

Journal of Student Financial Aid

Volume 7 | Issue 3

Article 1

12-1-1977

The Federal College Work-Study Program in the AAU Universities 1965-1975: Some Implications of Professional Discretion

John C. Crowley

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.library.louisville.edu/jsfa>

Recommended Citation

Crowley, John C. (1977) "The Federal College Work-Study Program in the AAU Universities 1965-1975: Some Implications of Professional Discretion," *Journal of Student Financial Aid*: Vol. 7 : Iss. 3 , Article 1.
Available at: <https://ir.library.louisville.edu/jsfa/vol7/iss3/1>

This Issue Article is brought to you for free and open access by ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Journal of Student Financial Aid* by an authorized administrator of ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository. For more information, please contact thinkir@louisville.edu.

THE FEDERAL COLLEGE WORK-STUDY PROGRAM IN THE AAU UNIVERSITIES 1965-1976: SOME IMPLICATIONS OF PROFESSIONAL DISCRETION

By John C. Crowley

Introduction

This is a summary of a study of the Federal College Work-Study Program (CWSP) which was completed early in 1977. The purpose of the project was to analyze the implementation of the Work-Study program since 1965 by the 48 institutions which comprise the Association of American Universities (AAU). The article addresses the ways in which these 24 private and 24 public universities have established this student assistance policy and considers some of the implications for universities and particularly for graduate students.

Methodology

A 4-part methodology was used in the project. Questionnaires were distributed in the spring to the 48 AAU Directors of student financial aid, and by last August all 48 had responded. Their purpose was to gather information concerning university Work-Study student selection and award policies, policy making processes and related program information. In addition, Congressional staff, United States Office of Education (USOE) officials and over 120 student aid officers, graduate and professional school deans, department chairmen, faculty and students were interviewed in 19 public and private universities. Program data were culled from USOE files of institutional fiscal operations reports and aid applications. Congressional hearing records, Committee reports, floor debates and related material also were reviewed.

Legislative History — Congressional Intent

A review of the program's legislative record supports the following conclusions: First, from its beginning the Work-Study program has enjoyed great popular-

Associate Executive Secretary of the Association of American Universities since 1974, Mr. Crowley has earned both his Ph.D. and M.P.A. in Public Administration from The Maxwell School, Syracuse University. His doctoral dissertation, published this year, concerns the federal college work-study program.

ity in the Congress and in colleges and universities. It is practically impossible to find criticism or even lengthy discussion of the program in the record. Indeed, because of this support the Work-Study program's legislative history is probably the thinnest of any Federal student aid program. As many Congressional staff quickly pointed out, however, this meager legislative record should be interpreted as a tribute to the program, and not as an indication of congressional disinterest.

Second, the Congress does intend the program to serve graduate and professional students as well as undergraduates. The law, the cumulative legislative record and congressional staff comments confirm this clearly. Since its beginning as Section 124 (C) (4) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 the law has made undergraduate, graduate and professional students eligible for Work-Study assistance. House and Senate hearing records also contain a number of specific references to and brief discussions about participation by graduate and professional students. To cite an early example, a 1963 USOE planning memorandum anticipated that approximately 20 percent of the funds would be awarded to graduate and professional students, and that the maximum and average awards to these students would be double those made to undergraduates.

Because of its popularity Work-Study has been steadily enlarged while escaping the controversies which have encumbered the grant and loan programs. When the legislation was renewed in 1968 and 1972 Work-Study was substantially expanded, but it was pushed aside in both houses of Congress by more controversial issues. In fact, until Chairman O'Hara's extensive oversight hearings in 1975, a full hearing had not been held in either house since 1964 specifically on the Work-Study program.

The attitude of the Congress in 1964 on the question of graduate student participation in Work-Study was summed up by a former Senate staff member, who was present at the time. He recalled Committee Chairman Senator Wayne Morse's feelings toward the program:

"He liked it. He worked as a student and he remembered. He had a great interest in taking care of the "C" student. He considered all students as a universe and he saw Work-Study as equally suited to graduate students. There is no good objection you could raise to it. At the time, Work-Study was also a popular idea with Congressional staff and Senators who had themselves done graduate work. Look at the age of the Senate when it passed; many members remembered the depression era program run by NYA."

Thus it is clear, as the law says, that the Congress intends the Work-Study program to serve undergraduate, graduate and professional students. There is nothing in the legislative history which indicates that the program was intended to exclude, or diminish the participation of, eligible graduate or professional students. When gathered together the record reads quite the contrary.

