated], November 14, 1941 in *San Antonio Scrapbook C, 1940-1949*.

[18] Alamo Colleges, "History," San Antonio College, accessed September 18, 2015, http://www.alamo.edu/mainwide.aspx?id=2146.

[19] Fehrenbach, *The San Antonio Story*, Location 1952; Miller, *Deep in the Heart of San Antonio Land and Life in South Texas*, 122.

plant, in the late 1940s and 1950s. Enrollment, which remained around 300 from the establishment of the school into the mid-1940s, began to increase by leaps and bounds. Boosted by the attendance of returning veterans using GI benefits, fall day-time enrollment moved up from 497 students in 1945 to 838 students in 1946.[20] Increased demand for education in San Antonio finally led to the improvements to the campus that the school had needed for so long. Though the outdated campus brought students closer together, it was clear that the old buildings on South Alamo Street were no longer sufficient for the operation of a school experiencing tremendous growth.

Jerome Weynand, a veteran who attended SAC from 1946-48 and would later become the school's president, remembers his time as a student fondly while also recognizing that conditions at the campus were suboptimal. Beyond continued reliance on coal stoves and "primitive toilets," Weynand recalls an incident where he "fell through a porch coming out of the chemistry lab one evening about five o' clock, six o' clock. With my heavy books and everything."[21] The persistent poor condition of the SAC campus led to the continued denial of accreditation from the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. While public universities in Texas accepted transfers from SAC, something needed to be done to improve the campus, and the local climate was finally conducive for investment in higher education by the 1950s.

In April of 1949, the San Antonio Union Junior College District purchased what previously had been a maintenance facility for the Transit Company on San Pedro Avenue

[20] Enrollment data for San Antonio College has been taken from the college catalog (enrollment data for each school year is published in the next year's volume of the catalog).

[21] Jerome Weynand, interview by the author, San Antonio, TX, June 3, 2015.

for $142,500.[22] The doors of the new campus opened in the fall of 1951 with a first term enrollment of 2,596 students (including day and evening students). Updates to the campus came quickly when city voters approved a $2.5 million bond measure in 1952 for the improvement of St. Philip's and SAC.[23] In the same year, voters also approved a tax increase for the college (from $.08 to $.15 for $100 property valuation). This tax rate was still the lowest in the state for a junior college district but at least represented a step forward for SAJC.[24] The new campus plant, coupled with the campus's history of high academic standards, finally led to SAC's accreditation in 1955.

As the previous history makes clear, San Antonio College faced a rocky road to advancement during the Era of Establishment. The school's initial affiliation with the University of Texas provided a base for a strong academic curriculum, but UT's state-mandated removal from San Antonio Junior College undercut the initial mission of the school (as a campus set up specifically to funnel transfers into UT). Unlike the junior colleges that Ratcliff studied in Michigan, Nebraska, and Massachusetts, community support was not the primary driver in the initial creation of SAJC.[25] The city schools provided facilities for the University Junior College, but UT held responsibility for running and administering the campus. When the school fell into the lap of the San Antonio Independent School District in 1926, the long-term fate of the campus was largely uncertain. The lack of state support for junior colleges before 1941 left SAJC primarily dependent on the will of the

---

[22] "Junior College Purchases San Pedro Building Site," *San Antonio Evening News*, April 5, 1949 in *San Antonio Scrapbook C, 1940-1949*.

[23] "Balloting Very Light on $2.5 Million in Bonds," [newspaper not indicated], c. 1952 in *San Antonio College Scrapbook E, 1952-1953*, McAllister Collection, San Antonio College Library, San Antonio, TX..

[24] "S.A. College Tax Rate Doubled," [newspaper not indicated], c. 1952 in *San Antonio College Scrapbook E, 1952-1953*.

[25] James L. Ratcliff, "'First' Public Junior Colleges in an Age of Reform," *The Journal of Higher Education* 58, no. 2 (1987), 151–80.

local populace. Though SAJC survived, the weak economy of San Antonio in the 1930s led to lukewarm support for a junior college in a city with other higher education alternatives (albeit private institutions) already in operation.

It was not until World War II (and the subsequent postwar boom) that San Antonio Junior College gained a stable base to expand. The introduction of state funding, the enrollment of returning veterans using federal benefits, and local voter approval of an independent junior college district (along with tax increases and passed bond initiatives) finally allowed for the acquisition and construction of a new campus and accreditation. San Antonio College's history shows the importance of time of establishment for the development of a junior college. While SAC struggled to gain community approval in the midst of the Great Depression, Navarro Junior College was established in a different era. Navarro Junior College's postwar origins led to a more rapid early advance for the school, but the health of both colleges was highly dependent on state and federal government support and the attitude of the local community.

Navarro Junior College

While the influence of the state government and an outside institution (UT) had the largest impact on San Antonio Junior College's first few years of operation, Navarro Junior College's establishment depended on the federal government and the initiative of local community members. The idea of creating a junior college in Navarro County did not originate in the 1940s. During the 1920s, the county enjoyed a high level of prosperity because of oil discoveries and increased production of cotton.[26] As Tommy Stringer explains,

[26] Tommy W. Stringer, *Corsicana* (Charleston, SC: Arcadia, 2010), 7.

on the heels of the oil boom in the 1920s, A. A. Allison, Corsicana's postmaster, suggested that a junior college should be created in the town (a better option than a four-year university because of the low population of the area). Allison gained support from the chamber of commerce in 1929, but the onset of the Great Depression stopped the plan from developing further.[27]

Because the proposal for a junior college in Navarro County came just four years after the establishment of the University Junior College in San Antonio, community leaders were able to avoid creating a college whose early years would have been a struggle during a time of economic hardship. It is entirely possible that if Mr. Allison had lobbied for the college's creation a few years earlier that he would have gained community approval, and NJC would have faced the same rocky beginnings as SAJC.

In the end, circumstances for the creation of Navarro Junior College looked much better in 1946 than in 1929. While the agricultural economy of the region suffered during the Depression, seen in the consolidation of cotton production into fewer farms (largely a result of New Deal reforms which benefitted large farmers), the economy of Corsicana was growing in the 1940s.[28] Movement into manufacturing began to yield rewards, and would continue to benefit the local economy throughout the Era of Establishment.[29] The county had also been the site of federal government activity during the war. Bethlehem Steel purchased

---

[27] Tommy W. Stringer, *Dreams and Visions: The History of Navarro College* (Waco, TX: Davis Brothers Publishing Co., 1996), 7–8.

[28] For a discussion on the impact of the federal government on Southern agriculture during the Depression see: Jack Temple Kirby, *Rural Worlds Lost: The American South, 1920-1960* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1987); Julie G. Miller, "Navarro County," *Handbook of Texas Online* (http://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/hcn02), accessed November 04, 2015. Uploaded on June 15, 2010. Published by the Texas State Historical Association.

[29] Christopher Long, "Corsicana, TX," *Handbook of Texas Online* (http://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/hec05), accessed November 04, 2015. Uploaded on June 12, 2010. Published by the Texas State Historical Association.

the American Well and Prospecting Company in 1944, expanding their operation, and was contracted by the government to produce bombs and other war materials.[30] "Unable to meet the high demand for pilots during World War II, the federal government contracted with civilian flying schools across the United States to train pilots for the Army Air Corps. One such facility was the Air Activities of Texas, which opened in 1941…6 miles south of downtown Corsicana."[31] The airfield used for the training of these pilots would eventually be a key factor in the establishment of NJC.

Verda Gooch, NJC Business Manager and wife of the college's first registrar, Gaston Gooch, explained that "the college movement received added impetus by the de-activation of the 'Air Activities of Texas'...Through negotiations with the Federal Works Agency and a trip to Washington by some interested citizens, the proposed Junior College District received tentative approval to use these facilities."[32] Allison's goal of creating a junior college in NJC did not die with the Great Depression, instead the seeds of community support he planted in the 1920s took root in the 1940s. Community advocacy got the junior college idea off the ground, but it was the role of the federal government which made the idea a reality.

The federal government not only provided facilities for the proposed campus, gifting the air field buildings to the school and leasing the land to the city, but the passing of the GI Bill provided the base of student demand that the college needed. Hoping to more successfully integrate returning veterans back into American society than in World War I (a failure seen most clearly in the Bonus Army March of 1932), the federal government passed

---

[30] Stringer, *Corsicana*, 48.

[31] Ibid., 51.

[32] Verda Gooch, "The First Twenty-Five Years at Navarro Junior College," in *Navarro County Scroll for the Year 1974* (Corsicana, TX: Navarro County Historical Society, 1974), 3, Box OS-B27-a, Pearce Museum Archives at Navarro College, Corsicana, TX.

the Servicemen's Readjustment Act in 1944 to provide veterans with "education and training, loan guaranty for homes, farms or businesses, and unemployment pay."[33] Educational aid for veterans was a boon for the junior/community college movement, and for Navarro Junior College in particular.[34]

With a plan for premises in place, and student demand (at least in the short-term) secured, it was up to the voters to approve the establishment of Navarro Junior College. Unlike San Antonio Junior College, which operated as part of a public school district for almost two decades, the initial proposal for NJC called for the creation of an independent junior college district with a board of trustees overseeing the financing of the school. This form of junior college governance had become more popular by the 1940s as the place of the junior/community college became more secure in the educational landscape of the nation. As the history of SAJC shows, the autonomy of a junior college (represented in its administration by an independent board with taxing powers) was important to the advancement of an institution.

"The election was called for July 16, 1946. The election carried with an excess of three to one majority in favor of forming a Junior College District composed of all of Navarro County. I shall never forget the many people who walked the streets, made house to house canvasses and telephone calls, spoke at <u>any</u> and <u>all</u> county meetings, service clubs, and

---

[33] Kathleen J. Frydl provides useful insights on the impact of the GI Bill on higher education, including the perception of veterans as more mature and vocationally-oriented: Kathleen J. Frydl, *The GI Bill* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 303-351. For a brief overview of the GI Bill see: "Education and Training: History and Timeline," *U.S. Department of Veteran Affairs*, accessed November 4, 2015, http://www.benefits.va.gov/gibill/history.asp; "The Bonus March (May-July, 1932)," Public Broadcasting Service, accessed February 9, 2016, http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/amex/macarthur/peopleevents/pandeAMEX89.html.

[34] For a discussion on the impact of the GI Bill on the junior/community college movement see: Witt et al., *America's Community College*, 125-138.

church meetings in behalf of this great undertaking."[35] Verda Gooch's explanation of the vote to approve the college highlights the importance of community support (both in lobbying and approving the measure) in the establishment of NJC.

As I will detail in Chapter Two, the emphasis on community at NJC carried through into the school's initial administration and faculty appointments. Ray Waller was appointed as the college's first president after previously serving as the superintendent of Dawson's public schools (located in Navarro County).[36] The aforementioned Gaston Gooch was the first registrar of the school, but he previously served as the principal at Corsicana High School.[37] In addition, many of the initial faculty members were taken from county high schools. These appointments were not just done out of convenience, but represented a concentrated effort to ensure that the staff of the college represented the people in the county they served.

Students who attended NJC when it was located at the airfield recounted how the ties to the county public schools made them feel at home at NJC. Jack Bradley, who attended NJC from 1947-1949, remembers that he "had excellent teachers. In fact, we even knew most of them from different times in school. Like the president of the college—I knew him because he taught—superintendent at Rice at one time."[38] Ruthellen Scott, who attended NJC during its first year, recounted how "some of the teachers I'd had in high school also moved to Navarro. They were teaching there, and I knew a lot of those people. And…others had come from local schools…around here."[39] Pulling in staff members from across the county

[35] Gooch, "The First Twenty-Five Years at Navarro Junior College," 4.
[36] "Ray L. Waller Heads Navarro Junior College," *Dallas Morning News*, November 24, 1946, 15.
[37] Stringer, *Dreams and Visions*, 16.
[38] Jack Bradley, interview by the author, Corsicana, TX, May 27, 2015.
[39] Ruthellen Scott, interview by the author, Corsicana, TX, May 28, 2015.

made students feel comfortable on campus, and also ensured greater confidence in the institution from members of the community. An original faculty member, Margaret Pannill, explained that the employment of people from across the county was not a coincidence. "This was to be a County school, so it was essential that we have county support, as well as city support. Mr. Waller was an excellent choice, a very personable man. He had connections and many, many friends, and he had the ability to get this thing started. Mr. Gaston T. Gooch was the first registrar. He was from Dawson, and he too had connections in the County."[40]

Despite being established during a time of relative economic prosperity and enjoying greater community support, Navarro Junior College's first five years were still challenging. While the federal government did provide facilities for the college, a former air flight school was not the same thing as a college campus. Barracks were used as on-campus dorms (on-campus housing was rare at junior colleges, but less-so at rural campuses).[41] Utilitarian buildings set up for short-term use for the air school were now made permanent offices and classrooms. On the first day of classes, teachers recalled walking into classrooms with no tables or chairs (also a consequence of the quick turnaround between the vote to establish the school and when it opened its doors).[42] Rain turned the campus into a muddy quagmire which made conducting school activities difficult, and lack of proper insulation made the rooms uncomfortable during the winter months.[43]

The federal government, again inserting itself into the college's early history, was instrumental in making the campus at least tolerable as a place of learning. James Edgar, a science teacher, recalls that "if it hadn't been for the government surplus materials, we would

---

[40] Margaret Pannill, interview by Tommy Stringer, Corsicana, TX, December 15, 1977.
[41] Ibid.
[42] James Edgar, interview by Tommy Stringer, Corsicana, TX, February 7, 1978.
[43] Margaret Pannill, interview by Tommy Stringer, Corsicana, TX, December 15, 1977.

have had much more difficulties than the ones we did have. We were able to get desks, chairs, and various scientific equipment from them. Often it wasn't suitable to be used in the classroom, but we got it."[44] The acquisition of surplus land, buildings, and repurposed teaching materials from the federal government were enough to get the school off the ground, but not enough to provide a suitable campus for college students. While the smallness of the campus, coupled with high veteran enrollment, led to strong camaraderie among students, improvements to the physical plant were needed.

Unlike SAJC, which endured substandard facilities for 25 years, NJC relocated to a more suitable campus after only five years. During the worst years of the Great Depression, SAJC could not muster the financial support to upgrade the school's physical plant. In the context of the postwar boom, however, NJC gained the necessary support to raise the county tax rate to 20 cents per $100 valuation in 1947, and got voter approval for a $540,000 bond to build a new campus in 1949.[45] In the same year that San Antonio College moved to its new location on San Pedro (1951), Navarro Junior College also moved to new facilities on Highway 31 in Corsicana (the current home of the campus).[46]

Conclusion

Despite concerns about the long-term health of the school following the initial influx of veterans, Navarro Junior College moved to a suitable campus, established a more stable financial base (through increases in local taxes and state support), and gained accreditation

[44] James Edgar, interview by Tommy Stringer, Corsicana, TX, February 7, 1978; the importance of surplus materials for the school was also emphasized by C. G. Strickland, the school's first Dean: C. G. Strickland, interview by Tommy Stringer, Waco, TX, December 9, 1977.

[45] "Tax Increase Voted," *Dallas Morning News*, July 23, 1947, p3; "Voters Approve New $540,000 Home for NJC," *The Growl* (Corsicana, TX: Navarro Junior College Student Newspaper), 1949.

[46] "Junior College to Open in New Units," *Corsicana Daily Sun*, August 25, 1951, 1.

from the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (occurring in 1954) in a very short time.[47] The basis for NJC's more rapid advancement, in comparison to SAJC, lies in the stronger economy of the region at the time the campus was established, greater interest in the junior college movement from the federal and state government after World War II, and the more concentrated effort to appeal to the community in the operation of Navarro Junior College. This latter point not only helped in gaining approval for tax increases and bond elections, but led to more engaged alumni at NJC. Former students set up a scholarship fund early in the college's history, and homecoming was, and continues to be, a major campus event.[48]

While community appeal seems to separate the experience of SAJC from NJC, it is important to keep in mind how much time of establishment affected each college's history. If you look at SAC's development from 1946-1955, the college advanced at a strikingly similar pace to NJC (in fact, the higher population allowed for an enrollment boom that far outpaced NJC). Both schools moved to new campuses, increased taxes, passed bond initiatives, and gained accreditation during this decade of development. Similarities in progress over these years seems to point to the state of the economy and government support as the most significant factors in the rapidity of a junior/community college's rise, regardless of the density of the population.

Emphasis on community outreach correlates with the circumstances at each school. Focusing on community appeal (through the composition of college staff, extracurricular activities, and content of the curriculum) allowed NJC to evolve despite having limited

[47] "Navarro Junior College is Granted Top Accreditation," *Corsicana Daily Sun*, December 7, 1954, 1.
[48] Gooch, "The First Twenty-Five Years at Navarro Junior College," 18.

demand from a less populace locale. San Antonio Junior College, on the other hand, served a much larger population, letting the school focus more on internal development as opposed to community outreach. The buy-in of the local community was more crucial for NJC's continued existence than at SAC, particularly in the healthier economy of the late 1940s and early 1950s.

The effort to appeal to the community, however, did lead to substantive differences in the operations of each school. As the next chapter will detail, NJC's choice to employ local community members with public school experience led to a different faculty/administration relationship than seen at SAJC. Even though faculty at SAJC did not achieve the campus power of university professors, the UT roots of the school led to a more equitable faculty/administration relationship. Navarro Junior College, on the other hand, maintained a campus power-dynamic in which the administration held greater sway over the direction of the school.

CHAPTER 2
SECONDARY SYSTEM OR A COLLEGE COMPLEX?: ADMINISTRATION AND FACULTY DURING THE ERA OF ESTABLISHMENT

The early twentieth century was a transformative time for United States higher education. The establishment of Cornell (1865) as a model for the diversification of higher education curriculum, and Johns Hopkins (1876) as a model of the research university, marked a shift away from the traditional liberal arts-based colleges of earlier years.[1] Beyond the introduction of new university archetypes, the demand for higher education began to increase exponentially in the early twentieth century as completion of high school (particularly in urban areas) became more common.[2] This increased demand for higher education opened the door for entrepreneurial university presidents to market their changing institutions.

The pivotal role of these new university presidents has been highlighted most prominently by historian Laurence Veysey in his seminal work on this topic. He explains that "the American university of the early twentieth century…included administrators who might almost as easily have promoted any other sort of American enterprise. These leaders…spoke for goals with which a large American audience could readily sympathize: moral soundness,

[1] For information on Johns Hopkins's founding see: John R. Thelin, *A History of American Higher Education*, 2nd ed. (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2011), 90; For information on Cornell's pioneering status in university education see: "University Facts: Cornell by the Numbers," Cornell University, accessed on November 12, 2015, https://www.cornell.edu/about/facts.cfm;

[2] For a discussion on the economic impact of mass educational opportunity in the twentieth century see: Claudia Goldin and Lawrence F. Katz, *The Race Between Education and Technology* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2008). John Rury discusses the rapid expansion of the high school in the United States in the early twentieth century in: *Education and Social Change: Contours in the History of American Schooling*, 4th ed. (New York: Routledge, 2013), 156-158. For a discussion of the extension of high school education to a previously excluded population see: Stephen A. Lassonde, "Should I Go, or Should I Stay?: Adolescence, School Attainment, and Parent-Child Relations in Italian Immigrant Families of New Haven, 1900-1940," *History of Education Quarterly* 38, no. 1 (1998): 37–60, doi:10.2307/369664.

fidelity to the local group, and the implicit promise of enhanced social position."[3] College presidents like William Rainey Harper at the University of Chicago (who was also a pioneer in the junior college movement) were instrumental in the selling of the modern university, with its varied purposes, to the early-twentieth century public.

The increasing visibility of college administrators and the changing character of the university inevitably changed the role of faculty members at these institutions. Veysey argues that these changes "resulted in a stratified, departmentalized structure in which there was firm direction of overall policy from the top but isolation and autonomy in academic matters [for faculty]."[4] He describes faculty members as capitalizing on the unclear mission of universities during a period of transition. Able to pursue their own interests, particularly as researchers, faculty members established individual spheres of influence.[5] The solidification of university tenure policies, bolstered by the organization of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) in 1915, ensured a tenuous balance between administration and faculty power within the modern university.[6]

While authors like Veysey, Frederick Rudolph, Roger Geiger, and John Thelin discuss the faculty/administration relationship at universities during the first half of the twentieth century, this relationship has not been evaluated as deeply at the junior college (despite being a major part of the transformation of higher education during this period).[7]

---

[3] Laurence R. Veysey, *The Emergence of the American University* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965), 443–444.

[4] Ibid., 379.

[5] Ibid., 443-444.

[6] Michael B. Katz, *Reconstructing American Education* (Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 1987), 171; "History of the AAUP," American Association of University Professors, accessed November 18, 2015, http://www.aaup.org/about/history-aaup.

[7] Veysey, *The Emergence of the American University*; Frederick Rudolph, *The American College and University: A History* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1962); Roger L. Geiger, *To Advance Knowledge: The Growth of American Research Universities, 1900-1940* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986), 67-76; Thelin, *A History of American Higher Education*.

Previous scholarship has suggested that national leadership and local administrators at junior colleges, similar to those at universities, held great power over the direction of the institutions they oversaw. Furthermore, they sought to reorganize these colleges to fill a perceived niche in the United States higher education market by promoting vocational education as a central mission of the college. As Steven Brint and Jerome Karabel explain, the leadership of the American Association of Junior Colleges stood at the head of the push for a greater vocational orientation for the college in the early twentieth century:

> Leonard Koos and Walter Crosby Eells [both AAJC officials] developed the ideas and techniques that were later used in the campaign to "sell" terminal vocational education to academically oriented junior college administrators, faculty, and students. These ideas and techniques included a conception of the potential training markets open to the community colleges, the formulation of a "counterideology" to combat the prevailing academic ideology, and the promotion of intelligence testing and guidance counseling in the junior colleges as means of channeling students into occupational programs.[8]

College leadership's promotion of vocational education, according to historians like John Frye and David Labaree, ran up against opposition from faculty members and students in the years before World War II.[9] Frye explains that the reason that the vocationalization of junior colleges was a slow process was due, in part, to junior college faculty viewing

---

[8] Steven G. Brint and Jerome Karabel, *The Diverted Dream: Community Colleges and the Promise of Educational Opportunity in America, 1900-1985*, Kindle Edition (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989), location 554.

[9] David F. Labaree, "The Rise of the Community College: Markets and the Limits of Educational Opportunity," in *How to Succeed in School Without Really Learning: The Credentials Race in American Education* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1997), 190–223; John H. Frye, *The Vision of the Public Junior College, 1900-1940: Professional Goals and Popular Aspirations* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1992).

themselves in the same light as university professors, thus prioritizing traditional academic subjects for transfer over terminal vocational programs.[10] This narrative runs contrary to the power structure of universities during this period. Instead of administrators driving the direction of their institutions while faculty members took solace in their individual autonomy, the historiography suggests a more active conflict for power at the junior college.

While the narrative on the faculty/administration relationship at the junior college during the Era of Establishment seems fairly linear in the previous historiography, the development of this relationship at the two institutions studied here suggests that local context impacted power dynamics on junior college campuses. For the most part, San Antonio Junior College follows in-line with the assertions of the previous historiography. Marked by its brief relationship with the University of Texas, and attractive as a destination for academics, faculty at San Antonio Junior College mirrored their university counterparts. Hailing from prestigious schools across the nation, SAJC faculty members established a seniority ladder (though not an official tenure policy), reasonable continuity in employment, and oversaw an overwhelmingly transfer-oriented curriculum. Despite the business background of the college's board of trustees (after 1946), and the vocational expertise of SAJC's president, San Antonio Junior College developed primarily as a transfer institution despite leadership's ambition to promote terminal vocational programs.

On the other hand, Navarro Junior College's faculty/administration relationship was markedly different, resulting primarily from its establishment in a less-densely populated, rural area. Community appeal was essential for NJC's long-term health since local demand was limited by a small county population. Furthermore, the county did not have another

[10] Frye, *The Vision of the Public Junior College, 1900-1940*, 119–120.

higher education institution to act as a precedent for the community on the general operation of a college or university. In order to appeal to constituents, the faculty and administration when the school was established were generally taken from local secondary schools. Administration put in place school policies that reflected high school ideals of behavior to ease the transition for students from small communities. Similar to a high school principal, the college president stood as an important public face and maintained considerable power over the direction of the campus. Faculty generally hailed from area universities or teacher colleges, in contrast to the geographic diversity of SAJC's instructors. Even a hint of university-style tenure was not visible at NJC during these years, and faculty turnover was very high (a result of difficulties in attracting and retaining teachers in a little-known area).

Although administrative power was higher at Navarro Junior College, this power was tempered by the overarching need to ensure the college's marketability to the community in order to maintain adequate enrollment. Increases and decreases in terminal coursework at NJC closely followed trends in the community. In Navarro County, the will (or the perceived will) of the community came first, the goals of the administration came second, and the initiative of the faculty to shape the college's mission came third. Faculty members maintained relative autonomy within the classroom, but quick turnover, fears for the fate of a young institution, and a secondary school administrative structure, limited their impact on the larger direction of Navarro Junior College.

These findings suggest that the description of the faculty/administration relationship in the early twentieth century put forward by previous historians is more relevant for large, urban junior colleges than small, rural campuses. The head of an urban institution was more likely to follow and promote national trends in the junior college movement through

participation in professional organizations, while placing community appeal as a secondary consideration in an area where higher education demand was relatively large. For a small, rural campus, however, meeting local needs had to take precedence in order to ensure survival, particularly for a young institution.

Administrators trying to sell the new modern university to the public were described as entrepreneurs and marketers by Laurence Veysey. Even though a junior college education was also a new product to sell during this period, administrators at junior colleges did not have the long tradition that four-year college education held in United States higher education to fall back on when promoting their product. William Rainey Harper was marketing a substantial tweak to an institution that already had a known function. While national junior college leadership may have attempted to carve out a place in higher education by promoting vocational education, the real impact of this advocacy was limited at the institutional level because of faculty seeking to emulate the universities they attended (a stronger factor in urban settings), and a community who looked to colleges for academic, not vocational, training (a stronger factor in rural settings).

San Antonio (Junior) College

Despite being located in a large city, San Antonio Junior College was still a relatively small institution (by contemporary standards) for the first two decades of its operation. Enrollment oscillated between 200 and 400 students, and the size of the college faculty remained under 20 in the 1930s.[11] As mentioned previously, the economic context of the

[11] Enrollment data for San Antonio College has been taken from the college catalogs (enrollment data for each school year is published in the next year's volume of the catalog). The college catalogs are located in the McAllister Collection at the San Antonio College Library.

Great Depression led to little financial support for SAJC and blunted the possible expansion of the college. These conditions, however, were not unique to San Antonio. Even though SAJC's early history was rocky, other institutions in the state suffered from the same economic hardships. San Antonio Junior College's location in the largest city in Texas helped it to survive where many other institutions failed, and made it a leader within the junior college movement in the state.[12]

The leadership of San Antonio Junior College was demonstrated through the actions of the college's first "director," Joseph E. Nelson. Before coming to San Antonio Junior College in 1928 (the school was operated directly by the public schools from 1926-1928), Nelson earned a Master's degree from the University of Texas and "held educational posts in Midland and Clarendon, and had been director of physics at the summer normal school of the University of Texas."[13] That Nelson attended school and was employed by the University of Texas was not a coincidence. Despite ceasing their affiliation with what was then the University Junior College after less than a year, SAJC still maintained a connection with UT. Nelson and many of the faculty members he hired held degrees from the University of Texas, and it was common for SAJC graduates to transfer to UT for their upper-level coursework.[14]

Nelson's history in Austin did not end with his position in the university's summer normal school however. As the director of what was then one of the largest junior colleges in

---

[12] Enrollment at early junior colleges was low and academic quality of institutions set up in the 1920s were suspect. San Antonio College's distinction as the oldest public two-year college still in operation in the state, despite others being established earlier in the 1920s, is testament to the difficulties these early institutions faced: Sue Johnson Blair, "The Emergence and Development of the Community/Junior College in Texas" (Ph.D. Diss, Texas Tech University, 1991), 61.

[13] "Joseph E. Nelson Dies; Was First SAC Director," *The Junior Ranger* (San Antonio, TX), September 8, 1952, 1, "The Ranger Image Collection," accessed February 9, 2016, http://sacweb03.sac.alamo.edu/eLibrary/RangerImageCollection.aspx.

[14] "Quarter Century at SAC Holds Many Memories for Mamie McLean," *The Ranger* (San Antonio, TX), May, 2, 1954, 3.

the state, Nelson served as the president of the Texas Public Junior College Association. During his presidency, in 1929, Nelson was a leader in the lobbying group that pushed the Texas Legislature in Austin to pass its first public junior college law which set down requirements for the establishment of new colleges in the state.[15]

While a leader in the early junior college movement in Texas, Nelson and his colleagues were still preoccupied with ensuring the short-term health of their institutions and that future colleges would have the necessary financial base for stable development. National junior college leadership began ramping up the call for a more diverse curriculum, including vocational programs more prominently, during Nelson's presidency, but the tenuous position of Texas's junior colleges (still not receiving state funding until 1941) forced him to focus his time on ensuring SAJC's survival as opposed to instituting progressive reforms.[16] Newspaper references to Nelson usually centered on attempts to justify the institution to the public and push for improved facilities. Labaree and Frye have implied that faculty and student resistance were key factors in the delayed introduction of terminal vocational programs into the junior college curriculum, but SAJC's history indicates that drastic deviation from the original junior college model (based on transfer coursework) was not a realistic option during a time of economic crisis, regardless of suggestions from the American Association of Junior Colleges.[17] The problem of financing was particularly acute because of SAJC continuing to operate within the city's public schools (thus lacking independent funding mechanisms).

---

[15] Jerome Francis Weynand, *San Antonio College: In the Beginning, 1925-1956* (San Antonio, TX: Adrome House, 2002), 5.

[16] Walter Crosby Eells, *Why Junior College Terminal Education?* (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1941).

[17] Frye, *The Vision of the Public Junior College, 1900-1940*; Labaree, "The Rise of the Community College: Markets and the Limits of Educational Opportunity."

The composition of the college faculty during Nelson's tenure is a testament to SAJC's focus on academic coursework. During Nelson's first year, in 1928, the college still employed a fairly large number of instructors whose highest degree was the Bachelor's or less (31 percent of the faculty). These instructors were concentrated in early vocational programs in engineering drafting and shop.[18] By the mid-1930s, however, the overall educational level of the faculty had risen considerably with 93 percent of the faculty holding at least a Master's degree (seven percent earning a Ph.D.).[19]

Despite some changes, the composition of the faculty remained relatively stable over the college's early years. SAJC's ties to the University of Texas continued a decade after its establishment, seen in the continued high concentration of UT graduates as faculty members. In 1935, 10 of the school's 14 faculty members held terminal degrees from UT.[20] An original faculty member of the school, Mamie McLean explained that "practically all the faculty members of SAC are, and have been, graduates of the University of Texas or some other state school, and a majority of the graduates from San Antonio College transferred there…that is why the two schools have always been closely associated."[21] Other faculty members in 1935 were graduates of the University of Missouri and the University of California-Berkeley.[22] The strong academic training of SAJC's faculty contributed to the creation of a university-like atmosphere in which academic courses were given priority and faculty stability allowed for a balance of power with Nelson's administration.

---

[18] Faculty backgrounds can be found here: "San Antonio Junior College Bulletin: Announcement of Courses for 1928-1929" (San Antonio: San Antonio Junior College, 1928), McAllister Collection, San Antonio College Library, San Antonio, TX.

[19] "San Antonio Junior College Bulletin: Announcements of Courses for 1935-1936" (San Antonio: San Antonio Junior College, 1935), McAllister Collection, San Antonio College Library, San Antonio, TX.

[20] Ibid.

[21] "Quarter Century at SAC Holds Many Memories for Mamie McLean," *The Ranger* (San Antonio, TX), April 2, 1954, 3.

[22] "San Antonio Junior College Bulletin: Announcements of Courses for 1935-1936."

Nelson resigned from his post in 1941, likely due to ill-health, and was replaced by J. O. Loftin. Working during a time of economic regeneration for the nation (and finally receiving state funds), Loftin was a savvy pick for the college in a period where expansion now seemed possible. Loftin was hired after serving the previous seven years as the president of the Texas College of Arts and Industries (Texas A&I) in Kingsville (currently Texas A&M-Kingsville).[23] Texas A&I was originally established as a normal school in 1913, but by the time of Loftin's presidency it operated as a technical school with both liberal arts and vocational coursework.[24] Before working in Kingsville, Loftin spent 20 years employed in San Antonio's public schools, including an appointment as the principal of San Antonio Vocational and Technical High School (where he "founded the program of vocational education in San Antonio").[25] Following from his previous experience, he called for the introduction of more terminal and technical coursework at the college.

Despite a setback when the original proposal for setting up a junior college district failed in the first year of his presidency, Loftin did oversee an expansion in enrollment in terminal and vocational programs at SAJC. The evening division at the school, which catered to full-time workers seeking vocational training in the evening, exploded over the course of Loftin's tenure.[26] During World War II, Loftin served as the director of the civilian pilot training program at SAJC and helped to make the postwar curriculum more diverse to serve

---

[23] "Loftin Named Head of Junior College; Suburb Cuts Taxes: Former A. I. Leader Plans Expansion," *San Antonio Express*, August 13, 1941 in *San Antonio Scrapbook C, 1940-1949*, McAllister Collection, San Antonio College Library, San Antonio, TX.; Weynand, *San Antonio College*, 54.

[24] Jimmie R. Picquet, "Texas A&M University-Kingsville," *Handbook of Texas Online* (http://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/kct10), accessed November 18, 2015. Uploaded on June 15, 2010. Published by the Texas State Historical Association.

[25] "Loftin Named Head of Junior College," *San Antonio Express*, August 13, 1941 in *San Antonio Scrapbook C, 1940-1949*.

[26] Expansion can be seen in the large increases in enrollment and faculty appointments over the years from 1941-1955. See: "San Antonio College Catalog: Announcement of Courses for 1955-1956" (San Antonio, TX: San Antonio College, 1955), McAllister Collection, San Antonio College Library, San Antonio, TX..

the interests of returning veterans.[27] His support for vocational coursework had an impact on the content of the school curriculum, but the overall transition to a more comprehensive mission for the school was a gradual process, with quick changes tied more to student demand (such as an increases in veteran enrollment) than administrative initiative (though both were necessary for change).[28] Beyond activism for the integration of more vocational programs, Loftin's tenure was also notable for the key support he provided for the eventual creation of the San Antonio Union Junior College District in 1946 and the purchasing of the new campus site on San Pedro Avenue in 1949 (which was crucial for finally gaining accreditation for San Antonio College).

Consistent with the major changes seen at SAJC during this period, the size of the college faculty increased exponentially between 1945 and 1955 (from 21 to 143 faculty members).[29] A large number of these new hires worked in the evening division of the school in support of the increased vocational coursework the college now offered. Despite a move away from traditional academic coursework, however, the faculty continued to hold advanced degrees from prestigious universities. The University of Texas remained the most common choice for terminal degrees, but instructors also held 14 Ph.D.'s from institutions across the county including the California Institute of Technology, Columbia, New York University, Northwestern University, the University of California-Berkeley, and the University of California-Los Angeles.[30]

---

[27] "President J. O. Loftin Devotes Energy to College's Progress," *The Ranger* (San Antonio, TX), November 7, 1952, 3.

[28] For a more thorough explanation of curricular change during the period please see Chapter Seven.

[29] "San Antonio College Catalog: Announcement of Courses for 1955-1956" (San Antonio, TX: San Antonio College, 1955), 8-18.

[30] Ibid.

San Antonio's desirability as a place to work can be attributed to the city's strong economy after World War II, the college's increasingly firm financial footing by the 1950s, and the academic atmosphere SAJC had fostered since its creation. Even though a formal tenure policy was not instituted during this period of the college's history, the use of seniority-based faculty titles (assistant, associate, and full professor), which mirrored positions held by tenure-line professors at universities, serves as evidence for SAC's status as a career destination for academics (hoping to climb the faculty ladder).[31] While the Loftin administration wielded a lot of influence, seen in the curricular reorientation of SAC in the 1940s and 1950s, the early history of SAC's faculty built a base of power that the newly created faculty senate would try to extend upon during the Era of Expansion.

In spite of the college's successes during his tenure, Loftin's presidency was not free from drama. The failure of the campaign to set up a junior college district in 1941 still led to changes in the operation of the city's junior colleges. St. Philip's Junior College (formerly supported by the Episcopal Church, but in increasingly dire financial straits during the Depression) also came under the control of the San Antonio Independent School District in 1942 following the failed district election. This shift in control came partly because the proposal for the junior college district called for the all-black St. Philip's and SAJC to be administrated jointly by the proposed district, and also because of the efforts of St. Philip's president, Artemesia Bowden. Bowden's fundraising kept St. Philip's afloat in the 1930s, but she saw public school affiliation as necessary to ensure St. Philip's future. The plan for joint

[31] Ibid.

administration of the two schools within a junior college district eventually came to pass in 1946.[32]

Before the *Brown v. Board of Education* Supreme Court decision in 1954, southern colleges were still segregated campuses nominally operating under the "separate but equal" doctrine established by *Plessy v. Ferguson* in 1896.[33] With St. Philip's now publicly operated, and San Antonio Junior College functioning as a segregated campus (made up of primarily white and a small number of Mexican American students), the San Antonio Union Junior College District was increasingly pressured in the 1950s to improve the facilities of St. Philip's to get it up to par with SAC's new campus.

This increased pressure was possibly bolstered by the Supreme Court decision in *Sweatt v. Painter*, issued in 1950. In this case, the denial of admission to a black law school applicant at the University of Texas based solely on his race, citing a state law, was found unconstitutional (a breach of the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment) because the separate law school set up for African Americans by UT had inferior facilities.[34] Considering San Antonio's proximity to Austin, the higher education climate in the region likely factored into calls for integration or improved facilities at St. Philip's in the early 1950s.

Beyond clear differences in quality of physical plant, curriculum disparity between the two campuses became a sore point as black students were limited to blue-collar

---

[32] Marie Pannell Thurston, *St. Philip's College: A Point of Pride on San Antonio's Eastside*, Kindle Edition (College Station, TX: Texas A&M University Press, 2013), Location 1413, 1501.

[33] For an overview of court decisions related to segregation/integration from *Plessy v. Ferguson* to *Brown v. Board of Education* see: "History-Brown v. Board of Education Re-Enactment," United States Courts, accessed November 19, 2015, http://www.uscourts.gov/educational-resources/educational-activities/history-brown-v-board-education-re-enactment.

[34] For an overview of the case and the text of the Supreme Court's decision in *Sweatt v. Painter* see: "Sweatt v. Painter," Legal Information Institute at Cornell University, accessed April 20, 2016, https://www.law.cornell.edu/supremecourt/text/339/629.

vocational options at St. Philip's. "If San Antonio Junior College offered science courses, St. Philip's was limited to offering introductory science classes. San Antonio Junior College had departments offering engineering, physics, and mathematics, while St. Philip's divisions offered industrial education and home economics, classes not offered at its sister school."[35]

These issues came to a head in 1950 when the NAACP leveled grievances against the district claiming that "St. Philip's College [was] denied school buildings, guidance and educational instruction as good as provided white students of San Antonio College."[36] Loftin denied these charges, noting similar library and instructional facilities at the two campuses, but the NAACP was not mollified.[37] The building of the new SAC campus, which would make the inferiority of St. Philip's physical plant acute, was the trigger for the NAACP calling for the two campuses to be integrated to ensure that inequality would not persist.[38] The NAACP continued to pressure the district for the next two years, leading to a call for a bond issue in 1952 to improve district facilities, particularly at St. Philip's. The bond eventually passed, but the majority of the $2.5 million in funds were allocated to building projects at SAC despite the original impetus for the bond election, so the basis for St. Philip's grievances persisted. [39]

With district efforts at making SAC and St. Philip's "equal" facilities stalled, the attempts of black students to enroll at SAC in 1952, citing "crowded" classes at St. Philip's and hopes to register for white-collar vocational programs only available at SAC, again

---

[35] Thurston, *St. Philip's College*, location 1541.

[36] "Local College 'Inequalities' Hit," [newspaper not indicated], October 15, 1950 in *San Antonio College Scrapbook D, 1950-1952*, McAllister Collection, San Antonio College Library, San Antonio, TX.

[37] Ibid.

[38] "S.A. College Urged to Stop Segregation," *San Antonio Express*, May 20, 1952 in *San Antonio College Scrapbook D, 1950-1952*.

[39] "College Bond Vote Favored," [newspaper not indicated], c. 1952 in *San Antonio College Scrapbook D, 1950-1952*; "Balloting Very Light in $2.5 Million in Bonds, c. 1952 in *San Antonio College Scrapbook E, 1952-1953*, McAllister Collection, San Antonio College Library, San Antonio, TX.

brought the issue of integration of the city's junior colleges into the limelight.[40] Though the students attempted to enroll of their own volition, the NAACP took up their cause by suing the district when they were denied entrance to SAC.[41] This case never reached a conclusion since it was shelved due to the pending *Brown v. Board* case being considered by the Supreme Court in 1954. After the *Brown* decision called for the integration of public schools to proceed "with all deliberate speed," the junior college district, citing instructions from the Texas Commissioner of Education to "continue segregation," delayed integrating the campus until 1955.[42]

While this delay may appear as a bigoted attempt to avoid following the dictates of the Supreme Court, the district's eventual integration process showed a willingness to comply with federal policy despite being hampered by the direction of the state. When asked about the possibility of integration in 1954, Loftin commented that he was "not surprised [by the *Brown* decision] and certainly not disturbed. We've worked for this day and not against it." San Antonio College "was the first public college in Texas to admit Negro students in June 1955."[43] Hubert F. Lindsay, an army veteran, enrolled in the evening division in an advanced biology course. Linus Dietrick, a civil service employee at Fort Sam's Surgical Research Center, enrolled in a German course. Loftin claimed that Lindsay was admitted because he correctly pointed out the coursework he needed was not available at St. Philip's,

---

[40] "Negroes Try to Enroll in San Antonio College, *San Antonio Express*, September 10, 1952 in *San Antonio College Scrapbook E, 1952-1953*.

[41] "Two Injunctions Attack Segregation Barriers," [newspaper not indicated], November 25, 1952 in *San Antonio College Scrapbook E, 1952-1953*.

[42] "Junior College Board Delays Desegregation," *San Antonio Express*, June 29, 1954 in *San Antonio Scrapbook G, 1954-1955*, McAllister Collection, San Antonio College Library, San Antonio, TX.

[43] Weynand, *San Antonio College*, 109.

and "at that point…[Loftin] said the two junior colleges…are 'no longer segregated schools.'"[44]

The early resistance to integration at SAJC can be attributed both to pressure from the state government to maintain segregation following the *Brown* decision, and a continued lack of diversity on the San Antonio Union Junior College District Board of Trustees. The lone dissenting voice on the board (made up primarily of white businessmen and financiers) to the district's approach to integration before 1955 came from the only African American board member, G. J. Sutton (who called for integration beginning in the early 1950s).[45] The marginalization of African Americans on the board reflected the small black population in the city at this time, around six percent, but was also problematic considering one of the two schools in the district enrolled solely black students.[46]

While the black population of the city was small, the historically black neighborhoods on San Antonio's east side were able to wield considerable political influence. "For much of the twentieth century, a black political machine existed in the city that garnered favors for the black community in exchange for votes. The black population in return received such benefits as street lighting, plumbing, and schools."[47] As opposed to states like Mississippi and South Carolina where black majorities existed in certain regions leading to persistent racial tension, the black population in San Antonio was a smaller threat to the economic and

---

[44] "Negroe's Hush-Hush Enrollment in S.A. College Disclosed," *San Antonio Express*, June 12, 1955 in *San Antonio College Scrapbook G, 1954-1955*.

[45] Ibid.

[46] Bureau of the Census, "Census of Population: 1950: Characteristics of the Population, Number of Inhabitants, General and Detailed Characteristics of the Population: Texas," ed. Howard G. Brunsman, Volume 2, Part 43 (Washington D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1952), 43-94.

[47] "John Reynolds, "The San Antonio Story of Segregation," University of Texas-San Antonio, accessed November 18, 2015, http://colfa.utsa.edu/users/jreynolds/HIS6913/Updegrove/.

political influence of the city's white population (the sizable Mexican American population was a greater threat).

The racial conditions in San Antonio led to initial resistance to integration, as a historically segregated community, but relatively early compliance in comparison to other parts of the state (and certainly in comparison to the South as a whole).[48] Still, fears of possible resistance to the school's integration led SAC to keep the enrollment of Lindsay and Dietrick as quiet as possible. The press did not report on SAC's integration until after the students had registered, noting that "considerable effort" was put in to keep the story from the public.[49] Attempts by southern institutions to conceal integration efforts to avoid community backlash was fairly common, seen prominently in Houston's process of desegregation in the early 1960s in which civil rights activists, local businessmen, and the press coordinated media blackouts during integration.[50] The same effort to keep the public unaware will be seen again when discussing integration at Navarro Junior College during the Era of Expansion.

The mid-1950s was a major time of transition for San Antonio Junior College. Not only did the college move to a new campus, gain accreditation, and enroll black students, but the first Mexican American on the board of trustees gained his office in 1954.[51] Manuel C. Gonzales was an attorney and a longtime civil rights leader, earlier serving as president of the

---

[48] As I will discuss in Chapter Five, Navarro College did not integrate until 1961.

[49] "Negroe's Hush-Hush Enrollment in S.A. College Disclosed," *San Antonio Express*, June 12, 1955 in *San Antonio College Scrapbook G, 1954-1955*.

[50] David Berman, "The Strange Demise of Jim Crow: How Houston Desegregated Its Public Accommodations, 1959-1963: A Documentary," (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1998), VHS.

[51] "Two Candidates File for Trustees," *The Ranger* (San Antonio, TX), April 2, 1954, 1; "Mexican CC Head Seeks College Post," *San Antonio Light*, April 3, 1954 in *San Antonio College Scrapbook F*, 1954, McAllister Collection, San Antonio College Library, San Antonio, TX.

League of United Latin American Citizens.[52] Before Gonzalez's election, the administration and board members at SAJC had not included any Mexican Americans despite Mexican American students enrolling at the school since its establishment.[53]

The lack of diversity among the college's administration was also seen in the ethnic composition of the faculty. Instructors with Hispanic surnames did not appear until the 1950s, and then only as Spanish faculty in the evening division of the school.[54] Though discrimination may be part of the reason for this lack of diversity, the pool of potential instructors was also limited in this period because of the low enrollment numbers of Mexican Americans in institutions of higher education before the 1960s. As Victoria-María MacDonald, John Botti, and Lisa Clark detail, the federal government's focus on African American education and the lack of dedicated Latino colleges and universities (in comparison to Historically Black Colleges and Universities) before the mid-twentieth century, led to only a small number of Latinos attaining advanced degrees.[55] Issues of ethnic diversity and discrimination on campus at SAJC would come to a head during the Era of Expansion as Mexican Americans became more empowered on campus, drawing from the momentum that began in the mid-1950s.

---

[52] Cynthia E. Orozco, "Gonzales, Manuel C.," *Handbook of Texas Online* (http://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/fgo57), accessed November 18, 2015. Uploaded on June 15, 2010. Published by the Texas State Historical Association.

[53] For a list of original board members see: Weynand, *San Antonio College*, 79; A discussion of enrollment numbers for Latinos at San Antonio Junior College is included in Chapter Three.

[54] "San Antonio College Catalog: Announcement of Courses for 1955-1956" (San Antonio, TX: San Antonio College, 1955).

[55] Victoria-Maria MacDonald, John M. Botti, and Lisa Hoffman Clark, "From Visibility to Autonomy: Latinos and Higher Education in the US, 1965–2005," *Harvard Educational Review* 77, no. 4 (2007): 475–478; for a detailed discussion on the size of Latino enrollment in higher education institutions over time, including specific data on the small number of Hispanic surnames students at UT in the 1920s, please see: Victoria-María MacDonald and Teresa García, "Historical Perspectives on Latino Access to Higher Education, 1848-1990," in *The Majority in the Minority: Expanding the Representation of Latina/o Faculty, Administrators and Students in Higher Education*, edited by Jeanett Castellanos and Lee Jones, 15-46, 20 (1928 UT data) (Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, LLC, 2003).

Before 1955, the overall power of San Antonio Junior College flowed from the administration down to the faculty. This is unsurprising for a new institution as typically the initial administration hires the first faculty members and sets the foundational policies for the college. For San Antonio Junior College, the school's relationship with the University of Texas and its desirability as a career destination (attracting national interest from potential instructors), however, ensured the creation of a faculty culture more akin to a university than a high school. Even with the transition to a more comprehensive mission for SAC during Loftin's presidency, moving away from a pure academic focus, faculty maintained considerable influence on campus.

Navarro Junior College

Unlike San Antonio Junior College, where a university-like governance structure was emulated (though not fully realized) on campus, Navarro Junior College's focus on community appeal led to an administrative organization more akin to a secondary school, with clearer administrative direction and greater awareness of community needs in campus decisions. As mentioned in the previous chapter, the initial board members, administrators, and teachers at NJC came from across the county to ensure community support. Located in an area with a smaller population, and not a clear destination for career academics, Navarro Junior College adapted its operating procedures to better suit its local context.

Navarro Junior College's first president, Ray Waller, held his position throughout the Era of Establishment at Navarro Junior College (until his death from a heart attack in 1956). Waller held a Master's degree from Southern Methodist University and had worked in Navarro County schools for years before his appointment. He formerly served as the

superintendent of schools in Rice and Dawson, both towns located in Navarro County, before the board hired him as the college's first president.[56]

Ray Waller fostered a community atmosphere on campus. The 1947 edition of *El Navarro*, the college yearbook, includes a section on "Our Friend, the President":

> When we look at the sign over the door of his office we read "President" but his small, round face with its friendly smile and dancing brown eyes set beneath a small, shiny, round dome say "Friend." When walking on the campus he willingly slows or halts his "I-need-to-hurry-but-oh-how-I-hate-to" strut to chat with the students. In closing a conversation or an assembly meeting he is usually able to impart some clever remark or statement to brighten up the day.[57]

The familiar tone employed by the yearbook's authors when describing the President shows the effort the early administration put into maintaining close relationships with students.

In order to broaden the college's appeal to the local community, the early administration also put a high priority on extracurricular activities, mainly sports, despite the college's limited size.[58] Former Corsicana High School Principal R. A. Armistead argued "that President Waller and the board made some excellent early decisions, and that was to go all out. They had a football team, basketball team, baseball team, track in the beginning, golf, they had publications, they had everything in the beginning...It indicated it was going to be a permanent thing."[59] The local newspapers reported on NJC's sports teams regularly.

---

[56] "Ray L. Waller Heads Navarro Junior College," *Dallas Morning News*, July 24, 1946, p15; "Navarro Junior College Bulletin: Announcements for 1946-47 and 1947-48" (Corsicana, TX: Navarro Junior College, 1947), 1, Pearce Museum Archives at Navarro College, Corsicana, TX.

[57] Students of Navarro Junior College, *The 1947 El Navarro* (Corsicana, TX: Navarro Junior College), Box 1-B15-b, Pearce Museum Archives at Navarro College, Corsicana, TX..

[58] Ibid.

[59] R. A. Armistead, interview by Dr. Tommy Stringer, Corsicana, TX, June 20, 1978, Pearce Museum Archives at Navarro College, Corsicana, TX.

