DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 126 323 95 CE 007 456

AUTHOR Quie, Albert H.
TITLE Education and Work: A Congressional Perspective.
INSTITUTION Ohio State Univ., Columbus. Center for Vocational Education.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE May 76
CONTRACT NIE-C-74-0012
NOTE 14p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Career Education; *Educational Assessment; *Educational Needs; Educational Objectives; Educational Problems; *Educational Responsibility; Federal Government; *Government Role; *Vocational Education

ABSTRACT

Education should be responsible for giving the student a deeper appreciation of cultural and aesthetic values as well as a better understanding of ethical and moral precepts underlying society. These responsibilities are often unfulfilled because of the failure to teach basic reading, writing, and communication skills at the elementary level and the ignoring of moral judgments at the post secondary level. A solid grasp of fundamental skills and an appreciation of the moral underpinnings of society are two basic needs education should meet which have a considerable effect on the relationship between education and work. Preparing students to function effectively in productive jobs is a fundamental responsibility of education. This view is shared by Congress and is manifested by the increasing financial support for vocational education from the Federal government. Congress also seeks to improve its data-gathering techniques in labor market information and tries to help educators experiment with models for effective career education programs. It places a high priority upon vocational education being closely related to the actual employment market. The need for career education programs can be met by utilizing trained counseling and guidance personnel and a closer cooperation between school and community. (Author/EC)

EDUCATION AND WORK: A CONGRESSIONAL PERSPECTIVE

by

The Honorable Albert H. Quie

Ranking Member
House Education and Labor Committee
Congress of the United States

The Center for Vocational Education
The Ohio State University
1960 Kenny Road
Columbus, Ohio 43210

May 1976

This publication was prepared pursuant to a contract (No. NE-C-00-4-0012) with the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Presentations prepared under the auspices of the NIE do not necessarily represent official NIE or CVE position or policy.

THE CENTER MISSION STATEMENT

The Center for Vocational Education's mission is to increase the ability of diverse agencies, institutions, and organizations to solve educational problems relating to individual career planning and preparation. The Center fulfills its mission by:

- Generating knowledge through research
- Developing educational programs and products
- Evaluating individual program needs and outcomes
- Installing educational programs and products
- Operating information systems and services
- Conducting leadership development and training programs

PREFACE

The Second Career Education National Forum, held in Washington, D.C. in February 1976, was evidence of The Center's continuing commitment to research and development in career education. Prominent researchers and academicians were joined by leading practitioners in a second nationwide effort to share ideas, research, and operational programs in career education. We are hopeful that this exchange will lend insight to and impact upon future developments at federal, state and local levels. Corinne Rieder, Associate Director of the NIE Education and Work Task Force, and I look forward to planning and organizing the Third Forum—with hope that the interest and dedication of career educators will again form the foundation for stimulating discussion and thoughtful critique.

The Center is indebted to the National Institute of Education, sponsor of the Forum, for its support and advice in Forum planning. We also appreciate the time and efforts of those presenters who shared their insights with us all.

This monograph series includes Forum keynote presentations and additional papers from distinguished lectures presented at the Forum.

The Ohio State University and The Center are proud to share these papers with you.

Robert E. Taylor
Director
The Center for Vocational Education

INTRODUCTION

Rep. Albert H. Quie, Dennison, Minnesota, was elected to the U.S. Congress in 1958, while serving as a Minnesota State Senator. The ranking Republican Member of the House Education and Labor Committee is nationally recognized as a leading spokesman on education in the House of Representatives and has played a major role in shaping education legislation in recent years.

Mr. Quie introduced legislation to expand opportunities to educationally deprived children in Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Countless other improvements in the Education Bill, including the consolidation of categorical grants and expansion of aid to the handicapped, directly reflect Mr. Quie's leadership. He was one of the main authors of the Higher Education Amendments of 1972, and most recently has been reshaping vocational education legislation.

Mr. Quie holds distinguished service awards from the National Education Association, Learning Disabilities Association, Vocational Education Association, the Council of Exceptional Children, and the National Council of Local Administrators. During The Center's week-long Tenth Anniversary celebration in March 1975, Mr. Quie was honored with The Center's Distinguished Service Award. He holds honorary doctorate degrees from a number of colleges and universities, including his own alma mater, St. Olaf College.

The Center for Vocational Education and the National Institute of Education are proud to share with you Mr. Quie's presentation, "Education and Work: A Congressional Perspective."

Education and Work: A Congressional Perspective

The Honorable Albert H. Quie

I am delighted to be able to share some of my thoughts on "Education and Work" with you because I recognize the critical importance of relating education to work in such a way that people will be able to function successfully in this society and contribute to its growth and well-being.

I congratulate the National Institute of Education and The Center for Vocational Education at The Ohio State University for making this conference possible and for their leadership in helping educators and lay citizens to create an educational environment which will meet the needs of our entire population.