CWSP in the AAU Universities 1965-1976.

But what has been the experience in the research universities since 1965? In total, graduate students are a very small proportion of the national Work-Study

population. According to a 1975 American Council on Education Report, 3.9% of all Work-Study recipients in 1974 were graduate students. However, graduate students are approximately 10% of total CWSP recipients in universities. USOE data also show a steady increase in the total number of graduate students aided in recent years. In 1971, 17,500 graduate students received Work-Study support. By 1974, it is estimated that the number of graduate students awarded Work-Study had doubled.

Since Work-Study is a so-called campus based program, it should surprise no one that the size of Work-Study programs and student support policies and practices have varied dramatically among the nation's leading public and private research universities, all of which enroll substantial numbers of graduate and professional students. Some universities proportionately have very large Work-Study programs, others are quite small (Table 1). Some universities in both sectors consistently have allocated substantial proportions of Work-Study funds to graduate and professional students; while others which enroll comparable proportions of graduate students have allocated all, or virtually all, of the money to undergraduate students.

Among the 24 private AAU universities the programs in Federal Fiscal Year 1976 ranged in size from \$74,000 spent aiding 142 students at Catholic University, to \$2.5-million spent aiding 2,623 students at the University of Pennsylvania. The total amount of Work-Study funds spent at the graduate level ranged from \$452 at the University of Rochester to \$550,000 at Columbia University. In FY 1976, (Table 2) the Work-Study populations of Chicago, Yale and Columbia were each over 40% graduate students; 58% of Chicago's, 44% of Yale's and 41% of Columbia's Work-Study recipients were graduate or professional students. These universities also allocated large proportions of their Work-Study funds to these students. Chicago allocated 68%; Yale, 52%; and Columbia, 47% at the postbaccalaureate level.

In sharp contrast, among the private universities were the University of Rochester, Vanderbilt and Princeton, which in FY 1976 each reported awarding almost no Work-Study funds at the graduate level. Until last year Rochester and Princeton had awarded no Work-Study support to graduate students since 1968. In FY 1976, Rochester reported awarding Work-Study funds to one graduate student; Vanderbilt aided eight graduate students and Princeton aided 22 graduate students. Cal Tech, a small, well-supported research university, did not begin a Work-Study program until FY 1976.

The average amount spent per aided student also varies widely among the 24 private AAU universities. The average amount per undergraduate in a private university was \$647. The range was from \$395 at Tulane University to \$932 at the University of Pennsylvania. The average graduate award ranged from \$452 at the University of Rochester to \$1866 at M.I.T. The average award to a graduate student in both private and public AAU universities, interestingly, was \$902.

TABLE 1
THE RELATIVE SIZE OF AAU CWSP PROGRAMS, FY 1976

Private Universities	CWSP Spent			Public Universities	CWSP Spent		
	Rank	Per Student Enrolled	Per Graduate Student Enrolled		Rank	Per Student Enrolled	Per Graduate Student Enrolled
MIT	1	202.0	187.9	Oregon	1	98.7	79.1
Clark	2	169.1	224.1	U.C. - Berkeley	2	82.9	72.0
Penn. State	3	135.5	63.8	Colorado	3	76.8	35.3
Duke	4	109.5	90.5	U.C. - Los Angeles	4	71.3	102.6
Syracuse	5	104.2	58.6	Mich. State	5	56.1	18.6
Case West. Res.	6	101.6	43.8	Iowa	6	54.2	60.0
Cornell	7	91.7	34.9	Indiana	7	51.7	55.0
Columbia	8	89.6	67.3	Missouri	8	49.9	39.1
Yale	9	83.0	104.1	Nebraska	9	45.1	21.5
Princeton	10	79.1	9.2	Purdue	10	42.7	8.5
Brown	11	70.9	150.7	Michigan	11	42.2	32.1
Cal. Tech.	12	59.7	15.9	Wisconsin	12	42.0	29.1
Johns Hopkins	13	59.7	5.0	Ohio State	13	39.3	31.0
Southern Cal.	14	52.4	14.6	Virginia	14	38.7	49.9
Harvard	15	43.4	19.2	Washington	15	38.7	35.4
Tulane	16	137.0	38.4	North Carolina	16	37.6	20.1
Rochester	17	35.6	0.3	Minnesota	17	37.1	18.8
Chicago	18	31.7	32.6	Texas	18	34.2	37.5
Northwestern	19	29.5	20.2	Pittsburgh	19	25.4	14.0
Stanford	20	22.7	6.5	Kansas	20	21.5	33.8
Washington U.	21	22.2	3.9	Iowa State	21	21.0	9.6
Vanderbilt	22	15.7	5.2	Penn. State	22	19.5	1.6
New York U.	23	13.2	6.7	Maryland	23	17.0	1.7
Catholic	24	10.6	2.7	Illinois	24	5.2	2.8
AVERAGE:		66.2	35.9	AVERAGE		41.6	34.9
AAU Summary:	Total CWSP Spent	\$47,204,234	\$47.80	Total CWSP Spent-Graduates		\$9,755,973	\$49.70
	Total Enrollment	987,827		Total Graduate Enrollment		276,333	

