

T2.14

67/14

C

NATIONAL STUDENT RELOCATION COUNCIL

*new set up
of NSR Council*

WHAT IS THE NATIONAL STUDENT RELOCATION COUNCIL?

M A number of organizations last spring began the work of finding college opportunities for students now in Assembly and Relocation Centers. In order to make this work more effective the War Relocation Authority, with the hearty approval of Assistant Secretary of War, John J. McCloy, requested Clarence Pickett, Executive Secretary of the American Friends Service Committee (Quakers) to form a Council of distinguished educators which would bring together those persons and agencies who had been working on the problem. In response to this request, educators, representatives of organizations dealing with student placement, and officials from the interested government agencies met in Chicago on May 29. This group established the National Student Relocation Council, of which Dr. Robbins W. Barston, President of the Hartford Seminary Foundation, has been named National Director.

All the groups which have been aiding in student relocation were asked to join in the work of the new organization. In particular the agencies already active in the West have been asked to form the West Coast Committee of the National Student Relocation Council. Joseph Conard, who is the Executive Secretary of this Committee was formerly Executive Secretary of the Student Relocation Committee.

WHAT IS THE WORK OF THE NATIONAL STUDENT RELOCATION COUNCIL?

The national office of the Council in Philadelphia will approach Midwestern and Eastern colleges and universities to find openings for student placement. In addition it will attempt to raise scholarship funds.

The West Coast Committee will assemble information concerning all students who planned to attend college or university during 1942-43 or those who, because of changed conditions, now wish to do so.

HOW WILL STUDENTS BE SELECTED?

The first step in the West Coast program is the distribution of questionnaires. The National Student Relocation Council hopes, through these questionnaires, to form as complete a picture as possible of student needs and desires on the college or graduate school level. It is therefore important that all students who are eligible for college or graduate school answer this questionnaire even though they may not wish or be able to continue their education this fall, and even though many may have already answered other questionnaires.

Representatives of the National Student Relocation Council will bring the questionnaires to each Center, explain them, and work out plans for distributing them. The method of distribution and collection will differ in the various Centers, but in each Center arrangements will be made for returning the completed questionnaires to the nearest office of the National Student Relocation Council.

Students who are not living in Centers may apply by mail to Joseph Conard, National Student Relocation Council, Union Street at Allston Way, Berkeley, California, for questionnaires and should return them, filled out in triplicate, to the same office.

When the questionnaires, together with college and high school transcripts and letters of reference, have been assembled, a committee of college deans, registrars, and student counselors will carefully study these records and recommend the students who seem best fitted for placement. The selection will be based on scholarship and qualities of character, adaptability, and leadership. The Counselors may wish to hold interviews with students as a supplement to the written record.

TO WHAT COLLEGES CAN STUDENTS GO?

While the information concerning individual students is being collected and studied in the West the Council Staff in the East will be seeking college openings. There are limitations of time and circumstances upon the program of student relocation and it is not yet certain what colleges can offer placement. Within the limit of the possibilities, the Council will try to find openings for students in the kinds of institutions they most desire.

HOW WILL COLLEGE EXPENSES BE MET?

It is too soon to determine the amount of scholarship aid that will be available to students this fall. It is important therefore that students who can pay all or part of their expenses for study and travel to the East should do so. The Council will assemble all possible aid for those who cannot meet their own expenses. A number of colleges will offer opportunities for students to help pay their expenses by part-time work.

CAN THE COUNCIL HELP STUDENTS AFTER THEY REACH COLLEGE?

The Council will consult in advance with the colleges to which students go as to satisfactory living arrangements. Student associations and other groups connected with the Council will help the students after their arrival to find friendly contacts in their new college communities.

WILL STUDENT RELOCATION BE POSSIBLE AFTER THE FALL TERM?

It is hoped that some of the students now wishing to attend college who cannot find placements in the fall of 1942 will be able to enter at the beginning of subsequent terms. The Council plans to continue its program as long as it can be effective.

NATIONAL STUDENT RELOCATION COUNCIL

WEST COAST OFFICE

Union Street at Allston Way

Berkeley, California

File 5/17

NATIONAL JAPANESE AMERICAN STUDENT RELOCATION COUNCIL

AMERICAN FRIENDS SERVICE COMMITTEE
20 S. TWELFTH ST., PHILADELPHIA, PA.

RITenhouse 9372

Chairman
JOHN W. NASON

Executive Secretary
CLARENCE E. PICKETT

Director
ROBBINS W. BARSTOW

A STATEMENT REGARDING PROGRAM AND PROCEDURE

THE NATIONAL JAPANESE AMERICAN STUDENT RELOCATION COUNCIL is a non-governmental agency organized at the request of the War Relocation Authority, and working under its general oversight, to deal with the special problem of relocating in approved colleges and universities, American-born Japanese students affected by the evacuation of all Japanese from West Coast Defense areas. The Council and its program have the endorsement and cooperation of the War Department and the United States Office of Education, as well as of the War Relocation Authority.

SERVING ON ITS EXECUTIVE OR REGIONAL COMMITTEES are such leading educators as President Sproul of the University of California and Vice-President Deutsch; Chancellor Wilbur of Stanford University; President Sieg of the University of Washington; Father Dunne, President of the University of San Francisco; President Bird of Occidental College; President Mendenhall of Whittier College; Dean DeVoss of San Jose State College; Dean Baker of Fresno State College; Dean Odgers of Mulnomah College; Dean Onthank of the University of Oregon; President Nason of Swarthmore College; President Davidson of Knox College; President Sills of Bowdoin College; Dean Ackerman of Columbia University; Dr. Zook, President of the American Council of Education; Dr. Snaveley, Executive Secretary of the Association of American Colleges; and many others.

