DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 223 171 HE 015 692

AUTHOR Karabel, Jerome; And Others
TITLE The Politics of Federal Higher Education Policymaking: 1945-1980. [Report from the] Project on Politics and Inequality in American Higher Education.
INSTITUTION Huron Inst., Cambridge, Mass.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Apr 81
GRANT NIE-G-77-0037
NOTE 155p.; For related documents, see HE 015 690-691.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC07 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Access to Education; Advocacy; College Planning; Community Colleges; Construction Programs; Educational History; Enrollment Trends; *Federal Legislation; Financial Support; Government Role; *Government School Relationship; *Higher Education; Minority Groups; Policy Formation; *Public Policy; Retrenchment; Social Stratification; Socioeconomic Status; Student Financial Aid; Vocational Education

ABSTRACT

Key federal policy decisions since World War II that have affected the number and characteristics of students entering higher education and, overall, the social-stratification role of higher education are reviewed. The focus is on legislation and other policy decisions concerning student aid, community colleges, and postsecondary vocational education. Attention is also directed to institutional aid, higher education coordination and planning, persons and groups instrumental to the passage of major legislative enactments, and the climate of opinion in which federal policy decisions have been made. From 1945 to 1958, the central arguments in favor of increased access were that: the United States faced severe shortages of highly trained manpower, the Soviet Union was dangerously ahead in the training of such manpower, and the realization of the goal of equality of opportunity required equality of access to higher education. While initially, discussions about who should enter college mostly focused on the highly talented, attention shifted in the early 1960s to specific social groups, notably black and lower-income youth. Policymakers did not rely primarily on the goal of equality of opportunity as a justification of greater access until the mid- to late 1960s. Among the issues pertaining to direct federal aid to colleges was the need for constructing academic facilities to respond to large increases in enrollment. Interest in community colleges and postsecondary vocational education accelerated markedly during the early 1960s. By the late 1960s, the focus of attention was for aid to be used for general operating expenses. During 1973-1980, retrenchment in higher education was the major concern. Appendices provide a synopsis of federal higher education legislation and information on sources of funds for higher education, 1930-1980. (SW)

REPORTS

From The

PROJECT ON POLITICS AND INEQUALITY IN AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION

Jerome Karabel
Principal Investigator

and

Steven Brint
Kevin Dougherty
David Karen
Steven Levine
Katherine McClelland
Mark Osiel
David Swartz

This research has been supported by the National Institute of Education under Grant NIE-G-77-0037. Views or conclusions contained in this study should not, however, be interpreted as representing the official opinion or policy of the National Institute of Education.

THE HURON INSTITUTE
April, 1981

The Politics
of
Federal Higher Education Policymaking: 1945-1980

Project on Politics and Inequality
in
American Higher Education

This research has been supported by the National Institute of Education under Grant NIE-G-77-0037. Views or conclusions contained in this study should not, however, be interpreted as representing the official opinion or policy of the National Institute of Education.

THE HURON INSTITUTE
April, 1981

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. THE PURPOSES OF THE STUDY 1

II. A LONG WINTER AND A SHORT SPRING, 1945-1958

A. Federal Higher Education Policymaking 5

B. The Wider Ideological and Political Context 13

III. THE SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC REVOLUTION, 1959-1965

A. Federal Higher Education Policymaking 28

B. The Wider Ideological and Political Context 33

IV. TWO STEPS FORWARD, ONE STEP BACK, 1966-1972

A. Federal Higher Education Policymaking 49

B. The Wider Ideological and Political Context 60

V. THE AGE OF RETRENCHMENT, 1973-1980

A. Federal Higher Education Policymaking 75

B. The Wider Ideological and Political Context 79

VI. REFLECTIONS ON THE POLITICS OF FEDERAL HIGHER EDUCATION POLICYMAKING 90

Notes 93

References 95

Appendix A. Synopses of Federal Higher Education Legislation 105

Appendix B. Sources of Funds for Higher Education, 1930-1980 144

This paper is concerned with the background to key federal policy decisions since World War II that have affected the number of students entering higher education, their socioeconomic characteristics, and how they have fared both during and after higher education. The postwar period has been one of spectacular growth in both higher education enrollments and federal involvement in education. Degree-credit enrollments, for example, rose from approximately 2.1 million in 1946 to 9.7 million in 1975 (U.S. National Center for Education Statistics, 1979: 89). As part of this rise in enrollments, more and more working-class students have entered higher education (Karen, 1979), and a college degree has become increasingly important to attaining a professional or managerial job (Squires, 1979: 86-95). The current-fund income of higher education institutions that came from the federal government also shot up, from $39 million in 1940 to $7.2 billion in 1977 (O'Neill, 1973: 28-29; and U.S. National Center for Education Statistics, 1979).

The coincidence of rapid growth in both higher education enrollments and federal higher education involvement does not mean the federal government is the main cause of the rapid postwar growth of higher education in size and importance. If this honor must be given to a branch of government, then it should be given to the state and local governments. Their aid to higher education rose from $176 million in 1940 -- 4.5 times the federal contribution to-14.9 billion in 1977 -- 2 times the federal share (O'Neill, 1973: 28-29; and U.S. National Center for Education Statistics, 1979:129). The interest in the federal government's policy toward higher education does not, then, stem so much from the fact that the federal government has been the decisive influence, but from the fact that it has been a very important influence, both directly and indirectly through its symbolic and catalytic effect on state and private action. The issues and controversies that have attended the development of federal higher education policy have often catalyzed or at least mirrored similar issues and controversies at the state level.

The policy decisions that have influenced the social-stratification role of higher education are not easy to isolate. I have decided to focus on legislation and other policy decisions concerning student aid, community colleges, and postsecondary vocational education. The reason for the first is straightforward. Student aid clearly affects the number and characteristics of people entering higher education. The reasons for the latter two deserve more comment, however. Community college and occupational enrollments have risen very rapidly in recent years. For example, total enrollments of all two-year colleges rose from 737 thousand in fall 1963 (15.4% of total enrollments in all higher education) to 2.8 million in 1973 (28.9 percent) (U. S. National Center for Education Statistics, 1975: 20-21; and U. S. Office of Education, 1965: 6). This rise in enrollments is significant not only in and of itself but also because there is evidence that two-year colleges and their occupational programs may actually hinder the social mobility of less advantaged students. Two-year colleges and occupational programs disproportionately enroll students from lower socioeconomic backgrounds (Cross,197:191;Fetters,Dunteman,and Peng, 1977: 7-8; and Karabel, 1972: 526-530, 540-541). For example, the National Longitudinal Survey of the High School Class of 1972 found that, among seniors who entered college that fall, 43 percent of those in the bottom quartile in socioeconomic status (SES) but only 23.5 percent of those in the top quartile entered two year colleges (Fetters et al., 1977: 7). This would not pose a problem if it were not that evidence is mounting that community colleges and occupational programs have a negative impact on the educational and economic futures of their students. More than two-thirds of two-year-college entrants plan to get a bachelor's or more advanced degree, but less than a fourth actually do. In fact, community-college students are considerably less likely than four-year-college students to receive a bachelor's degree, even with

differences in academic aptitude and family socioeconomic background controlled (Folger, Astin, and Bayer, 1970: 176; Karabel, 1972: 532-536; and Olivas, 1979: 40-49). In addition, two-year-college students do not do as well economically as four-year college graduates. In reanalyzing data from several major surveys, Jencks et al. (1979: 161-164, 172, 183-184, 224-228) found that students with only one to three years of higher education (the group into which two-year-college graduates would fall) secure considerably poorer occupations and incomes than do students receiving a college degree, even with family background and test scores controlled.

The focus will be on student aid, community colleges, and postsecondary education, but attention will also be paid to legislation and other policy decisions concerning institutional aid and higher education coordination and planning. The former comprises a broad range of aid, from grants for academic-facilities construction to subsidies for operating expenses. This aid is intended to expand access to higher education, but unlike student aid, it goes directly to institutions. Coordination and planning efforts are important for the light they shed on the goals of higher education and for the effects they have on the structure and outcomes of higher education. Until recently, the primary impetus behind such efforts has been the desire to most easily broaden access to higher education. Especially in the last decade, howeve , a new motivation has come to the fore: the desire to expand community colleges and occupational programs in order to provide a diversity of educational opportunities that correspond to the apparent diversity in individual needs and abilities.

Two approaches will be taken to study the development of federal higher education policy. One will be that of a political history, a chronicle of the major legislative enactments and a description of the persons and groups

instrumental to their passage. This approach will be treated in sections entitled "Federal Higher Education Policymaking." The other approach will proceed at the level of ideology and politics, broadly conceived. The concern here will be to describe the climate of opinion in which federal policy decisions have been made. This description will often address statements and actions that may have had no direct effect on federal decisionmakers but nonetheless indicate what political and ideological forces have influenced them.

A LONG WINTER AND A SHORT SPRING, 1945-1958

Federal Higher Education Policymaking

The period from 1945 to 1958 brought thirteen lean years and then one very fat year for higher education. No major federal initiative toward higher education took place between the passage of the G.I. Bill in 1944 and the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) in 1958, with the possible exception of the National Science Foundation and College Housing Acts of 1950. Even these acts, however, lacked the direct impact on the social-stratification role of higher education of the G.I. Bill, the NDEA, and the enactments of the 1960s and 1970s.

The leanness of 1945 to 1957 period is at first puzzling, for the report of the President's Commission on Higher Education (1947) and the support it attracted would seem to have been enough to push through a major expansion federal aid of higher education. The report proposed a well-articulated plan that anticipated virtually all the major federal initiatives of the next 25 years. Among other things, it called for prohibition of discrimination in admissions, federal funding of scholarships and fellowships, expansion of community colleges (and, especially, their occupation programs), aid to colleges for construction and operating expenses, improvements in high school guidance and counseling programs, and expansion of adult education programs (President's Commission on Higher Education, 1947: vol. I, 25-44, 67-70; III, 62-63; V, 3-7, 59-62).

Furthermore, the Commission's proposals were endorsed or echoed in many different quarters. President Truman, in his January 1950 budget message to Congress, strongly endorsed federal scholarship aid:

> Primarily because of low family incomes and of the high costs involved, more than half of our young people who could benefit from a college education are now unable to attend. This failure to develop to the fullest extent the capacities of our young people is a matter of national concern. As a step toward correcting this situation, I shall transmit to the Congress a legislative proposal to authorize a limited Federal program to assist capable youth who could not otherwise do so to pursue their desired fields of study at the institutions of their choice. (U. S. Library of Congress, 1951: 127).

Similar endorsements of a national scholarship program were made by the following organizations in the late 1940s and early 1950s: Hoover Commission Task Force on Public Welfare (1949), American Council on Education, Association for Higher Education, Congress of Industrial Organizations, National Education Association, National Congress of Parents and Teachers, and the National Catholic Welfare Conference (U. S. Library of Congress, 1951: 99-100, 107, 113, 118; 1956: 31-34).

Partly motivating the enthusiastic response of many college educators to the Commission's proposals was a rapidly mounting fear that college enrollments would soon begin plummeting and college revenues sagging, as the wave of World War II veterans entering college began to recede (Commission on Financing Higher Education, 1952: 77-84, 100-105; and Henry, 1975: 85-92). In fact, degree-credit enrollments did drop nearly 8 percent between 1949 and 1957 (U. S. National Center for Education Statistics, 1979: 91).

The widespread concern about federal aid to higher education was reflected in a flurry of Congressional activity. Numerous bills were filed providing for student aid and aid to colleges for building construction and program expansion (U. S. Library of Congress, 1951: 20, 25), but little came of these efforts and others in the years up to 1958. A large number of factors seem to have been responsible for this paralysis of action. Some concerned aid to education at whatever level: widespread fear of federal control over education and bitter

controversies over whether federal aid should go to segregated schools and to religious, especially Catholic, schools. Other factors, however, affected higher education only: for example, concerns about the effect of mass higher education on the quality of student bodies.