Homecoming at the college and annual dances were well attended, and the success of the college football team broadened the school's support in the county.[60] The popularity of sports on campus was so high that a later accreditation report warned the "college [to] be careful not to let athletics become the primary function of the institution."[61]

Attempts by the administration to make the school relatable to the community also led to the incorporation of school policies that seemed more at home in a high school than a college campus. For instance, the college maintained a strict attendance policy, with specific dictates for how many absences were allowed per semester (three), and how to count absences on quiz days. Faculty members were required to turn in attendance sheets to the Dean on a weekly basis.[62] Euneva Burleson, clerical staff at the college during this period, suggested that the community was not familiar with how colleges operated. She recounted an anecdote in which she received calls reporting that students were playing hooky because they were not in class throughout the day.[63] This unfamiliarity with higher education practices was understandable since the county lacked a college or university as a historical model (as opposed to San Antonio). Furthermore, higher education attendance was not common in rural areas of Texas, where farm workers over the age of 25 averaged 8.1 years and nonfarm rural workers averaged 8.6 years of formal education in 1950. This is in contrast to Texas's urban population which averaged 10.1 years of formal education during this period.[64]

---

[60] The college yearbook, *El Navarro*, is full of pictures each year of sports events and social activities with high attendance (especially considering the relatively small enrollment at the school).

[61] Gary Edmonson, "College Accreditation: Committee Took Harsh Look at NC's Education Program, Faculty," *Corsicana Daily Sun*, January 23, 1975, p1.

[62] Tommy W. Stringer, *Dreams and Visions: The History of Navarro College* (Waco, TX: Davis Brothers Publishing Co., 1996), 19.

[63] Euneva Burleson, interview by Tommy Stringer, Corsicana, TX, February 14, 1978.

[64] Bureau of the Census, "Census of Population: 1950," 402-403.

The administration's wish to create an atmosphere on campus that was relatable to the community and comfortable for students was also reflected in the practices of teachers at Navarro College. Like the original administrators, early faculty members were hired primarily from local high schools.[65] These faculty members faced difficult conditions when trying to set up their classes in the ill-suited environment of the former air flight school. NJC's first science teacher, James Edgar, recalled that "there wasn't a chair or table or anything in it [the classroom on the first day the school opened]. There was nothing. I did call the roll, and I told them to come back the next class meeting, and I would have something for them. In the meantime, I got out and hustled and built some crude tables and borrowed some chairs from a funeral home."[66] Faculty members were given relative autonomy in their teaching, even to the point of having to scrounge for materials and adequate facilities for their classes. Edgar remembered that the science teachers had to rig up their own heating system for their classrooms and offices. The system put in place, which included using a rubber hose from the science lab to transfer heat from a stove to other parts of the building, led to an unfortunate fire which burned down half of the science building.[67]

Instead of these substandard conditions leading to discontent, denizens of the school seemed to come together during these early years. Margaret Pannill, an English teacher, said that during "maybe the second or third year---there was always an all-school picnic. These students...made a special effort to see that everybody, every faculty member came to the picnic. Those students were leaving, and that would be the last time we would all be together.

---

[65] Stringer, *Dreams and Visions*, 17.

[66] James Edgar, interview by Dr. Tommy Stringer, Corsicana, TX, February 7, 1978, Pearce Museum Archives at Navarro College, Corsicana, TX.

[67] Ibid.

It was important to them."[68] Interviews with former students also highlight the close relationships they shared with faculty members. Speaking almost 70 years after her time as a student at Navarro Junior College, Ruthellen Scott still remembered the excellent instruction she received at the school, particularly from the aforementioned James Edgar.[69] Jack Bradley, a student in the late 1940s, also recalls that he "had a lot of good times, good feelings, good relationships. Not only with the students, but with the teachers as well," some of whom he knew from his hometown and church.[70] Strong relationships with students also translated into solid instruction in general, seen in the awarding of the Texas Junior College Teachers' Association Teachers of the Year awards to James Edgar, Margaret Pannill, Lucille Boyd, and Lee Smith, all faculty members during NJC's first decade of operation.[71] Even though NJC shared some structural similarities with secondary schools, the academic rigor was a clear step up for students transferring from local high schools.

Despite the strong camaraderie that existed on campus at NJC during the Era of Establishment, length of employment for faculty members was not as high as at San Antonio Junior College. Teachers remembered in student interviews, like James Edgar, remained at the school for a long time, but faculty retention was low overall. By 1955, only four of the faculty members employed in 1946, when the school was established, were still at NJC.[72] The high turnover in instructors was a common phenomenon on rural junior college campuses. In an American Association of Junior Colleges report, Edwin Vineyard describes

---

[68] Margaret Pannill, interview by Dr. Tommy Stringer, Corsicana, TX, December 15, 1977, Pearce Museum Archives at Navarro College, Corsicana, TX.

[69] Ruthellen Scott, interview by the author, Corsicana, TX, May 28, 2015.

[70] Jack Bradley, interview by the author, Corsicana, TX, May 27, 2015.

[71] Stringer, *Dreams and Visions*, 42.

[72] "Navarro Junior College Bulletin: Announcements for 1946-47 and 1947-48," 2-3; "Navarro Junior College: Announcements for 1955-1956" (Corsicana, TX: Navarro Junior College, 1955), 2-4, Pearce Museum Archives at Navarro College, Corsicana, TX.

“attracting and developing staff” as particularly difficult for rural junior/community colleges.[73] Job openings in cities, and the expansion of higher education opportunities in general, during the postwar period made it challenging for Navarro College to retain staff in Corsicana.

While Navarro College was able to employ some faculty holding degrees from universities across the nation when it opened in 1946 (including Columbia, Northwestern, and the Royal Hungarian University), the educational background of the staff became more concentrated regionally by the end of the Era of Expansion.[74] Contrasting with San Antonio College, which had begun to broaden its faculty base beyond University of Texas graduates by 1955, Navarro Junior College increasingly relied on hiring staff with regional ties who attended school at North Texas Teachers College (now the University of North Texas), East Texas State Teachers College (now Texas A&M-Commerce), and Sam Houston State Teachers College (now Sam Houston State University).[75] All of these schools were located within two hours of Navarro Junior College.

The lack of continuity in the college faculty by necessity heightened the power of the college administration. Teachers controlled their classroom with relative freedom, but without an organized faculty, and lacking clear seniority incentives (in the absence of a set tenure policy), it was difficult for the faculty to build up consequential influence over the larger direction of the college. A Faculty Club was established in 1954, but this organization did not operate as a campus legislative body, and the faculty remained susceptible to

[73] Edwin E. Vineyard, "The Invisible Wall: A Report on the Status of the Rural Community College in America" (Washington D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1978), 7–8.

[74] “Navarro Junior College Bulletin: Announcements for 1946-47 and 1947-48,” 2-3; “Navarro Junior College: Announcements for 1955-1956” (Corsicana, TX: Navarro Junior College, 1955), 2-4.

[75] “Navarro Junior College: Announcements for 1955-1956,” 2-4.

dramatic shifts in the colleges overall direction at the whims of the board of trustees and the president.[76] My discussion of the Era of Expansion will show clearly that shifts in administrative control had a more dramatic effect on Navarro Junior College than at San Antonio College, a trend that can be linked to faculty power on each campus.

Conclusion

"The notion of 'academic freedom' was still a novel concept" when the public junior college movement began to gain momentum.[77] With the modern university increasingly prioritizing research (a process accelerated in the latter half of the century), academic freedom was oftentimes framed in terms of avoiding administrative interference with professors' research inquiries. When the American Association of University Professors set down a "Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure" in 1940, their definition of the scope of academic freedom began by stating: "Teachers are entitled to full freedom in research and in the publication of the results, subject to the adequate performance of their other academic duties."[78] Although the definition of academic freedom was extended to encompass a professor's classroom activities and personal beliefs, it is not a coincidence that the call for formal tenure policies and protection of academic freedom came at the same time that research grew as a central function of the university.

---

[76] *El Navarro, 1955* (Corsicana, TX: Navarro Junior College, 1955), Pearce Museum Archives at Navarro College, Corsicana, TX.

[77] "History of the AAUP," American Association of University Professors, accessed November 19, 2015, http://www.aaup.org/about/history-aaup.

[78] Committee on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure of the American Association of University Professors, "1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure," accessed November 19, 2015, http://www.aaup.org/file/1940%20Statement.pdf, 14.

Junior college instructors could pursue research interests on their own time, but publication was not a central requirement for junior college faculty members. Because of this, discussion of academic freedom, at least in the early years of the junior college movement, was not emphasized in the professional literature. Policies at both schools allowed for relative autonomy of teachers within their classrooms (a tenet of academic freedom), but without strict tenure policies as a protection, junior college faculty members were at a clear disadvantage in potential conflicts with administration.

The balance of power between faculty and administration was fairly equitable at San Antonio Junior College. Greater continuity in employment and more regionally diverse academic backgrounds among faculty members, hailing from prestigious universities nationwide, led to a university-like campus culture. That said, a formal tenure policy was only hinted at (in the use of seniority-based titles) instead of instituted during the Era of Establishment. Persistent growth after World War II allowed for reasonable job security despite possibly being susceptible to administrative whims in the absence of tenure security. The foundation of faculty influence that early SAJC faculty put in place was built upon during the Era of Establishment with the advent of an influential faculty senate and the formal incorporation of a tenure policy.

At Navarro Junior College, the position of faculty members was more tenuous. Though administrative dismissals were not common, high turnover and less diversity in academic experience among the faculty (making instructors less in-tune with professional norms nationwide) ensured that administrators wielded primary power on campus. Instead of addressing faculty grievances, at a rural campus an administrator's major concern lay in maintaining a strong relationship with the community to ensure the continued health of the

institution. The small size of the faculty, coupled with high turnover, heightened the importance of administrators' control through hiring and firing (department-based search committees were not in use at this time). Tenure policies, weakly emulated at SAJC, were absent at NJC, and still do not exist to this day. The precarious position of the faculty members at Navarro Junior College will be on full display during the Era of Establishment when new administrators fundamentally shifted campus practices.

The findings of this chapter suggest that the size and characteristics of the population served by a junior college had noticeable effects on power dynamics on campus. Larger, urban campuses had less problems attracting highly-qualified faculty members who, upon employment, attempted to replicate the university environment they enjoyed during their own schooling. Smaller, rural campuses, in contrast, struggled to attract and maintain faculty members, leading to greater administrative control.

Urban campuses could focus their energies on internal development since demand for schooling in the served community was higher, leading to more stability in campus policies and a greater sharing of governing power. This structure made the college change less quickly, because of greater bureaucracy, but pace of change was less important when demand was higher. Rural campuses placed greater importance on external factors, specifically the attitude of the local community, in order to maintain adequate enrollment despite limited demand. To remain responsive to the community, greater centralization of power allowed for quicker incorporation of institutional changes.

Without research as a central task, instructors at public junior colleges did not have the same incentive to press for academic freedom and formal tenure policies during the first half of the twentieth century as their university colleagues. Even though tenure is often

linked to research freedom, it is also an important factor in promoting shared governance of higher education institutions. The lack of discussion of academic freedom and faculty power on junior college campuses left junior college instructors at a disadvantage in disputes with administration. This power dynamic became a bigger issue during the Era of Expansion as administrative attempts to accelerate the transformation of transfer-oriented junior colleges into comprehensive community colleges led to greater conflict on campus.

CHAPTER 3
DUPES OF DIVERSION, AWARDEES OF ACCESS, OR CATALYSTS FOR CHANGE?: STUDENTS DURING THE ERA OF ESTABLISHMENT

Students attending junior colleges are both the most talked about and neglected group in the junior/community college historiography. On the one hand, the impact of the junior college on its students, whether it has been a positive or negative force, lies at the center of historical discussion. On the other hand, the methods of historians to determine this impact have focused on the words of the junior college national leadership and administrators on the mission of the institution and, by extension, its students.

Statistics are cited by these scholars to give a broad perspective on student outcomes, but the individual experiences of students are rarely detailed. This omission has led to students seeming like a passive force instead of a key group in the development of the junior/community college. One side of the historiographical debate argues that these colleges serve to divert the social mobility aspirations of primarily working class students to the benefit of either universities (who are seeking to remain "elite" institutions) or capitalists (who are looking to junior colleges to provide semi-skilled workers for middle management). The other branch of the historiography, dominated by scholars representing the American Association of Junior Colleges, argues that the existence of these institutions democratizes higher education, giving all Americans greater access and the potential to better their socioeconomic status. Within each of these arguments students are either passive victims or passive beneficiaries. A dupe of diversion or an awardee of access.[1]

[1] This is an overview of the branches of the junior college historiography which I discuss in this study's introduction. For a more in-depth description of these histories please refer back to that original explanation of the historiography. Major works in the revisionist historiography include: Steven G. Brint and Jerome Karabel, *The Diverted Dream: Community Colleges and the Promise of Educational Opportunity in America, 1900-1985* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989); Steven G. Brint, "Few Remaining Dreams: Community Colleges since 1985," *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 586,

The weaknesses of previous portrayals of students does not make prior histories useless as a foundation for contemporary study, but there is space to reshape students as historical actors on campus. Previous studies have provided valuable information on the backgrounds of junior college students before World War II. John Frye's survey data on the "social origins of students" shows that early junior college students were generally middle class in origin (though lower class than their university counterparts).[2] Leonard Koos's exhaustive study of the *Community College Student* provides more precise data on the economic background of early students, finding that around the time of SAJC's establishment 15.6 percent of public junior college enrollment was made up of low income students, versus 10.9 percent of enrollment at private colleges and universities.[3] Overall, the pre-World War II junior college student body was made up of working and middle class students, attending in hopes of eventual transfer to senior institutions.

The composition of the student body began to change after World War II, spurred on by the influx of veterans capitalizing on GI Bill benefits, and the introduction of more vocational coursework as a way of appealing to non-traditional students (particularly older men and women). Generally the changes in enrollment in the period from 1945-1955 were centered on the white population, however. The popularity of the community college in the South in particular limited opportunities for black Americans, since these were segregated

---

no. 1 (2003), 16-37; J. M. Beach, *Gateway to Opportunity?: A History of the Community College in the United States* (Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, LLC, 2010). Major works supporting the traditional democratizing narrative include: Walter Crosby Eells, *The Junior College* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1931); Jesse Parker Bogue, *The Community College* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1950); Allen A. Witt et al., *America's Community Colleges: The First Century* (Washington D.C.: The Community College Press, 1994).

[2] John H. Frye, *The Vision of the Public Junior College, 1900-1940: Professional Goals and Popular Aspirations* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1992), 100–104.

[3] Leonard V. Koos, *The Community College Student* (Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1970), 284.

institutions, and also because the community college was seen as a "poor substitute" to university level education by black leaders.[4]

This wariness seems warranted when considering the arguments made in revisionist histories of the junior college, beginning in the 1980s. These scholars, generally sociologists, have questioned the opportunity for social mobility that junior/community colleges really offered, and suggest that these colleges oftentimes acted as a filter for working class ambition. William DeGenaro argues that "two-year institutions…put students into specific jobs and provided industry with relatively cheap labor. Of course, most working-class students were already headed for these jobs, but the two-year college, as a kind of assembly line producing worker-citizens, assumed the role of facilitator for the particular industries that the workers would serve."[5] Gregory Goodwin mirrors this argument in his explanation of the national junior college leadership's perspective on the United States' educational institutions: "The elementary schools existed for the masses and the universities adequately educated the professional elite. It would be the unique mission of the community-junior college to train men for 'middle management' or as 'foremen for society.' If such a force of men were properly developed, it was argued, it could reduce possible friction between the educated elite and the masses."[6] Considering how the stipulations of philanthropy and the advocacy of Booker T. Washington pushed black Americans into vocational, instead of

---

[4] Allen A. Witt et al., *America's Community Colleges*, 197–198; This lack of enthusiasm for community colleges among black leadership is also reflected in the Brint and Karabel's investigation of the community college movement in Massachusetts: Steven G. Brint and Jerome Karabel, *The Diverted Dream*, Kindle edition, location 2806.

[5] William DeGenaro, "Class Consciousness and the Junior College Movement: Creating a Docile Workforce.," *JAC: A Journal of Composition Theory* 21, no. 3 (2001): 508.

[6] Gregory L Goodwin, *A Social Panacea: A History of the Community-Junior College Ideology* (Washington, D.C.: Educational Resources Information Center, 1973), 13.

academic, education after Reconstruction, it is unsurprising that black leaders were wary of the increasingly vocationally-focused community college after World War II.[7]

These arguments on the junior/community college's impact on class structure have also been refined in the wider higher education historiography. In this literature, historians have gone into detail about the competing American ideologies of democracy and capitalism. Clyde Barrow describes how this ideological battle has manifested itself in higher education: "capitalism calls for an effective corporate economic system, with trained workers, while democracy calls for equality of opportunity. The adaptation of the universities to the economic needs of the capitalist class had to be balanced against the greater access to higher education and social mobility that the democratic goal called for."[8] This idea is applied directly to the junior college by David Levine when he argues that "the prospect of mass and democratic education in the aftermath of World War I…fostered both the selective liberal arts college and the public junior college, and each in many respects owes its existence to the other."[9] These authors claim that the popularization of the junior college in the first half of the twentieth century was not coincidental, but was a consequence of a need to appease the democratic impulses of the working class after World War I, and continuing after World War II. These impulses were bolstered by the rhetoric politicians used to justify intervention in these conflicts. Liberal arts colleges became refuges for the elite, while public junior colleges quenched the democratic thirst for equality of access among the lower classes.

---

[7] James D. Anderson, *The Education of Blacks in the South, 1860-1935* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1988).

[8] Clyde W. Barrow, *Universities and the Capitalist State: Corporate Liberalism and the Reconstruction of American Higher Education, 1894-1928* (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1990), 9.

[9] David O. Levine, *The American College and the Culture of Aspiration, 1915-1940* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1986), 21.

The previous historiography has made claims that the public two-year college has allowed for greater access to higher education, but revisionists have questioned how transformative this access has been for community college students. The weakness of these claims lies in researchers' over-reliance on sources reflecting the perspective of a small number of men, generally the leadership of the American Association of Junior Colleges, to form their conclusions. Robert Pedersen describes this deficiency when he points out that:

> With rare exception, junior college historians have written exclusively of the evolution of a distinctive junior college ideology as articulated by such nationally-prominent schoolmen as Leonard Koos and Walter Crosby Eells [both AAJC officials] without examining whether this ideology was shared by those parochial figures, civic leaders, schoolmen, parents, and students directly responsible for the organization, governance, and support of these institutions.[10]

The relative youth of the junior college historiography is partly to blame for this phenomenon. Broad statistical data and the words of prominent leaders are easier to access than the individual experiences of typical junior college students. Furthermore, these types of sources are more credible, on the surface, when trying to generalize a national movement made up of hundreds of institutions for an audience hungry for simple and broad answers on the evolution of the junior college. Historians have made some compelling claims about the impact of a junior college education on students who attend, but it is time to broaden the historiography's methodological approach. This chapter attempts to identify who junior college students were and their primary concerns when attending these institutions. This

[10] Robert Patrick Pedersen, "The Origins and Development of the Early Public Junior College: 1900-1940" (Ph.D. Diss., Columbia University, 2000), 16.

approach will allow for the empowerment of students as active participants in the junior college movement, as opposed to their previous portrayal as passive victims or beneficiaries of leaderships' whims.

The colleges studied here were composed of primarily working and middle class white students during the Era of Establishment. These students generally sought to transfer to senior institutions, particularly at SAJC, with vocational coursework becoming more attractive after World War II, considering the increasing demand for semi-skilled labor in the booming United States economy. The major attraction of the junior college was cost in San Antonio, and proximity in Navarro County. At Navarro Junior College in particular, the establishment of NJC led to the attendance of young men and women who otherwise most likely would not have attended college at all. Both schools included student bodies active in campus activities, clubs, and sports, though non-academic extracurricular activities were more central to NJC's culture than SAJC's.

Overall, San Antonio Junior College's attraction lay in its convenience, cost, and quality of education. Navarro Junior College's attraction lay in its proximity, comfortable campus culture, community outreach, and diverse course offerings for returning veterans. Student support and action was central to each campuses' development. Without student advocacy, it is unlikely that SAJC would have survived the trials of the Great Depression while continuing to offer a quality education. Similarly, without student support and the creation of a notably close campus culture, it is unlikely that a college in sparsely populated Navarro County would have survived past its initial surge of veteran students. The centrality of student actions to the history of both of the colleges studied here suggests that their part in

the history of the junior/community college movement deserves more attention, at the individual level, than previous histories have allowed.

San Antonio (Junior) College

The class background of San Antonio Junior College students during Nelson's presidency (from 1928-1941) and their reason for attending school, for eventual transfer to a university, follows the national trends as described by John Frye and Leonard Koos for this era.[11] A closer look at student activities on campus during this period shows, however, that students did not passively accept administrative policies, but lobbied actively for campus improvement, quality educational opportunities, and affordable tuition.

Students enrolled at SAJC in its early years were generally working and middle class, evidenced by the large number of students maintaining employment while working on their degree.[12] The student population was overwhelmingly white throughout the Era of Establishment, but there was some ethnic diversity, and considerably more gender diversity, on campus.

Black enrollment at San Antonio Junior College was non-existent until 1955 due to the segregation of the city's junior colleges. Latinos, on the other hand, made up a small, but significant, minority of students at the junior college in this era, but even their small presence stands as testimony to the long-established influence of Mexican American families in the

[11] Frye, *The Vision of the Public Junior College, 1900-1940*; Koos, *The Community College Student*.

[12] "20 Per Cent of Junior College Students Dividing Time Between Work and Their Classrooms," c. 1931 [newspaper not indicated], in *San Antonio College Scrapbook A, 1925-1931,* McAllister Collection, San Antonio College Library, San Antonio, TX.

city.[13] From an enrollment of 12 students with Hispanic surnames for the 1927-1928 school year (out of 345 total students, or about 3.5 percent), this number increased slightly to 26 by 1942 (out of 305 total students, or about 8.5 percent).[14] While Latino students made up only a small percentage of the college's student body during Loftin's administration, there is evidence that they excelled academically. One graduate, Carlos Gonzales, went on to enroll at Rice University, before becoming an honor roll engineering student at the University of Texas.[15] Henry B. González was also a distinguished graduate from SAJC, earning his degree in 1937.[16] González's family immigrated to Texas during the Mexican Revolution, emblematic of the demographic shift that led to San Antonio's explosive growth in the early decades of the twentieth century. He would go on to serve in the state legislature before representing Texas's 20th District in the United States House of Representatives from 1961-1999.[17]

---

[13] For a discussion on the establishment of social position of prominent Mexican families after Anglo settlement in Texas see: Raúl A Ramos, *Beyond the Alamo : Forging Mexican Ethnicity in San Antonio, 1821-1861* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2008); Richard A. Garcia, *The Rise of the Mexican American Middle Class: San Antonio, 1929-1941* (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 1991). The presence of Latino students at SAJC is somewhat surprising considering the lack of high school availability to Mexican-American students in the first half of the twentieth century. For more information on early twentieth century Latino education see: Victoria MacDonald, *Latino Education in the United States: A Narrated History from 1513-2000* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004).

[14] The size of Latino enrollment at SAJC was taken by looking at the names of enrolled students listed in the college catalogs. The list of Hispanic Surnames consulted to determine student background can be found at: "Appendix E: Census List of Hispanic Surnames," Florida Cancer Data System, accessed November 27, 2015, https://fcds.med.miami.edu/downloads/DataAcquisitionManual/dam2014/25%20Appendix%20E%20Census%20List%20of%20Spanish%20Surnames.pdf.

[15] Local newspaper sources for this chapter were taken from scrapbooks put together by San Antonio College that include clippings of local articles referencing the college. Unfortunately, the articles sometimes do not include the name of the specific paper it is taken from (the *Express*, the *News*, or the *Light*). For these references I will include the name of the scrapbook the article was included in and the date, as much as this can be determined, from the information in the scrapbook: "San Antonio Junior College Graduates Enable City to Win Honors at University of Texas," in *San Antonio College Scrapbook A, 1925-1931,* February 1930.

[16] San Antonio College, "Outstanding Former Students: Award Recipients," accessed November 27, 2015, http://www.alamo.edu/mainwide.aspx?id=3481.

[17] "González, Henry B., (1916-2000)," Biographical Directory of the United States Congress, 1774-Present, accessed November 27, 2015, http://bioguide.congress.gov/scripts/biodisplay.pl?index=G000272.

While Mexican-Americans made up a visible, but small, minority of the student body, women enrolled in numbers only slightly lower than men during SAJC's early years, primarily for coursework in education. The pictures of student organizations in the college's yearbook makes it clear that outside of study in the "regular academic course," preparation for teaching was a major function of SAJC. The yearbook released in 1928 shows a picture of 115 members of the Education Club, with a primarily female membership.[18] Considering the total enrollment of the college for the 1927-1928 school year was 345 students, the active participation of one third of the student body in the Education Club is striking.[19]

The importance of education programs in the junior college in this period reflects state and national conditions. As mentioned in the section introduction, the state legislature's first act related to junior colleges, passed in 1916, allowed junior colleges to train and grant certification to teachers to work in state public schools.[20] In the early decades of the twentieth century there was a great need for teachers as school enrollment across the nation, particularly in secondary schools, increased dramatically.[21] Furthermore, education programs and colleges of education at universities were still in their infancy, and the influence of normal schools (devoted to teacher training) was waning. For SAJC in particular, a close

---

[18] Students of San Antonio Junior College, *The Alamo, 1928*, 63-64, McAllister Collection, San Antonio College Library, San Antonio, TX.

[19] "San Antonio Junior College Bulletin: Announcement of Courses for 1928-1929," (San Antonio, TX: San Antonio Junior College, 1928), McAllister Collection, San Antonio College Library, San Antonio, TX. Enrollment numbers were determined by counting the number of students appearing in the back of each year's school catalog as "Regular Session" students.

[20] The first two decades of the twentieth century saw the training of teachers in Texas move increasingly to colleges, culminating in a 1921 law which "decreed that all future certificates were to be based on college studies": *Handbook of Texas Online*, Alan W. Garrett, "Teacher Education," accessed April 25, 2016, http://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/kdtsj. Uploaded on June 15, 2010. Published by the Texas State Historical Association.

[21] John L. Rury, *Education and Social Change: Contours in the History of American Schooling*, 4th ed. (New York: Routledge, 2013), 156-158.

relationship with UT ensured that those students who completed the education program at the junior college could then transfer to complete their training at the senior university.[22]

Because of the increasing preference for female public school teachers in the early twentieth century, many young women enrolled in preparation for a future career in education. The membership of the Education Club at SAJC was heavily populated by women. Both the cost-effectiveness of using female teachers (who were generally paid less) and the arguments of major figures like Catherine Beecher in the nineteenth century, that the raising and teaching of children was "the peculiar duties of the female sex," led to the increased presence of female teachers in public schools.[23] The college's curriculum, particularly the presence of an education program for training local teachers, led to an almost even gender diversity at SAJC in its early years.

While an overview of the composition of the student body in the 1920s and 1930s is useful, the advantage of a focused study lies in a researcher's ability to delve more deeply into the experiences of students while attending these schools. Even though SAJC's catalogs from 1928-1940 list a myriad of reasons that SAJC served an important function in the city (offering students quality instruction from dedicated teachers, allowing students to live at home under parent's guidance, etc.), the focus of student protest revealed the overarching importance of quality and affordability to SAJC's early students.[24] Student concerns with transfer of credits and alumni performance at senior institutions reflect their emphasis on

---

[22] This was particularly true for the education program which was set up so secondary school education students could transfer into UT's program: "San Antonio Junior College Bulletin: Announcement of Courses for 1928-1929," 24-25.

[23] Catherine E. Beecher, "An Essay on the Education of Female Teachers for the United States, 1835," in Fraser, *The School in the United States: A Documentary History* (Boston: McGraw-Hill, 2001) 61.

[24] "San Antonio Junior College Bulletin: Announcement of Courses for 1928-1929."

quality of education at SAJC. Concerns over quality can also be seen in the consistent advocacy of students and alumni to improve the campus physical plant in order to gain national accreditation. Outside of quality, student protests against a proposed tuition hike in the 1930s shows that one of the major appeals of SAJC was its affordability.

Even though SAJC struggled to improve its campus from the 1920s through the 1940s, a result of the reticence of the San Antonio Independent School District to invest funds, students did not accept the junior college's secondary status sitting down. When the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools denied SAJC's application for accreditation in 1932, students were justifiably worried about the potential transfer of their credits to four-year colleges and universities.[25] The SAJC student newspaper, *The Junior Ranger*, lessened this worry by reassuring students that "at present the school is classified as a first class Junior College by the Texas State Department of Education, and by the Association of Texas Schools and Colleges. This means that Junior College credits are acceptable at every school in Texas and in all of the leading institutions throughout the United States."[26] This rebuttal can be corroborated, at least somewhat, by the University of Texas's continued acceptance of SAJC students. Credits would still be accepted at UT, but signaling a questioning of quality, UT began requiring a grade of C for transferrable credit.[27]

Throughout the early 1930s, *The Junior Ranger* reported on the overall success of SAJC students at senior institutions, particularly at the University of Texas.[28] A report

---

[25] "No Wonder Junior College is Barred by S. A. C.," *San Antonio Express*, February 15, 1932 in *San Antonio College Scrapbook A, 1925-1931*.

[26] "J.C. Credits Good Anywhere," *The Junior Ranger*, February 12, 1932, 1, "The Ranger Image Collection," accessed February 9, 2016, http://sacweb03.sac.alamo.edu/eLibrary/RangerImageCollection.aspx.

[27] "University to Accept Grades Averaging 'C'," *The Junior Ranger*, October 14, 1932, 1.

[28] "J. C. Grads Cop New Honors at Austin," *The Junior Ranger*, March 11, 1932.

released by UT in 1932, the same year that accreditation was denied, claimed that SAJC alumnus were the highest performing junior college transfers at the school. The basis for this claim can be seen in the high percentage of former SAJC students making the honor roll (40 percent) at UT the previous year, in 1931.[29] Considering the seemingly high instructional quality at SAJC, which can be partly attributed to the school's early affiliation with UT, students were clearly upset that funds could not be found to make the campus's physical plant meet the quality of education offered by the institution.

Despite assurances that state recognition of SAJC ensured transfer of credits to public institutions in the state, students and alumni fought for campus improvements throughout the 1930s. The poor state of the campus became a running joke in the student newspaper, and eventually led to an organized effort to pressure the school board for greater financial support. Student discussion of the poor facilities at SAJC reached a boiling point in 1935 and 1936. In 1935, local papers reported on the raising of a flag over SAJC with the words "Orphan's Home" to convey the idea that SAJC students "were the step children of the board of education."[30] A student petition (signed by 200), and the advocacy of a newly formed PTA, again failed in 1936 to gain new facilities, but did wrench minor concessions from the school board. The school was granted general repairs, two cots, a dressing table, paper towel racks, and potentially gas heating.[31] A pattern emerged in the 1930s where student agitation led to small improvements in the form of largely superficial updates and general

[29] "City Students Get High Rating," [newspaper not specified], March 22, 1931 in *San Antonio College Scrapbook A, 1925-1931*.

[30] "College Students Defy Instructions," in *San Antonio College Scrapbook B, 1931-1940,* April 12, 1935, McAllister Collection, San Antonio College Library, San Antonio, TX.

[31] "School Board Improves J.C. with Repairs: Improvements Include Two Cots, Dressing Table for Girls' Room, Paper Towel Racks; Gas Heating Possible," *The Junior Ranger,* November 20, 1936, 1.

maintenance, but the type of renovations necessary to gain accreditation were not forthcoming in the economic climate of the Great Depression.

The anti-tax culture of San Antonio dogged the development of SAJC and led to ongoing discussion on whether the school was worth the cost. San Antonio Junior College had been operating at a loss during the Depression years (the third highest loss of any junior college in the state), when balancing tuition and fees against operating expenses, leading the school board to look for ways to decrease the budgetary burden of SAJC.[32] The same community resistance to taxation that would defeat the plan to form a junior college district in 1941 made it impossible to alleviate this shortfall through taxation, particular in the midst of the "Roosevelt Recession."

In order to balance the city's education budget, the board of trustees called for a tuition increase for the 1937-38 school year. For the previous few years, students had been charged $12.00 per course for tuition (rates already putting the college in the top half of Texas junior colleges in tuition costs). The proposed hike would increase the rate to $12.50 per course.[33] After failing to get anything beyond minimum improvements to the existing campus, students did not take kindly to paying more in tuition. *The Junior Ranger* captures the sentiment of the student body when explaining that "...there are 5 million young people looking for work today who were not looking for work in 1929. They know the difficulty of getting anywhere without the specialized training which college offers...Schools are running on a budget insufficient for efficient operations, and students need money and jobs so they

[32] Frederick Eby and Benjamin Floyd Pittenger, *A Study of the Financing of Public Junior Colleges in Texas*, The University of Texas Bulletin 3126 (Austin, TX: The University of Texas Press, 1931), 27–28.

[33] "San Antonio Junior College Bulletin: Announcements of Courses for 1938-1939," 17, McAllister Collection, San Antonio College Library, San Antonio, TX.

can go to school."[34] An increase in tuition represented a real burden to students struggling to make ends meet, and additional schooling was increasingly seen as a prerequisite to gainful employment.

Although an increase of $.50 per course (a 4 percent increase) does not seem like much, considering the struggling local economy, and the relatively high tuition rate SAJC already had, it is no wonder that students did not take kindly to the proposal. In Frederick Eby and Benjamin Pittenger's survey of junior college finances in Texas, published in 1931, they found that SAJC had the second highest tuition rate in the state.[35] High tuition costs and low-quality campus facilities led students to take action in the winter of 1937.

Citing the tough context of the Great Depression, students coordinated a strike at school registration for the following school year to oppose the increased tuition rates. The registration picket only held up for two days but it did create genuine concern whether enough students would enroll to allow the school to continue to operate.[36] Forging a compromise, the board maintained the tuition hike but allowed students to pay some of the cost later in the year.[37] Along with an extended payment plan, the Board of Education offered some funds for the improvement of the SAJC campus to take away some of the bitterness from the tuition increase. This time the renovations included the purchase of new slate blackboards, improvements to school lighting, and redecorated rooms.[38]

---

[34] "J.C. Strike Voices Call for Better Education," *The Junior Ranger*, February 5, 1937, 2.

[35] Eby and Pittenger, *A Study of the Financing of Public Junior Colleges in Texas*, 21.

[36] "Students Picket Junior College as Registration Gets Underway," *San Antonio Evening News*, February, 1937 in *San Antonio College Scrapbook B, 1931-1940*.

[37] "Tucker Explains Tuition Notes in Call Assembly: Committee Chairman Clarifies Method by Which Students May Meet Tuition Raise; Tells of Improvements to Come," *The Junior Ranger*, February 12, 1937, 1, 4.

[38] "Well! Well! Junior College Gets Repairs," *The Junior* Ranger, February 26, 1937, 1.

The actions of students, particularly in response to the tuition hike, reveals one of the major attractions of SAJC, its low cost. In addition to sensitivity to the cost of schooling, the fear created by the accreditation controversy showed the students' understandable concern that their course credits would transfer to senior institutions. Of all of the reasons for establishing a junior college offered by SAJC in their catalog, the characteristics of the college prized most highly by students were its low cost, convenience, and comparable curriculum to a senior institution. Instead of distinguishing itself as a place of superior education for college underclassmen, the niche the junior college was building lay in its convenience and cost.

While student attention centered primarily on academic and financial issues at SAJC, another notable trend was the high participation rate of the student body in extracurricular activities. Like Navarro Junior College, SAJC fielded several sports teams, including football, track, tennis, basketball, baseball, and swimming.[39] These sports, however, were not as integral to the school's operation as they were at NJC. For instance, the baseball team was discontinued after a ball broke a classroom window in 1931.[40] That this relatively small incident led to the abolishment of an entire sports program shows that sports were more of a diversion than a central function of the school.

On the other hand, academic and social clubs were very popular and well-organized at SAJC during the Era of Establishment. As mentioned early in this chapter, the Education Club sported a large membership. In addition, the school newspaper, the yearbook, and the

[39] Students of San Antonio Junior College, *The Alamo, 1928*.

[40] Students of San Antonio Junior College, *El Alamo, 1931* (San Antonio, TX: San Antonio Junior College, San Antonio, TX), McAllister Collection, San Antonio College Library, San Antonio, TX.

debate team won state and national honors.[41] Social fraternities and mutual interest clubs, particularly the literary interest group Ye Olde Cheshyre Cheese Club and the Pie Eaters fraternity, maintained robust memberships.[42] Despite having to struggle for better facilities while enduring higher than average tuition costs, SAJC students during the Nelson administration forged a positive academic identity for the school through their strong performance after transfer to four-year institutions, and by developing mechanisms for maintaining high academic standards through extracurricular activities.

The lead up to World War II and the hiring of J. O. Loftin as SAJC's new president led to some changes to student life on campus during the 1940s. These changes manifested themselves in revisions of the mission of the college. The 1940 college catalog argued that "in a democracy, education is the birthright of the individual. The welfare of the state as well as the basic interest of the individual demands it."[43] While this idea is far from new, Thomas Jefferson argued this forcefully in the eighteenth century, the application of this idea to SAJC represented a major change in trajectory.[44] Emphasizing increased access to higher education as a mission for the junior college foreshadowed a change from emulation of senior universities to a new idea of the two-year college as an institution offering higher education to students who otherwise might not attend college at all.

---

[41] "College Press Rates 'The Ranger' Only Junior College All-American," *San Antonio Evening News*, November 15, 1955 in *San Antonio College Scrapbook H, 1955-1956*, McAllister Collection, San Antonio College Library, San Antonio, TX; Students of San Antonio Junior College, *El Alamo, 1930* (San Antonio, TX: San Antonio Junior College, San Antonio, TX), McAllister Collection, San Antonio College Library, San Antonio, TX.

[42] A short history of the school's clubs is available in the 1931 yearbook: *El Alamo, 1931*, 71-75, McAllister Collection, San Antonio College Library, San Antonio, TX.

[43] "San Antonio Junior College Bulletin: Announcements of Courses for 1940-1941 Vol. III, No. 2, July 1940," (San Antonio, TX: San Antonio Junior College, 1940), 10, McAllister Collection, San Antonio College Library, San Antonio, TX..

[44] For an example of Thomas Jefferson's equating of democracy with educational access see: James W Fraser, *The School in the United States*, 20.

Some subtle changes to SAJC's curriculum gave substance to the words of this mission of democratization. New programs began to appear that would appeal to adults returning to school, or men and women hoping to move into semi-skilled jobs.[45] In addition to preparatory degree programs, school officials added a new program in 1940 for "A Year of Terminal Education for Students Not Continuing College Education Beyond the Junior College Level."[46] This new course of study included classes in English, math, history, and public speaking. Each of the courses emphasized skills applicable directly to everyday life. For example, the English class assigned passages from *Reader's Digest* and instructed students on writing personal correspondence. The math courses included lessons on personal finances, applicable for students going into any profession. This year of study would appeal most to adult students not interested in pursuing a degree at a four-year university, but picking up skills for non-professional life.

Beyond offering a course of study for adult terminal education, SAJC in 1941 introduced a vocational program as part of a larger initiative by the Texas Association of Junior Colleges. Working out of the San Antonio Vocational and Technical High School, SAJC added a new group of courses specifically for students training for semi-skilled jobs.[47] Courses appearing under the vocational/terminal heading included classes in business administration, drawing courses for engineering, home economics courses, meteorology and navigation courses, and a shop lab. SAJC included the meteorology and navigation courses after the federal government selected the college for the Civil Pilot Training Program by the

[45] By semi-skilled jobs I am referring to positions requiring technical skills that can be attained in the course of a two-year program.

[46] "San Antonio College Bulletin: Announcements of Courses for 1940-1941," 22.

[47] "San Antonio Junior College Bulletin: Announcements of Courses for 1941-1942," 26-27, McAllister Collection, San Antonio College Library, San Antonio, TX.

Civil Aeronautics Administration, an agency created by Franklin Delano Roosevelt in 1939 to oversee non-military aviation.[48]

Despite historians claims that the introduction of terminal vocational programs resulted in conflict between students and junior/community college leadership in the 1920s and 1930s, as portrayed by Labaree and Frye, rising enrollment shows that the introduction of new course options was popular at SAJC in the 1940s.[49] Part of the reason for this lay in the large number of veterans who enrolled after World War II, many of whom were older than typical college students. With different backgrounds than traditional junior college enrollees, many "insisted on vocational courses that the junior college had never offered."[50] San Antonio Junior College enrolled 193 World War II veterans in the years immediately following the conflict according to a local newspaper (though other sources estimate that veteran enrollment was in the 200s or 300s).[51] The only higher education institution in the city to enroll more veterans was Trinity University.

Enrollment at SAJC more than doubled between 1943 and 1946, with the new students enrolling disproportionately in the school's evening division (which was more vocationally oriented). This growth mirrored the expanding enrollment of junior colleges nationally. Between 1944 and 1947 national enrollment increased from 251,290 to nearly

---

[48] For more information on the Civilian Pilot Training Program see: Theresa L. Krauss, "The CAA Helps America Prepare for World War II," Federal Aviation Administration, accessed November 27, 2015, https://www.faa.gov/about/history/milestones/media/The_CAA_Helps_America_Prepare_for_World_WarII.pdf

[49] Frye, *The Vision of the Public Junior College, 1900-1940*; David F. Labaree, "The Rise of the Community College: Markets and the Limits of Educational Opportunity," in *How to Succeed in School Without Really Learning: The Credentials Race in American Education* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1997), 190–223.

[50] Witt et al., *America's Community Colleges*, 129.

[51] Jerome Francis Weynand, *San Antonio College: In the Beginning, 1925-1956* (San Antonio, TX: Adrome House, 2002), 86–87; "Korea Vets Flood Classrooms*," San Antonio Light*, August 30, 1953 in *San Antonio College Scrapbook F, 1954*, McAllister Collection, San Antonio College Library, San Antonio, TX; "More World War II than Korea Vets in College," *San Antonio Light*, November 24, 1954 in *San Antonio College Scrapbook F, 1954*.

half a million, largely as a result of the GI Bill. Veteran enrollment at SAJC continued into the 1950s as men returning from the Korean War (167 total) began to register for courses.[52]

Jerome Weynand, one of these returning veterans, remembers the campus culture in the wake of World War II fondly:

> My remembrance of the time at the old campus, San Antonio Junior College, was the camaraderie I had rejoining a number of my high school buddies--who had served in various branches of the military also and were coming back--and we socialized and fished together, camped out, double dated, stuff like that. To me, the associations—in those two academic years, '46 through '48—were some of the highlights of my life. And the learning seemed to come easily.[53]

The introduction of non-traditional students in the 1940s and 1950s stretched beyond returning veterans. The number of Latino students at the school increased slightly, making up almost 10 percent of the student body by 1946. This number was still not proportional to the size of the Mexican American population in the city, but marks the beginning of a trend towards greater Latino enrollment that would continue during the Era of Expansion. Victoria-María MacDonald offers insight on the slow entrance of Latinos into SAC, and higher education institutions in general, in the years immediately following World War II. She argues that the GI Bill offered new opportunities for Latinos, who served in large numbers during the war, to go to college, though persistent low high school completion rates hampered the pace of Latinos entrance into U.S. colleges.[54]

---

[52] "More World War II than Korea Vets in College," *San Antonio Light*, November 24, 1954 in *San Antonio College Scrapbook F, 1954*.

[53] Jerome Weynand, interview by the author, San Antonio, TX, June 3, 2015.

[54] Victoria-María MacDonald, "Demanding Their Rights: The Latino Struggle for Educational Access and Equity," National Park Service, accessed November 27, 2015, http://www.nps.gov/history/heritageinitiatives/latino/latinothemestudy/education.htm; for a chapter-length

In the mid-1950s, the Go and Learn Club was established at San Antonio College for "women [who] have had a home or career and for some reason or other have decided to go back to school and to continue to learn." The club had 40 initial members including Mrs. Howard W. Peak, whose biography was outlined in a city newspaper. Formerly a housewife taking care of three children, Peak went back to school to become a teacher and attended classes three days a week.[55]

Peak's experience, as a woman seeking greater opportunity through higher education in the 1950s, was not unique. Linda Eisenmann argues in *Higher Education for Women in Postwar America* that, in contrast to the common narrative of women moving back to the home after the war, women in the workforce and in higher education increased in the years after World War II. The GI Bill did lead college campuses to orient their mission to the needs of veterans (similar to what happened at SAC), but the number of women in higher education institutions also grew during the postwar period.[56] San Antonio College's affordability, proximity, and adaptability in scheduling made it a good choice for women with established households looking for training to further their career options.

During the Era of Establishment, the primary concerns of students attending San Antonio Junior College evolved over time. During Nelson's tenure as president, from 1928-1941, predominantly white working and middle class students pushed administration to secure the college's reputation to ensure the smooth transfer of credits to senior higher

---

discussion on the impact of the GI Bill on Latinos see: Angélica Aguilar Rodríguez, Julian Vasquez Heilig, and Allison Prochnow, "Higher Education, the GI Bill, and the Postwar Lives of Latino Veterans and Their Families," in *Latina/os and World War II: Mobility, Agency, and Ideology*, edited by Maggie Rivas-Rodriguez and B. V. Olguín, 59-74 (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2014).

[55] "Go and Learn Club at S. A. College," *San Antonio Express*, March 30, 1958 in *San Antonio College Scrapbook L, 1958*, McAllister Collection, San Antonio College Library, San Antonio, TX.

[56] Linda Eisenmann, *Higher Education for Women in Postwar America, 1945-1965* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2006), 4.

education institutions. With a strong instructional foundation in place, student attention centered instead on updates to the physical plant necessary to gain accreditation. Beyond demanding quality coursework and facilities, SAJC's early students were attracted to the campus primarily due to its affordability. The severe backlash of students to a proposed tuition hike during the Great Depression serves as evidence that getting a quality education at a reasonable price was a key concern for students enrolled at SAJC during the 1930s.

In the stronger postwar economy, and benefitting from federal government benefits through the GI Bill, the importance of affordability began to lessen after J. O. Loftin became the president of the college in 1941. Offering inexpensive coursework still made SAJC appealing, but flexible scheduling (particular the expansion of the evening division) and providing a diverse curricula was increasingly important for the continued growth of the institution. Although the shift to a comprehensive mission for the community college has previously been depicted as an imposition of the administration on an unwilling student body, SAJC/SAC's history suggests that this transition was a reflection of student needs during this time. Explosive expansion in enrollment in the 1940s and 1950s stands as mute evidence to the popularity of this change.

Navarro Junior College

San Antonio Junior College built a niche for itself within the crowded higher education landscape of one of the state's largest cities by offering affordable quality courses and an increasingly diverse curriculum. Free from local competition, Navarro Junior College's appeal lay in its proximity and comfortable campus culture. The original statement of purpose for the school recognized "proximity of the college" as one of NJC's major draws,

but framed this advantage as relating primarily to cost.[57] A look at the sources from this time, however, suggests that the advantages of proximity also lay in ease of transportation, and the opportunity to attend a college with a more comfortable and familiar campus environment than a larger university outside the county.

At the time of NJC's establishment, no public higher education institutions operated in Navarro Country. Those hoping to attend a nearby college would enroll at Baylor University (a private institution one hour away), Southern Methodist University (one hour away), North Texas State College (one and a half hours away), East Texas State Teachers College (two hours away), Sam Houston State Teachers College (two hours away), or Texas A&M University (also two hours away). After attending public grade schools where a graduating class commonly numbered less than thirty, and sometimes was as low as two, going off to a large college a significant distance away could be a daunting prospect for Navarro County residents.[58] The establishment of Navarro Junior College in the conveniently located county seat, Corsicana, and offering on-campus housing, busing services, and familiar faces among the staff, made the new school appealing to young men and women from the community seeking a college education.

As noted in Chapter One, NJC's creation depended heavily on the support of the federal government, particularly the passing of the GI Bill. Unlike San Antonio Junior College, where the student gender ratio remained close to 50/50, NJC's initial enrollment

---

[57] Navarro Junior College Faculty and Administration, "Report of Self Study of Navarro Junior College" (Corsicana, TX: Navarro Junior College, 1963), 6–7, Box B12-a, Pearce Museum Archives at Navarro College, Corsicana, TX.

[58] This was a particular point of emphasis in my interview with Dr. Tommy Stringer, who also wrote a history of Navarro College. He recounted a story where a former student he interviewed was second in a class of two, but took advantage of his opportunity at Navarro Junior College and eventually earned a PhD and worked as a professor at the University of Alabama: Tommy Stringer, interview by the author, Corsicana, TX, May 28, 2015.

was heavily weighted towards men, many of whom were using G.I. benefits. Only 44 out of 238 students who attended NJC during the 1946-1947 school year were women.[59] Even after the original surge of veterans attending the school began to slow down by the end of the 1940s, men still continued to "outnumber girls 2 to 1" on campus.[60]

Instructors remember their time with the school's first students fondly, though noting differences in their behavior due to their background. Margaret Pannill recalled one incident where "a car backfired, and this man dropped to the floor right under the piano. Those sudden explosions he still responded to. But those veterans were a joy to teach…They were a little more mature than the typical college freshman."[61] The maturity of the students can also be seen in enrollment trends at NJC through the early 1950s. While at San Antonio Junior College the number of freshman far outstripped the number of sophomores enrolled during the Era of Establishment, a sign of early transfer to a university or dropping out, these numbers stayed close to even at Navarro Junior College, with freshman enrollment only slightly higher.[62] Scholars and educators have long been alarmed by the high dropout rates at junior/community colleges, but NJC's early years are notable for the high level of retention maintained in enrollment.

Navarro Junior College did a good job accommodating the particular curricular needs of its unique student population by embracing vocational programs early in its history to meet the demands of returning veterans. As the veteran population began to wane, the pace

---

[59] Tommy W. Stringer, *Dreams and Visions: The History of Navarro College* (Waco, TX: Davis Brothers Publishing Co., 1996), 18.

[60] "Boys Outnumber Girls 2 to 1 as Registration Hits 237," *Growl*, October 10, 1949, 1, Box 1-B5-b, folder 10, Pearce Museum Archives at Navarro College, Corsicana, TX.

[61] Margaret Pannill, interview by Dr. Tommy Stringer, Corsicana, TX, December 15, 1977.

[62] An imperfect measure of proportion of freshman versus sophomore students can be seen in the number of students pictured in early yearbooks. But the school newspaper also quoted exact statistics on freshman and sophomore enrollment in 1949: "Boys Outnumber Girls 2 to 1 as Registration Hits 237," *Growl*, October 10, 1949, 1, Box 1-B5-b, folder 10, Pearce Museum Archives at Navarro College, Corsicana, TX.

of curricular change slowed as transfer coursework took center-stage.[63] There is little evidence of student disappointment with the overall direction of the school at NJC during the Era of Establishment, particularly in comparison to the sometimes turbulent relationship between administration and students at SAJC. Quickly updating the campus (helped by the economic context of when the school was established), gaining accreditation quickly, offering a diverse curriculum, and existing free from local higher education competition, led to relatively calm institutional development during this period. Issues like integration, administrative change, and disgruntled international students shook up this placidity in later years, but NJC's first decade remained largely quiet.

