



Full Text Provided by ERIC

ED105795

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

GRANTSMANSHIP: FEDERAL CONTEXT

FROM

STATE LEVEL PERSPECTIVE

BY

BONNY FRANKE

DIRECTOR

**Division of Development
South Carolina State Board for
Technical and Comprehensive Education**

**A publication of the Center for State and Regional Leadership
(Florida State University/University of Florida)
with the assistance of a grant from the
W. K. Kellogg Foundation**

**Tallahassee, Florida
March
1975**

FOREWORD

One of the principles considered basic to salesmanship is the use of an action word which will capture the attention of the potential audience. "Grantsmanship" is increasingly popular as an "attention-getter." The title originally proposed by Dr. Bonny Franke for this monograph used the term "resource development." I exercised the prerogative of director of the F. S. U. Center for State and Regional Leadership by changing Dr. Franke's term in the title of this monograph. Although the strategy was to provide an appealing invitation to read the monograph, another objective was to demonstrate a point. Grantsmanship, first considered an art and now viewed as a science, has become a component of an evolving new career field. Public and private colleges and universities have found it increasingly necessary to address the various facets of garnering, allocating, and monitoring resources in a systematic approach which encompasses the total institution. As reported in this monograph, a cadre of pioneering professionals in the field of resource development have organized on both regional and national levels. It is apparent their role in the future of institutions and systems of institutions will broaden in scope and multiply in number.

This monograph should prove helpful to educational leaders at both state and local levels. Dr. Franke has been one of the pioneer "grantsmen" recognized as an authority on resource

development. She was the recipient of an in-service award made possible under the provisions of a grant from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation to The Florida State University/The University of Florida Center for State and Regional Leadership. The grant was used as a means of transition from service at the institutional level to her present position with the South Carolina State Board for Technical and Comprehensive Education.

The purpose of the grant from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation is to provide opportunities to incumbent state officials responsible for community and junior colleges to spend a concentrated period of time studying issues or problems significant to their own state, but which also have potential applicability for other states. Recipients of the in-service stipend are assisted by the partnership universities in outlining the methodology and procedures for examining the problem and then assisting the awardee in attaining the information, experiences, or resources needed to successfully complete the project. In Dr. Franke's case, this meant an opportunity to examine state level practices and policies concerning resource development as well as to examine relationships and procedures between state offices and constituent colleges concerning jurisdiction, responsibilities, and methods of relating federal funding programs to institutional missions. This informative and useful monograph has been the outcome of that endeavor.

Louis W. Bender
Professor of Higher Education

ii

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction.....	1
The Impact of Federal Programs.....	6
Historical Perspective.....	6
Redirection of Federal Involvement.....	7
Shifting of Priorities.....	13
Regionalization.....	16
Revenue Sharing.....	21
The State Level Situation.....	25
State 1202 Commissions.....	30
Office of Management and Budget.....	31
A Study of State Agency Involvement in Resource Development.....	34
Background.....	34
Purpose of the Study.....	35
Limitations.....	35
Procedures.....	35
Results.....	36
Conclusions.....	39
Resource Development.....	41
Present and Future Directions.....	41
Procedures.....	42
Outline for Preparation of Project or Program Description.....	47
Sources for Trend Identification.....	50
Bibliography.....	54

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to examine awareness on the part of educational administrators at both the state agency and institutional levels as to the importance of following the trends and priorities in legislation and in fund dispersals at both federal and state levels. The study also attempted to provide some limited assistance in approaching an expanded resource development potential at state and institutional levels.

Resource development is the practice of identification and procurement of funding sources which help assure fiscal support and expansion of the educational enterprise based on need analyses and goal oriented priorities of the institution.

The resource development process is dependent upon knowledge of sales promotion techniques, the political arena in which the institution functions, and marketing analysis procedures necessary to relate needs to fiscal operations. In the business communities these are old skills, well refined, and closely documented as an on-going effort. In the education community, emphasis has traditionally been placed on alumni support and private donations from individuals or estates within the private sector and public funding sources within the public sector.

While large business enterprises were depending upon skilled marketing research analysts and professional advertising agencies to keep them advised on market shifts or trends and potential sources of revenue, the chief administrative officer in an educational institution usually

depended upon his own personal astuteness in identifying and procuring sources of revenue. In the large business enterprises, skilled managerial staff continue to refine marketing and distribution research and methodologies. In education, the complexities of moving away from a cloistered existence into the mainstream of modern contingencies are forcing the chief administrative officer to rely on an expanded managerial staff to assist in identifying and procuring sources of revenue. The needs of the institution vary with its individual situation; the levels and type of potential resource varies; and the approach to procurement varies.

But, whatever the approach and whatever the nature or type of higher education institution involved, a prior realization of the nature of the competitive field in which resource development is placed is an essential increment in institutional identification and sound fiscal progress. Postsecondary education is a political sub-system, and, as such, it receives an allocated material resources and symbolic values which are in limited supply. Like other sub-systems within the larger society, it competes in the public and private political arena for material support. Depending upon perceived missions, educational agencies or institutions may seek funds from state appropriations, federal programs, private or public foundations, individual donors, business and industry. Capturing material support sustains the organization and moves it forward as it serves to meet larger social and individual needs.

Budgeting processes are constrained by earlier decisions and prior

commitments as well as the probability of attaining a certain level of funding. Decisions relating to educational resources therefore, must take into consideration not only past commitments, but future needs and continuing claims against available resources.

This paper concentrates on the problems and techniques relative to procurement of public (federal) funds. Information on gaining support through volunteer groups, alumni giving, local gifts, etc., is available in literature related to public relations.

At the same time that categorical aid sources are diminishing, measurable objective statements, performance standards via tight-line schedules and highly sophisticated forms are making their appearance across the gamut of federal and state funding agencies. If accountability has been the cry within educational circles in the past few years, it is being echoed loud and clear in the offices responsible for fund disbursements.

The initial approach to fund solicitation is as individualized as each square on a patchwork quilt. Many agencies will not consider funding a request unless there is a personal interview and lengthy discussion of the activities projected. Others take the opposite extreme and all but refuse to discuss any of the plans, processes or anticipated outcomes. They rely on receipt and formal review of a completed and extensively documented proposal package developed according to complex guidelines and rigidly formatted procedures. While each agency has its own modus operandi, one commonality binds the package. There is a plethora of forms to complete as a part of the administration of the

funds once received.

Large universities and other well established institutions of higher education have professional contract and grants offices, usually operating within the larger framework of a development office. Other smaller, newer and/or less sophisticated institutions have only limited staff devoted to resource development. Business managers, deans, or the chief administrative officer attempts to wade through the myriad of sources, forms, eligibility requirements, priorities and funding levels or trends. Those two-year colleges of the country which did not recognize the need for professional development officers during the soft-money heyday of the sixties often find themselves caught in the competition trap of the seventies.

In a study by Hargis and Blocker (1973), it was shown that

"Cash gifts to public (two-year) institutions with development officers exceed cash gifts to schools without such individuals by more than two to one, while gifts of land to these two categories of institutions exceed a five-to-one ratio, \$5.28 income per student for schools with development officers, and \$.89 income per student for colleges without professional fund raisers."

But where are development staff receiving their training? What are the resources available which assist them in gaining the necessary measure of expertise? What are the patterns and shifts in legislation and educational funding which they must identify and follow in order to function effectively? What level of emphasis is being placed on the resource development activity at the state offices or local institutions? What are the basic questions which must be considered prior to seeking funding?

In an attempt to provide at least partial answers to the above questions, this report has been divided into three sections: first, the impact of federal programs in postsecondary education; second, a status study of state involvement in resource development activities; and third, the evolving nature of resource development per se, including some specifics which have been identified by development practitioners.

The entire report was prepared with the assistance of a grant from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation in cooperation with the Center for State and Regional Leadership, Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida, and the University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida. Sincere appreciation is expressed for the support provided by the Kellogg Foundation, and the guidance of Dr. Louis W. Bender in the preparation of the manuscript.