THE COUNCIL IS SECURING FULL PERSONAL DATA concerning approximately two thousand individual students in the college group, and is working with the institutions of their former enrollment to secure transcripts and appraisals to serve as a basis of recommendation for their relocation.

A SPECIAL COMMITTEE OF EXPERTS in college administration and counselling is volunteering its services in the study and rating of this vast amount of data. Among those who are helping in this important work are Dean Hoyt of the University of California; Dean Corson of the College of the Pacific; Dean Baker of Fresno State College; Dean Homan of San Francisco State College; Dr. Eckert of Stockton Junior College; Emeritus Dean Stebbins of the University of California; Dean DeVoss of San Jose State College; Dr. Marian Brown, Dean of the University High School, Oakland; Dr. Catherine Greene of the University of California; Miss Margaret Cosgrave, Registrar of Fresno State College; Dean Voorhies of the University of California; and others of like high competence.

THE PROCESS OF RECOMMENDATION for student relocation involves several significant factors. Because it may be impossible to make the desired adjustments for all eligible students, first consideration is being given only to those in the upper brackets, scholastically, except in cases where students have already been admitted to some receiving college and have adequate funds to preclude need of scholarship aid from the Council. Each record is studied with a view to the relative importance of the completion of an academic program for the particular individual. The analysis includes such matters as professional goal, service to the Japanese community, maturity of character, evidence of successful Caucasian contacts, special interests or talents, etc., etc.

UPON THE BASIS OF THIS ANALYSIS, plus personal interviews, the placement committee will then recommend particular students to particular colleges which have evidenced their willingness to consider such enrollment. In each case, the college will be given the full data upon which the recommendation is based. Because of the complexity of the problem, and the time involved, the Council hopes that the receiving colleges will make prompt decisions on the recommendations of the placement committee, even, if necessary, waiving customary routines in order to expedite enrollment.

AFTER A STUDENT HAS BEEN TENTATIVELY ACCEPTED by a college, and financial adequacy is assured, the proposed enrollment will then be submitted to the government agencies that may be designated to handle this aspect of the total task, for investigation as to the loyalty of the student and the appropriateness of the college placement. If everything is deemed satisfactory, a certification of release will be issued to the student, who will then be permitted to leave his Center and proceed to the college or university designated, to continue his studies. Notification will also be sent to the receiving institution that the enrollment is approved by the government, together with any necessary instructions as to the circumstances of the enrollment and the status of the student.

WHEN ONCE ENROLLED AS ABOVE, the relationship between the student and the college will be normal in every way, subject only to such regulations as the government may require in special cases. The relocated student is to be considered as a regular member of the campus and the community.

THE NATIONAL JAPANESE AMERICAN STUDENT RELOCATION COUNCIL seeks the full cooperation of all collegiate institutions, universities, graduate and professional schools, in making possible for as many of these students as may be, the continuance of their education for citizenship and useful community service. In this situation we find an exceptional opportunity to demonstrate the good-will, the sense of justice, the respect for personality, and the recognition of character and achievement that are inherent in all our best traditions of American Democracy.

August 11, 1942

Robbins W. Barstow, Director

This statement has the approval of

THE WAR RELOCATION AUTHORITY

by Dillon S. Myer, Director

THE UNITED STATES OFFICE OF EDUCATION

by John W. Studebaker, Commissioner

THE WAR DEPARTMENT

by John J. McCloy, Ass't Sec'y of War

THE WARTIME CIVIL CONTROL ADM.

by Col. Karl R. Bendetsen

*Office
Copy* *can
keep
duplicate*

PROCEDURE FOR ANALYSIS OF STUDENT QUALIFICATIONS.

This is a suggested plan for the analysis and appraisal of student applications by a composite rating that will be an attempt to reduce to a numerical figure selected points of ability on the part of the applicant, and thus provide a means of roughly sorting students in the order of preference so far as the items considered in this rating are concerned. It is to be emphasized that this is an approximation in order to give a general ordering of students according to promise, but that all final decisions should be checked against the individual record to be sure that points not adequately considered in the mathematical figure can be taken into account.

We recommend that every student whose application is analyzed be given a "rating" according to each of two types of promise, "scholarship" and "personal factors", and that in addition to these two figures, there should be a composite rating which combines them. The detailed method of analysis appears below. In general, it is believed that this method will make selection easy for the majority of students to be accepted. Thus, if there are fifty openings, the first forty in our composite scale would presumably be fairly clear cases, and particularly careful study would only need to be made to see which of the next twenty deserve the ten extra places available. It is suggested that analysis should be made for all citizen students (whether Kibei or not) in the active file after preliminary sifting. This would include:

1. All A and B students, both those just graduating from high school and those who have previously attended college.

2. All C students who can financially support themselves without help from the Student Relocation Council, except where there may be some important reason to the contrary.

3. Any C students who, though needing financial help, deserve consideration for any particular reason.

Analysis should not be made unless the transcript and at least two references are available, together with the student application.

It is suggested that wherever possible two analysts make independent studies of student applications and record their suggested "ratings" separately. These two may then meet together if they wish, in order to compromise whatever differences there may be in judgments formed, and wherever they cannot fully agree, a third judgment should be sought.

Analysts should be persons with extensive educational experience, and preferably with college admissions experience. At least one member of each team should have experience in college admissions or scholarship work.

It is suggested that analysts fill out student record cards for the applicants they appraise. This may be done partly in advance by clerks if that seems best to the analysts involved, but those who met together in Berkeley felt that the analysts would benefit materially from having to fill out the entire card. Yellow Cards will be used for all high school graduates not having entered college, salmon-colored cards for undergraduate students who have previously entered college, and green or blue cards for graduate students.