The fear that federal aid to education would eventually lead to federal control was quite widespread and deeply implanted (Congressional Quarterly, 1965b: 1195). President Eisenhower frequently raised the dangers of federal controls, as in the following excerpt from a letter in 1958 explaining his opposition to any general program of aid to colleges (Sundquist, 1968: 196):

> The more that our institutions, in general practice, lean on the federal government for this kind of help, the more they invite a kind of federal influence and domination that could have very bad effects. These I do not need to elaborate.

This sentiment was not confined to government officials, however, but was also widespread in higher education (Davidson, 1955: 118-122; Farrell, 1952; Hollinshead, 1952: 90-91; Millett, 1952: 438-441; and Perkins, 1955: 108).

Compounding the effect of this fear of federal control were bitter and seemingly unresolvable controversies over whether religious schools and racially segregated schools should be eligible for federal aid. The issue of aid to religious schools largely pitted Catholics who opposed any federal aid program that did not assist Catholic schools against Protestants and Jews who opposed any aid to private schools, especially religious ones. This issue, which was quite heated in the late 1940s, subsided in the 1950s, and cropped up again in the early 1960s. The slack during the 1950s was taken up by the issue of whether segregated schools should be barred from receiving federal aid (Bendiner, 1964: chps. 2,4,6; Congressional Quarterly, 1965b: 1195-1197, 1201-1207; Farrell, 1952; and Sundquist, 1968: 156-173).

Major federal initiatives in the area of higher education were also stalled for reasons peculiar to higher education. Proposals to increase access through large programs of aid to students and to institutions were opposed by many prominent college officials and educators on grounds such as the following: massive expansion would lower educational standards (Farrell, 1952: 98-100; Hollinshead, 1952: 92-94; Hutchins, 1952; and Millett, 1952: 44-45, 48, 50-51, 476); massive expansion would lead to massive unemployment and underemployment of college graduates (Harris, 1952: 68-71; and Millett, 1952: 46-47); lack of motivation and not of money was the major obstacle to college enrollment (Havighurst, 1952: 64-71; and Millett, 1952: 51-55, 390-392); and nonfederal sources of revenue were rapidly picking up, thus obviating the need for massive federal aid (Commission on Financing Higher Education, 1952: 155-185). These ideological objections were materially aided by the renewed vigor of old sources of funding and the rise of new sources of funding and enrollments. Tuition fees and alumni giving showed increased vitality, especially as new forms of money raising, such as alumni annual giving, were discovered. Corporate support rose rapidly from practically nothing due to changes in the tax laws and the efforts of the newly established Council for Financial Aid to Education. Many public universities set up foundations that could select and receive contributions. And, perhaps most important, the Korean War G.I. Bill (1952) came along to fill in the place rapidly being vacated by the World War II G.I. Bill (Davidson, 1955: 118-119; Henry, 1975: 84-92, 112-115; Millett, 1952: 437; and idem, 1955: 208-209).

This short period of relative calm was soon broken, however. By 1955 pressure was building up for new federal programs for financial aid to higher education. In 1955, over 39 bills providing for some form of financial aid to higher education were introduced in Congress (U. S. Library of Congress, 1956: 45-58). In 1956, only 20 bills were introduced, but in 1957, around 70 bills were introduced (Congressional Quarterly, 1956: 299-301; 1957: 415-419). Furthermore, calls for federal aid to higher education came from a number of prominent quarters: the President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School (1957: 13-14); the Educational Policies Commission (1957: 136, 144, 151); the Association for Higher Education; the National Education Association; several state meetings of the 1955 White House Conference on Education; New York Governor Averill Harriman; and, in a weak voice, Adlai Stevenson (U.S. Library of Congress, 1956: 40-45, 58-59).

A number of factors propelled or at least justified this rebirth of interest in federal aid to education. One was the realization that the Korean War G. I. benefits were beginning to peter out and the fear that tuition rates were reaching the point where many students would be driven away (Conrad and Hollis, 1955: 161; Davidson, 1955: 118-119; and Henry, 1975: 109-110). Closely associated with the fear that higher education would be facing problems in raising revenues was the sudden realization that college enrollments were beginning to rise rapidly, threatening to inundate higher education by the 1960s (American Council on Education, 1954; Henry, 1975: 99-107; Nasaw, 1979: 197-213; and President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School, 1957: 3-4). Another factor was concern about apparently severe shortages of highly trained personnel, especially research scientists and engineers (Trytten, 1955: 20-21; and Wolfle, 1954: chap. 5). This concern was often coupled with the fear that the Soviet Union was forging so far ahead of the United States in the production

of scientists and engineers that we were in great danger both militarily and economically (Congressional Quarterly, 1958: 213; Nasaw, 1979: 183-189; and U. S. Library of Congress, 1956: 11-14, 42-44, 69-70). (For more discussion of views at that time about these factors, see the next section below.)

Despite the push of these strong ideological and material forces, the establishment of a large-scale federal program of aid to higher education still faced formidable obstacles. The religious and racial issues were still seemingly intractable, and the fear of federal control was still strong. This fear was even given voice by two of the most influential bodies studying the needs of higher education in the late 1950s (Educational Policies Commission, 1957: 144, 151; and President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School, 1957: 11, 13-14, 19-20).

What broke this impasse was, of course, the Russian launching of Sputnik I on October 4, 1957. This event, which provoked an almost hysterical reaction from many Americans, swept away all objections to broad-based federal aid to education. This was clearly realized by the main advocates of the NDEA, who saw Sputnik as a perfect excuse to push through programs that had actually been germinating for years (Henry, 1975: 122; Sundquist, 1968: 176; and Thomas, 1975: 23-24). James Sundquist describes how Senator Lister Hill, Chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, assembled the bill that eventually became the NDEA:

> A memorandum from the chief clerk of this committee, Stewart L. McClure, suggested that Sputnik be made the vehicle for carrying an aid-to-education program through the Congress. Hill agreed. He told a staff group headed by John S. Forsyth, committee counsel, to assemble a bill that, besides linking education to defense, would "steer between the Scylla of race and the Charybdis of religion." This they did, piecing together suggestions from individual scientists and educators

> and their organizational representatives in Washington and taking what they liked from the drafts of the administration bill that Richardson supplied them--making bigger and better, of course, the more appealing sections of the administration proposal. In accepting the title "national defense education act," Hill observed that his colleagues would not dare vote against both national defense and education when joined in the same bill.

The immediate origins of the National Defense Education Act are to be found, however, in proposals made by President Eisenhower and subsequent additions made by Congress. Eisenhower, never enthusiastic about federal aid to education (Congressional Quarterly, 1965b: 1206-1207), made an abrupt about-face in a January 1958 special message to Congress in which he asked for undergraduate scholarships, graduate fellowships, and programs of testing and guidance in the high schools (Congressional Quarterly, 1958: 68, 610). These proposals had been drawn up by a task force, headed by the Commissioner of Education, which had been set up after the President's Committee on Education Beyond High School (1957) had delivered its report (Sundquist, 1968: 175). Congress, however, did not entirely go along with Eisenhower's proposals. It dropped the scholarship program and added programs for student loans, modern foreign languages, and area vocational education (Congressional Quarterly, 1958: 213-216). The resulting package, while less ambitious than many proponents of federal aid to education had hoped for, was rightly hailed by the U. S. Commissioner of Education Lawrence Derthick, as "a milestone in the history of federal-state partnership on behalf of the Nation's youth" (Congressional Quarterly, 1958: 217).

The fitness of this accolade was not because the NDEA was unprecedented. The programs it enacted had in many cases been proposed for several years. Federally funded scholarships, fellowships, and loans had been widely called for in the 1940s, most notably by the President's Commission on Higher Education (1947: vol. II). Programs for testing and guidance of high school students had

also been proposed earlier by the President's Commission on Higher Education (1947: II, 41-43, 67; III, 62-63), the President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School (1957: 8-9, 18-19), the Educational Policies Commission (1957: 3), and several well-known studies of manpower development and utilization (Ginzberg, 1958: 135-136; and Wolfle, 1954: 251-254). Furthermore, the arguments made for and against the NDEA and the actors making those arguments were not new. Advocates of the NDEA principally argued that a shortage of scientists, technologists, and teachers was endangering the United States in its competition with the Russians. The critics--which included the National Association of Manufacturers, U. S. Chamber of Commerce, and Protestants and Other Americans United for Separation of Church and State--noted the danger of federal control and raised concerns about letting aid go to segregated and religious schools (Congressional Quarterly, 1958: 214-216, 219; idem, 1965b: 1195-1197; and Sundquist, 1968: 173-180). In the end, what was new about the National Defense Education Act was the simple fact that it had passed, thus laying the basis for a very new relationship between the federal government and higher education.

The Wider Ideological and Political Context

This section will review for the period from 1945 to 1958 the political and ideological forces that have dominated policymaking concerning the expansion and differentiation of higher education. Four issues will be treated in this section as well as the section by the same name that will cover the 1959 to 1980 period: access to higher education (why should access be increased, for whom, and by what means); aid to higher education institutions (should it be provided and how); community college and vocational education and the legitimation of institutional and curricular diversity within higher education; and coordination and planning. These issues have been chosen because they appear in debates concerning higher education throughout the 1945-1980 period and because they touch most directly on the role of higher education in the process of social stratification.

In order to facilitate comparison across time periods, the four topics will be numbered and discussed in the same order. Since the sections on the context of higher education policymaking are intended to reflect debate occurring in a wide variety of locations, and not just the federal government, separate sections have been provided to discuss the development of federal aid to higher education in particular.

1. The Question of Access

Who should be in college and why: The question of access to higher education provoked a lively debate in the years from 1945 to 1958. There was a profusion of different arguments in regard to access, with as many against increased access as for it. The central arguments in favor of increased access were that

the United States faced severe shortages of highly trained manpower, that the Soviet Union was dangerously ahead in the training of such manpower, and that the realization of the goal of equality of opportunity required equality of access to higher education.

The manpower shortage argument was quite popular, particularly in the mid- to late 1950s, in good part because of the impact of several well-known studies on manpower development and utilization.[1] Certain themes were common to most formulations of the manpower shortage argument. First, there were serious shortages in a number of occupations, especially in science, engineering, medicine, and teaching (Trytten, 1955: 20-21; President's Commission on Higher Education, 1947: I, 75-81; and Wolfle, 1954: Chapter 5). As Wolfle (1954: 268) stated,

> When conservative predictions of future demand are compared with estimate of future numbers of college graduates, it appears likely that for the next few years there will be shortages in engineering and science, in schoolteaching, in medicine and nursing, and in some other fields. The total number of graduates in all fields combined will fall short of employers' desires, and the gap will be even larger between the number of jobs and the number of graduates available for civilian employment. For the next few years, upgrading and other such devices and the better utilization of available manpower will be necessary. In another decade college graduating classes will have increased to a point where some of the shortages may have been overcome. But if a high level of economic activity is maintained that point is years away. For the years ahead, shortages must be expected.

Furthermore, there was a large amount of manpower wastage or talent loss, represented especially by high school graduates of high ability who do not enter college (Educational Policies Commission, 1957: 29; Ginzberg, 1958: 73; President's Commission on Higher Education, 1947: I, 35-36; President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School, 1957: 8; and Wolfle, 1954: 137-142, 174-184). Wolfle (1954: 269) again stated this theme well:

> The United States wastes much of its talent. College graduating classes could be twice as large as they currently are, and with no loss of quality. The potential supply gets drained off, in large or small amounts, all the way through the educational system. Practically all potentially good college students enter, and most of them finish high school, but after high school the loss is large. Fewer than half of the upper 25 per cent of all

> high school graduates ever earn college degrees; only 6 out of 10 of the top 5 per cent do. Society fails to secure the full benefit of many of its brightest youth because they do not secure the education that would enable them to work at levels for which they are potentially qualified.

