DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 056 640 HE 002 639

TITLE	Higher Education for the Future: Reform or More of the Same?
INSTITUTION	Southern Regional Education Board, Atlanta, Ga.
PUB DATE	71
NOTE	40p.; Proceedings of the SREB Legislative Work Conference (20th, Key Biscayne, Florida, July 14-17, 1971)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	College Admission; Conference Reports; *Educational Change; *Educational Opportunities; *Financial Problems; *Higher Education; *Manpower Needs; Open Enrollment

ABSTRACT

The 20th Annual Legislative Work Conference of the Southern Regional Education Board provided participants with an opportunity to hear and discuss specific proposals for change in higher education. The participants considered the relationship between manpower needs and postsecondary educational opportunity and the kinds of students who attend various institutions and why. The papers included in this report are: "Perspectives on Manpower and Education in the South," by Eli Ginzberg; "Accessibility to Higher Education: Who Gets in and Why?" by Alexander Astin; "Non-Military National Service and its Impact on Higher Education," by Steven Muller; "Less Time, More Options," by Clark Kerr; "The New Depression in Higher Education: The Growing Crisis and Ways to Resolve it," by Earl F. Cheit; and "Reflections on Education and Government," by Governor Jimmy Carter. Also included are responses by other State officials, and a roster of delegates. (AF)

Higher Education for the Future: Reform or More of the Same?

Proceedings of the 20th SREB Legislative Work Conference

Sonesta B Hotel
Florida
July 14-17, 1971

Southern Regional Education Board
130 Sixth Street, N.W. Atlanta, Georgia 30313

$1.50

Contents

Introduction

Nineteen seventy-one has been a year of proposals for reforming higher education. Much national attention has been devoted to proposals from many quarters—students, faculty, administrators, public officials. A series of reports such as those produced by the Carnegie Commission, the Assembly on Goals and Governance of Higher Education, and the Newman Committee have provided many suggestions for change in every aspect of higher education, from rebuilding the structure of state systems to shortening the time required to complete degrees.

The higher education community is deeply involved in debating the need for change in its organization; how best to serve a more diverse student population; what fields of study have priority over others in terms of need; and how to make educational experiences more meaningful to students. Significant and lasting changes, however, will require understanding and support by more than academic leaders. Public sentiment will greatly affect changes in governing structures and financial support, particularly. Legislators who must make decisions in the best public interest have a particular need to understand the complexities and interrelationships of the various proposals before the public today.

The topic, "Higher Education for the Future: Reform or More of the Same?" provided participants at the 20th Annual Legislative Work Conference with an opportunity to hear and discuss specific proposals and to consider analyses of relationships between manpower needs and postsecondary educational opportunity, and of the kinds of students who attend various institutions and why.

The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education is probably the best known of the groups proposing reforms in nearly every aspect of higher education. Recommendations in one of its reports, *Less Time, More Options,* require a review of policies and practices in many areas. The conference provided legislators with an opportunity to thoroughly explore these suggestions and to discuss their many implications with the commission chairman, Clark Kerr.

Many changes advocated for breaking the "lockstep" of higher education leave questions about what young people will do if they change attendance patterns. There is growing discussion about providing youth with alternatives to military service and with opportunities to apply their interests and energies toward the solution of domestic social problems. The conference members had a chance to debate various possibilities, including a specific proposal for compulsory national service for all young people following completion of secondary school. Such a proposal implies drastic changes in the structure and content of higher education.

Any consideration of reform and the future of higher education must inevitably deal with financing. In light of the pressure to find adequate funds to support many state services, legislators have an added responsibility to determine appropriate public policies regarding the means of financing higher education. A special session of the conference gave the law-makers an opportunity to explore the current financial crisis in higher education and to offer their own ideas about ways to solve it, including the possibility of having students bear a greater portion of the cost of education. These legislators also recognized the need for more effective planning at state and institutional levels to prevent unnecessary expansion and duplication of expensive programs, and to insure programs of quality through sound and effective management.

Whether higher education in the future will be basically different or essentially the same cannot be answered simply. However, without broad understanding of the possibilities by public officials, constructive and lasting reform is not likely. Hopefully the papers and discussion at this Legislative Work Conference will help legislators and educators think in new terms, and will stimulate the best efforts to create constructive change.

Perspectives on Manpower and Education in the South □ ELI GINZBERG

Calling himself "an outsider looking in," Dr. Eli Ginzberg, in a wide-ranging speech, discussed problems of higher education access for poor and blacks in the South, the need for the middle class to pay for a larger share of its education, organizational problems of higher education, the need for curriculum revision, and the Southern delegation to Congress. He began by pointing out that the percentage of students going into postsecondary education in some Southern states is far too low to meet the needs of a changing economy and to provide for adequate personal opportunity, and ended with the point that education does not primarily or solely guarantee anyone anything but an opportunity to get an education. Conference participants seemed to be most interested in finding ways to relate institutional programs more closely to manpower needs, but Professor Ginzberg warned that most projected needs are based on present practices and ratios, making information about the future highly questionable. There were many comments and questions related to issues about developing full opportunity for blacks in the South. In a pointed remark, Ginzberg said, "The South is spending too little money on the education of blacks," and reminded legislators that "Black poverty is a permanent drag on the economy and society of the South."

You have to be elected to your jobs. I don't; I have operated as a consultant, as a political hermaphrodite, having served the last six presidents. My present principal Washington assignment is as chairman of the National Advisory Manpower Committee. In fact, the reason that I cannot stay longer here is that we have a new subcommittee of the NAMC which will hold its first meeting tomorrow—the Subcommittee on Professional, Scientific and Technical Personnel, with Allan Cartter, the chancellor of New York University, as chairman. It has taken 10 years to convince the bureaucracy to establish this subcommittee, but now that the structure of higher education and the demand for educated manpower are out of balance, the federal government is concerned.

When my wife asked me why I had to be away on our 25th wedding anniversary, pressing me to tell her what you legislators have that she doesn't have, I said, "They have problems and they have asked me to talk to them."

It is 38 years since I first visited the South. I came South for the first time through Muscle Shoals, the back route through Decatur, to Atlanta, six months after the Scottsboro Trial. I traveled through the whole of the South at that time and many times thereafter. It is 10 years since I gave a presentation to the Southern Economic Association on segregation and manpower waste because the program committee believed that it would be easier for a Northerner to deal with that prickly theme. And I keep coming to the South whenever the opportunity offers because, from many points of view, I find it the most dynamic and interesting of all the regions in the United States. More things are happening here. And I think that the South is moving in the right direction more often than other sections of the country. I go to California to see how bad the United States will look 10 years thereafter, because the West Coast is usually ahead of the rest of the country. The smog covered Los Angeles 10 years before it hovered over New York.

In addition, the South is the most interesting section of the country. When I first saw it in 1933, it seemed more alien to me than France or Italy. At

---

Dr. Ginzberg is Professor of Economics at Columbia University and Chairman of the National Manpower Advisory Committee

that time it was not fully integrated into the United States; today it is.

The most interesting touchstone of Southern change is the racial issue. I think that you are doing considerably better than we in the North. The rate of change is qualitatively greater in the South than in the North. Hence I welcome every opportunity to come down and take a look.

Let me present a New Yorker's view of the South. Your metropolitan areas are on a par with the rest of the country. I just looked at the Georgia figures: income in the standard metropolitan areas of Georgia is at about 90 percent of the country's average. Since the cost of living in Georgia is a little lower than up North, this brings you pretty close to the national average. The important fact, however, is that you still are highly rural in relation to the rest of the country, and that is the source of many of your problems, including many of your educational and manpower problems.

The next point is that the South is not one region, but many regions. There is nothing particularly Southern about Florida. Its major city looks very much like parts of New York. On the other hand, there are areas in the South that are distinctive. Moreover, unusual changes are taking place. For instance, the 1970 census reveals that 10 of the 16 Southern states have had a white in-migration during the past decade. After having exported manpower to the rest of the country for many years, the South turned around during the 1960's and started to import white manpower. Only two states—West Virginia and Kentucky—had an outflow of white manpower. The blacks continue to leave. Despite the belief in many parts of the North that the black out-migration from the South is declining, the census data show that this has not been the case. What has changed is the turnaround in white migration patterns.

The South has become more dependent economically on the military-space program. The recent study of the Southern Regional Education Board of the coastal plains region shows that over 40 percent of the employment gain in the last years had been directly connected with military base expenditures. Fortunately from your point of view, the President of the United States, according to *The New York Times* of recent date, is slowing the closure of military bases. This heavy dependence of the South on federal programs for military bases and space exploration has implications for the 1970's. You will have to find substitutes as these efforts decrease.

Having complimented the South for its progress on the racial front, I must state that despite these gains the gap between white and black people is still substantial. When we consider only full-time workers, that is, people who have regular jobs, we see that the average white male employee in the South earns about $11,000 a year; a black man earns on the average about $7,400. The differential in favor of the white man is just under one-half of what a Negro earns. On the West Coast a white man earns $12,500 or about $1,500 more than a white man in the South. But the black man's earnings on the West Coast average $11,500, or scarcely 9 percent below the white man. This means that the gap between the earnings of white and black people in the South is almost five times greater than the gap on the West Coast. That suggests the distance the South still has to go before it brings the sizable black population fully into its economy and society.

The South has long been capital-poor and manpower-rich. Ever since the Civil War the South has been a manpower surplus area. Some years ago, I said that the major crop of the South was babies. That is no longer true, even though your rural areas have an above average birthrate. However, the South has sharper class and race differentials and the region remains somewhat outside of the mainstream of national development. The major interchange is still between east and west; that is the country's main-line. While there are some disadvantages to not being on the main-line there are also some advantages. The critical point is that the relationship between the South and the rest of the country is becoming closer.

Looking ahead, I see continuing large-scale changes in the South growing out of the emergence of new political power centers for blacks, particularly in municipal and state legislatures Despite the heavy and continuing out-migration of blacks the potential political leverage of an awakened black constituency in the South is greater than in most areas in the North. And, as should now be clear after three years of a conservative Republican administration in Washington, the federal power is certain to be used to expedite the political enfranchisement of the black community.

So much for one Northerner's view of the South. Now a few words about my perspectives on national trends as they bear on the interaction between higher education and trained manpower.

We learned one lesson in the 1960's. It is a sad lesson but an important one. Monetary and fiscal policy alone cannot maintain a high level of employment—not nearly as high as the country wants and needs. When unemployment drops below the 4-1/2 to 4 percent level, inflationary pressures are unleashed that are hard to control. Congress has just passed and the President has signed a $2.25 billion public service employment bill. This is the first large-scale employment creation effort since the 1930's. Only a few months ago, the President vetoed a similar bill on the ground that he was opposed to make-work projects. My own opinion is that the new public service employment act is only the opener for what will be a large and increasingly important national employment program in which the federal government will be forced to create jobs directly because it cannot rely solely on fiscal and monetary means to assure high-level employment.

Secondly, I believe that the national scene is changing rapidly: we are entering a labor market different from that of the 1960's. For the last three decades the demand for trained people exceeded the supply. I will skip the reasons back of the recent change and just allude to the actions that have been taken in the South, as in other parts of the country,

to expand the educational system's capacity to produce trained people. The numbers flowing through these institutions (junior colleges, upper-level colleges, four-year colleges, graduate schools) have increased to a point where the vastly larger numbers who attend and graduate from institutions of higher learning can no longer count on an economic payoff, no matter how enriching the educational experience has been culturally. Reworded, this means that graduating from a junior or senior college will no longer guarantee a preferred career any more than high school graduation or, in earlier times, graduation from elementary school guaranteed a man a good job and a good income. As more and more young people acquire a college diploma the career payoff becomes more equivocal.

While I am not as pessimistic as Dr. Allan Cartter about the employment outlook for young people with Ph.D.'s, I agree with him that we are in a new ballpark. It is new because of two trends: we have vastly expanded our production facilities so that we are now training many more young people and at the same time the demand for their services has begun to level off. Let me take an extreme example—the outlook with respect to the health industry. We have increased our expenditures for health rapidly during the past decade and we are now spending in excess of 7 percent of the GNP on health and medical care. increases in health personnel, despite assumptions to the contrary, have also been rapid. Although many politicians are promising spectacular new gains from national health insurance—often at little or no additional cost—skepticism is in order. The American people may think twice before they make large additional commitments. They may remember that most people are born healthy. If they have a few shots during childhood, they are likely to stay healthy unless they meet a truck. If that happens of course they need attention. Almost all people need medical care when they start to age but at that point doctors cannot do much for them: if they are lucky they get over their coronary; if not, they die. Putting more and more public money into health is a questionable policy and we have just begun to ask some penetrating questions about health programs similar to the questions that are surfacing about space and the military.

Warning signs are being raised about the expansion of medical training facilities. The Dean of the University of Utah's Medical School has warned about the rapid expansion in the training of physicians. Let me point out how rapid it may be. We are likely to double the output of physicians within 8 to 10 years. In 1968 we graduated about 10,000 physicians; by 1978 the total is likely to be close to 20,000. That's a big increase. It may not be too early for both the federal and state governments to take another hard look at the future supply of physicians now that the following changes are under way: the elimination of the requirement of internship; federal subsidies for larger enrollments in medical schools; reduction of the four-year curriculum to three; the stream of new medical schools; the advance planning for additional medical schools; the conversion of two- to four-year medical schools and the other actions which will increase the supply. Without stating that we will be producing too many physicians in the future, I contend that the fact that the question is raised suggests the need for more careful planning across the gamut of training professional and scientific manpower.

This leads me to a related point. Industry in the South is becoming more sophisticated technologically. Textiles, lumber, apparel are shrinking in importance and you are expanding chemicals, petroleum, electrical manufacturing. The American economy, including the burgeoning Southern economy, needs a large number of people with skills above those provided by our high schools. The high school system does not provide the future labor force with an adequate level of competence. There is no reason that it shouldn't, but it doesn't. There is a practice in the United States of building new structures when the existing ones fail to do the job. When the elementary school failed to graduate pupils who were able to master the three R's, we built high schools. When the graduates of high schools were found to be undereducated, we expanded our colleges, senior and junior. Recently, more and more college graduates go on to graduate school. As a professor in a graduate school, I feel on occasion that I am teaching my students what they should have learned in elementary school—basic mathematics, language, an ability to think. W[illegible]pting to assess culpability, we must recog[illegible] the country has a larg number of poorly educated persons and that the proportion in the South is considerably above the national average.

There is a fair chance that the President's welfare program will pass. If it does, more poor people, who are also the less educated, will remain in the South. This is, in fact, a basic aim of the new program. The political deal is to give more money to the poor people in the South so that they will remain there and not flood the cities in the North and in the West. The prospect for welfare reform hinges on the votes of the Southern bloc. I think it will accept the deal. If the bill passes you will have to improve adult education in order to raise the literacy level of the many poor people who will stay here until they die. If their productivity is to be raised, they need more education and skill.

Another challenge that the South together with other parts of the country will face in the years ahead is to provide greater access to educational opportunities for mature people who are changing their occupations and career goals. My colleague, Dale L. Hiestand, has recently written a book on this subject *Changing Careers After 35* to be published by Columbia University Press. More people are going to have multiple careers, and this means that they need access to the educational facilities for retraining. The educational cycle after high school will no longer be restricted to the years between 18 and 26. Adults will need an opportunity to come back to school for further education to adjust to the changes in the economy and to shifts in their interests and goals.

I will end my comments on the national perspective by stressing that the expansion of employment is likely to lag during the next few years. I think the economy is slowly moving up, but jobs are increasing more slowly than the labor force. Moreover, we face a new demand-supply situation for young people graduating from college and the university; they will find a much tighter labor market than in the 1960's. A soft economy, a lower than desirable level of total employment, and a large and growing output of trained manpower does not make a rosy picture for the prospective job seeker. That, however, is the picture of the near future.