Each office may determine how many personal interviews should be held between applicants and analysts. The Berkeley committee feels increasingly that there would be material danger of misunderstandings within the Centers if many but not all persons are interviewed. Berkeley analysts also felt that there was serious danger of misjudging students by interviews conducted at a time like this. The Los Angeles committee on the other hand feels strongly that every student recommended for placement should be interviewed at least long enough to discover whether there is any important factor which should preclude recommending a student to the college and which might not show up without an interview. It is suggested that each area office proceed as it thinks best on the question of interviews and share what it learns with the other offices.

Before proceeding with a detailed description of the method of analysis, it should be stated that hosts of very able and experienced educators have been consulted in developing this recommendation. It is certainly recognized that there will be good arguments against any suggestion made and the proposals which follow grow out of the careful study and rejection of many alternative methods which have been recommended.

Scholarship Rating:

It is suggested that all grade point systems be reduced to the following method which has been in most general use and happens to be that of the University of California: A--three points per unit; B--two points per unit; C--one point per unit; D--0 points per unit; conditions or failures received prior to August, 1941, minus one point per unit; all conditions or failures received subsequent to that date do not involve loss of grade points. The total grade points are divided by the total units attempted, and the result is the "Grade Point Average". For example, a G.P.A. of 1 indicates a "C" average, 2 indicates a "B" average, 3 an "A" average. The disadvantages of this proposal are clear, but since a great many

university students, virtually all junior college students and many others are being appraised by these standards already, it seemed sensible to follow this procedure.

From the "grade points" given by the above method, scholarship rating for students may be mathematically deduced as follows:

<u>Grade Point Average</u>	<u>Scholarship Rating</u>	<u>Grade Point Average</u>	<u>Scholarship Rating</u>
3.0	9.5	1.9	8.4
2.9	9.4	1.8	8.3
2.8	9.3	1.7	8.2
2.7	9.2	1.6	8.1
2.6	9.1	1.5	8.0
2.5	9.0	1.4	7.9
2.4	8.9	1.3	7.8
2.3	8.8	1.2	7.7
2.2	8.7	1.1	7.6
2.1	8.6	1.0	7.5
2.0	8.5	etc. to 0.0	6.5

No allowance is made in this rating for trend or for the schools attended, some of which admittedly have higher standards than others. Such points should be brought out under "remarks". They are too complex to include in ratings (e.g. trend may be down because the student has taken much harder subjects in his last years, or because he has had to earn his living the last time, etc. Furthermore, the difficulties of December 7th may affect trends in ways which should not be too seriously counted against the students involved.)

Personal Factor Rating:

The general principle is simple. By personal factors is meant the sum-total of all the elements that enter into personality and adaptability and general promise where not related to scholastic ability. This includes the capacity of the student to make a good impression and also his capacity to wear well over a period of time. Maturity, self-reliance, adaptability are

important. Reliability, diligence, special interests, leadership, evidence of successful Caucasian contacts and contribution to the Japanese community are all important. "Ratings" given according to the various subjective judgments of "personal factors" follow: "Outstanding"--10; "Superior"--9; "Average"--8; "Below average"--6.

Notice that "7" is not listed here. Thus the student rating drops fairly fast if he is rated as "below average". Raters may use decimals here as in the scholarship rating to show judgment between points defined.

Composite Rating:

The composite rating is computed mathematically from the other two ratings. Multiply the scholastic rating by 3; multiply the personal factor rating by 2; add these products. Thus the student with a B average and a superior personal factors rating would have a rating of 43.5 (2.0 grade average gives scholarship rating of 8.5; superior personal factors gives 9.0 rating for that; 3×8.5 plus 2×9 equals 25.5 plus 18 equals 43.5). Student with straight A average and only average personal factor rating would have a rating of 44.5, and would be favored over the other so far as composite rating is concerned, whereas a straight A student with a personal factor rating definitely below average would receive only 40.5. In all cases selections will be only guided, not fully determined, by the mathematical rating.

It may seem to many that in view of the particular problems relating to successful placement of Japanese Americans, "personal factors" should receive a heavier weight than suggested above. This matter has been carefully considered and the proposals given here are based on several considerations, including the following:

1. In a great many cases information will be inadequate to make a very confident judgment of just what should be the "personal factor" rating

of a student. As opposed to this, the scholarship rating is more clear-cut and certain.

2. In order adequately to safeguard ourselves against undue placement of students whose personal factor is definitely unfavorable, the rating itself for any student whose personal factors are regarded as "below average" drops to 6 instead of to 7. This is, of course, equivalent to giving a very important weight to "personal factors" at the point where this quality may be critical.

3. Receiving colleges themselves are in the habit of giving major importance to scholastic achievement and will probably continue to do so in their own judgments of applicants.

4. The Student Relocation program is much like the usual competition for scholarship aid, and giving first place to scholastic achievement is sound, is the common practice, and the practice most likely to be acceptable to all concerned--student, college, and general public.

dupl call

NATIONAL STUDENT RELOCATION COUNCIL- WEST COAST AREA
2538 Channing Way, Berkeley, California

July 8, 1942

SUGGESTIONS FOR A COVER LETTER TO ACCOMPANY PLANS FOR A COMPOSITE RATING

A suggested plan for a composite rating for application blanks submitted to this Committee accompanies this letter. It seems advisable to explain the use of this rating by the local groups.

The composite rating attempts to reduce to a numerical figure selected points of ability on the part of the applicant and combine these figures in such a way as to indicate roughly the applicant's position on the composite scale. It is to be emphasized that this is an approximation of his position and final decisions should be checked against the chart and the individual record to be sure that other points, which would make the composite rating too complex, have not been overlooked.

It is suggested that this rating be applied to the applicants by college classes. That is, group all graduate students and their composite ratings then be compared, and similarly for Senior, Junior, Sophomore, Freshmen, and High School Senior students.