The argument that the United States was allowing the Soviet Union to forge ahead in the production of scientists and engineers also became quite common in the mid-1950s. The fear was that, in ceding technological superiority, the United States was also endangering its economic and military superiority (Congressional Quarterly, 1958: 213; Ginzberg, 1958: 30-34, 69; Nasaw, 1979: 183-189; and U.S. Library of Congress, 1956: 11-14, 42-44, 69-70). The following statement in 1956 by Senator J. William Fullbright (D.-Ark.) is typical of how the Soviet threat was perceived (U.S. Library of Congress, 1956: 12):

> I feel strongly that it is in the national interest to encourage the education of young people. Not only will education contribute to the material well-being of our citizens, but in this period of competitive coexistence with the Soviets, the intelligence and training of our population may well be the key to our survival. The great emphasis which the Soviets have placed on the training of technicians, engineers, and scientists is a challenge which cannot be ignored by the Western World.

Quite commonly, however, calls were made for increased access to higher education in terms that drew almost equally on the Russian danger and manpower shortage/talent loss arguments. The following statement in 1956 by the Senate Democratic whip, Earle Clements (Ky.), illustrates the interweaving of these various themes (U.S. Library of Congress, 1956: 12):

> In these days when engineers and scientists are already so few as to threaten the very foundation of our economic security, and our physical safety, the loss between high school and college is nothing short of tragic. Eight out of ten promising young people of college age abandon their efforts to secure an education to earn immediate returns in less productive forms of work. Some of these boys and girls would go on with their studies if they had financial encouragement. It is to save them for the national defense that I have today introduced a bill to provide 5,000 scholarships a year....We have no time to lose, and a start must be made that we may build as its usefulness is proven. Our task is to defend and protect our national freedoms, and this is part of the price we must pay. It can be sound investment in the future of our youth and the welfare of our Nation.

Expanded access to higher education was also justified on the grounds of equality of opportunity. The U.S. President's Commission on Higher Education (1947: I, 36) stated in a striking fashion why broadened access to higher education was necessary to greater equality of opportunity:

> We have proclaimed our faith in education as a means of equalizing the conditions of men. But there is grave danger that our present policy will make it an instrument for creating the very inequalities it was designed to prevent. If the ladder of educational opportunity rises high at the doors of some youth and scarcely rises at all at the doors of others, while at the same time formal education is made a prerequisite to occupational and social advance, then education may become the means, not of eliminating race and class distinctions, but of deepening and solidifying them. It is obvious, then, that free and universal access to education, in terms of the interest, ability, and need of the student, must be a major goal in American education.

Similar calls for equality of opportunity were also made by the U.S. President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School (1957: 8) and the Educational Policies Commission (1957: 6-7). The report of the President's Committee had a rather conservative tone on the whole, but nonetheless it stated:

> The American goal is to enable each young person to develop to his or her full potential, irrespective of race, creed, national origin or sex. Our Nation has made enormous strides toward that goal but a long way remains to go. Each year some 200,000 of the ablest young people fail to carry their education beyond high school due to lack of motivation, proper guidance or financial resources or to discriminatory barriers. Closing the doors of educational opportunity to any young person because of race, creed, origin or sex is manifestly intolerable under the democratic principles upon which the United States is founded, and the Committee urges every American, as a matter of high moral obligation, to work toward the abolition of such barriers wherever they exist.

The statements by the 1947 and 1957 Presidential Commissions were quite forceful, but the call for equality of opportunity was rather restricted in its scope. As will be pointed out below, policy makers were most concerned about insuring that there be equality of opportunity to attend, regardless of background, for those among the top quarter of third of high school graduates.

Many college officials were flatly opposed to the call for large-scale expansion of higher education. The main reason was a fear that it would lower educational standards by encouraging less intelligent or motivated students to

attend (Farrell, 1952: 98-99; Hollinshead, 1952: 92-94); and Millett, 1952: 44-45, 50-51). Another reason was a fear that expansion would lead to more college graduates than the labor market could absorb (Conant, 1948: 198; Harris, 1952: 68-70; and Millett, 1952: 46-47). John Millett, then executive director of the prestigious Commission on Financing Higher Education, drew together these two objections:

> A higher quality student body rather than a larger student body ought to be the objective of higher education as an institution. If this were done, the problem of the future employment opportunities for college graduates may take care of itself (Millett, 1952: 51).

The typical rejoinder to the first objection was that there were more than enough potentially qualified students to allow enrollments to rise sharply without any lowering of academic quality (Wolfle, 1954: 180). In the case of the second objection, the usual reply was that sufficient college-level jobs would be available and that, in any case, higher education has benefits that go well behond simply developing job skills (Henderson, 1952: 76-80; Wilson, 1955: 79; and Wolfle, 1954: 264-266).

Given the tenor of the debate over whether higher education should expand, it is not surprising that most discussions on who should enter college focused on the question of intelligence. Virtually everybody believed that only "able" students should attend, but there was wide disagreement on where to draw the line. The President's Commission on Higher Education (1947: I, 41) drew the most encompassing boundary for the proportion of the population "with reasonable expectations of completing higher education at specific levels":

> At least 49 percent of our population has the mental ability to complete 14 years of schooling with a curriculum of general and vocational studies that should lead either to gainful employment or to further study at a more advanced level. At least 32 percent of our population has the mental ability to complete an advanced liberal or specialized professional education.

The President's Commission reached these conclusions by using the test scores of entering college freshmen to determine what scores would be necessary to complete certain amounts of college (President's Commission on Higher Education, 1947: I,

40-41). The 1957 President's Committee arrived at similar conclusions, with the proportions being that at least 50 percent of high school graduates could benefit from some type of formal postsecondary education and that a "substantial proportion" of these in turn should enter a regular college program (President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School, 1957: 9).

Most commentators on the question of who should go to college adhered to a different standard, however. In almost all cases, the alternative standard was that only the top quarter of the high school graduating class definitely constituted college material (Millett, 1952: 48-49):

> When AGCT scores, various studies of I.Q. scores, studies of high school and college records, and other studies are considered, we have come to the conclusion that it is safe to say about 25 percent of young people are of college caliber....To be sure, intelligence and other tests are not infallible guides. They must be used in conjunction with other indicators, such as high school class standing and the rating of high school teachers. But to permit admission standards to fall below the top 25 percent of an age group, or approximately I.Q. 110, is to deny the intellectual basis of the educational programs of higher education.

The battle over where the line should be drawn was in some respects more apparent than real, for there really was not that much disagreement over who really was "college material." The President's Commission did call for access by the top 49% of the population, but for many it was access only to the first two years of college. Only two thirds of these--about 32 percent--were seen as having the capacity for a four-year or more advanced education. In the end, then, the standard set by the President's Commission was not much different from Millett's 25 percent. The difference lay in the fact that the President's Commission had a vision of higher education with much broader boundaries and more differentiated institutional and curricular offerings than that of the Commission on Financing Higher Education.

The emphasis on getting the most gifted into college was associated with an idealization of talent, especially talent based on a high degree of academic training. The new men of talent, best symbolized by the research scientist, were described as the vanguard of a new and vastly more productive society:

> With only 6 per cent of the world's land and 7 per cent of its population, the United States publishes 27 per cent of the world's newspapers, owns 31 per cent of all radio and television sets, produces 40 per cent of all electric power, uses 58 per cent of the world's telephones, and drives 76 per cent of its automobiles. These material benefits resulted from the thought and ability of a relatively few people, but they are enjoyed by a population of 160 million. The nation as a whole profits from the fact that some people possess the ability to design a dam, to plan an automobile production line, to isolate an antibiotic, to conceive an atomic power plant, to develop high-yield hybrid corn, to compose a symphony, to settle a labor dispute (Wolfle, 1954: 1).

This cult of talent reflected the rapid postwar growth in numbers and prominence of the "new middle class" of salaried professionals and managers. According to one estimate, the new middle class grew from 8.8 million in 1950 to 12.2 million in 1960, an increase of 38.4 percent, and its share of the labor force rose from 15.9 to 18.9 percent (Burris, 1978: Table 3). This growth was powered by huge postwar increases in research and development activity, government employment, and college enrollments and by fundamental alterations in the organization of industry and finance (Burris, 1978: 42-43).

It would seem at first that the focus on the talented would be quickly dismissed as a covert claim for special privilege by the new middle class. In fact, however, the cult of talent had few detractors. This may have reflected a crucial aspect of meritocratic claims in this particular period: far from being seen as legitimating inequality, they were seen as subversive of its traditional defenses. The following statement by the Congress of Industrial Organizations (CIO) illustrates this view:

> For many years, independent research has shown that college education was not available to many of the sons or daughters coming from families in the lower economic brackets. Distinguished educators have stated bluntly that it is possible to replace the present students enrolled in universities with a higher caliber of students from the groups that are financially unable to send their children to college....It is important that opportunity for study in the field of higher education should be made available to all young people on the basis of merit and ability and not on the basis of the income group from which these people come (U.S.Library of Congress,1951: 99-100).

The discussions about who should enter college mostly focused on the highly talented, but some attention was paid to specific social groups that encountered

special problems in securing access. The obstacles minority group members, especially Blacks, faced in securing a decent education were noted by several influential commentators (Educational Policies Commission, 1957: 26-27; President's Commission on Higher Education, 1947: II, 29-36; and Wolfle, 1954: 167-169). All three attributed the lower educational attainment of minority group members to environmental conditions, among which the President's Commission (1947: II, 29-30) quite explicitly included racial discrimination. Both the President's Commission (1947: 26) and the Educational Policies Commission (1957: 27) buttressed their calls for alleviating the deprivation of minority-group members by claiming that failure to do so had exposed the United States to embarassing criticism from abroad. Other groups receiving mention were Jews (President's Commission, 1947: II, 36-39) and women (President's Commission, 1947: II, 39-40; and West, 1956: 77). The President's Commission noted that in both cases there was evidence of discrimination in admissions, particularly for graduate and professional school.

The President's Commission stated forcefully that discrimination in admissions on the grounds of race, creed, sex or ancestry should be abandoned. This recommendation explicitly included quota systems, in which the number of minority-group members enrolled is tied to their share of the population. The "only defensible basis" for admissions, the Commission argued, is "total ability and interest" (President's Commission on Higher Education, 1947: II, 25, 36). Thus, in ironic counterpoint to the 1970s, the progressive position in the 1940s took the form of insistence on the primacy of ability as a criterion in admissions and opposition to quotas as a means of selection.

How to increase access: Most answering the question of what are the main barriers to access by qualified students pointed to lack of money, inadequate motivation, lack of proximity to nearby colleges, and discrimination (Educational Policies Commission, 1957: 25-28; President's Commission on Higher Education, 1947: I, 27-35; West, 1956: 69-99; and Wolfle, 1954: 243). The means most commonly proposed to overcome these obstacles were better testing and guidance, increased student aid,

and expanded higher education facilities (Educational Policies Commission, 1957: 34-41; President's Commission on Higher Education, 1947: II, 43-57; President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School, 1957: 8-9; and Wolfle, 1954: 244-252). Scholarships attracted the most attention, while other types of aid--such as tuition reduction, loans, work-study and tax credits--attracted only a small amount of attention (President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School, 1957: 10-11).