Now, as an outsider looking in, I will briefly review selected issues that bear directly on educational and manpower planning in the South. The first is the state of postsecondary education. The first fact that strikes me is the uneven development that has taken place. Some states have done well in expanding opportunities beyond the high school level. Other states, such as Georgia, South Carolina, Arkansas, and Virginia are lagging. I reach this conclusion from the fact that they are sending only about one-quarter of their college-age population to postsecondary schooling, while the national average is about one-half. These states, then, are lagging.

Inadequate facilities are one aspect of the problem; a related issue is the articulation among the several different types of postsecondary institutions. In North Carolina, an effort has been made to relate the technical institutes to the community colleges. In Florida, steps are under way to dovetail junior colleges and upper-level colleges. Unless the several parts of the educational system are articulated, the individual will find it difficult to build on what he has acquired in one institution when he seeks to enter another. The cost to society and to the individual is high. A better design would include maximum linkages among institutions so that people can move among them, and back and forth from school to work in whatever way makes the most sense to them. They should be able to accumulate the points they need for certificates, diplomas and degrees in the way that best meets their personal needs. More important than certificates and diplomas is the acquisition of competence. As an individual acquires competence at one level he should be able to move to the next level. South Carolina has done quite well in building manpower training institutions which assist workers to obtain jobs in new industries. However, the question remains: How does a narrowly trained worker build on what he has learned in order to acquire a higher level of skill? South Carolina's training institutions are not responsive to this challenge.

I would recommend that you put as much as possible of your postsecondary training into the community college structure. Further I would encourage you to persuade the educators to reappraise the requirements for degrees, diplomas and certificates. I think there is little rationale to distinguishing between subjects that carry credit and those which do not. A course in the elements of physics taught in connection with electronics is not generally considered liberal arts, while an esoteric course on French literature is. In short, I would seek more integration among institutions, curriculum, and degree requirements.

I think that the curriculum offerings of many institutions have proliferated unduly. This tends to raise costs and reduce quality. A preferred goal would be instruction in basic skills with an occupational thrust. An individual needs to learn to use language properly, to use mathematics, to be capable of analysis—basic skills that relate to all occupations, from electronics to the health arena. A true desideratum would be a limited number of basic programs with some occupational specialization. At present, there are too many special programs. They are hard to staff; they are costly to run; and they do not provide adequate flexibility for a diversified student body.

I read recently that Florida Atlantic University had broken the educational lockstep by granting advanced standing to able students; the first follow-up showed that these students are doing well. It is foolish to make everybody—dull, average, superior—move at the same pace. Some ought to accelerate; it will save them time and money. Others ought to move more slowly if they are to derive benefit from their educational experience. You should encourage the educators to think through new designs for matching students and institutions. They must remember that institutions have been established to help young people, and that young people are not there to make the institutions work.

Although the next speaker will focus on broadened access to education, I want to comment briefly on this subject. Many people from low-income families in the urban South do not have access to higher education, and this is particularly true of the blacks. The future education of the blacks in the South is centered in the urban areas. Part of the present difficulty grows out of the past patterns whereby black residential colleges, especially the large public institutions, are located in the hinterland. If it were possible, which it is not, to sell these rural institutions and use the proceeds to build new schools in the urban areas that would be desirable. But although that can't be done, it is important that most new investment in black education be made in the cities. I was impressed to read that Miami-Dade Junior College decided that students from families at or below the poverty level do not have to pay tuition. I think you need more approaches like that. If you are to find more money to spend on the poor you must avoid excessive subsidies to middle-class and upper-middle-class students.

In general, your relatively low tuitions in most state institutions represent an unwarranted subsidy to the middle- and upper-income groups. A family with $15,000 of annual income should be asked to cover more of the cost of its child's education, even if the family has to take out a loan to do it. Only then will there be more scholarship money available for the student from a low-income family.

I noted that several state legislatures in the South have begun to make grants to private colleges

and universities according to one or another criterion of enrollment. There are many private institutions in the region though not as many as we have in the Northeast. You surely do not want to liquidate them, and it can often save the taxpayer money if funds are allocated to existing private institutions rather than to expand the state structure. In New York State we found that we could not afford to expand the state system to cope with the rising demand. We have been using state money to help the private institutions carry more of the load.

Now to the critical question of the doctoral level student. I will probably step on some toes when I say that you have four top-ranking institutions in the whole of the South—Duke, North Carolina, Vanderbilt, and University of Texas. There are many other good schools in the region, but in terms of national standards, these four are top drawer. Many doctoral programs have recently been established or expanded in institutions that simply do not have adequate resources. This does not make sense. The smaller states might limit their investment in graduate education to building one strong state university. Beyond that, much more reliance should be placed on regional cooperation. The South does not need 25 doctoral programs in ancient history. Students interested in these fields can study out of state. Even if the demand and supply situation for educated manpower were not as ominous as it now is, the centers for graduate education should be limited for reasons of quality. A good graduate program cannot be run with five students. It needs a critical mass of students and professors. Students educate each other. In fact, without good students, the professors go to seed. Professors stay alive by having good students. A university is certain to have a poor graduate program unless it has a core of good students. But there are not sufficient good students to support scores of graduate programs. Planning should aim at a limited number of strong centers.

Now with respect to the education of blacks. There are many weak black institutions in the South. Of course there are also many weak white colleges—in absolute numbers actually more—but in the present context, let us focus on the black ones. There is too little state money going into the education of blacks. The situation remains unequal. Discrimination continues to take a heavy toll. Federal money goes overwhelmingly to white schools, as does state money. Thirdly, as I stated earlier, too many black institutions are isolated in the hinterland. It is the wrong environment; students must live away from home; it is harder to recruit faculties; much of the curriculum has little contact with the urban-industrial reality. Although Tuskegee is one of the stronger black institutions in the South, it too has a long way to go. The question is how to strengthen those black institutions that hold promise.

The South has one of two choices. Either it takes the problem seriously or it continues to double-talk. I suspect that most of the white leadership prefers talk to action. It does not have enough money for whites; how can one find more money for blacks? But the leadership must remember that blacks account for 21 percent of the population of the South. Their average income is only about 50 percent of the income of whites. Black poverty is a permanent drag on the economy and society of the South. Segregation, discrimination, unequal treatment are bad for the blacks and they hurt the white community. At a minimum I would plead for more interinstitutional ties. As legislators, when you give money to selected white institutions, you ought to insist that they strive to help neighboring black institutions. It is sad that there is no effective relation between Auburn and Tuskegee although they are less than an hour's drive apart. It makes no sense to have one veterinary program at Tuskegee and another at Auburn. More importantly there is need for more linkages between black and white institutions which specialize in teacher training, particularly since you are making steady progress in desegregating your elementary and secondary schools.

With white leadership, the South should be able to get more foundation help for this effort. Unless the white South helps black colleges they will remain in a bind. However, with white leadership, the South might attract federal money, even if disguised, for black schools. The white South can do a lot for itself if it helps the blacks.

The next point relates to curriculum revision. I have earlier touched on it, but I want to emphasize it. There should be more opportunity for youngsters to move at their own pace through the structure. There is no reason to keep bright people moving at the present slow pace. At present, there is an effort to reduce the period of medical training by at least two years. That is a significant reduction. In the North we used to have professional options: after three years in college, a bright youngster could enter law school, medical school, or a school of theology and get his undergraduate degree after the completion of his first year in professional school. Such a procedure makes lots of sense. In addition to permitting students to move at their own pace, curriculum planning should emphasize fundamentals. We are becoming more and more a white-collar society. In Florida, for instance, 72 percent of all jobs are in the service sector. Manufacturing, construction, and agriculture are not expanding relatively; in fact, they are contracting. With most jobs in the white-collar arena, a worker needs to know how to read, write, calculate. These elements are critical.

A few words about work-study. With the cost of education going up rapidly, legislators must be concerned about how young people can help pay at least part of their way through college and graduate school. The University of Cincinnati, Northeastern, Antioch have demonstrated over the years that while it is not easy to structure a work-study plan it can be done; and if done properly it can enhance the quality of education that students receive. We lose close to 50 percent of all who enter college. That suggests that most of these students should not be in college in the first place. The more they learn about the world of work, the more meaningful and useful their college education will be. I would therefore recommend a rapid expansion in work-study programs. Among the

ancillary advantages will be the feedback that institutions receive about how well or poorly they are educating their students. Educators have had it easy because they did not have to account for their graduates. But if schools are linked to the world of work, it will be harder for their educators to escape from the criticisms and suggestions of those who hire their students.

A related matter is the need for more operational research. The education industry simply does not know enough about the outputs of its system. We know that a high percentage of students who enter junior or community colleges never gets a diploma. The figure may be as high as 75 percent. Such a high figure is not *prima facie* evidence of malfunctioning. But we do need to know more. The educational authorities need more follow-up information about their graduates and dropouts.

Even in the absence of detailed data I do not believe that community colleges should be totally under local control. The American economy is too dynamic and the labor force too mobile to leave junior colleges under local control. There must be a state presence in planning and in operation. The role of the state should be strengthened since these young people will enter different labor markets when they finish school.

Secondly, there is need for more interstate cooperation. I had been impressed with the fact that 1,000 students cross state borders for their education, but, on reflection, this appears to be a small figure, especially after a regional effort of more than 20 years. There must be opportunity for more interchange within the region.

A related disturbing aspect of educational planning is the loss in effectiveness of the Southern delegation in the Congress now that Senator Hill is no longer a member. In my opinion the South has claims on the federal government because it continues to lag behind the rest of the country. Moreover, the South still has the more serious class and racial problems. But your politicians must do something to solve them or nobody will.

I have covered a great many manpower and educational problems of the South in too brief context. I have had an opportunity to share with you my sense of some of your problems, but little more. Let me now, in conclusion, highlight a few themes. There is a tendency to expand the educational system rather than to change what is in place, and that is a costly tendency. It is almost always easier politically to add than to change an existing organization in seeking new needs. An alternative approach which would aim at conserving public and private resources would be to explore how to get more out of existing institutions. The junior college came into being in part because the high school was not performing effectively. We should be able to offer within the high school structure most if not all of what we are offering in junior colleges. In the future we should look with suspicion on further elongating the educational system and try instead to reform the existing institutions so that they can perform better. That is my first conclusion.

My second proposition is that the past methods of financing higher education cannot continue indefinitely. I raised this issue with Clark Kerr 15 years ago when he was provost at Berkeley. Even at that time it seemed to me that the rich state of California would not be able to come up with sufficient tax money to cover the costs of all who wanted to pursue higher education. In the less affluent South new approaches are needed so that students will be able to cover a larger share of their educational cost. In part this will have to be done through loans. There is an advantage in making the consumer cover more of the costs: he will calculate more carefully whether the effort is worthwhile. If the cost goes up, many casual students will disappear. There is no great harm if a wealthy man is willing to let his offspring stay in college even though they may be wasting their time and his money. But it is not sound to ask the taxpayer to subsidize uninterested students.

Next, there is need for more interfaces among industry, community leadership, and the educational institutions to insure a better fit between what students learn and what employers need. I indicated earlier some cautions about the rapid expansion of medical education. For instance, Florida now offers many allied health programs at the collegiate level. I would like to see what has been happening to the graduates, and I would like to project supply and demand for the next 5 to 10 years to be sure that even in such a rapidly growing state the supply is not outdistancing the jobs that will open up. While no set of projections, no matter how carefully they are carried out, will necessarily be proved correct, the closer the contacts between the educational institutions and the world of work, the more likely that imbalances will be corrected before they become serious. The real danger is that colleges and universities will keep producing specialists who have little sensitivity for the changing employment scene.

Another challenge relates to women. Education in the South must pay more attention to their needs. More and more mature women are entering and reentering the labor force. The figures are clear. Many women need educational opportunities at different stages of their lives. They often need access to college or graduate school at age 35 or even 40. I remember visiting a community college in St. Louis some years ago where the student body had a bimodal distribution: half were youngsters of 18 and half were mature women. The important point to remember in strengthening your community colleges is that they should be open to more and more adults who want or need to return for a degree, a diploma, or for a course. We are degree-mad in this country. We need people with more competence, not people with more degrees and diplomas. The two are not the same. Twenty-three years ago, a group of which I was the chairman recommended that the nursing profession be reorganized along a series of fronts including cutting the course of instruction for a registered nurse from three to two years and encouraging the training of many more practical nurses. The leadership has been struggling to "upgrade" the profession by extending the period of training

for most nurses to include the baccalaureate, without attending closely to the changed curriculum requirements that should accompany their intentions that the professional nurse become a supervisor. While the nurse leadership gets pummeled by forces that it cannot possibly control, the words continue to flow in one direction, the actions in another, and the patient gets caught in between.

If we find it so difficult to correlate education and work, perhaps the preferred alternative would be to loosen the bonds, at least with regard to "selling" education to the public. Access to higher education should not be considered a guarantee of anything other than an education or, more correctly, an opportunity for an education. The prospective graduate must recognize that he is guaranteed neither an attractive career nor a high income.

Educational opportunities should be readily available for those capable of and interested in profiting from them. But the individual must recognize that the risks are his and the returns are questionable. Unless a student is conscientious, unless he is interested and concerned about getting the most from his teachers and his books, the years he spends in school are not likely to be rewarding. The primary end of education is self-improvement. All else is secondary. I look on the current financial squeeze not as a crisis but as an opportunity. I would not have liked to have seen an indefinite proliferation of the ways we had been going, because we were almost past the point of payoff. This is a good time for the South to catch its breath, to take a new hard look at some of the tough steps that need taking. A financial squeeze frequently leads to an improvement in productivity. I hope this will be the case with higher education in the South.

Accessibility to Higher Education: Who Gets In and Why? ◻ ALEXANDER ASTIN

Only the bright and more able students should go to college.
Everyone who wants a college education should have the opportunity to attend.
Colleges should devote special attention to the lowest-performing and most disadvantaged members of society.
These diverse views on admissions are in the forefront of discussion today because of increasing public demand for higher educational opportunity.
But, as Alexander Astin pointed out, the issues will not be resolved until there has been more extensive discussion and some agreement on the purposes of higher education.
These three views on admissions, outlined by Astin, sharply focus on the questions of public policy that legislators and planners must deal with.

Of all the practices of colleges and universities that have come under attack in recent years, selective admissions is surely one of the most controversial. Selective admissions has traditionally been the process whereby persons are either granted or denied access to higher education, but as the concepts of open admissions and universal higher education gain wider acceptance, the question of "Who gets in?" will gradually become a question of "Who gets in where?"

I am afraid that it will be difficult to resolve the controversy over admissions policies until we first reach some agreement on what the purposes of higher education ought to be. Each different position on admissions, it seems to me, implies a different concept of the appropriate mission of the higher educational system. There are at least three contrasting concepts of this mission, and each carries with it a different point-of-view about admissions. I have found it convenient to label these views as elitist, egalitarian, and remedial.

Those who subscribe to an elitist conception of higher education maintain that only the ablest and brightest should go to college. Those who support an egalitarian plan believe that everyone who wants it should have the opportunity, and that the investment of resources should be about equal across the spectrum of ability. Finally, advocates of a remedial plan feel that special attention should be devoted to the lowest-performing and most disadvantaged members of the society. Note that the allocation of resources in this plan would be precisely the reverse of what it would be under an elitist plan.

An elitist plan has been implicit in the American higher educational system in the past, and especially in the higher educational systems of Western Europe. Under an elitist system, resources are devoted entirely to the education of the most able persons; there is relatively little concern, if any, with improving performance among those with the least ability. Thus, it is not necessary or even desirable to admit to higher education people at the lower end of the ability spectrum in order to implement an elitist plan.

An egalitarian view of the proper role of higher education assumes that all members of the population should be given an opportunity to attend college, and that the investment of resources should be roughly equal across individuals. Consequently, in order to implement an egalitarian plan, it would probably be necessary to admit **all** members of the population to some form of higher education, or at least to provide some sort of **opportunity** for everyone who wishes it.