Despite the black population making up a significant minority in the county, integration did not occur at NJC during this era.[64] Administrators claim that even after the *Brown v. Board* ruling created an opening for black residents to try to enroll, no attempt for a black man or woman to attend occurred until the 1960s.[65] This trend is surprising considering that the county lacked an all-black junior college campus (like St. Philip's) as an alternative to NJC. These developments suggest that the higher profile of San Antonio made it a battleground for integrationists more than the presence of conditions conducive to judicial reform. The absence of an "equal" campus for black students to attend provided grounds for protest even under the *Plessy v. Ferguson* decision (which *Brown* overturned). Navarro

---

[63] For an in-depth look at curriculum change over time please refer to the final chapter of this dissertation. While Navarro College initially adopted a curriculum with a substantial amount of terminal coursework (about 16 percent of available courses), this number stayed relatively stable until the 1970s.

[64] The 1950 census lists the black population as making up almost 25 percent of the total population of Navarro County (9897 of 39,916 total people in the county): Bureau of the Census, "Census of Population: 1950: Characteristics of the Population, Number of Inhabitants, General and Detailed Characteristics of the Population: Texas," ed. Howard G. Brunsman, Volume 2, Part 43 (Washington D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1952), 43-190.

[65] Dr. Ben Jones, interview by Dr. Tommy Stringer, Corsicana, TX, January 7, 1985, Pearce Museum Archives at Navarro College, Corsicana, TX.

County's relative smallness put the onus for racial change on the local black community due to less secure connections with national organizations pushing for desegregation.

While the campus was overwhelmingly white and male during this period, the composition of the student body began to change in the mid-1950s. With the number of veterans at the college dropping, the gender gap on campus began to close. In terms of ethnic diversity, the end of the Era of Establishment saw the first introduction of international students at NJC (beginning during the college's second year). The first international students to attend were Demetrios and John Dellaportas from Athens, Greece. They knew about NJC because their uncle, who lived in Navarro County, had been in communication with his brother in Athens about his nephews coming to the United States to study.[66] Beyond familial connections, the direct advocacy of NJC faculty also led to the introduction of international students on campus. Cecil Williams, an instructor in the Business Department, attracted Bolivian students to NJC after teaching in the Latin American nation for one year on a grant. The year after completing his grant, five Bolivian students enrolled and others followed moving into the Era of Expansion.[67]

Although the size of the international student population was relatively small during this era, their numbers would increase noticeably in the decades to come. International student enrollment in junior/community colleges has not been widely discussed in historical studies, but for both of the colleges here, particularly in the 1960s and 1970s, they left significant marks on the development of these campuses. Unlike Navarro County residents, who were mainly attracted to the school because of its proximity and familiar campus

---

[66] "2 Greek Hi-School Graduates have Enrolled in Local Junior College; Expect to Arrive Soon," *Corsicana Daily Sun*, October 23, 1946, 12.

[67] Stringer, *Dreams and Visions*, 33; Margaret Pannill, interview by Dr. Tommy Stringer, Corsicana, TX, December 15, 1977, Pearce Museum Archives at Navarro College, Corsicana, TX.

culture, international students were attracted to the school because of its affordability and open door admissions policies.[68]

Affordability, and particularly access to G.I. benefits, certainly helped Navarro Junior College attract the necessary students to get off the ground, but it was administrators and faculty members' receptivity to the needs of students and the community that made the college a fixture in the county. Capitalizing on the college's proximity advantage, administrators provided bus transportation to campus beginning during NJC's inaugural year.[69] Student and former bus driver Jack Bradley remembers picking up students from his hometown of Frost. Other students would operate buses going to other country towns like Kerens and Rice. Bradley explained how the buses operated:

> Whoever wanted to go to school in Corsicana, they would ride down, we would go by the high school. We would pick them up at locations of different students, and take them out to the airport where the college was in those days. And each town had a situation the same way: with a student driver going by--not going by their house per say, but going by different locations--and they knew where to meet. So that's the way we got to school.[70]

While attending a four year college one or two hours away would likely require students from Navarro Country to relocate, these same students could pick up a bus blocks from their

---

[68] Chapter Six will go into greater detail on the experience of international students at SAC and NC. During the Era of Establishment enrollment of international students was small, and sources on their experience are sparse. During the Era of Establishment, however, international students increased in number and influence on both campuses.

[69] "Announce Schedule of Transportation Navarro Jr. College," *Corsicana Daily Sun*, September 14, 1946, 10.

[70] Jack Bradley, interview by the author, Corsicana, TX, May 27, 2015.

house to enroll in comparable coursework (at a more affordable price) at the local junior college.

The way the bus system operated also lent itself to creating a closer campus culture. The buses only ran one cycle per day, picking up students in the morning from their homes to get them to campus before the first courses began, and taking them back to their hometowns in the afternoon. Ruthellen Scott remembers spending her downtime between classes, and waiting for the afternoon bus, getting to know her classmates. Instead of feeling intimidated as one of the few female students at NJC at the time, she found her time on campus liberating. "Between classes we would play cards. And, you just got to know people. A lot of people—I rode the bus out to Navarro. And that was all day because it didn't come back in until, I guess, about 4:00. And that was unusual for me. But I got to meet a lot of people from little towns around here that I wouldn't have known otherwise."[71]

The commuter culture which can undercut student body cohesion and comraderie, a particular problem at junior colleges which often do not have on-campus housing, was absent at Navarro Junior College. Converted barracks provided rooms for veterans as well as county residents looking for some separation from their families. The new campus on Highway 31 had housing for up to 40 women and 80 men, with all furniture provided (though no linens or curtains).[72] Instead of the split between on-campus students and commuters creating a divide on campus, the logistics of the bus schedule helped bridge the social gap between these two

[71] Ruthellen Scott, interview by the author, Corsicana, TX, May 28, 2015.

[72] "Navarro Junior College: Announcements for 1953-1954" (Corsicana, TX: Navarro Junior College, 1953), 19, Pearce Museum Archives at Navarro College, Corsicana, TX. Early on-campus housing was also mentioned in interviews conducted by Tommy Stringer: James Edgar, interview by Dr. Tommy Stringer, Corsicana, TX, February 7, 1978, Pearce Museum Archives at Navarro College, Corsicana, TX; Margaret Pannill, interview by Dr. Tommy Stringer, Corsicana, TX, December 15, 1977.

groups. Although students living at home did not sleep on campus, the long period between bus rides ensured that they became invested in campus life.

The consistent presence of students on campus, even outside of required time in classes, led to the growth of an impressive array of extracurricular activities at NJC. Athletic programs provided some students with a chance to compete, but even more students a chance to sit in the stands and support their classmates. Jack Bradley recalls that "there was really a lot of things going on, on campus. We had good football teams. We had good baseball teams. We had basketball teams. We all enjoyed going. We had bonfires we enjoyed before a lot of these games. We just had a lot of good times together." [73]

While San Antonio Junior College fielded teams in multiple sports, athletics was not nearly as fundamental to campus life in comparison to NJC. The idea of cancelling an athletic program because of a broken window would have been unthinkable at Navarro Junior College. The school's first yearbook dedicated ten pages to the football program, including a team picture, individual pictures, and a written description of each game the team played the previous season.[74] Similarly, coverage of the basketball team spread across six pages, comprised of individual shots of each player and short descriptions of their particular contribution to the team.[75] Throughout my interviews for this project, attending sporting events stood out as a key social activity for students, bringing the campus closer together.

While athletics were prioritized by all parts of the school community, from administration down to students, social and academic clubs also made up a key part of campus life. Though not published as consistently as *The Junior Ranger*, Navarro Junior

---

[73] Jack Bradley, interview by the author, Corsicana, TX, May 27, 2015.

[74] Students of Navarro Junior College, *The 1947 El Navarro* (Corsicana, TX: Navarro Junior College), Box 1-B15-b, Pearce Museum Archives at Navarro College, Corsicana, TX.

[75] Ibid.

College also printed a school newspaper (*The Growl*), in addition to the well put together yearbooks cited above. Although the initial clubs on campus were primarily social, and gender segregated, by the time the campus moved to its new site on Highway 31 the diversity of club opportunities increased noticeably. The catalog for the 1952 school year listed a large group of academic and interest-based clubs including: musical organizations (band, chorus, and the Senoritas drill team), a student-faculty council, Phi Theta Kappa honor society, Dramatics Club, Future Teachers Club, Spanish Club, N-Club (for athletes), Business Administration Club, the NJC Aggies (for agriculture students), and a Pre-Engineering Club. All of these clubs maintained considerable memberships, seen in group pictures in the college yearbooks, despite the relatively small size of the student body.[76]

Outside of formal organizations, dances and theme-based social events offered opportunities for all students on campus to get together outside of class. Thanksgiving, Christmas, and Sweetheart dances (not holiday specific) were well-attended by couples. Students embraced Ranch Day, nearly uniformly dressed in cowboy and cowgirl gear. The popularity of homecoming events show the sense of belonging that transcended the time men and women spent at the school as enrolled students.[77]

When asked about their overall experience at Navarro Junior College, interviewees praised the school for the educational opportunities it offered, but also because of the relationships they built while attending. Ruthellen Scott finished high school early, and NJC offered her an opportunity to continue her schooling in a comfortable campus environment

[76] "Navarro Junior College Bulletin: Announcements for 1952-1953" (Corsicana, TX: Navarro Junior College, 1952), 16-17, Pearce Museum Archives at Navarro College, Corsicana, TX.

[77] School yearbooks included photographs taken from these various social events. For an example see: *El Navarro, 1955* (Corsicana, TX: Navarro Junior College, 1955), Pearce Museum Archives at Navarro College, Corsicana, TX.

despite apprehension due to her young age. She enjoyed getting to meet people from across the county and the sense of independence she gained as a student at NJC.[78] Both Scott and Bradley recognized that without Navarro Junior College, many county residents would not have attended college at all.[79] Its convenient location and low cost made a college education accessible.

Furthermore, the social aspect of attending a college continues to enrich the lives of NJC alumni. Scott and Bradley are members of the "Barrack's Bunch," an alumni group made up of those students who attended NJC while it still operated at the former flight school. Members of the group still attend homecoming activities and are readily recognized by those currently at the school. The continued engagement of former students in a college they attended almost 70 years ago is a testament to the special place Navarro Junior College continues to hold in the hearts of its former students.[80]

Conclusion

The previous historiography describes the typical junior college student during the Era of Establishment as white and working or middle class. After World War II, the demographics of the junior college began to change, particularly with the influx of veterans taking advantage of GI Bill benefits. Historians suggest that junior college students enrolled in these early years with hopes to transfer to a senior institution, despite the wishes of

[78] Ruthellen Scott, interview by the author, Corsicana, TX, May 28, 2015.

[79] Jack Bradley, interview by the author, Corsicana, TX, May 27, 2015.

[80] Navarro (Junior) College has had an active group of alumni since the beginning of the school. A major function of the N-Club was to keep alumni involved on campus. As mentioned in a previous chapter, alumni created a scholarship program for later students. As early as 1948, student leaders (specifically student body president Bill McKie) called for the creation of an alumni association: The Students of Navarro Junior College, *El Navarro of 1948* (Corsicana, TX: Navarro Junior College), Box 1-B15-b, Pearce Museum Archives at Navarro College, Corsicana, TX.

national junior college leadership to expand the college's mission by introducing more terminal vocational and adult education programs.

For the most part, the schools studied here followed these trends. The student population was generally white, and the importance of cost as a reason for enrollment highlights the working and middle class origins of early students at these schools. Differences in when the two campuses were established led to deviations in the college curriculum (with Navarro College offering a greater slate of vocational courses in its initial catalog), but the transfer function remained central to each campus's mission.

While the base foundational facts included in the previous historiography generally hold true at the colleges studied here, the historical interpretation of these facts can be questioned when investigating junior college development at the institutional level. Historians' suggestions that there was an active conflict between leadership's desire to extend the curriculum beyond transfer coursework and students' desire to focus on traditional academic classes did not surface in my research. Both schools integrated vocational coursework into the curriculum, particularly in the years after World War II, but rising enrollments during this time of change suggests that new students were attracted by the expansion of the college mission instead of being turned off by a shift away from transfer curricula. The smallness of both campuses, particularly Navarro Junior College, made appeasing student wishes vital to the survival of the institution. The pace of curricular innovation related more to the composition of the student body (particularly the introduction of veterans) and the health of the overall economy (with financial stability allowing for innovation) than an ideological conflict between national leaders and junior college students. Even at San Antonio Junior College, where administrators were active in state and national

organizations (and presumably were aware of calls for greater integration of vocational programs), there was no evidence of campus conflict over the state of the curriculum.

Scholars have portrayed the eventual integration of terminal vocational programs as evidence of the filtering function of the junior college.[81] The experiences of the students at Navarro Junior College and San Antonio Junior College suggests that the impact of their enrollment amounted to more than a diversion of their educational goals. In the case of San Antonio Junior College, students prized the opportunity to get a quality education at an affordable price, a combination of factors not available at the private universities in the city. When either of these institutional advantages were threatened, in the case of a proposed tuition hike or failed accreditation applications, students actively sought reform to make sure their college was meeting their needs. Student were active agents in the development of SAJC, and viewed it as a springboard for future success instead of an obstacle to social mobility.

Steven Brint, one of the two authors of *The Diverted Dream*, the key text in the revisionist historiography on community colleges, admitted later that he had underestimated the advantages of an Associate's degree, and that community colleges offered the only option for attending a higher education institution for some of its students when revisiting his initial arguments 14 years later.[82] The experience of students at Navarro Junior College highlight the importance of these colleges as places of opportunity, instead of dwellings of diversion. Before NJC was established, residents hoping to pursue post-high school studies had to face the possibility of leaving the county, a possibility that was worrisome both socially and

[81] This was a major argument in Steven Brint and Jerome Karabel's work: Brint and Karabel, *The Diverted Dream.*

[82] Steven G. Brint, "Few Remaining Dreams: Community Colleges since 1985," *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 586, no. 1 (2003): 27.

economically. With Navarro Junior College as an option, students from small towns now could attend a school for two years that offered affordable comparable coursework on a campus that was less intimidating socially. The school's receptivity to the needs of the community helped to erode the social and economic barriers which previously may have stopped county residents from attending a higher education institution.

The primary purposes of each school were shaped by their local environment, but in both cases these purposes benefitted students instead of working against their interests. Prioritizing strong faculty recruitment, close ties with the University of Texas, and trying to keep costs low for students, helped SAJC establish its own place in the crowded San Antonio higher education landscape, surviving the tough times of the Great Depression. Establishing a college campus in an area too sparsely populated to support a university, and building that campus to provide an academic and social bridge for students from small towns, made NJC an attractive option for county residents, many of whom would otherwise not have enrolled at a college at all.

SECTION II
THE ERA OF EXPANSION (1955-1980)

During the Era of Establishment, both San Antonio Junior College and Navarro Junior College struggled through growing pains to establish a solid foundation for future advancement. Local circumstances and the state of the wider economy affected the pace of development at each campus, but both schools reached important milestones by 1955. Gaining accreditation, establishing independent junior college districts with taxing powers, and procuring state-level support, left both of these schools in prime position to expand greatly in the strong economic climate of the late 1950s and 1960s. The same conditions which allowed for expansion at these colleges during this period also led to the rapid expansion of the community college movement, and higher education in general, across the nation.

Benefitting from the strong economy and increased federal support of higher education, community colleges were built at an astounding pace throughout the United States during the postwar years. "By the fall of 1970 there were 1,091 junior colleges nationwide, an increase of 413 colleges in ten years."[1] Enrollment quadrupled at junior/community colleges over the same period.[2] Much of this expansion occurred in areas previously reticent to support community colleges because of the presence of more established higher education institutions in the region, including urban areas nationwide and the Northeast.[3] The exponential growth of the community college movement began to slow down by the mid-1970s, concurrent with a weakening national economy, but overall the Era of Expansion saw

[1] Allen A. Witt et al., *America's Community Colleges: The First Century* (Washington D.C.: The Community College Press, 1994); Michael Olivas data shows that the number of public two year colleges nearly tripled between 1958 and 1974, from 309 to 901: Michael A. Olivas et al., *The Dilemma of Access: Minorities in Two Year Colleges* (Washington D.C.: Published for ISEP by Howard University Press, 1979), 11.

[2] Witt et al., *America's Community Colleges*.

[3] Ibid.

the community college transform from an emerging, but still suspect, higher education experiment, to a mainstay within the United States education system.

The increased presence of the federal government helped to solidify the community colleges place in the higher education landscape. In the midst of the Cold War, the federal government came to "dominate the financial support of research and to lead in public support of students through financial aid."[4] The support of research was rooted in Cold War competition in technological advancement, and led to the ascendance of research universities like Stanford.[5] Applied research was the focus of federal funds in the years immediately after World War II, with money increasingly allocated to basic research (more broadly theoretical research, particularly in STEM subjects) moving into the 1950s.[6]

The social movements of the 1960s, particularly the activism of the New Left, helped to change the trajectory of higher education funding. With universities coming under increased scrutiny for establishing questionable ties with the federal government (particularly the Department of Defense) and private industries that could undercut their intellectual integrity, funding shifted from applied and basic research towards combatting issues of social justice and access.[7] The civil rights-based movements of the 1960s consistently pointed to equal education access as a key component of establishing an equitable society, a more palatable reform proposal for national lawmakers since it was based on the American ethos

---

[4] Clark Kerr, *The Great Transformation in Higher Education, 1960-1980* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1991), 203.

[5] Rebecca S. Lowen, *Creating the Cold War University: The Transformation of Stanford* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997).

[6] Roger L. Geiger, *Research and Relevant Knowledge: American Research Universities since World War II* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993).

[7] Ibid., 230–270.

of opportunity instead of entitlement.[8] The Higher Education Act of 1965 marked a shift in the federal government's approach to higher education funding, as federal funds increasingly went to support financial aid to students instead of research dollars to institutions.[9]

The community college benefitted from the federal government's approach to higher education funding throughout the Era of Expansion. When federal dollars were concentrated on research in the early years of the Cold War, a real fear began to grow that the research university was relegating the education of students to a secondary role. As Rebecca Lowen explains in her investigation of Stanford from World War II through the 1960s, "the leaders of the nation's universities, along with patrons and scientists, strongly influenced the creation of the cold war university. For both institutional and ideological reasons, they favored and promoted development of heavily subsidized scientific work and stressed the production of knowledge over the education of students."[10] With universities concentrating on high-level research to the potential detriment of instruction, community colleges filled a more concrete position as institutions dedicated to the teaching of students. Furthermore, the increasing emphasis of community colleges on vocational/terminal coursework (beginning in the 1940s) offered a clear and separate path from the high-level research focus of the nation's universities.[11]

---

[8] For an example of a civil rights leaders views on the importance of education see: Martin Luther King, Jr., "The Purpose of Education," *The Maroon Tiger*, 1947, accessed on December 29, 2015, http://www.drmartinlutherkingjr.com/thepurposeofeducation.htm.

[9] George B. Vaughan, *The Community College in America: A Short History* (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1985), 18–19.

[10] Lowen, *Creating the Cold War University: The Transformation of Stanford*, 9.

[11] For an explanation of the shifting priorities of the community college after WWII see: Jesse Parker Bogue, *The Community College* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1950); Jesse P. Bogue, "The Community College," *Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors* 34, no. 2 (July 1, 1948): 285–95, doi:10.2307/40220284; for an explanation of shifts in the community college curriculum and enrollments in the 1970s see: W. Norton Grubb, "Vocationalizing Higher Education: The Causes of Enrollment and Completion in Public Two-Year Colleges, 1970-1980," *Economics of Education Review* 7, no. 3 (1988): 302.

Community colleges also benefitted from the federal government's post-1960s commitment to offering greater access to higher education. Increased availability of financial aid benefitted the community college's clientele greatly, since these schools' low cost and local availability (reducing living costs) had traditionally made them attractive to working class students. In addition, the general upsurge in college attendance across United States higher education in this period allowed universities to become more selective in their admissions.[12] Community colleges' continued promotion of the open door made them a natural resting spot for those students not able to attend universities for either financial or academic reasons.

Data unearthed by community college and general higher education scholars shows the disproportionate importance of public two-year colleges in offering access to populations traditionally underrepresented in higher education. Michael Olivas, in his study of minority access to two year colleges in 1979, found that "minority students accounted for over 20% of all enrollments in two year colleges...Blacks enroll 50% of their students in two year institutions; Asians, 52%; Hispanics, 59%; American Indians, 67%."[13] Beyond offering access to racial and ethnic minorities, researchers have also found that the working class, regardless of social background, was increasingly found in community colleges during the Era of Expansion.

David Karen studied enrollment patterns in higher education from 1960-1986 related to social and economic background and found that populations with greater political mobilization (particularly women and blacks) saw greater gains in enrollment, particularly

---

[12] This was the period where admissions examinations (like the SAT) became commonplace and essential in admissions decisions as discussed by: John R. Thelin, *A History of American Higher Education*, 2nd ed. (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2011), 302.

[13] Olivas et al., *The Dilemma of Access*, 25.

enrollment in elite institutions, during the Era of Expansion.[14] Populations with weaker political mobilization, specifically the working class, saw less concrete gains. "At public two-year colleges, the students from poorer families increased their representation from 17 to 20 percent in this period, while the students from well-off homes decreased their representation from 11 to 9. This data based on income, then, supports the notion that, as more working-class students have entered postsecondary institutions, they have become relatively more concentrated in the lowest tier."[15] Greater access to higher education overall led to larger enrollments across the board, but community colleges, as a result of political mobilization correlating with access to elite institutions, became more identifiable as a primary educator of the working class.

The prominence of the working class in the community college during the Era of Expansion has made this period a key point of historiographical conflict. The traditional junior/community college historiography views the growing enrollment of community colleges, particularly the enrollment of underserved populations, as a symbol of the democratizing function of these institutions. As George Vaughan notes, "perhaps the most important concept to influence the development of the community college was the belief that all Americans should have access to higher education."[16] The community college offered opportunities to those students who previously did not have access to higher education institutions.

On the other end of the historiography, however, revisionist scholars worry that the rise of minority and working class enrollments, concurrent with the expansion of

---

[14] David Karen, "The Politics of Class, Race, and Gender: Access to Higher Education in the United States, 1960-1986," *American Journal of Education* 99, no. 2 (1991), 208-237.

[15] Ibid., 220.

[16] Vaughan, *The Community College in America*, 18.

terminal/vocational programs, signals that these schools served as a diverter of potential social mobility. The change in public two year colleges' names, from "junior" to "community" colleges, was not just a rebranding, but was meant to represent a real shift in the mission of the college to more fully embrace the educational needs of the communities they served. The community college incorporated more vocational and adult education programs to appeal to a larger segment of its locale. Sociologists and historians view this change not as an expansion of opportunity, but a means to filter working class students into low-tier vocations (and away from universities).[17] The community college, in the revisionist narrative, becomes a gate gilded in the golden light of democratization, but a gate that nonetheless separates the working class from the ivory tower it protects. As L. Steven Zwerling puts it, "instead of blunting the pyramid of the American social and economic structure, the community college plays an essential role in maintaining it. It has become just one more barrier put between the poor and the disenfranchised and the decent and respectable stake in the social system which they seek."[18] One of the major goals of this section will be to assess the impact of community college education on the students it served at the individual level (particular through oral histories) in order to see whether greater access truly allowed for greater opportunity.

Whether the community college was an institution of opportunity or diversion, the large increase in number of colleges and enrollment made it impossible for state governments

---

[17] Burton R. Clark, *The Open Door College: A Case Study.* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960); Steven G. Brint and Jerome Karabel, *The Diverted Dream: Community Colleges and the Promise of Educational Opportunity in America, 1900-1985* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989); J. M. Beach, *Gateway to Opportunity?: A History of the Community College in the United States* (Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, LLC, 2010).

[18] L. Steven Zwerling, *Second Best: The Crisis of the Community College* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1976), xvii.

to continue ignoring the important place of the public two-year college within a state's higher education system. States began devising holistic higher education plans to more effectively define the missions of different higher education institutions and to regulate their operations during the Era of Expansion. The most famous of these plans was the Master Plan of 1960, created by Clark Kerr for the state of California. Within this plan, the community colleges of the state provided "a port of first entry for all students," while state college's (like Cal State-Fullerton) automatically accepted the top 33 percent of high school students and conferred bachelor's and master's degrees, and institutions in the University of California system drew from the top 10 percent and held the "exclusive right among public institutions to confer the doctoral degree."[19]

Texas, following Sue Blair's claim that "Texas has consistently lagged in terms of state recognition, coordination and funding of public community/junior colleges," was not the trailblazer that California was in devising higher education master plans, but the creation of the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) in 1965 signified a change in the administration of the state's community colleges.[20] The need for greater coordination of the state's public two-year colleges was acute considering that Texas ranked "second [in the nation] in the number of public junior colleges and freshman and sophomore students enrolled" in 1960.[21]

---

[19] Thelin, *A History of American Higher Education*, 287.

[20] Sue Johnson Blair, "The Emergence and Development of the Community/Junior College in Texas" (Ph.D. Diss, Texas Tech University, 1991), iii; Randolph B. Campbell, *Gone to Texas: A History of the Lone Star State* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003), 135; Despite Blair's claims that Texas has lagged behind in governance, others have lauded the coordination of Texas's higher education institutions since the creation of the THECB: Gerardo E De Los Santos, "A Comparative Study of State-Level Community College Governance Structures in Texas and Illinois," (Ph.D. Diss, University of Texas, 1997), 134.

[21] Leland L. Medsker, *The Junior College: Progress and Prospect.* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960), 279.

The creation on the THECB did not lead to a plan quite as concrete as what was adopted in California, but a master plan for the state was proposed and accepted less than five years after the creation of the board. The plan emphasized making community colleges accessible to all persons in the state. "To achieve this goal, fifty-three regions were proposed; and a public junior college was believed feasible in each region." Community colleges were charged with specific tasks including offering transfer coursework, as well as "responsibility in the technical-occupational area…[with] particular attention…given to the economic and occupational needs and opportunities in the geographic area served by each college."[22]

Previously, requirements that state funding would only be available for coursework also "offered in one or more state-supported four-year colleges" had hampered the expansion of terminal/vocational programs at Texas's two-year colleges, but the new master plan allowed for the rapid expansion of these programs.[23] "By the fall of 1973, the enrollment in general academic work and vocational-technical work was almost evenly divided…This was a marked shift from enrollment that was almost 66 percent academic in 1968 [a year before the master plan was adopted]."[24]

The two decades following the adoption of the THECB's master plan saw not only curricular changes, but also greater state funding of community colleges in general. Across higher education in the state, government appropriations increased by 327 percent between 1968 and 1989.[25] The greater investment of the state in the community college helped stimulate changes in the composition of college coursework and helped maintain the growth

[22] Blair, "The Emergence and Development of the Community/Junior College in Texas," 127–128.
[23] Medsker, *The Junior College*, 281.
[24] Blair, "The Emergence and Development of the Community/Junior College in Texas," 143.
[25] Ibid., 144.

of Texas's community colleges in the 1970s, with enrollment numbers increasing over 200 percent over the course of the decade.[26]

The increased role of the federal and state government in higher education impacted the development of both San Antonio College and Navarro College during this period. Because of San Antonio College's larger size and more consistent grant writing, the influence of the federal government, both as a funder and a regulator, was felt earlier and more acutely than at Navarro College. Federal dollars were put to use in building projects in the 1960s which improved college facilities at SAC generally, but particularly benefitted recently incorporated vocational programs. Following the trend visible during the integration of SAC, social justice legislation passed in response to the social movements of the 1960s empowered denizens of the schools to press for progressive change on campus, citing federal law to attack perceived discrimination in employment and treatment of students. SAC's physical location, in one of the nation's largest and diverse cities, ensured that national attention would shape its development.

In contrast, the impact of the state government was more evident at Navarro College. An influx of federal dollars, beyond financial aid to individual students, was not seen at Navarro College until the latter years of the 1970s (in fact, community funding was more significant in building projects in the 1960s than federal funding at NC). Eventual federal funding was a result of state-level reforms which forced NC to shift its priorities or face barriers to its institutional growth. The creation of the state's master plan led directly to the establishment of competing community colleges in surrounding counties which caused enrollment numbers to dwindle at NC. Alarmed by the stagnation of the campus during a

[26] Ibid., 151.

period of general higher education expansion, the college's board of trustees brought in a new, more entrepreneurial president who made the incorporation of technical/vocational coursework a higher priority for the school, fueled by grants from the federal government.[27]

Similar to the previous era, administration maintained more power at Navarro College than at San Antonio College. This trend is most apparent when assessing the impact of a change in administration at each campus. San Antonio College maintained relative administrative continuity throughout this period through inside hires. Navarro College, on the other hand, used an outside hire when replacing the college president in the mid-1970s as a deliberate way to reform the campus and make it more desirable for students. Changes in curriculum, funding, and composition of the faculty and staff were more apparent during times of administrative change at Navarro College than at San Antonio College. Greater faculty continuity at SAC, a persistent trend from the previous era, allowed instructors to build a stronger base at their campus than their counterparts at NC. This period saw the creation of a relatively powerful faculty senate at SAC, the adoption of a tenure policy, and an increasing insistence on due process being carried out in the case of faculty member firings. In contrast, a change in administration led to the mass reshaping of the college faculty at NC with little recourse for instructors.[28]

Despite differences in the role of the government, administration, and faculty at each of the studied colleges, there were some clear similarities in the experiences of students at both campuses during the Era of Expansion. Steven Brint's admission that he, and his co-author, had understated the importance of the community college as the only point of higher

---

[27] The impact of the community and the government at each campus will be the major topic of Chapter Four.

[28] The relative power of administration and faculty at each campus will be the major topic of Chapter Five.

education access for many of its students in *The Diverted Dream*, and that the benefits of an Associate's degree were similarly understated, is portrayed as only a small mistake in his later article revisiting the findings of his original work.[29] Interviews with students and faculty members at these campuses made it clear that these two advantages of attending a community college were more significant than Brint's article would lead one to believe. At both schools, students and faculty members mentioned that attending a community college was their (or their students) only chance to attend a higher education institution, and that attending the school held benefits for them in later life, whether economic or social. Perhaps the community college does not lead to the level of social mobility that some scholars would like. Perhaps the overly large mission of the college made it difficult to carry out all of its tasks exemplarily. Perhaps open access led to difficult conditions for instruction and retention. And perhaps the community college has had (and still has) problems, but that does not mean that it has not provided possibilities.[30]

[29] Steven G. Brint, "Few Remaining Dreams: Community Colleges since 1985," *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 586, no. 1 (2003): 16–37.

[30] The experience of the community college student at each of these campuses will be the major topic of Chapter Six.

CHAPTER 4
FEDERAL FUNDS, STATE SUPPORT, AND COMMUNITY-CONSCIOUSNESS: COMMUNITY AND GOVERNMENT DURING THE ERA OF EXPANSION

During the Era of Establishment, the Texas government was notable more for its absence than its direct impact on the state's junior colleges. The state's slow movement to fund and regulate junior colleges made community support a determinative factor in the pace of development for each of the colleges selected for this study in their early years. San Antonio Junior College struggled to progress after its initial relationship with the University of Texas was aborted. Only in the final years of the Era of Establishment did the combination of greater federal support (particularly through the GI Bill), legislation approving state funding, and an improved local economy allow San Antonio Junior College to finally improve its campus, gain accreditation, and expand enrollment. Navarro Junior College, located in a county free from higher education competition and more attuned to the needs of its locale in terms of staff, curriculum, and extracurricular activities, enjoyed greater community support and more rapid development in its first decade of development.

The nature of the United States' economic recovery after World War II, based more on urban development and manufacturing than agricultural expansion, left Navarro Junior College in a tenuous position as it tried to consolidate its early gains.[1] While San Antonio's economy improved measurably in the postwar years, Navarro County's cotton production plummeted. Beyond a false oil boom in the late 1950s, the county struggled economically

[1] For a discussion on the transformation of the agricultural economy of the South during these years, particularly the negative impact of these changes on small farmers and agricultural laborers, please see: Jack Temple Kirby, *Rural Worlds Lost: The American South, 1920-1960* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1987).

and saw its population fall to its lowest level in the twentieth century (31,027) in 1970.[2] With the initial surge of returning veterans to populate the campus slowing down, and with its local tax base eroding, Navarro College increasingly leaned on state funding and continued attempts to engage the community in order to continue to develop during the Era of Expansion.

While the state government was also important in the development of San Antonio College after 1955, the federal government was a more visible player in the school's expansion in comparison to Navarro Junior College. Funding from the federal government, through the Vocational Education Act, accelerated the incorporation of a more comprehensive curriculum at SAC through building projects in support of vocational/technical programs. Both financial aid provided to students through the Higher Education Act and draft deferments granted to college students during the Vietnam War, helped swell enrollment in the late 1960s and early 1970s. SAC's visibility as one of the largest public colleges in the state also led to greater federal oversight of the campus. Similar to the spotlight placed on SAC during integration, legislation and regulations passed by the federal government in response to the social movements of the 1960s led to greater attention being placed on SAC's hiring practices, in terms of gender and ethnic diversity, during the Era of Expansion.

As the subsequent discussion will show, outside factors continued to have a determinative effect on community college development in Texas in the years from 1955-1980, irrespective of major differences in local context. Despite the preoccupation of

[2] Julie G. Miller, "Navarro County," *Handbook of Texas Online* (http://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/hcn02), accessed January 01, 2016. Uploaded on June 15, 2010. Published by the Texas State Historical Association.

previous histories on the impact of local administrators and national community college leaders on institutional development, the history of these two colleges suggests that broad political and economic forces had as much to do with the size and shape of these campuses than the ideological direction proposed by the American Association of Junior Colleges. Local context impacted the relative importance of these outside forces (community, state government, and federal government), but at both campuses sources of funding were key in not only sustaining daily operations, but also shaping how each campus expanded during United States higher education's "Golden Age."[3]

Navarro (Junior) College

Conditions at the beginning of the Era of Expansion at Navarro Junior College justified optimism for the college's future. Worries about the long-term health of the college following the graduation of World War II veterans were largely unfounded, as an invested community, increased state funding, and accreditation by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools signaled a bright future for the school. Despite Navarro County's uneven recovery from the Depression, the discovery of a new oilfield in East Corsicana in 1956 brought new life to the county's economy.[4] Despite high hopes of a boom to equal what the county enjoyed in early twentieth century, the yield from these new wells was disappointingly low since "the field had been depleted in the first boom."[5] With agricultural

[3] John Thelin calls the years from 1945-1970 the "Golden Age" of U.S. higher education in his survey history of these years: John R. Thelin, *A History of American Higher Education*, 2nd ed. (Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2011), 260.

[4] Jack A. Stroube, "The History of the Petroleum Industry in Navarro County," in *The Navarro County Scroll for the Year 1964* (Corsicana, TX: Navarro County Historical Society, 1964), 54-55, Box OS-B27-a, Pearce Museum Archives at Navarro College, Corsicana, TX.

[5] Ibid.

production limping, and the energy sector tapped out, the county economy began to diversity with the "most growth in employment from 1953 to 1980 in construction, wholesale trades, finances, and services."[6]

Without the security of a strong local economy to generate revenue for the campus through property taxes, NJC leaned on state support, community philanthropy, and local bonds to fund the school's expansion. While local taxes remained a primary source of funding during the 1950s, between 30 and 35 percent of college funds, local tax support made up only 6.4 percent of NJC's revenue by 1980.[7] Early school leaders' decision to engage the community in the college's development was key to filling in the gap left by diminishing tax revenue over the course of the Era of Expansion. A 1959 bond passed, providing the school with $200,000 for funds for "the addition of a library wing to the Administration Building."[8] While the value of local property stagnated in the late 1950s and 1960s, voters approved a tax increase and a $1 million bond in 1965. "This…bond issue was to provide funds for a Vocational Technical Arts building…These funds were matched 40-50% by Federal Funds provided by the Higher Education Act."[9] Community support, supplemented by federal dollars, allowed for NJC to continue to expand its physical plant, and to begin the process of diversifying its curriculum.

---

[6] Miller, "NAVARRO COUNTY."

[7] Navarro Junior College Faculty and Administration, "Report of Self Study of Navarro Junior College" (Corsicana, TX: Navarro Junior College, 1963), 22, Box B12-a, Pearce Museum Archives at Navarro College, Corsicana, TX; Navarro Junior College, "Institutional Self-Study Prepared for the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, 1984" (Corsicana, TX: Navarro Junior College, 1984), IV–42, Box B12-b, Pearce Museum Archives at Navarro College, Corsicana, TX.

[8] Navarro Junior College Faculty and Administration, "Report of Self Study of Navarro Junior College," 14.

[9] Verda Gooch, "The First Twenty-Five Years at Navarro Junior College," in *Navarro County Scroll for the Year 1974* (Corsicana, TX: Navarro County Historical Society, 1974), 20, Box OS-B27-a, Pearce Museum Archives at Navarro College, Corsicana, TX.

Beyond direct support from the county as a whole, Navarro Junior College also enjoyed uncommon philanthropic support from the community. Frank Neal Drane, founder of the Corsicana Power and Light Company, created the Navarro Community Foundation in 1938 to fulfill his "[wish] to share his personal prosperity with fellow citizens."[10] His Foundation, commonly referred to as the Drane Foundation, "assumed the financial responsibility of $465,000 for constructing and equipping a new science building, 'The Frank Neal Drane Hall of Science.'...The Foundation also contributed $25,000 to the Library for books in the fields of Science and Mathematics."[11] James Edgar, NJC's first science teacher, credits the Foundation, and the educational climate resulting from the launching of Sputnik, as major drivers for the building of the new science building. Having fallen victim to the unfortunate fire that resulted from inadequate facilities during the college's early years, Edgar appreciated the significance of the Foundation's grant: "That was one of the greatest pleasures of my life when they announced they were giving the money for a science building."[12]

The high regard that Navarro Junior College maintained in the community resulted from the school's concentrated effort to remain responsive to local needs. One of the most visible effects of the college on the community was the rapid rise in educational attainment that the county enjoyed during this period. "The number of residents over twenty-five years

---

[10] "Frank Neal Drane," Uncovered Texas, accessed January 1, 2016, http://www.uncoveredtexas.com/texas-historical-markers-detail.php?city=Corsicana&county=Navarro&type=&an=5349011615.

[11] Gooch, "The First Twenty-Five Years at Navarro Junior College," 15.

[12] James Edgar, interview by Dr. Tommy Stringer, Corsicana, TX, February 7, 1978, Pearce Museum Archives at Navarro College, Corsicana, TX.

of age with a high school or college degree increased from 17.7 percent in 1950 to 48.5 percent in 1980."[13]

Beyond offering a convenient venue for coursework, NJC also continued to engage the community through its athletic programs. In 1961, a new football stadium was built in coordination with the local public schools using funds from NJC, the Corsicana Independent School District, and the Drane Foundation ($120,000 total).[14] At times, the community's passion for the school's sports program could put the citizenry at odds with the school, but this was more an indication of the investment of the local population than any real dissatisfaction. Former administrator Lary Reed recalls that "we have a football team, and in those early years…I think there was a closer relationship between athletics and the community, and there were times when the community tried to run the athletic program because they were so involved in it."[15]

The growing presence of Christian organizations on campus in the 1950s also symbolized NJC's responsiveness to the school's local context. Reflecting the social conditions of a town full of historic churches, the school approved the appointment of a Bible Chair, sponsored by the West Side Church of Christ in Corsicana, in 1955 and the incorporation of religious coursework beginning in the 1956-1957 schoolyear.[16] The introduction of this new curriculum ran in-line with the wishes of many of the school's

[13] Miller, "Navarro County."

[14] Tommy W. Stringer, *Dreams and Visions: The History of Navarro College* (Waco, TX: Davis Brothers Publishing Co., 1996), 37–38.

[15] Lary Reed, Interview by the author, Corsicana, TX, August 14, 2015.

[16] Stringer, *Dreams and Visions*, 36.

students, evidenced by the operation of a Baptist Student Union and the Methodist Student Movement during this period.[17]

Similar to the Era of Establishment, community support was key in the sustained growth of Navarro Junior College in the years from 1955 to 1965. The beginning of state funding of junior and community colleges in the 1950s provided much needed financial stability for the campus, but this money (based solely on enrollment) was not transformative. The creation of the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) in 1965, and the adoption of its proposed master plan later in the decade, changed NJC's relationship with the state from passive to active.

Greater state attention on the operation of junior/community colleges put pressure on Navarro Junior Colleges to more fully embrace a comprehensive mission, including technical/vocational and adult education programs, moving into the 1970s. Dr. Ben Jones, president of the college from 1956 to 1973, was resistant to the larger trend of curricular diversification within the community college movement during this period.[18] Despite Navarro Junior College beginning with a relatively large slate of terminal programs at the time of its establishment, to serve the needs of returning veterans, the school began to lag behind in curricular innovation over the course of the 1960s and early 1970s. At the time of Jones's resignation in 1973, the proportion of terminal coursework at the school was nearly equal to what it was when the school was established (near 16 percent of all coursework).[19] It

[17] *El Navarro, 1957* (Corsicana, TX: Navarro Junior College), Pearce Museum Archives at Navarro College, Corsicana, TX.

[18] "Dr. Ben Jones," Navarro College, accessed January 1, 2016, http://www.navarrocollege.edu/about/presidential-history/jones-bio/.

[19] Tables of data and analysis of changes in curriculum over time at both NC and SAC will be the major subject of Chapter Seven.

is unsurprising therefore, that the reorganization of the state oversight of higher education in the late 1960s led to changes at NJC soon after.

When the state reformed its higher education apparatus, the THECB was created for supervision of public four-year institutions and general proposals for higher education in the state, but funding and coursework approval for technical programs remained with the Texas Education Agency.[20] "During the early part of the decade [the 1970s], a survey was conducted by the Texas Education Agency at the request of the college [NJC] which showed a need for various technical and vocational education programs."[21] Dr. Reed, the head of technical programs at NC during these years, recalls the real impact that the state had on the development of the school. "I think the Texas Education Agency had a significant impact on the direction that the college was going with vocational and technical education...The state agency was pressing vocational/technical education, and that's another reason I think that our priorities started more of that in probably the mid-60s."[22] The board of trustees accepted Dr. Jones's resistance to these changes while the school expanded in terms of physical plant and enrollment in the late 1950s and 1960s, but as enrollment gains slowed down and state pressure increased the need for substantial changes to NC's operation became clear to board members.

Beyond general suggestions to incorporate more technical/vocational programs, the creation of new community college districts in surrounding areas as part of the THECB master plan made change necessary to ensure NC's continued success. "Between 1969 and

---

[20] Sue Johnson Blair, "The Emergence and Development of the Community/Junior College in Texas" (Ph.D. Diss, Texas Tech University, 1991), 144.

[21] Navarro Junior College, "Navarro Junior College Self-Study: Prepared for the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, January, 1974" (Corsicana, TX: Navarro Junior College, 1974), 7, Box B12-a, Pearce Museum Archives at Navarro College, Corsicana, TX.

[22] Lary Reed, interview by the author, Corsicana, TX, August 14, 2015.

1973…the State Legislature created new community college districts in McLennan(Waco), Tarrant (Fort Worth), and Dallas counties. Students that previously might have attended Navarro enrolled at those new institutions. Hill Junior College, which was closed in 1950, reopened in 1962, drawing away more prospective students from NJC. By 1973 Navarro's enrollment declined to 970 students."[23] Dr. Jones's continued opposition to major changes on campus, concurrent with stagnant enrollment, led to his forced resignation in 1973 and the hiring of Dr. Kenneth Walker as his replacement to increase student interest by making the college more appealing to the community.[24]

Lary Reed, one of the only administrators retained after the shakeup in college leadership, remembers Walker as a "breath of fresh air" for the school.[25] It might be more accurate to describe Dr. Walker as a torrent of wind preceding a storm of activity because his administration led to wholesale changes in the college's operation (more information on the role of these administrators at the college will be a major subject in Chapter Five). Understanding that his appointment was made in order to reform the school to make it more marketable in an effort to boost enrollment, Dr. Walker embraced not only the suggestions of the state, but enlisted the aid of the federal government to ease the financial burden of reforms.

The composition of the school curriculum shifted dramatically in the late 1970s, with a near-doubling of proportional terminal coursework at the school. The most visible representation of this shift was seen in the changing of Navarro Junior College's name to

---

[23] Stringer, *Dreams and Visions*, 46.

[24] "Dr. Kenneth Walker," Navarro College, accessed January 1, 2016, http://www.navarrocollege.edu/about/presidential-history/walker-bio/; James Newman, "NJC Board Approved Community Thrust Idea," *Corsicana Daily Sun*, December 14, 1973, 1; "Walker New Navarro Boss," *Dallas Morning* News, February 2, 1974.

[25] Lary Reed, interview by the author, Corsicana, TX, August 14, 2015.

Navarro College to reflect its more comprehensive mission.[26] The first year Dr. Walker was in office, 1974, "Navarro College played a pioneering role in solar energy training as the first solar energy State grant recipient in Texas, and later with additional funding from the Department of Energy and the National Science Foundation, the College was instrumental in developing a two-year solar technician training program…used as a model throughout the nation."[27] State and federal funds allowed the school to expand its curriculum, but also to appeal to the community by adding coursework preparing students for jobs in the energy industry, a familiar sector of the economy for Navarro county residents.

Tommy Stringer, a history instructor at Navarro College in the 1970s, and later an administrator, points to the content of terminal/vocational programs as one of the ways that NC has evolved uniquely to meet the needs of the local community. When I asked Stringer to give his opinion on what made the campus unique, in comparison to another community college campus in the state like SAC, he pointed to the incorporation of community-responsive terminal programs in energy and agriculture.[28] Reforms to the school curriculum in the late 1970s, spurred by state-level pressure (in terms of competition and curricular proposals) and federal dollars, led to increased enrollment as the college broadened its appeal to the community.

In addition to the incorporation of a solar energy program, Navarro College also set up a Geothermal/Aquaculture Project:

> In 1978, at the suggestion of local citizens, Navarro College began exploring the possibility of utilizing the geothermal waters known to exist below Corsicana as an

[26] "'Junior' Deleted from College Name," *Corsicana Daily Sun*, April 9, 1974, 1.

[27] Navarro Junior College, "Institutional Self-Study Prepared for the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, 1984," II–21.

[28] Dr. Tommy Stringer, interview by the author, Corsicana, TX, May 28, 2015.

> alternate source of heating. That same year, a group of Corsicana citizens sponsored the drilling of an exploratory well on College property, and a medium temperature geothermal resource was located in the Woodbline formation. Funding through the United States Department of Energy was negotiated to initiate a project to determine the feasibility of utilization of this resource.[29]

The process by which this project landed at Navarro College, through community activism and federal support, represents a pattern in the school's development. Just as local citizens lobbied the federal government for backing (in terms of land and buildings) when the school was established, the same community/federal relationship was also crucial in the transformation of the college during the late 1970s.

While the support of the federal government was important in changes at Navarro College in the final years of the Era of Expansion, the community and the state were still the key outside influences on the college's development over these years. The federal government was largely a passive force, a force whose assistance depended on active engagement from administration or community members. During the first fifteen years of the Era of Expansion, NJC depended on community support to ensure the success of its initial establishment was sustained. Contributions of local philanthropic organizations and citizen support for bond elections and tax increases (despite less than stellar economic growth locally) allowed the school to expand its physical plant and increase enrollment during Jones's administration. The reorganization of Texas's higher education administration, under the newly created THECB, was the major catalyst for institutional change at NJC during the

[29] Navarro Junior College, "Institutional Self-Study Prepared for the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, 1984," IX–47.

1970s. Increased competition from other colleges in the region affected NJC's enrollment and put pressure on the board of trustees to make changes on campus. Suggestions of the Texas Educational Agency that incorporation of technical and vocational programs would make the school more appealing to the local community gave the school a path to improved long-term health.

San Antonio College

Choosing two colleges within the same state was a deliberate choice made for this project under the assumption that this decision would help minimize the impact of state governance as a determinative factor in the studied colleges' development. After looking deeper at the history of these two schools, however, it became clear that local context had a clear effect on how an institution interacts with the state. Because Navarro Junior College was more isolated from national attention, the attitudes of the local community and the dictates of the state were felt more acutely on campus. At San Antonio College, where faculty members hailed from across the nation, administrators were officials in national organizations, and the school was located in one of the largest cities in the region, state influence was only one of many factors driving the school forward.

San Antonio's more diverse urban economy benefitted more from the postwar boom than the agriculturally-based economy of Navarro County. While Navarro County's population began a slow decrease due to the consolidation of agricultural production after the 1930s, San Antonio's population "grew by almost 44 percent" over the course of the 1950s,

and "continued to grow at a more sedate pace of 10 to 20 percent a decade" thereafter.[30] The intervention of the Good Government League, a new political machine that arose in the early 1950s, led to horizontal growth for the city.[31] Instead of skyscrapers rising in downtown to show San Antonio's expansion, the focus of postwar growth was in the north, the home of the Good Government League's major constituents. The 1960s and 1970s saw the establishment of the University of Texas Health Science Center (1968) and the University of Texas-San Antonio (1973) in the city's northwest.[32]

Alongside the growing industries of medicine and education, capital investment in tourism began to yield benefits during this period. A mix of local, state, and federal government dollars, along with private funding, helped finance HemisFair '68. "The first officially designated international exposition in the Southwestern United States," HemisFair was set up near the center of San Antonio in recognition of the city's 250th anniversary and to highlight the "cultural heritage shared by San Antonio and the nations of Latin America."[33] The creation of a fair focusing on San Antonio's international heritage in 1968 reflected the demographic shifts occurring at the time in the city. "By the 1970s, more than half the city's population was Hispanic, making it the first major American city to have a Spanish-speaking

---

[30] T. R. Fehrenbach, "San Antonio, TX," *Handbook of Texas Online* (http://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/hds02), accessed January 04, 2016. Uploaded on June 15, 2010. Published by the Texas State Historical Association.

[31] T. R Fehrenbach, *The San Antonio Story: A Pictorial and Entertaining Commentary on the Growth and Development of San Antonio, Texas*, Kindle Edition (Tulsa, OK: Continental Heritage, 1978), Location 1967.

[32] Char Miller, *Deep in the Heart of San Antonio Land and Life in South Texas* (San Antonio: Trinity University Press, 2012), 12; for a short history of UTHSCSA see: "A Brief history of UTHSCSA," UT Health Science Center, San Antonio, accessed January 4, 2016, http://uthscsa.edu/hr/briefhistory.asp; for a short history of UTSA see: "History," The University of Texas, San Antonio, accessed January 4, 2016, http://www.utsa.edu/about/history/.

[33] Frank Duane, "HemisFair '68," *Handbook of Texas Online* (http://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/lkh01), accessed January 04, 2016. Uploaded on June 15, 2010. Published by the Texas State Historical Association.

majority."[34] Major landmarks of present-day San Antonio, including the Tower of the Americas and the Institute of Texas Cultures, were constructed for this fair.[35]

The international spotlight brought to San Antonio by HemisFair '68 also led to private investment in land around the San Antonio River to "stich together many of the disparate elements of a new urban fabric."[36] While the 1929 "Shops of Aragon and Romula," a downtown commercial development, did not yield immediate financial benefits (particularly due to its date of establishment), a plan for private investment on the river in downtown was taken up again in earnest after 1968. Hilton's Palacio del Rio Hotel, created in 1968 at the time of the fair, marked the beginning of an active tourist industry on the Riverwalk.[37]

San Antonio's postwar transformation was not all rosy, however. The same process of deindustrialization which plagued the urban economies of the Northeast and the Midwest in the second half of the twentieth century, affected San Antonio's economy as well. Manufacturing jobs in the city began declining in the late 1970s, making the local population more dependent on lower paying jobs.[38] "Its [San Antonio's] poverty is historic and has been linked to its inability and unwillingness to push beyond its dependence on military spending and tourism to fill the communal coffers."[39] Investment in medicine and education have helped counteract this dependence since the 1970s, but during the Era of Expansion the economic growth of the city could not fully neutralize the continued problems of low wages and ever-present poverty.