PART I
THE IMPACT OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS

A. An Historical Perspective

It is very difficult to approach the question of resource development within higher education without considering the role of the federal and/or state governments and their involvement in providing resources. Ours is a federal but tripartite governmental system. During the early history of our country, the federal government avoided involvement in providing direct aid to education. The signing of the Morrill Land Grant Act in 1862 by President Lincoln, however, set a precedent for both indirect support and governmental involvement in education. Governmental roles were slow to evolve, but patterns are discernible.

Prior to World War II, the responsibility for the financial support of educational institutions lay primarily with churches, private philanthropists and state tax structures. The student's cost rested primarily with his family, with loans and scholarships playing only a minor role. The few scholarships then in existence were primarily based on academic achievement, not financial need.

The G. I. Bill was one of the first important changes toward education for the masses based on financial need. The success of this bill, in combination with the post World War II baby boom, fostered legislation for the Economic Opportunity Grants (EOG), the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) Loan Program, and the College Work-Study Program (CWSP). Another important aid to students was the Guaranteed Loan Program (GLP) which helped assure parental borrowing power (primarily

from private sources) at standard interest rates. It was not until early in the 1960's that the federal government substantially expanded grants and loans to the disadvantaged and thus began to assume more than a modest role in higher education.

As the federal government continued to increase support for students, the enactment of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, the Higher Education Act of 1965, and the Education Professions Development Act (1965) guaranteed federal support for the operation and expansion of the institutions themselves, with training of on-payroll employees as a bonus. The Higher Education Act of 1965 authorized major support for institutions by providing additional funds for facilities construction and purchases as well as for library acquisitions. Other programs also provided construction and equipment monies such as those operative under the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), the National Institute of Health (NIH), and the General Services Administration (GSA).

B. Redirection of Federal Involvement

While the Higher Education Act of 1965 added to the power structure of the Office of Education (OE), the traditional pattern of decision making and program control subtly changed hands and directions with the appointments of Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW) Elliott Richardson, and Commissioner of Education Sidney Marland in 1971. The original power center of educational decision making in fund allocations, the United States Office of Education (USOE), had been under several months of attack from a variety of opponents with Congresswoman Edith Green of Oregon one of the most vocal. At the same time, USOE was subject

to less visible scrutiny by the Nixon Administration. The White House, HEW, and USOE's communications grew more and more threadbare until the point was reached of establishing various task forces to examine the critical conditions of the Office of Education and the entirety of the nation's educational superstructures.

Along with the task force studies, HEW Secretary Richardson and Commissioner Marland quietly set about making repairs between the Office of Management (OMB), the Domestic Council, the White House staff and other education related federal agencies. One of their first major tasks was to deal with two seemingly radical concepts proposed by their predecessors, Secretary Robert Finch and Commissioner James E. Allen. When adopted by Congress, these concepts would serve theoretically to reorganize the national impact in education in the form of two new national organizations, one of which would be a National Institute of Education (NIE) within HEW. This organization would function as a research, development and demonstration agency for reform of the American educational system. It would report to the Secretary's office within HEW, but would not be independent of the Office of Education. The National Institute would serve not only to coordinate high priority research and development tasks, but would also act as the funding agent for programs traditionally supported by OE's National Center for Research and Development. Funding was to come from the consolidation of the budgets of regionalized Research and Development Offices in combination with newly authorized monies from Congress. President Nixon requested a \$125 million budget as initial support for the operation of the National

Institute of Education, (NIE). The intent of the Institute was:

"To provide a source of funds to encourage excellence, innovation and reform in Higher Education; to strengthen post secondary educational institutes or courses of instruction that play a uniquely valuable role in American higher education or that are faced with specific difficulties; and to provide an organization concerned with the development of national policy in higher education."
(HR 16621, p.2)

The second new organization was the National Foundation for Higher Education (NFHE) which was to be established simultaneously with NIE. The foundation was to operate within HEW under the supervision of a director who would report to the Secretary of HEW through the Commissioner of Education's office. It would include all forms of post-secondary education and give particular emphasis to career education. In a report to the Sub-Committee on Education, HEW Secretary Richardson described the Foundation as follows:

"The mission of the Foundation is reform--and not just any reform, not just change for the sake of change, but new orientation programs and innovative structures which will substantially enhance the capacity of higher education to serve the needs of all our citizens." (Higher Education and National Affairs, 1971)

The three primary purposes of the proposed Foundation, which requested an initial funding of \$100 million, would be: (1) to develop new modes of educating the populace within higher educational institutions; (2) to support the development of new administrative practices and procedures in conjunction with expansion of types of facilities; and (3) to encourage the searching of new ways in which to attain new higher levels within traditional and newly conceived program formats. (Higher Education and National Affairs, March, 1971). As an independent agency within the federal government, NFHE would handle some of the

programs traditionally controlled by OE as well as develop new and unique ones. NFHE's independence placed it on a par with the National Science Foundation, National Foundation on the Arts and Sciences, and comparable organizations.

The process of developing the long-debated Higher Education Amendments of 1972 prompted close examination of postsecondary education and the more than 300 federal programs directed toward its support. In line with the scrutiny turned toward higher education and the federal program, federal policy and national priorities were subjected to examination.

The 1972 Higher Education Amendment debates themselves, however, centered on many of the basic questions which were being raised by educators as they moved into a period of financial crisis. Some important questions raised about the 1972 Higher Education Legislation were:

- (1) What form will the institutional aid finally take?
- (2) Will there be sufficient maintenance of effort on the part of the state governments to offset heavy federal involvement?
- (3) Will a large subsidy to the low-income student cause a general rise in tuition and therefore, a burden for the non-low-income student?

There were approximately 44 differences between the House and the Senate versions of the 1972 legislation. The most substantial differences centered around:

- (1) Financial aid to students,
- (2) Institutional assistance to individual campuses, both public and private,

- (3) Involvement of the state,
- (4) Level of funding.

Clark Kerr described the legislation's program of institutional aid as, "The most important development in the legislative history of American and Higher Education since the Morrill Act." (Letter, 1971) Dr. Kerr and the Carnegie Commission offered many alternative formulae to the proposed institutional packages.

The undercurrent of anxiety attached to the non-categorical aid to institutions appeared almost directly related to the concern over federal control of education. The Carnegie Commission labeled the proposed across-the-board grants a "direct move" away from state support and toward a nationalized system with government controls. The Commission's rationale against non-categorical aid was based on the following premises:

- (1) Substantial extension of federal support would lead to loss of independence,
- (2) Direct federal funding of any substantial amount would result in controls that would, in the end, produce uniformity, mediocrity, and compliance,
- (3) The lack of any objective basis on which to distribute funds: (Carnegie Report, 1971)

The American Council on Education (ACE) supported the institutional aid concept as strongly as the Carnegie Commission opposed it. (ACE National Convention, 1971)

Just as educators were attempting to resolve many of their mixed reactions to increased or decreased federal involvement in higher education, the Congress was concerned with its lack of ability to resolve

many of the funding and programmatic issues. In an effort to add to its own ability to review programs, to provide a basis for decision making and to improve financing patterns, the Congress added a proviso to the 1972 Amendments which created the National Commission on the Financing of Post-Secondary Education. Funded at \$1.5 million, the Commission was to study:

"The impact of past, present, and anticipated private, local state, and federal support for postsecondary education.

The appropriate role for the states in support of higher education (including application of state law on postsecondary educational opportunities).

Alternative student assistance programs.

The potential federal, state, and private participants in such programs." (Financing Postsecondary Education in the United States, December, 1973, p. 5)

Among the several sub-subjects to be included in the Commission's tasks was the following:

"The study shall determine the need, the desirability, the form, and the level of additional governmental and private assistance to postsecondary education." (Financing Postsecondary Education in the United States, December, 1973, p. 5)

The Commission's extensive report was completed approximately fourteen months (December, 1973) after its first meeting. The report reflects the recent strengthening of state and local funds for institutional support. State and local governments were the principal contributors to institutional support providing 36 percent from tuition and fee payments by students, 10 percent from gifts and endowments, and 14 percent from auxiliary enterprises and other earnings. (Financing Postsecondary Education in the United States, December, 1973, p. 128)

Most of OE's programs involve formula grants to the individual states. Only approximately 10 percent of the Office of Education's

budget is designated for discretionary fundings with rather specific criteria for eligibility. Within the state eligibility framework, priorities established by societal and Congressional demands restrict institutions in making application for the funds. The priorities encompass not only student assistance packages, but also aid to developing institutions, special programs for training of personnel to work with the disadvantaged and projects involving the disadvantaged themselves.