A remedial concept of higher education, on the other hand, views the education of persons at the lower end of the ability spectrum as one of the system's important missions. Implementation of the remedial plan, like in the egalitarian plan, would require that the lower performers be admitted into some form of postsecondary education. However, in the remedial plan it would probably be necessary, in addition, to invest a disproportionate amount of our

Dr. Astin is Director of Research of the American Council on Education

resources in the education of these low performers. This type of resource allocation is, of course, precisely the reversal of what is done now: the highly selective institutions currently spend substantially more per student than do the less selective ones.

Some advocates of the elitist plan for higher education would argue that it is essential to invest most of our resources in the education of the exceptionally bright in order to promote scientific and technological progress. In elitist circles this is referred to as the "let's not lose the Third World War" plan. Advocates of the remedial or social welfare plan, on the other hand, might argue that the lowest-performing members of the society represent the biggest drain on the society and, in the long run, the biggest threat to the general welfare of the society. According to this argument, substantially improving the competence of these lowest performers might ultimately have enormous societal benefits by alleviating poverty, crime, and similar social problems.

In short, the three alternative models pose some interesting questions of value for legislators and planners. Does a given dollar investment in the highly able student have the same payoff—the same value to the society—as an equal investment in the less able student? And what about investments in the average student? Of what personal value are given investments to the individuals themselves? Although there is not time here for us to debate such issues, one thing seems certain: the educational system cannot hope to enhance the performance of individuals at any point on the ability spectrum if it excludes them from the system altogether. Nor can it hope to have much success in recruiting and educating individuals not currently in the system unless it provides sufficient financial support and develops programs appropriately geared to their initial level of performance at the point of admission.

With all of the talk about the "new" students who are now flooding into our public colleges under open admissions programs, it is not generally recognized that higher education in the United States has for many years been providing opportunities somewhere in the system for virtually all types of students: the bright and the not-so-bright, the rich and the poor, the 18-year-old and the adult, the black and the white, and so on. The main difference between now and a few years ago is, I think, one of numbers—a difference in a quantity rather than a quality. As these new students continue to grow in number, a critical issue is what kind of opportunities the private and public systems are going to provide. Are we simply going to expand higher education pretty much along earlier lines, or should new systems be tried out?

As we look at the institutional system as it is currently structured, it becomes clear that American higher education has evolved into a kind of status system—with a few prestigious "centers of excellence," a fairly large middle class of "good" institutions, and a very large number of relatively unknown and undistinguished institutions. The educational significance of this institutional hierarchy is that it represents a kind of track system, where nearly all of the students in the most prestigious institutions are very bright, and where most of the students in the least prestigious institutions are average or below average in ability.

Although some educators have developed elaborate arguments in support of this hierarchical arrangement of institutions, it is probably safe to assume that the system is perpetuated not for educational reasons but for reasons of competition and status. Professors support selective admissions because they feel that bright students are more fun and easier to teach. Indeed, even within a given institution or within a given classroom, professors probably favor their brightest students. Selective admissions gains support from alumni, legislators, faculty, administrators, and probably a great many students because having only bright students enhances the prestige of the institution. Many college administrators probably support selective admissions because having a good input of highly motivated and talented students will almost guarantee a good output of distinguished and possibly wealthy alumni in years to come. The secondary schools support the track system that results from selective admissions because they see it as a reward or incentive system for motivating their students; teachers and guidance counselors can frequently be heard to tell their students something like, "Study hard so you can get into a 'good' college."

But what are the educational justifications for the institutional hierarchy? Is there any validity to the idea that a hierarchical arrangement will yield a better overall educational outcome than some other sort of arrangement?

Perhaps the most common educational justification for ability tracking is the assumption that the student will develop better academically if he is grouped with students of similar ability. There are, in addition, several important corollary assumptions: (1) that the brighter student needs the stimulation and the competition of other bright students if he is to realize his full potential, (2) that the brighter student will become bored and less motivated if he is grouped with students of lesser ability, and (3) that the less able student will become intimidated and discouraged if he is forced to compete with students of higher ability. Although there has to date been much too little research on these questions, the available evidence suggests that there is little or no intellectual "value added" for those students who attend a highly selective college. By the same token, those few bright students who go to colleges of average or even below-average selectivity do not appear to suffer intellectually. Although these studies (which have relied on standardized tests of achievement administered to college seniors) cannot be regarded as the final word on the question of how selectivity affects intellectual development, they do suggest that sorting students into separate institutions on the basis of their academic abilities may not really benefit either the bright or the dull students.

One possibly undesirable consequence of ability tracking is that it inevitably segregates the rich from the poor and, in particular, the white from the black. Some selective colleges have attempted to rectify

the racial imbalance in their student bodies by establishing racial "quotas." In essence, this practice amounts to the use of double standards of admissions for whites and blacks (and sometimes for other selected minorities). While such double standards are probably the most straightforward means of integrating student bodies, there are certain possibly undesirable side effects which should be taken into account. For example, in contrast to a simple policy of open admissions, the use of double standards will tend to accentuate differences between the races in academic ability and past performance. The reason for this is that the pools of black and white applicants already differ—substantially in many institutions—in their past academic achievements and in their performance on tests of academic ability. Simply applying these criteria at admissions, without regard to race, will have the effect of admitting proportionately few blacks than whites, although those blacks who are admitted will not differ appreciably from the whites in terms of academic ability and past performance. However, if double standards of admissions are employed, the criteria for admitting blacks will have to be lowered, and, as a result of the consequent decline in the number of places for whites, the criteria for admitting whites will be raised. The net result of these lowered criteria for blacks and raised criteria for whites will be to produce a class of entering students in which the association between race and ability is accentuated. If the criteria for blacks are relaxed (or eliminated altogether, as some institutions have done), the resulting freshman class will include a substantial number of blacks (if not the majority) whose level of academic preparation is below that of practically all of the white students who are admitted. Since the subsequent academic performance of most of these black students is likely to be worse than that of most of the white students, the potentiality for increased racial tensions and racial hostility is very great.

One possible advantage of open admissions, in contrast to double standards of admissions, is that the students who enroll at the institution will not form ability dichotomies related to race. On the contrary, a substantial number of white students will enroll whose ability and past performance is comparable to that of the typical black student. In this sense, then, a policy of open admissions has less potential for racial conflict once the students are admitted than does a policy of double standards which is implemented solely in order to increase the proportion of minority students enrolling at the institution.

Those who favor continuation of selective admissions commonly argue that relaxing admissions criteria will tend to lower "academic standards." While such a consequence is indeed possible, it is by no means inevitable. The traditional view is that academic standards are determined primarily by the abilities of the students who are admitted. This bit of folklore may apply to institutions that grade strictly on the curve, but there is no reason why colleges cannot set any standards they wish, independent of their admissions practices. Academic standards have to do with the performance that the institution demands of a student before it will certify that he has passed certain courses or completed certain requirements for the degree. It is true that fewer students are likely to succeed (be certified) if very high performance levels are required at the same time that admissions criteria are relaxed. Nevertheless, standards of performance can still be defined and maintained whatever changes are made in the admissions process.

If one accepts the idea that the college has a primary responsibility for educating its students, then the model of selective admissions based on test scores and grades is difficult to defend. In fact, one could regard selective admissions, perhaps somewhat uncharitably, as the process whereby colleges try to select those students who already know what the college is supposed to teach them. However, if an educational insitution exists to educate students, then its mission is to produce certain desirable changes in the student, or more simply, to make a difference in the student's life. Given these goals, a college should strive in its admissions practices to select those applicants who are most likely to be favorably **influenced** by the particular educational program offered at the institution. Instead, the typical admissions officer today functions like a handicapper: he tries merely to pick winners. He looks over the various candidates, evaluates their respective talents, and attempts to select those who are most likely to perform well. Handicappers, it should be stressed, are interested only in **predicting** the horse's performance, not in helping it to run better and faster. The irony here is that an educational institution should function not like a handicapper but like a jockey or a trainer: it has the responsibility of improving the performance of the student, not just of identifying those individuals with the greatest potential.

In another sense, college admissions officers tend to operate like personnel managers in a commercial enterprise rather than like educators. Picking winners is an appropriate activity for businesses and industries, since their goal is to hire the very best talent in the interests of maximum productivity and profit. Similarly, competition among rival companies for the limited pool of available talent is consistent with the very nature of business. But the business model—which has been adopted by all too many institutions—is not appropriate to education. The mission of the college is **not** simply to maximize its output of distinguished alumni by enrolling as many talented students as possible. Such a static process reduces the college to a kind of funnel: what comes out is purely a matter of what goes in. Colleges and other educational institutions exist in order to change the student, to contribute to his personal development, to make a difference. The personnel manager, looking for applicants who can help the company, is performing his proper function; the admissions officer, seeking students who will eventually enhance the reputation of the college, is not. He **should** be looking for applicants whom the institution can help.

One of the hidden issues here is the problem

of certification—the awarding of credits and degrees. As long as the college is required to play both roles—that of the educator as well as the certifier—it will be caught in a squeeze between the educational needs of the student and the demands of the employers, graduate schools, and other consumers of the graduate. My impression is that colleges would feel much more comfortable about relaxing admissions criteria if they were not at the same time forced to certify their graduates. If the certifying function were taken out of the hands of the college, then the college could devote its primary effort to the task for which it is presumably best qualified—the educational development of the student. The move toward external degrees and credit by examination in a few states is, I think, a very important step in this direction. We can only hope that many more states will have the courage and foresight to implement programs of external degrees on a much larger scale.

The certification function has, I think, forced most colleges into practices which are in many ways inimical to their educational missions. Compare, for example, how the typical college operates in comparison to the typical elementary or secondary school. Students are admitted to college only if they give evidence that they will "pass" certain prescribed courses and eventually "graduate" with a college degree. To reduce the possibility that students will not "pass," the less able are simply excluded from the institutions; those few "unqualified" students who manage to slip through the admissions net and who subsequently perform below their classmates are "flunked out." Most elementary and secondary schools, by contrast, take a much more active stance with respect to their educational responsibilities. Students likely to have difficulty in mastering certain tasks are not screened out beforehand, nor are those who experience such difficulties eliminated from the system ("flunked out"). On the contrary, the elementary and secondary schools assume a responsibility for educating **all** their students, regardless of abilities or past achievements. At worst, the dull or poorly prepared student is accepted as an unavoidable burden; at best, he is regarded as a challenge. In either case, the public elementary and secondary schools nearly always accept all comers and attempt to develop educational programs that are suited to a diversity of student abilities and interests. This job is not always easy, to be sure. But when programs fail, most secondary schools try to revise them, rather than to jettison those students who do not fit into the programs.

It is sometimes argued that expanding higher educational opportunities imposes new educational burdens on colleges and universities that they are "not equipped to handle." Yet most secondary schools and even a few of the largest state systems of higher education in the United States have for many years been operating on what is essentially a policy of open admissions. Moreover, several hundred private colleges have (not out of choice but necessity) traditionally enrolled students in the lower ability ranges, students who in many respects closely resemble those who enter the system under a program of open admissions. For that matter, many of the great state universities in this country have been able to accommodate students at all levels of ability without apparent ill effects. Such institutions have, to be sure, instituted a kind of track system within their curricular programs, but because these programs have operated within a single institution, many of the social and political problems that result from an **institutional** hierarchy have been blunted. A single institution can accommodate a wide range of student ability by establishing curricular programs similar to the ungraded primary system found in many elementary schools. Confining these programs to a single institution also facilitates easy and rapid transfer of students across and within various curricular tracks.

To summarize briefly: I have argued that the issue of who should be admitted to college, and where, cannot be resolved without a more careful consideration of the desired objectives of the higher educational system: Should we strive for outcomes that are egalitarian, elitist, remedial, or what? What are the long-term implications of these various types of objectives for the society?

I have also tried to point out that, whatever our objectives may be, a vertical or hierarchical arrangement of institutions in American higher education may not be the most effective means of achieving these objectives. What is needed, I think, is a more horizontal arrangement, where students are sorted in terms of common interests and goals rather than academic ability.

Finally, I have argued for greater flexibility in the matter of credits and certification of students. Specifically, I have suggested that the certifying function of colleges interferes with their educational function, and that the various states might be well advised to consider relieving the colleges of this burden and establishing some form of certification by examination. One immediate effect of such a change, I think, is that colleges will become more flexible in both their programs and their requirements, and will permit the new student to enter at his current level of performance and to progress at his own rate. Educational resources which would be conserved by accelerating the progress of the brighter student could thus be used to support the more protracted education of the less able student. In this way, we free the high performer from the four-year lockstep of traditional undergraduate education and relieve the less well-prepared student of the burden of unrealistic and unreasonable expectations.

References

Astin, A.W. "Undergraduate Achievement and Institutional 'Excellence'". Science, *1968,* 161, *661-668.*

Astin, A.W. Predicting Academic Performance in College. *New York, New York: The Free Press, 1971.*

Nichols, R.C. "Effects of Various College Characteristics on Student Aptitude Test Scores". Journal of Educational Psychology, *1964,* 55, *45-54.*

Rock, D.A., Centra, J.A., and Linn, R.L. "Relationships Between College Characteristics and Student Characteristics". American Educational Research Journal, *1970,* 7, *109-122.*

Non-Military National Service and Its Impact on Higher Education

□ STEVEN MULLER

Students have called for more relationship between their classroom learning and the "real world" outside the institution. Involving students off-campus through volunteer programs and paid internships has become a wide-spread practice in answer to these requests. There are many, however, who feel that more planned opportunities must be offered and see a relationship between student interest in stopping out of higher education, many needs of society that could be served by today's youth, and a possible alternative to military service.

Steven Muller believes one answer to these needs is a period of compulsory national service for all persons between the ages of 18 and 26. Tied into his proposal is a guaranteed right to two years of higher education to be taken at any time throughout the person's life.

The proposal greatly interested legislators, but their questions and comments showed they considered the structural aspects to be politically unfeasible. Muller also admitted that a compulsory system had defects, but impressively defended his position.

Young men and women in today's America face a troubling paradox. Their society is rich; it can produce to the point of over-production, and it over-consumes. The wages of labor are high—as is the cost of living—and millions of working men and women form, not a lower, but the middle class—and an affluent one. But there is another side. Poverty continues, widespread in this sea of plenty. Crucial services are either not performed at all, or performed badly. Many evident social and human needs are not met. And most poignantly for the young, jobs are difficult to find, and there are thousands upon thousands of youthful unemployed.

In part society is manicured to near-perfection, with the aid of a new suburban technology of upkeep. In other parts, in the inner cities and along the highways, it is littered with filth. Every imaginable comfort can be purchased, but the meaning of life beyond comfort is a mystery. The society has been mobilized for self-defense as long as today's youth has been alive, but it is not mobilized for self-improvement. The problems of social reform seem so gigantic as to be meaningless, and in response many just turn their eyes away.

There is not only a sense of downward drift, but also of boredom. Sensation is exhausted. Some therefore seek for constantly heightened sensation and keep turning up the volume—literally in the field of popular music, and figuratively in the world of drugs, pornography and thrills. Others search for a new sense of meaning, but this is still in the main a private rather than a public search. In the midst of all this, the educational system is desperately troubled. Trying to prepare the young to enter society, it is peopled with young who question this very aim, and who are often already bored for lack of purpose and find no purpose in education *per se*.

Mass problems are public problems. One thinks therefore of new public policy—policy that would mobilize society to redress its own wrongs, that would enlist the nation's youth in this effort, that would provide meaningful work for all the young, and that would restore to social life a vital sense of purpose. And so one speculates about the concept of universal national service for the young—service not for war but for a better nation.

What would happen if Congress passed a law requiring every American man and woman to spend two years in national service between ages 18 and 26, with the provision that such service would nor-

Dr. Muller is Vice President and Provost at Johns Hopkins University

mally be rendered upon the completion of secondary education and that deferments for later service would be granted only upon application? What would millions of young people do to discharge this obligation, and how could they work productively without forcing others out of work? A possible answer lies precisely in those areas of social need which society has failed to address effectively.