A general composite rating is contemplated, made up of a figure representing the scholastic average, a figure representing the importance of the professional goal, and the best possible estimate that can be made from material available as to adaptability of the applicant.

The Committee put a value of 100 as the top value on the scholastic average. A top figure of 20 on the professional goal, and a top figure of 30 on adaptability, representing their opinion of the relative importance of the three factors. It was expected that the scholastic average figure would be arrived at by considering that a student with a straight A record or a 3.0 grade point average would be given 95 points. 2.9 grade point average would be 94, and so on.

In other words, the top figure for scholastic average for any institution that calculates on the basis of grade points would be 95 rather than 100.

It was suggested that the professional goal be rated in the following manner: 20 points would be given for a goal in certain restricted fields which had direct significance for the work of community life in the Japanese Centers or which would fit the student applicant for positions if they were attainable outside the Japanese Centers which would release members of other races for work directly connected with the war effort. Suggested professions of this sort are, of course, nursing, medicine, the immediately important sciences, engineering, lab. technician work, pharmacy, optometry, social welfare (this is not considered to be an all inclusive list). 10 points would be given for other definite professional goals less directly connected with the war effort. Teaching of any sort is an excellent illustration. 5 points were suggested for an applicant whose object in further education was not clearly defined.

As to the rating for adaptability, it was suggested that four points be considered:

1. Maturity.
2. Evidence of successful Caucasian contact.
3. Special interests such as music, journalism, drama, athletics.
4. Reliability.

Top figure for each of these four points would be 7.5. It was hoped that the reference letters and the application blanks would provide majority of material upon which this rating would be judged. It was suggested in each case that where there is no definite evidence of a lack of one of these points such a figure as 3 or 4 be added in so that a zero rating on reliability means a clear indication of the absence of reliability, a 7.5 rating means a definite indication of reliability, a rating of 3 means simply that reliability can be assured.

A composite rating reporting the financial position is suggested which totals 100. 49 points being assigned for the possession of special work skills which will make it possible for the student to earn a major portion of his way at

relatively high rates of pay. Any rating committee can work out rough lists of occupations in which the students are prepared to do will be covered. The object of this figure is to give the student who has full secretarial training a high rating, higher than the student who is only prepared to sit with children in the evening.

A difficult rating to apply is that reporting the student's financial position as portrayed by funds which he has himself or can borrow himself directly. Here it is suggested that an absolute basis be used, e.g., that the availability of \$600.00* be rated as (or anything over that)* 60, \$500. as 50, and so on.

A student in the most advantageous position would have a financial composite of 100, and in the most advantageous position possible as to desirability would have a general composite rating of 145. There is no intention that these two figures combined shall be used to limit the choice of students suggested to the Eastern institutions. The financial composite rating is intended to assist in the practical matching of students who are desirable on the basis of the general composite rating with positions that are available particularly when scholarship funds are not also available.

SUBMITTED BY MRS. GREEN for that COMMITTEE

Roberts
King
Scardigli
Stevens
Stephenson

} all have copies.

PROCEDURES FROM START TO FINISH

<u>Procedure</u>	<u>Department</u>	<u>Staff & Cost</u>	<u>Time</u>
I. Questionnaire arrives: (Form #1)	<i>Records</i>		
A. Check all new questionnaires with index card file.			
B. Listed in Chronological Book (Book #1).			
C. Make and file 2 cards: one in alphabetical file and one in center file.			
D. Separate questionnaires, numbering them I, II, III.			
1. Put questionnaires, number II and III, in transcript box with route slip (Form #2) clipped to questionnaire on folded edge just below name of the high school. <u>Mark on the route slip each subsequent step as it is taken in the following procedure:</u>			
2. Put questionnaire number I in untouchables, after making necessary tabulations or marking questionnaire number on list of those not tabulated.			
3. Make out student card for denominational file. (Form #3)			
E. Make student folder. (Tab colored appropriately to educational status).			
F. Letters sent requesting transcripts from all schools attended.			
1. Form #4 and general recommendation from school or college (Form #5) with Form #6 to newly approached schools.			
2. Pencil check on questionnaire names of schools from which transcripts are requested, and appropriately mark route slip.			

<u>Procedure</u>	<u>Department</u>	<u>Staff & Cost</u>	<u>Time</u>
------------------	-------------------	-------------------------	-------------

G. Letters sent to references
(Form #7)

1. Check questionnaire for completeness of reference names given. If necessary send to student for further information.

H. Letter sent to work reference
(Form #8) on questionnaire.

1. Pencil check all names from which references are requested again marking route slip.

I. Separation of "postponed" cases:

1. Issei
2. Kibei
3. Voluntarily postponed

J. File folders:

1. Postponed folders in "postponed" box, making proper notation on index card.
2. Regular folders in incomplete file.

II. Transcript arrives from school
(3 copies)

- A. File two copies in folder, with notation that other is out for checking.
- B. Send other transcript to be checked for grade-point average, listing by name under name of checker in Book #2.
- C. If only 1 transcript arrives, send Form #4 again to the school, requesting 2 additional copies (~~see~~ *also* Form 4 *to*)

Records

Procedure

Department

Staff & Cost

Time

III. References arrive:

Records

- A. Reference reviewed for adequacy, checking with green pencil the name listed on the questionnaire.
- B. If inadequate, another reference sought.
- C. Reference filed in student folder, checking to see if all necessary transcripts are back from checkers, which would make the folder complete.
- D. If transcripts back, send the necessary data to analyst.