C. Shifting of Priorities

While the Office of Education is still undergoing reorganization and may continue to lose programs, it remains a major influence within higher education. This was evidenced by the 1971-72 budget of \$4.43 billion; nine times that of a decade ago. Estimates of 1974 USOE outlays show a decrease from 1972 except in funds directed to students and to programs serving the disadvantaged, however.

Total support for postsecondary education in 1971-72 consisted of an estimated \$25.1 billion in institutional support and \$4.4 billion in student financial aid. State and local governments were the principal source of student financial aid used by students to pay tuition and other fees. An additional \$1.1 billion in federal student aid went to help students pay for their books and supplies and normal living costs. (The estimated \$1.1 billion in federal student aid for books and supplies, housing, and meals includes Veterans' and Social Security benefits).

In 1973, the Senate requested an \$18 billion budget for higher education. The administration's proposed budget was \$7.4 billion. This

reduction of support to colleges and universities was due primarily to the fact that legislative priorities did not meet the newly designated priorities of the administration.

A prime example of the priorities in higher education was seen in President Nixon's \$7.4 billion budget for 1973. His program dictated that students "particularly those from disadvantaged and minority groups, would be the biggest beneficiaries." (Fields, 1972) As a further indication of the federal government's shift in priorities, the 1975 outlays for student support programs in higher education will show an increase of almost 25 percent over the 1974 level and approximately 60 percent increase over the 1973 level. (Special Analysis, Budget of the U. S. Government, 1974)

A survey of the \$8.5 billion estimated to serve national education purposes for 1975, reveals the following: 56% will be spent at the elementary and secondary levels. Higher education will receive 36% of the total. The balance is directed toward adult and continuing education, research, public libraries, the Library of Congress, Public Broadcasting and the National Foundation in the Arts and Humanities.

Higher Education's \$3.1 billion, or 36% of the total, includes only \$403 million in non-student assistance categories while the Basic Opportunity Grant category alone is estimated to be \$488 million. (Budget Analysis, 1974)

Institutional needs and priority areas become almost obliterated as the federal priorities move increasingly toward assisting students in financing their educational cost and away from subsidies to institutions

for facilities, personnel, equipment, etc.

"The goal of equal educational opportunity has the greatest funding priority in higher education" was stated repeatedly by the Nixon Administration; it is one of the five basic charges to the National Institute of Education; it is reflected in the emphasis on full funding of the Basic Opportunity Grants (BOG) and other USOE assistance programs, Veterans benefits, Social Security student entitlements under OASDI, and the recent move toward student health manpower assistance and away from support for health manpower training programs. In addition to the traditional student assistance programs, there are other agencies which provide student aid, i.e., the Law Enforcement Assistance funds and the Comprehensive Employment and Training fund.

It is highly significant for the progress of this country that

"More than 1.6 million needy students will be aided by the basic grants in 1975, which will be supplemented by the existing work study and loan programs. The college work study program, at a 1975 level of \$250 million, will benefit over 520,000 students." (Budget Analysis, 1974)

The basic premise that no qualified student will be denied a college education is commendable one. The intent here is not to discount the value which any of these programs hold for the individual student in pursuing equal educational opportunities. However, a too complete reversal of support of educational institutions which was evident during the 1960's may serve to make absolute the "depression" in higher education which the Carnegie Commission described at the beginning of the 1970's. Students will be able to afford to attend institutions which may no longer be able to afford to offer educational opportunities. Veterans'

legislation is a notable exception wherein a modest level of institutional assistance for administration is provided based on the number of students served by each institution.

The federal government's role in the finance (and therefore control) of higher education will continue to be a topic of debate among many factions. Nevertheless, no case is being made to propose new national priorities at the federal level or to propose replacement legislation which might include institutional aid formulae.

D. Regionalization

A cryptic analogy was drawn in 1971 in describing what has continued with apparent strengthening tendencies since that time. "New Federalism" was the phrase coined and the process was likened to the establishment of the Roman States within the ancient empire. Regionalization of formerly nationally based programs was begun with a long-range view toward decentralization of the federal bureaucracy.

In a White House memorandum in 1969, President Nixon said, in part,

"...greater decentralization should contribute to close cooperation and coordination between Federal agencies and State and local governments since decision-making will be closer to the non-federal agencies directly responsible for delivery of services."

The Office of Education began regional staffing following the enactment of the 1950 legislation on School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas (SAFA). The regional operations were augmented when the National Defense Education Act of 1958 (NDEA) became operational. President Johnson's special task force on education resulted in expansion of the regional staffing and created a bureau status for the field operations.

Every major branch of HEW has an office within the regional complex. Some of the offices function in an advisory capacity, some in review capacity, some offer technical assistance to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and to the Bureau of the Budget (BOB) concerning statistics related to their area. Many now have final decision-making authority.

President Nixon supported the strengthening of regional operations in 1969 when he announced common boundaries for the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO), the Small Business Administration (SBA), Housing and Urban Development (HUD), the Department of Labor, and Health, Education and Welfare (HEW). He announced the consolidation of existing regional offices into ten regional centers: Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Atlanta, Chicago, Dallas, Kansas City, Denver, San Francisco and Seattle. This meant that the Charlottesville office of OE moved to Philadelphia. Seattle was a newly created center. The others remained as originally established. With the reorganization of OE in 1970, the names were changed from Field Service to Office of Regional Coordination. The regional offices function under the direction of a Regional Commissioner and ten Deputy Commissioners, one for each of the ten national regions.

In August of 1971, the Office of Education had 18 basic programs with representation in the Regional offices. The regions were charged with administration and the operational functions of the programs, but the national or federal officers maintained control. The USOE (known in the regions as "Headquarters"), set national policy and procedures, identified needs, evaluated program operation and provided other leadership services.

In 1972, there were only three programs for which the regions were given authority. They were a triad of special assistance to the disadvantaged student: (a) Special Services, (b) Talent Search, and (c) Upward Bound. At the beginning of the 1972 fiscal year, almost 600 people were on the staff of the regional offices. Twenty-two programs, directed at every level of education, were included in the regional operations as either wholly or partially controlled endeavors. By Categories, they were:

Higher Education:

Educational Opportunity Grants

Work Study Programs

National Defense Education Act Student Loans

Insured Loans to Students

Undergraduate Facilities Construction

Loans to Construct Academic Facilities

Vocational and Technical Education:

Vocational Education Act of 1963, Parts B-H

Adult Basic Education

Manpower Development and Training

Libraries and Educational Technology:

Grants for Public Libraries

Interlibrary Cooperation

State Institution Library Services

Library Services for the Handicapped

Research:

Small Research Grant Programs

Fundamental Research Grants

Elementary and Secondary Education:

School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas

Construction of Schools in Federally Affected Areas

Disaster Assistance

Title IV of the Civil Rights Act

The Emergency School Assistance Program

Technical Assistance for Programs for the Disadvantaged (Title I)

By 1974, two short years later, 124 categorical programs funded by USOE had been designated for decentralization with the regional offices assuming authority from the national offices. The central or national offices interpret enacted legislation. Regional offices' authority varies among programs -- from extreme autonomy as in the case of the TRIO programs -- Upward Bound, Talent Search, and Special Services -- to a mere sign off for final centralized decisions as in the case of Adult Education.

In addition to OE programs, other major agencies felt the movement toward decentralization during 1974. Health Manpower programs under the Public Health Service moved Nursing Education and Allied Health into the regional offices. The National Advisory Committee on Nursing maintained the final decision-making prerogative, but absolute authority for selection of grant awardees was exercised by the regional offices in Allied Health short-term and advanced traineeship programs.

One reflection of the intensification of decentralization is seen in the fact that HEW's Health and Human Resource Development Offices increased their regional staffs by almost 100 percent during 1974. Similar increases in staffing are expected by USOE in 1975, with the movement of Title III (HEA 1965), Basic Institutional Development Programs and Title III (HEA 1972), Advanced Institutional Development Program, Title IV (HEA 1968) Cooperative Education Program, etc.