One can envision a national service organization with four key components: 1) a national day care system open to all preschool children, at no charge, supervised by professionals but staffed mainly by national service personnel whose formal education has concluded with high school; 2) a national neighborhood preservation system that places essential responsibility for neighborhood security, cleanup, and social service activity in the hands of elected neighborhood councils, assisted by a large work force of national service personnel drawn from the neighborhood itself; 3) a national health corps, charged with the delivery of paramedical services to homes and neighborhoods, staffed by national service personnel supervised and trained by medical authorities; and 4) a national elementary teacher corps providing high-school graduate service personnel not only to relieve the existing teaching staff but also to relieve overloaded educational budgets with services provided at no charge.

Some basic considerations underlie selection of these key components. In each case, urgent large-scale needs are coupled to a lack of requisite large-scale manpower resources. In each case, it seems possible to provide rapid, effective training to secondary school graduates. In each case, the need is national but the impact is local, so the whole nation would benefit through each of its communities and neighborhoods. In several cases, a particular objective is to associate young men and women with children of various ages to create a mutual relationship to substitute for that once provided by the large associational family but now often lost in broken homes and in the small nuclear family. In each case, the intent is to stress services in an immediate human context and to emphasize humane concerns that can balance and relieve the impact of a competitive, technological society. In each case, federal resources would be applied to remedy local problems that now exhaust the limits of local resources.

In addition to the key components, one can envision a limitless number of special service options. The most obvious would be military service, which would become a voluntary option for both men and women within the context of obligatory national service. Another would be an automotive safety corps to assume responsibility for administration on a massive scale of highway and automotive safety regulations, under supervision and after training by police agencies. There could be a hospitality corps charged with round-the-clock assistance to travelers in airports, rail stations, bus depots, on metropolitan transportation, and the like, to restore a human orientation to bewildered travelers from both home and abroad. National service personnel could volunteer for positions to supplement inadequate staffs at institutions for the elderly, the infirm, and the mentally handicapped. There could be a disaster emergency corps, trained and in reserve to respond to natural disasters ranging from earthquakes, floods, storms, or epidemics to such lesser emergencies as temporary power failures or severe snowfalls. There could be a domestic services corps to help in households where both parents must work or where injury or other disability has created temporary emergencies. There is no quick end to elaboration of these options.

How would a troublesome generation of young Americans respond to the challenge of universal national service? There is reason to believe that such a system would answer two deep needs: it would provide an organized framework for meaningful, active expression of latent idealism, and it would break an educational lockstep that now unduly prolongs vicarious and passive experience.

The touching idealism of the young is plainly seen on every college campus. In the midst of a society that preaches liberty but practices conformity; that professes democracy but supports a government openly dominated by vested interests; that is committed to equality under law but has not achieved that goal; and that invokes the pursuit of happiness but perpetrates Mylai, urban ghettos, eroding inflation, and pollution—in the midst of this society, it is the young who aspire to be the restorers, not the destroyers, of the American dream. Confronted by the hyprocrisy and evasion adopted by the mature society to compromise with these contradictions, the young are repelled and dream of revolting. With the naive and sometimes terrifying integrity of youth, some of the student generation are in revolt, some are dropping out into drug usage and mysticism, and some are seeking a communal counterculture, but most are still seeking a cause—a better, more valid cause than the soiled compromises their elders have made and into which the young are drifting. With desperate intensity, youth are searching for meaningful service to build the America they believe in.

At the same time, today's youth are confined in an education ghetto. Physically mature by their late teens, bursting with energy and impatience, sophisticated beyond past measures by the media and secondary education, these students find themselves locked into an educational system that cloisters them from society and is designed primarily to equip them for successful entry into the unchanged America they reject. The ghetto of the campus may be plush, but the origin of the term indicated segregation, not squalor. In great numbers, undergraduates lack purpose and direction. Throughout late childhood and early adolescence, their lives have been shaped primarily by educational considerations. Their undergraduate years seem simply an extension of previous experience, which is both the only major social experience they have had and the experience with which they are surfeited. They lack the practical knowledge essential to developing professional motivation but are obligated to endure years of vicarious knowledge of the world. Their cries for rele-

vance are loud but mistaken and misunderstood; mistaken, because for purposeful and highly motivated students intensive instruction in an educational institution is, in fact, completely relevant; misunderstood, because what these students really seek is temporary release from educational bondage rather than better terms of confinement.

Universal service for domestic improvement may constitute a workable answer to both problems. Limited voluntary efforts, such as the Peace Corps, Teacher Corps, and VISTA, offer proof that youthful idealism could well be a component of a more comprehensive system. Present efforts, however, are too small, restrictive, and specialized to meet the larger need. As for the attempts now being made or considered by collegiate institutions to build social service activities directly into undergraduate education, difficulties exceed possible benefits. Educational institutions are not equipped to manage social action programs, and priorities assigned to social activism threaten the integrity of the educational process. National service may be a better solution for both students and institutions of postsecondary education.

Even so, what about the inevitable and awesome costs involved? The answer is two-fold: one part assumes that the costs would be lower than first imagined; the other asserts that the services envisioned are urgently needed and would have to be paid for in any case. Why might the costs be less? One need not think necessarily of a national service force in uniform, living entirely in special quarters provided by the taxpayer. Most national service personnel could live at home or in private quarters, because, as suggested earlier, they would render service principally in their own communities. Badges, armbands, or other insignia worn on everyday clothing would eliminate the need to put the nation's youth entirely in uniform. Only a minority of national service personnel, such as those in the disaster emergency corps or in military service, would require special housing, with which the armed forces are already provided. As for the other part of the answer, the nation's need for more day care programs, greater paramedical care, increased neighborhood security and improvement, and the like is already acute. A national service system might well prove a less costly and more effective means of providing services than the expensive and partial expedients to which government normally resorts.

What about the cost of paying those on active national service? There would, of course, have to be both a uniform minimum salary to cover essential daily expenses and a uniform minimum housing and maintenance allowance payable to those not quartered and fed in national service or military installations, to compensate the families of those living at home or to make it possible for others to afford their own quarters. Both salary and allowance should be minimal, and those on active national service should receive no additional expendable funds.

However, the federal government should establish a deferred-spending or compulsory savings account for each individual in national service, restricted to [illegible] uses and aggregating not less than $250 per [illegible]th for each individual. One allowable use would [illegible] the cost of postsecondary education for the individual. The other allowable use would be a retirement allowance supplementing social security and payable with accrued interest after the end of national service) either as an allowance after age 65, or as a lump sum or allowance benefit to survivors if death occurs before age 65. This measure would involve great expense offset by great benefits. If used for higher education, the expenditure would be a major step toward a national investment in postsecondary training and would effectively shift much of the individual costs away from the family and to the individual. If used for retirement, it would supplement admittedly inadequate social security payments.

Envisioned along these lines, could universal national service be voluntary, or would it have to be compulsory? The hard answer is that only a compulsory scheme would be truly universal and equitable and that it alone would be practicable. The establishment and administration of national service represents a task so complex and expensive that justification in practice demands universality. Further, national service is an obligation either for all or for none. A voluntary system would have such merits as free choice, higher motivation, smaller volume, and—not least—a better political chance of adoption. But the demerits would be greater. It would lack predictability and equality. It would represent a sacrifice borne more easily in direct relation to personal affluence and, regardless of motivation, would therefore tend to exclude the less affluent. It would inevitably develop discriminatory features, such as biases against women or blacks. It would establish invidious distinctions among those who serve and those who do not. It would be too costly and possibly too ineffective to establish for only an annually incalculable fraction of the nation's youth.

Would such a system harm those who are highly and rightly motivated to pursue postsecondary education without interruption? Not if provision is made for national service boards authorized to grant deferments in such cases. No one could then avoid national service before age 27, but postponement beyond age 18 would be possible. In fact, highly trained individuals entering national service after deferment would be needed to furnish skills not available from personnel entering after the completion of high school.

Could institutions of higher education adapt to a system of universal national service? Not easily, but ultimately, after transitional [illegible], yes—and to their own advantage. With compulsory service, the average entering undergraduate would be 20 or 21 years of age. He would be more mature, purposeful, and refreshingly free from academic fatigue and would be impatient to complete formal education and commence a career. Faced with large numbers of such students, colleges and universities might then do what they have resisted so long: change their curricula radically and shorten both the undergraduate and graduate experiences by making them

more intensive. There might even be reason to eliminate the anachronisms of the present academic calendar, geared as it still often is to an agricultural past.

Could a scheme of universal national service be properly administered? This is perhaps the hardest question. A compulsory national scheme involving all young Americans obviously represents an administrative challenge of large proportion, perhaps one of the largest this country would ever face. The biggest pitfall would be an extensive new administrative establishment at the federal level, one afflicted with a magnified version of the problems now besetting the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. However, the logic of the suggested scheme points to extensive decentralization of the administration to a local level even below municipal government in the nation's larger cities.

A rough outline of an administrative plan might look like this: Record-keeping would be done centrally at the federal level. The experience of the internal revenue and social security systems suggests that this is feasible. National supervision would be provided by a cabinet-level secretary of national service heading a new department. (The new department could result in some reduction in the size and scope of HEW.) This department would be responsible not only for central records but also for direct control of components of the system working at the national level, for example, the emergency service corps, and for supervision and liaison with the local agencies responsible for decentralized administration. There would then be a national service office in each state and in each county. The state office would not directly administer programs but would exist primarily to supervise and coordinate the county offices.

Direct administration of the decentralized programs would occur essentially at the county level. Administrators at this level would be involved with the organization of suitable component programs within each county and would be the first level of accountability for the staff. All payment to permanent staff and enlisted personnel would come from the federal government, but administrators at the county level would bear the principal burden of maintaining liaison with county and other local governments and of establishing effective new neighborhood organizations, particularly in urban areas. Staff hierarchies would be governed by a uniform federal pattern of organization, but staff recruitment and supervision would be exercised primarily at the county level. A cardinal role of the state offices would be to ascertain that appropriate and nondiscriminatory procedures were observed at the county level in recruiting and assigning staff and in operating programs.

One virtue of this approach is that it parallels the notion of federal revenue sharing. While such an administrative scheme would not share federal revenue as such, it would place a national resource in the form of mobilized young talent at the disposal of local authorities for use in achieving maximum local benefits. It would also challenge local governments to develop greater competence and cooperation in making the most effective use of national service resources. Embodied in this envisioned administrative system is the ideal combination of massive egalitarian deployment of human resources, possible at the national level, and utmost flexibility, possible at the local level, to afford the maximum local impact.

If these are the rudiments of a possible universal national service system, what can be said in brief about the virtues and defects?

As to virtues, there are perhaps four significant aspects:

1) Universal national service would restore the moral and patriotic qualities of service to society within a context of national priorities which appears to be legitimate in terms of the most pressing social needs. In the majority of cases, it would balance service to the nation with service to the local community—the nation in microcosm at a familiar level. It would represent service to causes of unquestionable necessity and integrity, by all for all, providing equal opportunity as well as equal obligation.

2) Universal national service would offer a new opportunity to young Americans to actively address their society's major problems. It would permit them to serve by making maximum use of their talents, while simultaneously providing them the opportunity to measure themselves in action and to discover new reasons for continuing their education. It would place at the disposal of the nation the priceless talents of its young, not only to defend the nation but also to preserve and to strengthen a society worth defending. It would provide the manpower to accomplish necessary tasks that lie beyond the operation of the national economy.

3) The scheme would break the lockstep of the present educational progression. While every young person need not meet his obligation automatically upon graduation from secondary school, there would at least be the opportunity to interrupt the educational continuum with two years of applied activity. An almost certain result would be more highly motivated, more mature, and fewer academically fatigued students in higher education. Higher education benefited greatly from the impact of World War II veterans, who brought analogous motivation and enthusiasm, as well as greater maturity, to the campus.

4) Finally, universal national service would contribute to the erosion of discrimination. It would enroll women and minority group members—blacks, Puerto Ricans and others—on an equal basis. It would not only permit but also encourage participants to maximize the benefits of their particular backgrounds and to apply them to the most urgent problems in their own communities. To use young black Americans as an example, the proposed scheme would offer a structured opportunity for them to work in black communities under local neighborhood supervision or, alternatively, with young black children. Women would participate equally with men. One question that naturally arises is whether such a scheme would defer marriage. The answer is not necessarily. Because it is proposed that most national service personnel live at home or on their own, rather than in special facilities, there would

appear to be no reason why marriage—or parenthood—could not be concomitant with national service. Service personnel with children could take advantage of the proposed day care facilities. New career opportunities would open for those interested in becoming permanent staff for the national service system. In some cases, such careers might be particularly attractive and suitable for women and minority group members.

As to the defects, there are again at least four obvious considerations:

1) The concept of universal national service involves enormous national expense. No matter how persuasive the argument that such expense is justified by the nation's need, the total funding would be so great as to raise serious questions.

2) A compulsory system goes against much American tradition. It was argued earlier that a compulsory system is preferable to a voluntary system, but many will object strenuously to any new obligation.

3) A compulsory system of national service, particularly one addressed to the nation's domestic needs, will seem to some to smack of socialism. The argument will be made that a free society should find voluntary means within the structure of free enterprise to meet its problems.

4) Even though the suggested plan envisions maximum administrative decentralization, the argument will be made that it requires too large a bureaucracy to be workable and that the bureaucratic defects of so large a system would tend to counteract its possible benefits. A speech attacking the scheme based on analogies to Communist China's Red Guards is neither hard to imagine nor hard to write.

One may conclude that the virtues of a compulsory universal national service system outweigh the defects, or one may reach the contrary conclusion. But a final question can be asked: What chance is there that Congress or the administration would adopt such a scheme? In the American system a political decision to enact national service depends on the calculation of whether such action is good politics. That calculation in turn depends on the degree to which the nation has been discussed and advocated by society. A society in major difficulties must be prepared to consider major steps to deal with them. A compulsory universal national service system would be a major step of unprecedented proportions, but that alone argues as much for as against it. What is required is mature consideration. Reflections on American's problems and their causes abound. At the very least, the need is most urgent for serious discussion, not only of what is wrong and why, but also of what must be done.

These ideas have in large part recently appeared in print in the Winter 1971 issue of the *Educational Record*. However, this is my first opportunity to share them with a wider audience. I particularly welcome the opportunity for public discussion with this distinguished and knowledgeable group.

Less Time, More Options □ CLARK KERR

The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education has issued the most extensive and influential studies and reports on the future of higher education in recent years. The appearance of its chairman, Clark Kerr, provided legislators an opportunity for extensive discussion of Commission recommendations for reform.
Commission recommendations contained in the report Less Time, More Options **served as the basis for Kerr's paper, but he dealt with many broader aspects of reform that are of concern to legislators.**
Kerr told the conference that this is a decade for examination and innovation in higher education and urged these leaders to invite institutions in their states to seriously examine and comment on the Commission's work.

Ladies and gentlemen, it is a great pleasure to participate once again in a conference organized by the Southern Regional Education Board. I have always admired the high quality of the programs and how well they are organized. Let me say also that after having had an opportunity to see higher education across the nation, it is my judgment that there are more favorable current developments in higher education in the states affiliated with the Southern Regional Education Board, than in other regions of the country. This is partly the result of the SREB, but it is also the result of the very great interest of legislators and governors in the Southern states.

I believe also that the whole nation ought to realize that the section of the country that is making the most progress in equality of opportunity, both generally and in higher education, is the South; and, in many respects, equality of opportunity in the North is now deteriorating. Rather than looking upon the ancient problems of equality in the United States as particularly Southern problems, we should acknowledge that the solutions to them appear to be coming most effectively here. I think you ought to be very proud of this accomplishment, and should be very pleased with what it means for the progress of the South.

Now, before turning to my specific topic, let me say a word about the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. Our Commission was established to take a look at higher education in the United States to the year 2000 with particular attention to the 1970's. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching had previously conducted a series of studies of education under James Conant, the former president of Harvard, and the reports of those studies had a substantial impact on the American high school. When that series of studies was finished, the Carnegie Foundation set up our commission on higher education.