TABLE 2
THE FEDERAL COLLEGE WORK-STUDY PROGRAM
IN AAU UNIVERSITIES, FY 1976
Private Members

University	CWSP STUDENTS		CWSP FUNDS SPENT		AMOUNT SPENT PER STUDENT			STUDENTS EMPLOYED		UNEXPENDED CWSP AUTHORIZATION
	Total	Graduate	Total	Graduate	Under-graduate	Graduate	On-Campus	Off-Campus		
	No.	%	Amount	%						
Brown	554	22	437,066	44	569	1,577	389	184	27,988	
Cal. Tech	168	10	80,823	11	475	534	168	0	0	
Case Western Reserve	830	17	642,721	23	717	1,053	785	83	928	
Catholic	142	25	74,095	17	526	504	142	0	1,332	
Chicago	262	153	217,757	68	646	963	256	14	3,253	
Clark	604	74	465,106	19	711	1,196	546	58	10,278	
Columbia	1,323	542	1,172,148	47	797	1,014	816	507	3,968	
Cornell	1,860	231	1,596,625	12	860	850	1,778	390	0	
Duke	1,207	347	1,000,078	31	803	892	1,152	128	0	
Harvard	703	214	548,889	28	805	726	426	277	0	
Johns Hopkins	658	42	592,171	5	917	643	552	106	35,560	
MIT	1,328	250	1,309,345	36	782	1,866	1,145	183	0	
New York University	400	122	270,696	30	680	670	285	115	25	
Northwestern	690	122	465,163	25	614	956	629	61	10,978	
Pennsylvania	2,623	484	2,540,252	22	932	1,128	2,438	493	0	
Princeton	586	22	423,013	2	732	474	512	268	0	
Rochester	301	1	200,014	0	665	452	301	0	0	
Southern California	1,510	201	1,302,102	13	863	857	1,459	51	424,970	
Stanford	487	41	266,607	13	522	823	442	52	65,762	
Syracuse	2,562	252	1,572,908	14	582	908	2,225	337	148,800	
Tulane	577	105	297,625	37	395	1,058	472	132	29,031	
Vanderbilt	187	8	98,916	8	506	8,283	180	7	10,262	
Washington University	460	26	212,353	7	453	603	437	23	7,554	
Yale	955	417	688,642	52	614	860	759	196	0	
					Avg.					
TOTALS	20,977	3,958	16,475,115	24	674	902	18,294	3,665	780,689	
									(100%) (20%)	

Source: USOE File Copies of Institutional Annual Fiscal Operations Report, FY 1976.

Among the AAU public universities in FY 1976 (Table 3), total Work-Study populations ranged in size from 424 students at the University of Illinois to 3,546 students reported by Michigan State University. The graduate student proportion of the Work-Study population varied from 1% at the University of Maryland and Penn State University to 39% or more at UCLA, Iowa and Virginia. Total Work-Study funds spent in FY 1976 ranged from \$182,000 at the University of Illinois to \$2,445,000, which aided 2,215 students, at the University of California at Berkeley. Michigan State followed Berkeley closely, spending over \$2.3 million in Work-Study funds.

The proportion of Work-Study funds spent at the graduate level by the public universities varied from 1%, or \$10,616, at Penn State University to 47%, or \$1,031,000, at UCLA. The average amount spent per undergraduate student was \$735, and the amount ranged from \$418 at the University of Illinois to \$1,382 at the University of Washington. The average amount spent per aided graduate student ranged from \$507 at Illinois to \$1,491 at the University of Minnesota.

In FY 1976, 31 private and public universities reported unexpended Work-Study authorizations including several universities which have small graduate Work-Study programs. There are numerous reasonable explanations for unexpended Work-Study authorizations, but it is at least interesting to note that \$1.7 million was reported as unexpended by 18 public universities, and \$781,000 was reported by 13 private universities. Two private and six public universities each reported over \$100,000 in unexpended funds.