Considerable disagreement existed on the effectiveness and even necessity of federal student aid. Many people argued that inadequate motivation was at least as important and perhaps even more important than lack of money as an obstacle to college access (Havighurst, 1952: 64-67; and Millett, 1952: 50-54). As Millett (1952: 50) stated,

> We have reason to believe that as many as 100,000 to 125,000 of the more than 200,000 [high ability] high school graduates who do not now go to college might be interested in doing so. We suspect further that in at least half of these instances financial difficulty is not the major deterrent. Inadequate personal and family incentives lead some students not to go to college, and high schools either discourage some or do little actively to encourage others.

Many concluded from this that student aid would not be a powerful means of increasing access to higher education. In any case, some argued, massive federal student aid was not necessary, because other sources of aid were effectively meeting the need (Commission on Financing Higher Education, 1952: 131-137; Davidson, 1955: 119-120; and Millett, 1952: 54-55, 390-393). Underlying much of this questioning of the usefulness or benefits of federal scholarship aid was a fear that it would lead to an undesirable degree of interference in academic affairs (Commission on Financing Higher Education, 1952: 157-164; Educational Policies Commission, 1957: 144; and Millett, 1955: 210).

Some controversy also existed on the question of what criteria should determine eligibility for student aid. Most commentators on the question agreed that both ability and need should be taken into account, but a minority took the position that only ability should be taken into account (Millett, 1952: 435-436; and

West, 1956: 121, 122). This minority sentiment has been attributed to the unsavory reputation means tests developed during the 1930s, due to the way they were administered, and to the fact that the availability of G.I. Bill aid for most students freed colleges to shift their own funds to attracting the brightest students (Alterman, 1973: 22; and Millett, 1952: 435-436). In any case, by the late 1950s the principle that student aid should be distributed on the basis of need as well as ability was firmly in place.

2. Aid to Institutions

A number of conditions led many higher education officials to call at different times during this period for governmental aid to help institutions meet rapidly increasing operating and construction expenses. In the late 1940s and early 1950s, advocates of more institutional aid largely pointed to the rapidly worsening financial position of higher education (Henry, 1975: 88-92; and Lib. of Cong.,1951: 14, 53-55). High inflation during the war and after ravaged higher education as much as other sectors of society, and enrollments, after rising to a peak in 1949 due to the GI Bill, began dropping rapidly, not to recover until the mid-1950s. The President's Commission on Higher Education played an important role in the late 1940s drive for increased institutional aid, but it was for reasons different from those of many others. Its concern was not so much to alleviate the present financial malaise of higher education as to provide higher education with the means necessary to realize the Commission's enrollment goal of 4.6 million in 1960, double the number enrolled in 1947 (President's Commission on Higher Education, 1947: V, 1-7).

Going into the mid to late 1950s spokesmen for higher education continued to worry about its financial condition, but the main driving force behind their calls for more institutional aid now was the sudden realization that college enrollments were beginning to rise very rapidly, to the point that the 1960s would bring a "tidal wave" of new students who would swamp available college facilities and teaching staff (American Council on Education, 1954; Henry, 1975: 99-107; Nasaw, 1979: 197-213; Perkins, 1955: 102; and the President's Committee on Education Beyond the High

School, 1957: 3-4). The President's Committee provided a typical statement of the problem:

> Our colleges and universities are expected by the American public to perform something close to a miracle in the next 10 to 15 years. They are called upon to provide education of a continually improving quality to a far larger number of students--at least 6 million by 1970 compared to 3 million now....But our institutions of higher learning, despite their remarkable achievements in the past, are in no shape today to meet the challenge. Their resources are already strained, their quality standards are even now in jeopardy, and their projected plans fall far short of the indicated need....To pay adequate faculty salaries and accommodate twice as many students--at present student-teacher ratios and with present amounts of building space per student--would require something like a trebling of the current level of expenditures.

The advocates of increased institutional aid recommended that increased revenues should be sought from all sources, including business and foundations, but their main hope clearly lay in the state and federal governments (Educational Policies Commission, 1957: 137-145; Perkins, 1955; President's Commission on Higher Education, 1947: V, 25-49; and President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School, 1957: 13-14). The advocates of expanded governmental aid to colleges recommended that state governments increased their already sizable aid programs and, often with trepidation, that the federal government begin to provide general aid to higher education. The form of federal aid recommended tended to vary considerably. The President's Commission (1947: V, 42-45, 60-61) recommended that public institutions be given grants to meet their operating expenses and to build academic facilities and that both public and private institutions be given loans to build residential facilities. The President's Committee (1957: 14) was less expansive, recommending that both public and private colleges be given grants to build academic facilities. The Educational Policies Commission (1957: 144) was the most tentative, limiting itself to a proposal that more money be appropriated for loans to construct residential facilities. As it happens, the recommendation for aid to build academic facilities and for aid to cover operating expenses were not realized until the passage of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 and the Education Amendments of 1972.

The proposals for federal aid to colleges were quite controversial. Many feared that federal aid would endanger the autonomy of higher education (Commission on Financing Higher Education, 1952: 157-164; Davidson, 1955: 117-118; Educational Policies Commission, 1957: 143-144, 151; and Morrill, 1955). The most ardent opponents of federal aid stressed that economies of operation and funding from private sources should be vigorously pursued instead.

3. Community Colleges and Vocational Education

Community colleges first secured wide public attention in the mid- to late 1960s, but stirrings of interest could already be found in the 1940s and 1950s. The President's Commission on Higher Education played an important role in fanning this interest by devoting a significant amount of attention to them. In fact, the Commission was instrumental in having junior college replaced by community college as the term of choice (President's Commission on Higher Education, 1947: III, 5, 8-9):

> The President's Commission suggests the name "community college" to be applied to the institution designed to serve chiefly local community education needs. It may have various forms of organization and may have curricula of various lengths. Its dominant feature is its intimate relations to the life of the community it serves (III, 5).
>
> A change of name is suggested because "junior" no longer covers one of the functions being performed. The name was adopted when the primary and often the sole function of the institution was to offer the first two years of a four-year college curriculum. Now, however, one of its primary functions is to serve the needs of students who will terminate their full-time college attendance by the end of the fourteenth year or sooner. For them a wide variety of terminal curricula has been developed. Such an institution is not well characterized by the name "junior" college (III, 8-9).

The growing interest in community colleges sprang from three sources that were to prove quite enduring over the years. One was the desire to increase access by providing low-cost institutions (Brumbaugh and Sugg, 1955: 35; and President's Commission, 1947: I, 37). As the Commission stated,

> The time has come to make education through the fourteenth grade available in the same way that high school education is now available....To achieve this, it will be necessary to develop much more extensively than at present such opportunities as are now provided

> in local communities by the two-year junior college....Such institutions make post-high-school education available to a much larger percentage of young people than otherwise could afford it.

Another reason for building community colleges was to divert students away from four-year colleges. This would allow state governments to keep a lid on their educational outlays, because costs were higher at four-year colleges (Brumbaugh and Sugg, 1955: 35; Conant, 1956: 74; and Perkins, 1955: 104).[2] Diverting students to community colleges could also be used to allow universities to increase their selectivity and to concentrate on upper-division and graduate education (Commission on Financing Higher Education, 1952: 53; Conant, 1956: 70-73; and Millett, 1952: 76). As the Commission on Financing Higher Education put it,

> From a social point of view and from the point of view of educational cost there is a great deal of waste which results from admitting large numbers of students to four-year colleges who will not remain for the four years. Many of these students are young persons of little or no intellectual interest; they constitute the marginal element in freshman and sophomore classes and cause the sizable dropout record with which our colleges must contend. This situation might be corrected if our society increased the facilities for students of low intellectual capacity and motivation and so terminated their formal education with a two-year program.

The third and final reason for interest in community colleges was for their role in terminal education, especially vocational education, which was attracting increasing attention (Conant, 1956: 73; Educational Policies Commission, 1957: 29-30, 147; and President's Commission on Higher Education, 1947: I, 68-69). The President's Commission vigorously stated the case for a deeper involvement by community colleges in vocational education:

> Half the young people who go to college find themselves unable to complete the full 4-year course, and for a long time to come more students will end their formal education in the junior college years than will prolong it into the senior college. These 2-year graduates would gain more from a terminal program planned specifically to meet their needs than from the first half of a 4-year curriculum. For this reason, the Commission recommends that the community college emphasize programs of terminal education. These terminal programs should include both general education and vocational training. They should be designed both for young people who want to secure as good a general education as possible by the end of the fourteenth grade and for those who wish to fit themselves for semiprofessional occupations. Semiprofessional training, proper-

> ly conceived and organized, can make a significant contribution to education for society's occupational requirements. In not providing this sort of training anywhere in existing programs, the educational system is out of step with the demands of the twentieth century American economy.

The Commission felt that postsecondary vocational education had to be expanded in order to meet the needs of less able students and to keep the education system in correspondence with a greatly changing occupational structure. The service sector was growing rapidly, with many openings being created for medical technicians and secretaries, hotel and restaurant managers, salesmen, and so forth (President's Commission on Higher Education, 1947: I, 68-69).

The advocates of a vast expansion of community colleges and vocational education realized that their proposals entailed a fundamental restructuring of higher education that demanded a rationale. The problem they faced was how to avoid the charge that those who are provided higher education in the form of community-college and vocational education are not truly being given higher education and are thus being denied equality of opportunity for higher education. The preferred answer was one that had been given in the early 1900s, at the time of the introduction of vocational education in the high school (Bowles and Gintis, 1976: 191-192): equality of opportunity does not lie in providing the same education to all but in tailoring education to individual needs and abilities (Educational Policies Commission, 1950: 3-4; and President's Commission on Higher Education, 1947: I, 67 II, 3). The Educational Policies Commission boldly stated this justification of differentiation:

> To say that every citizen in a democracy has the right to demonstrate his competence to make use of social opportunities is to affirm, in a limited sense, the principle of equal opportunity for all. But to insist that equal opportunities must always take the form of identical experiences is unrealistic. Efforts to impose identity of experience on individuals of differing interests and abilities are not only foredoomed to futility; they are also unfair--especially to those individuals who deviate markedly from the average; and because they discriminate against individuals in such minority groups as the handicapped and the gifted, they are undemocratic. Moreover, to the extent that such efforts succeed, they prevent the maximum advancement of the general welfare.

4. Coordination and Planning

In the years between 1945 and 1958, the state governments moved noticeably to bring order to their rapidly expanding higher education systems. The number of states with statutory coordinating boards rose from 19 in 1949 to 26 in 1959 (Berdahl, 1971: 35). In a number of states--most notably California, New York, Florida, and Minnesota--studies were conducted on how to cope with the enrollment increases (Brumbaugh and Sugg, 1955: 33-36). Several regional interstate compacts were established: the Southern Regional Educational Board in 1949, the Western Interstate Compact for Higher Education in 1953, and the New England Board of Higher Education in 1954 (Brumbaugh and Sugg, 1955: 36-39). These developments were in keeping with the recommendations of the President's Commission on Higher Education (1947: III, 25-33, 55), the Educational Policies Commission (1957: 116-118, 148), and the President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School (1957: 20,22).

The explanations or justifications given for increasing coordination and planning usually centered on considerations of managerial efficiency (Brumbaugh and Sugg, 1955: 32, 24-25; Educational Policies Commission, 1957: 115; Millet, 1952: 242, 244; and President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School, 1957: 20, 22). State budgets were badly strained by rapidly increasing educational costs, which in turn were due to rising enrollments and inflation; this prompted attempts to curb duplication of facilities both within states and between adjoining states. Furthermore, the public higher education institutions were often fighting each other in pursuit of higher budget appropriations, often leaving legislators unable to decide how to reconcile competing interests. The President's Commission (1947: III, 32), however, provided reasons beside managerial efficiency for seeking greater coordination and planning: the need to determine the extent to which equality of opportunity is being denied, to devise means of overcoming barriers to access, and to establish procedures for identifying youth of "exceptional talent" and encouraging them to enter college.