As John Morrow aptly stated,

"FY 74 will be remembered as a year of unparalleled frustration for grant chasers attempting to identify government resources for institutional research and development projects. Discernible patterns of government funding established during previous years by major federal agencies, such as HEW, were largely non-existent as the Administration began in February of 1973 to launch its 'New Federalism' concept, which if fully implemented would redesign the total structure of federal funding. Although subsequent political events prevented much of the 'New Federalism' from achieving fruition and many long-term programs that were buried by the administration in its FY 74 budget were resurrected during the fiscal year, planning institutional programs through the use of governmental categorical funds was extremely difficult. The release of impounded funds during the end of December, 1973 and the launching by many agencies of the decentralization concept compounded the problem of planning effective strategies for tapping governmental resources..." (Federal Research Report, June 28, 1974).

A second trend or possible answer to the question "Where are we going at the federal level" is: toward the increasing possibility of discontinuance of categorical aid. Strong and increasingly evident arguments are heard from many quarters. Congresswoman Green has been a staunch pioneer for a move in this direction as evidenced in her New York Times article:

"The enormous federal influence has not yet really entrenched itself, either structurally or philosophically, in the American experience. It is by no means too late to cut discretionary funds to a justifiable and manageable amount, and to do away with the myriad of

categorical programs. To the extent that financial assistance is required for educational programs, such assistance can be supplied through outright block grants with minimum restrictions on how or for what they are spent, once a basic overall need has been established. Decentralization and general aid are key concepts in the rehabilitation of our educational system; they and they alone permit each locality to determine its own priorities, plans and objectives -- to focus on its own particular educational problems."

E. Revenue Sharing

Under the general Revenue Sharing Act of 1972, \$30.2 billion federal dollars was legislated for distribution to state and local governments by the end of 1976. The ratio of disbursement was two-third for local governments, one-third to state government.

Described by some as "the cornerstone of the New Federalism", revenue sharing is a mix of federal assistance and incentive pay to local communities to meet growing needs for public services, a fiscal apparatus to show the federal government's intent, strengthen the state's role in the national structure, and a way to cut down on categorical grant programs.

General revenue sharing reflects the concept of "power to the people" which underlies the movements espoused within the "New Federalism." Operating from the same national perspective is a second-level concept of Special Revenue Sharing which includes projections and plans for Educational Revenue Sharing. Aside from the multiple errors surrounding the first several dispersals of funds from General Revenue Sharing, a majority of the regulations, guidelines and the implications of the Act have remained a technical issue. Local and state governmental officials are recognizing serious inadequacies within the distribution formulas.

The uncertainty which the "New Federalism" prompted through release

of revenue sharing funds without adequate understanding as to all their legal ramifications, combined with almost simultaneous impoundment of categorical funds and a rising rate of inflation, seriously affected state level budgeting. The confusion relates to virtually every federally reinforced program. Education is no exception.

Dr. Richard Millard, in a speech to the National Council of State Directors of Community Junior Colleges described what appears to be a lingering situation:

"We seem to find ourselves today in a period in which not only old assumptions but even some of what were thought to be new assumptions in relation to financing and planning of and for community colleges and higher education and postsecondary education as a whole no longer seem to hold or are being seriously challenged. The roles of local, state, and federal governments in the support picture are shifting. The scope of institutions, agencies, and operations falling within the postsecondary educational ambit for planning purposes has increased. Expected federal support programs have not materialized. In some areas in spite of change we seem to be marking time rather than making progress." (July, 1973)

Education Revenue Sharing, one of the posed answers to the growing dilemma of financing postsecondary education, is viewed by some as a less than acceptable alternative plan.

The initial proposals centered around elementary and secondary education, but it appears likely that higher education's system of revenue sharing may not be radically different. Many reasons, arguments, rationalizations and other points in favor of educational revenue have emerged; among these are:

- (1) Revenue Sharing would eliminate the need to continue the vast number of categorical aid programs with their multiplicity of guidelines, regulations, reporting and accounting requirements;
- (2) The need for the accompanying bureaucracy of categorical aid

programs would be eliminated at the federal and/or regional level thus realizing a substantial savings in the budget;

- (3) The avowed administrative (but not congressional) commitments that there would be no reduction in funds over those received through traditionally categorical programs;
- (4) The funds would be "a new source of revenue" for the states;
- (5) There would be no need to establish new state agencies to handle the in-state dispersals since an existing education agency would be designated as responsible for all fund management;
- (6) Additional funds would serve as incentives for changing state equalization systems and provide a sound base for correcting program disparities in education;
- (7) The automatic revenue sharing formula would be forward funded one year in advance in order to facilitate planning and to promote program stability.

These and other assurances have been counter-balanced by the antagonist camp with some of the following arguments:

- (1) Education revenue sharing would require states to identify local needs that fit national priority areas, not local ones;
- (2) Amounts dispersed to the states would be unpredictable since appropriations, not authorizations, would determine the amount available;
- (3) Some states may be short-changed since a needs formula is expected to be the basis for dispersals;
- (4) State level bureaucracy may grow up rather than be reduced due to the need for additional monitoring of fund usage;
- (5) Broad public participation in the development of state plans, while desirable, may impede use of funds in critical areas, if political coups emerge;
- (6) Federal monitoring and enforcement activities will require an accompanying bureaucracy at the federal level;
- (7) Federal priority categories are expected to exist, with limited transfers of funds from one category to another.

Still not broadly implemented, the Education Revenue Sharing Act was introduced on April 29, 1971, by the late Winston Prouty. Directed primarily toward elementary and secondary education, Prouty's remarks, nevertheless, are apropos to higher education:

"Guidelines, regulations, matching fund requirements ensnarl the educator in time-consuming trivia which is counter-productive to the educator's primary role -- education.

Clearly, remedial action is necessary to make federal aid to education more responsible and less cumbersome." (Congressional Record, 1970, HR 16621)

Whether or not it can be described as "remedial action", educational revenue sharing, as exemplified in the proposed Consolidated Education Grants Program, was a reflection of the 1974 national education goals of the federal government.

One of the arguments in favor of education revenue sharing is that it is a less expensive (but does it also follow that it is therefore more productive?) form of aid than categorical grants since revenue sharing eliminates the need for managerial bureaucracy. Congresswoman Edith Green (D. Oregon), addressed this question on January 16, 1974 when she wrote:

"Each new program spawns at least one new administrative unit within the government. This involves new office space, new staff of many ranks, new organization charts, new regulations. Administrative growth is a galloping cancer. Many listed as new state or city employees are there solely because of federal funds or federal requirements....."

Senator Buckley, in remarks to the Senate on May 16, 1974, expanded this point to include the overall federal approach to educational funding processes:

"The present system wastes time, money and personnel. The intricacy and hodge-podge is so great that many state and local agencies have to hire larger staffs charged with the sole responsibility of cutting through the maze of applications, guidelines, regulations and reporting requirements which are an intrinsic part of the present grant system. On the federal side, an army of bureaucrats is required to process and review applications and grants to attempt to make sure that every petty regulation and requirement is complied with. All in all, these procedures require thousands of unnecessary scribblers and paper shufflers."

F. The State Level Situation

The process of identifying what is important in legislation is complex and frequently results in educators contradicting educators as they try to "follow the string" of legislative activity. But as resources continue to dwindle, priorities continue to shift, and sources of funds continue to fluctuate -- educators at all levels must continue to make the effort necessary to more clearly define their own areas of competence and to clarify their roles in the arena of awareness of legislative activities both at the state and federal levels. At the same time that state and local administrators must develop a keener awareness of the movements of decision-making power bases within federal funding areas, the state level situation affects and complicates the local situation. Many local institutions' Board of Trustees find increasing reluctance on the part of property taxpayers, for example, to increase millage and bond obligations. Increasing costs, combined with recession economics, unpredictable federal appropriations or impoundments signaling the demise of entire federal agencies, push state level budget decision makers to critically examine state level priorities.