AAU Work-Study Policies

In view of this diverse experience, it is not surprising that the AAU universities' Work-Study policies governing the allocation of funds also vary dramatically. Section 175.9(1) of the Federal regulations, which were adopted last September, requires institutions to make Work-Study employment or equivalent employment "reasonably available to the extent of available funds to all eligible students in the institution in need thereof," and to give preference in awarding funds "to those of its students with the greatest financial need." In addition, the institutions are required to have a written student selection policy: "The institution's selection procedure shall be uniformly applied, set forth in writing, and maintained in the files of the institution's office which selects student aid recipients."

All 48 aid directors responded to the question which asked whether their university has a written policy which establishes selection procedures for awarding Work-Study funds to eligible undergraduate, graduate and professional students. Two-thirds of the private and one-half of the public university aid directors reported that they do not have written student selection policies, while eight private and 12 public university aid directors indicated that their award policy is in written form. One private aid director responded affirmatively and simply cited "The Federal guidelines" as his university's written policy.

Thirteen of the 20 aid directors who responded affirmatively also provided copies of their written policy statements.

TABLE 3
THE FEDERAL COLLEGE WORK-STUDY PROGRAM IN
AAU UNIVERSITIES, FY 1976
Public Members

University	CWSP STUDENTS		CWSP FUNDS SPENT		Graduate %	Undergraduate	Graduate	UNEX- PENDED CWSP AUTHORI- ZATION	On Campus	Off- Campus	STUDENTS EMPLOYED
	Total	Graduate	Total	Amount							
U.C. - Berkeley	2,215	629	2,445,411	648,034	27	1,133	1,030	14	1,577	931	
U.C. - Los Angeles	1,943	766	2,213,376	1,031,087	47	1,004	1,346	0	1,591	616	
Colorado	2,265	201	1,640,437	145,574	9	724	724	111,004	1,676	589	
Illinois	424	51	181,738	25,881	14	418	507	389,160	341	87	
Indiana	2,894	577	1,484,300	331,290	22	498	574	35,189	2,440	564	
Iowa State	729	40	445,873	32,434	7	600	811	0	693	36	
Iowa	1,195	396	1,185,177	430,502	36	944	1,087	0	838	436	
Kansas	631	154	382,414	102,612	27	586	666	11,354	631	0	
Maryland	812	11	559,411	9,900	2	686	900	86,015	795	79	
Michigan State	3,546	165	2,346,373	139,095	6	653	843	105,597	3,546	522	
Michigan	2,174	391	1,642,741	408,485	25	692	1,045	140,997	2,032	217	
Minnesota	1,748	114	1,682,349	170,027	10	926	1,491	0	1,491	257	
Missouri	1,904	224	1,132,411	190,100	17	561	849	0	1,766	138	
Nebraska	1,378	101	1,010,007	97,667	10	714	967	32,887	1,196	182	
North Carolina	1,334	192	730,125	112,759	15	541	587	0	912	473	
Ohio State	2,471	286	2,097,450	335,827	16	806	1,174	28,075	2,259	232	
Oregon	2,151	339	1,536,766	268,934	18	700	793	78,219	1,714	437	
Pennsylvania State	1,628	17	993,290	10,616	1	610	624	118	1,467	161	
Pittsburgh	947	135	685,987	103,523	15	717	767	46,815	817	166	
Purdue	1,924	41	1,115,326	30,374	3	576	741	46,692	1,881	552	
Texas	1,550	292	1,458,608	330,825	23	896	1,133	66,783	1,268	282	
Virginia	818	289	578,147	259,688	45	602	898	114,683	707	146	
Washington	1,001	230	1,371,972	306,281	22	1,382	1,332	53,393	451	550	
Wisconsin	2,937	325	1,809,430	249,608	14	597	768	348,394	2,227	775	
TOTALS	40,619	5,966	30,729,119	5,771,123	19	735	902	1,695,389	34,316	8,428	(24%)
						Avg.					(100%)

Source: USOE File Copies of Institutional Annual Fiscal Operations Report, FY 1976.