Federal Higher Education Policymaking

Congressional activity in education slowed down sharply following the remarkable upsurge represented by the National Defense Education Act (NDEA). No important new legislation concerning education was passed in the five years between the signing in 1958 of the NDEA and the signing in 1963 of the Higher Education Facilities Act (HEFA) and the Vocational Education Act. Important bills concerning education were filed each year, but they died for one or another reason.

A bill to provide loans to colleges for constructing undergraduate academic facilities was passed by Congress in 1959 but vetoed by Eisenhower, who wanted to hold down spending (Sundquist, 1968: 197-199). In 1960, bills were introduced providing for scholarships, insured loans, and aid for the construction of academic facilities (including the establishment of public junior colleges), but no action was taken on them beyond holding hearings (Congressional Quarterly, 1960: 367). In 1961, a bill providing aid for academic facilities and scholarships was again introduced--this time with Administration backing--but the bill was bottled up by the House Rules Committee and never reached the floor (Congressional Quarterly, 1961: 235, 244-246, 875). In 1962, bills providing for scholarships and aid for facilities construction were introduced with President Kennedy's backing. These proposals died, however, when the House rejected a compromise bill hammered out by a House-Senate Conference Committee, largely because it provided some scholarships aid (Congressional Quarterly, 1962: 230-231, 236). In 1963, President Kennedy proposed an omnibus aid to education bill, providing among other things aid for academic facilities and, in place of the controversial scholarships, insured loans and work-study funding. The prospects for the omnibus bill at first did not seem bright. But, by the end of 1965, virtually all of its major parts had been passed, along with a number of important programs that Kennedy had not asked for. In particular, aid for construction of academic facilities was established under the Higher Education Facilities Act (1963). Work-study funding was enacted by the Economic Oppor-

tunity Act (1964). Insured loans were established by the Higher Education Act (1965). The additions included the scholarship and developing-colleges program enacted by the Higher Education Act of 1965 (HEA): the first had been requested by Kennedy in 1961 and 1962 but not 1963; the second originated with Johnson (Congressional Quarterly, 1963: 188-190, 194-201; 1964: 208,259; 1965: 270-272, 295-305; and Sundquist, 1968: 205-220).

The proposals for aid to construct academic facilities provoked sharp controversy. The main arguments against the aid centered on the danger of federal control and the unconstitutionality of aid to religious colleges. (For more on the arguments for and against aid to the colleges, see pp. 39-40.) The main critics of federal aid to colleges per se included the Chamber of Commerce and conservative Republican Congress members. The critics of aid to religious colleges in particular included Jews, Protestants (especially from the South), and various educational groups (particularly the National Education Association). The supporters, meanwhile, included the higher education associations and the American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations (AFL-CIO) (Congressional Quarterly, 1960: 368; 1961: 244-246; 1962: 231-238 and 1963: 191-193). This alignment of opposing forces was complicated, however, by differences of interest within higher education. The public institutions tended to favor grants over loans, since they were often barred from taking the latter, while the reverse held for private institutions. This division of interest sometimes prevented the higher education associations from presenting a unified front and thus exercising much influence on the consideration of federal aid for facilities (Congressional Quarterly, 1961: 246; Henry, 1975: 131; and Sundquist, 1968: 197-201).

Proposals for student aid, especially in the form of scholarships, also provoked such opposition that President Kennedy, after proposing them in 1961 and 1962, dropped them in 1963 in favor of proposals for work-study employment and insured loans (Alterman, 1973: 63; and Congressional Quarterly, 1963: 188). Opposition

to scholarships largely came from conservative Republicans, who preferred loans, and the public higher education associations, which preferred aid to colleges in order to keep tuitions low. (See pp. 38-39 for more on this.)

The insured loan program also attracted opposition, principally from the American Bankers Association and the United States Aid Fund, a private nonprofit loan insurance program (U.S. Senate, 1965: 1011, 1094-1095). They withdrew their opposition, however, once a compromise was reached with the Administration; the federal loan insurance role was recast into one of encouraging and supplementing, rather than supplanting, state and nonprofit private loan insurance programs (Alterman, 1973: 97-105; and Congressional Quarterly, 1965: 296, 299-300).

The developing colleges program attracted little controversy, but there was some question about whether junior colleges should be made eligible for it. The bill originally proposed by the Administration did not mention them as developing institutions. However, several of the higher education associations--including not only the American Association of Junior Colleges (AAJC), but also the American Council of Education (ACE), Association of American Colleges (AAC) and Association for Higher Education (AHE)--pushed for including junior colleges under the title (U.S. Senate, 1965: 354, 860-861). The U.S. Office of Education opposed this suggestion, arguing that this would reduce the amount of funds going to individual institutions and that, in any case, junior colleges are often not as directed to the crucial problems of manpower development and college completion as are four-year colleges (U.S. Senate, 1965: 372-373). The upshot, however, was that two-year colleges were made eligible.

A natural question, after reviewing federal educational legislation between 1959 and 1965, is why such frequent failure was followed by such sudden success. As to the failure, it is clear that the passage of the NDEA had not vanquished the fear of federal control and the opposition to aid

to religious schools, although it had undermined, if not fatally injured, them. The issue of federal control continued to burn steadily, and the religious issue, largely dormant throughout the 1950s, flared up dramatically in 1961 and 1962 (Congressional Quarterly, 1965b: 1195, 1208-1212; and Sundquist, 1968: 180-205). As to the sudden success, several commentators have noted various causes (Alterman, 1973: 113-120; Brock, 1968: 39-46; and Sundquist, 1968: 481-489).

An obvious cause is the assassination of President Kennedy, which not only created an enormous well of sympathy on which Lyndon Johnson could draw, but also seemingly played a role in Johnson's conversion from a cautious, centrist legislative tactician into a crusading liberal moralist. In addition, the liberal wing of Congress was strengthened by the Democratic landslide in the 1964 elections and by other important developments: the enlargement of the House Rules Committee in 1961 (thus diluting the strength of its conservative members), the replacement in 1961 of the conservative Graham Barden by Adam Clayton Powell as chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee, and the growing confidence of the House Democratic leaders who took office in 1962 (Speaker John McCormack and Majority Leader Carl Albert).

Furthermore, the opposition to college aid and to scholarships died down as old issues cooled down. In the case of college aid, the racial issue became less heated after the 1964 Civil Rights Act passed, and the issue of grants to religious colleges subsided as the furious controversy over aid to religious elementary and secondary schools wound down. The controversy over aid to religious schools had caused the 1961 college aid bill to be killed and was a constant source of trouble for later college aid bills. The controversy wound down as opponents and proponents of aid to religious schools came to realize that their conflict had resulted in denying new federal aid to both public and private schools. In the case of scholarships, the powerful Association of Land Grant Colleges and State Universities--which had long favored aid

to institutions over aid to students--came out finally in support to scholarships.

Finally, there was growing belief that poverty constituted a crisis for the United States that was fully as significant as the Russian challenge, as symbolized by Sputnik. This concern with poverty reflected the impact of the early 1960s "discovery" of poverty and, more importantly, the rapidly strengthening civil rights movement (Hodgson, 1976: 158-160, 172-174). (For more discussion on this, see p. 37.) In order to defuse middle-class opposition, however, the emphasis on poverty was partially counterbalanced by attention to the needs of students from "middle income" families. Considerable concern had been expressed in Congress about the problem these families faced in financing a college education, whether because more than one of their children was in college or because their children were not eligible for many student aid programs (U.S. Senate, 1965: 129-130, 872, 1526). In order to blunt powerful sentiment in favor of tax relief for middle income families with children in college, the Administration proposed that the insured loan program be established and that students from middle income families be eligible for work-study aid (Congressional Quarterly, 1965: 1476; Gladieux and Wolanin, 1976: 40-41; and U.S. Senate, 1965: 278).

The Wider Ideological and Political Context

As before, the categories that will be used to organize the discussion of the ideological and political forces affecting higher education policy making will be those of access, institutional aid, community-college and vocational education, and coordination and planning.

1. The Question of Access

Who should be in college and why: The answers to this question changed greatly in the period from 1959 to 1965. Opposition to increased access to higher education virtually disappeared, and the arguments used in favor of increased access changed substantially. To be sure, many of the arguments used in the 1950s were also invoked in the early 1960s: the existence of major shortages of or needs for highly trained manpower, the social costs of talent loss, and the need to meet the Russian challenge. (See President Kennedy, 1963, and the remarks by Representative Brademas, Cohelan, and Donahue in Congressional Record--House, 1963: 1453-1454, 14161 and 14176.) The tenor of these old arguments was changing, however. The manpower shortages pointed to were as much for technicians as for the scientists and engineers they were to assist (Kennedy, 1963: 977). Also, the Russian specter became a less potent goad to action, as evidenced by President Kennedy's (1963: 979) rather off-hand mention of the Russian educational effort and President Johnson's virtual silence on it. But most important was the appearance of new justifications for increased access, ones which moved away from manpower and foreign policy arguments toward considerations of social justice and equality of opportunity.

One of these new justifications, based on human capital theory, played an important transitional role in the shift from an economic to an ethical legitimation of increased equality of opportunity for education. President Kennedy (1963: 975) presented a striking statement of this argument:

> For the nation, increasing the quality and availability of education is vital to both our national security and our domestic well-being. A free Nation can rise no higher than the standard of excellence set in its schools and colleges. Ignorance and illiteracy, unskilled workers and school dropouts--these and other failures of our educational system breed failure in our social and economic system: delinquency, unemployment, chronic dependence, a waste of human resources, a loss of productive power and purchasing power and an increase in tax-supported benefits. The loss of only one year's income due to unemployment is more than the total cost of twelve years of education through high school. Failure to improve educational performance is thus not only poor social policy, it is poor economics....This nation is committed to greater investment in economic growth; and recent research has shown that one of the most beneficial of all such investments is education, accounting for some 40 percent of the nation's growth and productivity in recent years. It is an investment which yields a substantial return in the higher wages and purchasing power of trained workers, in the new products and techniques which come from skilled minds and in the constant expansion of this nation's storehouse of useful knowledge.

President Johnson also drew on this argument, but in a way that emphasized the element concerned with social justice. This can be seen in the following two statements from his January 1965 message to Congress on education (Johnson, 1965: 1374, 1375):

> Over one hundred thousand of our brightest high school graduates will not go to college--and many others will leave college--if the opportunity for higher education is not expanded. The cost of this neglect runs high--both for the youth and the nation. Unemployment of young people with an eighth grade education or less is four times the national average....We can measure the costs in even starker terms. We now spend about $450 per child in our public schools, but we spend $1800 a year to keep delinquent youth in a detention home, $2500 a year for a family on relief, $3500 a year for a criminal in state prison.
>
> One hundred years ago, a man with six or seven years of schooling stood well above the average. His chances to get ahead were as good as the next man's. But today, lack of formal education is likely to mean low wages, frequent unemployment, and a home in an urban or rural slum. Poverty has many roots but the taproot is ignorance. Poverty is the lot of two-thirds of the families in which the family head has had eight years or less of schooling. Twenty percent of the youth aged 18-24 with an eight grade education or less are unemployed--four times the national average. Just as ignorance breeds poverty, poverty all too often breeds ignorance in the next generation.

In fact, President Johnson came very close to a justification of increased access to education that simply relied on an appeal to equality of opportunity. In arguing for a program of federal scholarships, he stated (Johnson, 1965: 1376):

> Each year an estimated 100,000 young people of demonstrated ability fail to go on to college because of lack of money. Many thousands more from low-income families must borrow heavily to meet college costs. Only one out of three young people from low-income families attend college compared with four out of five from high-income families.