A change in existing priorities, or reduction in funding, will have

a rippling effect on the entire spectrum of state supported institutions which exist (theoretically) to serve the public's best interest. A shift in perspective as to what serves the public's best interest may indicate that low tuition at public institutions does not serve the public nor the state budget, particularly since the state is the primary supporter of higher education. A position of reports from the Carnegie Commission and the Committee on Economic Development during 1972-73 stated that state appropriations exceeded tuitions and fee receipts three times, was four times more than voluntary corporate and individual contributions, and twice the amount provided by the U. S. Office of Education.

Any question of higher education funding at the state level is further complicated by intense competition from other public service areas. A shift in emphasis away from education as the solution to social problems places institutions in a defensive position. Questionable efficiency in management of funds received, inflated estimates of needs and unnecessary rivalry among differing types of institutions all tend to aggravate any possibility of optimism. There are, of course, multiple other factors which contribute to the complexity of the situation.

In line with the national emphasis on state's rights, support of all levels of education is placed primarily with the states and their many local governmental sub-systems. Higher education systems have traditionally been the responsibility of state-level governments.

"To carry out their responsibility with respect to postsecondary education, the states are empowered to grant charters and other privileges of incorporation to educational institutions, provide for the establishment and maintenance of public institutions of higher education, tax or exempt from taxes the property and income

of educational institutions, provide for the establishment and maintenance of public institutions of higher education and protect the public's interest in the operation of both public and private educational institutions and agencies. In addition, each state has specific powers and duties regarding the establishment, governance, and support of postsecondary education that are listed explicitly and implicitly in its constitution." (Financing Postsecondary Education in the United States, December, 1973, p. 81)

The legal base which gives state governments the function of controlling the educational curriculum arises from the Tenth Amendment to the Federal Constitution. This means, in effect, that the state legislature has complete control over the instructional programs of all public educational institutions within the state unless there is a special proviso limiting the control or jurisdiction of the legislature. Any such restriction may be incorporated within the state constitution. The possible exception may be when there are situations covered by individual rights within the Federal Constitution.

The unwritten law is that local school districts and public postsecondary institutions maintain autonomy for innovation only in the absence of specific written laws at the state or federal level. It is then generally left up to the local innovators to proceed within the implied areas of jurisdiction. An example of this is a fee collection system and the interpretation which it is given. If fees are collected for participation in extra-curricular events, the local school or institution is the determinant of what constitutes extra-curricular.

As national priority changes affect resources, so trends at the state level are also important if an understanding of movements affecting funding and state level involvements in funding are to be better understood.

At the turn of the century, only about 4 per cent of the country's college age population attended college. Prior to World War II, post-secondary support from the states was limited to relatively low level involvement with public university systems and state teacher colleges receiving the majority of state monies. As the post World War II educational boom affected federal involvement in education, the state budgets were also being affected. During the late 1950's there was an unprecedented demand for post-secondary education of all types. This growth pattern and its concomitant support continued through the 1960's.

"From an enrollment of under two million in the late 1940's, student numbers jumped to over six million in 1960, and are projected to reach twelve million by 1980. What is more relevant from the perspective of the states, the proportion educated in public institutions increased from about 50 per cent in 1950 to 67 per cent in 1965 with 77 per cent projected in 1980. State expenditures rose from \$5 billion in 1967, and unless Federal aid increases massively, they should reach \$10 billion by 1980. Constituting about 7 per cent of all state expenditures in 1950, higher education now consumes about 15 per cent. Clearly, higher education has become a major concern of state governments." (Berdahl, 1971, p. 29)

Enrollment growths precipitated expansion of program offerings within existing institutions and the creation of many new public two-year colleges across the country. These, in turn, expanded opportunities to a large number of first-generation college students who could only afford to attend a college close to home or who could not meet the entrance requirements of many of the four-year institutions.

Following the enrollment growth pattern and a pattern of diversity of types of institutions, came a related diversity of type of

control at the state level. The multiplier effect of increased numbers of students, the proliferation of new institutions plus the expansion of existing ones, pressed the state coffers and initiated increased efforts toward coordination and control at the state level. Limited resources and growing public concern over proliferation of programs and potentially unnecessary duplication of efforts fostered increased centralization efforts. Recognizing that the state legislature can function only as a mandator of coordination and control of education through external boards or state-level agencies, each state took its own tack. The result has been a variety of state-level agencies which provide a super-structure for higher education. The patterns of organization, levels and areas of authority and the extent of state agency control varies widely among the states, with 50 states taking almost 50 approaches. Descriptive titles include "State Board for, Commission on....., etc. Local boards were established as a buffer against too much direct control from political factions at the state level, but the measure of their control (or lack of it) usually rests within the executive budget at the state level.

There are evidences of continuing need for local or state boards to fulfill the buffer, or insulating role, on behalf of the local institutions due to national pressures. Some of these pressures at the federal level are reflected in two vehicles which were designed to promote increased communication in the competitive arena. One is a federal review process facilitated by an A-95 review form which must be completed and circulated among certain agencies when categorical aid

funds are requested. The other is a federally legislated state 1202 Commission. These two communication vehicles have their own distinctive purposes and their own influence upon resource development. No attempt is made here to evaluate the measure of that influence; but a brief description of the 1202 Commissions is included for information purposes and the number of agencies participating in the A-95 review process is reported.

G. State 1202 Commissions

The establishment of state-level 1202 Commissions can be seen as an indication of the increasing concern that the public interest be protected as institutional diversity and development takes place during a period of constrained resources. While the frantic pace of individual institutional expansion appears to have slowed down, the need for wiser distribution and use of resources is gaining in increased attention.

The State 1202 Commissions, which were invited into existence by Section 1202 of the Higher Education Amendments of 1972, are still in formative stages in many states and the full implications for coordination, control and fund distributions are yet to be determined. The law prescribes that the commissions must be "broadly based and equitably

representative of the general public and public and private non-profit and proprietary institutions of post-secondary education in the state, including community colleges, junior colleges, post-secondary vocational schools, area vocational schools, technical institutes, four-year institutions of higher education and branches thereof."

The decision was left to the governor as to whether or not a state would (1) establish an entirely new commission, (2) designate an

existing agency or commission, if it meets the criteria; or (3) augment an existing commission or agency in order to meet the criteria. The move away from decision-making at the federal level and into the state offices was a further indication of the trend away from centralized government.

H. Office of Management and Budget Circular A-95

As a management tool for improved communications among the various factions competing for resources, and as a means of assisting with coordination and control of fund flows, a review process of federal funding requests was established in 1968. Issued by the Office of Management and Budget, and commonly referred to as the A-95, the federal review process serves to help implement Title IV of the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968. Title IV, in part, directs the President to "establish

rules and regulations governing the formulation, evaluation and review of federal programs and projects having a significant impact on area and community development."

Section 401 (b) of the Act requires that:

"All viewpoints --- national, state, regional and local -- shall, to the extent possible, be taken into account in planning federal or federally assisted development programs and projects."

Section 401 (c) adds,

"to the maximum extent possible, consistent with national objectives, all federal aid for development purposes shall be consistent with and further the objectives of state, regional and local planning."

In effect, the notifications and review systems implemented through the OMB/A-95 process serves as advance communication of the intent to pursue funding from a selected group of Federal programs. This affords the appropriate local and state officials an opportunity

to review, comment on, and be involved in efforts to obtain and use Federal assistance. In many states, the process is facilitated by instructions and regulations from the governor's office with local clearinghouses established within the state's planning districts.

The following programs following under A-95 are referenced by their Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance identification numbers. They are included in summary form and are listed as an indication of the breadth of inter-agency inclusiveness within the process. They are listed pursuant to the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968 and Section 204 of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966.