Process follows:

1. Take questionnaire number III, turn right side out; put number on upper right hand corner, stapling in upper right hand corner of page 3, the data in order, including yellow slip with grade point average.
Order of data from bottom up, as follows: References, letters from student, replies from us, high school transcript, junior college transcript, our yellow *college transcript* slip.
2. Clip with paper-clip the unfilled student card for analyst. (~~Form~~ *Form 3*)
3. List reference letters, and clip this list to student questionnaire and route slip.
4. List the folder thus prepared in Book #2 in numerical order recording name of analyst and date sent; sending about 15 at a time to an analyst.
5. Mail with copy of analyzing procedure. (Form #10)
6. The student folder and index card are each marked with a circle (O) indicating the folder is complete; the student folder is filed in pending file awaiting return of material from analyst.

Procedure

Department

Staff & Costs

Time

4

IV. Transcript arrives from checker

- A. File in folder, clipping three transcripts together with the slip indicating grade point average.
- B. If one reference and necessary other transcripts on hand, send to analyst (see III D above).

Records

V. Folder arrives from first analyst

- A. Check return in Book #2, left side of student number.
- B. Go to second analyst with blank student card.
- C. First analyst's students' cards are placed together in back of numerical card file box, unfiled.

Records

VI. Folder comes back from second analyst

- A. Check return in Book #2, right side of student number.
- B. Student card paired with card from first analyst, average of composite rating and of personality rating recorded in both cards.
- C. One card filed in numerical card file, the more completely filled-out card filed in composite rating file.
 - 1. Note: Cards in composite rating file are segregated into the 3 coastal areas.
- D. Analyst folder filed in student folder in regular files.
- E. When student is in category being matched, folder goes directly to matchers with card from composite rating box, checking on index card to show date and location of folder.

Records

*Records to
Matchers*

VII. Miscellaneous department procedures:

Records

- A. When folders borrowed by Release Department or matchers, record is kept (with date) on alphabetical index card.
- B. When folders returned from above, date of return indicated on alphabetical index card.
- C. When folder borrowed by any one else, "out cards" are made.
- D. When a folder which is in Matching Department is requested by Release Department, a list is given to matcher (Ada) on blue card of name and number, and student card and folder come to Records Department. Notation is made on student card of where the student is accepted and if the acceptance is a result of the student's initiative, the card is filed back of "Accepted T.K.". If a result of the matching procedure, the card is filed back of "Accepted by Matching". The folder is then checked out to the Release Department with proper notations on the index card.
- E. When folders are returned from matchers after having been recommended to but not accepted at some college, the student card is placed in the pending file and the folder is filed in the completed file.

<u>Procedure</u>	<u>Department</u>	<u>Staff & Cost</u>	<u>Time</u>
VIII. When College is cleared by Washington: Information goes to Release Department; if all papers are ready, permit is requested for students accepted there. Next, information to Matching Department.	<i>Release</i>		
IX. When it is decided to match a group of students:			
A. Description of the group is given to Records Department (e.g. "upper 10% by composite rating"). Records Department takes out these folders, recording on alphabetical index card.	<i>Records</i>		
B. Records of <u>students</u> (folder and card) are examined for all data pertinent to college selections, and notations made on route slip.	<i>Matching</i>	<i>Wyman</i>	
C. Where necessary material is lacking, Record Department is asked to secure same.	<i>Records (by Matching)</i>		
D. A college is recommended in the light of student preference, money available, courses desired, colleges willing to take students, status of quota, Washington clearances, etc. Constant check on scholarship fund to be sure not to recommend too many unfinancable students.	<i>Matching</i>	<i>Scardigli</i>	
E. Letter is then written to college, including appropriate community acceptance request. (Form #11)	<i>Matching</i>	<i>Scardigli</i>	
F. Letter, written, is given final check (including check with Release Department re other possible college acceptances), and material enclosed; sent to college with letter from Conard (Form #12) and pamphlet (Form 12 b). Notation made on folder indicating where material sent: folder goes to post-matcher.	<i>Matching</i>	<i>Wyman</i>	
G. Letter (Form #13) sent to student at once with Form #14.	<i>Matching</i>	<i>Wardlaw</i>	
H. Folder and card are filed in Records Department.	<i>Records (from Matching)</i>		

<u>Procedure</u>	<u>Department</u>	<u>Staff & Cost</u>	<u>Time</u>
X. When reply comes from college re acceptance of a student, or when student sends same, it goes to Release Department.			
A. Where community acceptance applies to other students, proper action taken (see below).	Release Dept.		
B. Where community acceptance is lacking, it is sought.	Release Dept.		
C. Where student funds adequate, Release Department keeps folder for action. (see F or G below).			
D. Letter goes to post-matching			
E. Notice sent to Matching Department describing College acceptance or rejection of students.	Release to Matching	Wardlaw	
F. If college reply is favorable:			
1. If college not yet approved, put on list to notify Washington when fifteen accumulate.	Release	Wardlaw	
2. If letter 13 had not been sent for securing student documents, and if we matched student, letter 15 should go to student with form 14. (Required documents). Adapt letter if college not approved.	Release	Wardlaw	
3. If student had secured his own acceptance, Form #14 is sent with covering letter where needed.	Release Dept.	Wardlaw to King (Picketts)	
4. Student records are examined, recommendation made for scholarship allotment if needed and desirable; if recommendation is to finance student, letter #16 is filled and sent to college expert for approval to mail to college; then typed, mailed; carbons to Post-Matcher and student folder.	Financial Aid	Ken Stevens	
4.5. If funds not needed, folder goes to Release Dept.	Financial Aid to Release		