This statement is striking in two regards. It still partially draws on the rhetoric of talent loss in its reference to "100,000 young people of demonstrated ability" but it emphasizes class differences in educational access. This was by no means the first time that pleas had been made to remove inability to pay as an obstacle to access to college. However, most of earlier pleas were concerned with money--removing financial obstacles to access, especially by highly able students--rather than class--eliminating differences in access according to socioeconomic background.

The changes in the justification of increased access were accompanied by changes in which were the groups whose access to higher education was considered at risk. In the 1950s, the group of most concern was the "talented," with most discussion on access centered on how broad this group was and how many were failing to enter higher education. Very little attention was given to specific social groups. In the early 1960s, however, attention shifted away from the talented, and certain specific social groups--notably Black and lower-income youth--came into view.

In 1961, President Kennedy had defined the "talented and needy" as the object of his proposed student aid program (Congressional Quarterly, 1961: 875), but within only a few years this standard had given way to a concern with all students who were "qualified," even if not talented (Alterman, 1973: 74-75, 114-115, 172-174). By 1965, Frances Keppel, then U.S. Commissioner of Education, had announced a different focus for federal student aid programs (U.S. Senate, 1965: 275):

> Please note that this program is designed to help able but needy students. It is not aimed at selecting and rewarding the most academically gifted but rather at giving a helping hand to students qualified for a higher education who are members of poor families.

This approach received strong endorsement from the American Council on Education, the American Association of Higher Education, and a number of Congressmembers, most notably Senator Wayne Morse (U.S. Senate, 1965: 413, 434-435, 866-867, 1305).

The new standard of who should go to college left much room for interpretation, however. This shows up the varying interpretations given to the commonly held position that everyone, regardless of family background, should have an opportunity to develop his or her talents to the maximum. The 1964 Democratic Party platform, for example, stated that "regardless of family status...education should be open to every boy or girl in America up to the highest level which he or she is able to master" (Congressional Quarterly, 1964: 1097). While most did not do so, some of those upholding the goal of maximum individual development took this to mean universal higher education. The Association of Higher Education and the president of the United Electrical Workers (IUEW) stated this goal in tentative terms (U.S. Senate, 1965: 869), but a representative of the Americans for Democratic Action did not: "Higher education should today be the normal expectation of American young people....The time is now to extend the principle of free public education to higher education. Only such an approach is consistent with the needs of our times" (U.S. Senate, 1965: 1286).

The specific social groups of concern to education policy makers in this period were Blacks, low-income youth, and middle-income youth. Interestingly, mention of Blacks seems to have been virtually absent before 1964 or 1965. In those years, however, Blacks were mentioned repeatedly, sometimes directly and sometimes under such euphemisms as the "culturally deprived" (U.S. Senate, 1965: 642, 875, 878, and 907). The interest in middle class youth stemmed from the belief that middle class families were finding it increasingly hard to finance a

college education due to rising college costs, the presence of more than one child in college, and difficulty in qualifying for financial aid (U.S. Senate, 1965: 104, 129-130, 1235, 1290, 1520).

The causes of the dramatic shift in the legitimations for increased access to higher education are not immediately evident, but one factor that must be given considerable weight is clearly the civil rights movement. Another is the discovery of poverty in our midst, beginning with Michael Harrington's The Other America, and the development of poverty as a political issue (Hodgson, 1976: 158-160,172-174). Lyndon Johnson, in fact, treated poverty as constituting a crisis fully as significant as the Russian challenge, as can be seen below (Congressional Quarterly, 1964: 876):

> On many historic occasions the President has requested from the Congress the authority to move against forces which were endangering the well-being of our country. This is such an occasion. On similar occasions in the past we have often been called upon to wage war against foreign enemies which threatened our freedom. Today we are asked to declare war on a domestic enemy which threatens the strength of our nation and the welfare of our people.

A third and less easily isolated factor is the growing American confidence that an expanding economy allowed social problems to be solved and competing demands to be reconciled. This was a major tenet of what Godfrey Hodgson calls the "liberal consensus" that grew during the 1950s and came to full flower in the early 1960s (Hodgson, 1976: 79-81).

How to increase access: As in the 1950s, the barriers to access most frequently pointed to were lack of money (Johnson, 1965: 1370), lack of space at the colleges (U.S. House of Representatives, 1963: 6), lack of institutions in close proximity (Kennedy, 1963: 977), and lack of aspirations (Conant, 1961: 36; and Gardner, 1961: 120-122). Unlike the late 1940s and early 1950s, low aspirations were now mentioned not in order to argue against student aid but to argue for supplementing student aid with programs for identifying and guiding college prospects.

The means proposed to increase access were much the same as in the 1950s. To deal with the problems of motivation and information, programs to identify and

counsel college prospects were proposed (Conant, 1961: 43; Gardner, 1961: 122-123; and Kennedy, 1963: 978). To eliminate the problems of space and proximity, higher education facilities, particularly community colleges, should be expanded and put closer to people (Kennedy, 1963: 977). And to overcome lack of money, federal student aid was proposed in various forms. Kennedy and Johnson proposed scholarships and work-study funding for needy students and insured loans for children of middle-income families (Johnson, 1965: 1376). The public four-year colleges argued for aid to institutions to keep their tuitions low (U.S. Senate, 1965: 731). A loose coalition of Republicans and maverick Democrats, such as Senator Abraham Ribicoff, called for tax credits for tuition payments (Congressional Quarterly, 1964: 532).

The proposals for scholarships and tax credits proved particularly controversial. The principal argument made for scholarships was that a high proportion of qualified high school students was not going on to college or dropping out of college in large part because of lack of money. Scholarships were recommended in particular because those who most needed financial aid were reluctant to saddle themselves with large loan debts (U.S. Senate, 1965: 103, 730, 845-846, 872, 877). The main argument made against scholarships was that they lack the "character-building effect" of loans. For example, several Republican members of the House Committee on Education and Labor argued that "those wonderful, inspiring, high-idealed and energetic students now working their way through would...climb onto the 'free ride' of outright grants, thus hurting their character and ideals" (Congressional Quarterly, 1961: 246). Another argument--one made especially by the large public four-year colleges--was that educational opportunity was better increased by a policy of encouraging low or free-tuition public higher education than by one of providing federal scholarships (Congressional Quarterly, 1960: 368; idem, 1969: 246; and U.S. Senate, 1965: 731, 1117-1118). Motivating this argument in good part was the fear that a federal scholarship program would lead many students to choose

private over public institutions. In an immense turnabout, however, the public four-year colleges in 1965 retracted their opposition to scholarships in statement submitted to the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare as it conducted hearings on the Higher Education Act (U.S. Senate, 1965: 642).

Proposals for tuition tax relief were usually advanced on the basis that they would help middle income students who could not qualify for scholarships and would aid colleges, by allowing them to raise their tuitions, without the danger of federal control of higher education (U.S. Senate, 1963: 26-27; and Congressional Record--Senate, 1963: 18865-18867). The arguments made against the tax credit proposals were that they provided relatively little aid to middle-income families and virtually none to low-income families, they would cost much more than other forms of student assistance, and they would bring no immediate relief to the colleges (Congressional Record--Senate, 1963: 18871-18872; and U.S. Senate, 1965: 278, 415, 731-732, 867).

2. Aid to Institutions

The question of direct federal aid to higher education institutions was almost wholly restricted to aid to construct academic facilities, such as classrooms and laboratories. Higher education already received aid for research and for the construction of dormitories, and aid for general operating expenses was not yet seriously considered. The principal argument used in favor of aid for academic facilities was that higher education was having enormous difficulty in meeting the "tidal wave" of enrollments. As the House Education and Labor Committee (1963: 3-5) stated:

> By 1970, the number of students seeking admission to institutions of higher education will be almost double the total campus enrollments of 1960, due chiefly to the increase in the numbers of young people of college age....Testimony presented to the Committee on Education and Labor and letters from hundreds of college and unviersity officials provide irrefutable evidence that the needs of higher education institutions for new construction exceed their available resources.

Many Congressmembers feared that, without aid, many institutions would have to

turn away deserving college applicants.

The opponents of institutional aid raised a variety of objections, most of which had also been made in the 1950s. The critics argued that there were many unfilled places in higher education, that the colleges could raise the money if they needed to, that federal aid would sap state and local responsibility, that federal aid would lead to federal control of higher education, and that federal aid to private colleges was unconstitutional (U.S. House of Representative, 1963: 23-26; and U.S. Senate, 1963: 26-27). The fear of federal control was the most fundamental objection, but the constitutional issue was also quite powerful. As alternatives to direct federal aid, the critics favored tax credits for tuition and gifts and more efficient use of facilities (U.S. Senate, 1963: 24-26).

3. Community Colleges and Vocational Education

Interest in community colleges and postsecondary vocational education accelerated markedly during the early 1960s. Bills providing for grants to construct community college facilities were introduced each year from 1960 to 1963 (Congressional Quarterly, 1960: 367; 1961: 245, 246; 1962: 232, 233; 1963: 189-190). Success finally came with the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, which provided aid to all higher education institutions, including community colleges, for construction of academic facilities.

The reason that community colleges were attracting greater attention lay less in the rise of new reasons for attraction than in the added force of existing reasons. As in the 1950s, proponents of the community colleges argued that they would expand opportunity, be cheaper to operate than four-year schools, divert students from four-year colleges, and provide the best site for postsecondary vocational education. These reasons took on added lustre in a time of both strengthening desire to increase access to higher education and rapidly rising enrollments.

Community colleges were seen as a particularly useful means of expanding access, because they could be placed close to students and operate at a low cost

to both students and the financially hard-pressed state governments. Senator Clifford Case (R-N.J.), a long-time advocate of community colleges, spoke for many members of Congress at that time when he described the attractive feature of community colleges (Congressional Record--Senate, 1963: 18509):

> Community colleges are economical to establish and economical to attend. Community colleges do not include expensive dormitory and eating facilities, and, therefore, do not require the tremendous sums involved in such structures. Student expenses are usually low, because, for the most part, junior colleges are within commuting distance.

Similar sentiments were also expressed by state officials. For example, one of the six reasons the much imitated California master plan for higher education gave for shifting more entering students to community college was that "costs per student to the state for both operation and plant are lower in the junior colleges than in the state colleges and the University" (Liaison Committee, 1960: 59).[3] The quest by state governments for economy in higher education stemmed from their increasingly straitened financial position, beset as it was by the costs imposed by the baby boom, rising social welfare expenditures, and expanding public-service employment. In 1960, for example, state and local governments poured $1.5 billion into higher education, an eightfold increase since 1940. This state and local aid constituted 26.5 percent of the income of all higher education institutions from all sources—while the federal share was 17.9 percent--and 45.8 percent of the income of public institutions (O'Neill, 1973: 28-29).

The desire to divert students from four-year colleges stemmed from a variety of considerations. As already discussed, state governments believed that community colleges are cheaper to build and operate. In addition, state officials were concertned that four-year colleges remain at a manageable size (Liaison Committee, 1960: 59). Finally, many higher education officials wished to allow four-year colleges, especially the top universities, to concentrate on upper-division and graduate education (Conant, 1961: 145; Liaison Committee, 1960: 58, 65; and McConnell, 1962: 90) and to become more "selective" by raising their admission standards.

T.R. McConnell (1962:11), one of the major architects of the California master plan, described the last function of community colleges:

> The University of California could not have become so selective without the system of state colleges, which admit students with a wider range of ability, and junior colleges, which are essentially unselective....The existence of sixty-nine junior colleges makes it possible for the public four-year institutions to reject a student without denying him an opportunity for higher education. This is a cardinal factor in maintaining a selective state college and university system in the face of widespread public demand for access to higher education.