We are sponsoring a series of studies by independent scholars. Dr. Astin, who spoke before you yesterday, has, with Calvin B. T. Lee, written a book for us which will be released in the fall and which you should find quite interesting. It is about what he calls the "invisible colleges," all the small colleges around the United States that are hardly heard of outside their localities and are in particularly difficult financial straits, but which seem to do about as good a job in educating their students as any place else, including Harvard. Another of our studies that you will be hearing about tomorrow morning is by Professor Cheit of the University of California. It is *The New Depression in Higher Education.* All together we will be publishing about 40 books by independent scholars, and additional reports by the Commission itself.

Thus far we have issued eight Commission reports. Our first one was on federal aid to higher education—how much there should be, and what form it should take. In his message on higher education

---

Dr. Kerr is Chairman of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education

in March 1970, President Nixon accepted the goals of our report in principle. In fact, he used some of our language and repeated it again in 1971, although the administration's proposals did not provide as much money as we recommended. Judging by the accounts in the morning press, the Senate has accepted these same goals, although it would provide somewhat more money than the Carnegie Commission had recommended. That first report has been quite controversial because organized higher education has not agreed with what we have recommended. But it seems to be receiving agreement not only in the White House but also in the Congress and is on its way to becoming, quite evidently, national policy.

Another report is on the community colleges, recommending their spread throughout the United States so that 95 percent of all Americans would be within commuting distance of one by the end of this decade. We prepared a report on higher education and the health of Americans, which is also very quickly becoming national policy. President Nixon, when he made his health proposals, referred to our Commission; pending bills on the subject in the House and the Senate reflect our suggestions. Congressman Rogers of Florida, in particular, has made proposals following along the lines of our recommendations. This report has been called the "new Flexner report" and, although it is less than a year old, it is already the most influential report on health manpower and the training of doctors since 1910.

We have a report on the future of the black colleges under the title of *From Isolation to Mainstream.* On that report, I might say, we had extraordinarily good help from the staff of the SREB. We recently issued *The Campus and the Capitol,* a report on relations between the states and higher education. Another recent report is on *Dissent and Disruption* and concerns how we can protect the right to dissent and at the same time prevent disruption.

Our Commission has 18 members. At our last meeting—in Seattle, a distant corner of the United States, at the end of June, when vacations were beginning—14 of our 18 members were in attendance. We could have had 16 except two commissioners, including Bill Friday, who was detained by legislative problems in North Carolina, encountered last minute difficulties.

The report I will discuss this morning is looked upon by some persons in higher education as a very radical—some people might even say subversive—report. So I would like to indicate that we are neither a radical nor subversive organization. Our membership includes, in addition to Bill Friday, who's been so active within the SREB; former President Pusey of Harvard, who is the new head of the vast Mellon Foundation which will be the third largest foundation in the United States; former Governor William Scranton of Pennsylvania; Clifton Phalen, former vice president of American Telephone and Telegraph and now chairman of the executive committee of the Marine Midland Banks, Inc., in New York; Ted Hesburgh, president of Notre Dame, and others of equal stature.

The subtitle for your conference is "Reform or More of the Same?" Those of you who sit in legislatures and on legislative committees think that for higher education it is always just more of the same. When I saw that title, I was reminded that back at the time that Samuel Gompers founded the American Federation of Labor there were some Congressional hearings. The question at issue was, What does the American Federation of Labor want? Does it want to end capitalism, does it want to destroy society, does it want 100 percent of the products of society? At one hearing, one of Gompers' top colleagues, Adolf Strasser, was asked, "What are your ultimate aims?" In this very highly charged atmosphere of the new trade movement, Strasser said, "We have no ultimate aims." The chairman said, "Are you going to be satisfied when you get 100 percent of everything America produces?" and Strasser said, "No, we won't be satisfied even then." The chairman said, "Well, what is your aim then?" and Strasser said, "Our aim is more, more, more, and now!"

Some of you legislators may feel that's the way higher education has been approaching you. You are correct. It does so by necessity because there are more students and they cost more per year. We can, therefore, expect more of the same, and the real question is whether there will be reform to go with it.

Our Commission has identified three great goals for the 1970's. One is to achieve equality of opportunity. We promised it to all Americans when this nation was founded and equality of opportunity today includes the equality of opportunity to get an education. We think another great goal of the 1970's is to supply the health manpower that the nation requires. We have a great deficit in our health manpower—perhaps as many as a million people. Beyond that is the third major goal for the 1970's—achieving needed reforms in the structures and programs at our colleges and universities.

Talking about the reform of the basic structure of higher education, inevitably gets down to discussion of the degrees that we offer. We have now two basic degrees, the B.A. degree taking four years to earn and the Ph.D. taking from five to 10 to 15 years, and all of our institutions are geared to these basic degrees and time requirements.

I would like now to indicate some of the concerns of our Commission as we talked about the future of higher education and its structure. Then I want to report very briefly on the measures we recommend to meet these concerns.

First of all, we felt that in the United States we have been creating only a single channel for young people to enter productive life—going to college. If a student doesn't go, he is handicapped in the labor market ever after. In the State of California now, 75 percent of all high school graduates are entering college, and if you project the trends into the future, it is going to 100 percent. Is it wise to have only this one channel to enter productive life?

We also became disturbed because, as our society increasingly accepted the single channel, we were getting more and more of a captive audience in our colleges. There was a study made recently by Professors Jaffe and Adams at Columbia, which,

among other things, tried to get at these questions: How much of a captive audience do we have already? How many students are in college against their will or feel that they are there under pressure? It turns out to be about one in eight. With eight million students in higher education, this would amount to one million students who regard themselves as an absolutely captive audience. What kind of students are they likely to be?

A second concern of the Commission is that the United States seems in the process of becoming too much of a "certificate society," when you can't get anyplace without a certificate. And, rather than decide what a man's merit really is, employers, or their agents who do the employing, will only look at what degrees he has. Shouldn't there be more careers open to talent, and less formal certification?

Our third concern is this: Are we not prolonging the stage of youth over too many years? Until modern times, young people left their parents early to start their own family—get married and have kids. They stopped working with their parents to work their own farms, their own pieces of land. We have, in modern times, instead, a long period of dependency. At college age, you're no longer in your parents' family. You're not yet in your own family. You're not producing for society. You're in a dependent situation, sitting in a classroom. Leading psychologists like Kenneth Keniston and Bruno Bettelheim have raised the question, Are we prolonging youth, this period of dependency, too long?

Our fourth concern is: Are we wasting a lot of the time students spend in high school and college? Are we using their talents fully, or do we duplicate the work that they undertake? Can we save some of their time? A recent study was made of the curricula in high schools and the first two years of college. High school teachers looked at what was given in the first two years in college, college professors looked at what was given the last two years of high school. They found that 30 percent of the work given in the freshman and sophomore years in college now exactly duplicates work that students have had in high school. Now 30 percent in each of two years adds up to 60 percent duplication in a single year. Additionally there are some studies which are not duplicated but which we think result in somewhat wasted time.

A fifth question: Can we not only save time for students, but costs for society? Do we have to spend as much money as we do on educating our college students? How much cost can be saved?

A sixth concern is: How can we get better students? The GI's who went to college after World War II were outstanding students. I was teaching in the classroom at that time, as I had been before and as I have been since, and I would say—as I think almost any professor who went through that experience would say—they were the best students that we ever had and were probably the best students in the whole history of American higher education. They came in more mature and more oriented to what they wanted to get out of college. Is there some way to get back the GI type of student?

I might say that concern arises also by knowing about the situation in Israel, where no man can enter higher education unless he's had three years of national service, which means almost entirely in the military, nor can any woman enter unless she's had a year or a year and a half in national service, and it seems to work very well. I have been for a number of years on a commission advising Emperor Haile Sellassie on higher education in Ethiopia. On one of our earlier visits there, they were putting in a compulsory year of national service for all students in their university system. At that time there was great resentment about it. The faculty members were saying that it was a waste of time; it was not academic. Most of the students would have to go out in the country to work in schooling and on health problems. They said they didn't like to go into the country. Their whole orientation was that they came out of villages and were trying to get to cities where they could work in civil service for the rest of their lives. When we were there this last spring, we found the faculty members liking it. Now they are saying: We don't want this just run by the university as a whole. We want it turned over to our individual departments so we can make it even more meaningful for academic work. The students are saying that they have learned a great deal by being out in contact with real problems. The national service requirement never would have been established if the Emperor had not said it had to happen. A few years later it is really almost demanded because of its success. And Ethiopian students came back from national service like our GI's after World War II. So, how can we get better students?

Our seventh concern is that we now tend to exclude older people from higher education. We say college is for people from 18 to 21 or 18 to 22, and that's all. Shouldn't there be ways that everybody can get in anytime they want to, anytime that will serve their purposes?

Our next concern is: Do our degrees really fit what people do, and particularly does the Ph.D. degree? William James, way back in about 1900, wrote a famous essay called "The Ph.D. Octopus," and complained that everything was being oriented towards specialized research. Yet studies show that 85 percent of the people that get the research degree, never do any research. In fact they teach and they don't do research. We became concerned that education for the Ph.D. degree in some ways was bad training. It trained people away from a broad orientation for teaching and the teaching art. So we said: Does the Ph.D., in particular, fit what America needs?

Our last question is: Do we have to have all these dropouts? Half of our students now drop out along the way.

I'd like to give you now very quickly what solutions we think we found to these concerns.

1) First of all, we concluded that the time spent getting degrees was just too long. Students come out of high school better prepared than ever before. We have this duplication between high school and college that I mentioned. The last year in high school is often wasted. Many students get admitted to col-

lege on November 1 and then waste the rest of their senior year. I have talked with students in many many states and they tell me that they think they waste at least two years in high school and college. We say, let's save at least one. So we recommend that the amount of time for each degree be reduced by one-fourth; that the standard length of time for the B.A. not be four years but three; that the length of time spent for the M.D. not be four but three, and as an intern and resident not be four or five years but be three (which would save a medical doctor three years getting into practice); and that the length of time for the Ph.D. be set at four years, not the five or six or 10 or 15 or 18 it takes at the present time. We conclude that you could save one quarter of the time students spend in school. I know that the opponents of our report say quality will go down. We're convinced it would not.

2) We also feel that young people ought to be given more options in lieu of formal education. Why does everybody have to go to college? They can go through apprenticeship training, trade unions' apprenticeship programs, industry training programs, and lots of other alternatives. They might be given the option to defer college attendance and engage in national service—something like Steve Muller talked about. Instead of regarding the **drop out** as a bad idea, why not have the **stop out** as a good idea. We recommend that people not say, if you drop out, you somehow fail; but, rather, that we're going to encourage you to stop out between high school and college, or between lower and upper division or between your B.A. degree and going into graduate work. We encourage the stop out to get national service and work experience; and we also support more opportunities for students to change directions while in college.

3) Also we feel that people ought to be given more of a chance to get an education throughout their lives. Higher education ought to be accessible to the woman who has raised her children and now wants a career, to people who want to change their careers, to all Americans regardless of age. We suggest that people be given what we call "two-years-in-the-bank," so that if they want to go to college, they don't have to go there right out of high school in order to get loans, or grants, or work-study help, or other benefits. They would be told that they have two years coming to them anytime in their lives.

4) Next, we recommend two new degrees which would be oriented toward teaching and which would give students a broader orientation than the present research degree. The present M.A. is geared toward research with the emphasis on a thesis, and the Ph.D. is based on a narrow dissertation and narrower research problems. We propose that there be a two-year Master of Philosophy degree which would be broadly oriented, not just toward some aspect of, say, economics, but toward all of economics or the social sciences, with some emphasis on teaching ability and the teaching arts for people who are going to teach in the community colleges (and they will soon be the biggest element of higher education). And then the four-year Doctor of Arts degree for most of the teachers in our colleges. We think they would be better oriented for teaching and make less demands for research facilities. In some fields, in my judgment, research is now quite overdone. So the Doctor of Arts degree would respond more to what the students want today—somebody who wants to teach and not be off doing research. This is not, of course, intended to downgrade the Ph.D., which is still highly desirable for people who are going to do basic research.

5) We suggest that rather than having the four-year module, as we have at the present time, we have shorter modules. We suggest that if students can get a degree every two years, we would have fewer dropouts. Students are more likely to finish up a two-year program than a four-year program. So we talk about making the Associate in Arts degree a much more important degree than it is now, and available in one year or one and one-half years, offering the standard Bachelor of Arts two years later, the Master of Philosophy two years after that, and the Doctor of Arts or the Ph.D. two years beyond that.

6) We talk in our report about relying less on certification and asking employers, and testing agencies that work with them, to look at the person and not just at his degrees.

7) We suggest, in terms of savings, that not only can we save at least a year out of the lives of millions of young Americans, but we can also save society quite a bit of money. Now, you may say, if we reduce the length of time by one-quarter then why don't you save one-quarter of the cost? The reason is that our program is aimed at having less dropouts. We estimate, if our program became accepted across the nation, that the cost of higher education in 1980 would be reduced by 10 to 15 percent, which means by $3 to $5 billion per year. This would mean in the state of California (which is the largest state and thus not representative) that the reduced cost to the legislature in 1980, as compared with what would happen under current trends, would be $500 to $800 million per year. That's for a single state. We now have a report under way in which we're going to recommend still other savings.

8) We also recommend emphasis on part-time studies. The idea of working people going to school to earn degrees at the same time they work to earn a living is being pioneered by England's Open University. New York State is now trying to follow that example. A less known system will begin this fall in Japan. It is a nationwide university based upon the video cassette, and the Japanese now have the technological equipment to do it. They aren't yet very good on what's called the "software" for the program, but they are now prepared with the "hardware." This would mean that one really could have life-long learning—that everybody, who wanted to, could get higher education throughout their lives.

All of these suggested changes would be very good for society. We are now developing a class of students which is sort of against the class of workers. The two classes are fighting each other, resenting each other, and not understanding each other. We

think it would be more normal if students also had experience with work; more normal if people who are in the employed labor force also had some opportunity to get more education; more normal to mix the ages and to mix the roles; and more normal to avoid this growing class antagonism between the pure student and the pure worker. Freud once wrote that work was the best contact with reality that most people have, and I really believe that if you don't give people some contact with work, with real life, that you're depriving them of contact with reality. So we became convinced that it would be much better to mix work and study, mix youth and age.

I want to mention the two most controversial aspects of the report. The first is cutting out the one year of undergraduate studies. It is claimed that this will reduce quality, and it will push the students too hard. It is also said that if you are going to reduce a year, why not take it out of the high school? Let me say that we don't think that quality needs to be reduced. We think that students would be better off if they were pushed a bit harder, and that there's plenty of leeway at the present time. We looked at the possibility of having a three-year high school. We came out against that on these grounds: the high school student lives at home more frequently than the college student does and thus it is more costly for students to take the time out of high school when they can live at home; also, there are many parents who would not like to have their children leave the home that early. So we thought if one year could be saved, that it was better to save it at the college level than the high school level.

This proposal to reduce time spent in college has an impact within higher education that frightens some people. The fact that there may be fewer students coming means that there are going to be fewer teaching jobs and fewer openings. In a period when there's a surplus of Ph.D.'s anyway, this thought does become kind of scary. It is not mentioned publicly, but it does lie behind some of the criticism of our suggestion.

The other point which has been most under attack in the academic community is the idea of a Doctor of Arts degree. Higher education has been geared toward the Ph.D.—toward research. Some feel that our Commission is downgrading the Ph.D. We don't fee that way at all. We're all in favor of the highest quality Ph.D.'s we can get. That degree is a specialist's degree for people who will really do research. We also feel that the Doctor of Arts degree would not be a downgraded degree, but a *different* degree for a *different* purpose. The Ph.D. degree has these effects: somebody gets a Ph.D. and goes to a junior college, he wants to teach a course in the same subject matter as his dissertation; nobody wants that particular course, but he insists on it. He also insists on a research library. He also insists on research equipment. He doesn't want to teach the broad subjects at a junior college or a state college; he wants to teach his own specialty. So we feel that the Ph.D. degree—a degree that is very, very useful for people who will really use it—provides a negative training for people who won't need it or use it. It gives them false expectations, and does not prepare them well to do their jobs.