ProcedureDepartmentStaff & CostTime

X. (Continued)

F. (Continued)

5. Letter seeking board and room opportunity *is sent if needed and desirable.* *Financial Aid*
6. Where funds ^{needed but} not recommended, letter to student indicating situation; *Financial Aid*
(Form #17) same to college
(Form #18)
7. Form #19 for Dean Stebbins, indicating allotment promised in letter to college, is filled out. *Financial Aid*
8. Chart showing daily balance in scholarship account is marked to show allotment. *Financial Aid*
9. Student file goes to Release Department files. *Fin. Aid to Release*
10. Letter from college copied for each student and for Scardigli. *Financial Aid*
- G. If college reply is unfavorable: Student folder returns to matchers with letter from college for recommendations to another college. *Release to Matching*

XI. When community acceptance comes:

- A. Goes to Release Department
- B. Indicated in community acceptance folder. *Release Dept.*
- C. Permit requested for any students thereby able to leave. *Release Dept.*

XII. When student documents arrive, they go to Release Department:

- A. If inadequate, more requested *Release*
- B. If adequate, and if other matters satisfactory: *Release*
 1. Permit request is prepared for Whitcomb (Forms #19b, 19c)

<u>Procedure</u>	<u>Department</u>	<u>Staff & Cost</u>	<u>Time</u>
XII. (Continued)			
B. (continued)			
2. Student is notified with Form #20 (including college sponsor). Let us know arrival.	Release		
3. College is notified of permit request. Probable date of arrival (Form #20b) Approval from Washington Student will need help registering, having no catalogues.	Release		
C. If documents adequate, but funds lacking:			
1. Allocation of our funds made precisely.	Financial Aid		
2. Our pledge of funds is typed for WCCA, carbons to student file, donor, National office of student Relocation Council, and Financial Aid File	Financial Aid		
3. Letter #21 is sent to student, together with letter #20.	Financial Aid		
4. Allotment is indicated on chart showing scholarship account.	Financial Aid		
XIII. When travel permit granted:			
A. Notice sent to Scholarship Department. <i>Financial Aid</i>			
B. Check for travel sent if student needs this.	Financial Aid		
C. Notice sent Philadelphia of other payments due.	Financial Aid		
D. Report (Form #22) is prepared for Friends in Community Good References Former School or College Philadelphia office Donor, if any Inquirers	Post Release		

<u>Procedure</u>	<u>Department</u>	<u>Staff & Cost</u>	<u>Time</u>
XIV. Policy, correspondence East, Whitcomb, relations, etc.		Conard	
XV. Director of Matching, Release, General Correspondence; signer of all letters from these departments.		Bodine	
XVI. Telephone, telegraph, routing of work for secretaries, filing		?	
XVII. Dispatching of mail (marking "Air Mail" on all distant mail; weighing, etc.)		Anna Levine ?	
XVIII. Supervisor of <u>all</u> work <u>not</u> under Bodine, Purchasing, etc. (secretaries, purchasing, etc.) (Secretarial employment, mimeograph supervision, typewriters)		B. Goodman	
XIX. General Correspondance		{ Beale J. Goodman	
XX. Filing for Release Department and Matching Department.		Warshaw	
XXI. Public Relations and Information		Beale	
Eastern Office:			
Advance money to colleges			
Write college explaining procedures, trusteeship, etc.			
Secure money from donors			
Reimburse Western office for travel donations			
Seek board and room jobs in towns suggested by us.			

XXII When WRA Form 26 comes:

A. It goes to Records Dept't for change of address

Records

B. It goes to Release for Washington FBI clearance

Release

*Revised
Can Key
duplicate*

JOE CONARD'S SUGGESTIONS TO RATERS
(excerpts from a letter to the Los Angeles office)
July 26, 1942

It is suggested that rating be done on all students in the active file after preliminary sifting. This would include all A and B students, both those just graduating from high school and those who have been in college. It also includes those C students who were put in the active list after preliminary reading. This includes all those C students who can financially support themselves without help from us (unless there is some important reason to the contrary): it also includes other C students who for any reason seem to deserve consideration despite their grade average. It does not include non-citizens at present, but the last meeting of our executive committee (July 24) orders that it should include all Kibei. Each of the latter is to be considered on his merits, none to be ruled out "per se."

Each student file should include the transcript and presumably two references before any rating is done on it. Each student will be rated independently by two different raters, who will then get together where they differ. If they cannot come to complete agreement, a third judgment should be asked. Raters should be persons with much maturity, and in general they should be persons with admissions experience.

It is suggested that raters fill out student record cards for the student they rate. You may want part of this done by clerks in advance, but in any case there are parts which only the raters can fill. Some of our raters prefer to fill the entire card, but this is up to the area to do as it wishes.

The present recommendation is that raters should interview the students when and only when an interview seems desirable or necessary in order to make a rating. The more recent opinions of our committee place less and less emphasis on the interview because of the psychological condition of the persons interviewed after what they have gone through and because of many other reasons, including the misunderstandings which might arise if a sizable number of persons are interviewed and another sizable group is not. We incline therefore toward very few interviews, but we feel that the area offices can form as valid a judgment on this as we. The rater, therefore, in the light of policy developed in the Area Committee Meetings, shall determine who shall be interviewed.

We have exhaustively studied the problem of rating. We have changed plans many times and have consulted hosts of able and experienced people. We know that no plan is really adequate, and certainly that ours is not. Yet I doubt if there are many possibilities which have not been hashed out many times in the process of forming the following suggestion, and I earnestly hope it will recommend itself to your group despite the arguments which I know can be brought against it or any other proposal.

We recommend that each student be rated according to each of two types of promise, and that in addition to these two ratings which will be given each student a composite rating be given which combines them. The Record card has space for each of the three ratings, since the composite rating will often mean less than the two parts which make it up. Those two parts are (1) Scholarship and (2) Personal factors.