Most of these documents were of two kinds: 1) either full or partial packaging instructions and formulas which counselors use to make awards or 2) general information materials typically distributed to interested students. One university provided a statement which was identified as a formally adopted university policy. The introduction read, "The financial aid packaging procedures for 1976-77 are based upon the approved policy of the university, drawn up jointly by the Office of Institutional Planning and the Office of Financial Aid and approved by the Deans, Vice-Presidents and President of the University. This packaging procedure will be utilized to make financial aid awards for the 1976-77 academic year."

The provisions of the written and unwritten policies governing the award of Work-Study funds to students, also vary widely. To illustrate, 11 private and 15 public university aid directors reported that they do not limit the use of Work-Study or give preference to students in the award of funds by academic level. Nine aid directors in public universities and 13 private university aid directors reported that they give at least some preference to students by academic level. Policies vary widely among them. For example, two major public universities reportedly prohibit entering freshmen from accepting a Work-Study job, but they give no preference to other students by academic level. Several, however, reported they give first priority to entering freshmen. Others reported making no distinctions between freshmen and upperclassmen, while favoring undergraduates over graduate and professional students.

Interviews with several of these aid directors revealed a variety of policy rationales. One private university aid director who reported giving graduate and professional students third and fourth priority for Work-Study funds said:

"The whole focus and emphasis of this office is undergraduate aid. A few graduate students walk in for NDSL and Work-Study. The graduate school has become more active in seeking Work-Study, but we have inhibited them and have used it at the undergraduate level. We have needed it there.

The graduate student aid is not sufficient. If the graduate school can latch on to Work-Study eligibility, it helps. . . I don't know what the graduate school does with its own money. We would be happy to include them if we had the Work-Study funds, but our primary focus would be to give an undergraduate a bachelor's education. That has been and will continue to be the focus of this office."

Another private university aid director explained,

"Over the years, the graduate school has asked once a year if they could participate. We said, 'No, sorry,' and that was the end of it. The graduate school is in the dark ages in financial aid. They don't package aid, know student needs or have student budgets. Some day the light will come on in the graduate school. They conceivably could make strong arguments for looking into it, if you were talking about additional money. I could with six months work put work-study in the graduate school, but there are not many arguments to shift the pie to graduate school students. We have hosted Aid Directors' Meetings here and everybody does it differently."

A public university aid director explained:

"Basically the American Public has been conditioned to accept that we have an obligation to put students through undergraduate, but not graduate and professional school. Graduate students are older, married and want to be independent too. They have one degree and are working on another. They have salable skills and can get part-time jobs on their own, so they are not as dependent on Work-Study.

The departments don't have much interest in undergraduates only in graduate students. Early in the program professors wanted to use Work-Study for assistantships, and we fought it.

Those graduate students on the program have been those who could not get a job as easily as others, handicapped, or no skills, as a last resort. Most graduate students are on TA's, RA's and Fellowships. Unless we get more money, we'll keep it at the undergraduate level."

A public university aid director, who also considers academic level in the award of funds, explained a different policy:

"We award Work-Study to students with highest need. All students regardless of year in school are eligible—Freshmen to Doctoral students are on the program. We award by computers and set perimeters by need. We rank freshmen need highest to keep them off loans. We change week by week, depending upon the amount available."

Congressional Intent

In interviews, 13 financial aid officers also discussed their understanding of how Congress intended institutions to implement the program. Together their comments reflect unclear and conflicting perceptions of Congressional intent concerning the purposes of the program, particularly as they relate to graduate and professional students. One can obtain totally conflicting interpretations of the Program's purposes and of Congressional intent among those who award funds based on academic level and among those who do not. One public university aid director, who awards Work-Study by academic record said:

"I don't think Congress did intend it to be used by graduate students. That has been developed by graduate departments in the graduate community. I never saw anything that indicated that Congress intended it; I never received direction from Congress or HEW which would have influenced our direction. There is nothing specific in the law in this; I don't recall anything in the law."

A private university aid director, who administers a large graduate Work-Study program, explained it differently:

"Congress likes the Work-Study Program. They don't talk about doing away with it, while they do about grants. The work ethic is very good. I get the feeling that they would rather have students work for an education than be given funds, unless the student is at the very bottom of the income scale. There are no guidelines on undergraduate-graduate proportions, but I really believe institutions must have the flexibility to use it in light of their needs. I see nothing in the literature which would show that Congress didn't intend Work-Study for graduate and professional students."

Despite the variety in interpretation, interest in using Work-Study at the graduate and professional level has grown rapidly in recent years, especially among private universities. In their 1976-77 applications for funds several private universities, including Brown, USC, Yale, Northwestern, Harvard and M.I.T., explained at some length their increased reliance on Work-Study for needy graduate and professional students.