In spite of criticisms, there has been a great deal of favorable response to our report. The Association of American Colleges, which is made up of about 800 mostly private liberal arts colleges in the United States, passed the following resolution unanimously at its annual meeting in January 1971:

> *Whereas* the recent report of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, entitled *Less Time, More Options: Education Beyond the High School* advocates reforms which would require sweeping changes in American higher education and are therefore of vital interest and concern to the members of the Association of American Colleges;
>
> *Be it resolved* that the Association commend the commission for bringing these important issues before the academic community, urge each of its member colleges to study the proposed reforms and their implications for the future of higher education, and undertake as an association to explore those issues on behalf of its total membership.

Beyond that, a substantial number of institutions are looking at our proposals. Some of you may have seen in the *Wall Street Journal* for July 15 a report on what they called "Instant Sophomores" and giving credit to the Carnegie Commission for opening up this question for national discussion. They point out that the California State Colleges and the State University of New York, which are the two biggest systems of higher education in the nation, are very seriously studying our proposals and planning in the very near future to introduce some aspects of them. They mentioned that Harvard and Princeton are also making serious studies of the proposals. The new president of Harvard, in one of his very first statements about the future of Harvard, said that he wanted to look at the suggestions of this report, and particularly the three-year degree. The *Wall Street Journal* did not mention certain other places studying these possibilities. They include the University of California, which is the largest University System in the nation, and the University of Nebraska. A consortium within the state of Connecticut headed by the University of Connecticut is also taking a look at these ideas. The one place in the United States, to my knowledge, which had done something along these lines before our report was New College in Sarasota, Florida. I visited that college in the course of our work on the report to look at the three-year option which they had developed there. And we also point out that all of British higher education is on a three-year program. And no one would claim that the British degrees are of low quality.

Now, as I reach my conclusion, let me list the forces which I think are at work in the directions I've been presenting to you, and those which are against it. These are three forces favorable to these directions.

First of all, we created three million places for students in the 1960's, but we need three million more in the 1970's, a period of great financial stringency. If you reduce the length of time required to

complete a college education, you open up a lot of places, quite obviously, for these three million new students coming in.

Second, by and large, students favor the idea of both less time and more options. Generally they are on the side of this kind of reform.

Third, anybody concerned with costs—governors, legislators, and trustees—has to be interested in this approach.

Now, what are the forces against it?

First of all, faculty members for some of the reasons I've indicated are doubtful. They fear that a three-year degree won't be as good as a four-year degree, that the Doctor of Arts degree won't be as good as the Ph.D.—and, anyway, it's a change. Steve Muller made the comment that changing a curriculum is like moving a graveyard. I personally have had experience working with trade unions, industry, government agencies, universities, and private associations, and there is no group in the United States as conservative about its own affairs and as liberal (and sometimes radical) about everybody else's affairs as a college faculty. As soon as the professor who is a radical about society walks into the faculty club, he is the greatest of conservatives. They just do not like change, so faculties are doubtful. There will be resistance at the staff level, too, because what we're recommending would give rise to a lot more flexibility—deferred admissions, stop outs, things of that sort—which would make it tougher for the bureaucracy of the campus to administer the rules.

And then, third, if our program went through, it would also make the work of hiring offices for employers tougher. They would have to use their judgment about whether an applicant is a good person or a bad person rather than hiding, as they so often do, behind the person's degrees.

Let me say just very briefly, in conclusion, that the Commission would hope that each of the states within the SREB—your 14 states—as well as elsewhere, would invite the institutions which it supports to examine and comment on *Less Time, More Options*. We believe that affirmative action on our recommendations would both improve the quality of higher education and reduce the costs. Higher education can no longer just stand on the platform of what has been done in the past should be done in the future. The 1970's should be a decade of reexamination, innovation and improvement. External encouragement, I'm sorry to say, not only can assist this process of innovation, but may also be necessary. Historically—going back to the founding of the University of Bologna in the 12th Century—most reforms that have taken place in higher education, over all the intervening centuries, have come either from outside leadership or the influence of changing outside circumstances.

The recommendations of the Commission may seem radical to many within higher education. They are instead, in my judgment, conservative in the light of the changed circumstances outside, in the general society. So I appreciate very much your attention, and look forward to the chance to participate in further discussions about these ideas.

The New Depression in Higher Education: The Growing Crisis and Ways To Resolve It

□ EARL F. CHEIT

The administrator of a public institution faces a rising sea of students, surrounding a shrinking island of money.
This was the message Earl F. Cheit, author of The New Depression in Higher Education, **a study done for the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, brought to the Legislative Work Conference. While this dilemma wasn't news to state legislators, Cheit's presentation at the conference triggered a lively discussion of the seriousness of the "depression" in higher education. Cheit described the method and results of his 41-college survey, and indicated that nearly three-fourths of the institutions studied were either in financial trouble or headed for it. He expressed optimism about solving the "financial crunch," however, and said that the operating expenditures deficit could be met with funds from federal, state, local and private sources. A panel discussion following the paper uncovered political leaders' continuing concerns that additional funds were being requested, while the needed reforms in higher education had not been initiated, and that states are unable to meet demands for increased higher education spending.**

I

During the last few years when college and university presidents spoke to alumni and friends about the programs and aspirations of the campus, it was easy to predict what would happen when the question period started. An impatient hand would wave, and an angry voice would not question but assert, "All this talk about academic programs is fine, but the fact is you have troublemakers on campus who are there to disrupt, not to get an education, and you haven't kicked them off. *That* is why the campus is in serious trouble, in bad shape."

In response, the president took the broad philosophic view: "Like all other schools in the nation," he would say, "we have had a few incidents, much overblown by the press. But the main point of my remarks about the campus still stands—fundamentally we are in very good shape."

Today in the same setting, the roles are reversed. Today the college president is talking about the financial crisis in higher education. In a worried, even angry, speech, he will demonstrate it creates a crisis on his campus. In the question period, that angry fellow has been replaced by a financial philosopher who will say, "Along with other campuses in the nation, you are having a few difficulties, most of them exaggerated by the media. Everyone is having financial troubles. If you concentrated more on academic work and less on bigger budgets you would see my point—fundamentally, the campus is in very good shape."

I note this story about role reversal not only for what it says about the job of the president nor to remind us that it is a parallel to the role reversal that occurs about the power of ideas at different times.

I emphasize the story now because how one responds to the title of this conference session "The New Depression in Higher Education: The Growing Crisis and Ways to Resolve It" depends in considerable part on whether one lines up with the worried president who sees a growing crisis, or with the financial philosopher, who sees an internal campus problem.

Backing the worried president's view that we are experiencing a financial crisis is a growing number of studies, including one by the American Association of Colleges, the work of Hans Jenny on the liberal arts colleges, and many reports on individual institutions. It is the view of organized higher edu-

Dr. Cheit is Professor of Business Administration at the University of California, Berkeley

cation, as revealed in testimony before the House Subcommittee on Congresswoman Green's bill on institutional aid, that there is a financial crisis.

On the other hand, our financial philosopher's view that this is mainly an internal problem will find support in last month's *Morgan Guaranty Survey*, which concludes that the colleges themselves are responsible for high costs, and that their "own actions in tightening up operations will be critical to restoration of financial health." California's Governor Reagan put himself in that camp on June 22, when he told the San Francisco Commonwealth Club that greater funding was not the best answer to the university's financial problem, but that the situation should be handled internally.

Early in the year it appeared that this might also be the view of the federal government, but no longer. In his testimony on June 9 1971, before the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, HEW Secretary Elliot L. Richardson stated that his department had reviewed all existing studies, and conducted several studies of its own, and, "Yet despite all these studies, it is not possible for us or anyone else to arrive at a clear-cut set of conclusions about the financial health or educational needs of institutions of higher education. We are dealing with a constantly moving target as to which aggregate data are nearly always out of date. More importantly, there are many different indices for determining whether or not higher education institutions are in trouble. . . thus while most institutions either have or feel they have financial problems, we conclude that what higher education faces at present is not a general 'crisis' but a 'crunch'—a crunch which affects institutions differently, and has been brought on by the convergence of a number of different economic and political forces. . ."

In her testimony before the House Subcommittee, Dr. Alice Rivlin of the Brookings Institution told the Subcommittee ". . .my own impression from available studies and conversations with higher educators is that there is no *general* crisis of higher education finance," implying there are selective crises, which she then describes as they affect various kinds of institutions.

In a paper prepared for delivery next fall at the American Council on Education meeting, my colleague, Fred Balderston of the University of California, concludes that he prefers the term "stress" to that of "crisis" because "the latter implies that there is a peak of tension and then an end to it."

My own study leads me to conclude that there is a serious financial problem in higher education—a problem both for institutions, and for students and their parents.

Whether one describes that situation as "The New Depression in Higher Education" as I did on the basis of my recent study: or "Going Broke on Campus" as did *Newsday;* or "Universities in Danger" as did the *New York Times;* or "How Colleges Cope with Red Ink" as did *Business Week,* the basic story is the same around the country: Higher education has come upon hard times. I came to this conclusion after studying the experience of 41 colleges and universities. Let me comment briefly on that study, then turn to its implications, and finally to the steps we can take to improve the situation.

II

The study was conducted for the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, and its findings were published a few months ago.[1] Because the Commission was receiving an increasing number of reports of financial troubles on campuses around the country, it was eager to have a prompt overview of the situation.

My assignment was to produce for interested persons off and on campus a short, current, factual analysis of the financial health of institutions of various types.

My first problem was: How does one measure the financial health of a college or university with no handy criteria comparable to profits or price/earnings ratios? Budget deficits are clues to financial conditions of private institutions, but considered alone they can conceal as much as they tell. Deficits can be budgeted as a means of stimulating gifts, or they can be avoided by the means of low program aspirations. They can also be a sign of trouble. State institutions can show no budget deficits, at the same time suffering quality deficits, which while difficult to measure and easy to deny, are no less severe for being hidden in diluted programs.

This question—how do you measure the financial health of colleges and universities—was of primary importance not only to the formulation of a sensible study, but also for development of responsible public policy. My study sought to contribute to that end. I established three classifications of schools: 1) those not in trouble; 2) those headed for trouble; and 3) those in financial difficulty.

For purposes of the study, those colleges and universities which could meet current quality and program standards, and could with some assurance plan their projected program growth, were classified "not in trouble." An institution was classified as "headed for trouble" if at the time of the study, it had been able to meet current responsibilities without reducing quality, but either could not assure that it could much longer meet current program and quality standards or could not plan support for evolving program growth. An institution was judged "in financial difficulty" if its current financial condition forced upon it a loss of quality or a loss of services that were regarded as part of its program.

III

Forty-one institutions were selected for study (see Table 1). The study consisted first of gathering for each institution basic income and expenditure information for the decade of the 1960's. The second phase of the study was visit to each of the campuses and an extensive interview there with campus administrators, usually the president and his administrative colleagues most directly concerned with financing the institution and influencing its academic direction.

What did I find? First, that almost three-fourths of the schools studied (71 percent) were either in

financial difficulty or headed for it. The Carnegie Commission staff estimates (by a national projection of my sample) that two-thirds of the nation's colleges —enrolling three-fourths of the nation's students— are in financial difficulty or headed for it.

My study found that all types of institutions are affected. The major private universities were hit first, but the others are not far behind. Public and private alike are facing increasing financial trouble. No class of institution is exempt from the problem or free from financial trouble. This is illustrated by the list of schools, grouped by the study classification and categories (see Table 2).

Twelve schools (29 percent) were classified "not in trouble." Although it is natural to try to find one unifying explanation that accounts for any

Table 1

Institutions Studied in The New Depression in Higher Education

National Research Universities (7)
Harvard University
Stanford University
University of California, Berkeley
University of Chicago
University of Michigan
University of Minnesota, Minneapolis
University of Texas, Austin

State & Comprehensive Colleges (5)
Boston College
Central Michigan University
Portland State University
Saint Cloud State College
San Diego State College

Primarily Black Colleges (5)
Fisk University
Howard University
Huston-Tillotson College
Morgan State College
Tougaloo College

Leading Regional Research Universities (8)
New York University
Ohio University
Saint Louis University
Syracuse University
Tulane University
University of Missouri, Columbia
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill
University of Oregon

Liberal Arts Colleges (11)
Albion College
Allegheny College
Beloit College
Carleton College
Cumberland College
Hamilton College
Knox College
Meredith College
Mills College
Pomona College
Whitman College

Two-Year Colleges (5)
City Colleges of Chicago
College of San Mateo
Flint Community Junior College
Gulf Coast Junior College
Mesa College

These were chosen, not as a representative sample of all 2,763 institutions of higher education in the nation, but as schools that are illustrative of the major types of educational institutions.

Table 2

Classification of Institutions, By Type and By Level of Financial Difficulty.

National Research Universities

Not in trouble	Headed for trouble	In trouble
University of Texas, Austin	Harvard University University of Chicago University of Michigan University of Minnesota	Stanford University University of California, Berkeley

Leading Regional Research Universities

Not in trouble	Headed for trouble	In trouble
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill	Ohio University Syracuse University University of Missouri, Columbia University of Oregon	New York University St. Louis University Tulane University

State and Comprehensive Colleges

Not in trouble	Headed for trouble	In trouble
Saint Cloud State College	Central Michigan University Portland State University	Boston College San Diego State College

Liberal Arts Colleges

Not in trouble	Headed for trouble	In trouble
Hamilton College Meredith College Mills College Whitman College	Albion College Allegheny College Carleton College Cumberland College Knox College Pomona College	Beloit College

Primarily Black Colleges

Not in trouble	Headed for trouble	In trouble
Howard University Morgan State College		Fisk University Huston-Tillotson College Tougaloo College

Two-Year Colleges

Not in trouble	Headed for trouble	In trouble
College of San Mateo Flint Community Junior College Gulf Coast Junior College	City Colleges of Chicago Mesa College	

school's not being in financial trouble, there is almost certainly not a single theory that will apply to the schools in this study. It is always easier to determine the causes of impaired financial health than it is to determine the cause of continued good health. I concluded that there were at least 10 important conditions present, among them, that the only public universities "not in trouble" were in the South; that no large private research universities were in the group; that the Northern schools not in trouble were, in the main, not in urban areas; that they were less affected by campus disturbances; and that they had much smaller student aid expenditures.

Even so, these institutions show early signs of financial trouble. For some, the situation will probably deteriorate. All are beginning to feel the same cost-income problem affecting higher education. Let's look at the general cost-income problem—starting with the income side.

IV

For all the schools income grew during the first seven years of the decade at the rate of between 8 and 10 percent per student per year. But the rate of growth declined in the last three years due to declining growth rates in federal government support, gifts and grants, and endowment income. Until recently, state appropriations had continued their past rate of increase except in California and a few other states. However, some schools had already felt, and many more are anticipating, the effects of a reduced rate of state support.

Colleges and universities are increasing tuition rapidly—the current annual increase is about 7.5 percent. But many feel that they cannot for long continue to raise tuition at this rate, for it will deny access to some, and put some private schools in a poor competitive position.

What about costs? As with all organizations, they continue to rise.

At each campus in this study, the administrators were asked in the interview to identify the main components in their institution's cost situation.

The interview responses can be summarized in a list of five main components of the cost side of the problem. These are: 1) the effects of inflation; 2) rising faculty salaries; 3) rising student aid; 4) campus disturbances, and theft and destruction of property; and 5) growth in responsibilities, activities, and aspirations.

(Two points should be stressed about these factors. First, they are not mutually exclusive. Inflation influences the other factors in a variety of ways. Second, growth in responsibilities, activities, and aspirations is in part a residual factor. It is intended to cover several types of costs cited in the interviews. These include those costs often associated with the "knowledge explosion," with its increase in demand for more sophisticated equipment, such as computers. It also includes the costs associated with new academic and community activities of campuses, increased operating costs of new buildings put into service, any increase in per-student costs attributable to enrollment growth, and new legal responsibilities under social legislation for unemployment benefits, minimum wages, etc.)