Scholarship rating:

We suggest that all grade point systems be reduced to the following method, which happens to be used at most schools including the University of California: A, 3 points; B, 2 points; C, 1 point; D, 0 points. The grade point average will be recorded on the record card, and from it will be mathematically deduced the scholarship rating, which also appears on the card. Deduction of this rating is as follows:

<u>Grade Average</u>	<u>Scholarship Rating</u>	<u>Gr. Av.</u>	<u>Sch. Ratg</u>
3.0	9.5	1.9	8.4
2.9	9.4	1.8	8.3
2.8	9.3	1.7	8.2
2.7	9.2	1.6	8.1
2.6	9.1	1.5	8.0
2.5	9.0	1.4	7.9
2.4	8.9	1.3	7.8
2.3	8.8	1.2	7.7
2.2	8.7	1.1	7.6
2.1	8.6	1.0	7.5
2.0	8.5	etc. to	
		0.0	6.5

No allowance is made in this rating for trend or for the school attended, some of which are admittedly much harder than others. Such points should be brought out under remarks. They are too complex to put in ratings (e.g. trend may be down because the student has taken much harder subjects in his last years, or because he has had to earn his living the last time, etc.).

I have not had time to analyse the problem of high school grades and their rating, or the question of college freshmen who have some college grades to show but whose college record may be seriously impaired by the emotional disturbances of December 7 and following. Problems like this are among the reasons for my not having written sooner. Our top Dean is out of town. Please give us any recommendation you have at this point, and our committee will presumably be glad to adopt your proposal.

Personal Factor Rating:

The general principle is simple. By personal factors we mean the sum-total of all the elements that enter into personality and adaptability and general promise where not related to scholastic ability. Several factors are included in the list which I will send later. They include the capacity of the student to make a good impression and also his capacity to wear well over a period of time. Maturity, self-reliance, adaptability are important. You can complete the list as well as I.

We suggest that the highest possible rating on "personal factors" would be 10. This might be listed as "outstanding". 9 would be "superior". 8 would be average, and 6 below average. Notice that 7 is not listed here. Thus the student rating drops fairly fast if he is regarded as "below average". Raters may use fractions here as in scholarship to show judgments between points defined.

Composite Rating.

The composite rating is computed mathematically from the other two ratings. Multiply the scholastic rating by 3; multiply the personal factor rating by 2; add these products. Thus the student with a B average and a superior personality would have a rating of 43.5 (2.0 grade average gives sch. rating of 8.5; superior personality gives 9.0 rating for that; 3×8.5 plus 2×9 equals 25.5 plus 18 equals 43.5). Student with straight A average and only average personal factor rating would have a rating of 44.5, and would be favored over the other, but a straight A student with a personal factor rating definitely below average would receive only 40.5

It may seem unwise to weight scholarship higher than "personal factors", but we had long debate over that point and decided in favor of the present proposal partly because the "personal factor" rating is so highly subject to error with point, where personality is below average, we counter-balance the low "weight" by reducing the "personal factor" rating itself, giving 6 instead of 7.

NATIONAL STUDENT RELOCATION COUNCIL

TABULATION OF THE 732 QUESTIONNAIRES
Received up to Noon, July 14, 1942

mf

	Received at <u>Berkeley Office</u>	Received at <u>Seattle Office</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>% of Total</u>
Males	335	161	496	68 %
Females	151	85	236	32 %
Class:				
High School	112	59	171	23 %
College	329	160	489	67 %
Graduates	47	27	74	10 %
Courses:				
General	74	56	130	18 %
Fine Arts	42	11	53	8 %
Medicine	130	39	169	23 %
(pharmacy, nursing)				
Business	74	70	144	19 %
Theology	9	0	9	1 %
Engineering	82	42	124	16 %
Agriculture	32	2	34	5 %
Social Science	31	11	42	6 %
Home Economics	13	15	28	4 %
Grade Points - College Students				
2.5 - 3.0	68	29	97	17 %
2.0 - 2.4	126	57	183	34 %
1.5 - 1.9	78	49	127	23 %
1.0 - 1.4	86	37	123	21 %
Below 1. and unstated	19	15	34	5 %
Grade Averages - High School Students				
High School A's	36	16	52	30 %
High School B's	59	34	93	56 %
Low and unstated	14	9	23	14 %
Religion				
Buddhist	98	29	127	17 %
Protestant	328	174	502	69 %
Catholic	8	13	21	3 %
None	52	30	82	11 %
Want to Continue Education				
Now	458	216	674	92 %
Later	27	30	57	8 %
Not at all	1	0		
Cash				
0 - \$250	219	67	286	39 %
\$250 - \$500	89	73	162	22 %
\$500 - \$1000	63	59	122	16 %
\$1000 and up	99	44	143	20 %
unstated	16	3	19	3 %
Have tried to enter College				
Yes	149	89	238	32 %
No	337	157	494	68 %
Accepted	49	32	81	

INFORMATION CONCERNING AMERICAN BORN JAPANESE STUDENTS
FACING EVACUATION

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

On Saturday, March 28, a meeting was held at Eagleson Hall for all American-born Japanese students attending the University of Washington. The following information tabulated on the 150 students present may serve to indicate the kind of problems that similar students on the Pacific Coast are facing so far as the continuation of their studies is concerned.

1. Will you be free to continue your college education?

117 students or 78% answered yes.
14 students or 12.7% answered no.
19 students or 9.3% did not know.

2. Do you have adequate funds to continue college?

38 students or 25.3% answered yes.
67 students or 44.7% answered no.
15 students or 10.5% answered partially.
30 students or 20% did not know.

3. What approximate funds do you have available to continue your college education?

Out of the group of 150 students listed, 70 listed the amount of funds that they had available. The average amount available for these 70 students was 405 dollars.