1. Department of Agriculture

- a. Farmers Home Administration (10.400 - 10.419)
- b. Soil Conservation Service (10.901 - 10.904)

2. Department of Commerce

- a. Economic Development Administration (EDA) (11.300 - 11.303)

3. Department of Defense

- a. Department of the Army, Office of the Chief Engineers (12.101 - 12.108)

4. Department of Health, Education and Welfare

- a. Health Services and Mental Health Administration (13.206 - 13.249)
- b. National Institutes of Health (NIH) (13.340 - 13.369)
- c. Office of Education (13.408 - 13.494)
- d. Social and Rehabilitation Service (13.711 - 13.746)

5. Department of Housing and Urban Development
 - a. Housing Production and Mortgage Credit/FHA (14.100 - 14.149)
 - b. Metropolitan Planning and Development (14.200 - 14.214)
 - c. Model Cities Administration (14.300)
 - d. Renewal and Housing Management (14.602 - 14.609)
6. Department of the Interior
 - a. Bureau of Outdoor Recreation (15.400 - 15.401)
 - b. Bureau of Reclamation (15.501 - 15.503)
 - c. National Park Service (15.904)
7. Department of Justice
 - a. Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (16.500 - 16.502)
8. Department of Labor
 - a. Manpower Administration (17.205)
9. Department of Transportation
 - a. Federal Aviation Administration (20.102)
 - b. Federal Highway Administration (20.201 - 20.211)
 - c. Urban Mass Transportation Administration (20.500 - 20.501)
10. Appalachian Regional Commission (23.003 - 23.012)
11. National Science Foundation (47.036)
12. Office of Economic Opportunity (49.002)
13. Water Resources Council (65.001)
14. Environmental Protection Agency
 - a. Air Pollution Control Office (66.001)
 - b. Solid Waste Management Office (66.300 - 66.301)
 - c. Water Quality Office (66.400 - 66.407)

PART II

A STUDY OF STATE AGENCY INVOLVEMENT IN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

A. Background

The movement of resource development and especially federal grantsmanship activities from the private educational sector into public institutions has become more evident in the past few years. This movement has been due to several factors. One was the press of economic conditions and a resultant need for identifying funds for special expansion and programmatic activities within the public institutions. Another was the categorical nature of federal funding patterns. There were, of course, other factors, many of which are mentioned in Part I. In combination, the result was increased awareness of the need for federal involvement at the institutional level. Only recently, however, have development activities been viewed as a function or domain of state-level leadership.

With the recognition of the trend toward state agency involvement in resource development activities, came many questions relating to the specifics of that involvement. For example, did the type of institution associated with any particular state agency influence the amount of grantsmanship or resource development activity? how extensively were the postsecondary state agencies staffed to handle resource development? from what areas of educational training were resource development officers being drawn? This paper was developed in an effort to provide at least partial answers to some of the above questions.

B. Purpose of the Study

The basic purpose of the study was to survey the current emphasis being placed on resource development (i.e., federal grantsmanship) at the state agency level as indicated by the number of full-time and part-time staff members assigned resource development responsibility, and the extensiveness of agency involvement in the A-95 Review Process.

C. Limitations

No effort was made to assess the merits of state agency coordination versus institutional autonomy, nor was any effort made to determine whether or not the state agency activities were such that they were required to participate in the Federal A-95 Review process.

D. Procedures

With the assistance of an in-service grant from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation through the State and Regional Higher Education Center of the Florida State University, a national survey was conducted utilizing mailing lists of two state-agency organizations. One was the State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO) organization which includes among its members statewide boards with governing or coordinating responsibilities for public institutions of higher education. The other was a list of the members of the National Council of State Directors of Community-Junior Colleges, (hereafter, referred to as the "National Council").

The following table represents the distribution of the brief two-page questionnaires by the type of agency according to membership in the two national organizations.

Table A		
Distribution of Questionnaires		
Type of Agency	Number Sent	Number Replies
SHEEO (All postsecondary, higher education)	50	32
NATIONAL COUNCIL (two-year junior & community colleges)	49	32
TOTALS	99	64

E. Results

The combined total of the sixty-four agencies responding to the brief questionnaire indicated that they collectively represented approximately 1,400 two and four-year institutions across the country. In the relationship of the institutions to their respective state agency, only 14 of the 64 state agencies indicated that their individual institutions were required to have state agency approval prior to soliciting outside funding.

As an indication of how extensively the state agencies were staffed for resource development, the following responses were given to the question, "Is there state agency staff with the assigned responsibility of securing other than state funds for the agency?"

Table B			
Number Full-time/Part-time Development Staff			
Type of Agency	Number of Full-time	Number of Part-time	Total Agencies with Development Staff
SHEEO (All postsecondary higher education)	5	4	9* (**)
NATIONAL COUNCIL (Two-year junior and community colleges)	20	6	17
TOTALS	25	10	26
* One responded "yes" and indicated that "all staff" have resource development responsibilities.			
** One responded "yes" but gave no indication of the number.			

Twenty-six of the sixty-four agencies responding had either part-time or full-time staff responsibilities for securing other than state funds for the agency or their constituent institutions. The remaining twenty-eight agencies reported they had no staff responsible for securing other than state funds. One agency categorized vocational education resources as state funds, and was not included in the total.

Two states, Michigan and Ohio, each had four staff members with resource development responsibilities. All of the four in Michigan were full-time. All of the four in Ohio were part-time. Connecticut, Washington,

South Carolina and Pennsylvania have two resource development officers each, Virginia reported three. The other 11 states reporting staff, each had one, for a total of 35 staff within 26 agencies. Twenty-five of the twenty-six agencies had full-time staff; two of whom were females. There was a total of ten part-time staff reported; two of whom were females.

The years of experience reported ranged from one-half year to a maximum of 28 years. The average years of experience was six, with eleven individuals (approximately one-third) having more than six years experience. Academic degrees ranged from 10 Bachelor degrees, 11 Master degrees, 8 Ed.D. degrees, four Ph.D. degrees and one not given. Thirteen of the degrees reported were in education, six were in business or public administration, one in law, one in theology, and one in military security. Eight did not indicate major areas of study.

In response to the question, "Does your agency participate in the Federal A-95 Review Process?", the following was indicated by agency membership in the two national organizations:

Table C								
Involvement in A-95 Review Process								
AGENCY	YES HEAVILY	YES FREQUENTLY	YES SELDOM	TOTAL YES	NO	NO ANSWER	NUMBER RESPONDING	PERCENT
SHEEO	2	10	3	15	15	2	32	48%
NATIONAL COUNCIL	8	7	5	20	11	1	32	62%

F. Conclusions

The federal agency ladder-like approach to funds has already been alluded to in the descriptions of state, regional and federal sign-offs necessary before decisions can be made and contracts be negotiated. As indicated by the relatively few state agencies with full-time development staff, state educational agencies appear to have optioned to concentrate their efforts on maintaining a position of refined balance between the institutions and the state government without wading too deeply into the competitive field of federal fund procurement.

The Federal A-95 Review Process is only one example of the constraints under which state agencies operate while attempting to establish and interpret policy, approve new programs, reallocate existing programs, survey planning and research activities and provide public services. In resource development, there is an additional variety of impingements placed upon the state agency, with a multiplicity of sign-offs required prior to procurement or receipt of funds from most sources. Civil rights compliance statements, environmental statements, etc., all add to the cob-webbing effect of interlocking educational and non-educational agencies. The higher percent of two-year state agencies indicating their involvement in the A-95 Review Process (62% as opposed to 48% of SHEEO agencies) may be interpreted to mean that, as new agencies, they are more directly involved with federal agency activity; or that, they are under additional unidentified constraints to avoid duplication of effort with their four-year counterparts. It may simply mean, however, that this

response relates more directly to the larger number of full and part-time staff members assigned direct responsibility for resource development within the two-year agencies.

A need for expanded pre-service and in-service training for resource development personnel is evidenced by the relatively few agencies which have assigned staff responsibility to resource development, and by the variety of disciplines from which available resource development officers are drawn.

PART III
RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

A. Present and Future Directions

The complexity of the present scene in educational resource development cannot be understated. The severity of the financial crisis is evident to many educators and legislators, but even in time of plenty there remains the questions of how public funding sources are to be identified, and how they are to be secured. These questions relate to questions of how the larger funds will be earmarked for distribution.

"The certainty of more federal programs in higher education is matched only by the uncertainty of how they will be channeled: to the student as grant or loan, to the faculty member for research, to the institution as block grant or categorical aid, to the state as general grant or grant earmarked for specific purposes, or (most likely) some combination of these." (Berdahl, 1971, p. 263)

It has already been indicated that if there is a common denominator among state agencies, it is diversity. The same generality can be applied to the profession of educational resource development, if indeed it can be termed a profession in the traditional sense of the word.