Education serves many needs—personal, economic, and societal. It can and should help enrich the lives of students through a deeper appreciation of cultural and aesthetic values and a better understanding of ethical and moral precepts which undergird a good society. The educational system should foster self-appreciation, self-confidence and self-respect. It should strive to produce good citizens who will protect and strengthen democratic institutions. The school shares with other institutions the responsibilities inherent in its role as an extension of the family. Where the family succeeds the school can help confirm that success; conversely, where the family fails the school must often assume the burden.

I am somewhat dismayed, frankly, by the failure of education, in many instances, to fulfill these responsibilities in two fundamental respects.

First, there is the failure at the elementary school level to teach reading, writing, and computational skills. This requires an

increasing emphasis in later years on remedial work, which is more difficult because students who initially fall behind tend to fall farther and farther behind. One result is that many drop out before they can be reached by effective remedial efforts. Another is that, increasingly, in both vocational and academic post-secondary programs, basic educational skills must be taught. While my impression is that academic educators do a better job of remediation, it should not be necessary at all except in very exceptional circumstances. The most frequent complaint of employers of both high school and college graduates is that they cannot write standard English.

Second, I find it appalling that so much post-secondary education ignores—indeed disparages—moral judgments. One major purpose of education is to transmit the values of our society to a future generation. It cannot do this and either be free of values or treat all values as relative. Indeed, the problem is that too often higher education *is* teaching values, but these values are the antithesis of those held by the vast majority in our society. Several studies have shown college seniors to be more alienated from their families, less responsive to the moral judgments of our society, and far more hostile to our free enterprise economic system than are high school graduates. If parents wish to deliberately choose a private education which is going to destroy belief in the values they hold, that is their business. But I do not feel that the majority of taxpaying citizens should be asked to subsidize the destruction of their value system without having something to say about it.

I know this presents problems. Academic freedom is precious, but a free society is precious, too, and we have every right to expect education to transmit its basic values—or, at the very least, not to set out to disparage them.

In short, a solid grasp of the fundamental skills of education and an appreciation of the moral underpinnings of our society, including our private enterprise economic system, are two of the basic needs I would hope education would meet. They are not needs unrelated to a consideration of the relationship of education to work.

However extensive the list of needs served by education becomes, and however important these needs are, education cannot ignore the fundamental need of the student to function effectively in society. Unemployment and dependency do not build character, enhance appreciation of cultural heritage, or contribute to good citizenship. Quite the contrary, unemployment and dependency undermine and often destroy the other values with which education is concerned. So I would argue that preparing students to function effectively in productive jobs in our economy—helping to meet the economic need of the student and of society—is a fundamental responsibility of education.

That view is shared widely in Congress and has been for many years. It accounts for such historic legislation as the Land Grant College Acts and the Smith-Hughes Vocational Education Act. In recent years it was the foundation for the near-unanimous support for federal funds for vocational education, and the increasing federal emphasis on the broader concept of career education.

I am encouraged to believe that this long-term Congressional interest is shared by many educators, which accounts for the outstanding progress made in implementing the career education concept. I am delighted that all fifty states have a coordinator of career education programs. I only hope that not only the need, but the *urgency* of the need to build firmer linkages between education and work, is recognized.

In rebuilding a perennial loser among professional football teams, George Allen coined the phrase "The Future is Now" for the Washington Redskins. He recognized that the fans didn't want to wait for a winner. In discussing the Congressional perspective on education and work I would borrow that thought and say that the future is now—at least in terms of using every available means to better prepare today's student for tomorrow's career opportunities. And, for older students, we will have to improvise in trying to better prepare them for immediate career and job opportunities. Students,

parents, and the general taxpaying public don't want to wait too long for education to be a winner in that sense.

To me this challenge requires that at a minimum, two conditions be met: (1) that schools accept career orientation, guidance, and preparation as a basic reason for their existence; and (2) that instructional personnel in the schools—most particularly the counselors—inform themselves as completely as possible about existing and emerging career opportunities and job demands. In short, educators will have to work more closely with those who have some understanding of the demands of the labor market. Unfortunately, labor market information is not among the best data we have in our society. We are working in the Congress and in the state and federal governments to improve our data-gathering techniques in that field. Meanwhile, making use of the information we have is far preferable to doing nothing at all.

We are also trying to help educators experiment with and perfect models for effective career education programs. As you know, this is being done through the Office of Career Education in the U.S. Office of Education and through the Education and Work Group of the National Institute of Education.

Section 406 of the Education Amendments of 1974 established an Office of Career Education in the U.S. Office of Education with a Director reporting directly to the Commissioner of Education. Pilot and demonstration projects were authorized to be funded, and $15 million was authorized for each of three fiscal years. Actually, $10 million was appropriated for each of the first two fiscal years—1975 and 1976—and 81 projects out of 880 applications received were funded in fiscal 1975. An equal number of projects will be funded in fiscal 1976, but there already are 1,500 applications—a demonstration of the growing interest in career education. Fortunately, there are several thousand career education projects across the country funded solely by state and local funds.

The provisions of section 406 of the 1974 Act were not unlike some I had sponsored in 1971 and which were enacted in 1972 as

Part B of a new title X of the Higher Education Act labelled the "Occupational Education Act of 1972." Part B was never funded, but amendments to various titles of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which I initiated, were enacted. These amendments were designed to stress the importance of both placing occupational preparation on an equal footing with traditional academic preparation, and of occupational orientation and counseling in our schools.