Although they do not apply equally at each school, these five factors can be said to account for the historic rise in costs. In the study, we sought to determine the impact of each factor and the control campuses had over each. This permits us to estimate how much income the schools will need.

The analysis shows that given the recent rate of inflation (4.2 percent) even under a determined policy of prudence costs will rise between 6 and 7 percent per student per year. If the rate of inflation could be reduced to 2 percent per year, a policy of prudence would still require an annual income increase of just over 5 percent. We then estimated what a stringent, rock bottom, and improbable budget (except for short periods of time) would require; the answer, at recent rates of inflation, was a 3.5 percent increase in expenditures per student per year.

At today's rate of inflation (about 6 percent), our estimate shows that a minimum growth policy requires at least 8 percent per student per year in new income. Several schools I have checked recently are estimating about 3 percent per student in new income. One is assuming none. Another is planning for an increase of 5 percent per student. In contrast, the governor's budget proposes for California's public institutions a decrease of about 4 percent per student.

V

Let me restate two of the main findings of my study: 1) There is a current cost-income gap of at least several percentage points per student; and 2) This gap cannot be closed by the institutions alone, but will require additional funding. Other studies have produced similar findings. In recent weeks there has been extensive press coverage of the problem. The experience of schools has been analyzed, and the problems have been explored in some depth. Along with many others, I have complained about some press coverage of campus disturbances. I now want to give credit to the press for the way the depression in higher education has been handled.

What these media reports show is that colleges and universities are being forced to make adjustments, some very painful adjustments, to their new economic situation. How serious is the situation? Serious enough to give presidents nightmares. As I understand them, there are at least three kinds.

First, there is the nightmare of the president of the small liberal arts college: His school opens next fall but no freshmen show up. In competition with other types of institutions, his school has been priced out of the market.

The president of the large private university has a different nightmare. Next fall his school opens and the freshman class is there, but it consists entirely of sons and daughters of wealthy parents, and a few from very poor families. They are the only ones who could find the money to pay the tuition the institution is forced to charge.

The president of the public college or university has still a different nightmare. His school opens

next fall and several freshman classes are there. Swamped by numbers and short of money, his school is qualitatively levelled.

VI

How closely do these nightmares correspond to reality? Closer than you might think. Private institutions report a sharp drop in applications. Declines of 15 to 20 percent in applications are not uncommon and for the first time since the 1930's, some colleges are privately worried about filling their freshman class. According to a recent newspaper report, this year "one small liberal arts school in Georgia, accustomed to 350 applicants, has only seven." [2]

As to the large private university, its cost-income problem has forced tuition up to very high levels. Last year fixed fees at Harvard were $4,470 a year, not counting travel or incidentals. Other private universities are, give or take a few hundred dollars, within that range. Students of middle income parents cannot afford to attend these schools without financial aid. The president of a large private university told me recently that the median parental income of students applying for financial aid at his institution is now well over $16,000 a year. That is why he is having nightmares.

The president of the public institution sees in his nightmare a rising sea of students, surrounding a shrinking island of money. And with good reason. At my own institution, since 1966-67, and including projected enrollment for next year, the university has added a 34 percent increase in enrollment, with a 6 percent increase in budget (when adjusted for inflation). When added to the effects of earlier budgets, this would give the University of California (in constant dollars) 20 percent less money to spend on each student than it had five years ago. Even in the Great Depression, the University of California was not forced to reduce its faculty. If the budget now before the legislature is adopted unchanged, the University of California will be forced to eliminate more than 100 faculty positions, while at the same time it is enrolling 4,000 additional students.

In short, the small liberal arts colleges see growing evidence of financial peril; the private universities are legitimately concerned about being forced to become wealthy enclaves or to lose their important role in the discovery of knowledge; and the public institutions are threatened with a serious erosion of quality.

VII

While this sounds rather pessimistic, I can offer some encouragement, for unlike many of the problems we are dealing with, the financial one can be solved. I say this for several reasons. First, relative to other problems, the actual amount of money involved is not large. If we assume a cost-income gap per student of several percentage points, this means that the nation's colleges and universities need between $300 and $700 million in additional operating income. If we assume that gap is about 5 percent, it would still represent only $1 billion. When we recall that this would come from federal, state, local, and private sources in 50 states, it is hardly a frightening sum. Indeed, at the lower levels, it comes close to the amount that a couple of our largest corporations are now seeking or getting from the federal government in public support for private business.

The second reason for encouragement is that newer educational models—the three-year undergraduate program, the external degree program, for two examples—should in time bring some relief from rising costs.

The third reason for encouragement is that by the late 1970's the enrollment crushes which have characterized the last 15 years will have eased.

These reasons promise longer term relief, but the depression in higher education is here and now. What measures can be taken to keep it a short depression? Or to keep the "crunch" from becoming catastrophic?

First, there must be understanding of the problems on the campus. There must be an awareness that to motivate additional investment in higher education the campuses must reveal themselves as reasonably governable, reasonably efficient in internal operations, and be engaged in activities whose purposes the supporting public can understand and respect. No one wants to tempt fate by affirming that this condition is being generally achieved, but a growing amount of evidence supports that view. Campus attitudes are changing.

Second, there must be an understanding that there is a money crisis in higher education—and that the crisis is growing. I believe that this point is becoming generally understood. When I was doing the study a year ago, I found considerable pessimism among academic administrators about how well their situation was understood off the campus. I am fairly confident that I would not find that to be the case today. Public understanding has moved rapidly as the facts of school finance have become more generally known.

The *third* condition I would emphasize is the realization that although the colleges and universities can make (and have made) cuts, they cannot cut their way out of the financial problem. There is also growing understanding of this point, but it is still fragile, and as I indicated at the outset, not everyone agrees with it.

This brings up the *fourth* condition, namely, the need to acknowledge that the schools do need help, and that there must be a commitment for additional investments in higher education. This point must be emphasized for two reasons. Some people are inclined to believe that, although there are problems in higher education, they will be solved as the stock market rises, and the war in Vietnam is phased out. As welcome as these events would be, there is no reason to believe that they would automatically solve the problem. There is a need for conscious policy. Another reason to emphasize the need for more investment in higher education is that there is an obvious temptation to use the growing number of studies about the need to reform higher education as an excuse for not facing the hard money problems, much like the argument of the husband whose wife

wants to buy a dishwasher that it wouldn't be wise to spend the money because they haven't perfected them yet. Higher education hasn't been perfected yet, but if we use that as an excuse to avoid facing the money problems, it will take much more than reform to restore institutions that were built up over decades.

VIII

Finally, a consideration of how the financial problems of higher education are to be solved must start from the understanding that this is going to be a problem for the foreseeable future. Given the economics of education, the fiscal problems of the country, the new students who will be enrolling, and changed attitudes, it is not just a short-term problem. We will, therefore, need both short-run and longer-run approaches, and I propose to list them that way, introducing several areas for our discussion panel.

Among the short-run matters (by which I mean the next couple of years), is the matter of money. A hard-headed look will indicate four short-run money problems that need legislative attention.

1) There is need for more student aid in various forms, and for such aid to reach students whose parents are at "middle-class" income levels. In general, our conception of income level eligibility is too low.

2) There is need for some institutional aid, especially for some private colleges and universities. Perhaps it can be by payment for service, or payment for specialized instruction. The blunt fact is that many private institutions are in far worse shape than is publicly known, or even privately admitted.

3) The short-term danger to public institutions is not that they will be destroyed, but that areas of high quality will be eroded. Therefore, there must be recognition of the high cost of building quality, and the need to sustain it, even selectively, because the alternative is even more costly.

4) Under short-term money solutions, there are special financial needs for the historic Negro colleges, whose role at this point in our national life is highly important.

IX

Along with the short-term money problems, certain policy and administrative measures should be taken.

1. **Internal administration.** There is much we could all learn from the argument of the Morgan Guaranty Letter (as could all institutions). Compared to any other institution, public or private, colleges and universities are notoriously underadministered. They are not less well managed, they are managed less. That will have to change, and the institutions will have to move in three areas: first, the general management of funds, and housekeeping; more important, determining what their programs actually cost; and finally, establishing credible ways for determining priorities and making decisions, not by growing but by substituting and even contracting. These steps will enable moves into the new areas that Clark Kerr talked about.

2. **Boards of Governors.** At the trustee level there should be a policy decision to work on a strategy for dealing with the financial problem. This means facilitating the kind of administrative work I spoke of earlier, participating in some of it, and making an overall determination of what is important to the institution and how it will be preserved. This is crucial to the administrative success, and the good spirit of the organization under difficulty. I am often asked what would I change if I were doing my study today. One thing I would do is add a fourth category to my classification system of 1) not in trouble, 2) headed for trouble, and 3) in financial difficulty. That fourth category would be schools headed for, or in financial difficulty, but developing a strategy for working their way out. The role of the board is crucial here.

3. **State or Regional Planning Level.** The perspective that comes at this level of work on higher education can be very helpful to the campus, especially in times of financial trouble. The campuses can be helped to understand the need for new and cost-effective methods, and the public can be helped to understand that these cannot be crude or mechanistic methods. It is fear of the latter that makes faculty members concerned about the kinds of change cost pressures will bring. Good innovation is not cheap, and does not come about automatically. It takes energy, money, and skill, and, I believe, the campuses can be helped by work at this level.

Secondly, the development of plans for federated and coordinated effort can be initiated at this level. This, too, is a broker's role—this time between one institution and another rather than between the campus and the public.

X

In my longer-run category, I list problems that do not require immediate solution, but which in the longer term are basic to the financial future of higher education. Although they are longer-run problems in the sense that we need not have immediate policy solutions, we need to start work on them promptly. As you will see from the list, they involve all levels of concern in higher education. I list four areas.

1. **The productivity problem.** The historic rise in costs in higher education comes from the fact that although wages in education rise at about the same rate as the rest of the economy, productivity does not. This problem is not limited to higher education, but is common to that group Peter Drucker calls "knowledge workers," managers, sales-clerks, accountants, symphony orchestras. It may be rhetorically effective to say to professors "teach more" or to musicians "play more" but that is no fundamental solution. Not only for education, but for much of the economy, a major problem in the next 10 years will be how to measure productivity, and how to increase it by means other than a simple speed-up. What is required are policies appropriate to this sector and its continuing cost-income squeeze. In higher education the need for such policies is paramount.

2. **Division of federal-state responsibility.** There

are some evolutionary trends here which could produce a better cost distribution and working relationship. Graduate education, medical education, and perhaps certain specialized functions should become increasingly recognized as federal functions, whereas undergraduate education should be seen as a state responsibility. Once a better theory is worked out, and federal approaches that supplement states are devised, the financial future of higher education will be more stable.

3. **Policies that insure a pluralistic approach to higher education.** This means the formulation of support policies that help retain private institutions as part of the system of higher education, policies that permit individualism and do not homogenize institutions. This area leads naturally to questions of purpose in higher education. We cannot expect to derive rigorous solutions, but trying to answer the question of purpose can help to clarify our thoughts, reunite our support, and guide our actions a bit more wisely. From the history of higher education, it is evident that our institutions started with the purpose of producing moral men. They were value-transmitting institutions. This function yielded to one of usefulness. For a long time our institutions invested in people and made them our measure of output. In more recent years, institutional usefulness seems to be becoming the criterion, and with it, different institutional aspirations. These are now being challenged.

The additional investment needed for higher education is not a frightening sum. The task is difficult not because of the amount but because of the need to motivate people to expend it. Our ability to generate such motivation will at bottom be related to an understanding of our purpose. And I believe that it will center around pluralism, and investment in men and women.

4. **Restatement of the theory of access.** For many of our institutions, the theory of access is one that evolved from the land-grant tradition. Others have either assumed to be carrying on the land-grant tradition, or are moving in new directions, experimenting with new forms of accommodation to the needs of different student populations.

What makes this matter important as a longer-term financial issue is that the recent wave of criticism of higher education comes in large part, not from its failures, but from its successes—successes in absorbing numbers, its overall growth, its many purposes, its usefulness to the society at large. Higher education has begun to generate the criticisms that go with growth; its external costs of growth are under attack. We should recognize the parallel with other problems in the society, problems that are due to the rise in per capita income, to access. When only a few people could afford cars, there were no public outcries about smog. When only a few people could afford to go to college, there were no outcries about dehumanized learning. Just as we hear cries for fewer cars, we increasingly hear the question: Why does everyone need to go to college? We should remind ourselves that policies of control are attractive to those who have made it, but it is growth and development that appeal to those who have not. In short, higher education is now becoming part of a classic struggle, and we need to restate growth theory and access theory so that those who are about to gain access to higher education are not shut off in the name of their own good.

References

[1] *Earl F. Cheit*, The New Depression in Higher Education *(New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971).*

[2] New York Times, *February 27, 1971, p. 1.*

State Officials Respond

Governor Robert W. Scott, North Carolina, Chairman, SREB, 1970-1971

Senator Lamar R. Plunkett, Georgia, Chairman, Legislative Advisory Council, 1970-1971

Senator Frederick L. Eagan, Louisiana

House Speaker Ray S. Smith, Jr., Arkansas

Reacting to Cheit's paper, panelists said they were unable to do much about the education depression because state governments as a whole were experiencing their own "depression."

Senator Plunkett referred to estimates that Georgia's anticipated revenue for 1972 will be down some $57 million because of a sluggish economy, and Senator Eagan said that Louisiana cannot continue to operate a system that requires more and more money, especially when increases in budget requests from higher education exceed the total revenue increase in the state budget.

Governor Scott said that competition for education funds from elementary and secondary schools, community colleges, and colleges and universities had ceased to be friendly and "it is getting worse and worse." In a comment from the floor, Governor Jimmy Carter of Georgia, SREB's new chairman, said he did not intend to increase the university system's budget until he and the legislature were convinced "that educators are doing all they can to economize without decreasing the quality of education."

The complaint that higher education has failed to give proper accounting of its expenditures led Cheit to comment that "the burden of proof for the

legitimacy of expenses has shifted. It is very important that colleges and universities show that they are reasonably governed, are concerned with efficient and effective use of resources, and have purposes that the public can identify with."

House Speaker Smith of Arkansas questioned the advisability of providing access to higher education for all because of predictions that relatively few colleges graduates would be offered jobs that utilize their skills. Cheit responded that a more fundamental problem was providing alternatives to a college or university education which are attractive and allow a person to enter life's meaningful work. "At the present time, these alternatives are not available in abundance, and as long as that is the case, we cannot turn off access at the precise moment when the least privileged of groups are about to get it."

A legislator asked if a poor job market and lower salaries would eventually cause enrollments in colleges to decline. Cheit said he did not think so because students do not enter undergraduate education exclusively for economic reasons. "It is not the job market after graduation that is the determining factor. It is the cost of getting in and obtaining an education that will have the bigger influence."

One legislator noted that campus disruptions make it difficult "to appropriate even needed funds." Cheit pointed out that attempts are being made around the country to create reasonably governed and reasonably efficient campuses. In California, he said, faculty members have done a better job of eliminating destructive colleagues than many other professional groups. "They certainly have done a better job than doctors or lawyers. They have not done as well as people would like them to do, but I think the facts will show they have done a pretty good job."

The panelists agreed that institutions must initiate important changes if there is to be significant new investments in higher education. They mentioned such matters as establishing centers for the continuing reform of higher education, eliminating duplication in the curricula of high schools and colleges, requiring greater performance from students, encouraging universities to assume broader responsibility for the entire education system, discouraging duplication of Ph.D. programs, and expanding interinstitutional arrangements through SREB.

As for the matter of increased investments, Cheit estimated that if students increased in number as they did in the 1960's, the operating expenditures alone for higher education would amount to $40 billion in the next 10 years.