---

[34] Fehrenbach, *The San Antonio Story*, Location 1975.
[35] Frank Duane, "HemisFair '68."
[36] Miller, *Deep in the Heart of San Antonio Land and Life in South Texas*, 170.
[37] Ibid.
[38] Ibid., 26.
[39] Ibid., Kindle Edition, Location 96.

San Antonio College benefitted from the economic climate of the city during the Era of Expansion. A healthy national economy, concurrent with city investment in economic and educational ventures, provided opportunities for social mobility for the city's working class. SAC's enrollment increased from under 6,000 students for the 1955-56 school year (day and evening regular sessions) to over 29,000 during the 1979-1980 school year.[40] The explosive growth of the school was sustained by local and state funds, similar to what was seen at NJC, but more prominently by federal funds in support of building projects, curricular innovations, and individual student financial aid.

Unlike the 1930s and 1940s, when an anti-tax culture blocked attempts to improve San Antonio Junior College's physical plant and structure of governance, the brighter economic climate of the 1950s made the community more receptive to investment in the school. Financing for SAC's rapid expansion in enrollment during this period was partly taken up by the students themselves, with tuition costs doubling in 1957.[41] While the 1930s proposal of a tuition hike was met with student pickets, the 1957 tuition increase was weathered without protest. The college's stronger foundation, housed on a new campus and having recently gained national accreditation, made students more willing to shoulder greater costs for attendance.

There were also signs that the college was more receptive to the needs of the community as well during this period. SAC began offering more adult education coursework for non-traditional students, and added summer recreational programs for seven to thirteen

[40] Enrollment numbers for this dissertation, unless otherwise noted, are taken from college catalogs. San Antonio College's catalogs include enrollment numbers for the previous year.

[41] "Tuition Going Up," *San Antonio Light*, June 28, 1957 in *San Antonio College Scrapbook K, 1957-1958*, McAllister Collection, San Antonio College Library, San Antonio, TX.

year olds in the city.[42] It also created the "first mortuary science course ever offered in a state supported school in Texas…at the request of the Texas Funeral Directors and Embalmers associations" in 1961, showing a willingness to listen to the business community when considering new programs for the school.[43] The city as a whole was more invested in the school by this period. In the same year as the tuition hike (1957), the local property tax supporting SAC was raised by the junior college district from 16 to 20 cents.[44]

In comparison to Navarro College, where sources point to a palpable connection between the community and the school, leading to local investment even during a time of economic stagnation, San Antonio College's community support during the Era of Expansion seemed to be rooted more in the city's growing prosperity than personal connections to the college. Robert Zeigler, former student, faculty member, and recently the president of San Antonio College, questions how well the school has adapted to the needs of the community historically. He suggests that a preoccupation with "prepar[ing] people for the University of Texas" may have undercut an "appreciation of what the community needed in terms of preparing students."[45] A problem that has grown more acute in recent years, particularly since the creation of the University of Texas-San Antonio (UTSA), Zeigler feels that "the contribution of the community college, and the quality of the community college" is still not fully "appreciated by community leaders."[46] He suggested in our interview that respect may

---

[42] "Recreation Program Starts at S.A. College," *San Antonio Evening News*, June 11, 1961 in *San Antonio College Scrapbook P, 1961*, McAllister Collection, San Antonio College Library, San Antonio, TX.

[43] "S.A. College: Mortuary Class," *San Antonio Light*, March 15, 1961 in *San Antonio College Scrapbook P, 1961*.

[44] "College Dist. Tax Hiked 5c," *San Antonio Evening News*, July 17, 1957 in *San Antonio College Scrapbook K, 1957-1958*.

[45] Dr. Robert Zeigler, interview by the author, San Antonio, Texas, June 2, 2015.

[46] Ibid.

be "greater at a smaller college in a smaller community than it is at one like SAC where you kind of get lost in all the universities and other higher education institutions."[47]

During the Era of Establishment, San Antonio Junior College enjoyed support from local businessmen and the media (at least in words if not always in dollars), but concrete proposals for increased funding were met with active opposition from the local populace and policymakers. During the Era of Expansion the same outlets that allowed proposals for greater financing to be put to the public in a positive light remained, but the active opposition to the media's portrayal of SAC, and calls for greater support, began to crumble. A more liberal local government and a more prosperous populace allowed for reasonable, if not extraordinary, local support for the campus during the Era of Expansion.

State support was important for SAC's expansion, specifically in the 1950s and 1960s, but not as transformative when compared to NJC. Early in this era, in 1955, a shift in state funding to a lump sum payment based solely on number of students enrolled benefitted large colleges in the state.[48] Previously funding for the first 500 students enrolled was set at a higher rate than subsequent enrollees, leading to per pupil funding being higher at smaller colleges. This change meant that larger schools like San Antonio College were no longer discriminated against by the funding formula. The introduction, and rapid increase of state funding, for community colleges in the 1950s, alongside increased tolerance by the local populace and students for greater financial support of the college, led to swelling budgets at SAC. San Antonio College's annual income grew from $1.94 million for the 1958-1959

[47] Ibid.

[48] "Compromise Believed Set on Junior College Funds," *San Antonio Express*, May 10, 1955 in *San Antonio College Scrapbook G, 1954-1955*, McAllister Collection, San Antonio College Library, San Antonio, TX.

school year to $3.07 million only five years later for the 1962-1963 school year.[49] District taxes, state aid, and tuition made up "more than 90% of the total income" of the college during this period.[50]

When discussing Navarro Junior College in the first half of this chapter, the impact of the state, beyond basic funding, ramped up in the years after 1965, when the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board was created. While the years from 1965 to 1974 were shaped by state influence at NJC, changes at SAC during the same period can be linked more closely to the actions of the federal government. The call for more community college districts in the state by the THECB led to waning enrollments at NJC because the establishment of new colleges in surrounding counties generated competition for students. San Antonio College, located in a city with a rapidly growing population, enjoyed greater local demand for schooling and did not suffer, in terms of enrollment, from the new state plan for higher education. The call for greater attention to vocational/technical programs by the state had a clearer impact on SAC, but it was the support of the federal government that made this shift in curricular emphasis possible.

The federal government's influence on campus increased beginning in the mid-1960s. In 1964, SAC received federal aid under the Vocational Education Act for "a new library building and a vocational-technical building."[51] Courses offered at the newly constructed building were "in such fields as data processing, industrial drafting, medical and dental assisting technicians, business technology, production management, mortuary science,

---

[49] Members of the Instructional and Administrative Staffs, "The Institutional Self-Study Report of San Antonio College for the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, 1963-1964" (San Antonio, TX: San Antonio College, 1965), 70, McAllister Collection, San Antonio College Library, San Antonio, TX.

[50] Ibid., 65.

[51] "U.S. to Aid $3-Million SAC Expansion," *San Antonio Express*, March 21, 1964 in *San Antonio College Scrapbook U, 1964*, McAllister Collection, San Antonio College Library, San Antonio, TX.

nursing, and electronics."[52] San Antonio College's nursing department also received a boost in 1966 when the program received $50,000 from the federal government (alongside $25,000 from the state) to fund the first year of operations for a new program offering an Associate's degree in Nursing to students after two years of study. [53]

The intervention of the federal government helped ensure that SAC's long-term commitment to transfer coursework would not impede the development of a more comprehensive curriculum to meet the needs of a diversifying local and national economy. Dr. Johnnie Rosenauer, a Business/Real Estate faculty member hired in 1974, remembers what the campus climate was like during this period of transition:

> Many of my colleagues then still saw us as a school designed to transfer folks to UT-Austin or some such institution. We're much more than an arts and science transfer institution now. We—the whole division that I represent, the professional/technical education-workforce development, we're an entity in and of ourselves. And I don't mean that we could stand alone, but our goal is to—my goal is to have students that can go out and practice real estate, or mortuary science, or whatever the field may be.[54]

Rosenauer saw the tension between the traditional academic focus of the school and the more comprehensive mission SAC was beginning to embrace when he joined the faculty in 1974. Over the course of his tenure, he saw the consolidation of the technical/vocational side of the curriculum and the ultimate transformation of SAC's role as a higher education institution.

---

[52] "SAC Enters New Field," *San Antonio Light*, November 29, 1964 in *San Antonio College Scrapbook V, 1964-1965*, McAllister Collection, San Antonio College Library, San Antonio, TX.

[53] Mike Cantu, "SAC Nurse Setup Gets Funding OK," [newspaper not indicated], June 18, 1966 in *San Antonio College Scrapbook Y, 1966*, McAllister Collection, San Antonio College Library, San Antonio, TX.

[54] Dr. Johnnie Rosenauer, interview by the author, San Antonio, TX, June 2, 2015.

Federal dollars did more than just push vocational education, however. The support of the federal government also helped SAC to continue to improve its infrastructure for traditional academic coursework. In 1965, SAC was the recipient of a $1.7 million U.S. Office of Education grant "for a 7-story library, classroom and faculty office building."[55] This building, named the Moody Learning Center, still stands as the most prominent building on campus (and provided a nice home for my research and interviews for this project).

Federal aid to individual students, combined with the granting of draft deferments to college students during the Vietnam War, led to a dramatic increase in student enrollment in the late 1960s and early 1970s. San Antonio College students received the most funds for any higher education institution in the city for the 1965-1966 school year under the Higher Education Act, totaling $200,670 in support of 573 students.[56] The period of heightened federal government attention at San Antonio College, between the 1964-1965 and the 1975-1976 school year, saw day enrollment at the school increase from 5,043 to 16,173 students.[57]

The diversification of the college's curriculum and improvement to campus facilities, spurred by federal funding and state planning, helped San Antonio College overcome the introduction of potentially problematic competition in public higher education in the city in the 1970s. The establishment of UTSA, following the denial of proposals to convert SAC itself into a four year institution, represented a possible threat to San Antonio College's position in the city's higher education landscape.[58] SAC and St. Philip's no longer stood as

---

[55] "U.S. Grant for SAC Buildings," *San Antonio Light*, May 26, 1965 in *San Antonio College Scrapbook W, 1965*, McAllister Collection, San Antonio College Library, San Antonio, TX.

[56] "S.A. Colleges Get U.S. Aid for Students," *San Antonio Express*, March 23, 1966 in *San Antonio College Scrapbook Y, 1966*.

[57] See footnote 40 for an explanation of sources for enrollment data.

[58] UTSA was part of the University of Texas system and began admitting graduate students in 1973 and undergraduates in 1975: "History of UTSA," University of Texas-San Antonio, accessed April 25, 2016, http://www.utsa.edu/about/history/; "S.A. Jr.-Sr. State College Said Unlikely," *San Antonio Evening News*, November 17, 1966 in *San Antonio College Scrapbook Z, 1966-1967*, McAllister Collection, San Antonio

the only public colleges in the city. Despite the potential for this new competition to severely reduce enrollment, SAC capitalized on its affordability and mixed curriculum to establish a clear niche within the higher education institutions of San Antonio.

Instead of fighting UTSA, the administration at SAC sought to coordinate their efforts with the other public institution in the city. Even before UTSA began admitting students in 1973, SAC officials assured San Antonians that they would provide "accurate counseling to prepare them [students] to join UTSA and will outline methods of credit transfers from the junior colleges to the new state university."[59] Jerome Weynand, president of San Antonio College when UTSA began admitting undergraduate students in 1975, recalled that he "worked with the university—UTSA—forerunners, to get that school started, and did not, for one moment, fight them. We worked very closely together. Had them speak at our convocations in front of our faculty. And that was one of my problems, I guess, of having a four-year college come to drain us off a little bit. But in the long run it didn't hurt us."[60] Enrollment numbers at SAC back up Weynand's claim. Enrollment at San Antonio College may not have grown by the leaps and bounds it did in the years from 1965 to 1975, but enrollment did stay consistent between 16,000 and 18,000 day-time students over the remainder of the 1970s.[61] The stagnation in SAC's enrollment over the latter half of the decade can be partly attributed to UTSA's establishment, but can also be connected to

---

College Library, San Antonio, TX; "UTSA Won't Affect Enrollment," *San Antonio Light*, May 28, 1969 in *San Antonio College Scrapbook EE*, 1969, McAllister Collection, San Antonio College Library, San Antonio, TX.

[59] "UTSA, Colleges Map Cooperation," *San Antonio Evening News*, September 26, 1973 in *San Antonio College Scrapbook MM, 1973-1974*, McAllister Collection, San Antonio College Library, San Antonio, TX.

[60] Dr. Jerome Weynand, interview by the author, San Antonio, TX, June 3, 2015.

[61] See footnote 40 for an explanation of sources for enrollment data.

reduction in funding from the federal government during a time of national economic struggle and the end of the Vietnam War (and the incentive of potential draft deferments).

Overall, it is a testament to SAC's growing appeal in the community that the emergence of direct competition for students within the same city had only a limited impact on enrollment. Continued efforts to extend adult education programs in the 1970s made the school attractive to a wider segment of the population. In 1971, SAC created Project Get Smart, a "program…conducted in cooperation with businesses in the area for disadvantaged people who want to get ahead in their jobs."[62] San Antonio College also tried to widen its academic curriculum to appeal to an increasingly diverse student population. The school began offering classes in "Black History, the History of the Mexican-American, and the History of Mexico" to broaden the traditional historical narrative to more fully appreciate the contribution on non-white populations.[63] In addition, the Foreign Language Department created a program specifically for "interpreting and translating for the bilingual students" and the school housed "cultural development activities includ[ing] a series of films, displays, speakers, and special celebrations."[64] The introduction of these community-responsive programs and activities shows that SAC was increasingly moving away from being a traditional junior college focused solely on transfer coursework and instead embracing the community college concept.

---

[62] Aziz Shihab, "San Antonio Takes Lead in Adult Education Field," *San Antonio Light*, October 26, 1971 in *San Antonio College Scrapbook JJ, 1971-1972*, McAllister Collection, San Antonio College Library, San Antonio, TX.

[63] Jerome F. Weynand and Paul R. Culwell, "San Antonio College Self-Study Report, 1973-1975" (San Antonio, TX: San Antonio College, 1975), 71, McAllister Collection, San Antonio College Library, San Antonio, TX.

[64] Ibid.

The support of the federal government and the community did come with strings attached, however. The shifts in the social contours of the nation that led the federal government to increasingly focus on social justice in higher education funding, including aid to individuals and programs for the economically disadvantaged, also demanded higher accountability and oversight for recipients of funds. In the 1970s, San Antonio College would come under increased pressure to develop a more diverse staff and faculty, in terms of gender and ethnicity (this included the opening of an Equal Employment Opportunity Commission investigation of the campus).[65] These events will be a major subject of the following chapter (Chapter Five) which discusses faculty and administration at SAC during the Era of Expansion. Students, many of whom grew up during the explosion of social protest in the 1960s, began organizing cultural and political groups on campus and demanding change when the college acted in a way that they perceived as discriminatory (this issue will be a major subject of Chapter Six). More federal investment in the campus led to higher standards on how the school operated and greater oversight to ensure compliance with federal law.

Conclusion

The two major branches of the historiography both place national leadership at the center of the transformation of the two-year public college mission in the second-half of the twentieth century. The works of community college leaders themselves, particularly Jesse Bogue and Edmund Gleazer, recognize the growing interest of the federal government in the

[65] "SAC 'Bias' Denied," *San Antonio Evening News*, November 12, 1976 in *San Antonio College Scrapbook SS, 1976-1977*, McAllister Collection, San Antonio College Library, San Antonio, TX.

community college, but place national leadership, along with local administrators, as the protagonists of a heroic narrative in which community colleges rise as the institution of the people. College leaders are portrayed as advocates for the expansion of the college mission and the retention of open door admissions policies as a way of making the college more community-responsive in an effort to democratize higher education.[66] The revisionist narrative, on the other hand, depicts the broadening of the college mission to embrace vocational programs as a form of "anticipatory subordination."[67] Instead of trying to democratize higher education, community college leaders were trying to establish a niche for themselves within the higher education marketplace by appealing to business and government leaders, even when these sources of outside influence were not actively seeking these changes.[68]

The findings of this chapter suggest that the role of the community and the government in the expansion and transformation of the community college from 1955-1980 has been understated in the historiography. Furthermore, the relationship between the college and interested external parties was profoundly impacted by local context. Reports on the condition of rural community colleges in the 1970s show that the differences in experiences between SAC and NJC were not unique to these two schools. One of the key grievances of rural community colleges, according to a 1978 article by Harry Margolis, is that "most of the available writing on curriculum and teaching is directed toward large urban schools."[69] Rural

---

[66] Jesse Parker Bogue, *The Community College* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1950); Edmund J. Gleazer, *This Is the Community College* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1968).

[67] Steven G. Brint and Jerome Karabel, *The Diverted Dream: Community Colleges and the Promise of Educational Opportunity in America, 1900-1985,* Kindle Edition (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989), Location 343.

[68] Ibid.

[69] Harry S. Margolis, "Community Colleges: Rural Academe," *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning* 10, no. 6 (1978): 63.

colleges felt that their unique role in the community, including "maintain[ing] one of the largest payrolls in the local economy," was not fully appreciated by national leadership or policymakers.[70]

This misunderstanding of the position of rural community colleges often led, according to these reports, to the adoption of policies which hampered development. Rural campuses, where funding sources were tighter due to a limited tax base, suffered more under government requirements for local reports and data for compliance and funding.[71] Less dollars for overhead costs and support staff also made it more difficult for rural campuses to support grant-writing initiatives.[72] Overall, policymakers overlooked the unique needs of a rural community college, according to these reports, due to generalizations being drawn from the experiences of larger institutions.

The history of NJC and SAC during this period follow these trends. San Antonio College was in a better position than NJC to capitalize on changes in federal funding of higher education during the 1960s and 1970s. A larger budget, pulled from both local taxes and a new state funding formula favoring larger institutions, allowed SAC to remain adaptable when seeking financial backing for a shift to a more comprehensive curriculum. This firm financial backing also made SAC more resilient in the face of possible negative effects from state-level planning and increased local competition. With administrators holding positions of influence in the state community college movement, San Antonio College was able to ensure that policy changes would not have a ruinous effect on

[70] Ibid.

[71] Edwin E. Vineyard, "The Invisible Wall: A Report on the Status of the Rural Community College in America". (Washington D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1978), 8.

[72] Ibid., 7-8.

institutional development. Overall, SAC was in a better position to make sure that they could pull from new sources of funding while maintaining steady growth.

Navarro Junior College's ability to expand during this period, however, was more uncertain. A foundation of community support, despite relatively hard economic times locally, allowed the school to expand after the initial influx of veterans subsided. Tight budgets made NJC administrators more conservative with funds in the 1960s, leading to only marginal changes in the college's curriculum and less federal dollars coming into the school in comparison to SAC. The creation of the THECB, and the adoption of the board's master plan, had a clearer effect on NJC's development than SAC. Relatively low local demand for higher education resulted in the establishment of new colleges in the region representing a threat to the school's future growth. Limited funds made the call for a new college mission a greater risk for a smaller, rural campus in comparison to a large urban campus. In the end, state level planning forced Navarro College to shift its mission, but it took a change in administration and entrepreneurial risk-taking for the campus to right the ship after the changes that occurred in the late 1960s and early 1970s.

While the relationship of SAC and NC to the community and government differed during this period, these outside forces clearly had a large effect on each school's development. The funding of the federal government was a key factor in the incorporation of technical/vocational programs at both schools, though at different times (due to local context). The funding of the state government was crucial for the financial stability of each school during the Era of Expansion (leading to more solid budgets than in the Era of Establishment), though state-level planning clearly had a larger impact on the transformation of Navarro College. The support of the community allowed SAC to establish a clear niche for

itself in the higher education landscape of San Antonio, even when UTSA seemed to represent potentially ruinous competition. The lukewarm support of SAJC in the previous era had slowed down the school's progress, but greater community backing after 1955 was important for SAC's explosive growth following its rocky start. While community support was important for SAC, it was crucial at NJC, allowing the school to continue to expand despite lower levels of state and federal funding than what SAC enjoyed.

Overall, previous historians have made a convincing point that college leadership proposed the introduction of vocational coursework as a way for community colleges to establish a clear and unique function within United States higher education. The experiences of these two schools, however, suggests that the growth of these schools, and the evolution of their curriculum, at the institutional level, was more dependent on the will of the community (who enrolled there) and the funding of the government (and the stipulations placed on this funding) than the proposals of college leaders. Community college leaders may have talked the talk, but it took actual funds for community colleges to walk the walk.

CHAPTER 5
PRESIDENTIAL POWER AND FACULTY FREEDOM: ADMINISTRATION/FACULTY DURING THE ERA OF EXPANSION

Because of the rise of the research university in the years following World War II, the faculty/administration relationship in higher education during the Era of Expansion has emerged as a hot topic in the higher education historiography. The creation of the American Association of University Professors and the outlining of tenure policies were set up in the first half of the twentieth century as a protection for faculty against the rising power of administration within the modern university (see my discussion in Chapter Two). The advent of the Cold War made the federal government an increasingly active player in United States higher education, leading to the balance of power between faculty and administration again shifting at universities in the latter half of the century.

While the debate on power dynamics on campus has been a subject of interest for historians studying universities, the community college historiography has not followed suit. Discussions on the experience of administrators and students have dominated the historical narrative for this period. National community college leaders have been credited with driving the transformation of the junior college into the community college. Historians and sociologists have looked at the impact of a community college education on students who attend these institutions. Faculty members, however, are consistently lost in the shuffle. This chapter seeks to highlight the faculty/administration relationship during the Era of Expansion to extend the narrative of balance of power on campus, developed by the university historiography, to the community college.

An overview of how the university historiography has approached this question is instructive for my own investigation of the faculty/administration relationship. Historians in

this field have emphasized the impact of the rising role of the federal government and the application of free market ideas to higher education. The introduction of federal funds for research, particularly in the 1940s and 1950s, accelerated universities' shift away from the liberal arts college tradition. According to Jonathan Cole, "what has made our great universities so distinguished is not the quality of our undergraduate education. Other systems of higher learning, including our own liberal arts colleges, compete well against our great universities in transmitting knowledge to undergraduates…We are the greatest because our finest universities are able to produce a very high proportion of the most important fundamental knowledge and practical research discoveries in the world."[1] Increasingly the focus of higher education at United States universities shifted away from instruction of undergraduates to research.

The growing priority placed on research discoveries, and funding from the federal government and industry, led to changes in the faculty/administration relationship. Rebecca Lowen suggests that administrators' drive for prominence led universities to "adopt the nation's cold war agenda," while many faculty members "called for a balanced approach to university resources."[2] Administration sought to lessen the impact of departmental objection to their fundraising approach by appealing to individual faculty members. In Roger Geiger's analysis of the development of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, he notes that this era saw the power of specific faculty members rise, as their personal expertise gave them leverage in acquiring funds from the federal government or from private companies.[3]

---

[1] Jonathan R. Cole, *The Great American University: Its Rise to Preeminence, Its Indispensable National Role, and Why It Must Be Protected* (New York: PublicAffairs, 2009), 4.

[2] Rebecca S. Lowen, *Creating the Cold War University: The Transformation of Stanford* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997), 150.

[3] Roger L. Geiger, *Research and Relevant Knowledge: American Research Universities since World War II* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 65.

Because university faculty could choose projects of their own free will, and their ideas and talent were necessary to produce gainful research, specific individuals improved their relative position within the university hierarchy. John Thelin extends Geiger's argument on rising faculty power by suggesting that the exponential rise in enrollment in the years from 1945 to 1970, and the subsequent increased demand for college professors, "gave a generation of professors unprecedented opportunities."[4] According to these historians, this period saw rising administrative influence on the overall direction of universities towards lucrative research, but also gains in faculty power for individuals with marketable research interests (generally in STEM subjects) and for faculty as a whole as a result of increased demand for professors.

The growing dependence of the university on outside interests, including the state and private industry, presented a real risk to the principle of academic freedom which underlay the balance of power at the modern university. Michael Katz argues that the reinvention of faculty members as virtual entrepreneurs, the reorganization of universities to resemble corporations, and the expectation that universities "appeal to the 'needs' of the economy, society, technology, or some other great force," undercut ideals of academic freedom. He highlights the significance of this loss by suggesting that academic freedom provided "the greatest barriers to total victory of the marketplace" in higher education.[5] Other historians, including the aforementioned Roger Geiger, counter that professors' choices in seeking support for their research (whether public or private sources) offered some form of academic freedom (or at least initiative), but the enticement of outside funding still influenced the

[4] John R. Thelin, *A History of American Higher Education*, 2nd ed. (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2011), 310.

[5] Michael B. Katz, *Reconstructing American Education* (Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 1987), 177–178.

direction of the university.[6] With pressure from administrators to funnel faculty interests into lucrative research pursuits, and the relative influence of the college department decreasing, the importance of tenure as a defense for academic freedom continued to increase during these years.

Rebecca Lowen and Michael Katz might have highlighted developments which warrant legitimate worry about the development of the modern university, but the history of San Antonio College and Navarro College raise the possibility that their concerns may be even more pronounced at the community college level. Lowen's argument, that administrative initiative shaped faculty practices, holds true at the community college as well. Research was not a central function of the community college (though it proved a catalyst for change in universities), but a broadening curriculum was the source of administration's increased influence during the Era of Expansion. Without research as a mission, questions of academic freedom were not discussed as prominently at community colleges in comparison to universities. This resulted in the late development, or the complete non-existence, of tenure policies at community colleges. Without tenure, the natural power of administration over hiring and firing was magnified.

This power over hiring and firing became more important as the public two-year college mission changed after World War II and the size of enrollments and college budgets swelled. The increased impact of outside forces (the government and community) on fast-growing community colleges led to greater oversight of their actions. Even though research dollars were not a priority for community colleges, dependence on state and federal government funds for building projects, curricular innovations, and basic per pupil funding

[6] Geiger, *Research and Relevant Knowledge*, 39–41.

increased pressure to appeal to educational agencies and accreditors. Appeasing these groups often took demonstrated action, and without tenure as a protection faculty members could find themselves a target of institutional restructuring to maintain growth and/or compliance. Similar to universities, rising enrollment gave faculty members some leverage due to demand for their services, but without formal protections their possible replacement remained a possibility.

Though the faculty/administration relationship during this time has not been a focus of the community college historiography, Edward Ifkovic's personal and oral history of his time at Tunxis Community College (a community college established in 1970 in Connecticut) gives some insight into power dynamics at these schools in the 1970s.[7] He recalls that "the early administration was resolutely autocratic, so pronounced that some staff members were constantly terrified."[8] That Ifkovic was working at a smaller institution (only recently established) is significant. My own investigation suggests that administrators at smaller community colleges, such as Navarro College, held greater power than at larger institutions. Smaller schools have a smaller faculty to establish a base to counter administrative power. Furthermore, small colleges oftentimes have less stable revenue sources and enrollment, making the inducement for radical change higher than at larger institutions. As the history of Navarro College will show, weak faculty influence, lack of tenure, and pressure on the administration to change to ensure growth, put instructors at small community colleges in a tenuous position during this period,.

---

[7] "Tunxis Facts: History," Tunxis Community College, accessed January 9, 2016, https://www.tunxis.edu/offices-departments/institutional-effectiveness/institutional-research/tunxis-facts/#history.

[8] Edward Ifkovic, *A Bend in the River: Voices from a Community College, 1970-2000* (San Jose, CA: IUniversity Press, 2001), xx.

The history of San Antonio College, on the other hand, suggests that the years of the Era of Expansion saw the building of an early foundation for greater faculty stability and influence on larger community college campuses. During this era, San Antonio College developed a strong faculty senate and instituted a tenure policy that was refined over time. The adoption of this tenure policy correlates with a noticeable increase in the voices of faculty members being heard, with grievances aired not only through the faculty senate, but also the media. Tenure also stood as a deterrent to unbridled firings by administrators as this era saw a rise in law suits for dismissals without proper due process at SAC (an appeal that only holds weight with tenure).

Although the prominence of administrative control on campus, relative to faculty members, has only been a minor theme in the previous historiography, the diversity of administrators and faculty members has been a more prominent topic. As I discussed in the introduction to this section, community college students became more diverse racially, ethnically, and economically during the Era of Expansion. Previous histories have shown that community colleges struggled to match this diversity in the composition of their staff. Michael Olivas's investigation of minority representation at community colleges found that minorities were woefully underrepresented in both administrative and faculty positions (with administrators in particular being "overwhelmingly white and male").[9] He describes a trend in which minority administrators were concentrated in positions "performing affirmative action tasks."[10]

[9] Michael A. Olivas, *The Dilemma of Access: Minorities in Two Year Colleges* (Washington: Published for ISEP by Howard University Press, 1979), xiv, 90 (quote).

[10] Ibid., 102.

The lack of minority faculty and administrators on campus was particularly disheartening considering the importance of staff diversity on student outcomes at community colleges. Former community college administrator William Moore suggests that "white faculty were crucial in the continued tracking of ambitious students to lower-class jobs and vocational tracks."[11] While Moore's research is mostly anecdotal, other studies have also concluded that faculty members serve an essential role in "the sorting and winnowing-out process" and "seem to have lower expectations of their students" than their university colleagues (though Moore's work ties this trend more clearly to faculty's race). [12]

Other researchers have presented convincing evidence that a diverse staff is a key factor in the retention of working class and minority students. Mark Escamilla found that the cultural climate on campus, including the presence of African American faculty and administrators, was a key factor in the success of black students. He explains that "college officials' awareness of different world-views in order to serve the diverse student populations of community colleges is paramount."[13] Emily Klement builds on Escamilla's finding in her research on Hispanic community college students in Texas. She argues that "the presence of Hispanic faculty on community college campuses is the highest indicator of influence on the transfer rates for Texas Hispanic students."[14] The following discussion will show that both Navarro College and San Antonio College struggled to develop a diverse staff during the Era

---

[11] William Moore, *Behind the Open Door: Racism and Other Contradictions in the Community College* (Victoria, B.C.: Trafford, 2006), 10.

[12] Burton R. Clark, *The Open Door College: A Case Study.* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960), 123; Kevin Dougherty, "The Effects of Community Colleges: Aid or Hindrance to Socioeconomic Attainment?," *Sociology of Education* 60, no. 2 (1987): 95.

[13] Mark Steven Escamilla, "Factors Affecting African-American, Anglo and Hispanic First-Generation Community College Students, Who Have Persisted and Graduated from Four-Year Institutions between 1990 and 2000 in Texas" (PhD Diss.: University of Texas, 2001), vii.

[14] Emily Conrady Klement, "Transfer Rates of Texas Hispanic Community College Students to 4-Year Institutions: Selected Institutional Factors" (Ph.D. Diss., University of North Texas, 2012) 70.

of Expansion. A more diverse student body (and local community), greater media scrutiny, and greater reliance on federal funding, however, put more pressure on San Antonio College to address this problem than Navarro College.

The faculty/administration relationship was the core, sustained dynamic on community college campuses, especially since students theoretically matriculate in only two years. Outside sources may affect funding, but the ultimate operation of the classroom was intimately tied to the actions of administrators and faculty members who put this funding into action. It is key for the community college historiography to focus more closely on the balance of power between faulty members and administrators to better understand the strengths and weaknesses of community colleges as educational institutions.

Administrative influence on the college mission is a developed thread in the historiography. Historians' neglect to assess the power held by faculty members at community colleges, however, brings into question how much the actions of administrators are influenced by the will of their staff. If the omission of the faculty from previous histories is an indicator of their lack of influence then this has real implications for the historical legacy of the community college, particularly since community college leaders have consistently pointed to superior instruction (because teachers' time is devoted solely to instruction) as a key advantage of the education they offer. If faculty members are little more than pawns of administration, living in fear for their jobs if they do not toe the line, then the bounds, and the effectiveness, of their instruction is severely limited. If faculty members are, instead, a more important player in community college development, historians must do a better job of determining the nature of their influence in different college settings. This chapter seeks to open a clearer historical dialogue on the role of faculty and administration

on community college campuses, and the relationship between these two groups. This study, of course, is limited to the history of only two institutions. Historians investigating this topic at other community colleges, and comparing their findings with the trends at these two schools, will lead to a fuller understanding of the faculty/administration relationship at these institutions moving forward.

Navarro (Junior) College

The beginning of the Era of Expansion saw Navarro Junior College's first change in president. Ray Waller's death in 1956, whose administration oversaw the establishment and rapid development of NJC in its first ten years, led to the appointment of Dr. Ben W. Jones to fill his position.[15] Similar to the hiring of the next college president in the 1970s, Jones was an outside hire. Because of the small size of Navarro Junior College, there were not a lot of administrators to choose from within the institution when the board of trustees sought a replacement for the president. The registrar, Gaston Gooch, was offered the job, but chose to stay in his position in order to ensure continued close interaction with the college's students.[16] With Gooch refusing the appointment, the board of trustees instead brought in Jones, a Georgia native who most recently worked as the president of Northeast Mississippi Junior College (appointed in 1952).[17] Jones held a doctorate from the University of Texas in

[15] "College Head Dies in Home at Corsicana," *Corsicana Daily Sun*, February 12, 1956, 19; Tommy W. Stringer, *Dreams and Visions: The History of Navarro College* (Waco, TX: Davis Brothers Publishing Co., 1996), 32.

[16] Ben Jones, interview with Tommy Stringer, Corsicana, TX, January 7, 1985, Pearce Museum Archives at Navarro College, Corsicana, TX.

[17] Northeast Mississippi Junior College has since been renamed as Northeast Mississippi Community College.

junior college administration and previously worked as an education professor at the University of Mississippi.[18]

Jones's resume was at odds with the former trend in administrator's backgrounds at NJC. Previous administrators, as well as faculty members, were predominantly brought in from local school districts because of availability due to proximity, but also as a way of forging ties between the campus and the community. With Navarro Junior College on firmer financial footing, and following the campus's successful application for accreditation, the board was ready to take the school in a slightly different direction to continue to improve the college and to push for greater growth moving forward. The willingness of the board of trustees to bring in Jones, despite prior precedents, could relate to their business backgrounds and a recognition for the need to change to adapt to new conditions. Board members at the time worked in insurance, law, medicine, farming, and ranching.[19]

While Jones's background was a deviation from prior hiring practices, his initial instructions to faculty members show that he recognized the importance of community support for the future health of the college. "He encouraged them to take an active part in civic and religious activities in the community…'A religious affiliation,' he said, 'makes for a better faculty member'…[He] let them know that they still represent the school outside the school and within their personal life."[20] While Jones's seeming invasiveness into faculty's religious practices seems at odds with contemporary standards (particularly working at a public institution), his advice was connected to the norms of this particular time and place.

---

[18] "Navarro College President Named," *Dallas Morning News*, April 29, 1956, 16.

[19] Navarro Junior College Faculty and Administration, "Report of Self Study of Navarro Junior College" (Corsicana, TX: Navarro Junior College, 1963), 30, Box B12-a, Pearce Museum Archives at Navarro College, Corsicana, TX.

[20] "College Faculty Told Education Past High School Level is Becoming 'Must'," *Corsicana Daily Sun*, September 10, 1956, 1.

Interviews with former students often included references to their comfort with particular teachers due to familiarity beginning with common church memberships.[21] Overall, Jones's emphasis on community appeal paid dividends, as the college enjoyed local support during his presidency (see Chapter Four), even at a time when the county was struggling economically.

Jones's final advice to faculty members in his address, however, was concerning when investigating the nature of the faculty/administration relationship during his tenure. "He urged faculty members to 'be cautious in your political affiliations,' pointing out he recognized their right to hold their own political convictions and right to vote."[22] While Jones did not go as far as to try to restrict personal political ideology, his call for instructors to censor their own political views during instruction treads the line of limiting faculty's academic freedom.

It is important to note that this pronouncement was made just after the McCarthy Era, a time when university professors' political ideology was a source of concern for administrators and government officials. John Thelin calls the lack of action by the Association of American University Professors to support its members "throughout the skirmishes and major battles" of the McCarthy era (1948 to 1953) a "disappointing development."[23] Without precedents on academic freedom to point to, community college faculty were even more susceptible to administrative control than their university peers. Jones did not go as far as to actively restrict professors' personal political convictions, but his

[21] Cheryl Tatum, interview by the author, Corsicana, TX, May 27, 2015; Jack Bradley, interview by the author, Corsicana, TX, May 27, 2015.

[22] "College Faculty Told Education Past High School Level is Becoming 'Must'," *Corsicana Daily Sun*, September 10, 1956, 1.

[23] Thelin, *A History of American Higher Education*, 276.

willingness to make such a pronouncement, in a form reported on by the media, suggests that he felt little hesitancy in possibly limiting the academic freedom of his faculty members. The context of this pronouncement is important to keep in mind. Considering the majority of his instructions to faculty members related to community engagement, it seems that his advice on political affiliation was likely made to ensure that faculty members did nothing in their classrooms to upset the local populace. Considering the college's funding base in this period, Jones's advice made sense, but restriction on how an instructor can approach their own classes set a dangerous precedent for college-level instructors.

While faculty members at Navarro Junior College did not have a group as historically strong as the AAUP to represent their interests, the Texas Junior College Teachers Association (TJCTA), created in 1948, began to gain members during this period.[24] At this point, however, the group maintained a relatively small membership and focused mostly on organizing annual conferences for members. "The weak committee structure during the early years limited the scope of service provided to the members in the areas of concern."[25] Dr. Ben Jones should have been well aware of the TJCTA's priorities, including academic freedom, considering his election as the president of the Texas Junior College Association, "a group that meets annually and concurrently with the TJCTA."[26] It seems clear that, at this point, professional organizations representing community college faculty in Texas were not at a point to actively push for academic freedom.

While currying favor with the local community was a point of emphasis for Jones, even at the expense of faculty autonomy, Jones had to face possible displeasure from county

---

[24] Sarah Elizabeth Hutchings, "A History of the Texas Community College Teachers Association between 1948 and 1998" (Ph.D. Diss., University of Michigan, 2002), 489.

[25] Ibid., 490.

[26] "College Teachers Elect Sinderman," *Corsicana Daily Sun*, February 16, 1969, 3.

residents when the issue of integrating the campus arose in 1961. The delay in Navarro Junior College's integration was because "no black students attempted to enroll at NJC following the Brown ruling [1954] until 1961."[27] Jones commented that "we had been expecting it to come before it did, but we would have enrollment period come and no one would show up…It was a solemn unwritten thing that we would…deal with it when it comes."[28] The eventual enrollment of "five black young ladies from the East Side" in 1961 did not come from out of the blue, however.[29] These young women recall, and Jones's own recollections confirm, that school officials met with black community leaders during the summer of 1961 to pave the way for integration.[30]

Community activism and the intervention of the NAACP were integral to the eventual integration of San Antonio College. Navarro Junior College did not face law suits to potentially force integration, but the referenced meetings with the black community suggest that local activism led to black students' enrollment at NJC (since Jones's testimony makes it clear that administrators were not actively seeking to integrate). In Navarro County, a less populated area, community initiative was the determinative factor in integration due to the absence of professional and legal support enjoyed in a larger area like San Antonio.

While the conditions leading up to integration at NJC might have differed from SAC, the handling of the actual event had clear similarities. San Antonio College administrators attempted to minimize media coverage of black students' entrance to the school in order to avoid potential backlash to the move. The same tactic was employed by NJC. The only hint

---

[27] Stringer, *Dreams and Visions*, 34.

[28] Ben Jones, interview with Tommy Stringer, Corsicana, TX, January 7, 1985.

[29] Ibid.

[30] Ben Jones, interview with Tommy Stringer, Corsicana, TX, January 7, 1985; Thelma Butcher, interview with Tommy Stringer, Corsicana, TX, September 19, 1978, Pearce Museum Archives at Navarro College, Corsicana, TX.

that integration occurred was a small front page article in the *Corsicana Daily Sun* which proclaimed that "Jackson High Graduates Enter Junior College."[31] Jackson High School was the segregated black high school in Corsicana, so the enrollment of Jackson High graduates at Navarro Junior College implied that integration had occurred. Nowhere in the article, however, did the author mention the words "integration" or specifically that the Jackson High graduates were black. NJC and the media worked to make sure that integration was handled quietly, without causing an uproar in the community.[32] The largest newspaper in the region, *The Dallas Morning News*, was clearly taken aback in their own coverage of NJC's integration. Their article did not appear until over two months after the semester began and indicated clearly the author's displeasure that administration and local media tried to cover up the event.[33] Jones's approach to integration seemed to pay dividends, since he claimed that beyond receiving a few letters there was no major actions taken by the community to oppose integration.[34]

Navarro Junior College and *The Corsicana Daily Sun's* handling of integration may bring up questions on media ethics (specifically the responsibility of the press to clearly inform the public on major events), but the recollections of the first black students who enrolled at the campus indicate that the integration process went fairly "smoothly."[35] Beyond some name-calling, Thelma Butcher (one of the black students who enrolled in 1961) felt reasonably safe on campus, at least she "didn't feel like [she] was in danger as far as bodily

---

[31] "Jackson High Graduates Enter Junior College," *Corsicana Daily Sun*, September 6, 1961, 1.

[32] Jimmie Dee Vellow Powell, "History: The Following Pages are a Record of Formative Years of our School which was at that Time Fred Douglass and Later Became G. W. Jackson" in *The Navarro County Scroll for the Year 1970* (Corsicana, TX: Navarro County Historical Society, 1970), 41-85, Box OS-B27-a, Pearce Museum Archives at Navarro College, Corsicana, TX.

[33] "Navarro Junior College Desegregates Smoothly," *Dallas Morning News*, November 10, 1961, 9.

[34] Ben Jones, interview with Tommy Stringer, Corsicana, TX, January 7, 1985.

[35] "Navarro Junior College Desegregates Smoothly," *Dallas Morning News*, November 10, 1961, 9.

harm."[36] In fact, an impromptu welcome committee met Butcher when she arrived on campus for her first day of classes.[37]

Despite some scholars' suggestions that lack of faculty diversity had a negative effect on minority student outcomes, Butcher explained how teachers intervened to avoid possible racial strife on campus. In one instance, "one of the White boys made a remark when one of the black girls walked in the classroom, and the teacher came to her defense…He kind of told him off in a nice way…Most of the teachers were polite."[38] Butcher's experience suggests that even though NJC lacked diversity in its faculty (which remained all-white, with one brief exception, into the 1970s), teachers did their best to create an accepting culture on campus.

While the ethnic and racial composition of the college faculty was stagnant throughout the 1960s, their level of academic training did increase during Jones's administration. By 1963, "all but four members [of the full-time faculty had] earned at least the master's degree," and those without a Master's had plans to enroll for more coursework in the coming summers.[39] Jones made it clear from the beginning of his administration that improving the educational level of the faculty would be a priority.[40] Nearly 80 percent of faculty members held a Master's by 1974, with another 5 percent holding doctorates.[41]

Jones's initial pronouncements on his expectations for the behavior of the staff brought up concerns about his level of respect for the academic freedom of NJC's teachers,

---

[36] Thelma Butcher, interview with Tommy Stringer, Corsicana, TX, September 19, 1978.

[37] Ibid.

[38] Ibid.

[39] Navarro Junior College Faculty and Administration, "Report of Self Study of Navarro Junior College," 85.

[40] "College Faculty Told Education Past High School Level is Becoming 'Must'," *Corsicana Daily Sun*, September 10, 1956, 1.

[41] Navarro Junior College, "Navarro Junior College Self-Study: Prepared for the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, January, 1974" (Corsicana, TX: Navarro Junior College, 1974), 94, Box B12-a, Pearce Museum Archives at Navarro College, Corsicana, TX.

but a questionnaire reported on in a self-study conducted by the college for accreditation in the mid-1960s indicated that faculty members felt that they enjoyed a high level of academic freedom.[42] This questionnaire has to be taken with a grain of salt since it was being conducted to impress accreditors, but my own discussions with faculty members indicate that, despite pointed recommendations from administrators, teachers did not feel restricted in their approach to instruction.[43]

Even though actions in the classroom were not restricted, faculty members did express dissatisfaction with the "rule requiring the faculty to remain on campus from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. five days a week."[44] The maintenance of this requirement into the 1960s was a legacy of the secondary school structure that Navarro Junior College mirrored at its establishment. With the staff ties to local secondary schools beginning to break down almost two decades after the college's creation, these types of rules began to chafe for faculty members.

Conservatism in the revision of school policies for instructors also bled into Jones's larger approach to the school. Similar to his predecessor, Jones focused on remaining fiscally responsible while also building up NJC's physical plant. These were laudable goals for an administrator, but lack of curricular innovation during Jones's tenure made it difficult for NJC to adapt to new conditions when the advent of the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board changed the regional conditions for post-secondary schooling in the region and began the push for junior colleges to take on the community college concept. Former faculty

---

[42] Navarro Junior College Faculty and Administration, "Report of Self Study of Navarro Junior College," 93.

[43] Tommy Stringer, interview by the author, Corsicana, TX, May 28, 2015.

[44] Navarro Junior College Faculty and Administration, "Report of Self Study of Navarro Junior College," 93.

member and administrator Lary Reed recalls that in the 1960s Jones "didn't strongly support" preparing "a person to go immediately into industry."[45] The building of the Bain Center for Technical Arts in the middle of the decade, the influence of Reed himself, and the pressure placed on Jones by accreditors and the state, led to some forward movement for technical programs, but only grudgingly.[46]

Jones's lack of adaptability was also evident in his approach to changing social conditions in the late 1960s and early 1970s. Jones, along with the all-white and male board of trustees, failed to bring in minority faculty members despite the changing demographics of the campus. In 1970, outside of an Indian professor teaching chemistry, the rest of the college's instructors were white.[47] The only black staff members worked in maintenance. The first black administrator at the school, Alonzo Wedgeworth, was hired in the early 1970s, but the general composition of the faculty and administration remained overwhelmingly white (and generally male) during the first half of the 1970s.[48]

Despite this lack of diversity, Navarro Junior College did not face the same pressure to hire minority candidates that SAC faced in the 1970s (see the next section of this chapter). Jones did take some heat from the local media when the campus ignored "National Black History Week" in 1972. The local paper built off of this incident to point out that "although there are 125 black students at NJC, there is only one black librarian on the staff and no blacks are instructors."[49] Jones justified the school's lack of diversity by claiming that they

---

[45] Lary Reed, interview by the author, Corsicana, TX, August 14, 2015.

[46] A fuller discussion on the proportion of terminal programs at Navarro College is located in Chapter Seven.

[47] *The 1970 El Navarro* (Corsicana, TX: Navarro Junior College, 1970), Pearce Museum Archives at Navarro College, Corsicana, TX.

[48] *The 1972 El Navarro* (Corsicana, TX: Navarro Junior College, 1972), Pearce Museum Archives at Navarro College, Corsicana, TX.

[49] "Jones Explains NJC's Black History Lack," *Corsicana Daily Sun*, February 15, 1972, 1.

did not receive many applications from black candidates, and that faculty turnover was low.[50] Even though the local media did make an effort to point out problems with the racial composition of NJC's faculty and administration, a lack of government action on this issue (possibly because the school did not bring in many large federal grants in this period) allowed NJC to shrug off calls for change in the short-term. Furthermore, there is little evidence that NJC students pushed for the hiring and retention of minority staff members in comparison to SAC.

Jones's resistance to change, and overall power over the composition and actions of faculty members, was again in evidence in 1973. Jones testified against an "academic freedom and responsibility bill designed to prevent arbitrary firing of instructors...before the [Texas] House Education Committee...He charged that the bill provides for tenure which has kept some professors in teaching institutions although they should be retired."[51] That an administrator would fight state action to institute a form of tenure (or at least a protection against wrongful firing) was not surprising since the act would have lessened the power of administration's right to hire and fire, but it was clear that Jones also forbade his faculty members to speak to the media about this issue. The same article remarked that "several Navarro Junior College instructors Wednesday made the ironic decision not to voice their opinions" about the bill. Jones's actions, not only in opposing the bill but also barring his faculty members from speaking about it, shows the overriding power of administrators over instructors during his time as president. [52]

---

[50] Ibid.

[51] Rob Meckel, "NJC Teachers Won't Comment about Tenure," *Corsicana Daily Sun*, February 8, 1973, 1.

[52] Ibid.

The conservatism of the Jones administration was not sustainable by the mid-1970s, however. Decreasing enrollments forced the board of trustees to take action in order to ensure the future growth of the campus and Jones was forced to resign to pave the way for future changes.[53] Instead of looking for an administrator that prioritized balance of power with faculty or developing a more diverse campus climate, the board chose to bring in Kenneth Walker whose main priority was growth through expanding the school's curriculum by fully embracing the community college concept. The year of his appointment, 1974, Navarro College dropped "Junior" from its name to show its change in direction. "The College broadened its philosophy and purpose to encompass the comprehensive community based education concept and added new occupational education programs to serve the needs of the people."[54] Walker's approach to reforming the campus paid dividends as enrollments again began to grow, but his approach to the college faculty was concerning.

Walker was, again, an outside hire. He was formerly employed at Central Texas College in Killeen (beginning in 1966) where he eventually worked his way up to vice president in 1972.[55] In 1973, "the American Technological University (ATU) opened its doors [in Killeen], marking an historical effort on behalf of citizens in the area to establish upper-division higher education in the Central Texas area."[56] Walker was named the school's first vice chancellor. ATU focused on technological programs despite its designation as a

---

[53] Jim Bush, "Dr. Jones Resigns as NJC President: Lary Reed Named Active President," *Corsicana Daily Sun*, November 21, 1973, 1.

[54] Navarro Junior College, "Institutional Self-Study Prepared for the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, 1984" (Corsicana, TX: Navarro Junior College, 1984), iii, Box B12-b, Pearce Museum Archives at Navarro College, Corsicana, TX.

[55] "Walker New Navarro Boss," *Dallas Morning News*, February 2, 1974, 7.

[56] Texas A&M University-Central Texas, "5 Year Strategic Plan, 2011-2015," (Killeen, TX: Texas A&M University Central-Texas, 2011), 10. Accessed online at www.tamuct.edu/departments/president/extras/TAMUCTSP11-15Final.pdf.

university, so Walker represented a good fit for Navarro College's needs as it attempted to change its mission to be oriented more to technology/vocational programs.[57]

Walker's actions in the latter half of the 1970s led to a dramatic reshaping of the college's curriculum which increased student enrollment. The position of faculty members under Walker's administration, however, did not share in the college's general improvement. The Southern Association of Colleges and School's mid-decade review of NJC raised legitimate concerns about the position of faculty members on campus. Without tenure as a protection for their positions, "twenty-one people who served as instructors at Navarro in 1973-74 [were] no longer employed there. Furthermore, only two new instructors were hired, eliminating 19 positions, distributed evenly throughout the college."[58] Walker's actions were clearly motivated with budget concerns in mind, since it seems contradictory that an expansion of the college mission would result in a massive reduction in employed faculty members.

Walker's reworking of the now renamed Navarro College did not end with his dramatic reduction of the faculty. Lary Reed, the Dean of Technical Arts and Interim President after Jones's resignation, "was the only administrator that remained" from the pre-Walker era.[59] Reed describes Walker as "good for the college because he brought tremendous growth, but he also brought tremendous change."[60] Walker's ability to tremendously change the trajectory of an entire college suggests some unique characteristics of smaller, rural community colleges. Similar to a small business, a more limited bureaucracy made it easier

---

[57] "Walker New Navarro Boss," *Dallas Morning News*, February 2, 1974, 7.

[58] Gary Edmonson, "College Accreditation Committee Took Harsh Look at NC's Education Program, Faculty," *Corsicana Daily Sun*, January 23, 1975, 1.

[59] Lary Reed, interview by the author, Corsicana, TX, August 14, 2015.