This function of the community college was necessary if the great universities were to take their rightful place in society. Clark Kerr (1962: 121), another architect of the California master plan in his role as chancellor of the University of California, described the obstacles faced by the universities in this quest:

> The great university is of necessity elitist--the elite of merit--but it operates in an environment dedicated to an egalitarian philosophy. How may the contribution of the elite be made clear to the egalitarians, and how may an aristocracy of intellect justify itself to a democracy of all men?

The university's claim to special social regard was founded on its central role in society (Kerr, 1963: 88):

> What the railroads did for the second half of the last century and the automobile for the first half of this century may be done for the second half of this century by the knowledge industry: that is, to serve as the focal point for national growth. And the university is at the center of the knowledge process.

It is striking that the persons most often demanding that four-year colleges be allowed to become more selective were not public officials or businessmen but heads or former heads of universities (Conant, Kerr, McConnell). This desire seemed to reflect the natural pride of a powerful social group that had just come to prominence: the professional middle class of the late twentieth century. The great universities would be their monuments, ones dedicated to the principle of merit, just as the Eiffel Tower and Crystal Palace had been the monuments of the industrial middle class (Ehrenreich and Ehrenreich, 1979; and Gouldner, 1979:18-47).

The community college was also drawing favorable notice as a particularly good site for postsecondary vocational education, in which interest was rapidly increasing

in the early 1960s. One of the main reasons was a perceived shortage of technicians to work with doctors, engineers, and scientists. This shortage was seen as leading to inefficient use of these scarce professionals, for they were being required to do tasks easily handled by lesser trained workers (Congressional Record--House, 1963: 14156; and Kennedy, 1963: 977). In addition, postsecondary vocational education programs would be useful in meeting the needs of disadvantaged students and students who are in college transfer programs but do not transfer (Medsker, 1960: 4,23-25). Finally, however, postsecondary vocational education appealed to community-college advocates as providing the basis a unique role for community colleges. They would no longer be "junior" institutions that were simply anterooms to the more prestigious four-year, "senior" colleges (Lombardi, 1978: 1-2; idem, 1979: 22-23; and Medsker, 1960: 116-117). While not often mentioned, this desire to secure a special niche in higher education for community colleges may have been a more potent force than the other two. At the very least, however, it provided willingness to not only pursue federal aid for postsecondary vocational education but also to lobby for its establishment.

The advocates of increased differentiation--of increasing the higher education enrollment shares of community colleges and vocational education--were not unmindful that there would be resistance to this. For John Gardner, formerly President of the Carnegie Corporation and Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and now head of Common Cause, resistance to differentiation was almost inescapable (Gardner: 135-136):

> A long-continued process of "sorting out" the population (such as we have engaged in for some years and will probably intensify) will inevitably pull a substantial portion of the gifted to the top and leave the less gifted behind....Barring drastic equalitarian countermoves designed to halt the search for talent, we shall move toward a society in which the most gifted and most capable people are at the top. This is what we always thought of as the ideal society. And it is the only kind of society that can hold its own in this world. But how will it suit the people who are not on top?....To the extent that the less able individual does resist the sifting out of talent, to that extent he will foster the various institutional defenses which protect him from this process--the

> seniority rules, the rules against "ratebusting," and all the other arrangements designed to insure that high performance shall not be the chief criterion of status.

T.R. McConnell (1962: 59) also identified various sources of resistance to meritocratic differentiation:

> Attempts to allocate differential functions [to different types of higher education institutions] run against stubborn impediments. These center sometimes in the ambitions of the institutions themselves, sometimes in the students and parents who make little distinction between just going to college and going for a specific purpose or who, if they do make distinctions among institutions or educational programs, select the ones that conform to some stereotype of what "college" is.

At the end of his statement, McConnell touches on what many argued was at the root of resistance to differentiation: the overweening desire of many parents and their children for a college degree (Conant, 1961: 109; Gardner, 1960:13; idem, 1961: 95; and Medsker, 1960: 53, 97, 113). For instance, John Gardner (1960: 13) argued that

> The great prestige that college education has achieved is the source of many false notions, and one of the worst is that it is the only form of continued learning after high school....Most parents, teachers, and counselors have given little or no thought to the ways of learning and growing that do not involve college. No wonder many who lack the qualifications insist on having a try at it. As long as we insist on defining college as the only means of further growth after high school, we shall have increasing--and ultimately unmanageable--pressures for admission of unqualified students.

The question, then was how to accustom people to differentiation. Gardner pointed to a number of devices: establishing comprehensive high schools, which do differentiate but also maintain a connection between students in different programs; avoiding stigmatizing labels; giving people multiple chances so that opportunity never seems to be closed; and establishing programs that ease the transition between school and work, such as noncollege postsecondary education programs (adult education, industrial training, correspondence courses) (Gardner, 1960: 15-18; and 1961: 102-107, 137-138). But Gardner also pointed out that these organizational devices are not enough: "No society will successfully resolve

its internal conflicts if its only asset is cleverness in the management of these conflicts. It must also have compelling goals that are shared by the conflicting parties" (Gardner, 1961: 139).

A variety of ideological principles were offered to meet this need for a legitimation of differentiation. The two most fundamental are that education should be adjusted to individual needs and abilities (Conant, 1961: 100; Gardner, 1961: 88-102; and McConnell, 94-95) and that education should be lifelong (Gardner, 1960: 19-20; 1961: 165-172).

The principle that education should be adjusted to individual needs and abilities is quite abstract and allows for a wide variety of applications. On the one hand, it is the basis of passionate pleas for broadened equality of educational opportunity that takes the form of decrying the waste of talent (Gardner, 1961: 164-165). On the other hand, it also becomes the basis of defenses of differentiation that take the form of statements that equality of opportunity does not require equality in the amount or type of education:

> It is not the goal of a democracy that every citizen be the equivalent of a brain surgeon or a top executive. It is the goal of a democracy that every individual fulfill his own potentialities and live a meaningful and satisfying life in the context of those potentialities. The important thing is that he have the kinds of experiences and education that will bring out the best that is in him. College will do this for some kinds of people with some kinds of abilities. Other kinds of experience will do it for people with different abilities (Gardner, 1960: 13).

The principle of equal but separate education did not apply only to whether or not someone should go on to college. It also applied to the decision of what kind of institution he or she should enter (Gardner, 1961: 97-98):

> If we are to do justice to individual differences, if we are to provide suitable education for each of the young men and women who crowd into our colleges and universities, then we must cultivate diversity in our higher educational system to correspond to the diversity of the clientele. There is no other way to handle within one system the enormously disparate human capacities, levels of preparedness and motivations which flow into our colleges and universities.

T.R. McConnell (1962: 94-95) drew the same conclusion:

> Today it is appropriate to think of the "right to try" and of preparation for a wide range of occupations as characteristics of American public higher education as a whole rather than as the responsibilities of the major state universities or of the major land-grant institutions.

For Gardner, an important part of adjusting education to individual needs and abilities is an acceptance, even celebration, of individual differences. Society must put, he stated,

> greatly increased emphasis upon individual differences, upon many kinds of talent, upon the immensely varied ways in which individuals potentialities may be realized. If we develop such an indomitable concern for individual differences, we will learn to laugh at the assumption that a college education is the only avenue to human dignity and social worth. (Gardner, 1961: 96).

This attitude toward individual differences should also apply to the institutions within a differentiated higher education system. They must not, any more than people, fall prey to competitive status striving (Gardner, 1961: 98):

> We do not want all institutions to be alike. We want institutions to develop their individualities and to keep those individualities. None must be ashamed of its distinctive features so long as it is doing something that contributes importantly to the total pattern, and so long as it is striving for excellence in performance.

Besides the principle of adjusting education to individual needs and abilities, Gardner also proposed the principle that education should be "life-long" (Gardner, 1960: 19-20; and 1961: 165-172). As with the concept of "life-long" or "recurrent" education, which became popular in the 1970s, Gardner proposed that people should be encouraged to see education as taking place at different points throughout their lives and as drawing on a wide variety of resources, including the media, adult education programs, and industrial training programs. The beneficiaries would include high school dropouts, housewives entering the paid labor force, older workers needing retraining or refresher courses, and retirees. The major thrust of this goal of maximum self-fulfillment for

individuals of all ages is to discourage excessive interest in going to college (Gardner, 1960: 20):

> When the populace as a whole comes to recognize that education should be an enduring thing in their lives and can take place in a variety of settings, then the artificial emphasis on certain types of education will recede. Emphasis will be on individual fulfillment and personal growth, however they may best be furthered. And they will be sought for all.

4. Coordination and Planning

State governments and higher education policy makers expressed increasing interest in coordination and planning in the period from 1959 to 1965. The number of states with coordinating agencies, other than voluntary association, rose from 33 in 1959 to 39 in 1964 (Berdahl, 1971: 35). The 1960 California master plan was praised in many different quarters (Conant, 1961: 100; idem, 1964: 96-103; and U.S. Senate, 1965: 695). And many policy makers called for the development of an interstate compact on education, which would be modelled on existing organizations like the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (Conant, 1964: 121-134). As it happens, Conant's proposal was a catalyst for the establishment of the Education Compact of the States, which later became the Education Commission of the States.

A number of forces were behind the increasing interest in coordination and planning. The most important were skyrocketting enrollments and educational expenditures. Total degree-credit enrollment rose from 3.4 million to 5.5 million, a 64 percent increase, between fall 1959 and fall 1965 (U.S. National Center for Education Statistics, 1979: 84). State expenditures for higher education jumped from $1.2 billion in 1958 to 2.1 billion in 1964, an increase of 84 percent (O'Neill, 1973: 28-29), putting an enormous strain on budgets that were already hard-pressed by other social welfare demands. These factors, when coupled with the frequent and increasingly acrimonious clashes between

public institutions over state appropriations, led state public officials to push for strengthened controls over the pace and form of higher education expansion. Higher education policy makers usually regarded this push for greater coordination and planning as an assault on the autonomy of higher education, but a number of influential figures among them were arguing for a different stance. T.R. McConnell argued that greater coordination and planning were not only necessary but would also benefit higher education; they would preserve the special place of the university by preventing duplication of its distinctive programs (McConnell, 1962: 143). James Conant, also an advocate of the necessity of further rationalization, added that it would also benefit higher education by protecting it against the intrustion of outside political interests and the danger that it would become a "political football" (Conant, 1964: 58-59).

Federal Higher Education Policymaking

After a peak in 1965, with the passage of the Higher Education Act, federal higher education activity fell back dramatically, not reaching another high point until 1972. In 1966, the legislative harvest yielded a minor higher-education, but an important health-training, act (the 1966 Higher Education Amendments and the Allied Health Professions Personnel Training Act). In 1967, a fairly important teacher-training bill, the Education Professions Development Act, was passed. The harvest in 1968 brought another important health-training act, the Health Manpower Act, and two education acts, the Higher Education and Vocational Education Amendments, that were fairly important but did not really break new ground. In 1970 and 1971, three very important health training acts were passed. Finally, 1972 brought an act that made quite fundamental changes in the federal government's relationship to higher education.

Playing in counterpoint to the Congressional enactments were several important steps taken by the Johnson and Nixon Administrations on their own. The Johnson Administration tried to nurse the ailing guaranteed loan program back to health by making concessions to the banks, which were rather unenthusiastic about the program (Alterman, 1973: 127-140, 177-78; and Congressional Quarterly, 1966: 300, 305; and idem, 1967: 633). The Johnson and Nixon Administrations also commissioned a number of important studies of higher education, with the most notable being the "Rivlin" (U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1969) and "Newman" (1971) reports.