CWSP Policy Making

Turning to the next question, how are university Work-Study award policies established? Who decides on behalf of the university how funds will be allocated and which students will receive them?

The literature which attempts to describe universities as organizations has viewed them from several different perspectives. Universities have been described as collegial communities operating by consensus, as political systems where policies are set by traditional political processes, and as large bureaucracies where individual bureaucrats make policy in light of their professional expertise. Universities even have been analyzed as "organized anarchies".

Most AAU universities seem to have implemented the College Work-Study program in near classic professional bureaucratic fashion. In most universities, professional student aid officers appear to set policy determining how the university's Work-Study funds will be allocated and which students will receive them. Implementation of the program seems to have been delegated in most universities almost entirely to student aid directors and their staffs. They have established the university's Work-Study policy, and they have done so, they report, relatively free from the influence of others, including university heads, senior administrators, deans, faculty and students. Working in light of their own professional expertise and personal educational philosophies, they have determined how funds will be allocated and whether individuals, or groups of students, including graduate and professional students, will be awarded Work-Study funds.

Despite the assurances presented by various higher education witnesses before Congressional committees over the years, the program seems to have been implemented by the professionals in most universities without the guidance of a broader institutional policy framework. In most universities, aid directors report that Work-Study award policy is established by informal groups of administrators, most members of which are identified as student aid staff. In nine universities, aid directors reported that policy is set by a formal university committee. During interviews, however, five explained that their committee has never discussed graduate student use of the program and instead has left this question to the aid officer.

Student aid directors and staff in both public and private universities frequently expressed uncertainty about the financial aid resources, programs and philosophies of their university's graduate and professional schools. Many aid officers reported little communication between their offices and the graduate and most professional schools. Several expressed a sense of wonderment at the rudimentary state of student financial aid administration in the graduate schools. (Parenthetically, it is interesting to note that this concern has also been expressed by the AAU graduate deans in a 1976 report to the heads of the

AAU universities, titled, "The Research Doctorate in the United States".)

One private university aid director assessed his university's general awareness of Work-Study in blunt terms:

"This university is typical. The graduate school is a lot of fiefdoms. The graduate office has no idea of graduate student needs, they just know they need money. They have no idea of what they could do. I am surprised at the ignorance of the graduate schools and their deans.

The Vice-President of Finance, Comptroller and Chancellors here, and at other universities I know, make a big deal of going after \$50,000, but the higher administration doesn't know the value of this program. They're good at speaking of indirect costs — they have that cold — but they ignore this. The university commitment is not there, the program and policy has percolated up from the financial aid office. Maybe that is because it is student aid, but we are not talking peanuts."

A public university aid director, who has a large graduate Work-Study program, explained quite a different situation:

"From the beginning of the program, the deans have known Work-Study is available. It is true down to the department levels; all of them are aware of it. Each year they want to know whether sufficient funds will be available. I inherited the policies of my predecessor who left several years ago. His advice to us was to use it for all students without distinction. I could not shift the university policy now if I wanted to because everyone is aware of it."

He also was concerned about the attitudes of his fellow aid officers.

"I have other financial aid colleagues who say they give no funds to graduate students. They don't want anything to do with graduate students. I don't know how they do that. It seems illegal to me. They probably include graduate students in their applications for aid. We have never hidden it here, but one way to avoid aiding graduate students is to keep deans, chairmen and others uninformed."

Interviews with school deans and faculty confirmed that many are either unaware of the program or feel that it is solely intended for undergraduates. On several occasions I was asked to begin a conversation by defining the Work-Study program and by describing its terms and conditions. One graduate dean in a public university which awards a very considerable amount of Work-Study money to graduate students responded typically:

"I can't tell you much about it. I'm not much aware of it. It is handled entirely from another office. I have no idea what the financial aid director uses to supplement our aid. I have never talked to him about it. If we are ranked so highly in the nation, our department chairman must be aware of it. I just wonder who provided the impetus. It just has not been a part of my life and I am really quite surprised."

Of course, not all deans are uninformed concerning the program. A public university graduate dean explained:

"I can't remember the policy ever being discussed since it was originally established. However, from the beginning of the program, graduate students were eligible and could participate in Work-Study. With the growth in graduate assistance for graduate students, I brought in an associate dean for financial aid who was a "hustler". He got out there and scrambled for funds. We wanted our cut of Work-Study too."