[60] Ibid.

for institutional change to be implemented at a fast pace on a smaller campus (given the right incentive). Unlike San Antonio College, whose immense size by the mid-1970s would have made the overhaul of the faculty and the administration impractical if operations were to continue to run smoothly, Navarro College was able to adapt to new regional higher education conditions to ensure the future health of the institution. Furthermore, the legacy of high administrative power at Navarro Junior College during Waller and Jones's time as presidents left the college staff with little protection in the case of a dramatic change in NJC's institutional mission.

My discussion of the position of faculty members at Navarro College in this section may give the impression that they were powerless pawns, played and sacrificed at the whims of administrators, but interviews with students and instructors suggests that their role went beyond the content they taught and the relative power they held in campus politics. Faculty members may not have had the power that many of their university colleagues enjoyed, but their impact on individual students was just as large.

The role of counselors on junior/community college campuses has been a contentious topic in the historiography. Burton Clark's *The Open Door College*, was a sociological investigation of a community college in San Jose, California which dedicated large sections to discussion on the practices of counselors, particularly their treatment of "latent terminal students." These were the students who came to the campus seeking to transfer to a university, but who failed to advance in their transfer programs and ran the risk of dropping out. Clark suggests that "teacher-counselors urge the latent terminal student to give up his transfer intention, and they stand ready to console him in accepting a terminal curriculum. The effect of the drawn out counseling procedure when it operates effectively is never to say

a final 'no,' but to move the student into a position where it finally seems best to him to declare himself out of the transfer competition."[61] Clark's work has informed the revisionist branch of the community college historiography, thus the impact of counselors, and teachers acting as advisors, has been a major topic in studies in recent decades.[62]

Clark was not trying to suggest that counselors or teachers worked with malicious intent to crush student dreams, but his work provided a base for later claims that community colleges block the social mobility aspirations of their students. My discussions with students, some who transferred and some who did not, suggest that the role of counseling on campus was taken up almost completely by faculty members and none of them expressed dissatisfaction with the advice they were given. One of the most surprising findings of these interviews was that none of the interviewees recalled the name of one of the school's counselors or the content of their meetings with the guidance staff, instead they generally referred to their interactions with faculty members when discussing their experiences with counseling at NJC.

These recollections are in-line with interviews conducted by the University of Texas in the early 1960s in which "students of below average academic achievement were somewhat confused about the availability of …[counseling] services in their academic planning" at Navarro Junior College.[63] The UT interviews also found that students depended on "the faculty, rather than on the guidance staff, for academic as well as personal and

---

[61] Clark, *The Open Door College*, 76.

[62] The role of counselors in transfer decisions has been a consideration in works such as: Fred L. Pincus, *Bridges to Opportunity: Are Community Colleges Meeting the Transfer Needs of Minority Students?* (Washington D.C.: Academy for Educational Development and College Entrance Examination, 1989), 30.

[63] Navarro Junior College Faculty and Administration, "Report of Self Study of Navarro Junior College," 53.

vocational advice."[64] This reliance on faculty members as advisors was formalized in 1973 when the school implemented a policy in which "students are to be assigned to individual faculty advisers for educational counseling."[65] The dependence on faculty members as counselors persisted, evidenced by the improvement of the formal counseling program being cited as a major place in need of reform in an early 1980s accreditation report.[66]

At both of the campuses studied here, one of the things that faculty members remember most clearly about their job, and oftentimes most fondly, was their individual interactions with students outside of the classroom. Tommy Stringer, a history faculty member hired in 1972, provided excellent examples of how the individual attention of instructors had a positive long-term impact on students:

> I was in the grocery store just a couple of weeks ago, and a gentlemen there who is probably, I don't know 50 years old now,--whose on, by the way, on the school board in one of the district in our service area--he said "you know, you helped me when I was a student at Navarro, find a place to live." Something happened at the beginning of school, he thought he had everything settled and it fell through. So, there was an old gentleman here in town, who called me and said if anyone needs—I have a room to rent, or whatever. And so, this guy, I just called him and said—took him over there and introduced him. And he said, it wasn't a lecture, it wasn't this project, it was the fact that I helped find a place to live.[67]

---

[64] Ibid.

[65] Navarro Junior College, "Navarro Junior College Self-Study: Prepared for the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, January, 1974," 146.

[66] Navarro Junior College, "Institutional Self-Study Prepared for the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, 1984," VII–16.

[67] Tommy Stringer, interview by the author, Corsicana, TX, May 28, 2015.

The testimony of both student and faculty interviewees consistently pointed to faculty members as the central figures in the guidance of community college students, many times going beyond the academic and professional to the personal.

The findings of my interview are not at odds with Clark's assessment of the impact of counseling at a community college in the early 1960s, but the experiences shared with me by students and faculty members makes it difficult to swallow that teachers' advising has been a key cornerstone of the diversion of student aspirations. Kevin Dougherty suggests that "community college teachers' diminished expectations of their students reflect the difficulty of teaching students who arrive at college bereft of many of the skills that colleges traditionally expect and that make teaching go smoothly."[68] Instructors, faced with students struggling in their class and without the financial and social resources to persist, may have seen it as necessary to steer their students into vocational programs as a way to ensure their future job prospects. This scenario is believable (and has the added benefit of not demonizing teachers), but every one of the students interviewed for this project who enrolled in terminal programs did so, according to their testimony, on their own initiative.[69] My research suggests that more likely reasons for the lower social mobility of students enrolling in community colleges are the lack of formal counseling procedures focused on maximizing student potential (instead of pragmatic sorting based on current skills) and weak infrastructure for these students to build basic skills (going back to high school education).

Faculty members at Navarro College played a crucial role as teachers and as advisors, but a lack of dialogue about academic freedom, capitalized on by administrators focused on

[68] Dougherty, "The Effects of Community Colleges," 95.

[69] Ruthellen Scott, interview by the author, Corsicana, TX, May 28, 2015; Dairy Johnson, interview by the author, Corsicana, TX, May 27, 2015.

the overall growth of the institution, left them in a depressed position in comparison to their university colleagues. The institution of tenure at universities provided a bedrock for academic freedom and an important protection for faculty members from the instability of administrative initiative based on market conditions. Because research was not a central mission of the community college, discussions of academic freedom were not as robust as those at universities. Academic freedom, however, was also important within the classroom. In a more isolated, rural environment, teachers at Navarro Junior College faced pressure from administrators to conform to community norms and to stay silent on changes in campus policy. Although faculty members had a stronger sense of the pulse of the campus than administration (due to their daily interaction with students), their power over the larger direction of the institution was small in comparison to their influence. The experience of San Antonio College will show that a larger institution provided greater opportunities to increase faculty power, and the implementation of a tenure policy gave teachers at SAC the necessary leverage to make their voices heard in discussions on the larger direction of the campus.

San Antonio College

Similar to Navarro Junior College, the beginning of the Era of Expansion marked a change in administration at SAC. J. O. Loftin, the college president from 1941 to 1955, died tragically in a car accident outside of San Antonio after a hunting trip with fellow SAC administrators Wayland Moody and Jerome Weynand.[70] Loftin oversaw the organization of San Antonio's junior colleges into an independent district, the moving of SAC to a new

[70] "J.O. Loftin, Wife Killed," [newspaper not specified], January 1, 1956 in *San Antonio College Scrapbook H, 1955-1956*, McAllister Collection, San Antonio College Library, San Antonio, TX; Jerome Weynand, interview by the author, San Antonio, TX, June 3, 2015.

campus, and the early stages of the school's transition to the community college concept (seen in his emphasis on vocational education).

Dr. Wayland Moody, a former Dean and Administrative Assistant at SAC, took over the presidency following Loftin's death. Moody was a lifelong teacher and administrator, with experience as an instructor (and later as a Dean) at Westminster Junior College in Tahuacana, TX, as well as serving as a principal at Ferris High School, located southeast of Dallas.[71] While Navarro Junior College's outside hiring of Dr. Ben Jones as president, after Gaston Gooch refused the position, led to clear change on campus, the hiring of Moody allowed for greater continuity in SAC's operation. Moody's tenure saw enrollment continue to increase incrementally as it had in the decade previous to his appointment (enrollment increased by almost 1,000 students per year in the 1950s and 1960s).[72] Moody also oversaw the continued transition of SAC's curriculum as technical/vocational programs, particularly in medicine fields, became more prominent during his years in office.[73]

The overall stability of San Antonio College was also bolstered by a board of trustees with little turnover. Twenty years after the creation of the San Antonio Union Junior College District, three of the original board members (Jesse Fletcher, Lee A. Christy, and G. S. McCreless) still held their seats. The biggest change in the composition of the board came with the aforementioned election of Manuel C. Gonzales in 1954. Gonzales was not only the first Mexican American elected to the board, but his background as a county attorney was at odds with the business background of the rest of the board members. Again, similar to

[71] "Dr. Moody to Direct S.A. College Expansion," *San Antonio Light*, c.1956 in *San Antonio College Scrapbook H, 1955-1956.*

[72] Enrollment numbers are taken from annual college catalogs.

[73] Changes in the curriculum at SAC will be a major subject of Chapter Seven.

Navarro Junior College, board members worked overwhelmingly in business positions, particularly in insurance and finance.[74]

Despite being thirty years removed from official affiliation with the University of Texas, San Antonio College continued to maintain close ties with the senior institution during the Era of Expansion. Moody earned his bachelor's and doctoral degrees from UT and so did his successor Jerome Weynand.[75] Faculty members, though continuing to include representatives from colleges nationwide, still maintained many graduates from UT. A 1965 study showed that 98 full-time and 46 part-time faculty members were UT graduates.[76] University of Houston alumni were the second most prominent group among the faculty, though they were concentrated in part-time positions (with 28 full-time instructors and 52 part-time).[77] The high number of UT graduates among SAC's faculty and administration was natural, considering how close Austin is to San Antonio, only a 90 minute drive. The data suggests, however, that proximity was not the only reason for this trend. Texas A&M University, the second largest public university in the state, is located about three hours from San Antonio, but its graduates were almost completely absent from SAC's faculty (with only one full-time and five part-time faculty members).[78] Overall, Moody's years in office saw the school's development remain consistent with the previous era in terms of faculty composition, institutional growth, and steady curricular innovation.

---

[74] Members of the Instructional and Administrative Staffs, "The Institutional Self-Study Report of San Antonio College for the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, 1963-1964" (San Antonio, TX: San Antonio College, 1965), 14, McAllister Collection, San Antonio College Library, San Antonio, TX.

[75] Jerome Weynand, interview by the author, San Antonio, TX, June 3, 2015.

[76] Members of the Instructional and Administrative Staffs, "The Institutional Self-Study Report of San Antonio College for the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, 1963-1964," 89.

[77] Ibid.

[78] Ibid.

The majority of Moody's time in office was relatively free from major controversy, but changes to the campus during the Vietnam Era began to shake SAC's firm foundation. The years from 1967-1975 saw the steady growth of SAC in Moody's early years transition into a period of exponential growth. The federal government's extension of financial aid to individuals under the Higher Education Act, the granting of draft deferments to college students, and the changing local economy of San Antonio were all reasons for this upward tick in SAC's enrollment. Coupled with WWII-era faculty reaching retirement age, this increase in enrollment led to the rapid acquisition of new faculty members in the late 1960s and early 1970s.

Up to this point, SAC's teachers were pulled from a wider geographic range of institutions (even taking into account the bias towards UT grads) than their counterparts at Navarro College. Experience in diverse university settings, a larger faculty size overall, greater continuity in appointments, and high levels of participation in professional organizations, led to glimmers of future faculty power appearing in the years before 1970. Loftin's years in office saw faculty members given university-like titles to denote experience at the institution and salary levels. These titles, however, did not mean that a formal tenure policy was put in place. Sources do not point to the administration having the same influence on the behavior of the faculty at SAC as they did at NJC in the 1960s, but the continued lack of tenure at SAC still left instructors in a vulnerable position.

Johnnie Rosenauer, hired in 1974 as a business/real estate instructor, described the conditions on campus at the time of his appointment as a "time when we moved from a bunch of what would appear to me then, old guys--probably my age or younger now—and

moved to younger, non-military background individuals so we could have a greater blend."[79] The bringing in of new faculty members, representing a different generation, started to wake up SAC from its years of quiet growth. Faculty members began to question the overall direction of the campus, including open admissions policies, as well as insisting on their autonomy as instructors, free from administrative mandates.

One of the first points of contention between the early 1970s faculty and the administration was over the issue of student grades. An early 1971 faculty senate meeting focused on concerns over lowering academic standards at the campus. Faculty accused the administration of lowering standards due to an overly open admissions policy. Teachers who failed students were looked down upon and forced to gear their courses towards the lower-achieving students.[80] By 1974, teachers' complaints became more concrete when they charged that the college dean was mandating that "50 per cent or more of a teacher's students in a course should receive an 'A', 'B' or 'C' grade."[81] A chemistry professor, Dr. Dick Robert Markwell, claimed that the non-renewal of his contract was because he failed to comply with administrative grade quotas.[82]

Former faculty members that I interviewed also remember the stress that administration placed on maintaining high pass rates despite a perception that many of the students were not academically prepared to complete college-level coursework. Sylvia Sebesta, a history faculty member hired in a full-time position in 1971, remembers that "there was pressure…to pass more students. We were kind of—some of the administrators thought

---

[79] Johnnie Rosenauer, interview by the author, San Antonio, TX, June 2, 2015.

[80] "Low Standards Charge Due for Airing at SAC," *San Antonio Evening News*, March 30, 1971 in *San Antonio College Scrapbook HH1, 1971*, McAllister Collection, San Antonio College Library, San Antonio, TX.

[81] Mark Kilpatrick, "SAC Profs Boost the Grades?," *San Antonio Evening News*, July 2, 1974 in *San Antonio College Scrapbook NN, 1974*, McAllister Collection, San Antonio College Library, San Antonio, TX.

[82] Ibid.

we were failures if we didn't…reach that student."[83] Bill Knippa, history faculty from 1967 to 2010, explains why meeting administrative requirements for passing students was difficult. "I didn't really see myself as a gatekeeper, but they weren't really qualified…They didn't do the work. Most of them didn't study."[84] Maintaining the open door while also maintaining high pass rates for classes was a nearly impossible task. Instead of faculty members taking the blame for holes in the community college concept, mainly the inherent difficulties in setting up an institution purportedly supposed to offer all types of educational opportunities to all people and have them succeed (regardless of their background), they increasingly used their voices through the faculty senate to try to influence the direction of the campus.

The years from 1970 to 1975 saw the institution of tenure policies at SAC, which were refined later in the decade, and increased incidents of faculty voicing their displeasure when disagreeing with the actions of administration.[85] One of the clearest examples of the rising expectations (and dissatisfaction) of faculty members was the slew of lawsuits leveled against SAC in the 1970s making claims of wrongful firings. Markwell's suit, mentioned above, was not unique. Alfred Edward Ehm, a "full-time instructor of German at the college," sued the college in 1971, claiming that administrators fired him "to retaliate for his expression of opinion…violating his constitutional rights to freedom of speech and due process."[86] Ehm claimed that his firing was done at the suggestion of department chair William Samelson who was irritated with Ehm for not erasing the chalkboard at the end of

---

[83] Sylvia Sebesta, interview by the author, San Antonio, TX, June 24, 2015.

[84] Bill Knippa, interview by the author, San Antonio, TX, June 23, 2015.

[85] Kenneth Hairgrove, interview by the author, San Antonio, TX, June 4, 2015; "District Distributed New Guidelines for Specific Rules on Promotions," *The Ranger*, January 28, 1977, "The Ranger Image Collection," accessed February 9, 2016, http://sacweb03.sac.alamo.edu/eLibrary/RangerImageCollection.aspx.

[86] "Fired Prof Sues SAC for $100,000," *San Antonio Express*, March 9, 1971 in *San Antonio College Scrapbook HH1*.

his classes. Samelson denied this claim and "testified that Ehm had threatened him and called him a Nazi."[87] Ehm's complaint lay in the administration not allowing him due process before his firing, but his suit was eventually thrown out because he had not secured tenure, and thus the right to due process in his case.[88] Eham and Markwell's cases were also joined by a law suit by a young psychology professor, Douglas McKenzie, who sued SAC for wrongful firing in 1974. McKenzie was released from the school one year before gaining tenure (six years into a seven year probationary period), and claimed that his dismissal was made without receiving "formal explanation from administrators concerning his dismissal."[89] These law suits may not have been particularly successful, but the actions of these former professors suggests rising expectations of faculty members for some level of job security, and shows that the concept of tenure began to hold great weight for the balance of power at SAC.

Pressure on the administration did not just come from faculty members in the 1970s, however. Increasingly the student body and the board of trustees exerted their influence on the college's president. The student newspaper at SAC, *The Ranger*, attempted to print a letter critical of Moody in early 1971 but was denied by the editorial board for the paper (presumably at the behest of Moody). "The letter reportedly criticized Moody's administration, his recent $8,000 per year pay raise, and said the 68-year-old president is out of touch with his students and should retire."[90] Though the letter never made it into the paper, Moody did retire the following year. Over the course of his tenure, enrollment at SAC

---

[87] Aziz Shihab, "Vow to Ban Professor Reported at SAC Hearing," *San Antonio Evening News*, January 28, 1972 in *San Antonio College Scrapbook JJ, 1971-1972*, McAllister Collection, San Antonio College Library, San Antonio, TX.

[88] "Instructor's Suit Against SAC Dismissed," [newspaper not specified], c.1973 in *San Antonio College Scrapbook LL, 1973*, McAllister Collection, San Antonio College Library, San Antonio, TX.

[89] "Ex-SAC Prof Sues for Job," *San Antonio Express*, June 26, 1974 in *San Antonio College Scrapbook NN, 1974*, McAllister Collection, San Antonio College Library, San Antonio, Texas.

[90] "SAC Paper Can't Print Letter Blasting Moody," *San Antonio Evening News*, February 5, 1971 in *San Antonio College Scrapbook HH1, 1971*.

increased more than threefold.[91] The beginning of the 1970s, however, saw the city of San Antonio, the college's students, board members, and faculty members becoming increasingly outspoken on campus issues, a new campus climate that was faced by SAC's next president, Jerome Weynand.

Weynand had a long history at San Antonio College before becoming president. After serving as a marine during World War II, Weynand attended SAC as a student from 1946 through 1948. Following a stint working for a local newspaper (putting his journalism degree from the University of Texas to use), Weynand was hired as the registrar at SAC in 1955.[92] Weynand's interest in the position came partly out of his experience working as an assistant to the registrar during his time as a student at SAC: "I had six weeks while I was taking a Spanish and chemistry course. Instead of being a lifeguard, fifty cents an hour, the library was hiring at fifty cents an hour. So, I took a job as an assistant in the registrar's office."[93] During the early 1960s, he went back to school completing a doctorate at UT with a dissertation focusing on the mission of the community college.[94] Weynand moved up in the administration to become the Dean of Students and the Vice President before his appointment as college president in 1972.[95]

Weynand came to the presidency at a critical point for the college. The power of the faculty senate was increasing, student criticism of the operation of the school was on the rise, and most significantly for his time in office, the politics of the board of trustees began to

---

[91] Doris Wright, "Replacement of Moody Due?," *San Antonio Light*, January 16, 1971 in *San Antonio College Scrapbook HHI, 1971*.

[92] Jerome Weynand, interview by the author, San Antonio, TX, June 3, 2015.

[93] Ibid.

[94] Ibid.

[95] John Gonzalez, "Dr. Weynand Appointed SAC Chief," *San Antonio Express*, August 19, 1972 in *San Antonio College Scrapbook KK, 1972-1973*, McAllister Collection, San Antonio College Library, San Antonio, TX.

overshadow events on campus. Considering the rising storm clouds of criticism, Weynand's appointment made sense considering his reputation among the administration. Weynand recalled that "Dr. Moody always called me the Public Relations President, and not in a derisive manner. He hadn't done much of that, but…I taught public relations, bank public relations, on the side."[96] Weynand oversaw the consolidation of the campus's growth (so rapid in the 1950s and 1960s), sustaining enrollment and funding during less prosperous times for the city, the nation, and higher education in general. Pioneer of the California higher education Master Plan Clark Kerr, described the evolution of higher education in the years from 1960-1980 with these words: "growth, then intense politicization [through the student movement], and then depression, all taken together, created the greatest period of crisis ever experienced in American higher education by governance and leadership."[97] The timing of Weynand's presidency placed him at the climax of this crisis in higher education, where the pains of growth and a more engaged campus community created a hotbed for controversy.

Months before Weynand's appointment, Manuel Gonzales was involved in a close race for his seat on the board of trustees with George V. Ozuna. Raised on the west side of San Antonio, and formerly serving as the city manager for Crystal City, TX, Ozuna claimed that Gonzales was a "rubber stamp type of trustee," not the type of advocate that Mexican Americans in the city needed on the community college board.[98] Ozuna lost the election

---

[96] Jerome Weynand, interview by the author, San Antonio, TX, June 3, 2015.

[97] Clark Kerr, *The Great Transformation in Higher Education, 1960-1980* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1991), 199.

[98] "Candidates in SAC Runoff Clash Verbally," *San Antonio Evening News*, April 20, 1972 in *San Antonio College Scrapbook KK, 1972-1973*; Ozuna's claim represents growing tension between what George J. Sánchez calls the Mexican American Generation and the more activist Chicano Generation arising in the 1960s and 1970s: George J. Sánchez, *Becoming Mexican American: Ethnicity, Culture, and Identity in Chicano Los Angeles, 1900-1945* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993).

narrowly, but his rhetoric began to stir up Mexican Americans looking for a greater voice in college politics. The following year "the commission [for Mexican-American affairs] called on members of San Antonio's Mexican-American community to run for seats on the Union Junior College District board of trustees…and another resolution asked for a local Mexican-American to be appointed to some high-level post in the SAC administration."[99] Ozuna would again run for a seat in 1974, securing a place for himself on the board.

Questions about the ethnic composition of administration were joined by inquiries into the gender diversity of SAC's faculty in 1976. After the filing of complaints by two former faculty members through the National Organization for Women, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) began investigating the college's hiring practices. The EEOC report showed less qualified men getting positions over more qualified women, and overall statistics indicating "the existence of a pattern of practices of ethnic or sex discrimination," including that only one women served in administration (as an assistant).[100] Weynand "denied charges of discrimination against minorities and women in hiring, pay and promotion" despite the key findings of the study (including that only 10 percent of faculty members were Mexican American and one percent were black).[101]

In a pattern that would become common in the latter half of the 1970s, Ozuna capitalized on controversies at the college, seeking changes while also bolstering his political clout on campus. Ozuna "said the board should set aside funds for recruiting minorities…and

---

[99] "Mexican-Americans Seek More Say in SAC," *San Antonio* Express, November 25, 1973 in *San Antonio College Scrapbook MM, 1973-1974*, McAllister Collection, San Antonio College Library, San Antonio, TX.

[100] "Federal Agency Charges College with Employment Discrimination," *The Ranger*, November 5, 1976, 1.

[101] "SAC Bias Denied," *San Antonio Evening News*, November 12, 1976 in *San Antonio College Scrapbook SS, 1976-1977*, McAllister Collection, San Antonio College Library, San Antonio, TX.

develop a full college campus in the southwest quadrant of the city."[102] This second recommendation was a consistent focus for Ozuna during his years in office, finally leading to the establishment of Palo Alto College, a public community college located in southwest San Antonio, in 1987.[103]

Two former female faculty members in the history department who I interviewed for this project, Sylvia Sebesta and Ellen Myers, remembered the lack of women among the staff, but the extent of discrimination in their day-to-day activities was more subtle than overt.[104] Sebesta did not feel that she was discriminated against in general, but she did refer to instances of "unflattering humor" and expectations that she would make coffee and take notes in meetings. She claimed that when she voiced her concerns about these practices, however, these behaviors changed, particularly because of the intervention of her department chair, Truett Chance (who would later serve as college president for a short time in the 1980s).[105]

The EEOC report, however, suggests that the cumulative effect of subtle acts of discrimination led to real gender and ethnic disparities on campus. Unlike Navarro College, where this type of discrimination was not put into focus (despite being a more pronounced problem historically), San Antonio College administrators were left in a position where radical change was necessary to confront increasingly unacceptable problems. The use of inside hires for administration, the large size of the campus, and growing dissension among

---

[102] "Hiring Policy of Jr. College Dist. Attacked," *San Antonio Light*, December 18, 1976 in *San Antonio College Scrapbook SS, 1976-1977*.

[103] "About Us: History," Palo Alto College, accessed January 13, 2016, https://www.alamo.edu/pac/pac-history/.

[104] Ellen Myers, interview by the author, San Antonio, TX, June 24, 2015; Sylvia Sebesta, interview by the author, San Antonio, TX, June 24, 2015.

[105] Sylvia Sebesta, interview by the author, San Antonio, TX, June 24, 2015.

the board of trustees made changing the direction of the college more difficult than it was at Navarro College (where the school's operation changed dramatically in the mid-1970s).

When meetings were held by affirmative action officials to address the findings of the EEOC report, Sonny Soliz, Assistant Evening Director and Assistant Registrar at the Southwest Center (a branch of the district) "walked out after a discussion over whether the committee should make a statement about the lack of women in administration…The walkout was spurred by Soliz's anger that specific statements do not address the broader policy changes that were necessary to combat ethnic and gender biases among the administration."[106] This walkout signified the growing discontent of the community and minorities on staff on the inability of the college to enact concrete policies to address inequalities on campus during this period.

Anger at administration over the treatment of minority staff members came from students as well. The contracts of three Mexican American counselors, Irma Cantu, Isabel Salas, and Pedro Sosa, were not extended in 1974 because the Special Services Program they were employed for was terminated (this program depended on outside funding from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare).[107] The program was set up for "individual counseling and tutoring for students from low-income families."[108] Students came to their defense, and the three counselors took their issue to the board claiming administrative negligence in applications for re-funding of the program.[109] Lack of funding led to no board

[106] Jeff Johnson, "Hiring Discussion Spurs Walkout during Affirmative Action Meeting," *The Ranger*, April 1, 1977, 2.

[107] "Fired Counselors Tell Grievances to Trustees, *The Ranger*, April 25, 1974, 1.

[108] "Dismissed Counselors will Go to Board," *The Ranger*, April 19, 1974, 1.

[109] Ibid.

action to reappoint these counselors, again demonstrating difficulty in administration adapting to the concerns of students and faculty members.

The last two years of the Era of Expansion (1979-1980) were particularly difficult times for the college administration and saw a continuation of student and faculty activism on campus. Early in 1979 "an executive board member of the United Mexican American Students (UMAS), presented the San Antonio Community College District Board of Trustees with a statement signed by 18 witnesses to…alleged racist remarks" purportedly made by two professors during the fall of 1978.[110] The group claimed that one of the professors said that "this business of you people eating tortillas, drinking tequila and plucking the guitar is not going to get you anywhere." Weynand called for an investigation of the reported events, but claimed that this type of behavior was unique on campus and not an example of pervasive racism among the staff. Ozuna questioned Weynand's characterization of the event, recalling an incident in which a library reference book, investigated in 1975, included a statement that "all Mexicans who live on the Westside of the city keep their refrigerators on the front porch."[111] Following discussions between the professors and the offended students, the charges of racism were eventually dropped, but UMAS still called on the board to "adopt a policy restraining professors from making discriminatory remarks in class and to form a committee to write a student group grievance procedure" in response to these incidents.[112]

Policies restricting the use of discriminatory language by faculty members seemed like a reasonable course for the administration to take, but the policy proposal that came out of UMAS's request led to greater strife between faculty and administration. The board of

---

[110] "Club Member Charges Racism in Classrooms," *The Ranger*, January 26, 1979, 1, 2.

[111] Ibid.

[112] "Club Drops Charge of Racism in Class," *The Ranger*, February 16, 1979, 1; "Club Members Seek Action, Committee," *The Ranger*, February 23, 1979, 1.

trustees put forward "a proposal to draft a policy regulating political speakers in classrooms" and to restrict the use of discriminatory language by college staff.[113] The restriction on political speakers likely related to a concurrent issue on campus involving a series of demonstrations by Iranian students (this will be discussed in the next chapter).

Four teachers, all of them working in the social sciences, objected to this proposed measure, including Geoffrey Connally, an economics professor who was the president of SAC's chapter of the AAUP.[114] The professors objecting to the policy were joined by Dean Truett Chance (formerly a faculty member and department chair) who suggested that while the spirit behind the proposal was reasonable, that laying out a broad policy limiting the words spoken, and the guests invited to class, by college faculty would "limit academic freedom."[115] One of the professors speaking out against the measure, economics chairman Lewis Fox, suggested that "if some professor isn't acting professionally and is abusing rights under academic freedom, then we ought to deal with the individual, not try to draw a blanket policy which would limit the free debate and exchange and access to ideas."[116]

The strident opposition of the college faculty to possible restrictions on academic freedom highlights a sharp contrast between the administration/faculty relationship at SAC and NC. In 1973, when Ben Jones appeared before the state legislature to oppose the adoption of a policy supporting a form of seniority-based tenure for college faculty members, NC instructors did not make their voices heard in opposition to Jones's actions (even when asked directly by the press). Six years later, however, with the benefit of a stronger faculty senate and an increasingly well-defined tenure policy (rules for tenure were refined in 1977),

---

[113] "Teachers Agree Policy May Limit Academic Rights," *The Ranger*, February 16, 1979, 1.
[114] Ibid.
[115] "Dean Urges Board to Deny Policy Restricting Teachers," *The Ranger*, February 23, 1979, 1.
[116] "Teachers Agree Policy May Limit Academic Rights," *The Ranger*, February 16, 1979, 1.

teachers at SAC, supported by a member of the administration, put forward strong arguments supporting their academic freedom when threatened by a board proposal. Even without research as a major consideration, the experience of faculty members at both SAC and NC show that academic freedom was a key consideration for community college teachers. Furthermore, the presence of a tenure policy and strong representation were important factors allowing professors to maintain influence on campus.

Professors from SAC interviewed for this study consistently said that they did not feel their academic freedom was limited on campus. Bill Knippa explained that "we had a very strong faculty senate, and the board listened to them, and the administration. So, that's how I thought I had a voice."[117] Interestingly, David Mrizek, a speech faculty member in the 1970s, remembers that "the areas that created the most noise…were the government/history/economics people…[because] they didn't have anything else to do."[118] The latter part of this statement may seem derogatory, but interviews with history teachers indicate that they did spend a lot of time in discussion together on the top floor of the Moody Learning Center. While Mrizek portrays these discussions as idle time, the testimony of history faculty members suggests that time spent together in the department offices built strong camaraderie among this group, and gave them a place to air their concerns about the development of the college. Certainly the people who came out most strongly against the board proposal in 1979 worked in the social sciences. Beyond a supposed abundance of free time, it seems plausible that because these professors teach subjects that oftentimes focus on the work of governing bodies and policymaking (contemporarily and historically), they were

[117] Bill Knippa, interview by the author, San Antonio, TX, June 23, 2015.
[118] David Mrizek, interview by the author, San Antonio, TX, June 23, 2015.

in the best position to confront the administration and support the position of faculty members on campus.

Even though the level of faculty power at SAC and NC may have varied, the importance of faculty members as counselors was much the same. San Antonio College had a stronger formal counseling apparatus, but teachers still filled an important role as advisers to students. Robert Zeigler, who was an instructor at Texas Tech (while studying for his Ph.D.) before teaching at SAC, explained that "at the university-level, students didn't seem to need the hands-on kind of stuff that they needed here quite as much… I think even more important [at the community college-level] is to relate to the students, to make the students recognize that you care about them."[119] Several former faculty members mentioned that their role outside of the classroom was as important and enriching as their formal instruction. At a smaller college, less infrastructure for counseling made faculty members the primary advisers at the school, both professionally and personally, but the experience of teachers at SAC indicates that counseling made up a key component of community college instructors' role on campus, regardless of the local environment.

The final year of the Era of Expansion, 1980, saw the storm of conflict move away from faculty members and back to the college president and the board of trustees. In March of 1980, 33 maintenance workers walked off the job in support of fired maintenance supervisor John Boldt. One of the workers resigned soon after, but the other 32 workers were fired. These firings were opposed by the Federation of Federal, State, County, and Municipal Employees, Local Co. 2399, citing that the men were rehired on Monday after being docked pay, meaning that their later firing amounted to being punished twice for the same

[119] Robert Zeigler, interview by the author, San Antonio, TX, June 2, 2015.

incident.[120] Weynand denied the appeal of his decision to fire the workers, but the fallout from the incident was far from over.[121]

State representative Frank Madla took a special interest in the case, saying he was "stunned by the firing of the workers" after early indications that the punishment would be a short suspension. He called on his staff to "look into the bidding process and other allocations of state funds to the college."[122] With the issue now becoming a political hot point, George Ozuna (now a six year veteran of the board of trustees) took up the workers' cause as he positioned himself for a bid for board chairman later in the year.[123] The threat to state-level funding and the growing interest of the board led to the reversal of Weynand's decision and the rehiring of the workers in April of 1980. Not coincidentally, Ozuna was elected as chairman of the board the same month, riding the tide of the controversy. One of Ozuna's first actions was to call for Weynand's resignation.[124] Weynand, who had been a student at SAC and worked in administration for 25 years, was taken aback at the request (even if he and Ozuna were clearly not allies). After negotiation, the two agreed that Weynand would stay on for the remainder of his contract until 1981, allowing him to secure retirement benefits.[125]

Both campuses saw the direct impact of the board on campus affairs increase in the 1970s, though for different reasons. At Navarro Junior College, lagging enrollments due to

---

[120] Bill Graham, "32 Workers Fired by College District," *San Antonio Express*, March 7, 1980 in *San Antonio College Scrapbook YY, 1980A*, McAllister Collection, San Antonio College Library, San Antonio, TX.

[121] Wade Roberts, "Dismissals Stand: Maintenance Workers' Appeal Denied," *San Antonio Express*, March 15, 1980 in *San Antonio College Scrapbook YY, 1980A*.

[122] Juan Montoya, "Misled on SAC Firings-Madla," *San Antonio Light*, March 8, 1980 in *San Antonio College Scrapbook YY, 1980A*.

[123] Vicky Waddy, "Cheers Greet Bid to Rehire SAC Workers," *San Antonio Light*, April 9, 1980 in *San Antonio College Scrapbook YY, 1980A*.

[124] "Ozuna Wants Weynand to Resign," *The Ranger*, March 14, 1980, 2.

[125] Jerome Weynand, interview by the author, San Antonio, TX, June 3, 2015.

changes to higher education in the region, coupled with a lack of curricular innovation to meet the challenge, led to Ben Jones's replacement in 1974. At San Antonio College, a series of campus controversies resulted in greater community attention on the college (as SAC gained daily headlines in the paper), and thus led to the greater politicization of board positions. An activist board led to growing discontent among faculty members and on-campus administrators, who saw board management of daily campus affairs as overstepping its bounds, but the community's perception that actions needed to be taken gave the board greater license in their activities.[126] In both cases, boards of trustees were stirred to action by threats to the campus. The nature of these threats, however, were different. Navarro Junior College, a smaller campus with limited local demand, had to alter its course to maintain growth in enrollment. San Antonio College, a larger campus with plentiful demand, had to alter its course to maintain community and state support for funding to ensure it could meet this demand.

Conclusion

The Era of Expansion saw the mission of the community college begin to deviate more sharply from senior institutions. Universities increasingly focused on research, bolstered by the investment of the federal government and private industry. Community colleges sought to make their institutions more inclusive by introducing adult education coursework and extending their terminal/vocational programs. Despite the growing

[126] Vicky Waddy and O'Lene Stone, "SACCD Faculty Upset Over Actions of Trustees," *San Antonio Light*, July 31, 1980 in *San Antonio College Scrapbook YY, 1980A*.

separation in mission, however, the major characteristic that both types of institutions shared during this period, growth, led to similarities in their development.

A rise in student enrollment and an increase in potential sources of funding made both universities and community colleges more responsive to market conditions during the Era of Expansion. This trend led to growing concern about the academic freedom of university professors whose research pursuits ran the risk of warping under the pressure of ambitious administrators and demanding government officials. At the community college, the growth of the institution increased the pressure on administration to be adaptable to market conditions to ensure the sustainability of their school's rapid development. Many times this adaptability, to the influence of the community and government bodies, led administrators to impede on the autonomy of faculty members.

Dramatic reshaping of the composition of the college faculty and policies possibly infringing on a teacher's academic freedom were easier to carry out at a smaller institution like Navarro College. During Jones's administration, he felt little restraint in suggesting the proper behavior of his faculty members, inside and outside the classroom. Considering NJC's sources of funding, his focus was to first make sure the actions of the faculty were acceptable to the community, and second to secure his own authority over the direction of the campus (seen in the early 1970s controversy over a potential state tenure policy). Walker's presidency began with a mass restructuring of the college faculty, free from the constraints of due process mandated by tenure, in order to allow for the school's growth, and to reshape the college's mission to open up new sources of funds (particularly from the federal government).

The primary check on administration's power at NC was derived from the board of trustee's insistence on the continued growth of the school. Issues concerning the diversity of the administrators and faculty were not pursued heavily by the media, leading to less pressure on the administration to change their hiring practices in comparison to SAC. Criticism of the administration by faculty members was not prominent at NC, particularly without tenure as security against possible reprisals for their feedback.

Administrators at San Antonio College, a larger college with closer ties to senior institutions (particularly the University of Texas), found it more difficult to mold faculty members to best meet the expectations of market conditions. The use of inside hires at SAC led to less dramatic shifts in the operation of the school resulting from changes in presidency. Outside of conservatism in hiring, the college presidents, particularly in the 1970s, found the bounds of their authority restricted by the activism of the board of trustees, an increasingly outspoken faculty, a critical local press and community, and the oversight of the federal government. The gaining of a tenure track for faculty members reduced the power of administrative authority over hiring and firing and gave teachers more leeway to weigh in on campus issues (including policies potentially infringing on professors' academic freedom). Furthermore, faculty members (and former faculty members), were more willing to interact with outside sources of influence directly, leading to greater scrutiny of the school's operation by the federal government and the local community. The aggressive coverage of campus conflicts by local newspapers led to a more activist board seeking to address local concerns, but also to potentially spin these controversies to their political advantage.

At both institutions the relative power of faculty members in relation to administrators was less than at universities. The development of these two campuses suggests, however, that local context affected the power dynamics at community colleges.

CHAPTER 6
QUALITY VERSUS ACCESS: STUDENTS DURING THE ERA OF EXPANSION

The previous chapter introduced a new point of discussion into the historiography by examining the faculty/administration relationship at the community college. The relative newness of the subject has left noticeable gaps in the community college historiography, but the role of students has been a more heavily investigated topic in previous studies. The broad geographic scope of these histories, however, has led to large-scale conclusions at the expense of engagement with individual student voices. The narrower scope of this study allows for more space to access stories that put student experiences front-and-center in the community college's history. This chapter will consider how well the arguments on the experience of students made in broad histories of the community college hold up at the individual level and within different institutional contexts (rural versus urban environments).

Unlike the historiography on faculty and administration, where the histories of senior institutions and community colleges differed in degree and substance, both branches of the higher education literature share a major focus when looking at students in the latter half of the twentieth century: the issue of access and the composition of college student bodies. I previously mentioned David Karen's article which shows a narrowing of differences in college access for previously underrepresented groups between 1960 and 1986, but with the interesting caveat that access to elite institutions correlated with political mobilization (leading to a greater narrowing of the higher education gap for women and blacks than the working class).[1] The findings of Victoria-María MacDonald, John Botti, and Lisa Hoffman

[1] David Karen, "The Politics of Class, Race, and Gender: Access to Higher Education in the United States, 1960-1986," *American Journal of Education* 99, no. 2 (1991), 208-237.

Clark fall in-line with Karen's findings. In their investigation of Latino higher education since 1965, they found that the Chicano Movement provided a way for the Latino community to gain visibility from the federal government whose attention was largely on African Americans in the 1960s.[2] The earlier mobilization of black Americans following World War II made them the major subject of national attention through the mid-1960s, but greater activism by Latinos and women on the heels of the Civil Rights Movement helped to increase their access to higher education institutions.

The lack of a coherent working class social movement during the 1960s led to this group's concentration in lower-tier institutions, including community colleges.[3] Jana Nidiffer's study of "The Poorest in Higher Education" aligns with Karen's findings on working class students. Nidiffer argues that the preoccupation with issues of access and discrimination based on race has cloaked the fact that "socioeconomic background emerges as perhaps the most salient determinate of college attendance."[4] Unsurprisingly, the upsurge of working class enrollment at community colleges (where this group was concentrated), along with rising minority enrollments, has been a major topic in the community college historiography.

The most glaring fact about students at community colleges during the Era of Expansion was just what the name of the era implies, the stupendous growth in enrollments during these years. "In 1950, [national] enrollment in public two-year colleges was 168,043. The figure more than doubled over the next ten years to 393,553. Then, between 1960 and

---

[2] Victoria-Maria MacDonald, John M. Botti, and Lisa Hoffman Clark, "From Visibility to Autonomy: Latinos and Higher Education in the US, 1965–2005," *Harvard Educational Review* 77, no. 4 (2007): 476.

[3] Karen, "The Politics of Class, Race, and Gender," 208.

[4] Jana Nidiffer, "Poor Historiography: The 'Poorest' in American Higher Education," *History of Education Quarterly* 39, no. 3 (1999): 322.

1970, enrollments increased more than fivefold, reaching about 2.1 million. One estimate was that on the average, a new public community campus opened each week during the decade starting in 1960."[5]

Beyond a surface-level recognition that general enrollment was on the rise, community college histories have also detailed the changing composition of student bodies. The widening of the community college mission led to greater age diversity on campus, as many older students began to enroll in training and continuing education programs. The comprehensive mission of public two-year colleges in this era was also more adaptable to the needs of women, particularly mothers, as outlined by Paula Fass.[6]

Community colleges' adaptability and open door admissions made their student population more closely mirror the composition of the general population in comparison to senior institutions. Clifford Adelman found that the composition of community college student bodies "was more representative of the [high school] Class of '72 than those who either did not continue their education at all or who continued it only at 4-year colleges."[7] Adelman's conclusion takes into consideration issues of race and ethnicity (specifically noticing the increased enrollment of Latinos), economic background, educational background, and even military service.[8] His findings provide backing for the arguments of scholars working in the democratizing branch of the historiography who praise community colleges as instrumental in increasing access and developing as a "people's college."

---

[5] John R. Thelin, *A History of American Higher Education*, 2nd ed. (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2011), 299.

[6] Paula S. Fass, *Outside In: Minorities and the Transformation of American Education* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989), 169.

[7] Clifford Adelman et al., *The Way We Are: The Community College as American Thermometer* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Dept. of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, Office of Research, 1992), vi.

[8] Ibid.

Another thread of the community college historiography on student access and composition focuses on the nature of students' studies while in school. Considering the expansion in vocational/technical programs during this period, it is unsurprising that enrollment in this coursework increased, particularly in the early 1970s when "vocational graduates doubled" in a five year period.[9] W. Norton Grubb suggests, however, that vocational programs did not increase relative enrollment since the popularity of individual programs was not that high. Instead, the overall increase in enrollment was a consequence of the sheer volume of new programs, not their individual popularity.[10] Another interesting point about these programs is the reticence of African Americans to enroll in vocational coursework. Blacks saw community college attendance "as a stepping-stone to even *higher* education."[11] The lower popularity of terminal vocational coursework among blacks contributes to the trend that "blacks from the Class of '72 were far less likely to use the community college in their postsecondary education than Hispanics, and no more likely than whites."[12] Perhaps the imposition of industrial education programs on blacks historically contributed to their reticence to abandon the traditional academic curriculum.[13]

While the historiography of senior institutions and community colleges both include a focus on student access, they deviate when discussing students' higher education impact.

---

[9] Allen A. Witt et al., *America's Community Colleges: The First Century* (Washington D.C.: The Community College Press, 1994), 249.

[10] W. Norton Grubb, "Vocationalizing Higher Education: The Causes of Enrollment and Completion in Public Two-Year Colleges, 1970-1980," *Economics of Education Review* 7, no. 3 (1988): 314.

[11] Leland L. Medsker and Dale Tillery, *Breaking the Access Barriers: A Profile of Two-Year Colleges* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971), 78.

[12] Adelman et al., *The Way We Are*, 8; This argument about African American resistance to terminal/vocational programs in reflected in the findings of *The Diverted Dream:* Steven G. Brint and Jerome Karabel, *The Diverted Dream: Community Colleges and the Promise of Educational Opportunity in America, 1900-1985* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989), location 1653.

[13] For a discussion on the history of African Americans and industrial education preceding this era see: James D Anderson, *The Education of Blacks in the South, 1860-1935* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1988).

Scholars looking at universities and four-year colleges have spent considerable time looking at the impact of activist students on the campuses where they attended. Community college historians have looked at the opposite dynamic. Instead of looking at students' impact on the college, they have looked at the impact of a community college education on the student.

Students enter the university historiography of this era as a force for institutional change. Fueled by issues like civil rights, opposition to the war in Vietnam, and problems with the university structure, students increasingly demanded change in the operation of their schools.[14] As John Thelin explains, "The disagreements between undergraduates and university administrators that escalated between 1961 and 1965…were not about the facts of the university's role in society but rather the appropriateness of that role. Questions about the university as a home for research sponsored by the Department of Defense reached a new level of volatility in 1964 and 1965, when they became linked to growing political dissent about the United States' military presence in Southeast Asia."[15] The post-World War II ties between the university and the federal government began to come under fire, particularly due to increasingly controversial state actions, such as the escalation of intervention in Vietnam.

The power of student activism forced colleges to adapt to their demands, including a lessening of the research relationship between universities and the federal government, with state funds increasingly diverted to promoting individual student access. Thelin also argues that this period of "crisis" for the universities led to cultural changes on campus. The youth culture of the postwar era, including changing political attitudes, tastes in music, and vocabulary, forced universities to adapt their environment. The cultural climate of the new

---

[14] Roger L. Geiger, *Research and Relevant Knowledge: American Research Universities since World War II* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 231.

[15] Thelin, *A History of American Higher Education*, 309.

student bodies, coupled with a massive spike in enrollment, led to growing concerns about the issues of "retention and degree completion."[16] Universities had to address changes in society in order to ensure they were properly serving their clientele to allow for sustainable growth without weathering high levels of dropouts. Questions on the impact of students on the operation of community colleges has not been emphasized in the historiography, particularly their political activism, but this study will address the institutional impact of students directly to broaden the discussion started by historians of the university.

The issue of retention is also a major consideration in histories of the community college, though institutional change to respond to this concern is not as commonly addressed in this branch of the higher education historiography. Community college historians, instead, have focused on the ultimate outcome of attendance at a public two-year college, in terms of short-term attainment (completion of degree) and long-term social mobility. The fundamental divide within the historiography revolves around the central question which arises in response to this topic: if enrollment at a community college is beneficial for students and, if so, is it more beneficial than enrollment at a senior institution?

The aforementioned study of the Class of '72 by Adelman suggests a positive, though limited, role for the community college. "The community college functioned in a variety of 'occasional' roles in the lives of individuals. It accommodated their decisions to engage in learning on their own terms, and in their own time. Even if students were constrained by poor academic preparation or economic circumstances, they seemed to make of the community college what they wanted to make of it."[17] These findings support the arguments of

[16] Ibid., 329.
[17] Adelman et al., *The Way We Are*, v–vi.

community college advocates claiming that these schools have been key in expanding higher education in terms of curricular and academic access.

Despite the claims of those praising community colleges for its democratizing function, other researchers have presented data which suggests that "students who start their postsecondary schooling at a community college attain a bachelor's degree at a significantly lower rate than those who enroll directly at a 4-year institution."[18] These scholars have conducted quantitative analyses that show that, even when controlling for socioeconomic and educational background, initial higher education enrollment at a community college has a negative impact on a student's chances to gain a Bachelor's degree, even when enrolling with the intent to transfer.[19] Burton Clark's findings on the filtering role of the community college (identifying students capable of university work), and the availability of terminal coursework and counselors willing to push "latent terminal students" into these programs, provided a base for revisionist historians to claim that these institutions blunt students' social mobility chances.[20] Instead of serving the needs of its students, authors like Jerome Karabel argue that they instead "reproduce existing social relations."[21] Community colleges act as a safety valve for the democratic impulse that leads to calls for greater access to higher education, but these colleges lack the transformative power, in the arguments of revisionists, for this access to translate into real socioeconomic gains.

---

[18] Mariana Alfonso, "The Impact of Community College Attendance on Baccalaureate Attainment," *Research in Higher Education* 47, no. 8 (2006): 874.

[19] Kevin James Dougherty, *The Contradictory College: The Conflicting Origins, Impacts, and Futures of the Community College* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1994), 10.

[20] Burton R. Clark, *The Open Door College: A Case Study.* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960).

[21] Jerome Karabel, "Community Colleges and Social Stratification in the 1980s," *CC New Directions for Community Colleges* 1986, no. 54 (1986): 18.

The students of the colleges studied here share many of the characteristics detailed in previous histories. General enrollments increased at both schools over this era, though Navarro College's growth was less consistent. Their student bodies grew more diverse, though this diversity was more pronounced at San Antonio College because of the multi-ethnic demographics of the city where it was located and the stronger advocacy mechanisms for minority groups, particularly Mexican Americans.

While both of these campuses generally fall in-line with historians' arguments about the characteristics of community college students during these years, there are some noticeable deviations when looking at student activities on campus and the long-term impact of a community college education. Revisionist historians have spent considerable time studying the impact of initial community college enrollment on educational attainment, suggesting that community college attendance reduces chances to earn the Bachelor's degree, but at both of these campuses the larger issue of access outshines questions of ultimate degree attainment. Former students and faculty members on both campuses consistently pointed to the crucial function that community colleges play as higher education institutions, due to cost, proximity, and open admissions, in allowing those who would never have attended college an opportunity to continue their education.

In addition, previous histories' tendency to focus on the destination (earning a degree) instead of the journey (the student experience on campus) has led to a lack of appreciation for students' impact on campus development (a key component of the university historiography) and the social and political benefits of gaining an education. The findings of this study suggest that students at smaller schools, like Navarro College, were more active in athletic and social organizations on campus in comparison to community college students at larger

institutions in cities. Even though participation in social groups and investment in school athletics was not as consistent at SAC, its students were more engaged politically. SAC students, increasingly over the course of this era, took stands on the Vietnam War, challenged administration and faculty members for perceived discrimination, and organized to advocate in the interests of particular ethnic or political groups.

Interestingly, the greatest similarity in extracurricular events at both campuses revolved around the actions of Iranian students. Though not emphasized in the historiography, SAC and NC built up substantial bodies of international students during the Era of Expansion. The backgrounds of these students were fairly varied up until the late 1970s when Iranian students began to enroll at the schools in large numbers. Some of these students, especially in the midst of the Iranian Revolution, came into conflict with administration and staged protests on and off campus. The appearance of international student militancy would not come as a surprise at a large urban campus like SAC, but starkly similar occurrences at NC suggest that Iranian student activism at community colleges in the late 1970s went beyond a few isolated incidents.

The following sections will show that the community college historiography, largely through quantitative analyses, has succeeded in outlining the composition of student bodies on these campuses and describing the long-term educational and economic impacts of a community college education. This chapter seeks to humanize the community college student by accessing individual voices to capture why students enroll at these schools and what their experience on campus was like.