6 students had \$1000 to \$3000.
14 students had \$500 to \$1000
23 students had \$200 to \$500
19 students had \$100 to \$200.
8 students had less than \$100.

4. Would you be able to continue your college education if supplementary funds were available?

106 students or 70.7% answered yes.
5 students or 3.3% answered no.
39 students or 26 % answered did not know.

5. What college would you like to attend?

17 University of Minnesota
14 Washington State
13 University of Michigan
10 University of Chicago
10 University of Idaho
5 University of Colorado
5 Oberlin
2 Northwestern
2 University of Ohio
2 Whitman
2 University of Montana
1 University of Missouri
1 Iowa State
20 Any school near evacuation or were undecided.
62 Did not know what college they would like to attend.

Procedures followed by the National Japanese American Student Relocation Council in the placement of American-born Japanese students in nursing through this Council:

1. Student and nursing questionnaires to be completed by the student and returned to us.
2. We obtain transcripts and references. If student is on the project and has attended the project high school, it is best to send the transcripts with the questionnaire (3 copies of the transcript). Make sure that transcripts have the proper signature (on all copies) and affixation of the school seal or notary. Full names and addresses should be given of references; preferably Caucasian.

For a nursing student a reference from an R.N., from the Pastor or Advisor, from a close friend or business associate; a reference from each is valuable.

It usually takes four to five weeks for us to compile this information. The time depends entirely upon the references and the high schools - not upon us.

3. Upon compilation of this information, we are ready to make application to a school of nursing as indicated on preferences on the questionnaire. Counselors should know a student's transcript and should be consulted in choice of schools. A student frequently makes a choice in a state where she is not academically qualified. An interview with the Counselor who has the proper information will do away with this delay. Academic work is of primary importance in qualifying for state requirements; commercial and vocational subjects are limited in receiving proper evaluations. You probably know already that one unit of work is 250 minutes per week for 36 weeks - academic work.
4. When application is made, the school of nursing will send their own application blanks to be filled by the student and returned to the school. The student should immediately complete and return these forms to the school or hospital. Schools do not always send forms unless they wish to consider the student and an application blank from the hospital or school is a hopeful sign.
5. After the hospital receives the application forms from the girl, the hospital must obtain a transcript of the girl's secondary school record made upon a special form according to the state requirements. If a girl has gone to more than one school, each school must fill out the special form. Signature and school seal are extremely important. This process undoubtedly takes the most time. West coast high schools have a habit of being very late in filling out these special forms and applications are thereby delayed.

The question arises now - of what use were those original transcripts which the high school sends to this Council? Those transcripts are

primarily for the benefit of the school or hospital. By having the transcript a school can usually tell whether a student will meet requirements. It offers a basis for sending out application blanks. The special state forms are for the official files and for the final and official evaluation. Of course, we cannot obtain transcripts for a girl on all 48 official state forms.

6. The school of nursing will make their own evaluation either before or after the official state evaluation. There are schools which have higher requirements than state requirements. If the girl goes through this last and passes and if the school is favorable to the acceptance of Nisei, she then begins to worry some more.
7. Quotas: A girl may be accepted by a school but may not be able to enter because the quota for Japanese Americans are filled. She then waits on the waiting list and will most likely be in the next class. This last process is really the only extra procedure in obtaining acceptance from a school. The unwillingness of a school of nursing to receive Japanese American students is indeed disappointing; but, the delays, redtape, quota restrictions, and time consumed are even more disappointing. While our country calls for more nurses and while the federal government does its best to get more girls into nurse's training, students must still go through the redtape of the states. Schools of nursing operate under laws which have formed state boards of nurse examiners and 48 different state requirements over and above the individual school requirements are indeed hard on a person's patience. This redtape is not limited to Japanese American students.

I might mention that all girls who wish to enter nursing - Caucasian, Negro, or Japanese American - must go through the same preliminary procedures.

8. After all these processes, a girl will receive a letter from the school of nursing or from the State Board stating that she is eligible and/or accepted. If she received a letter from the State Board (IMPORTANT) she should immediately write of their decision to the school of nursing.

This Council has made at least one (and more often two) applications for each girl for whom we have a complete file:-transcripts and at least three references. Up to this date we have placed nursing students into 75 hospital schools of nursing. During the last five months we have made approximately 175 applications and have received approximately 50% acceptances. This figure does not include girls who are going to university or college schools of nursing.

WARNING!! Discourage indiscriminate making of applications to several schools at one time. Students should first obtain as much knowledge as possible about a school before they make application. Making applications to several schools

at one time is not an excellent procedure at all in the field of nursing. We have had four distinct cases where girls made applications on their own to many schools and also had this Council make application. In each case, the girl was accepted at more than one school; the girl failed to notify the schools which she did not wish to attend and Nisei girls actually lost a chance to attend. If more than one acceptance is received, a girl should immediately write to the school which she will not attend and state her decision. This will immediately open the way for another Nisei to take the place.

Niseis are accepted at some of the best nursing schools in the country. They are now in attendance at: Bellevue Hospital for Women in New York City (over ten girls); St. Louis University School of Nursing; University of Minnesota; University of Wisconsin; Cook County Hospital in Chicago; Pennsylvania Hospital in Philadelphia, etc.

Some university schools of nursing require a clearance through the Office of the Provost Marshal General in Washington. This procedure is another time delay. We have direct knowledge of the procedures and redtape involved.

As you will see from the above, delays are in most cases directly out of the hands of this Council. A girl can help by trying to know the state requirements of the area where she wishes to study and noting if she meets those requirements. Proper information and knowledge is important. The greatest delays are in the hands of the State Boards, the high schools (especially west coast), cross-country mail delays, improper completion of questionnaires (incomplete), reference delays, etc.

/s/ Ernest Kurkjian
Placement Department (Nurses)