Cheit stated that the present lack of funds might have some good effects on higher education since educators will have to give better accounting for funds provided to them, thus improving economy on the campuses, and eliminating some of the "fat" from budgets. But he warned that the kind of reforms that the panelists and participants in the discussion desired may be cut out when institutions are pressed for funds.

He cautioned that excessive belt-tightening may cause personnel to unionize and become more rigid, decreasing the ability of the college or university to be flexible enough for reforms. Interdisciplinary programs suffer, too, during times of financial hardship, although such programs are desirable.

Cheit said that many prestige institutions are reducing the number of graduate programs in order to save money, but the rush to introduce graduate programs, an expensive and sometimes wasteful move, was continuing in some of the institutions despite the money "crunch." A reason for this is that institutions can get more money from private donors and other sources by having such programs, and by shifting from college to university status. Legislators have been known to encourage this when it benefits their own districts, he said.

"Everyone has a hand in solving the problem," Cheit concluded, citing the responsibilities of higher education institutions, trustees, regional agencies, and legislatures. "I think with the right attitude and approaches, we can work our way out of this crunch."

Reflections on Education and Government □ GOVERNOR JIMMY CARTER, GEORGIA

In the conference's dinner address, Governor Jimmy Carter of Georgia, one of the South's outstanding new governors, called for more cooperation between higher education and state government to solve problems and to provide new opportunities. Recent elections show that people of the South have a new freedom which they wish to express through politics, government, and education, the governor said, and this openness can be developed through a better educational system. Governor Carter said SREB, as a permanent mechanism, can play a major role in establishing the highest common denominator in educational achievement and in tying together government and the educational institution.

I have a lot to learn and I am extremely eager to probe as deeply as I can into the Southern Regional Education Board, to extract from it and its fine staff as much help for my own state, for myself as governor, and for the other Southern states as I possibly can.

We have a region of the country which, in many ways, has been a little too quiet, a little too retiring, perhaps a little too ineffective, but we have the ability to equalize any deficit that we have in our own lifetime. I think we look to the future with an adequate measure of the ability of our own people which can be extrapolated from despair and satisfaction and used to expand our own efforts within the Southern region to reach for greater things.

We have some real problems in the South, and I am struggling with them, as all of you are. The one that presses most harshly on my own shoulders is the lack of adequate financing. I have seen a major portion of the increase in our own state budget, after the mandatory allocation to welfare and medicaid, go into higher education, which has been like a favorite child in Georgia.

Our Board of Regents has come forward year after year in the eight years that I have been involved, and has made requests which in general have been met almost above the other needs in the state. There has been very little examination of how the money was spent, and how effective these investments were.

I think that in many of the relatively poor states we have about reached the limit of this privileged status for the university system. It may appear at first to be a step backwards, but governors and legislators are in a position to demand greater insight into what is going on in the university system, to demand from educators a better accounting of the funds, and to obtain an agreement from them to leave the status quo and search for innovative ways to educate our people. In other words: More quality at lower costs.

We have not gone far enough in making sure that the courses offered are needed, that the established graduate programs are needed. And, I do not believe that we have gone far enough in insuring that a qualified instructor has his influence spread over a large enough number of students. We have been much more preoccupied with lowering the pupil-teacher ratio than with increasing the pupil-teacher ratio so that highly qualified teachers can teach more students.

I think that we have been too preoccupied with the number of publications written by the fine professors and not enough with improving teaching and with letting the influence of professors be felt more broadly in state government. We have been remiss in permitting an almost clear-cut cleavage, in many instances, between state government and the university system.

If there is one thing I learned last November it was that on the day after the election, I was no better qualified, no more experienced, no more intelligent than I was on the day before the election. I approached the governorship of Georgia with the possibility of attracting a previously untapped reser-

---

Governor Carter is 1971-72 Chairman of the Southern Regional Education Board

voir of talent, ability, understanding, training, and education that existed throughout the state but primarily in the universities.

In the past six months I have tried over some opposition to bring together qualified college people in the different disciplines and pragmatic political leaders who are responsible for effectuating the application of those disciplines in welfare, health, labor, pardons and paroles, corrections, vocational rehabilitation, and elementary and secondary education. We have had basically a division between those responsible for administration of programs in the agencies of state government and those qualified to advise, counsel, work, and think with us.

I think the Southern Regional Education Board in almost every instance can help us seek ways to break down these barriers. I have established communication with our own chancellor to help with this, and we now have nine full-time people from the Board of Regents and the colleges working in our state government reorganization program.

We have to a great degree a lack of involvement of our own young people in government. We have had an 18-year-old vote in Georgia since 1945 and it has been a great thing for the state, but we have held young people at arms length for too long. They are eager to learn about what is going on in their own society—their frustrations are evident—and there is a responsibility to tie together students and administrators in a free exchange of communication, ideas, and involvement.

This year SREB has helped us establish a wonderful internship program in which 135 students are working in welfare offices, prisons, mental institutions, and summer kindergarten programs. They are observing the practical application of government, and have been very helpful.

We also have a problem with the environment, and I feel that the period of the 1970's will show that the most difficult conflict that has to be resolved daily by state administrators is the one involving industrial expansion, building highways and shopping centers on the one hand, and preserving the quality of our environment on the other hand.

We had an interstate highway tied up for three or four years and were ready to go to court because we could not find any way to resolve our problems. So we turned to the University of Georgia and got assistance from Dr. Eugene Odum, a noted ecologist. It was almost unheard of for the highway department to turn to a college professor for help. Dr. Odum analyzed 85 different factors that go into the highway program, weighed each factor, put the information in the university's computer, and came out with a new route which was received overwhelmingly by the ecologists and proved to be $11 million cheaper than the route formerly desired by the highway department. This has opened up a new vista on how the highway department can save tremendous amounts of money.

Perhaps the most difficult of all of our problems will be the relationship between black and white citizens in the South. I know I share with your governors the responsibility to seek a way to preserve the finer aspects of our past, our heritage, our mores, our habits, and at the same time give large numbers of our black citizens a new vision of what they can accomplish through the educational process and convince them that we are seeking to be fair.

I do not know how to deal with this problem alone. I need the help of the legislature and knowledgeable people. For this is another area in which we need to bind ourselves together in a community of understanding, purpose, vision, and compassion.

We also have two basic problems to overcome in our college, high school and grammar school systems. One is how to be sure that a child's education is not handicapped by his lack of ability to pay; the other is how to be sure that we do not handicap a child because of his lack of ability to learn. I think we can overcome the first by making sure that education is provided to those children who have the capability and inclination to work in college and the lesser schools, through public funding.

We are going to have to move toward a realization that the very costly programs, the training of doctors and perhaps lawyers, are going to have to be financed by the students to a much greater degree than in the past. Student loans may be the best mechanism, but I do not see how we can continue to channel a major portion of a state's resources into extremely costly programs for graduates who derive great financial benefits and not have them share in the cost of their education. If we do not do this we will deprive those without resources who are simply seeking to earn a living and who will never have a high earning capacity.

Another question that we have not faced courageously involves an individualized approach to instruction. I want to be sure that in Georgia we give a student a chance to grow and develop to a degree consistent with his own ability. We need more understanding and knowledge about the limits of a child's capacity to learn.

I am in favor of establishing standards in the grammar and high schools, and requiring the schools to test themselves. This year we will initiate a statewide testing program at the third, seventh and eleventh grade levels. Over a period of time this will give us a chance to mold the instruction of children to match their capabilities and achievements, and help us identify children who are intellectually able to be educated, but are economically unable. The state would make a great investment in these particular children.

I think that all of you agree with me, that in order to keep all our young children in school, we cannot possibly continue to seek the lowest common denominator in educational standards. That is the easy way out, and it is the way that most of our educators have chosen.

I worked for Admiral Hyman Rickover, whose name is not very well received in some educational circles, who was influenced by the teachings of a philosopher, Ortega y Gasset. The philosopher said there were two specific kinds of people: those who considered each day a success if they arrived at its conclusion no worse off then when they started, and

those—a much smaller group—who each day strive to set additional standards of achievement, who are not fearful of new responsibilities, and who struggle to discern previously undiscovered capabilities and talents and utilize them to the fullest.

I believe more and more people in the South are searching within themselves for greater capabilities, and as governors and legislators we do not want to be an obstacle to this development. A lot of people, particularly newsmen, asked me, "What about the New South? I do not think there is any New South."

We have the same courage, the same ability, the same aspirations, the same doubts and fears, the same understanding that we have always had. There is a new recognition of the qualities that exist within the Southern people, among the Southern people by those from outside and by our neighbors within our states. More important, we appear to have a new recognition of the quality of our people on the part of elected officials who often have underestimated what Southerners can do, want, and strive for. This is one of the most vivid impressions I had of Georgians during my campaign.

We have a great opportunity in the South, and the attention of the nation is focused on us. Our people have a new striving, and the 1970 elections showed there was a basic change, a new freedom of expression. I think this freedom originated with the black citizens of the South, who were frustrated to such an extent that they were willing to demonstrate their frustrations in the streets. It was a shock to me, and I am sure to most of you, when I observed that Congress, the Supreme Court, and then our own people said that their frustrations were justified. Reluctantly we have made a basic decision to eliminate unfairness and to overcome obstacles in race relations.

We have seen students assume the same attitudes. They have been successful in their demands for a new involvement and a new approach to politics, and now I think the average citizens in our states have shown they want to express themselves through politics, government, and education. There is a new openness between government and the people, and this openness only can be developed through a better educational system.

We have a commonality of purpose and a commonality of problems and opportunities throughout the South, and I see SREB as perhaps the only permanent mechanism for establishing the highest common denominator among our people in educational achievement, in developing this new freedom which is so precious, in tying together government and the educational institution, and in guaranteeing that never again in the future will any politician or public leader make the serious mistake of underestimating our people.

Roster of Delegates

Alabama

Representative Bobby Crowe
Jasper

Senator Larry C. Register
Dothan

Representative Pete Turnham
Auburn

Representative Retha Deal Wynot
Gadsden

Arkansas

Senator Dorathy Allen
Brinkley

Senator John Bearden
Leachville

Representative B. Douglas Brandon, Jr.
Little Rock

Representative Roscoe D. Brown
Jonesboro

Representative Leon Holstead
North Little Rock

Representative Lloyd C. McCuiston
West Memphis

Speaker of the House Ray S. Smith, Jr.
Hot Springs

Representative Charles W. Stewart
Fayetteville

Florida

Representative William O. Birchfield
Jacksonville

Senator John R. Broxson
Gulf Breeze

Representative John R. Clark
Lakeland

Representative William R. Conway
Ormond Beach

Representative Talbot D'Alemberte
Miami

Senator D. Robert Graham
Miami Lakes

Representative Joel K. Gustafson
Fort Lauderdale

Senator Philip D. Lewis
West Palm Beach

Representative Kenneth H. MacKay, Jr.
Ocala

Representative Robert C. Milburn
Winter Park

Representative William E. Powell
Indialantic

Representative T. Terrell Sessums
Tampa

Representative Gordon W. Tyrrell
Pensacola

Georgia

Senator Paul C. Broun
Athens

Representative Jack Connell
Augusta

Representative Chappelle Matthews
Athens

Senator Lamar R. Plunkett
Bowdon

Speaker of the House George L. Smith, II
Swainsboro

Senator Terrell A. Starr
Forest Park

Senator James W. Tysinger
Atlanta

Kentucky

Representative Walter A. Baker
Glasgow

Representative Joe W. Haney
West Liberty

Senator Clyde Middleton
Covington

Senator Luther Plummer
Vanceburg

Representative Clifford M. Sharp
Williamsburg

Representative Eugene P. Stuart
Prospect

Louisiana

Senator Frederick L. Eagan
New Orleans

Representative Donald L. Fortier
New Orleans

Senator William J. Guste, Jr.
New Orleans

Representative J. Kenneth Leithman
Gretna

Senator Joe C. LeSage, Jr.
Shreveport

Representative Jimmy D. Long
Natchitoches

Representative Donald W. Williamson
Vivian

Maryland

Senator Clarence W. Blount
Baltimore

Delegate Arthur Dorman
Beltsville

Delegate John J. Kent, Jr.
Baltimore

Senator Mary L. Nock
Salisbury

Delegate Frank C. Robey
Baltimore

Senator Newton I. Steers, Jr.
Bethesda

Mississippi

Senator William G. Burgin, Jr.
Columbus

Representative George P. Cossar
Charleston

Representative Horace H. Harned, Jr.
Starkville

Representative Daniel B. Johnson
Meridian

Senator B.G. Perry
Horn Lake

Senator Perrin Purvis
Tupelo

North Carolina

Senator Gordon P. Allen
Roxboro

Senator John T. Church
Henderson

Senator Fred Folger, Jr.
Mount Airy

Representative James E. Holshouser, Jr.
Boone

Representative J.P. Huskins
Statesville

Representative Clarence Leatherman
Lincolnton

Senator L.P. McLendon, Jr.
Greensboro

Representative Dwight W. Quinn
Kannapolis

South Carolina

Representative Harold D. Breazeale
Pickens

Representative Purvis W. Collins
Winnsboro

Senator John Drummond
Greenwood

Representative J.C. Duncan
Lyman

Senator C. Anthony Harris
Cheraw

Senator Donald H. Holland
Camden

Senator Robert C. Lake, Jr.
Whitmire

Senator James M. Waddell, Jr.
Beaufort

Tennessee

Senator William R. Bruce
Memphis

Representative S. Thomas Burnett
Jamestown

Representative Kenneth W. Crocker
Bradford

Representative James E. Elkins
Clinton

Texas

Representative Frank W. Calhoun
Abilene

Representative Don W. Cavness
Austin

Representative Ed Howard
Texarkana

Representative Gibson D. Lewis
Fort Worth

Representative John H. Poerner
Hondo

Senator Max R. Sherman
Amarillo

Representative John Traeger
Seguin

Virginia

Senator H. Dunlop Dawbarn
Waynesboro

Delegate Ray L. Garland
Roanoke

Delegate Frederick T. Gray
Richmond

Senator Paul W. Manns
Bowling Green

Delegate William P. Robinson
Norfolk

Senator Edward E. Willey
Richmond

West Virginia

Delegate Kenneth Auvil
Belington

Delegate Calvin A. Calendine
Parkersburg

Delegate Phyllis E. Given
Charleston

Delegate Robert D. Harman
Keyser

Senator Chester R. Hubbard
Wheeling

Delegate Charles R. Shaffer
Buckhannon

Other Participants

Alexander Astin
Director of Research
American Council on Education
Washington, D.C.

Cyril Busbee
State Superintendent of Education
South Carolina

Jimmy Carter
Governor of Georgia

Earl F. Cheit
Professor of Business Administration
University of California
Berkeley, California

Robert E. David
Educational Assistant
Office of the Governor
South Carolina

C. Galbreath
U.S. Office of Education
Texas

Eli Ginzberg
Professor of Economics
Graduate School of Business
Columbia University
New York, New York

Clark Kerr
Chairman
Carnegie Commission on Higher Education
Berkeley, California

Nancy Moorman
West Virginia

Steven Muller
Vice President and Provost
Johns Hopkins University
Baltimore, Maryland

David P. Murray
Special Assistant
Office of the Governor
North Carolina

Roger Nichols
House Education Committee
Tallahassee, Florida

Allen Phillips
Florida

John Ritchie, Jr.
Executive Assistant
Office of the Governor
Virginia

Robert W. Scott
Governor of North Carolina

SREB Staff

Winfred L. Godwin, President

Christopher E. Eckl, Information Officer

Barbara Clarke, Secretary

James M. Godard, Director, Institute for Higher Educational Opportunity

Edwin C. Godbold, Director of Administration

Harold L. McPheeters, Director, Commission on Mental Illness and Retardation

William R. O'Connell, Director of Special Programs

E.F. Schietinger, Director of Research

Ruth Smith, Administrative Assistant

Joyce Tallman, Secretary

Charlotte Underwood, Clerk-Stenographer