Navarro (Junior) College

The most obvious change in Navarro Junior College's student body between 1955 and 1965 was in the number of students attending. Overall, on-site day enrollment at the school increased almost three times from 385 students in 1955 up to 1,078 in 1965 at the time of the creation of the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board. Enrollment largely stagnated at that point until picking up again in the mid-1970s after Kenneth Walker took over the presidency and embraced the community college concept.[22] Brint and Karabel claim that the motivation for the implementation of vocational programs came out of community college leaders' perception (anticipatory subordination) that these programs would appeal to industry and the state, and establish a niche for public two-year colleges.[23] Navarro College's experience, however, points to other reasons for some colleges embracing the comprehensive community college concept. The direct actions of the state (not perceived future actions), and the lack of growth in student enrollment while the school maintained the traditional junior college mission, are what led to institutional change at Navarro College. Enrollment numbers at NC suggest student interest, not student resistance, to the implementation of a more diverse curriculum.

The racial and ethnic composition of Navarro College's student body was slow to change during these years. Even though the school integrated early on during the Era of Expansion, in 1961, the presence of black students on campus remained small until the 1970s. The first year the college integrated, five black students enrolled.[24] By the mid-1960s,

---

[22] Navarro Junior College, "Navarro Junior College Self-Study: Prepared for the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, January, 1974" (Corsicana, TX: Navarro Junior College, 1974), 36, Box B12-a, Pearce Museum Archives at Navarro College, Corsicana, TX.

[23] Brint and Karabel, *The Diverted Dream*, location 344.

[24] Tommy W. Stringer, *Dreams and Visions: The History of Navarro College* (Waco, TX: Davis Brothers Publishing Co., 1996), 34.

the college yearbook only included pictures of 11 black freshman and 0 sophomores (suggesting early transfer or high drop-out rates).[25] Considering that the 1960 census placed the non-white population of the county at 25 percent, that only slightly higher than one percent of NC's enrollment was black is an alarming statistic.[26] It was not until the public schools in Corsicana integrated in the early 1970s that NC's racial composition began to more clearly mirror that of the local population.[27]

Reviewing the college's yearbooks, black students rarely participated in extracurricular activities outside of athletics until the late 1960s. It was only one year after integration that the first black student tried out for the football team, eighteen year old Marlow Crawford.[28] But the experience of Thelma Butcher, one of the first black students at NJC who focused on her studies but did not take part in social or educational organizations, seems to have been typical during this era.[29] Academically, black men seemed to follow the national trend pointing to black preference for academic programs by predominantly enrolling in the school's pre-law program. Black women, however, enrolled heavily in vocational nursing, one of the few terminal programs at NJC during the 1960s.[30]

The number of black students on campus increased in the 1960s, but the attitudes of local communities were not always accepting of integration. Cheryl Tatum, currently an

---

[25] *El Navarro, 1965* (Corsicana, TX: Navarro Junior College, 1965), Pearce Museum Archives at Navarro College, Corsicana, TX.

[26] U.S. Bureau of the Census, *U.S. Census of Population: 1960,* Vol. I, *Characteristics of the Population, Part 45, Texas* (Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1963), 45-101.

[27] Sylvia A. Waters, "Integration Implemented Quietly Here," *Corsicana Daily Sun*, August 27, 1972, 1.

[28] "First Negro is Trying to Make Bulldog Team," *Corsicana Daily Sun*, August 30, 1962, 1.

[29] Thelma Butcher, interview by Tommy Stringer, Corsicana, TX, September 19, 1978, Pearce Museum Archives at Navarro College, Corsicana, TX.

[30] *El Navarro, 1967* (Corsicana, TX: Navarro Junior College, 1967), Pearce Museum Archives at Navarro College, Corsicana, TX.

English faculty member, attended Navarro Junior College from 1967-1969. She recalled an incident in which:

> The choir went… for a week…[and] we sang in a different high school like Navasota and Centerville…So one night we were in this community and they were having a revival. I'm a Christian, and they were having a revival, and so some of us decided to go to the revival service. There were, I don't know, five or six, seven of us, and Carol was one of them, the African American girl [in the choir]. So we went in a little early…and sat near the front, and we were just going to attend the service and one of the deacons in the church went down the aisle and said 'I'm sorry, but you can't be here.'...Yeah, it was '69, '68. "I'm sorry, but you can't be here." And…you know, looking at her. And we got pretty angry. One of us got even more angry than I did, but we all left. Never forgot that.[31]

Tatum's experience suggests that the campus culture at Navarro Junior College was becoming more accepting of black students, evidenced by their increased participation in extracurricular activities and support from white students, but the attitudes of rural communities in East Texas (though this example occurred outside of Navarro County) still represented a barrier to societal integration.

Black enrollment at Navarro Junior College began to increase in the early 1970s as the public school system inched towards integration. Trends in the college yearbook show evidence of an increasingly accepting campus environment by the final decade of the Era of Expansion. Before 1970, all yearbook individual awards (such as Homecoming Queen and Mr. and Miss NJC) had gone to white students. The 1970 edition of *El Navarro*, however,

[31] Cheryl Tatum, interview by the author, Corsicana, TX, May 27, 2015.

shows the first instance of black students earning these titles (a trend that would continue throughout the decade).[32]

Dairy Johnson, one of the first black students to go to the previously all-white Corsicana High School (he transferred there during his junior year) went on to complete a degree in offset printing at Navarro Junior College in 1972.[33] Johnson, currently an administrator at NC, remembers the campus culture being accepting of black students by the time he attended due to their being "a pretty good ratio of African American students from all over."[34] Local newspapers did report on the lack of black faculty and administrators in proportion to the diversity of the college's student body (there were 125 black students by 1972), but there are no records of student-led organizing for campus reform to meet the needs of black students during these years.[35] Instead of individual or group advocacy, it seems like the proportion of black enrollment was directly related to the acceptance of black students on campus.

Dairy Johnson's enrollment in offset printing, a terminal/vocational program, marks an early trend towards diversifying Navarro College's curriculum, even before Kenneth Walker took over the presidency in 1974. Before the mid-1960s, college publications focused on the performance of transfer students after enrolling at senior institutions. An accreditation report in 1963 claims, based on faculty interactions with former students, that "transfers from Navarro Junior College do as well as, and in some cases better than, they have done in their

---

[32] *El Navarro, 1970* (Corsicana, TX: Navarro Junior College, 1970), Pearce Museum Archives at Navarro College, Corsicana, TX.

[33] Dairy Johnson, interview by the author, Corsicana, TX, May 27, 2015.

[34] Ibid.

[35] "Jones Explains NJC's Black History Lack," *Corsicana Daily Sun*, February 15, 1972, 1.

first two years."[36] The same report alluded to the success of "terminal business" students as well, but the major point of pride for the campus was transfer education.[37]

The calls of the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board, for junior colleges to embrace the community college concept, led to some changes at Navarro College in the late 1960s and early 1970s, despite President Ben Jones's resistance. By 1972, a substantial number of students (16 percent of enrollment) took vocational/technical coursework, most of them in "'occupational' rather than 'transfer'" programs."[38] Navarro Junior College took pride in their placement of these "terminal" students into gainful employment. The school's 1974 self-study for accreditation reports "that 176 of 316 technical arts graduates between 1966 and 1972 began working immediately after graduation.[39] One hundred eleven of the 316 continued their formal education."[40] Some quick math reveals that this means that 29 of 316 of these students were unemployed and unenrolled, but overall this is not a bad record for justifying the positive impact of technical arts education during these years. Dairy Johnson's own experience follows the trends in this data. Upon completing his two-year degree, he went on to work for 24 years at the *Corsicana Daily Sun*.[41] Despite previous historians' suspicions that enrollment in terminal coursework oftentimes came out of the advice students received from college staff, Johnson went to school seeking a technical arts terminal degree, and used the skills he received to move into the workplace.

---

[36] Navarro Junior College Faculty and Administration, "Report of Self Study of Navarro Junior College" (Corsicana, TX: Navarro Junior College, 1963), 72, Box B12-a, Pearce Museum Archives at Navarro College, Corsicana, TX.

[37] Ibid.

[38] Navarro Junior College, "Navarro Junior College Self-Study: Prepared for the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, January, 1974," 39.

[39] Ibid., 41.

[40] Ibid.

[41] Dairy Johnson, interview by the author, Corsicana, TX, May 27, 2015.

As vocational programs increasingly populated the Navarro College curriculum after the mid-1960s, and more prominently in the late 1970s, higher numbers of students enrolled in terminal coursework. The broadening of the college mission led to less proportional college transfers, and presumably, overall lower educational attainment for NC students who were now less likely, on average, to attend a senior institution. The growth of terminal coursework at the same time the student population became more diverse, particularly in terms of race, raises important questions. Do these concurrent trends point to intended diversion of the new community college student from higher levels of social mobility? Or, did the diversification of the curriculum attract these new students in the first place? The testimony of those I interviewed suggests that both perspectives have merit.

Beginning with the aforementioned Dairy Johnson, former students focused on Navarro Junior College's low cost and proximity as major reasons for their enrollment, recognizing that without the opportunities NJC offered they likely would not have attended a higher education institution. Johnson recalled the financial burden that a college education, even at a relatively inexpensive junior college, placed on his family:

> My mom, at that time, went to the old State National Bank which is the tallest building here in town. It's still standing, Chase Bank now. I don't know if we had financial aid at that time, but my mom borrowed money for my brother and I to go to school here...she borrowed the money, and she said, "well fellows, I'm going to do it this time, the rest you're on your own." So we had to grow up fast. We had to mature fast to take care and be responsible. So I knew that my education was very serious.[42]

[42] Ibid.

Johnson did not consider attending a different institution "because it was local…I can work here, live here, sleep here…It was the convenience of being here in Corsicana."[43] While the mission of Navarro College changed over the decades, its overall appeal, in terms of cost and proximity, remained strong.

Carole Davenport, another example of a student enrolling in a terminal program during this time of transition, complicates the narrative of the impact of curricular changes at the school. Davenport did not pursue her initial interest in education, instead enrolling in a one year secretarial certification program. She saw this as a pragmatic decision since it would guarantee her a job upon completion of her certificate. Her choice to enroll in the certification program instead of a transfer program in education came out of a personal belief that she was "not college material."[44] She did not attribute this statement to Navarro Junior College staff, but just a general feeling she had because she "couldn't discipline [herself] to be in one spot and just do [book learning]."[45]

Davenport's experience seems to point to the increased availability of terminal programs enticing students to seek short-term credentials ensuring employability. If she had attended NJC 15 years earlier, when terminal programs were mostly concentrated in male fields for returning veterans, she may have been more likely to pursue her original interest in education. Davenport was not advised to enter the secretarial program, but neither was she pushed to follow her original interest in teaching. Her experience suggests that passive factors at the school, including a changing curriculum and a lack of proactive advising to push for higher educational attainment, affected students' enrollment decisions. She admits

[43] Ibid.
[44] Carole Davenport, interview by the author, Corsicana, TX, May 28, 2015.
[45] Ibid.

that even if she had been advised to pursue a career in teaching "she…probably wouldn't have listened," but the fact remains that this hypothetical scenario never occurred.[46] Davenport went on to effectively capitalize on her talents as she now works as the Coordinator for Special Events for the Cook Center at Navarro College. I have no doubt, however, that if she had pursued an education career she would have been successful as well (the same talents she shows in establishing comfortable social settings and organization are also key qualities in teaching).[47]

Johnson and Davenport's experiences are mirrored in the recollections of other former students as well. Particularly the importance of cost, proximity, and familiarity as reasons for enrollment at NJC. Davenport remembers that the cost of her brother's education at Texas Tech and Baylor would have made it difficult for her parents to afford to send here to a four-year college.[48] Lary Reed, who attended NJC earlier in the Era of Expansion, explained that for him, "it was this college or nowhere. And it was only to get out of the hayfield. I hated the hayfield. And…Navarro was just here…it was close."[49] Peggy Herod, a student at NJC from 1959-1961, also remembers the appeal of the school's proximity and familiarity. During high school she saw Navarro Junior College students on the bus, providing an example for her future enrollment. She mentioned location and the campus environment as the college's main draw, explaining that "I think one thing when I think about Navarro, I think about feelings. About people that were here and you felt like they cared about you, from the president of the college to somebody that—Rosy that was in

[46] Ibid.

[47] "The Cook Center at Navarro College," Navarro College, accessed January 20, 2016, http://www.navarrocollege.edu/cookcenter/.

[48] Carole Davenport, interview by the author, Corsicana, TX, May 28, 2015.

[49] Lary Reed, interview by the author, Corsicana, TX, August 14, 2015.

charge of the cafeteria."[50] Creating a campus environment that was approachable for students coming from small surrounding communities was a priority for NJC's founders, and this foundation carried over into the Era of Expansion.

The accessibility of the campus environment stems from the continuation of another trend found during the Era of Establishment, the high participation of students in campus activities. The popularity of the school's athletic teams continued well past NJC's first decade, leading to the previously alluded to statement by an accreditor that "the college be careful not to let athletics become the primary function of the institution."[51] The students I interviewed who attended NJC/NC during these years recalled attending sporting events, but they also discussed their active participation in other campus groups. Cheryl Tatum was a member of the Phi Theta Kappa honor society, joined the choir, and served as the president of the Baptist Student Union.[52] She credits these opportunities as helping her to expand her social reach after growing up in the small town of Frost. Peggy Herod was also active in student activities including the Methodist Fellowship and the Future Teachers organization.[53] Carole Davenport was a member of the Senioritas, the drill team on campus.[54] Stepping up from the relatively small high schools in Navarro County, the large number of athletic, social, and professional groups that students could join offered easy opportunities to embrace a larger campus community.

Davenport, like the students who attended the school in its first few years, mentioned that knowing some of the staff outside of school, particularly through church, also made her

---

[50] Peggy Herod, interview by the author, Corsicana, TX, July 7, 2015.

[51] Gary Edmonson, "College Accreditation: Committee Took Harsh Look at NC's Education Program, Faculty," *Corsicana Daily Sun*, January 23, 1975, 1.

[52] Cheryl Tatum, interview by the author, Corsicana, TX, May 27, 2015.

[53] Peggy Herod, interview by the author, Corsicana, TX, July 7, 2015.

[54] Carole Davenport, interview by the author, Corsicana, TX, May 28, 2015.

more comfortable during her time as a student.[55] Similarly, Cheryl Tatum already knew her Spanish teacher since she was from her hometown of Frost.[56] Unlike San Antonio College, where personal connections to the faculty and staff were rare because of the size of the city and the geographic diversity of SAC's teachers (hailing from across the state and the nation), part of the appeal of Navarro Junior College came out of the less intimidating college environment it could offer for county residents hailing from smaller communities.

Navarro County residents made up the bulk of NC's student body, but the campus had a history of enrolling international students attracted to the school because of the quality education if offered at a relatively low cost (in comparison to senior institutions in the U.S.). In the previous section I mentioned that, beginning in the 1940s, Navarro Junior College enrolled international students, the first two coming from Greece.[57] Cecil Williams, an NJC faculty member, attracted Bolivian students to the school after working on a grant there in the 1950s.[58] By the 1960s, these students had built up enough of a base at NJC to establish the International Club. This club included "all students who are away from their home countries."[59] The initial membership of the club, established during the 1961-1962 school year, included a dozen students, primarily from Bolivia.[60]

The number of international students at NJC increased and became more diverse by the 1970s. During the 1970-1971 school year, 69 international students enrolled at NJC. "Among these [were] thirty-three from Iran, thirteen from Thailand, twelve from Bolivia,

---

[55] Ibid.

[56] Cheryl Tatum, interview by the author, Corsicana, TX, May 27, 2015.

[57] "2 Greek Hi-School Graduates have Enrolled in Local Junior College: Expect to Arrive Soon," *Corsicana Daily Sun*, October 23, 1946, 12.

[58] Stringer, *Dreams and Visions*, 33.

[59] *El Navarro, 1962* (Corsicana, TX: Navarro Junior College, 1962), Pearce Museum Archives at Navarro College, Corsicana, TX.

[60] Ibid.

three from Pakistan, two from Mexico, and one each from Venezuela, Surinam, Ethiopia, China, and Hong Kong."[61] Cecil Williams's work to increase NJC's outreach outside U.S. borders clearly paid dividends by the early 1970s, but a change in campus policy in 1972 put a dent in foreign admissions. The addition of an English fluency test to the admissions process during that year led to a dramatic drop in international student enrollment, which plummeted to a decade-low 30 students in the fall of 1973.[62] The implementation of stricter standards for admissions in this time period was an odd choice considering NJC's struggles to maintain adequate enrollment numbers in the new higher education climate of the state after the creation of the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board. Unsurprisingly, international student enrollment would increase again during Walker's presidency, aligning with his primary focus on campus growth.

The increasing attendance of Iranian students during the early 1970s picked up again in the latter years of the decade. The appearance of large numbers of Iranian students in Corsicana, Texas may come as a surprise, but demographic data on Iranian immigration patterns in the 1970s offers some explanation for this phenomenon. "The initial geographic distribution of Iranians in the United States shows the importance of universities and colleges in attracting Iranian students."[63] These student were concentrated "in southern California, New York, New Jersey, Texas, and Massachusetts."[64] There was a precedent for Iranians to

---

[61] *El Navarro, 1971* (Corsicana, TX: Navarro Junior College, 1971), Pearce Museum Archives at Navarro College, Corsicana, TX.

[62] Navarro Junior College, "Navarro Junior College Self-Study: Prepared for the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, January, 1974," 38.

[63] Ronald H. Bayor, *Multicultural America: An Encyclopedia of the Newest Americans* (Santa Barbara, CA: Greenwood, 2011), 1081.

[64] Ibid.

come to Texas to seek an education in this period, and the state's community colleges offered a more affordable option to begin their schooling.

Interviews with faculty members at both SAC and NC revealed that teaching Iranian students could sometimes be challenging. Struggles with the language and cultural differences led to problems in the classroom. Partly to address these difficulties, Navarro College implemented new admission requirements for international students for the 1977-1978 school year. The new policy "require[d] entrance exams [Test of English as a Foreign Language]…for all international students" and required them "to have 'adequate' health and automobile insurance, to take a special orientation course, to pay an additional $50 fee for processing immigration forms, and to be counseled regarding conduct in the community…Placement at Navarro" would be based on their exam results."[65] Iranian students attending, or interested in attending NC, were upset at the new admissions standards.

A *Corsicana Daily Sun* article on the experience of Iranian students, totaling 226 in the spring of 1977, gave some context for why this policy was implemented, and why it led to resentment from these students. The language exam that was put in place in 1972 was already seen as a great hurdle by Iranian students attempting to enroll at NC. Adding more admissions requirements, even if they were purportedly only for "placement" decisions, was worrisome for these students. Furthermore, the interviews quoted in this article show how differences between Iranian and United States pedagogy led to tension in the teacher/student relationship. One Iranian student commented that "American teachers do not have as much affection for the student. In my country, a student can go to his teacher with any problem,

[65] Richard Cole, "Admission Requirements to be Set for International Students at NC," *Corsicana Daily Sun*, April 14, 1977, 1.

even a personal problem, and expect to be helped...The teacher takes a personal interest in the student. Here the teacher comes to teach the class and then says, 'see you next Tuesday' and that's all."[66] Iranian students were also intimidated by the larger class sizes at NC.[67] This article, along with interviews with faculty members, suggests large potential for campus conflict due to wide cultural and language barriers making it difficult for each side to express their expectations.

In May of 1977, 35 Iranians protested the school's new admissions policies during NC's registration period. These young men and women identified as representatives of a group of 150 Iranians who did not gain admittance to Navarro. They held up "signs with printed slogans including 'Stop the English test now,' 'We will not take unjust admission test.'"[68] They also protested the rising costs of tuition. One of the signs, ironically, claimed that they "will not take the 'ungust' 'enterance' examination."[69] This sign seems to increase the argument for the need to implement the exam, but the overall demands of the protestors were still forcefully stated at the demonstration (in spite of spelling errors).

Fear of not gaining admittance was reasonable for Iranian students. Even though the new exam was only meant for placement, according to administrators, these months also saw the implementation of a new "policy limiting foreign student enrollment to 10 per cent of the total student body."[70] Meeting this new quota necessitated reducing "foreign student enrollment by roughly 33 per cent."[71] President Walker claimed that this new policy resulted

---

[66] Richard Cole, "Foreign Students Often Find Frustration in College," *Corsicana Daily Sun*, April 17, 1977, 4.
[67] Ibid.
[68] Ray Mayo, "Iranian Demonstrators Arrested," *Corsicana Daily Sun*, May 27, 1977, 1.
[69] Ibid.
[70] Richard Cole, "Foreign Students Limited," *Corsicana Daily Sun*, May 27, 1977, 1.
[71] Ibid.

from the state failing to offer Navarro College contingency funds despite growing demand leading to record enrollments.[72]

The protestors were eventually arrested because their actions made it difficult for other students to register for summer school since they were located in front of the Administration Building. "When the protestors refused to comply with a directive to disperse, the Administration called in the Navarro County Sheriff's Department. A confrontation between law enforcement officials and the students occurred…resulting in the arrest of several of the students."[73] The protestors were released soon after, but their anger at the college administration, and the U.S. government in general, continued to intensify. Some of them claimed that their arrest was a political maneuver orchestrated through an alliance between "the Shah of Iran's secret police and CIA and the U.S. government to harass Iranian dissidents."[74] One student even accused "college officials of being CIA operatives."[75] Not all of the protestors believed in the political conspiracy. The newspaper article quoted above estimated that about half believed there were political motives for their arrest.[76]

Continued unrest led to another protest a few days later when 80 Iranians congregated to protest admissions policies. The event again led to arrests, 55 this time, and further escalation of the conflict between Iranian students, the school, and now the community. Unlike the first incident, the arrests were not carried out cleanly. One protestor physically resisted an officer during an attempted arrest while an Iranian women accused the cops of

---

[72] Gary Edmonson, "Walker Says College Faultless: NC President Blames Outside Agitators and New Legislation," *Corsicana Daily Sun*, May 29, 1977, 1.

[73] Stringer, *Dreams and Visions*, 58.

[74] Gary Edmonson, "Iranians Claim Navarro Reneged on Admissions," *Corsicana Daily Sun*, May 29, 1977, 1.

[75] Ibid.

[76] Ibid.

being "fascists."[77] The 55 arrested Iranians were led to a bus for transportation. Upon entering the bus, they began chanting and rocking the vehicle, eventually damaging the bus.[78] They also damaged the jail they were sent to. Damages to the "plumbing, paint, bunks, and concrete" of the jail cell cost the city $5,000.[79]

The protestors threatened a law suit against the college if the charges against them were not dropped, the English exam done away with, "the 'conspiracy' between the college administration and Iranian consulate…'condemned'," and the "harassment of Iranian students…ended."[80] The college administration responded to these demands by pointing out that the exam the demonstrators objected to was only meant for placement, not as a way to deny admissions. It was supposed to help place students in the correct English class upon entrance into the school.[81]

The threatened law suit did materialize later in the year but was eventually dismissed, and the board's new policy restricting foreign student admissions led to a dramatic reduction in international students, particularly Iranian students, by the end of the 1970s.[82] Overall enrollment at NC dropped from a decade-high 1,936 students in 1977, down to 1,434 students in 1979.[83] A 1980s accreditation report claims that the implementation of the TOEFL exam came as a result of a clear trend indicating that the low performance of international students stemmed from language problems, not academic talent.[84] The report

---

[77] Gary Edmonson, "Demonstrators Arrested Again," *Corsicana Daily Sun*, May 31, 1977, 1.
[78] Ibid.
[79] "Damage to Jail Estimated at $5,000," *Corsicana Daily Sun*, June 9, 1977, 1.
[80] "NC Blames Outsiders, Communications 'Barrier'," *Corsicana Daily Sun*, June 1, 1977, 1.
[81] Ibid.
[82] "Iranian Alleges Rights Violated," *Dallas Morning News*, October 5, 1977, 9.
[83] Navarro Junior College, "Institutional Self-Study Prepared for the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, 1984" (Corsicana, TX: Navarro Junior College, 1984), III–10, Box B12-b, Pearce Museum Archives at Navarro College, Corsicana, TX.
[84] Ibid., III-24-25.

detailed that "since the TOEFL has been initiated as a requirement for admission, evaluations by Counselors indicate that foreign students have achieved higher scholastic competence than did foreign students admitted prior to requiring the TOEFL."[85] The tone of this statement seems to indicate that the use of the exam, and the interview process with students, likely went beyond placement decisions, as the Iranian protestors suspected.

A letter to the editor from one of the demonstrators in the aftermath of the arrests claimed that the initial policy put in place to restrict foreign admissions was originally intended to allow students to gain admittance on a first-come first-served basis, but the suggestions of members of the board led to a more extensive process. Board members called for an interview with the applicant to precede admission, adding a layer of subjectivity to the college's decision.[86] The administration claimed that the interview ensured the potential student's fitness to live in the county community, but applicants (considering the political currents of the time on the eve of the Iranian Revolution) saw this as a possible test of their loyalty to the Shah's regime.[87]

I could not locate a direct source for the content of these interviews to verify the substance of admissions' questions, but the use of this type of application process highlights the power of administration at small community colleges. For the most part, the policy actions of the board and the president at Navarro College did not come under fire from faculty members or students during the Era of Expansion outside of the actions of Iranians in 1977. The fact that the demonstrators were not yet students at the institution undercut their position, but the administrative response to their grievances was not accommodating. At best,

---

[85] Ibid.

[86] Baktash Jangjoo, "Letter to the Editor: Conspiracy with Shah Alleged," *Corsicana Daily Sun*, June 13, 1977, 6.

[87] Ibid.

there was a major communication error which led applicants to misunderstand the point of the language exam and the interview. At worst, college officials were implementing discriminatory policies, as the demonstrators accused, while failing to uphold the school's long-held dedication to open admissions standards.

These events suggest that at smaller community colleges the impact of student activism on campus development was muted due to the overarching influence of the administration. That said, while activism led to little short-term change, students still affected the college's development through their basic decision to enroll. In the mid-1970s, the implementation of stricter admissions policies for foreign students compounded the drop in enrollment growth brought on by greater higher education competition in the region and a lack of curricular innovation to attract new students. These conditions led to a change in president based primarily on the college's inability to appeal to potential students.

Although direct student action did not lead to major changes at Navarro College, particularly in comparison to events at senior institutions in this era, sources suggest that NC students were generally satisfied with their college experience (setting aside Iranians not granted admission). The implementation of the comprehensive community college concept did not lead to the concerted diversion of students into terminal programs, as other histories have suggested. The availability of these programs, however, and the lack of active counseling to push students with an interest to transfer, led to passive factors reducing overall educational attainment (particularly pursuit of the Bachelor's degree). That said, NC's continued dedication to creating a comfortable campus environment made college attendance less intimidating for local residents. Familiar faces on staff, opportunities to participate in social and educational organizations, low cost, and a convenient location, made Navarro

College an excellent stepping-stone for students from small local communities seeking to take coursework for an eventual transfer to a four-year college or university. In many cases, without NC, young men and women from Navarro County would not have enrolled at a higher education institution at all.

San Antonio College

The location advantage that Navarro College enjoyed, without other higher education institutions in the county, was not shared by San Antonio College, but the Era of Expansion still saw SAC's appeal rise in the community based on its cost and broad mission. The nature of SAC's growth during these years supports Clifford Adelman's contention that the community college student body was more representative of the local population than senior institutions.[88] In terms of age, race, and ethnicity, SAC became a more diverse campus after 1955. As Adelman argues, community colleges like SAC enabled students to learn "on their own terms, and in their own time."[89] A broader curriculum, increasingly incorporating vocational and continuing education programs, flexible scheduling, and open admissions allowed SAC to establish a clear niche within the higher education landscape of San Antonio. Similar to Navarro College, the nature of the changes at SAC during this period created passive factors (specifically the higher availability of terminal programs) which could potentially hamper plans to transfer to a senior institution, but the overall gains in higher education access outshone obstacles to overall attainment.

[88] Adelman et al., *The Way We Are*.
[89] Ibid., v-vi.

By the 1960s, San Antonio College was the largest junior/community college in the state (passing the junior college division of the University of Houston).[90] The most pronounced growth in enrollment was in the college's evening division. Night enrollment hovered around 2,000 students in the early 1950s, but a decade later increased to almost 6,000 students.[91] Opportunities to take evening courses made SAC a destination for older students. San Antonio newspapers were riddled with articles in the 1960s discussing the enrollment of middle-age professionals at SAC for training to further their careers. For instance, Odessa North, a 48-year old nurse's aid took science courses at SAC as prerequisites to "enter the nurse's training course at the Green [Hospital]" after being out of school for 30 years. People like Odessa North benefitted from the attitudes of San Antonio businesses who supported their employees' attempts to acquire more skills by returning to college.[92] Companies like the Southwestern Bell Telephone Company, the Southern Steel Company, and the City Public Service Board pushed their employees to take evening courses, sometimes helping with tuition costs.[93]

Even though other institutions in the city offered undergraduate coursework, SAC's open door admissions policy gave opportunities to students looking for a second chance after missteps in their early academic training.[94] A 1968 *San Antonio Evening News* article

---

[90] "Junior College Enrollment First," *San Antonio Light*, c. 1961 in *San Antonio College Scrapbook P, 1961*, McAllister Collection, San Antonio College Library, San Antonio, TX; "SAC is Largest Junior College," *San Antonio Evening News*, June 25, 1963 in *San Antonio College Scrapbook T, 1963-1964*, McAllister Collection, San Antonio College Library, San Antonio, TX.

[91] Enrollment totals taken from college catalogs.

[92] "Negro Whips Obstacles for Ambitions as Nurse," *San Antonio Evening News*, March 14, 1963 in *San Antonio College Scrapbook S, 1963*, McAllister Collection, San Antonio College Library, San Antonio, TX.

[93] Bill Lee, "More Adults Upgrade Abilities with School," *San Antonio* Express, October 27, 1963 in *San Antonio College Scrapbook T, 1963-1964*.

[94] Doris Wright, "Takes All Students: SAC 'Opens Doors,'" *San Antonio Light*, August 1972 in *San Antonio College Scrapbook KK, 1972-1973*, McAllister Collection, San Antonio College Library, San Antonio, TX.

introduced Janie Torres, a sixth grade dropout forced to wait tables for a living, who found an opportunity to pursue a new career in genetics by enrolling in a science program at SAC despite her rocky academic record.[95] Torres's experience highlights how important SAC's relatively low tuition (feasible for someone holding a working class job) and forgiving admissions standards opened up opportunities to go to college for many students.

Johnnie Rosenauer's experience as a business faculty member (focused primarily on real estate) showed the changing demographics of San Antonio College's students by the 1970s. Rosenauer explained that:

> we have traditionally, in my program—and every other fall…I do a program-wide survey of my students—and what I can tell you through all these years is my students tend to be older than even the typical student. If the typical student's 27, mine's probably 37. I got 'em 17 to 70, or 70-something. About a quarter have a degree already, and about a quarter have a high school diploma or less. And so, most of them are in the middle, but the reality is it's an open door policy, and we get them from all walks of life, and all levels of ability all in the same class.[96]

Rosenauer teaches in a subject area which includes both transfer and terminal programs (and was a center of curriculum innovation during the Era of Expansion). The age diversity of his students suggests that the changing orientation of the college during these years, particularly the incorporation of more continuing education and vocational coursework, made SAC attractive to new people in the San Antonio community.

---

[95] "6th Grade Dropout Now in College with Bright Future," *San Antonio Evening News*, February 11, 1968 in *San Antonio College Scrapbook CC, 1968*, McAllister Collection, San Antonio College Library, San Antonio, TX.

[96] Johnnie Rosenauer, interview by the author, San Antonio, TX, June 2, 2015.

Throughout my interviews, faculty members alluded to graduation ceremonies and how the gathering of students' families to celebrate their success underscored the school's importance. Sylvia Sebesta, a history faculty member, explained how these ceremonies were often ridiculed since students were receiving Associate's degrees or certificates instead of a Bachelor's or graduate degree, but she condemns that attitude as elitist because it overlooks the magnitude of these students' accomplishments:

> In many families that graduate is the first member of the family to finish college—I mean finish two years of college. And it's so inspiring to see a family with a picnic at that area, you know where McCreless Auditorium is. It's sort of a park area, a lot of lawn. The...whole family there, big family, for that one graduate getting that A.A. degree. It was some—you might call it snobbery but that's not too polite. You know, people thought "well, they're not really graduating from college." But they made it this far, you know.[97]

Though describing a more recent graduation, Thomas Billimek, a psychology professor, holds a similar appreciation for the accomplishment of SAC's students:

> And I went there [and] the auditorium was filled with people who were dressed in their finest. In many cases blue jeans and a western shirt. But what I noticed--and it just reminded me of something I already knew—what I noticed is, I don't care who these parents were, whether they were brown, black, white, purple, green, didn't make a difference. They were looking at their kids, and they were proud of them. And I get that from students who come in, and even though their parents may have come

[97] Sylvia Sebesta, interview by the author, San Antonio, TX, June 24, 2015.

here from Mexico for whatever reason, they value education sometimes I think more than we do.[98]

Seeing a first-generation college student finish their program was a fulfilling experience for faculty members, and serves as a strong example for the important function the community college plays as an institution of opportunity, particularly for those whose chances at higher education were blunted due to high costs and their prior academic record.

Revisionist historians would point out, correctly, that limiting my examples to those who were most successful at the community college (graduates) biases my discussion towards the exception, while ignoring the structural deficiencies of community colleges as higher education institutions. While San Antonio College did play an important role in terms of college access, the school's explosive growth and expansive mission also led to problems with retention and academic reputation.

An attitude among some members of the San Antonio community that SAC was not a proper college dogged the campus during the second half of the twentieth century. David Labaree describes the community college as "the last college...last in two senses of the word--the latest and the lowest," adding that these schools have been historically hampered by their "confused identity."[99] The issue of a "confused identity," which Labaree discusses, is rooted in the overly expansive mission of the community college.

Former speech faculty member and current administrator, David Mrizek, described SAC's mission this way: "we've always said the mission of the community college is to do everything for everyone all the time...I think this mission of the college is to provide an open

[98] Thomas Billimek, interview by the author, San Antonio, TX, June 3, 2015.

[99] David F. Labaree, "The Rise of the Community College: Markets and the Limits of Educational Opportunity," in *How to Succeed in School Without Really Learning: The Credentials Race in American Education* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1997), 191–192.

door opportunity for everybody."[100] Providing opportunities for all people to study all things was a noble goal and immensely ambitious, but maintaining a high level of quality while carrying out this mission was a nearly impossible task. Community colleges' relative newness and low admissions standards often brought the quality of the education they offered into question. Even though open admissions allowed students greater access to community colleges, it also led to an immensely diverse student body in terms of academic ability. This diversity made it difficult for teachers to structure their classes effectively to meet the needs of all of their students.

Robert Zeigler and Jerome Weynand, both former students and administrators, recalled the difficulties they faced building up the academic reputation of SAC in the community. They remember the characterization of San Antonio College as "San Pedro High," representing a certain disdain for the level of academic preparation the school offered.[101] Zeigler commented that upon entering the school, "I discovered very, very quickly that that was not the case. That this was really a place that not only valued teaching, but it was a place about equality."[102] Weynand, who was a student during the Era of Establishment, claims that the stigma attached to the school did not arise until after his time as a student (perhaps with the change in the school's mission and expansion after moving to a new campus). As an administrator, however, the one thing he claimed he wished he could change about his time as an official was to improve the reputation of the college in the city.[103] Suggestions by local residents that SAC was a glorified high school ran counter to what

[100] David Mrizek, interview by the author, San Antonio, TX, June 23, 2015.
[101] Robert Zeigler, interview by the author, San Antonio, TX, June 2, 2015; Jerome Weynand, interview by the author, San Antonio, TX, June 3, 2015.
[102] Robert Zeigler, interview by the author, San Antonio, TX, June 2, 2015.
[103] Jerome Weynand, interview by the author, San Antonio, TX, June 3, 2015.

Zeigler and Weynand actually saw in the classroom. Weynand described incidents where university students would enroll in summer courses and comment on the high level of rigor that the teachers demanded.[104] Their description seems to point to problems with SAC's reputation being rooted in community misunderstanding about the operation of the school instead of real issues with quality of instruction and academic preparation. Sources from the time suggest, however, that SAC did struggle to meet the needs of its diverse student body and the mandates of such a broad institutional mission.

The previous chapter discussed faculty members' attempts to preserve academic rigor at the same time that they felt pressure from administration to maintain high pass rates in their courses, even to the point of implementing grade quotas. This problem was particularly pronounced in the early 1970s, but other sources suggest that issues of high failure and dropout rates began in the 1950s. The school newspaper, *The Ranger*, published the findings of a survey done of students who dropped courses in February of 1959. Their research revealed that 461 students dropped courses that spring (nearly 25 percent of daytime enrollment), with the most drops occurring in core math, English, and history courses. The article went on to explain that 144 of the drops were linked to "outside work" responsibilities, and 37 dropped courses were because of "poor background" knowledge on the coursework. Another 104 students dropped either due to having too many absences or falling too far behind in the class.[105] The reasons students gave for dropping classes shows some of the difficulties community colleges faced in fulfilling their mission during this period. Removing major barriers to a college education, including cost and academic

[104] Ibid.

[105] "461 Drop Courses: Math Leads Field," *The Ranger*, February 16, 1959, 1, "The Ranger Image Collection," accessed February 9, 2016, http://sacweb03.sac.alamo.edu/eLibrary/RangerImageCollection.aspx.

preparation, allowed for greater college access, but not necessarily success upon entering college. Availability of financial aid, coupled with low tuition in general, made enrollment possible, but working class students had to maintain jobs while completing coursework, making it difficult to keep up with their studies. The results of the survey suggest, in addition, that difficulties in acclimating students with poor academic records to the requirements of a college course, in terms of base knowledge and study behaviors, led to problems with student retention.

This problem with student retention was also seen in the proportion of graduates versus total enrollment at SAC. In the early 1970s, day enrollment at San Antonio College was generally around 15,000 students. Despite the high total enrollment at the school, the number of students earning an Associate's degree (in Arts and Sciences, Mortuary Science, Nursing, or Applied Science) or a Certificate of Completion remained below 1,000 students per year from 1970-1973.[106] Students taking longer than two years to complete their degree or certificate due to outside responsibilities, those enrolled in continuing education coursework, and early transfers explains some of the discrepancy between total enrollment and number of graduates. However, considering that programs were set up to take two years or less for a full-time student, only one out of fifteen students graduating with a degree or certificate in a given year suggests high dropout rates at SAC during this period.

As revisionist scholars have correctly pointed out, high levels of dropouts at an institution where groups that are historically underrepresented in higher education are disproportionately concentrated brings into question how transformative enrollment at a

[106] Jerome F. Weynand and Paul R. Culwell, "San Antonio College Self-Study Report, 1973-1975" (San Antonio, TX: San Antonio College, 1975), 56, McAllister Collection, San Antonio College Library, San Antonio, TX.

community college actually was for students during the Era of Expansion. Quantitative studies have convincingly shown that initial enrollment at a community college, even with an intent to transfer, hampers a student's ability to earn a Bachelor's degree.[107] Though the experiences of students at SAC and NC point to passive forces (availability of terminal programs) instead of active forces (counseling students out of transfer programs) negatively impacting transfer rates, the idea that community colleges act as an obstacle instead of a springboard for social mobility is still troubling. Despite the difficulties community colleges faced in carrying out their expansive mission, the overall advantage of gaining access to higher education made these institutions beneficial for those who enrolled. Students of different ages and backgrounds found their way into the doors of a college like SAC when other local universities would not take them or would not offer them an education they could afford.

In addition, both sides of the historiography have discounted the importance of the social growth that occurs from attending a college. At Navarro College, students from small communities in the county attended a local institution with structures in place allowing for a smooth transition from high schools with less than 50 students to a larger collegiate atmosphere. Availability of athletic programs and social and professional clubs gave these students easy outlets to meet new people and acclimate themselves to a new and larger environment. Many of these students would build off of the confidence they gained in the social environment at NC to succeed at universities where the bigness of the school would

[107] Alfonso, "The Impact of Community College Attendance on Baccalaureate Attainment"; Dougherty, *The Contradictory College*; W. Norton Grubb, "The Decline of Community College Transfer Rates: Evidence from National Longitudinal Surveys," *The Journal of Higher Education* 62, no. 2 (1991): 194–222, doi:29.7.134.119; Karabel, "Community Colleges and Social Stratification in the 1980s."

have been too intimidating without their experience as a community college student to work off of.

San Antonio College offered opportunities for students to participate in athletic programs (though not as extensive a list as at NC) and college clubs, but the level of participation of students in these organizations was not as high, proportionally, when compared to Navarro College during the Era of Expansion. Articles in the student newspaper would often bemoan the low membership of campus organizations and turnout at group events.[108] Despite the disappointment of students working on the newspaper, there is evidence of political activism from the student body at SAC during the 1960s and 1970s. The actions of students were more in-line with events at national universities during this period in comparison to conditions at Navarro College. This suggests that the size and local environment of an institution factored into student activism as much as the nature of the specific institution students attended (community colleges versus universities). San Antonio College students had already been exposed to a large number of diverse people due to growing up in such a big city during a period of growth. Instead of providing a comfortable point of transition, SAC offered many of its students a place to actively push for change at the campus level, and even the national level.

Articles in *The Ranger* suggest a healthy presence of liberal and conservative students on campus during the 1960s and 1970s, keeping up an open dialogue on local and national events. These differing political strands arose first in a back and forth in 1959 and 1960 between SAC students over the advisability of colleges taking federal dollars under the

[108] "Only 9 out of 2,000," *The Ranger*, October 12, 1959, 2; Terri Bullock, "No Big Issues at SAC," *The Ranger*, April 3, 1970, 2.

National Defense Education Act considering that funds required taking a loyalty oath. This act was passed when Cold War tensions between the United States and the Soviet Union were on the rise due to the launching of *Sputnik* into orbit, "the world's first artificial satellite."[109] The act promoted training and research in STEM subjects (science, technology, engineering, and math) and foreign languages to help the United States build up a knowledge base to secure their position in the Cold War.[110]

In December of 1959, an editorial in *The Ranger* praised the decision of Harvard and Yale to not take part in the loan program of the National Defense Education Act because of the required oath.[111] Two months later, Robert P. Berry, a SAC student and a veteran of the U.S. Air Force, wrote a letter to the editor objecting to the argument in the original editorial, claiming that the author did not show an understanding of the freedoms men like him fought for when preaching the idea of freedom of thought.[112] The back and forth between a veteran student and a member of the newspaper staff mirrored the changing tides of national politics in this period. Younger Americans began to question the ideological conservatism which fueled the Cold War (a trend that would reach fruition with the advent of the New Left in the early 1960s). The debate over anti-communism, and United States active military intervention to stop its spread, crystalized after the U.S. role escalated in Vietnam in 1964 following the Gulf of Tonkin incident.

---

[109] "Sputnik and the Dawn of the Space Age," National Aeronautics and Space Administration, last modified October 10, 2007, http://history.nasa.gov/sputnik/.

[110] For more information on the National Defense Education Act see: Wayne J. Urban, *More than Science and Sputnik: The National Defense Education Act of 1958*; Jennifer L. Jolly, "The National Defense Education Act, Current STEM Initiative, and the Gifted," *Gifted Child Today* 32, no. 2 (2009): 50–53. For a discussion on the loyalty oath component of the act specially see: John McDonough Botti, "The NDEA, Loyalty, and Community: Resistance at Two Liberal Arts Colleges" (Ph.D. Diss: University of Maryland, 2014).

[111] "That Oath, Again," *The Ranger*, December 16, 1959, 2.

[112] Robert P. Berry, "Final Letters on Loyalty Oath," *The Ranger*, February 1, 1960, 2.

The more diverse student body at SAC, particularly the presence of older students and veterans, led to a complex political climate on campus. As the example above reveals, students born during different generations had contrasting views on the actions of the United States. An editorial in *The Ranger* from 1960 shows the growing resentment of younger students for the way American society had progressed, and the characterization of their generation. The author lashed out against the portrayal of his/her generation as misguided, or even criminal. The editorial goes on to say "this is one hell of a world our forefathers have so lovingly prepared for us [with] the H-bomb, cold wars, rat-race tension, continuing mechanization of the individual, stifling, suffocating conformity, Charles Van Doren, Green Stamps...it is a wonder that all youthdom is not a gibbering mass of catatonia."[113] This was written two years before the drafting of the Port Huron Statement in 1962, which is often seen as the official birthdate of the New Left. Even at this early point, SAC students were gaining a political voice during their years on campus and creating a dialogue about the problems of American society.[114]

Paralleling the experience of students at universities, which saw members of the New Left focus their efforts on the Vietnam War by the second half of the 1960s, political discussions on SAC's campus turned to Southeast Asia in 1965. Instead of opposing U.S. intervention, San Antonio-area college students (including students from SAC) went to the Alamo to support the government's actions, explaining that they "deplore the narrow-minded and anti-American demonstrations of students and faculty members elsewhere which serve

[113] "Where Lies the Fault," *The Ranger*, April 11, 1960, 2.

[114] Students for a Democratic Society, "The Port Huron Statement of the Students for a Democratic Society, 1962" Michigan State University, accessed January 25, 2015, http://coursesa.matrix.msu.edu/~hst306/documents/huron.html.

only to promote the Communist cause."[115] The resistance of San Antonio College students to embrace the political changes occurring at universities stretched to the cultural as well. The same year as the Alamo demonstration, a *San Antonio Light* article suggested that, despite the increased popularity of new, loose, fashion trends, the more mature student body at SAC still maintained professional, conservative dress, despite the lack of a dress code. "If a student should be tempted to pursue his quest for attention by wearing off-beat clothing, the college would simply withhold recommending him to prospective employers."[116]

The initial resistance of SAC students to the political and cultural currents of the university was likely more of a geographic than an institutional phenomenon. As mentioned above, the group supporting the Vietnam War included college and university students from across the city, not just San Antonio College. The early activism of the New Left was rooted in the West, Midwest, and Northeast, not the South.[117] Following the Tet Offensive in 1968, which was a major blow for American supporters of the war, SAC students increasingly demonstrated against the war.

The conservatism of campus policies related to political organizations was an obstacle to groups advocating for change on campus, however. Trying to build off of the momentum of a 500 student rally against the Vietnam War at San Pedro Park in 1969, a group of students considered applying for official club status on campus. This idea did not get off the ground because of a school policy dictating that SAC officials "cannot accredit

---

[115] "Students at Alamo Pledge Support of U.S. Viet Effort," *San Antonio Express*, October 29, 1965 in *San Antonio College Scrapbook X, 1965-1966*, McAllister Collection, San Antonio College Library, San Antonio, TX.

[116] Ed Foster, "San Antonio College Students Dress Right," *San Antonio* Light, November 25, 1965 in *San Antonio College Scrapbook X, 1965-1966*.

[117] The aforementioned Port Huron Statement was drafted in Michigan. The Free Speech Movement, which was an early focus of the New Left, began in California.

political activities on campus."[118] Students had already brought the policy discouraging partisan politics into question when meeting with administration in May of 1969. The administration claimed that the policy was not set up to quell political discussion, since there were recognized Young Democrats and Republican groups, but that "what we object to is campaigning for any particular personality in a race, which can get touchy at times, especially in a city election."[119] The attitude of the administration to the Vietnam protestors suggests, however, that the policy also barred the creation of anti-establishment groups.

While conservative campus policies were able to effectively keep the lid on anti-war demonstrators at SAC, the rising activism of Mexican Americans was more difficult to quiet. Even though Texas was not necessarily a leading region for the New Left or the counterculture (though major figures in these groups did hail from the state), it was a central location for the Chicano Movement. Major battles against education policies and the lack of political power for Mexican Americans were waged in Texas.[120] One of the reasons Texas became a major battleground for the Chicano Movement was the high concentration of Mexican Americans in the state. San Antonio itself was a major center of Chicano student activism, seen most clearly in the Mexican American Youth Organization's (MAYO) founding in San Antonio in 1967.[121]

---

[118] Deborah Weser, "SAC Moratorium Panel Will Seek Official Status," *San Antonio Evening News*, October 16, 1969 in *San Antonio College Scrapbook EE, 1969*, McAllister Collection, San Antonio College Library, San Antonio, TX.

[119] "Students Question Administration," *The Ranger*, May 16, 1969, 3.

[120] Texas's centrality to the Chicano Movement can be seen in the founding of La Raza Unida party in the state in 1970: Teresa Palomo Acosta, "Raza Unida Party," *Handbook of Texas Online* (http://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/war01), accessed January 27, 2016. Uploaded on June 15, 2010. Published by the Texas State Historical Association.

[121] Teresa Palomo Acosta, "Mexican American Youth Organization," *Handbook of Texas Online* (http://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/wem01), accessed January 27, 2016. Uploaded on June 15, 2010. Published by the Texas State Historical Association.

Increasingly, over the course of the Era of Expansion, SAC's student population began to reflect the ethnic diversity of the city. A 1967 Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) report showed that Mexican American enrollment was on the rise at SAC. HEW classified Mexican Americans as "others," along with populations that were not labeled at black or white. Their report estimated the student body in 1967 as 49 percent white, 7 percent black, and 44 percent other.[122] A 1974 *San Antonio Light* article shows how the composition of SAC's student body transformed during this era. "Statistics at San Antonio College revealed that in 1940 about 50 students with Spanish surnames attended college. This year's [1974] enrollment is 5,672...[of a] total enrollment [of] 16,750."[123] The Era of Expansion saw the college move from an era where the student body was generally white, young, and working or middle class, to an era where defining the "average" SAC student became nearly impossible because of the diversity of the campus.

The changing cultural ideology of SAC's students was on display during the college's registration period in December of 1968. College President Wayland Moody was baffled by 422 students indicating that they were American Indian when enrolling for the spring semester. The article detailing this event does not offer a compelling explanation for this irregularity, and Moody found it unlikely that such a high number of Native Americans had enrolled at SAC.[124] Looking back at the progress of the Chicano Movement by this time, it

---

[122] "Mexican-Americans 'Other,'" *San Antonio Evening News*, October 18, 1967 in *San Antonio College Scrapbook BA-1967-1968*, McAllister Collection, San Antonio College Library, San Antonio, TX.

[123] Frank Trejo, "More from Barrio Attend SAC," *San Antonio* Light, June 16, 1974 in *San Antonio College Scrapbook OO, 1974-1975*, McAllister Collection, San Antonio College Library, San Antonio, TX.

[124] "422 SAC Indians?," *San Antonio Light*, December 11, 1968 in *San Antonio College Scrapbook DD, 1968-1969*, McAllister Collection, San Antonio College Library, San Antonio, TX.

seems likely that Chicanos enrolled at SAC as American Indians, leading to the aberration in registration statistics.

The year after this incident, 1969, the Movimiento Estudiantil Chicano de Aztlán (MEChA) was established "on the principles of self-determination for the liberation of our people…believ[ing] that political involvement and education is the avenue for change in our society."[125] MEChA would become a prominent group on SAC's campus in the 1970s. One of MEChA's central beliefs was that Chicanos "are Indigenous people to this land."[126] The land referenced here is Aztlán, the "mythical place of origins of the Aztec people."[127] Aztlán included the lands ceded to the United States after the Mexican-American War, making up the majority of the Southwest United States.[128] The likely registration of Chicano students at SAC as American Indians represented their growing identification with the Chicano Movement, and foreshadowed increased activism on campus in the coming years since education was a major focus for the movement.