In the midst of the present confusion and complexity, many state agencies, institutions and individuals are attempting to develop expertise in the identification of trends and processes which relate to resource development. It is a field that is evolving largely without direction; however, with its members keenly aware of a lack of procedural guidelines, a lack of commitment on the part of the institution or agency with which

they are identified and a general confusion as to the overall state of the art due to the lack of prescriptive literature. There are no well-researched, clearly defined, and rigidly applied programs of study available for the refinement of the art of resource development. There are no well-tested curricula for the study and academic preparation of those who wish to practice the techniques of educational resource development. There are no textbooks delineating procedures, capsulizing historical discoveries, or postulating theories. There have been few structured training programs available for existing or potential development officers. Nevertheless, there is a growing body of individuals who serve at both the institutional and state agency level in the capacity of resource development. Also, there are neophyte organizations appearing whose purposes are to promote increased expertise in the development area. The Grantsmanship Center in Los Angeles, California, for example, conducts workshops, assists in identifying potential funding sources, and provides consulting services to educational institutions. The National Council for Resource Development (NCRD) was chartered in 1973 to provide a national organization for two-year college development officers. The literature of the field is becoming available and "how-to" formulae are being developed. In 1971, when "Developing Skills in Proposal Writing" by Mary Hall of Corvallis, Oregon was virtually the only handbook widely distributed, resource development was almost an individual approach.

B. Procedures

In order to discriminate effectively between available sources of funds, it is helpful to have a series of questions or basic procedures which will serve as a basis of decision making if in no other way than

by providing a process of elimination. The following series of procedures or questions should provide an indication as to whether or not the particular funding source being approached is the best potential supporter of educational needs:

1. Study the legal base: Initial questions usually are answered by a study of the actual law which mandates the availability of the funds. Copies may be obtained from local congressional representative's offices in the case of governmental funds. Foundations and other private sources have similar legal or incorporational guides which control their fund releases.
2. Guidelines: Study the published guidelines (available at no cost from the individual governmental agencies) for limitations, data/research requirements, the format of the actual writing, etc. A description of the intent of the law is ordinarily provided as well as any restrictions, requirements for qualifications, limitations of funds, personnel and/or activities. Federal, regional and/or state program officers may be indicated for advisory purposes.
3. Find out the total funds available. In the case of governmental funds, it is important to distinguish between the amount legislated and the amount appropriated. If the total funds available to a particular agency are limited, this usually will determine the size of the average grant. It is also helpful to know the percentage of awards in relation to the number of requests made to the agency in order to judge the competition factor.

4. How are funds allocated?: Are they formula or discretionary grants? Are they awarded through state agency or directly to the institution from a federal agency? Is there regional or state office control? Does a state educational agency have sign-off responsibilities?
5. What is the usual funding time period? Is the usual length of time for one year, three years, five years?
6. Requirements for matching funds: The level of federal or governmental support may impose restrictions on the institution and may create more financial problems than the grant will offset. Some federal grants require as much as fifty per cent matching funds from local or state sources. Others have no matching requirements. If there is a matching requirement, is it actual outlay, in kind, etc.?
7. Size of the average award: If the typical grant is \$10,000 and the project under consideration is calculated at \$100,000, a different source of support should be sought, obviously.
8. Grant awardees: Most of the federal agencies, and many of the private foundations publish a listing of the current years' grant recipients. It is advisable to study the characteristics of the institutions and the titles of their funded projects as an aid in determining the appropriateness of the project and individual institution's competitive possibilities. The agency priorities are often reflected rather clearly in the descriptions of the typical grant and its recipient.

9. **Deadlines:** The final date for proposal or application submission should be checked early. The actual writing of the project description may only take a few days of concentrated effort, but planning, information collection and the totality of the decision-making inherent within the proposal development may require many months.
10. **Budget and allocation of funds:** Since budgeting is a prime consideration, it is important to know when and how much of the total grant will be available to the grantee. Delays in receipt of funding are not unheard of, and if this possibility is anticipated and the length of delay is included in the planning, large initial costs to the institutions may be avoided. Consider the federal agencies' budgeting procedures, but also consider the institutions' budgeting procedures. Accounting procedures are often complex or inflexible to the point that an extremely large project may be unwieldy in the demands it places on the institution's business office.
11. **Continuation of programs:** One of the initial considerations should be feasibility of underwriting the program after a funding announcement has been received and contractual agreement fulfilled. The institution must evaluate its ability to provide funds from other sources to support the continuance of the program, or see its way clear to assume the continued support, assuming the nature of the project is such that it is to be an on-going effort.

12. **Interrelated sources:** Dependent upon the nature of the project under consideration, it may be feasible to solicit and receive support from multiple sources simultaneously. This approach has several inherent problems. If, for example, the total request involves separate but interrelated proposals from multiple sources, there will be a difference in deadlines, in the application procedures and the award dates. The success of the project may be in jeopardy if it is dependent on funds from three sources, for example, and only two (or one) of the agencies review the proposal favorably and award the funds.
13. **Contact the funding agency program officers:** This may be the single most effective means of determining whether or not the project idea is compatible with any one particular source of support. While they will not be able to assure actual funding, they are usually willing to provide technical assistance and give indications of funding priorities if approached well in advance of deadlines.

The following procedures are designed to assist in the planning and actual approaching of a potential funding source. Obviously, however, there is not one method or approach which is "fail-safe." Many of the different approaches depend on the nature of the project and the type of agency. Also, a research grant request will be significantly different from an innovative, short-term, institute type project request. One factor is consistent with all approaches, however;

the program narrative (description of the project) should be clearly and simply stated. Proposal reviewers are not impressed with complicated, wordy statements. They are attempting to conceive of the operation of an idea as they read a statement of intent or a proposal. If it is not presented logically, concisely, and with an indication of forethought, the readers will have little basis for a favorable response. "Jargon" will not improve the status of a projected activity nor will massive appendices of so-called "supportive" materials.

The majority of funding agencies need to know that the staff and facilities of an agency or institution are adequate to handle the proposed project. Resumes are sometimes appropriate for inclusion in the appendix, but usually a brief statement of the necessary types of personnel by job description and minimum qualifications will suffice.

A budget summary should not include requests for items not allowable through the particular funding source. It is obvious when this happens that there has been insufficient homework done by the requestor.

The following outline has been field-tested among practicing resource development officers and found to contain the basic essential elements of content usually required in narrative-type project proposals. It is included here only as a guide and is not intended to meet the specific requirements of every situation.

C. Outline for preparation of Project or Program Description

I. NEEDS ANALYSIS

- A. Identify the specific problem area being attacked and document conditions relating to it if possible.

- B. What local, regional, or national needs will be served by the project being developed?
- C. Spell out the target groups to be served both by type and number.
- D. Give a summary of local, regional and national conditions which relate to the problem area.

II. OBJECTIVES:

- A. Focus objectives sharply and state each one separately, clearly and concisely.
- B. Show how stated objectives will meet needs previously mentioned.

III. PROCEDURES:

- A. Identify specific steps involved in carrying out the project or program in terms of time frame, activities, techniques, etc.
- B. Include personnel, materials, equipment, etc., needed to answer "how" the process of meeting the objectives is to be carried out.

IV. EVALUATION:

- A. Show how results of the proposed project or program can be shown in terms of measurable objectives.
- B. Include any measurement techniques and/or follow-up procedures to be used in the evaluation process.

V. USE OF CURRENT RESOURCES:

- A. Consider the institution as a whole: Is the institution ready to tackle the problem? Are the facilities adequate? If not, why not?
- B. Pinpoint talents of the personnel who will be utilized in the project or program. How will the activities projected be staffed? Be sure to include any or all "experts" needed on a consulting or continuing basis.
- C. Is there evidence of real commitment of the existing staff, administration, faculty, students, in the home institution or any cooperating institutions in helping to meet the need?

VI. INNOVATION:

- A. Does the proposed project or program offer high promise for improvement over past practices? Or, is it the same old thing?
Answer specifically how and why it is considered to be innovative.
- B. Apart from commitment, why is your institution uniquely suited to handle the project or program under consideration?