I see no serious conflict or confusion between vocational education as an instructional program for those who want and need it at secondary and post-secondary levels and "career education" as a concept which infuses the entire instructional program. "Career education," in my view, is an educational philosophy which applies to all students, whatever their eventual career and job choices. It is a tool to help them make knowledgeable choices and to intelligently implement them.

Obviously, however, there can be no real implementation without the necessary educational facilities and programs. That is why so many of us in the Congress have placed such a high priority upon vocational education being closely related to the actual and developing employment market. The simple fact is that in this decade—between 1974 and 1985—less than twenty percent of all jobs will require an academic degree. That means that over eighty percent of all those who fill new jobs will need some education or training which is vocational in nature.

The U.S. Department of Labor projects 57.6 million new job openings in the 1974-1985 period, of which 9.4 million, less than 19 percent, are in the "professional" classification for which a baccalaureate or higher degree customarily is required. Moreover, the same projections predict 13.1 million college graduates in the same period with concurrent job market demand of only 12.2 million. Accordingly, 950,000 college graduates will be seeking employment for which they have not been adequately prepared. This fact in itself will have effects on the employment market which we cannot

readily assess, such as the skill demands which will be imposed upon high school graduates looking for a job.

The obvious over-emphasis on higher academic education may produce various undesirable effects, though it cannot be blamed entirely on the schools. Parents and students often have strong and unrealistic career expectations centered on an academic degree. The National Assessment of Educational Progress is a continuing responsibility of the U.S. Office of Education. It is now in the process of analyzing data from the Career and Occupational Development Assessment conducted during the 1973-1974 school year. In summary, it found that 53.8 percent of all thirteen-year olds wanted careers in job areas described as "professional and technical" which customarily require a college degree; 48.8 percent of all seventeen-year olds expressed the same aspirations. There were other breakdowns of the data, all of which revealed totally unrealistic expectations in terms of projected job market demands.

These data confront the educational system with an enormous challenge. Successful career education programs, beginning in early elementary school grades, are an obvious response to this challenge. But how are we to meet this challenge in a time of shrinking financial resources with which to finance new programs?

I would argue that one response is to make more efficient use of the trained personnel we have, beginning with the school counselor. Counseling and guidance personnel have long been the "whipping boys" for the failure of school systems to adequately serve the career guidance needs of all those served by the schools. Caught between the often unrealistic expectations of students and parents on the one hand, and the demands of school administrators and lack of teacher assistance on the other, it is not surprising that many school counselors have had little impact upon career choices. One cannot be both the school psychologist and assistant principal responsible for disciplinary problems; and still have time for career counseling.

Even if they could attend to counseling full-time, the numbers of students to counselors prevent their being effective as the basic source of career information for students. The ratio of school counselors to total public school enrollments nationally is 1 to 860 pupils. Obviously, a counselor cannot do the whole job. But in a career education program the entire instructional staff of the school (including principals, school psychologists, teachers and supporting professional personnel) should be involved. The ratio of public school counselors to instructional staff is 1 to 44 nationally. These are manageable numbers, when the school counselor becomes the basic resource person in a total program utilizing all instructional personnel, and in coordinating their efforts to prevent duplication. School counselors, increasingly, are filling this role in systems where the need is understood.

The other critically important job being done by school personnel is to organize and coordinate community participation in a career education program of the schools. The community is the most obvious and most overlooked educational resource available to the schools, and it is an indispensable resource in career education programs.

The cooperation between the school and the community, and the use of the community as an educational setting will be, in my judgment, a major feature in student planning for the future. The experiments completed thus far tend to demonstrate that not only do students gain a better appreciation of career possibilities when they spend part of their day in the community setting, but also that traditional school work becomes more meaningful to them. Accordingly, they perform better in academic tasks, which have a context of practical application.

The National Institute of Education deserves our gratitude and support for its work in developing community based career education models. The accumulating knowledge from these models is an educational resource for the entire nation.

We are also learning, as we attempt to relate academic work more closely to job skills, that education will have to take into account that most people will be changing jobs more often in a lifetime of work. Thus, there is likely to be more emphasis in vocational education on broad clusters of skills rather than on narrow job training. This may well be one of the factors in a total career education program which will bring academic and vocational students closer together. It also has obvious implications for the concept of lifelong learning.

We are in a time when almost everyone stays in school far longer than when most of us were starting school, and a time when the employment market is far more demanding. For the first time in the human experience we have created a society in which there is virtually no demand for a strong back. This means, as I have said many times before, that failure in school equates with failure in life. This also is new to the human experience, and it places a heavy burden upon the schools—a burden which the schools must learn to share with the community.

In meeting this new challenge the role of research and demonstration is critical and must be utilized to the fullest. I am confident that you are equal to this challenge. I am confident that education can meet the great expectations which the American people, perhaps more than any other in the world, have always had of it. I pledge to you my continued support toward that end.