In 1969, SAC's Young Democrats (one of the two political groups approved by administration), invited County Commissioner Albert Peña to speak about "the new militancy in the Mexican-American ranks."[129] Peña alluded to educational issues as a major problem for Chicanos, calling for a concentrated effort to fight illiteracy and for greater recognition by the federal government in addressing the needs of Chicanos. Peña was

---

[125] "About Us," Movimeiento Estudiantil Chicano de Aztlán, accessed January 27, 2016, http://www.nationalmecha.org/about.html.

[126] Ibid.

[127] "What is the Meaning of the Word Aztlán," MEChA at the University of Colorado, Boulder, accessed January 27, 2016, http://www.colorado.edu/StudentGroups/MEChA/aztlan.html.

[128] Ibid.

[129] James McRory, "Pena Lists Reasons for Chicano Revolt," *San Antonio Express*, May 15, 1969 in *San Antonio College Scrapbook EE, 1969*, McAllister Collection, San Antonio College Library, San Antonio, TX.

diplomatic in his speech, but the rhetoric of speakers at later meetings of the Young Democrats caused greater concern. In 1970, the use of the term "gringo" by an invited speaker led to some pushback from group members who saw this rhetoric as inflammatory and overly hostile. A letter to the editor by Everett Oden Lewis Jr. in *The Ranger* discussed the incident, and tried to smooth over the tension by explaining that a gringo was a white who claimed superiority over Mexican Americans, not all whites, thus (presumably) excluding the speech's audience from the derogatory term.[130] By 1971, however, engagement with students through already established mediums (the school newspaper and party-affiliated groups) gave way to direct demands to college officials.

The SAC chapter of MEChA leveled "charges of harassment" against Director of Student Affairs, Henry Webb, in 1971 due to his handling of their submission of club member names.[131] The president of MEChA at SAC, Pete Sosa, claimed that he had been repeatedly asked by Webb for the list of new member names despite having submitted the list on four different occasions. Eventually Webb cited the missing list as a justification to potentially revoke the club's charter. Sosa claimed that Webb's handling of this issue was discriminatory, particularly since other campus groups were not approached as aggressively by Webb.[132] The administration's attitude towards MEChA shows that, despite allowing the formation of a political group outside of the Young Republicans and Democrats, they still had not fully embraced the idea of free political dialogue on campus. This lack of receptivity to students would lead to greater pressure on administration over the balance of the 1970s.

---

[130] Everett Oden Lewis Jr., "Letter to the Editor," *The Ranger*, May 15, 1970, 2.
[131] "MEChA Levels 'Harassing' Charge," *The Ranger*, February 5, 1971, 1, 7.
[132] Ibid.

In March of 1972, twelve students, two of whom ran for board positions that year, picketed the college to protest administrators' lack of attention to student voices. Hinting at the upcoming investigation of SAC's hiring practices, the protestors not only called for greater administrative attention in general, but specifically called for the hiring of Mexican American faculty members to better reflect the composition of the student body.[133] *The Ranger*'s coverage of this event included interviews with students about the protest, many of whom supported the idea of greater student influence related to campus policy. While students generally supported the ideas behind the protest, there was also some trepidation that the students running for board positions would split the progressive vote and only lead to greater power for conservative administrators.[134]

Student, faculty, and community pressure against the administration led to major changes at SAC over the course of the 1970s, culminating in George Ozuna's ascension to board chair in 1980. At San Antonio College, the activism of the student body had real consequences for administration. The passive pressure of enrollment was always a major concern at Navarro College because of the confined market for higher education in the area (low population of potential students), but student activism was not as pronounced and did not lead to clear changes in the operation of the institution. Even when confronted with the active opposition of Iranians to changes in admissions procedures, administration deflected their protests instead of addressing them. At San Antonio College, spikes of increased pressure on the administration correlate with times of institutional change. In the early 1970s, students became increasingly critical of the leadership of Moody's administration. Though

[133] "Students Want Bigger Voice," *The Ranger*, March 24, 1972, 1.
[134] Ibid.

Moody was not forced to resign, the appearance of city and school newspaper articles suggesting his retirement within a couple of years of him leaving indicates that events on campus may have affected his decision. The organization of Chicano groups put greater pressure on administration to address issues of discrimination at SAC, particularly pertaining to hiring practices.

Despite distinct differences in the level of student influence on campus for much of the Era of Expansion, both Navarro College and San Antonio College played host to major protests by Iranians (some of them students, some of them not) in the late 1970s. At Navarro College, Iranian protests focused on the substance of admissions policies that they felt were discriminatory. The broader politics of United States/Iran relations were referenced during these events, with the demonstrators suggesting that college officials were following the dictates of the U.S. government and the Shah, but the major catalyst for the conflict was institutional policies. At San Antonio College, the campus conflict arose slightly later, in 1978, and began with the outside issue of U.S./Iran relations, only later focusing on campus policies due to administration's reactions to their demonstrations.

Similar to Navarro College, San Antonio College had a history of enrolling international students, though their presence on the campus came more out of San Antonio's more diverse population than the direct advocacy of a faculty member. Many of these students were sons or daughters of foreign government officials who were based in Texas.[135] *The Ranger* included biographical articles on international students during the 1950s. The content of these articles suggests that these students were a great asset to the school,

[135] "Students Arrive from Other Lands," *The Ranger*, September 23, 1966, 1.

providing new perspectives to broaden their classmates' minds beyond their local, and even national, mindset. One of these articles discusses Ivan Henrik Stola, a Hungarian refugee who fled from the communist government of his home country during the height of the Cold War. Upon entering SAC, Stola was surprised about fellow students' lack of knowledge about communism. They seemed to universally view it as bad, but lacked a foundational understanding of what communism entailed.[136]

Though international students appeared in the campus newspaper, their total enrollment at San Antonio College was not as high, proportionally, in comparison to Navarro College until the 1970s. In 1966, the new class of students at SAC included nine international students, including two from Mexico, one from Iran, one from Korea, one from Japan, two from Guatemala, and one from Panama.[137] Clearly the work of Cecil Williams was a major reason for the prominent presence of international students at NC, despite Navarro County being relatively small and less diverse than a city like San Antonio.

The proportional difference in international student enrollment between SAC and NC narrowed considerably by the 1970s. In 1978, SAC's student body included 771 foreign students, 304 enrolling with a student visa, while the rest were "refugees from Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos."[138] The majority of these foreign students were from Iran despite the

[136] "Hungarian Refugee Tells of Communistic Training," *The Ranger*, May 15, 1959, 2.
[137] "Students Arrive from Other Lands," *The Ranger*, September 23, 1966, 1.
[138] Manny Perez, "Culture, Language Main Problems for Foreign Students," *The Ranger*, April 7, 1978, 3.

large number of refugees from Southeast Asia.[139] During the spring of 1979, foreign student enrollment at SAC increased to 911, with 435 of these students hailing from Iran.[140]

Similar to events reported at Navarro College, the cultural transition for Iranian students was difficult. One of the main concerns of faculty members was the pervasiveness of cheating from these students on class assignments. Dr. Carol Swanson, an English teacher and the school's expert on English as a Second Language instruction, suggested that this behavior was rooted in cultural practices that accepted this behavior (seen as helping fellow classmates instead of academic dishonesty). She called for the implementation of remedial English courses for these students and direct instruction on correct behaviors in an American college setting.[141] Jerome Weynand, the president of the college at this time, remembers actively interceding to help Iranian students transition into the campus (and the city) community. The lack of dorms on SAC's campus made housing for foreign students a challenge, so Weynand helped locate rentals for them on Woodlawn Avenue (knocking on doors of properties with "For Rent" signs), not too far from the SAC campus. Differences in expectations for hygiene caused problems for these students, however, in their new homes and on campus. Weynand reported that students, mainly young women, would complain that Iranian classmates smelled, having not taken showers after Physical Education classes. The landlords of the rentals that Weynand located for these students complained about their tenants not keeping up the property and, many times, would throw them out for breaking

---

[139] Ibid.

[140] Annette Bernhard, "SAC Foreign Student Policy May Change: Move Follows Demonstration," *San Antonio Express*, January 18, 1979 in *San Antonio College Scrapbook WW, 1978-1979*, McAllister Collection, San Antonio College Library, San Antonio, TX.

[141] Manny Perez, "Culture, Language Main Problems for Foreign Students," *The Ranger*, April 7, 1978, 3.

lease terms.[142] While faculty members like Swanson and administrators like Weynand tried to help Iranian students integrate into campus life, it was clear that there was some tension building due to their presence at the school.

SAC's administration and staff did their best to accommodate the needs of Iranian students, but when they began to lead demonstrations against United States support of the Shah this relationship started to break down. San Antonio College students staged four marches over the course of 1978 "to protest the rule of Shah Mohammed Reza Pahlavi…designed to call attention to the new military rule in Iran."[143] The actions of SAC's Iranian students, and Iranian students from other San Antonio campuses, increasingly gained attention from the local press, particularly after a former SAC student, Hossein Jahanfar, was arrested in January of 1979 for staying in the country without an active student visa and on suspicion of "possible involvement in the Beverly Hills riot against the Shah's mother" earlier in the month.[144]

His arrest came on the heels of a high profile march, which Jahanfar led, that began at SAC's campus and moved to the Alamo after facing resistance at the campus. During the march, 26 Iranians met considerable opposition, along with some support, for their cause. One American student, Mark Englander, marched with the Iranians because he believed that their cause was just and that "the media, except *The Ranger*, have been unfair to [the Iranian demonstrators]."[145] While Englander showed solidarity with the Iranians, another SAC

---

[142] Jerome Weynand, interview by the author, San Antonio, TX, June 3, 2015.

[143] Alan Bailey, "Iranian Students Protest in S.A.," *San Antonio Express*, November 11, 1978 in *San Antonio College Scrapbook WW, 1978-1979.*

[144] Julie Baxter, "Protest Leader Faces Deportation," *The Ranger*, January 26, 1979, 1.

[145] Ibid.

student, identified in the paper as "R.G." walked ahead of the Iranians, actively opposing their actions. He "screamed and jumped to the delight of his American audiences…[saying] 'I'm sick and tired of these people using SAC as their play thing.'"[146] In a later interview he claimed to have sympathy for their protest against the rule of the Shah, but "claimed that the Iranian government of Khomeini will be anti-American and communistic."[147] With United States officials now held hostage in Iran, and a campus community that struggled to get along with Iranian students, the increased negative attention of these demonstrations was enough to spur administrative action.[148]

After the January protest and arrest, Weynand referred to Jahanfar's lack of an active visa as a reason for not allowing him back to SAC and hinted at "a 'clampdown' on foreign student admittance policies, especially for Iranians."[149] Because of the suspension of air mail service between the United States and Iran during the hostage crisis, the administration imposed a moratorium on new Iranian student admissions because of issues receiving proper paperwork to process applications.[150] The moratorium on student admissions did not put a substantial dent in Iranian student enrollment for the spring, which only dropped by about 30 students following the Iranian Revolution, and was largely supported by SAC's students.[151] "Sixteen of twenty students interviewed [in February of 1979]…favored the

---

[146] Ibid.

[147] Ibid.

[148] More information on the protest cited above can be found in the St. Philip's College newspaper: "Iranian Students Protest IRES District Collegians," *The Tiger*, January 1979, 2, available digitally from the University of North Texas's "Portal to Texas History," accessed January 27, 2016, http://texashistory.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metapth652099/m1/1/.

[149] Annette Bernhard, "SAC Foreign Student Policy May Change: Move Follows Demonstration," *San Antonio Express*, January 18, 1979 in *San Antonio College Scrapbook WW, 1978-1979*.

[150] Vicky Waddy, "Iranians at SAC Jubilant," *San Antonio Light*, February 13, 1979 in *San Antonio College Scrapbook WW, 1978-1979*.

[151] "Only 30 Iran Students Gone," [newspaper not specified], March 16, 1979 in *San Antonio College Scrapbook WW, 1978-1979*.

moratorium…The informal survey also revealed…[that students] expressed hostility toward Iranians because of recent protests."[152] There seemed to be a perception among students that the moratorium was not just a pragmatic action taken because of issues with receiving paperwork, but "an excuse not to allow Iranians here because of recent protests."[153]

It was not only American students at SAC who questioned the advisability of the protests, but the Iranian students as well. A large body of the Iranian students claimed that they did not support the protests because, even though they may sympathize with their intent, they wanted to focus on their education while keeping political advocacy private (citing that Iranian leadership did not call for protests).[154] Members of the Iranian Student Association, an unrecognized organization on campus, pushed for further protests to oppose United States intervention in the new Islamic Republic in Iran.[155]

The Iranian Student Association's intent to continue marches and demonstrations ran into an obstacle when the SAC board approved a ban on "all demonstrations concerning Iran on the SAC campus" later in 1979.[156] The college's student government supported the ban, but members of the faculty questioned the move.[157] Robert Zeigler, a relatively new history faculty member at that time, explained that "I wrote a letter in support of the students, and their right to protest, and I didn't get chastised—well, I did. I did [get chastised by

---

[152] Jeff Stiefl, "Survey Shows Student Support for Suspension of Admissions," *The Ranger*, February 2, 1979, 2.

[153] Ibid.

[154] "Iranians at SAC Divided on Protest," *San Antonio Express*, February 11, 1979 in *San Antonio College Scrapbook WW, 1978-1979*.

[155] Ibid.

[156] Jerry Deal, "SAC Student Government Backs Demonstration Ban," *San Antonio Express*, November 22, 1979 in *San Antonio College Scrapbook XX, 1979*, McAllister Collection, San Antonio College Library, San Antonio, TX.

[157] Ibid.

administration]. 'Why did you write that letter?'...The department was okay, but the administration didn't think it was a great idea, and I wasn't the only one, there were others too."[158] The support of student representatives, and a certain wariness of these demonstrations by the larger San Antonio community (as seen in media coverage of these events), outweighed the resistance of some faculty members and the ban was upheld.

The power of the Iranian protestors faced another obstacle when the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) began looking more closely at their visa statuses following the incident with Hossein Jahanfar. In November of 1979, the INS checked the paperwork of SAC's Iranian students (now numbering only 188) and found that 21 of them were "in violation of their visa status."[159] Infractions included working outside of their studies without authorization and continuing to enroll despite having expired visas.[160] Administration's moratorium on new Iranian student admissions and ban on demonstrations related to Iran during the spring of 1979, coupled with the increased scrutiny of the INS, led to a dramatic drop in Iranian student enrollment. Enrollment dipped from almost 435 students during the 1978-1979 school year, to 212 students during the fall of 1979, down to 110 by the fall of 1980.[161]

This decrease can be tied to more than just administration's growing opposition to the actions of the small body of Iranian students actively demonstrating against United States foreign policy. Even though faculty members like Zeigler supported Iranian students' right to

---

[158] Robert Zeigler, interview by the author, San Antonio, TX, June 2, 2015.
[159] "INS Investigation Finds 21 Iranian Students in Violation," *The Ranger*, November 30, 1979, 1.
[160] Ibid.
[161] "Iranian Student Population Down," *San Antonio Express*, October 3, 1980 in *San Antonio College Scrapbook ZZ, 1980b*, McAllister Collection, San Antonio College Library, San Antonio, TX.

demonstrate on campus, the appearance of an article detailing faculty grievances with Iranian student behavior suggests that some tension existed between these two groups. Furthermore, the student body at SAC generally supported the moves made by administration and resented the local depiction of the college that came out of the Iranian protests.

At both SAC and NC, administrative initiative, coupled with support from the general student body, led to the implementation of policies which led to dramatic reductions in Iranian student enrollment in the late 1970s. The root causes of Iranians demonstrations were different, focused on institutional policies at NC and international policy at SAC, but the final results were relatively similar (a general reduction in Iranian student enrollment). For the higher education historiography, it is notable that this type of foreign student activism was visible at community colleges. In addition, the activism not only took place in large urban areas, where the presence of foreign students would presumably be more common, but also in a rural area like Navarro County. I will be interested to see if this type of activism, on both urban and rural colleges, occurred in other states that had high number of Iranians during this time period, including California, New Jersey, New York, and Massachusetts. It is possible that Navarro College is an aberration, due to the school's unusual emphasis on attracting international students beginning with the work of Cecil Williams, but I suspect there is a lot more to be written about the presence, and activism, of foreign students on community college campuses moving forward.

Conclusion

The experiences of students at Navarro College and San Antonio College follow the trends, in terms of college access and economic impact, outlined in the existing community college historiography. Both schools grew larger and became more diverse, in terms of class, ethnicity, race, and age, over the course of the Era of Expansion. San Antonio College's student population, however, grew more diverse more quickly. This came as a consequence of the increasingly diverse local population of San Antonio during this period, particularly the growth of the Mexican American community in the city, as well as the earlier integration of San Antonio's public schools (coming quickly after *Brown v. Board* as "one of the first school districts to comply with the decision").[162] Early integration of the public schools gave minority students better academic preparation for a college education (instead of an emphasis on industrial education), and greater familiarity with the integrated social climate evolving at SAC's campus.

Navarro Junior College lagged in terms of racial diversity until the 1970s, likely due to the late integration of Corsicana's public schools and less initial community activism (and national support) behind efforts to enroll black students at NJC. San Antonio College was also able to entice higher numbers of older students and working class students earlier on in its history because of its gradual, but consistent, incorporation of continuing education and vocational programs after World War II. Despite an initial offering of terminal/vocational programs to appeal to veterans, the more conservative administration of Dr. Ben Jones led to

[162] "History of Education in San Antonio: Chronology of San Antonio Education," the University of Texas-San Antonio Libraries, last modified October 8, 2015, http://libguides.utsa.edu/content.php?pid=205758&sid=5538418.

a lack of curricular innovation at NJC during his tenure. The hiring of Kenneth Walker in 1974 led to wholesale changes in the direction of the school which gave it greater appeal to older students and those seeking shorter programs for increased employability. The history of these two campuses suggests that scholars' claims on the increasing size and diversity of community college campuses during this era holds true at both urban and rural schools, but that an urban environment was conducive to more rapid change than a rural setting.

The great division in the community college historiography centers on the question of the overall impact of a community college education on the students they serve. Those writing in the democratizing branch of the historiography suggest that these schools, with their open door admissions policy and comprehensive curriculum, offered students greater access to higher education and the opportunity to pursue different types of education (academic, vocational, or continuing).[163] Revisionists claim that the open admissions and low cost of the institution led to the concentration of minorities and the working class at the community college, and that these institutions, particularly because of their increased emphasis on terminal programs, blunt the social mobility aspirations of their students (particularly their chances of advancing to complete a four-year degree).[164]

My research suggests that both branches of the historiography are correct, and that when their interpretations are combined we get a clearer picture of the overall impact of the

---

[163] Jesse Parker Bogue, *The Community College* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1950); Edmund J. Gleazer, *This Is the Community College* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1968); Witt et al., *America's Community Colleges*; George B Vaughan, *The Community College in America: A Short History* (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1985).

[164] Brint and Karabel, *The Diverted Dream*; Labaree, "The Rise of the Community College: Markets and the Limits of Educational Opportunity"; J. M. Beach, *Gateway to Opportunity?: A History of the Community College in the United States* (Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, LLC, 2010).

community college in the United States. Interviews with students, faculty members, and administrators at SAC and NC revealed the importance both institutions held as the only point of access to higher education institutions for many of its students. Teachers at SAC look most proudly on the educational opportunities that they offered to first-generation college students. Students at Navarro Junior College discussed how the affordability, proximity, and comfortable environment offered at the institution led to their enrollment, when the inconvenience and unfamiliarity of a university might have kept them from continuing their education after high school.

Sources at both schools point to the importance of community colleges in terms of access, but the overly large mission of these institutions complicates the effectiveness of their operation. SAC and NJC both had to emphasize remedial education in their curriculum during the Era of Expansion.[165] Mirroring the findings of Adelman on the composition of the community college student body, the academic level of students at these schools was near the median for high school students generally, based on standardized test scores.[166] With an increasingly diverse student body to serve in terms of social, economic, and academic backgrounds, teachers struggled to meet the individual needs of all of their students, and the colleges as a whole struggled to maintain high levels of student retention and program completion. Furthermore, the expansion of the college curriculum that came with the institution of the comprehensive community college mission increased the passive factors

[165] Navarro Junior College, "Navarro Junior College Self-Study: Prepared for the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, January, 1974," 45–46; Agnes Heller, "Counselors Guide Students from Uncertainty to Confidence," *San Antonio* Light, January 8, 1967 in *San Antonio College Scrapbook Z, 1966-1967*, McAllister Collection, San Antonio College Library, San Antonio, TX.

[166] Navarro Junior College Faculty and Administration, "Report of Self Study of Navarro Junior College", 51–56.

deterring students from possible transfer to senior institutions. Higher availability of terminal programs naturally reduced the transfer rates of students because of the attractiveness of a shorter and less expensive education possibly yielding immediate employment. I found no evidence of either school actively counseling students into terminal programs, but I also did not find clear evidence of counselors actively pushing students away from these programs either (perhaps citing the long-term benefits of a four-year college degree). For the most part, it was up to students to set their own path, including seeking the aid of counselors if necessary (which generally did not happen, particularly for struggling students).

The question of the community college is not whether it increased access (it did), or if it sacrificed potential quality of academic preparation and potential for social mobility based on gaining a Bachelor's degree (it does). The question is whether the benefit of increased access outweighs the problems these institutions faced because of their lack of selective admissions and impossibly large mission to offer almost any type of training that the community needed. Based on talking to individuals who worked or studied at both of these schools, I would suggest that access is more important, but that questions of quality are warranted and must be taken into account in the history of these institutions. In the end, the community college gave its students greater agency in their schooling decisions than if they did not exist. The issues these colleges faced led to difficulties in carrying out their mission, but their presence allowed individuals of all backgrounds a chance to further their education, whether through pursuit of a short-term credential, or as a bridge to further academic preparation. In a utopian world, all students could seek the highest quality coursework in whatever subject they wanted, individually tailored, at no cost, without any outside barriers to their attendance, but this utopia did not exist in the period I studied. These community

colleges offered their students opportunities, though flawed opportunities at times, that they could not access at a university.

The focus of previous histories also ignores the personal social growth that comes out of attending a community college. Perhaps the perception of community colleges as commuter schools has led to this factor being de-emphasized, but the experiences of students at both Navarro College and San Antonio College showed that their years as a community college student were important for their personal development. At Navarro College, students from small communities in the county were able to attend an institution that made a concentrated effort to foster a comfortable environment for those looking to transition from small high schools to a college setting. Interviewees discussed their excitement when meeting new people, and the confidence they gained from their years in school when they moved on to senior institutions or into future jobs. Students at San Antonio College were able to access an intellectual environment, similar to a university, where questions of national and international policy were clear subjects of debate. By attending a college, instead of moving straight into the workforce, these students were able to spend time in a place where they could build a personal ideology on issues that stretch beyond their paycheck.

The places most in need of intervention in the community college historiography are details on the experiences of students while attending these institutions (discussed in the paragraph above) and discussions on how students have impacted how these schools operate. At Navarro Junior College, direct student activism was not very prominent, outside of the protests of Iranian students at the end of the era, but administration had to remain sensitive to levels of enrollment because of the limited higher education market in the county. Lagging

attendance, evidence of a loss of student interest, led to administrative change at NC in the 1970s. Instead of the incorporation of a comprehensive mission being carried out by college leaders seeking to establish a heretofore uncalled for niche in the higher education landscape, Navarro College's experience suggests that student interest (evidenced by enrollment numbers) was a major catalyst for some colleges to change their trajectory. San Antonio College, a much larger campus in an urban setting, saw greater student activism throughout the Era of Expansion. This activism influenced school policy, particularly on issues of discrimination and hiring. These findings suggest that the power of the student in college development in small communities lay in their decision to enroll. The power of the student in larger cities, where the demand for a college education was higher and thus worries over enrollment numbers were lower, was based more on student activism. When students at SAC pressured administration with the support of their classmates and the community, seen most clearly in the activism of Chicanos in the 1960s and 1970s, college officials were forced to change (or could face the possibility of losing their position).

Students at community colleges are more than statistics. More than enrollment numbers showing institutional growth. More than employment statistics to show the long-term impact of enrollment. The actions of community college students, from their decision to enroll, to the content of their studies, to their engagement in the campus community, have affected their personal development, as well as the development of the institutions where they attended.

CHAPTER 7
CURRICULUM COMPARISONS AND CONCLUSIONS

The first six chapters of this project have described the history of San Antonio College and Navarro College primarily through qualitative sources. At times, I have alluded to enrollment numbers and annual budgets to try to trace change over time quantitatively, but the foundation for my conclusions has been built on descriptions of events at each school, and the words of administrators, faculty members, and students. For the final chapter of this study, I created a method of analyzing the history of SAC and NC that would provide a more objective, quantitative, measure of their development. I could then compare the trends in the quantitative data with the conclusions I have drawn about each school in my initial qualitative analysis.

Historical and contemporary studies of the junior/community college have done a good job of incorporating quantitative data into their research. The first people to study the community college, conducting their research from the 1920s through the 1940s, included pages of survey data to show the overall growth of the institution (by counting the number of colleges and where they were located), and demographic data on the denizens of these schools, particularly its students.[1] This data showed the steady expansion of the junior college concept, as it moved from the Midwest and West to the South. Junior college students were shown to be primarily middle class, seeking a junior college education in the hopes of transferring to a senior institution. Scholars of the community college continued to compile impressive data to catalog the movement's development after World War II,

[1] Leonard V. Koos, *The Junior College* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1924); Leonard V. Koos, *The Junior-College Movement* (Boston: Ginn and Company, 1925); William Martin Proctor, *The Junior College: Its Organization and Administration* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1927); Walter Crosby Eells, *The Junior College* (Boston, 1931); Jesse Parker Bogue, *The Community College* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1950).

particularly those working in the democratizing branch of the historiography, but the emergence of the revisionist narrative led to a change in research orientation.[2] Understanding who attended these schools remained important, but understanding the long-term impact of students' enrollment became increasingly crucial for revisionists studying the community college. Statistics on rates of transfer to senior institutions rose as a major emphasis in the historiography from the 1980s to the present. With increasing numbers of minority and working class students enrolling at community colleges in the second half of the twentieth century, concurrent with an apparent rise in terminal/vocational programs, researchers were naturally interested in how public two-year colleges affected overall educational attainment.[3] These scholars have presented convincing evidence that community college attendance has had a negative impact on completion of a Bachelor's degree, even when controlling for socioeconomic background and limiting the data to those seeking to transfer, in comparison to those who initially enroll at four-year schools.

---

[2] Leland L. Medsker, *The Junior College: Progress and Prospect.* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960); Leland L. Medsker and Dale Tillery, *Breaking the Access Barriers: A Profile of Two-Year Colleges* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971).

[3] Jerome Karabel, "Community Colleges and Social Stratification in the 1980s," *CC New Directions for Community Colleges* 1986, no. 54 (1986): 13–30; Kevin Dougherty, "The Effects of Community Colleges: Aid or Hindrance to Socioeconomic Attainment?," *Sociology of Education* 60, no. 2 (1987): 86–103; Steven G. Brint and Jerome Karabel, *The Diverted Dream: Community Colleges and the Promise of Educational Opportunity in America, 1900-1985* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989); Fred L. Pincus, *Bridges to Opportunity: Are Community Colleges Meeting the Transfer Needs of Minority Students?* (Washington D.C.: Academy for Educational Development and College Entrance Examination, 1989); Kevin James Dougherty, *The Contradictory College: The Conflicting Origins, Impacts, and Futures of the Community College* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1994); Cecilia Elena Rouse, "Democratization or Diversion?: The Effect of Community Colleges on Educational Attainment," *Journal of Business and Economic Statistics* 13, no. 2 (1995), doi:129.7.134.119; David F. Labaree, "The Rise of the Community College: Markets and the Limits of Educational Opportunity," in *How to Succeed in School Without Really Learning: The Credentials Race in American Education* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1997), 190–223; Mariana Alfonso, "The Impact of Community College Attendance on Baccalaureate Attainment," *Research in Higher Education* 47, no. 8 (2006): 873–903; J. M. Beach, *Gateway to Opportunity?: A History of the Community College in the United States* (Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, LLC, 2010).

This conclusion leads naturally to a significant question: who drove the change in the community college mission which led to the adoption of a more comprehensive curriculum? The study that has answered this question most convincingly, thus far, is *The Diverted Dream*. Scholars working in the democratizing tradition have argued that the comprehensive mission was implemented to broaden the college's appeal, and to make the curriculum line-up more closely with the needs of local communities.[4] Their conclusions, however, are more theoretical than evidenced-based (citing primarily the rhetoric of college leadership seeking to promote these schools). Brint and Karabel chose to look at the community college through an institutional model of development, viewing changes in these school from the inside-out by weighing the importance of inside and outside influences on the overall direction of the institution. They concluded that "community colleges chose to vocationalize themselves" due to the "subordinate position of the community college in the larger structure of educational and social stratification."[5]

By the 1950s, when the community college concept was popularized, it became increasingly clear that the junior college sat at the lowest rung of the higher education ladder. Senior institutions, despite the ambitions of university presidents earlier in the century, did not abandon the education of underclassmen, so junior colleges remained subordinate to older and more prestigious institutions in their transfer programs. Brint and Karabel argue that community colleges' inferior position in higher education also had long-term economic effects outside of students' immediate education since the lower prestige of these schools

[4] Bogue, *The Community College*, 1950.
[5] Brint and Karabel, *The Diverted Dream*, location 326.

theoretically puts their students in "a subordinate position in the associated competition to place their graduates into desirable positions in the labor market."[6]

Working from this interpretation, Brint and Karabel put forward an intriguing argument to address the larger question on who drove the change in the curricular direction of the community college. As mentioned previously, the main argument in *The Diverted Dream* is that community colleges embraced a comprehensive mission because of their perceived low position within the larger realm of higher education. Thus their "anticipation" of "subordination" led to their attempts to appeal to businesses through incorporation of vocational programs in order to find a distinct place for themselves as a post-secondary education institution.[7] According to Brint and Karabel, big business was "indifferent" to the community college up until the 1960s, meaning that the change in the school's curriculum was a result of college leadership's initiative, not the active intervention of outside forces.[8]

In this chapter, I have developed a quantitative measure to trace curricular change at each of the studied campus's to better understand who influenced the overall direction of these institutions and, more specifically, the incorporation of terminal programs. Pulling from annual course catalogs available in each college's archives, I have compiled data on the number of courses offered, by subject, for each available year from 1925-1980.[9] I understand that the use of college catalogs comes with some risks, since their contents do not always correspond directly to what happens on the ground at the school. I chose to use college catalogs because they were the most stable source of curricular development that I could

---

[6] Ibid.
[7] Ibid., location 344.
[8] Ibid., location 310.
[9] "San Antonio (Junior) College: Catalogs, 1928-1980," McAllister Collection, San Antonio College Library, San Antonio, TX; "Navarro (Junior) College: Catalogs, 1946-1980," Box 1-B11-a, Pearce Museum Archives at Navarro College, Corsicana, TX.

access, available for almost every year at both schools. I found "schedules of classes" sporadically, but not with enough frequency to properly show change over time. Catalogs offered a stable source of annual data contained in publications put together for the same purpose at both colleges.

After compiling the data on annual course offerings from the college catalogs, I then coded each subject as "transfer," "terminal," or "mixed." Determining the course-type designation was done by comparing the subjects to the bachelor degree offerings of the largest public university in the state, the University of Texas. Subjects that had senior-level degrees were coded as "transfer," those that did not were coded as "terminal." Subjects with both academic and transfer coursework, when compared against UT's degree offerings, were coded as "mixed."[10] Beyond comparing the proportions of terminal and transfer coursework at each institution, I also looked at the differences in subjects offered at each college in an effort to see if noticeable curricular variation arose due to local context. Aberrations in the data will signal particular times of interest for further analysis. Throughout this chapter, I will attempt to explain irregularities in the data by discussing how events in my qualitative analysis of each school's development (from the main body of this study) offer likely explanations for why these changes occurred.

This approach will allow me to see which of the explanations offered in the historiography to explain the shift in the community college's mission, the democratizing or the revisionist branch, holds up better at the single institution level. If revisionists are correct, then the administration, clued into national dialogue on the junior college and sensitive to the

[10] "Undergraduate Catalog 1994-1996," The University of Texas at Austin, accessed September 10, 2015, http://www.utexas.edu/student/registrar/gopherfiles/catalog/cat-ug/.

perceived needs of business, will emerge as the most important factor in curricular change at the institution. If scholars touting the democratizing function of the community college are correct, then the community and the students will emerge as the most important determinant in the curricular development of the community college.

As my discussion in the following sections will show, the arguments of both branches of the historiography have some merit, though the degree of influence by different parties varies due to local context. The overriding influence of administration was more pronounced at Navarro College than at San Antonio College. The smaller size of the institution, the initial secondary school structure of the school, and the need for rapid change to meet the needs of a limited education market, all led to greater administrative power in a rural setting. At San Antonio College, in contrast, it is more difficult to connect administrative initiative to curricular change, particularly since, after 1941, new presidents were inside hires that did not alter the larger direction of the institution significantly.

I found that the importance of the community, clear in the democratizing branch but diminished in the narrative told by revisionists, was clear at both schools.[11] At Navarro College, the need to appeal to the community in order to maintain adequate financial resources and enrollment to survive, and hopefully grow, was a major driver in the types of courses available at the school, and the proportion of terminal coursework offered. At San Antonio College, the support of the community was crucial to the school's overall health. Without strong community backing, San Antonio Junior College was left in dire financial

[11]As mentioned in the introduction and Chapter One of this dissertation, the community encompasses external influences on the school at the local level (meaning the city of San Antonio for SAC, and the whole of Navarro County for Navarro College). This means that there is some overlap between community and government in my analysis (hence why they were treated in the same chapter) since local votes on taxes levied in support of the school, the structure/officials of the school, and bond issues are relevant for understanding the attitudes of the community towards the institutions while also relating to local politics.

straits in its early years, with little ability to innovate when the primary struggle was for base survival.

The largest finding of this curricular comparison, and a subject not discussed enough in the existing historiography, was the overarching impact of the state and federal government on both school's development. While the degree of influence of different levels of government varied depending on local context, with state government support being more important for Navarro College on average, and the federal government having greater influence on San Antonio College, for both campuses the actions of the government had a clear impact on the substance of their curriculum.

Overall, this comparison shows that community colleges were more reactive than proactive despite what either of the branches of the historiography would lead their readers to believe. Instead of being driven to change by anticipation of subordination, the basis of Brint and Karabel's argument, the colleges studied here changed in response to clearly visible conditions in the local community and in response to government policy. Instead of actively shifting the vision of the college to meet the perceived needs of the community after World War II, as the traditional historiography argues, the leadership at these colleges became more community-responsive in reaction to government policies, and only when buttressed by corresponding increases in student enrollment. Considering the community college's tenuous position in higher education, as young institutions existing alongside more prestigious liberal arts colleges and universities with well-defined missions, SAC and NC were cautious in their development, sensitive to the needs of their clientele, and only driven to drastic change in times of crisis.

San Antonio (Junior) College

Before World War II, San Antonio Junior College's development was shaped profoundly by two major groups: the state government and the community. The trajectory of University Junior College shifted dramatically when UT was forced to abandon the campus after only one year due to a state ruling. The character of the curriculum at San Antonio Junior College, renamed in 1926, was influenced heavily by its initial relationship with the University of Texas. The early operation of the school by UT "resulted in a curriculum closely paralleling the first two years of University work."[12]

As the data in Table 1 shows (see the following page), SAJC's curriculum remained extremely consistent during its first twenty years of operation. Following the junior college mission, SAJC offered courses generally in dedicated transfer subjects (generally over 70 percent of listed courses). The balance of the curriculum was in mixed coursework, primarily in business, education, and engineering. Even when the board of trustees appointed J. O. Loftin as the college's president in 1941, brought in due to his track-record in promoting vocational and technical programs, the school's curriculum remained largely the same (percentages of coursework were the same in 1939 and 1942).[13] Despite the calls of national leaders, like Walter Eells, for a greater emphasis on terminal programs at the junior college, and despite the hiring of an administrator dedicated to diversifying the curriculum, SAJC's proportional course offerings shifted very little before the mid-1940s.[14]

---

[12] Students of San Antonio Junior College, *El Alamo, 1930* (San Antonio, TX: San Antonio Junior College, 1930), McAllister Collection, San Antonio College Library, San Antonio, TX.

[13] "Loftin Named Head of the Junior College; Suburb Cuts Taxes: Former A. I. Leader Plans Expansion," *San Antonio Express*, August 13, 1941 in *San Antonio College Scrapbook C, 1940-1949*, McAllister Collection, San Antonio College Library, San Antonio, TX.

[14] Walter Crosby Eells, *Why Junior College Terminal Education?* (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1941).

SAN ANTONIO JUNIOR COLLEGE COURSE OFFERINGS 1928-1946 (TABLE 1)[15]

Year	SAC Transfer	SAC Terminal	SAC Mixed	SAC Transfer%	SAC Terminal%	SAC Mixed %
1928-29	23	0	9	72%	0%	28%
1929-30	25	0	9	74%	0%	26%
1930-31	26	0	9	74%	0%	26%
1931-32	27	0	10	73%	0%	27%
1932-33	26	0	10	72%	0%	28%
1933-34	27	0	10	73%	0%	27%
1934-35	32	0	12	73%	0%	27%
1935-36	33	0	13	72%	0%	28%
1936-37	33	0	13	72%	0%	28%
1937-38	31	0	13	70%	0%	30%
1938-39	29	0	12	71%	0%	29%
1939-40	29	0	12	71%	0%	29%
1940-41	40	0	11	78%	0%	22%
1941-42	39	0	16	71%	0%	29%
1942-43	39	0	17	70%	0%	30%
1943-44	45	0	16	74%	0%	26%
1944-45	43	0	23	65%	0%	35%
1945-46	45	0	23	66%	0%	34%

The reason that San Antonio Junior College's curriculum failed to evolve in its early years related closely to the role of the state and the community in the college's development. Innovation and flexibility were difficult values to imbibe for an institution struggling to survive. The state government, which would later offer community colleges substantial revenue by the 1950s, largely ignored the junior college for most of the Era of Establishment (beyond sundering SAJC's relationship with UT). Without state funds, which were not introduced until 1941, junior colleges depended on community-level support to expand. In the midst of the Great Depression, in a city with an anti-tax culture, and administrated by a

[15] The data presented in the tables in this paper were created by counting course offerings by subject in the college's catalogs and coding them as mixed, transfer, or terminal (see methodology above).

public school district which viewed the school as a grudgingly adopted drain on resources, SAJC did not have the necessary funds to take risks with their curriculum. [16]

SAN ANTONIO COLLEGE COURSE OFFERINGS 1946-1960 (TABLE 2)

Year	SAC Transfer	SAC Terminal	SAC Mixed	SAC Transfer%	SAC Terminal%	SAC Mixed %
1946-47	51	0	21	71%	0%	29%
1947-48	55	0	29	65%	0%	35%
1948-49	59	0	45	57%	0%	43%
1949-50	68	2	50	57%	2%	42%
1950-51	79	1	62	56%	1%	44%
1951-52	59	1	51	53%	1%	46%
1952-53	94	1	97	49%	1%	51%
1953-54	104	1	110	48%	0%	51%
1954-55	111	2	128	46%	1%	53%
1955-56	133	2	138	49%	1%	51%
1956-57	117	2	169	41%	1%	59%
1957-58	110	11	179	37%	4%	60%
1958-59	116	11	191	36%	3%	60%
1959-60	124	10	196	38%	3%	59%

During the postwar period, San Antonio College's curriculum began to change noticeably, resulting from the intervention of the federal government, greater support from the state, and an increasingly invested local community. The timing of this change in curricular emphasis (see Table 2) correlates with the post-World War II shift in junior/community college priorities that previous historians have discussed. The notable rise in mixed coursework during these years can be attributed to a couple of factors. First, the GI Bill provided an incentive for World War II veterans to return to school, many of whom

[16] William C. Morsch, *State Community College Systems: Their Role and Operation in Seven States.* (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1971), 122.

hoped to enroll in vocational, not traditional academic, coursework.[17] Another factor, less discussed in the historiography, was the macroeconomic context for the shift of the junior college to the community college. San Antonio Junior College often struggled to get support from an already beleaguered public school system before World War II.

The Great Depression magnified this struggle for funds. San Antonio taxpayers were often reticent to put money towards a new institution, even going so far as to block the initial application to create the San Antonio Union Junior College District (with taxing powers) in 1941 (not approving it until after World War II).[18] In the improving economic conditions of the 1950s, the board of trustees purchased a new campus site, increased tax rates twice, and raised tuition, without the kind of backlash from the community that these moves would have created in the 1930s and early 1940s.[19] Updated facilities and greater financial flexibility allowed the school to begin to expand its mission, increase enrollment, and offer a larger and more diverse curriculum.

The mid-1950s was a time of change at San Antonio College, reflected in the visible increase in mixed coursework at the school during these years. The presidency of the college moved from J. O. Loftin to Wayland Moody following Loftin's death. Moody was an inside hire, previously serving as Dean and Administrative Assistant at SAC, but his emphasis on institutional growth, particularly in terms of enrollment, factored into the mid-1950s expansion of mixed coursework at the school (increasing 8 percent between the 1955-1956

---

[17] Edwin Kiester, "The G.I. Bill May Be the Best Deal Ever Made by Uncle Sam," *Smithsonian* 25, no. 8 (1994): 129.

[18] One of the major reasons for the defeat of the initial plan for creating the Junior College District was the opposition of the Taxpayers' Defense League: Taxpayers Defense League, "No Junior College," *San Antonio Light*, November 13, 1941, in *San Antonio College Scrapbook C, 1940-1949*.

[19] "S.A. College Moves Soon," *San Antonio Light*, August 6, 1950 in *San Antonio College Scrapbook D, 1950-1952*, , McAllister Collection, San Antonio College Library, San Antonio, TX; "S.A. College Tax Rate Doubled," c. 1952-53 [newspaper not indicated], *San Antonio College Scrapbook E, 1952-53*, McAllister Collection, San Antonio College Library, San Antonio, TX.

and the 1956-1957 school years).[20] Firmer financial grounding and the support of students, seen in the campus's rising enrollment in the latter half of the 1950s (with day/night enrollment increasing from about 5,000 in 1955 to over 8,000 by 1960), enabled the introduction of new programs during this period,.[21]

San Antonio College also integrated in 1955, on the heels of the *Brown v. Board* Supreme Court decision in 1954. Having faced law suits for not providing black students equal facilities at St. Philip's College since the opening of the new SAC campus in 1951, and amidst questions about the lack of availability of some advanced vocational coursework at St. Philip's in the early 1950s, San Antonio College quietly admitted black students in 1955.[22] The substantial increase in mixed coursework beginning in 1956 can partly be attributed to the entrance of black students into SAC seeking second-year coursework in white-collar vocational programs (particularly in medicine).

It is important to note, however, that the proportion of coursework in dedicated terminal subjects remained very low at SAC before the 1960s (below five percent for the entirety of this period). Firmer financial footing allowed SAC to begin shifting its curriculum in the 1940s and 1950s (seen in the introduction of vocational tracks within traditional academic subjects, coded as "mixed" courses in this study), but SAC's junior college origins slowed the movement of the school towards embracing a comprehensive curriculum with dedicated terminal vocational programs. It would take the intervention of the state and

---

[20] "Dr. Moody to Direct S.A. College Expansion," *San Antonio Light*, c.1955 in *San Antonio College Scrapbook H, 1955-1956*, McAllister Collection, San Antonio College Library, San Antonio, TX.

[21] Enrollment data was again taken from annual course catalogs.

[22] "Negroes Try to Enroll in San Antonio College," *San Antonio Express*, September 10, 1952 in *San Antonio College Scrapbook E, 1952-53*; "Negro's Hush Hush Enrollment in S.A. College Disclosed," *San Antonio Express*, June 12, 1955 in *San Antonio Scrapbook G, 1954-55*, McAllister Collection, San Antonio College Library, San Antonio, TX.

federal government in the 1960s for San Antonio College to begin incorporating significant amounts of dedicated terminal subjects into the school's curriculum.

Overall, the support of the community, the state of the economy, and the role of the state government, had a large impact on the development of SAC's curriculum from 1925-1960. These trends continued into the 1960s and 1970s as dedicated terminal coursework became more common at the school. The rise in terminal coursework over the years from 1960 to 1980, from five percent to 19 percent, was rooted in state and national events during this period. An interesting trend in the data is that large increases in terminal course offerings occurred mid-decade (three-four percent) in both the 1960s and the 1970s. These mid-decade shifts occurred concurrently with the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools reaccreditation reviews of the campus.[23] Reflecting national trends in education research, and the suggestions of the federal government, accreditors put pressure on the school to display their adherence to the call for two-year public colleges to be increasingly comprehensive. Providing terminal/vocational coursework for nontraditional college students made up a major part of this comprehensive mission. Administrators interviewed for this project recognized that the self-reflection involved in accreditors reviews may have factored into SAC's changing curriculum, but they argued that the role of the government was more impactful.[24]

---

[23] Members of the Instructional and Administrative Staffs, "The Institutional Self-Study Report of San Antonio College for the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, 1963-1964" (San Antonio, TX: San Antonio College, 1965), McAllister Collection, San Antonio College Library, San Antonio, TX; Jerome F. Weynand and Paul R. Culwell, "San Antonio College Self-Study Report, 1973-1975" (San Antonio, TX: San Antonio College, 1975), McAllister Collection, San Antonio College Library, San Antonio, TX.

[24] Johnnie Rosenauer, interview by the author, San Antonio, TX, June 2, 2015; Robert Zeigler, interview by the author, San Antonio, TX, June 2, 2015.

The push for the college curriculum to be more comprehensive was one of the major recommendations of the newly created Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board, established in 1965, which called for the state's public two-year colleges to become more community-responsive while offering more vocational and technical coursework.[25] The increase in terminal coursework at SAC from 1965-1980, seen in Table 3, reflects SAC's adherence to the board's recommendations. Furthermore, SAC demonstrated its community-responsiveness through increased course offerings in medical fields (with demand bolstered by the creation of the UT-Health Science Center in San Antonio in 1959), foreign languages, protective services, and music and physical education electives.[26]

In addition to the goals of the state, the federal government also had a large impact on the character of the SAC curriculum in this period. Both the Vocational Education Act (1963) and the Higher Education Act (1965) provided the school with funds to further terminal/vocational programs.[27] Federal government actions, such as offering financial assistance through the Higher Education Act of 1965 and the granting of draft deferments to male college students during the Vietnam War, allowed (or incentivized) many students to go to college who otherwise may not have attended. These federal actions led to a large increase in SAC's enrollment and the expansion of course offerings beginning in the late 1960s.[28] The

---

[25] Sue Johnson Blair, "The Emergence and Development of the Community/Junior College in Texas" (Ph.D. Diss, Texas Tech University, 1991), 127–130.

[26] University of Texas Health Science Center, San Antonio, "A Brief History of UTHSCSA," accessed September 18, 2015, http://uthscsa.edu/hr/briefhistory.asp; Description of change over time by subject was put together by counting the number of course offerings in the college catalog by subject for each available year at the studied institutions. Because of the large number of subjects, this data could not be easily formatted into this paper. If you would like to see the full spreadsheets, please feel free to contact me at: bphoffman@uh.edu.

[27] For an explanation of the impact of these federal acts on Texas junior colleges see: Blair, "The Emergence and Development of the Community/Junior College in Texas," 134; for an explanation of federal sources of income at SAC specifically see: Weynand and Culwell, "San Antonio College Self-Study Report, 1973-1975," 70-71.

[28] For specifics on the explosive increase in enrollment during these years see: Weynand and Culwell, "San Antonio College Self-Study Report, 1973-1974," 44-45.

introduction of students from diverse socioeconomic backgrounds increased demand for a wider array of course options. Offering subjects that appealed to older and non-degree seeking students, while also introducing new programs in popular fields for a diverse urban community (such as medicine, foreign languages, and protective services) may have reduced SAC's transfer rate, but it led to record enrollments and more consistent local support for the school.

SAN ANTONIO COLLEGE COURSE OFFERINGS 1960-1980 (TABLE 3)

Year	SAC Transfer	SAC Terminal	SAC Mixed	SAC Transfer%	SAC Terminal%	SAC Mixed %
1960-61	123	15	188	38%	5%	58%
1961-62	130	16	186	39%	5%	56%
1962-63	139	17	194	40%	5%	55%
1963-64	156	21	192	42%	6%	52%
1964-65	156	25	200	41%	7%	52%
1965-66	170	46	185	42%	11%	46%
1966-67	173	58	200	40%	13%	46%
1967-68	173	62	211	39%	14%	47%
1968-69	193	87	228	38%	17%	45%
1969-70	218	97	240	39%	17%	43%
1970-71	229	100	263	39%	17%	44%
1971-72	238	107	277	38%	17%	45%
1972-73	241	118	331	35%	17%	48%
1973-74	238	117	335	34%	17%	49%
1974-75	243	123	320	35%	18%	47%
1975-76	243	153	347	33%	21%	47%
1976-77	248	146	371	32%	19%	48%
1977-78	251	153	343	34%	20%	46%
1978-79	260	146	355	34%	19%	47%
1979-80	265	147	365	34%	19%	47%

A deeper look at SAC's curricular development from 1925-1980 shows that community support, government recommendations and funding, and the pressure of accreditation (to a lesser degree), all contributed to the shift from primarily transfer coursework to a more diverse curriculum. Administrative change had some effect on the curriculum, particularly the appointment of Wayland Moody in 1956, but overall the impact of the community and the government emerge as clearer catalysts for curricular change than administrative initiative. At the institutional level, financial realities dictated institutional action more than proactive innovation. Instead of diversifying its curriculum to meet the perceived, but unspoken, needs of big business, as Brint and Karabel suggest, changes in SAC's curriculum were reactionary. Increased community support, state and federal funding, and student interest enabled the incorporation of terminal and mixed coursework at SAC.

Navarro (Junior) College

The importance of the government and the community, prominent in the history of SAC, also emerged as a clear trend in the development of Navarro Junior College. Despite this similarity, the impact of administration on the curricular direction of the school was more pronounced at NJC than SAC. This conclusion seemingly adds credibility to Brint and Karabel's findings that point to college leaderships' determinative role in the increased offering of terminal vocational programs at these institutions. However, Brint and Karabel paint administrative preference for vocational programs as a way of diverting students not suitable for transfer into terminal coursework, while also establishing a clearer role for their schools by appealing to big business. As Brint and Karabel put it, "the vocationalization project favored by most junior college administrators was not rooted in student preferences;

indeed, it had arisen in direct opposition to these preferences. For their part, the students--many of them of modest social origins--came to the junior college in search of upward mobility."[29] This was not the case, however, at Navarro Junior College.

The introduction of terminal programs at NJC related directly to the needs of the community and appealed to students. In fact, when a college president hesitated to expand NJC's mission by offering more terminal programs, the board of trustees forced his resignation due to lagging enrollment (an indicator of student interest) under the junior college model. The impact of administration at NJC appears clearly in curricular data, but their actions had more to do with ensuring institutional growth by appealing to potential students than gatekeeping transfers or attempting to appeal to "disinterested" county businesses.

Navarro Junior College's underlying community-responsiveness was apparent from its establishment. The support of the federal government, in acquiring the land and facilities for the campus and generating student interest through the GI Bill, was instrumental in NJC's creation in 1946, but the school's sustainability in a sparsely populated county depended on building strong community support. The advocacy of county public school officials was crucial in gaining approval for the opening of the campus and the creation of an independent junior college board with taxing powers. The building of community trust through the presence of familiar faces factored into decisions to appoint NJC board members, administrators, and faculty members taken from public schools across the counties. Navarro Junior College's commitment to the needs of the community, and its expected students, appeared clearly in the college's curriculum.