VII. CONTINUATION OF THE PROJECT/PROGRAM:

- A. Is the project or program a model or a potential guide for other similar projects?
- B. What will happen to the project after the monies are spent, and the grants expired?

VIII. BUDGET:

- A. Realistically project costs involved.
- B. Be sure all the dollars requested are really needed to successfully implement the program.
- C. Re-check to be sure all categories of funds requested are mentioned and that their justification is included in the narrative.

At the institutional level, once potential sources of funds are adequately researched, attention should be turned to the institution and its relationship to the potential funds. The following points are brief and obvious, but frequently overlooked:

1. Establish institutional policy -- clarify, explain, communicate! Set funds solicitation priorities in keeping with established long-range goals of the institution.

2. Assess needs of the institution, the clientele it serves or the situation to be addressed via the project or program for which funds are to be sought.

- a. Is there cost-sharing components of the projects requested?
- b. Will there be a need for increased personnel, space, and/or equipment?
- c. Will the addition of the project cause a shift in the priorities of the institution?

If program a will benefit the institution in x ways but costs z amount to support, then a basis for decision-making is available. This, of course, assumes that the institution knows the current costs of all program operations and has the data available as a basis of comparison. Too often an institution only knows the dollar input level of a particular program but does not have a realistic measure of the total cost of its on-going operation. For example: if a state legislature supports an institution at the level of providing \$500 per FTE per year, (and there is no other source of special funds) it is invaluable for that institution to have current information on the actual cost per student for program operation. If instructors, classrooms, equipment, services and administrative overhead all combine to cost the institution \$750 per FTE then the state appropriation is inadequate and an increase in enrollment (without an increase in faculty, equipment and facilities) is in order.

D. Sources for Trend Identification

Faculty and staff must have their imagination and awareness stimulated to the possibility of receiving additional funds for their areas. There are several ways in which this can be accomplished. One of the easier methods involves the establishment of a resource development committee through which information on various sources of support may be disseminated. Another more involved technique includes the drafting

of a tentative list of sources directly correlated with the goals and priorities of the institution. It may be tentative due to the nature of the legislation which supports the grant, the priorities of the foundations which recognize and support a particular type of institution, and/or the needs which the institution hopes to meet through a request for funds.

In addition to developing a continuous source of input information in the form of newsletters, legislative briefs, personal contacts with key individuals in agencies and with others involved in resource development, a reasonably complete library is essential. Only a few documents and/or reference sources listed may pertain directly to any one institution's situation, but there are many valuable ideas in the available literature which can be adapted for usability. The attached listing provides a cross-section of a variety of different types of references. Some are highly technical while others provide a more philosophical approach.

One of the more valuable resources for identification of federal agency personnel and for providing biographical information on United States Senators and Congressmen is the Official Congressional Directory, United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 20402, for sale by the Superintendent of Documents. The following brief listing of resources are included as suggestions for building a resource development library. As mentioned earlier, the emphasis here is on federal sources for funds. The list, therefore, is predominantly related to the federal arena.

SOURCES OF INFORMATION ON FEDERAL PROGRAMS

A Compilation of Federal Education Laws. Printed for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor, U. S. House of Representatives, Superintendent of Documents, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 20402.

Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance. Compiled by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Superintendent of Documents, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. 20402. (Pub. No. (05) 74-44)

Catalog of Federal Education Assistance Programs. Catalog #HE5,211:11035, Superintendent of Documents, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. 20402.

Federal Acts and the Community College System. Forest, Department of Community Colleges State Board of Education, Raleigh, North Carolina, 27602.

A Guide for the New Community College Development Officer. Cook, Lowell, J., Director of Development, North Iowa Area Community, Mason City, Iowa, Feb. 15, 1973.

A Manual for Obtaining Government Grants. Urgo, Louis A., and Corcoran, Robert J., 40 Court Street, Boston, Mass., 02108.

A Manual for Obtaining Foundation Grants. Urgan, Louis A. And Corcoran, Robert J., 40 Court Street, Boston, Mass., 02108.

The Complete Fund Raising Guide. Mirkin, Howard R., 104 East 40th Street, New York, N. Y., 10016.

Catalog of HEW Assistance, August 1969. Superintendent of Documents, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 20402.

The Foundation Directory. Columbia University Press, 135 South Broadway, Irvington-on-Hudson, N. Y., 10533.

Grants Administration. U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Superintendent of Documents, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 20402.

U. S. Office of Education Support for the Arts and the Humanities. Bureau of Research, U. S. Office of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., S. W. Washington, D. C., 20202.

Understanding Foundations: Dimensions in Fund Raising. McGraw-Hill Publishing Company, 330 West 42nd Street, New York, N. Y., 10036.

PERIODICALS AND PAMPHLETS

The Chronicle of Higher Education. Published twenty-two times a year by Editorial Projects for Education., 3301 North Charles Street, Baltimore, Maryland, 21218.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Berdahl, Robert O., Statewide Coordination of Higher Education, American Council on Education, Washington, D. C., 1971.
- Buckley, William, Remarks to the Senate, Congressional Record, May 16, 1974, p. S8314.
- Budget of the United States Government, Fiscal Year 1974, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1973.
- Fields, Cheryl, M., The Chronicle of Higher Education, Vol. VI., No. 17, January 31, 1974.
- Financing Postsecondary Education in the United States, The National Commission on the Financing of Postsecondary Education, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., December, 1973.
- Green, Edith, New York Times, January 16, 1974.
- Hargis, W. Douglas, and Blocker, Clyde E., A Comparative Study of Philanthropy to American Junior Colleges, 1960-63 and 1968-71, Harrisburg Area Community College, 1973, page 15.
- Huus, Helen, Ed., "The Role of the Federal Government," Education and the National Purpose, Paul C. Weaver, University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia, 1969.
- Institutional Aid, Federal Support to Colleges and Universities, The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, February, 1972.
- Kerr, Clark, Letter, 1971.
- Millard, Richard, Speech to the National Council of State Directors of Community and Junior Colleges, July, 1973.
- Morphet, Edgar L., and Ryan, Charles O., Designing Education for the Future, Citation Press, New York, 1967.
- Morrow, John, Federal Research Report, Vol. 11-4, Washington, D. C. and Chicago, Ill., June 28, 1974.
- Prouty, Winston, 91st Congress, Hr 16621, March 24, 1970.
- Richardson, Elliott, Higher Education and National Affairs, Vol. XX, No. 11, American Council on Education, Washington, D. C., March 19, 1971.
- Special Analysis, Budget of the U. S. Government, Fiscal Year 1974, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1973.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Berdahl, Robert O., Statewide Coordination of Higher Education, American Council on Education, Washington, D. C., 1971.
- Buckley, William, Remarks to the Senate, Congressional Record, May 16, 1974, p. S8314.
- Budget of the United States Government, Fiscal Year 1974, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1973.
- Fields, Cheryl, M., The Chronicle of Higher Education, Vol. VI., No. 17, January 31, 1974.
- Financing Postsecondary Education in the United States, The National Commission on the Financing of Postsecondary Education, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., December, 1973.
- Green, Edith, New York Times, January 16, 1974.
- Hargis, W. Douglas, and Blocker, Clyde E., A Comparative Study of Philanthropy to American Junior Colleges, 1960-63 and 1968-71, Harrisburg Area Community College, 1973, page 15.
- Huus, Helen, Ed., "The Role of the Federal Government," Education and the National Purpose, Paul C. Weaver, University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia, 1969.
- Institutional Aid, Federal Support to Colleges and Universities, The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, February, 1972.
- Kerr, Clark, Letter, 1971.
- Millard, Richard, Speech to the National Council of State Directors of Community and Junior Colleges, July, 1973.
- Morphet, Edgar L., and Ryan, Charles O., Designing Education for the Future, Citation Press, New York, 1967.
- Morrow, John, Federal Research Report, Vol. 11-4, Washington, D. C. and Chicago, Ill., June 28, 1974.
- Prouty, Winston, 91st Congress, Hr 16621, March 24, 1970.
- Richardson, Elliott, Higher Education and National Affairs, Vol. XX, No. 11, American Council on Education, Washington, D. C., March 19, 1971.
- Special Analysis, Budget of the U. S. Government, Fiscal Year 1974, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1973.