Then he added, "I have argued with several graduate deans about this who told me that graduate students were not eligible for Work-Study. They have been told by their aid officers that graduates are not eligible. In fact, one argued with me that it was illegal to give Work-Study to graduate students."

It is also significant to note that 31 of 45 graduate school catalogs reviewed did not identify Work-Study as a source of graduate student aid.

The explanation for this diversity of experience seems to include at least these factors:

First, until recent years many universities simply did not need Work-Study funds at the graduate and professional levels. The traditional and more prestigious forms of aid, fellowships and traineeships, were readily available and many departments provided full support for all students admitted. Some could afford to actively discourage the use of other funds. This has been particularly true in the sciences. But times have changed and some institutional and faculty attitudes and philosophies concerning graduate student support are changing out of necessity.

The explanation also stems from each university's definition of the role and responsibilities of its student aid office. Some aid directors have been formally assigned, or at least tend to perceive their role as servant, exclusively or predominantly, to undergraduates. Following what some refer to as a "first degree" philosophy, some aid directors serve graduate and professional students on an exception basis only, or for limited purposes such as certification of guaranteed student loan applications. Some tend to assume that graduate and professional schools adequately provide for their students, and that as recipients of one degree these students should not need further aid. Many graduate and professional schools simply have not challenged such assumptions, and communication between them and their university aid office frequently seems constricted at best. Conflicting, foreign worlds frequently seems an apt characterization for the relationship.

Work-Study as Graduate Student Support

Despite the dramatic differences in their policies and programs, the student aid directors and graduate and professional school deans with whom I talked, are virtually unanimous in the opinion that the Work-Study program could function very well for graduate and professional students. Thirty-one of the 48 aid directors favored an increase in the use of Work-Study at the graduate and professional levels; 11, including some who already administer large graduate programs, opposed an increase and six public and one private aid director professed indifference. Many of those who supported an increased graduate pro-

gram, however, stressed that additional funds would be required. They emphasized that they would resist vigorously attempts to shift funds from undergraduate to graduate students.

During the 1975 House hearings some witnesses were concerned that the provision requiring support of those students who demonstrate "the greatest financial need" might transform Work-Study into a predominantly graduate and professional aid program. A majority of aid directors, however, disagreed with that interpretation.

Many also feel that the program works better at the graduate level. Graduate and professional students reportedly hold Work-Study jobs which are closely related to their academic programs much more frequently than do undergraduates, primarily because they are more highly skilled. Contrary to some expectations, graduate and professional students also work longer hours. In almost all universities they reportedly worked about 15 hours per week, two or three hours per week more than undergraduates.

Some preliminary conclusions also were possible with regard to the distribution of Work-Study graduate and professional students by field and school. Graduate students, although frequently in small numbers in 1974-75, were aided with Work-Study funds in virtually all disciplines and at all program levels, from first year of studies through the dissertation year. It is not surprising that over 60% of the graduate students reported were pursuing humanities and social science programs where funds are especially scarce. Many fewer students were reported in the relatively more affluent biological and physical sciences.

Among the professions 39% of the students reported by 16 private universities, and 27% reported by 16 public universities, were law students. One aid director typically explained the aggressiveness of law students and their schools. He said, "It is a rare week that I'm not threatened by a law student with a law suit over his Work-Study money."

The number of professional school students aided is still low, but it could be prophetic to note that some universities such as Columbia, Indiana and Iowa, in 1974-75, supported students in several professional schools including medicine, dentistry, nursing, engineering, education, business administration, social work, allied health, optometry and others. Provided sufficient funds are available, the trend in many universities, particularly private universities, is clearly toward rapid, substantial expansion in both graduate and professional schools.

Conclusions

There are two points to be made in conclusion: the first concerns the universities, and the second, the Congress.

The diversity in Work-Study programs, policies and practices among the universities should surprise no one who is reasonably familiar with universities as organizations. Only the utopians still really believe that all important institutional policies are established by collegial consensus. And most also know from experience what influence academic politics can have on the development of programs, schools and institutions. But the routine decisions made by individual professional administrators also are very important, and they have escaped

thoughtful attention and analysis. It would be more cumbersome, but perhaps it also would be more precise to suggest that we begin to think theoretically and analytically of universities as "large, complex, highly decentralized organizations of academic *and* administrative professionals". It is the professional autonomy of expert administrators which shapes so many of the university's internal policies, and many of the policies of the national higher education associations. Left on their own, with inadequate program guidance from federal program officers — and there seems to be general agreement on that point — and with little or no overarching institutional policy to guide them, many, perhaps most student aid directors necessarily have formulated their own formal or informal policy to administer the program. This is not objectionable. It is unavoidable. The student aid profession and the major institutional associations have long defended institutional and professional discretion to the Congress.