[29] Brint and Karabel, *The Diverted Dream*, location 1110.

World War II veterans made up the bulk of NJC's first students, many of whom were looking for terminal, not transfer, programs. When comparing coursework proportions for 1946-47 at SAJC and NJC, the latter school had a slightly higher percentage of mixed coursework (seven percent more), but a significantly larger amount of terminal coursework (16 percent more). From the outset, NJC offered "courses in automobile mechanics, cabinet making, distributive education, secretarial training, and flight training" to serve the needs of the "sixty per cent of the students…[that] were veterans."[30] As the college yearbook explained, "the aim of the Vocational Division is to assist veterans and others in becoming established…in gainful employment."[31]The school also offered a variety of agricultural classes to serve the needs of a largely rural local economy. NJC introduced religious coursework and incorporated religiously-affiliated organizations early in the college's history (by the mid-1950s), reflecting the beliefs of the majority Christian local population. Navarro Junior College's early curriculum showed the school's commitment to meeting the specific needs of its students, veterans in particular in this period, while also offering coursework in-line with the county's socioeconomic makeup.

Beyond meeting the demands of their students, the relatively high amount of terminal coursework at NJC echoed the larger political climate at the time the school was established. On the cusp of the publication of the Truman Commission on Higher Education's report pushing for more community-oriented two-year colleges, and at a time when the AAJC lobbied harder than ever for the incorporation of terminal technical programs, Navarro Junior

[30] "Navarro JC Maps Program," *Dallas Morning News*, August 10, 1947, 13.

[31] Students of Navarro Junior College, *El Navarro, 1948* (Corsicana, TX: Navarro Junior College, 1948), Pearce Museum Archives at Navarro College, Corsicana, TX.

College was established at an opportune moment to debut a more diverse curriculum.[32] Though still primarily a junior college with a transfer focus, NJC integrated terminal coursework into the college's curriculum more quickly than at SAJC. The evolution of SAJC happened more gradually as a consequence of the continued legacy of its university affiliation and transfer focus.

NAVARRO JUNIOR COLLEGE COURSE OFFERINGS 1946-1960 (TABLE 4)

Year	NC Transfer	NC Terminal	NC Mixed	NC Transfer%	NC Terminal%	NC Mixed%
1946-47	40	13	30	48%	16%	36%
1947-48	40	13	30	48%	16%	36%
1948-49	50	27	38	43%	23%	33%
1949-50	51	30	45	40%	24%	36%
1950-51	51	32	51	38%	24%	38%
1951-52	55	43	57	35%	28%	37%
1952-53	66	46	75	35%	25%	40%
1953-54	68	44	83	35%	23%	43%
1954-55	68	46	86	34%	23%	43%
1955-56	68	45	87	34%	23%	44%
1956-57	69	48	90	33%	23%	43%
1957-58	73	47	91	35%	22%	43%
1958-59	73	50	90	34%	23%	42%
1959-60	73	53	91	34%	24%	42%

On a macroeconomic level, NJC benefitted from being established during a time of improvement for the national economy. Even though Navarro County did not enjoy the same level of economic growth in the postwar period as other areas in the state, like San Antonio, it was still a better time than the Great Depression for lobbying for local support.

[32] For background on the Truman Commission Report on higher education see: Philo A. Hutcheson, "The Truman Commission's Vision of the Future," *Thought & Action: The NEA Higher Education Journal*, Fall 2007, 107–15; Jesse P. Bogue, "The Community College," *Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors* 34, no. 2 (July 1, 1948): 285–95, doi:10.2307/40220284.

Furthermore, the availability of state and federal funds for two-year colleges was much better in the 1940s than it had been in the 1920s and 1930s. Instead of taking over 25 years to move to a more suitable campus, NJC moved to its present site after only five years at the airfield (the same year SAC moved to its own new address), was consistently able to pass bonds for campus improvement, and gained accreditation in less than ten years.[33]

Keeping in mind the needs of the community and the need to maintain adequate enrollment, NJC's administrators had a clear impact on the trajectory of the college's curriculum. Unlike SAJC, which was set up by a university and maintained some semblance of university governance (and preserved consistency administratively through inside hires), NJC's early structure more closely resembled a high school. This was most evident in the hiring of local high school teachers and administrators to fill official and faculty positions during the college's establishment and the overarching influence of the school's president.[34] Unlike the relatively consistent and gradual advance of terminal coursework at SAC over the studied period, NJC saw the proportion of terminal coursework rise and fall as a consequence of administrative preference. Similar to SAC, NJC did see an increase in terminal coursework in the mid-1960s, likely as a consequence of Coordinating Board recommendations and the suggestions of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, but this increase quickly dissipated. Integration, occurring in 1961, did not lead to a noticeable bump (perhaps since few black students enrolled) in terminal coursework as seen at SAC.[35] The lack of dramatic movement in terminal coursework in the 1960s, despite major

[33] For a general history of Navarro College see: Tommy W. Stringer, *Dreams and Visions: The History of Navarro College* (Waco, TX: Davis Brothers Publishing Co., 1996).

[34] For biographical information on early college leaders see: "Ray L. Waller Heads Navarro Junior College," *Dallas Morning News*, July 24, 1946, 12.

[35] "Jackson High School Graduates Enter Junior College," *Corsicana Daily Sun*, September 6, 1961, 1.

changes in government policy related to the community college, suggests that administrative preference could trump outside influence in the short-term. As enrollment growth slowed and even started to shrink, however, administrative conservatism gave way to greater innovation to ensure NJC's continued growth by appealing to the community in the new landscape established by the THECB.

The school's second president, Dr. Ben Jones (president from 1956-1973), prioritized strict budgeting and expansion of the campus over curricular innovation. His unwillingness to incorporate more terminal programs led to the board of trustees forcing his resignation in 1973 as a consequence of decreasing enrollment (a phenomenon also related to the opening of competing community colleges in nearby counties after the creation of the Coordinating Board).[36] At the time of his resignation in 1973, the proportion of terminal coursework at the school sat at 16 percent, the same percentage as 1946

Although Navarro Junior College was slow to incorporate coursework in dedicated terminal subjects, mixed coursework did rise during Jones's tenure, particularly in the mid-1960s (where it rose by almost 10 percent). The hiring of Lary Reed as a technical arts teacher in the early 1960s, coupled with the increased focus of the state on vocational education, through the THECB and the Texas Education Agency, led to the incorporation of some terminal tracks in the arts, business, engineering, and data processing despite Jones's resistance. Reed was instrumental in the construction of the Bain Technical Arts Center,

[36] Data on decreasing enrollment can be seen here: Navarro Junior College, "Navarro Junior College Self-Study: Prepared for the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, January, 1974" (Corsicana, TX: Navarro Junior College, 1974), 36, Box B12-a, Pearce Museum Archives at Navarro College, Corsicana, TX; While the reasons for his resignation were kept quiet in local papers, an interview I conducted with a fellow administrator at the time, Dr. Lary Reed, provided a clearer explanation of this event: Lary Reed, interview by the author, Corsicana, TX, August 14, 2015.

completed in 1966, and became the Dean of Technical Arts in 1967. Reed suggests that accreditation had a peripheral influence on the incorporation of vocational coursework during the mid-1960s, but that the Texas Education Agency's "funding...and emphasis on...vocational and technical education" had a clearer effect on the composition of NJC's curriculum during this period.[37] While an increase in mixed coursework showed some adaptability to changing state and local conditions during Jones's presidency, the slow pace of change at the campus, coupled with stagnant enrollment numbers, led to administrative change at NJC in 1974.

NAVARRO (JUNIOR) COLLEGE COURSE OFFERINGS 1960-1980 (TABLE 5)

Year	NC Transfer	NC Terminal	NC Mixed	NC Transfer%	NC Terminal%	NC Mixed%
1960-61	73	44	91	35%	21%	44%
1961-62	73	45	90	35%	22%	43%
1962-63	73	46	92	35%	22%	44%
1963-64	62	27	75	38%	16%	46%
1964-65	68	27	91	37%	15%	49%
1965-66	67	28	103	34%	14%	52%
1966-67	83	51	139	30%	19%	51%
1967-68	88	44	200	27%	13%	60%
1968-69	91	44	211	26%	13%	61%
1969-70	94	43	214	27%	12%	61%
1970-71	99	36	230	27%	10%	63%
1971-72	101	45	224	27%	12%	61%
1972-73	99	66	241	24%	16%	59%
1973-74	102	64	225	26%	16%	58%
1974-75	104	66	218	27%	17%	56%
1975-76	116	114	237	25%	24%	51%
1977-78	95	133	234	21%	29%	51%
1978-79	95	133	234	21%	29%	51%
1979-80	97	161	277	18%	30%	52%

[37] Lary Reed, interview by the author, Corsicana, TX, August 14, 2015.

Dr. Jones's replacement, Dr. Kenneth Walker, brought a more entrepreneurial spirit to the school. He removed all of the previous administrators (except for Lary Reed) and a large portion of the faculty. He prioritized growth first, and promoted greater incorporation of vocational programs and the more aggressive acquisition of outside funds from both the state and the federal government.[38] Navarro College applied these funds to new programs which mirrored the energy emphasis of a local community long invested in the oil industry. In the latter half of the 1970s, NC introduced coursework in solar and geothermal energy (based on federal grants), and began to catch up with SAC by offering courses in protective services, foreign languages, and mechanical vocations (like AC repair).[39] Walker's actions (and by extension the board of trustees) led to the near doubling of proportional course offerings in terminal subjects in the last five years of the 1970s (from 17 percent to 30 percent).

The level of community support and the availability of government funds and resources had an undeniable impact on NC's curriculum. The passing of the GI Bill and the availability of surplus supplies after the war were instrumental in the creation and improvement of the campus and the institution of a more diverse initial curriculum than University Junior College offered two decades earlier. NJC also put federal funds to use to entice new students in the late 1970s. The state government's impact appears even more clearly in the curricular development of Navarro College. The increased competition for students resulting from the Coordinating Board's Master Plan, and the state's call for public two-year colleges to embrace the comprehensive community college concept, led directly to

[38] Ibid.
[39] Stringer, *Dreams and Visions*, 55.

the hiring of Kenneth Walker in 1974, and the resulting expansion of terminal coursework at the campus.

Community support was a more positive force in Navarro Junior College's early years, perhaps because it was the only college in the area, but also because of a more forgiving economic climate for a college seeking taxpayer support in the period from 1946-1980 than it was during the Great Depression. The impact of administration was the clearest difference between SAC and NC. The secondary school structure of NC allowed for greater presidential control, and the bringing in of outside candidates as new presidents led to dynamic change correlating with administrative shifts at NC.

Curriculum Comparison Conclusions

Some major differences between the studied institutions became clear when I looked at the data compiled for this study. Revisiting one of the initial questions driving my research, I found that at the studied institutions time of establishment had a clear impact on the curriculum of the selected campuses. Navarro Junior College integrated terminal coursework more quickly into its curriculum as a school established after World War II. San Antonio College, on the other hand, introduced new subjects into the curriculum gradually over the years from 1945-1980. Despite Navarro Junior College's early adoption of a more diverse curriculum, however, the overarching power of a conservative administration (on a relatively small campus) led to little forward advancement in terminal coursework from 1946-1973. It took the direct intervention of the board of trustees, and the hiring of an

entrepreneurial president from outside the institution, for the comprehensive community college mission to take hold at Navarro College. The impact of the college president on the curriculum was less noticeable at the larger San Antonio College. Hiring administrators from inside the institution led to more continuity in administrative rhetoric and more gradual change from year-to-year at SAC. Though this is a limited sample, my research suggests the possibility that administrators at smaller, rural institutions held greater power over the curricular direction of the college than at larger, urban institutions.

Similarities in the experience of these two colleges also could have important ramifications for the historiography. First, at both institutions the support of the community, and the willingness of students to enroll, had visible effects on the college's curriculum. In general, curricular innovations, including the introduction of more terminal programs, were met with student enthusiasm, evidenced by increasing enrollment. Community support can be tied to the role of the college in a specific locale and macroeconomic factors impacting citizen approval of investment of funds in higher education. In addition, both the state and the federal government were instrumental in the establishment of each college and the shifting of the schools' curriculums. Since both colleges depended on state and federal funds for expansion, the will of the state and the federal government to push for more comprehensive two-year colleges translated into higher percentages of terminal course offerings in the 1960s and 1970s. Finally, at both schools the curriculum included coursework reflecting the needs of the local populace (such as energy courses at NC and medical courses at SAC). This variation, alongside differences in the relative impact of administrators at each campus, suggest possible complications when trying to generalize the community college experience beyond the local level.

Unlike previous histories, which tie the changing curriculum of the community college to administration's foresight, this comparison points to curricular shifts correlating with concrete contemporary factors. Brint and Karabel recognized the importance of outside influences on community college development, particularly the business community, but argued that the interest of these groups was illusory before the 1960s.[40] Instead of college administrators introducing terminal coursework against the wishes of students, to appeal to the perceived needs of big business, this comparison shows that curricular innovation had less to do with perception, and more to do with reality. Curricular change, at both campuses, consistently correlated with student and community interest, and depended heavily on each schools' financial health (dependent on state and federal support, local taxes, and student tuition). Times of curricular change occurred either when institutional growth allowed room in the budget for risk and innovation, or when lagging enrollment cut into revenue, making change a necessity for the college's long-term health. To use a tennis term, the junior colleges studied here were counterpunchers in their approach to curricular innovation, not aggressors.

[40] Brint and Karabel, *The Diverted Dream*, location 339.

CONCLUSION
THE PAST, PRESENT, AND FUTURE OF THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

I began this study by discussing my approach to historical comparisons, and attempting to break down comparative studies into their fundamental variables: location, time, and historical actors. I then explained how I considered each of these variables when setting up my study, including the major questions I would be introducing on the community college based on each of these factors. After presenting both my qualitative, and now my quantitative evidence, on both of these institutions, I would like to briefly reintroduce these central questions, and offer some insight on the conclusions I have drawn based on this study.

In terms of location, I sought to choose colleges located in distinctly different locales in order to determine how much local context impacted community college development. This issue was particularly important because the character of a "community" college was theoretically shaped by the needs of the community where it was located, specifically after the 1950s when the comprehensive community college mission was popularized. Despite this potential for local variation, previous histories have consistently attempted to define the development of the community college nationally in an attempt to build a generalizable narrative on how these institutions developed. By choosing colleges established in different socioeconomic contexts, I hoped to see whether this type of generalization was possible, or if the community college movement was more fragmented than previously believed.

Over the course of this study, I have found that local context does lead to clear differences in how community colleges developed, though some space remains to generalize across institutions. In general, the support of the local community was a more consistent concern for the college located in the less populated area of the state, Navarro College. Limited demand for higher education opportunities in the county made it important for NC to make sure it provided coursework that appealed to the community and fostered a comfortable campus environment for students transitioning from small public school systems into higher education. Furthermore, the smaller tax base in Navarro County, when compared to the more populace San Antonio, made engagement with the community a must to ensure sufficient revenue for institutional growth. The support of the community was important at SAC as well, particularly when the school attempted to expand from its modest beginnings, but the impact of the community on the character of the institution was more pronounced at NC than at SAC. Navarro College also held a clear advantage in its quest to remain community-responsive since the more limited scope of the county, in terms of demographic and economic diversity, made it easier for college leaders to identify the needs of the community. Similarly, Navarro College's smaller size, and need to remain institutionally flexible due to the constraints of its limited tax base, led to the development of greater administrative power to enact swift changes in comparison to SAC.

Local context also affected course offerings at both schools. While both campuses maintained the same backbone of transfer courses as the foundation for the curriculum, the adoption of a more comprehensive curriculum over time led to variation in course offerings.

Navarro College, appealing to the needs of the local economy and its students, offered more coursework in agriculture, energy fields, and religious studies. San Antonio College, on the other hand, incorporated more courses in medicine, foreign languages, protective services, and engineering, subjects more in demand in a diverse urban economy. Despite variation in terminal vocational programs, the overall incorporation of terminal and mixed coursework at both schools was fairly consistent, suggesting that local context had only a limited effect on the overall mission of the institution.

Alongside location, time was a major variable that I factored into this comparison. I hoped that studying the development of these two schools would provide insight on how much time of establishment impacted community college development and would help me identify a clearer periodization for the community college movement. The curriculum comparison above revealed that time of establishment had a clear impact on the incorporation of terminal coursework at a community college. Navarro College, established after World War II (at the time the comprehensive community college mission was popularized) was able to incorporate terminal vocational programs into its curriculum more quickly than a traditional junior college established before World War II, like San Antonio College. That said, administrative initiative, particularly at Navarro College, had a clear impact on the pace of curricular change at a specific school which led to variation independent of time of establishment.

Outside of the curriculum, the general pace of development of a school depended heavily on when it was established. Because San Antonio Junior College's establishment

occurred on the cusp of the Great Depression, it struggled to gain local support and remained relatively stagnant, in terms of curriculum, enrollment, and financing, until the 1940s. Navarro Junior College's establishment, on the other hand, coincided with the end of World War II, when greater federal and state support for junior/community colleges, coupled with a stronger economy allowing for local investment, led to NJC upgrading its campus and gaining accreditation much more swiftly than SAJC.

While this study allowed me to draw fairly concrete conclusions about the impact of time of establishment on community college development, clearly periodizing the community college movement will continue to be a difficult task for historians. I chose the mid-1950s as a transition point for this study because at that time both schools were changing presidents, had just moved to new campuses, and had recently gained accreditation. These intersecting events, however, were likely unique to these institutions (particularly the hiring of new administrators), and it would be difficult to point to the mid-1950s, specifically, as the transformative time for the junior/community college movement. However, the development of these two schools suggests that the 1950s, taken as a whole, provide a good point of transition for those looking to periodize the movement. The improvement of the national economy coming out of World War II, greater government support (at all levels) of public two-year colleges, and the growing popularity of the comprehensive community college mission by this point, provided a foundation for the explosive growth that would occur in the 1960s and early 1970s in the nation's community colleges. The experience of these two schools suggests that the late 1970s provides a good stopping point for the "Era of

Expansion," as the quest for continued growth became more difficult by this time, and the incorporation of the comprehensive mission was generally complete.

Even though time and location remained constant concerns throughout this study, the experience of different historical actors at these two colleges provided the meat for my analysis. The junior/community college historiography has focused primarily on historical actors when developing their conclusions on these schools. Historians, and scholars of the community college in general, have focused on two major questions in their investigations: which group fueled the increased incorporation of terminal/vocational programs at the community college after World War II?; and what impact has a community college education had on its students? This study provides new insights on these questions, while also raising new questions on the faculty/administration relationship in the community college and the overarching role of outside influences (community and government) on campus development.

It turned out that the impact of these outside influences, particularly the state and federal government, was more influential in the incorporation of the comprehensive community college concept than previous histories would lead readers to believe. Beyond curricular change, the support of the community and the state and federal government was crucial for both SAJC's and NJC's growth as institutions. The absence of state support and independent local taxing powers was a major impediment in SAJC's early development. At NJC, community support and state funds allowed the school to survive, and even prosper, after the initial flood of veterans, the impetus for the school's creation, died down.

Beyond the importance of general financial support, directed government funding and state planning to make public two-year colleges more community-responsive affected the development of these schools. At San Antonio College, the gradual incorporation of mixed and terminal coursework can be linked to the federal government's promotion of the community college concept and the passing of the GI Bill in the 1940s, and later to the availability of government funds for building projects related to technical/vocational programs in the 1960s. At Navarro Junior College, federal funds helped to solidify the vocational component of the school's mission in the late 1970s, but the role of the state government, both in setting up competing districts and calling for the adoption of the comprehensive community college concept, was more evident.

One group that is largely absent from the curriculum comparison in this chapter, and my discussions on the overall direction of the community college in this conclusion, is faculty members. While the impact of outside influences can be linked to events at both of the studied colleges, the collective will of faculty members is difficult to trace. Generally the actions of individuals on the outside get translated into policy by administration (who always keep in mind levels of enrollment), while faculty members have little input on the larger direction of the school. Though the function that faculty members play at community colleges, as the primary deliverers of the college's major product (instruction), was undeniable, their depressed position in the general power structure of the college dampened their influence outside of the classroom. Even at San Antonio College, where the development of a relatively strong faculty senate led to the incorporation of tenure policies,

faculty influence was wielded almost exclusively to ensure their autonomy within the classroom and as a protection from wrongful firing. At Navarro College, where tenure policies never developed, the overarching power of administration made it difficult for faculty members to build expectations for reasonable job security, let alone push for changes to the school's larger mission.

The question of faculty power on campus is instructive when considering historical discussions on the impact of a community college education on students who attend these institutions. I argued, within the studied era, that the greater access to higher education that community colleges offered, particularly for the working class and minority groups, made them beneficial institutions overall. Furthermore, access to a higher education institution was also important for students' social development, a point largely overlooked in the historiography. However, the overly large and complicated mission of the community college made the delivery of quality instruction difficult. Despite the difficulties that instructors at community colleges faced in teaching in such a diverse environment (in terms of demographics and curriculum), I was consistently impressed in my interviews at the conviction of faculty members in tackling this difficulty. By working at an institution where teaching was the major responsibility for community college faculty (in comparison to a university professor with research responsibilities), and having been drawn to the institution, oftentimes, by these schools' commitment to open access, I am confident that teachers offered their students opportunities to succeed, despite working in a complicated environment.

I also left my interviews feeling that the most important factor in the success of a community college was the stability and quality of its faculty members, even when keeping in mind their lack of power over the school's development. The importance of faculty members went beyond their work as instructors. Teachers' role as a counselor of students was nearly as important as their role as a deliverer of content. Discussions with faculty members revealed their investment in the long-term success of their students, and their pride in helping struggling or unsure students, often the first generation in their family to attend college, further their education.

The effectiveness of a faculty member as a counselor, and the level of investment they have in their students, was tied to their experience in the local community. Even though tenure policies developed slowly, or not at all, during the era I studied, many of the faculty members I talked with were at their institution for decades. A fair number of them grew up near the school where they would later teach. Their time in the community led to their commitment to the students they taught (who they could relate to), and their time at the institution led to their commitment to the long-term success of the college.

This discussion brings me back to the anecdote I introduced this study with. I promised that, at the conclusion of this dissertation, I would provide the reader with an updated response to the student asking me for advice on how best to approach her long-term goal, as a potential first-generation college student, of getting her law degree from the University of Texas. She was leaning towards attending the local community college because of its low cost, more comfortable environment, and proximity to her family. If she had asked

me this question within the era that I studied for this project, I would have supported her decision to attend the community college. Building off of their junior college roots, and benefitting from Texas's commitment to ensure transferability of college credits, I would have been confident that a community college would provide her with an inexpensive and quality transition point for her eventual transfer to the University of Texas.

If I was asked this question today, however, I would advise her to attend the University of Texas, foregoing initial enrollment at a community college. Attending UT would be difficult for her, both socially and financially, but I think that her enrollment at a senior institution would give her a better chance for eventually succeeding in getting her J.D. from UT. The basis for my changing advice over time lies in how the community college in Texas has evolved in recent years. Revisionist scholars have presented convincing evidence that attending a community college negatively impacts overall educational attainment in comparison to enrolling at a senior institution. I think the factor most likely to trump this trend, and to make community colleges a superior institution for underclassmen, has historically been its faculty members. Familiarity with the community, and thus where there students come from, and a dedication to teaching, were positive factors for effective instruction at community colleges. However, the reduction of state funds for community colleges in recent years has led to greater reliance on the hiring of adjunct professors who are

under-compensated and less likely to be invested in the local community or the institution they work for.[1]

Although the state of the community college currently was not a major focus of my interviews, this topic naturally arose in my conversations with former faculty members and administrators, and oftentimes evolved into a discussion on the potential impact of increased reliance on part-time faculty.[2] The two men I am most indebted to in setting up interviews for this project, Tommy Stringer and Robert Zeigler, each provided unique insight on the current state of the community college, and their personal histories provide evidence for the importance of full-time faculty members at community colleges.

Tommy Stringer retired from Navarro College in 2015 after working for the school for over 40 years as a faculty member and an administrator. Stringer seems to know not only everyone on campus today, but everyone on campus for all of NC's days (particularly because of his own historical study of the school). Each morning while working at NC he

---

[1] Matthew Watkins, "Facing Cuts, Community Colleges Plead for More Funds," *The Texas Tribune*, May 20, 2015, accessed February 17, 2016, http://www.texastribune.org/2015/05/20/facing-cuts-community-colleges-plead-more-funds/.

[2]There is a robust catalog of contemporary works discussing the growing reliance of community colleges on part-time faculty. For example, Amy Liu's research showed that, as of 2003, adjunct faculty made up 66.7 percent of faculty appointments at community college: Amy Liu, "Sources and Information: Community Colleges and Part-Time Faculty," *New Directions for Community Colleges* 2007, no. 140 (Winter 2007), 83; studies considering the advantages and disadvantages of adjunct faculty in community colleges include: Audrey J. Jaeger, and M. Kevin Eagan, Jr., "Examining the Effect of Part-Time Faculty Members on Associate's Degree Completion," *Community College Review* 36, no. 3 (2009): 167-194. John S. Levin, Susan Kater, and Richard L. Wagoner, *Community College Faculty: At Work in the New Economy* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006); Judith M. Gappa, *Part-Time Faculty: Higher Education at a Crossroads* (Washington D.C: Association for the Study of Higher Education, 1984); Chad Christenson, "The Employment of Part-Time Faculty at Community Colleges," *New Directions for Higher Education*, no. 143 (Fall 2008): 29-36; Charles L Outcalt, ed., *Community College Faculty: Characteristics, Practices, and Challenges* (San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 2002).

walked out to the center of campus and greeted students with a friendly smile and a wave. Alumni of the school I talk to made sure to let me know Stringer's importance to the school, and the work he has done to make students and alumni feel connected to the campus. When we discussed the increased hiring of part-time faculty at NC, he assured me that many of these men and women are excellent instructors, but conceded that greater reliance on adjuncts comes with hazards for the college:

> They don't really feel a lot of loyalty to the school. Like, people like me who have been here for all these years and you're part of the community, and you go to events in town, and you serve on boards, and you're in the Chamber of Commerce. It's not just a loyalty to the institution, it's a loyalty to the community. And a lot of these adjuncts, they don't live here, they're just here for a couple of days a week.[3]

The commitment to the community and the institution, which was important in my positive portrayal of the community college's impact in the era I studied, has the potential to erode if inadequate funding necessitates the large-scale hiring of part-time faculty.

Robert Zeigler, who I have quoted throughout this study, also began his professional affiliation with a community college in the early 1970s, when he was hired as history faculty at SAC (he also attended SAC as a student from 1959 to 1961). He recently retired, having moved from faculty member, to administration, and finally up to college president. His

[3] Tommy Stringer, interview by the author, Corsicana, TX, May 28, 2015.

insight on the contemporary impact of the increased hiring of adjunct faculty mirrors Stringer's perspective closely:

> When I started working here we were about 70 percent full-time, that was our target, 30 percent part-time, and most of that was at night. Then it went to 60/40. Now we're at 50/50, and in some departments much, much lower than that. I think that—I don't want to denigrate adjunct professors and their ability to teach, or their competence in the material, but…an adjunct professor is here to teach a class, and then they go. They may have a few office hours, but they're not really into the fabric of the institution to the extent that they should be. We're trying to improve that, but it's just the nature of it. And as you rely more and more on adjunct faculty, you have fewer faculty to be on committees, to do work for the Association reports. You don't have the kind of community of faculty that we used to have, and I think that's a problem.[4]

I believe that the community college has been an important and beneficial institution within United States higher education historically, but the burden they bear as open door and comprehensive colleges is becoming too large of a load to carry when compounded with increasingly inadequate funding. Federal officials, including President Barack Obama, are rekindling national interest in the community college, looking at them favorably as terminal education institutions.[5] Government interest in the community college is a good thing, but

---

[4] Robert Zeigler, interview by the author, San Antonio, TX, June 2, 2015.

[5] "Building American Skills through Community Colleges," The White House: President Barack Obama," accessed February 17, 2016, https://www.whitehouse.gov/issues/education/higher-education/building-american-skills-through-community-colleges.

concentrating funding on terminal vocational programs runs the hazard of compromising the historical importance of community colleges as inexpensive schools that offer quality instruction, close to home, for underclassmen seeking to transfer to a senior institution. State funds were instrumental in the growth of Texas's community colleges after the 1940s, particularly in rural settings where local taxes and enrollment were more limited and federal support was less likely. In recent years, however, they have been subjected to harmful funding cuts.

It will take a recommitment by the state for the opportunities that the community college offers to not be overcome by the complications they face in carrying out their expansive institutional mission. The increased proportion of part-time faculty members is one of the clearest consequences of recent budget cuts. Individuals like Tommy Stringer and Robert Zeigler were crucial to the success of the community college during the years discussed in this study, but finding their like will be difficult in the current community college climate. It will take government investment and citizen advocacy to ensure that the community college reaches its potential as a place of opportunity instead of developing into a den of diversion. These institutions have historically enjoyed clear advantages (low cost, proximity, faculty members dedicated to instruction, diverse course offerings) in educating underclassmen and those seeking short-term professional training, but community colleges need the funds to build a strong community within the campus before they can adequately serve the community without.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Armistead, R. A. Interview by Tommy Stringer. Corsicana, TX. June 20, 1978. Pearce Museum Collection at Navarro College. Corsicana, TX.

Billimek, Thomas. Interview by the author. San Antonio, TX. June 3, 2015.

Bradley, Jack. Interview by the author. Corsicana, TX. May 27, 2015.

Burleson, Euneva. Interview by Tommy Stringer. Corsicana, TX. February 14, 1978. Pearce Museum Collection at Navarro College. Corsicana, TX.

Butcher, Thelma. Interview by Tommy Stringer. Corsicana, TX. September 19, 1978. Pearce Museum Collection at Navarro College. Corsicana, TX.

Castillo, Max. "San Antonio College Self Study Report, 1985: Report on Planning." San Antonio, TX: San Antonio College, 1985. McAllister Collection. San Antonio College Library. San Antonio, TX.

Committee on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure of the American Association of University Professors. "1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure." Accessed November 19, 2015, http://www.aaup.org/file/1940%20Statement.pdf, 14.

Corsicana Daily Sun (Corsicana, TX)

Dallas Morning News

Davenport, Carole. Interview by the author. Corsicana, TX. May 28, 2015.

Edgar, James. Interview by Tommy Stringer. Corsicana, TX. February 7, 1978. Pearce Museum Collection at Navarro College. Corsicana, TX.

El Alamo, 1929-1967. San Antonio, TX: San Antonio (Junior) College. McAllister Collection. San Antonio College Library. San Antonio, TX.

El Navarro, 1946-1973. Corsicana, TX: Navarro Junior College. Pearce Museum Collection at Navarro College. Corsicana, TX.

Fraser, James W., ed. *The School in the United States: A Documentary History*. Boston: McGraw-Hill, 2001.

Growl (Corsicana, TX) Box 1-B5-b. Pearce Museum Archives at Navarro College. Corsicana, TX.

Hairgrove, Kenneth. Interview by the author. San Antonio, TX. June 4, 2015.

Herod, Peggy. Interview by the author. Corsicana, TX. July 7, 2015.

Johnson, Dairy. Interview by the author. Corsicana, TX. May 27, 2015.

Jones, Ben. Interview by Tommy Stringer. Corsicana, TX. January 7, 1985. Pearce Museum Collection at Navarro College. Corsicana, TX.

Junior Ranger (San Antonio, TX). The Ranger Image Collection. San Antonio College Library. Accessed February 9, 2016. http://sacweb03.sac.alamo.edu/eLibrary/RangerImageCollection.aspx.

Knippa, Bill. Interview by the author. San Antonio, TX. June 23, 2015.

Koos, Leonard V. *The Community College Student*. Gainesville, FL: University of Florida Press, 1970.

Medsker, Leland L. *The Junior College: Progress and Prospect.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.

Medsker, Leland L., and Dale Tillery. *Breaking the Access Barriers: A Profile of Two-Year Colleges*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

Members of the Instructional and Administrative Staffs. "The Institutional Self-Study Report of San Antonio College for the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, 1963-1964." San Antonio, TX: San Antonio College, 1965. McAllister Collection. San Antonio College Library. San Antonio, TX.

Mrizek, David. Interview by the author. San Antonio, TX. June 23, 2015.

Myers, Ellen. Interview by the author. San Antonio, TX. June 24, 2015.

Navarro Junior College. "Institutional Self-Study Prepared for the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, 1984." Corsicana, TX: Navarro Junior College, 1984. Box B12-b. Pearce Museum Archives at Navarro College. Corsicana, TX.

———. "Navarro Junior College Self-Study: Prepared for the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, January, 1974." Corsicana, TX: Navarro Junior College, 1974. Box B12-a. Pearce Museum Archives at Navarro College. Corsicana, TX.

Navarro (Junior) College. "Navarro (Junior) College Bulletin, 1948-1980." Corsicana, TX: Navarro (Junior) College. Box 1-B11-a. Pearce Museum Archives at Navarro College. Corsicana, TX.

Navarro Junior College Faculty and Administration. “Report of Self Study of Navarro Junior College.” Corsicana, TX: Navarro Junior College, 1963. Box B12-a. Pearce Museum Archives at Navarro College. Corsicana, TX.

Pannill, Margaret. Interview by Tommy Stringer. Corsicana, TX. December 15, 1977. Pearce Museum Collection at Navarro College. Corsicana, TX.

Ranger (San Antonio, TX). The Ranger Image Collection. San Antonio College Library. Accessed February 9, 2016. http://sacweb03.sac.alamo.edu/eLibrary/RangerImageCollection.aspx.

Reed, Lary. Interview by the author. Corsicana, TX. August 14, 2015.

Rosenauer, Johnnie. Interview by the author. San Antonio, TX. June 2, 2015.

San Antonio (Junior) College. “San Antonio College Bulletin, 1928-2012.” San Antonio College: San Antonio, TX. McAllister Collection. San Antonio College Library. San Antonio, TX.

San Antonio College Scrapbook, 1925-1980. McAllister Collection. San Antonio College Library. San Antonio, TX.

San Antonio Express

San Antonio Light

San Antonio Evening News

Scott, Ruthellen. Interview by the author. Corsicana, TX. May 28, 2015.

Sebesta, Sylvia. Interview by the author. San Antonio, TX. June 24, 2015.

Strickland, C. G. Interview by Tommy Stringer. Waco, TX. December 9, 1977. Pearce Museum Collection at Navarro College. Corsicana, TX.

Stringer, Tommy. Interview by the author. Corsicana, TX. May 28, 2015.

Students of San Antonio Junior College. *The Alamo, 1928*. San Antonio, TX: San Antonio Junior College, 1928. McAllister Collection. San Antonio College Library. San Antonio, TX.

Tatum, Cheryl. Interview by the author. Corsicana, TX. May 27, 2015.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. "Census of Population: 1950: Characteristics of the Population, Number of Inhabitants, General and Detailed Characteristics of the Population: Texas," Edited by Howard G. Brunsman, Volume 2, Part 43. Washington D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1952.

_____. "U.S. Census of Population: 1960, Vol. I, Characteristics of the Population, Part 45, Texas." Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1963.

Weynand, Jerome. Interview by the author. San Antonio, TX. June 3, 2015.

Weynand, Jerome F., and Paul R. Culwell. "San Antonio College Self-Study Report, 1973-1975." San Antonio, TX: San Antonio College, 1975. McAllister Collection. San Antonio College Library. San Antonio, TX.

Zeigler, Robert. Interview by the author. San Antonio, TX. June 2, 2015.

Secondary Sources

Adelman, Clifford. *The Way We Are: The Community College as American Thermometer*. Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Education, 1992.

Alfonso, Mariana. "The Impact of Community College Attendance on Baccalaureate Attainment." *Research in Higher Education* 47, no. 8 (2006): 873–903.

Anderson, James D. *The Education of Blacks in the South, 1860-1935*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1988.

Babbie, Earl R., ed. *The Practice of Social Research*. 14th ed. Belmont, CA: Cengage Learning, 2015.

Barrow, Clyde W. *Universities and the Capitalist State: Corporate Liberalism and the Reconstruction of American Higher Education, 1894-1928*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1990.

Bayor, Ronald H. *Multicultural America: An Encyclopedia of the Newest Americans*. Santa Barbara, CA: Greenwood, 2011.

Berman, David. "The Strange Demise of Jim Crow: How Houston Desegregated Its Public Accommodations, 1959-1963: A Documentary." Austin: University of Texas Press, 1998, VHS.

Beach, J. M. *Gateway to Opportunity?: A History of the Community College in the United States*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, LLC, 2010.

Blair, Sue Johnson. "The Emergence and Development of the Community/Junior College in Texas." Ph.D. Diss, Texas Tech University, 1991.

Bloch, Marc. *The Historian's Craft*. Translated by Peter Putnam. Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 1954.

Bogue, Jesse Parker. "The Community College." *Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors* 34, no. 2 (1948): 285–95. doi:10.2307/40220284.

———. *The Community College*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1950.

Botti, John McDonough. "The NDEA, Loyalty, and Community: Resistance at Two Liberal Arts Colleges." Ph.D. Diss: University of Maryland, 2014.

Brick, Michael. *Forum and Focus for the Junior College Movement: The American Association of Junior Colleges.* New York: Teachers College Press, 1964.

Brint, Steven G. "Few Remaining Dreams: Community Colleges Since 1985." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 586, no. 1 (2003): 16–37.

Brint, Steven G., and Jerome Karabel. *The Diverted Dream: Community Colleges and the Promise of Educational Opportunity in America, 1900-1985*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1989.

Burbank, Jane, and Frederick Cooper. *Empires in World History: Power and the Politics of Difference*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2010.

Campbell, Randolph B. *Gone to Texas: A History of the Lone Star State*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2003.

Christenson, Chad. "The Employment of Part-Time Faculty at Community Colleges." *New Directions for Higher Education*, no. 143 (Fall 2008): 29-36

Clark, Burton R. *The Open Door College: A Case Study.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.

Cole, Jonathan R. *The Great American University: Its Rise to Preeminence, Its Indispensable National Role, and Why It Must Be Protected*. New York: PublicAffairs, 2009.

Collier, David. "The Comparative Method." In *Political Science: The State of the Discipline II*, edited by Ada W. Finifter, 105-119. Washington, DC: American Political Science Association, 1993.

Cutler, William W. "Oral History: Its Nature and Uses for Educational History." *History of Education Quarterly* 11, no. 2 (1971): 184–94. doi:10.2307/367594.

DeGenaro, William. "Class Consciousness and the Junior College Movement: Creating a Docile Workforce." *JAC: A Journal of Composition Theory* 21, no. 3 (2001): 499–520.

De Los Santos, Gerardo E. "A Comparative Study of State-Level Community College Governance Structures in Texas and Illinois." Ph.D. Diss, University of Texas, 1997.

Diener, Thomas. *Growth of an American Invention: A Documentary History of the Junior and Community College Movement*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1985.

Dougherty, Kevin. "The Effects of Community Colleges: Aid or Hindrance to Socioeconomic Attainment?" *Sociology of Education* 60, no. 2 (1987): 86–103.

Dougherty, Kevin James. *The Contradictory College: The Conflicting Origins, Impacts, and Futures of the Community College*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1994.

Eby, Frederick, and Benjamin Floyd Pittenger. *A Study of the Financing of Public Junior Colleges in Texas*. The University of Texas Bulletin 3126. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1931.

Eells, Walter Crosby. *The Junior College*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1931.

———. *Why Junior College Terminal Education?* Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1941.

Eisenmann, Linda. *Higher Education for Women in Postwar America, 1945-1965*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2006.

Escamilla, Mark Steven. "Factors Affecting African-American, Anglo and Hispanic First-Generation Community College Students, Who Have Persisted and Graduated from Four-Year Institutions Between 1990 and 2000 in Texas." University of Texas, 2001.

Fass, Paula S. *Outside In: Minorities and the Transformation of American Education*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1989.

Fehrenbach, T. R. *The San Antonio Story: A Pictorial and Entertaining Commentary on the Growth and Development of San Antonio, Texas*. Tulsa, OK: Continental Heritage, 1978.

Frydl, Kathleen J. *The GI Bill*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Frye, John H. *The Vision of the Public Junior College, 1900-1940: Professional Goals and Popular Aspirations*. New York: Greenwood Press, 1992.

Gallagher, E. A. "Jordan and Lange: The California Junior College's Role as Protector of Teaching." *Michigan Academician* 27, no. 1 (1995): 1–12.

Gappa, Judith M. *Part-Time Faculty: Higher Education at a Crossroads*. Washington D.C: Association for the Study of Higher Education, 1984.

Garcia, Richard A. *Rise of the Mexican American Middle Class: San Antonio, 1929-1941*. College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 1991.

Gasman, Marybeth, ed. *The History of U.S. Higher Education: Methods for Understanding the Past*. New York: Routledge, 2010.

Geiger, Roger L. *Research and Relevant Knowledge: American Research Universities Since World War II*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.

_____. *To Advance Knowledge: The Growth of American Research Universities, 1900-1940*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.

Gleazer, Edmund J. *This Is the Community College*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1968.

Goldin, Claudia and Lawrence F. Katz. *The Race Between Education and Technology*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2008.

Gooch, Verda. "The First Twenty-Five Years at Navarro Junior College." In *Navarro County Scroll for the Year 1974*, 1-23. Corsicana, TX: Navarro County Historical Society, 1974. Box OS-B27-a. Pearce Museum Archives at Navarro College, Corsicana, TX.

Goodwin, Gregory L. *A Social Panacea: A History of the Community-Junior College Ideology*. Washington, D.C.: Educational Resources Information Center, 1973.

Grubb, W. Norton. "The Decline of Community College Transfer Rates: Evidence from National Longitudinal Surveys." *The Journal of Higher Education* 62, no. 2 (1991): 194–222. doi:29.7.134.119.

———. "Vocationalizing Higher Education: The Causes of Enrollment and Completion in Public Two-Year Colleges, 1970-1980." *Economics of Education Review* 7, no. 3 (1988): 301–19.

Hutcheson, Philo A. "Reconsidering the Community College." *History of Education Quarterly* 39, no. 3 (1999): 307–20.

_____. “The Truman Commission’s Vision of the Future.” *Thought & Action: The NEA Higher Education Journal* (Fall 2007): 107–15.

Hutchings, Sarah Elizabeth. “A History of the Texas Community College Teachers Association Between 1948 and 1998.” University of Michigan, 2002.

Ifkovic, Edward. *A Bend in the River: Voices from a Community College, 1970-2000*. San Jose, CA: iUniversity Press, 2001.

Jaeger, Audrey J. and M. Kevin Eagan, Jr. “Examining the Effect of Part-Time Faculty Members on Associate's Degree Completion.” *Community College Review* 36, no. 3 (2009): 167-194.

Jolly, Jennifer L. “The National Defense Education Act, Current STEM Initiative, and the Gifted.” *Gifted Child Today* 32, no. 2 (2009): 50–53.

Kaestle, Carl F. “Standards of Evidence in Historical Research: How Do We Know When We Know?” *History of Education Quarterly* 32, no. 3 (1992): 361–66. doi:10.2307/368550.

Karabel, Jerome. “Community Colleges and Social Stratification in the 1980s.” *New Directions for Community Colleges* 1986, no. 54 (1986): 13–30.

Karen, David. “The Politics of Class, Race, and Gender: Access to Higher Education in the United States, 1960-1986.” *American Journal of Education* 99, no. 2 (1991): 208–37.

Katz, Michael B. *Reconstructing American Education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1987.

Kerr, Clark. *The Great Transformation in Higher Education, 1960-1980*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1991.

Kiester, Edwin Jr. “The GI Bill May Be the Best Deal Ever Made by Uncle Sam.” *Smithsonian* 25, no. 8 (1994): 129.

Kirby, Jack Temple. *Rural Worlds Lost: The American South, 1920-1960*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1987.

Klement, Emily Conrady, and Beverly L. Bower. “Transfer Rates of Texas Hispanic Community College Students to 4-Year Institutions: Selected Institutional Factors,” Ph.D. Diss, University of North Texas, 2012.

Koos, Leonard V. *The Junior College*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1924.

_____. *The Junior-College Movement*. Boston: Ginn and Company, 1925.

Kyrgidis, A., and S. Triaridis. “Methods and Biostatistics: A Concise Guide for Peer Reviewers.” *Hippokratia* 14, no. Suppl 1 (December 2010): 13–22.

Labaree, David F. “The Rise of the Community College: Markets and the Limits of Educational Opportunity.” In *How to Succeed in School Without Really Learning: The Credentials Race in American Education*, 190–223. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1997.

Lassonde, Stephen A. “Should I Go, or Should I Stay?: Adolescence, School Attainment, and Parent-Child Relations in Italian Immigrant Families of New Haven, 1900-1940.” *History of Education Quarterly* 38, no. 1 (1998): 37–60. doi:10.2307/369664.

Levin, John S., Susan Kater, and Richard L. Wagoner. *Community College Faculty: At Work in the New Economy*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.

Levine, David O. *The American College and the Culture of Aspiration, 1915-1940*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1986.

Lijphart, Arend. “The Comparable-Cases Strategy in Comparative Research.” *Comparative Political Studies* 8, no. 2 (July 1, 1975): 158–77.

Liu, Amy. “Sources and Information: Community Colleges and Part-Time Faculty.” *New Directions for Community Colleges* 2007, no. 140 (Winter 2007): 83-88.

Love, Annie Carpenter. *History of Navarro County*. Dallas, TX: Southwest Press, 1933.

Lowen, Rebecca S. *Creating the Cold War University: The Transformation of Stanford*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997.

MacDonald, Victoria-María, John M. Botti, and Lisa Hoffman Clark. “From Visibility to Autonomy: Latinos and Higher Education in the US, 1965–2005.” *Harvard Educational Review* 77, no. 4 (2007): 474–504.

MacDonald, Victoria-María and Teresa García. “Historical Perspectives on Latino Access to Higher Education, 1848-1990.” In *The Majority in the Minority: Expanding the Representation of Latina/o Faculty, Administrators and Students in Higher Education*, edited by Jeanett Castellanos and Lee Jones, 15-46. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, LLC, 2003.

Mahoney, James, and Dietrich Rueschemeyer. *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Margolis, Harry S. “Community Colleges: Rural Academe.” *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning* 10, no. 6 (1978): 62–63.

Miller, Char. *Deep in the Heart of San Antonio: Land and Life in South Texas*. San Antonio, TX: Trinity University Press, 2012.

Moore, William. *Behind the Open Door: Racism and Other Contradictions in the Community College*. Victoria, B.C.: Trafford, 2006.

Morsch, William C. *State Community College Systems: Their Role and Operation in Seven States*. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1971.

Nidiffer, Jana. "Poor Historiography: The 'Poorest' in American Higher Education." *History of Education Quarterly* 39, no. 3 (1999): 321–36.

Olivas, Michael A, and Nan Alimba. *The Dilemma of Access: Minorities in Two Year Colleges*. Washington D.C.: Published for ISEP by Howard University Press, 1979.

Outcalt, Charles L., ed. *Community College Faculty: Characteristics, Practices, and Challenges*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2002.

Pedersen, Robert Patrick. "The Origins and Development of the Early Public Junior College: 1900--1940." Ph.D. Diss, Columbia University, 2000.

Peterkin, Darryl L. "'Within These Walls': Reading and Writing Institutional Histories." In *The History of U.S. Higher Education: Methods for Understanding the Past*, edited by Gasman, Marybeth, 9–18. New York: Routledge, 2010.

Pincus, Fred L. *Bridges to Opportunity: Are Community Colleges Meeting the Transfer Needs of Minority Students?* Washington D.C.: Academy for Educational Development and College Entrance Examination, 1989.

Pomeranz, Kenneth. *The Great Divergence: China, Europe, and the Making of the Modern World Economy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2000.

Powell, Jimmie Dee Vellow, "History: The Following Pages are a Record of Formative Years of our School which was at that Time Fred Douglass and Later Became G. W. Jackson" in *The Navarro County Scroll for the Year 1970*, 41-85. Corsicana, TX: Navarro County Historical Society, 1970). Box OS-B27-a, Pearce Museum Archives at Navarro College, Corsicana, TX.

Proctor, William Martin. *The Junior College: Its Organization and Administration*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1927.

Putnam, Wyvonne, and Navarro County Historical Society. *Navarro County History*. Quanah, TX: Nortex Press, 1975.

Ragin, Charles C. *The Comparative Method: Moving Beyond Qualitative and Quantitative Strategies*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987.

Ramos, Raúl A. *Beyond the Alamo : Forging Mexican Ethnicity in San Antonio, 1821-1861*. Chapel Hill: Published in association with the William P. Clements Center for Southwest Studies, Southern Methodist University, by the University of North Carolina Press, 2008.

Ratcliff, James L. "'First' Public Junior Colleges in an Age of Reform." *Journal of Higher Education* 58, no. 2 (1987): 151–80.

Rodríguez, Angélica Aguilar, Julian Vasquez Heilig and Allison Prochnow, "Higher Education, the GI Bill, and the Postwar Lives of Latino Veterans and Their Families." In *Latina/os and World War II: Mobility, Agency, and Ideology*, edited by Maggie Rivas-Rodriguez and B. V. Olguín, 59-74. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2014.

Rouse, Cecilia Elena. “Democratization or Diversion?: The Effect of Community Colleges on Educational Attainment.” *Journal of Business and Economic Statistics* 13, no. 2 (1995). doi:129.7.134.119.

Rudolph, Frederick. *The American College and University: A History*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1962.

Rury, John L. *Education and Social Change: Contours in the History of American Schooling*. 4th ed. New York: Routledge, 2013.

Sánchez, George J. *Becoming Mexican American: Ethnicity, Culture, and Identity in Chicano Los Angeles, 1900-1945*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Skocpol, Theda, ed. *Vision and Method in Historical Sociology*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1984.

Seidman, Irving. *Interviewing as Qualitative Research: A Guide for Researchers in Education and the Social Sciences*. New York: Teachers College Press, 1998.

Stringer, Tommy W. *Corsicana*. Charleston, SC: Arcadia, 2010.

_____. *Dreams and Visions: The History of Navarro College*. Waco, TX: Davis Brothers Publishing Co., 1996.

Stroube, Jack A. “The History of the Petroleum Industry in Navarro County.” In *The Navarro County Scroll for the Year 1964*, 52-56. Corsicana, TX: Navarro County Historical Society, 1964. Box OS-B27-a. Pearce Museum Archives at Navarro College, Corsicana, TX.

Thelin, John R. *A History of American Higher Education*. 2nd ed. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2011.

Thompson, Paul. *The Voice of the Past: Oral History*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Thurston, Marie Pannell. *St. Philip's College: A Point of Pride on San Antonio's Eastside*. College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2013.

Urban, Wayne J. *More than Science and Sputnik: The National Defense Education Act of 1958*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2010.

Vaughan, George B. *The Community College in America: A Short History*. Washington D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1985.

Veysey, Laurence R. *The Emergence of the American University*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965.

Vineyard, Edwin E. "The Invisible Wall: A Report on the Status of the Rural Community College in America." Washington D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1978.

Weynand, Jerome Francis. *San Antonio College: In the Beginning, 1925-1956*. San Antonio, TX: Adrome House, 2002.

Wilson, Norman J. *History in Crisis?: Recent Directions in Historiography*. Second Edition. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc., 2005.

Witt, Allen A., James L. Wattenbarger, James F. Gollattscheck, and Joseph E. Suppiger. *America's Community Colleges: The First Century*. Washington D.C.: The Community College Press, 1994.

Zwerling, Steven L. *Second Best: The Crisis of the Community College*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1976.