But there does seem to be, in many of the nation's leading universities, an unusual, and perhaps imprudent informality in the policy structure. The report of the Association of Graduate Schools described the situation this way:

"Given that support for graduate students springs from so many different rationales, serves so many different functions, and is distributed within universities with so little coherent policy, it is not surprising that on occasion the fundamental purpose of it all gets lost. The cumulative effect of these diverse practices is in many universities a non-system of student support that can be justified only on the grounds that it exists."

In these days of heightened sensitivity to the need to be accountable for public funds and to consumer interests, one wonders how well current university policies and practices would fare if they were subjected to scrutiny of Congressional committees or the Government Accounting Office. Additional legislation or regulations governing the administration of the Work-Study or other aid programs are not, or should not, be necessary. But, if institutions do not pay more careful attention to these policies and their implications, they may invite a Congressional reassessment of the concept of professional discretion and institutionally based program administration.

The AAU Graduate deans have offered a reasonable suggestion:

"Our general judgment is that every university should keep a careful eye on its student support policies, and that a strong case can be made for exploring in detail the relevance of financial need to every form of aid. We recommend that all universities put together a financial aid package that is consistent with the kinds of support available, and with the student's financial need and personal circumstances as well as their scholastic ability and career goals. Under such an arrangement the extent to which need affects the amount and kind of financial aid will continue to vary widely from field to field and university to university. This is not objectionable. What matters is that financial aid decisions be based on reasonable criteria consistently applied within each institution;

All in all graduate support policies would be more logical, equitable and economical if there were a greater degree of institutional awareness, and prompt attention to correct anomalies. This requires a central mechanism

with university wide authority to review current practice, consider the underlying issues, and make generally binding decisions. The capacity of some institutions to define and administer student support policies is weak."

Such strong university-wide mechanisms are necessary if a sense of order is to be imposed on university aid policies and programs. Otherwise the programs will continue to be vulnerable to attack by students, particularly graduate and professional students, and perhaps by the Congress.

This leads to a concluding point: If Congress were now to debate whether to make graduate and professional students eligible for the Work-Study program, I expect there might very well be a different outcome. Interviews with several key House and Senate committee staff members left the unmistakable impression that, if given the opportunity, some now would flatly oppose the award of Work-Study funds to graduate and professional students. Others would be cautious at best. A key House committee staffer summed it up.

"Graduate education has just not been a matter of concern over the last six to seven years. The members are not aware of graduate and professional education. Congressional attitudes are conditioned by what they hear in their districts and they don't hear much from graduate students. They, therefore, don't sense a great crying need out there for more funds, including Work-Study funds, for graduate students. If Work-Study funds shifted out of some states to others with greater graduate student enrollments, or if it were claimed that undergraduate needs weren't being met, a political issue would arise. Proceed cautiously."

Another staff member said graduate education is frequently described by members and staff as "removed, esoteric, foolish and unimportant." It is, in his opinion, particularly subject to harsh attacks on the House and Senate floors. Therefore, if given the opportunity he would advocate Work-Study aid for graduate and professional students only in selected and highly focused manpower shortage areas.

Not all staffers, however, held that view. One influential staffer said: "I would be interested to know if universities with unmet graduate need are returning Work-Study unspent. If so, we should kick some butts."

Political support for Work-Study as a graduate and professional aid program has been diminished by the generally unfavorable Congressional mood regarding Federal support for graduate students. But, as one staff member pointed out. "Legislatively, Work-Study for graduate students is a dead issue. The law is written to allow institutions to do it and they may do so — provided others don't begin to complain that poor kids are losing Work-Study funds to rich graduate students."

The task ahead for universities is to inform their Congressmen and Senators, and particularly those members of the authorizing and appropriations committees, of the continuing value of Work-Study for undergraduates and of the growing need and potential among graduate and professional students. It is a story which remains to be told effectively to the Congress. Most members of Con-

gress have been elected since Work-Study was established. Over half the members of Congress have been there six years or less. Few know the program's history. The only members to hear direct testimony on the graduate and professional aspects of the program, Congressmen O'Hara and Dellenback, have left the Congress. If Congressional champions are not found, the graduate and professional dimensions of Work-Study could be endangered precisely at the time of their greatest promise.