Ideologically, the period from 1966 to 1972 represents a curious time in the history of federal educational policymaking. It was a time in which a massive backlash against liberal reform began to gather, but it was also a time in which one of the most sweeping federal education acts, the 1972 Amendments, was passed and numerous and important initiatives were taken in

the training of health-care personnel. The backlash appeared in several different areas, all of which were to remain at the center of debate until well into the 1970s. The Johnson Administration began to propose as early as 1966 that deep cuts be made in many domestic programs in order to free funds to finance the Vietnam War and to counteract the inflationary impact of war expenditures (Congressional Quarterly, 1966: 298, 301; and 1967: 632). This drive was taken up the Nixon Administration for much the same reasons, but there was an added impetus in the traditional Republican suspicion of massive social-welfare expenditures (Congressional Quarterly, 1971: 581). Also in 1966, the use of schoolbusing as a means of desegregating schools came under fire in Congress, as it considered amendments to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (Congressional Quarterly, 1969b: 728). In 1968, the issue of how to deal with campus protestors flared up, fueled in good part by the Columbia University student sit-in (Congressional Quarterly, 1968: 491, 497, 498; idem, 1969b: 731-733; and Gladieux and Wolanin, 1976: 24). Finally, in 1970, President Nixon raised his concern about the need in education for accountability, reform, and a coherent federal policy (Congressional Quarterly, 1970: 29A-30A, 33A, 37A, 39A, 114A-115A). In giving voice to these concerns, he also stated what seemed to be a thoroughgoing repudiation of the premises that had guided federal educational initiatives up till then (Congressional Quarterly, 1970: 114A):

> During that decade [the 1960s], Congress was extraordinarily generous in its support of education, particularly in its enthusiasm for trying to compensate through education for the environmental disadvantages of our least fortunate children.... Much of this activity was based on the familiar premise that if only the resources available for education were increased, the amount that youngsters learn would increase, too. Somehow, it seemed reasonable to assume that the amount of dollars invested in education was all that really mattered. For we thought we knew what education was all about. It is, therefore, perfectly understandable that we, as a nation, have been reluctant to accept the findings of massive research and bold scholarly analysis which suggest that perhaps our cherished assumptions may simply not be true....There is no shame associated with this conclusion, and no blame to be

> assigned. But it is time to realize that every time we invest a billion dollars in a compensatory program we raise the hopes of millions of our most disadvantaged citizens; which hopes are more than likely destined to be dashed, for the programs and strategies on which they rest are themselves based on faulty assumptions and inadequate knowledge. This is bad government. It is bad politics. It is bad education.

The budgetary cutbacks proposed by the Johnson and Nixon Administrations affected higher education in two principal ways. Higher education appropriations, like education appropriations generally, were rarely funded at authorized levels. Furthermore, the Johnson and Nixon Administrations made determined efforts to phase out the National Defense Student Loan (NDSL) program in favor of a much expanded Guaranteed Student Loan (GSL) program. The GSL program required a considerably lower direct outlay by the federal government than did the NDSL program, an attractive feature to budget officials as they tried to cope with rapidly rising war expenditures and inflation (Congressional Quarterly, 1966: 298, 301; 1967: 632; and 1971: 581). Under the NDSL program, the federal government actually provided the principal for loans to students; under the GSL program, however, banks and other institutions provided the loans, and the federal government's role consisted of providing interest subsidies and stimulating the flow of loan funds by indirectly insuring the lenders against default. The Johnson and Nixon Administrations never succeeded in replacing the NDSL with the GSL program, in large part because Congress was quite devoted to the NDSL, but they did manage to trim the NDSL considerably.

The Education Amendments of 1972 were products of a protracted development that was shaped by many forces. Their official history begins with President Nixon's March 1970 message to Congress on higher education, continues with Congressional hearings in 1970 and 1971, includes a false climax at the end of 1971 when both houses of Congress passed the bill but the Senate

reconsidered and sent back to committee, and ends with President Nixon's signature in June 1972. Like all official accounts, however, this history misses major facets of the situation. For one, it misses the ideological backdrop to the passage of the 1972 Amendments. As early as 1967, Senators Claiborne Pell (D-R.I.) and Eugene McCarthy (D-Minn.) had introduced bills that dealt with one of the fundamental concerns of the 1972 Amendments: guaranteeing to all students accepted for college that financial resources would be available to allow them to go (Congressional Quarterly, 1967: 635). The concern animating these bills was one of many that surfaced in the late 1960s and influenced the passage of the 1972 Education Amendments. In addition to the fiscal woes of the federal government and student protest, the new issues included the financial plight of many colleges, concern about whether federal student aid programs were really reaching those in need, and growing criticism of the quality and worth of traditional academic education (Gladieux and Wolanin, 1976: 20-31).

The complex interweaving of political and ideological forces shaping the 1972 Amendments can best be appreciated by reviewing the sources of its most important provisions. The student aid provisions - most notably, the establishment of the Basic Education Opportunity Grants - drew from many sources but the results were quite harmonious. The proposals made by the Administration, the Carnegie Commission, the "Rivlin" Commission, and Senator Pell had several major themes in common. Student aid should be focused on the neediest. It should take the form of an "entitlement" --a guarantee by the federal government that all students will have a certain minimum amount of money to attend college-- that is well publicized so that all students will know about it in advance of applying to college. And finally, student freedom to choose among colleges should be maximized in the interest of spurring institutional accountability and innovation. This agreement did not preclude, of course,

considerable individual variation on the main themes. The Administration's program put heavy reliance on use of direct and guaranteed loans, while other programs stressed the expansion of the educational opportunity grants. The Carnegie Commission enthusiastically advocated a loan program in which repayment would be contingent on one's adult income, while the Rivlin commission was quite dubious about the idea (Carnegie Commission, 1968: 19-21; idem, 1972a: 3; Congressional Quarterly, 1971: 581; Gladieux and Wolanin, 1976: 50-53, 69-71, 85, 90-91; Nixon, 1970; and U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1969: 31-32).

The agreement among proponents of major changes in the student-aid program did not insure easy passage through Congress. The principle that student aid should be an entitlement attracted a fair amount of criticism (Gladieux and Wolanin, 1976: 132-133). Another battle also broke out over the principle of concentrating student aid on the neediest (Gladieux and Wolanin, 1976: 72, 79, 132). But the greatest controversy was over the Administration's proposal to rely on loans to carry the main burden of student assistance; many charged that this amounted to asking students to "mortgage their futures" (Gladieux and Wolanin, 1976: 72, 79; and U. S. House of Representatives, 1971a: 1053, 1086).

The controversy over the principle of concentrating financial aid, especially grants, on low-income students is worth examining in greater detail for the light it sheds on the political currents of the period. This principle was severely criticized by many Democrats, including such party stalwarts as Representatives Edith Green (Ore.), John Brademas (Ind.), and Roman Pucinski (Ill.). The critics argued that students from middle-income families were finding it difficult to finance a college education, but they were barred from much financial aid (U. S. House of Representatives, 1971a: 92, 235, 315, 1052). The anomaly that it was Congressional Democrats and

not Republicans who were the ones concerned about the plight on middle-class families may be due to how they defined middle class. Most of those voicing concern for these families did not explicitly mark out to whom they were referring, but many seemed to be thinking not of professional or managerial but working-class families, albeit relatively prosperous ones. This seems to be the case in the following statements by Representatives Green and Pucinski (U. S. House of Representatives, 1971a: 315);

> MRS. GREEN. It is my contention that it is the middle-income family that has fewer dollars. Their children cannot get any assistance while the neediest people who pay no income taxes get all of these other benefits because of the guidelines and because of our system. There are so many inequities.
> MR. PUCINSKI. That man who makes $7,500 a year and is trying to put his kid through college, put him up against a person who is on public assistance in Illinois, with a four-member family, by the time he gets through paying 40 percent tax and everything else, this man is really often in a much more difficult position.

An interesting feature of this statement is how it pits the interests of middle- and lower-income families against each other, thus carrying the flavor of the white working-class backlash against minority demands for redress of grievance.

A wide variety of groups contributed to or commented on the various student aid proposals entertained by Congress. The recommendations by the Carnegie Commission (1968) had a particularly great impact: they influenced the bill introduced by Senator Pell, and they provided the basis for bills by Senators Kennedy and Mondale and Representatives Quie and Brademas (Gladieux and Wolanin, 1976: 91-92, 120). The AFL-CIO played a role in the consideration of student aid by strongly advocating expanded student aid, strongly criticizing the Administration's proposal for its over-reliance on loans, and expressing concern about the policy of concentrating financial aid on low-income students. The AFL-CIO's concern about concentrating aid of low-income students was couched in terms of the burden on middle-income

families, among which it included many union families (U.S. House of Representatives, 1971a: 1052-1053).

Business also weighed in with comments but had little if any impact on student-aid deliberations. The National Association of Manufacturers submitted a statement to the House Education and Labor Committee supporting the concentration of financial aid on needy students and the standardization of the definition of need (U. S. House of Representatives, 1971a: 1046-1047). The Chamber of Commerce also submitted a statement but one that took a very different tone. While the Chamber supported federal student assistance, it opposed the principle of guaranteeing a certain level of financial resources to entering college students and continued to express a distinct distaste for grants as versus loans (U. S. House of Representatives, 1971a: 1140).

The provisions for aid to institutions for general operating expenses reflected an upsurge of interest in the late 1960s that was due in great part to what some called the "new depression in higher education" (Cheit, 1971). This crisis was ascribed to a variety of causes. Prices had risen rapidly in the late 1960s, hitting the service sector, traditionally an area that cannot easily combat rising factor prices through the pursuit of productivity gains, particularly hard. The traditional sources of income - federal research programs, tuition, alumni giving, endowments - did not raise their yields at a sufficiently rapid rate, due to such causes as high inflation and the winding down of the Vietnam war. Faculty salaries and student-aid expenditures were rising rapidly (Carnegie Commission, 1968: 5-6; idem, 1972a: 71-78, 195-250; U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1969: 13; and U. S. House of Representatives, 1971a: 435-446).

The higher education associations, the Carnegie Commission, and the Rivlin commission played an important role in the debate on institutional aid. They provided evidence on the need for federal institutional aid and

advanced arguments for one or another form of that aid. Virtually all of the higher-education associations favored formulas based at least in part on all enrollments but beyond that there was little agreement. Public institutions, particularly the less distinguished ones, supported formulas simply based on enrollments. Private colleges, however, called for attention to differences in quality and instructional expense. Universities favored weighting enrollments according to level, because upper-division and graduate students cost more to educate. Two-year colleges, however, opposed any such graduated scheme. (See Carnegie Commission, 1972a: 107-137, for descriptions of these formulas). The Carnegie Commission, however, while supportive of federal institutional aid, opposed the approaches based on general enrollments. The Commission (1972a: 2-3) argued that those approaches would probably restrain innovation, lead to an undesirable degree of federal control, encourage state and local governments to reduce their financial support of higher education, and run afoul of the church-state issue. These reasons led the Commission to call for cost-of-education supplements, which were also favored by the Newman and Rivlin commissions (Carnegie Commission, 1968: 30-31; Newman et al., 1971: 74; and U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1969: 28-29, 31). According to this proposal, federal aid would flow to institutions in the form of special supplements accompanying certain categories of students, usually those receiving federal student aid. This proposal was categorically rejected, however, by the American Council of Education and the public higher education associations (the NASULGC and ASCU) (Carnegie Commission, 1972a: 131, 135).

Business and labor played little role in the debate on institutional aid, but they did take stands on the issue. The AFL-CIO supported institutional aid, the National Association of Manufacturers opposed it, and the Chamber of Commerce stated that it should only be given on the condition that

the colleges tighten up their business procedures. Both the NAM and the Chamber called on higher education institutions to pursue operating economies and to drastically increase their tuitions (U. S. House of Representatives, 1971a: 1043, 1052, 1140).

In the end, the formula that was eventually incorporated in the 1972 Amendments was an eclectic combination of various proposals. It largely followed the cost-of-education approach advocated by the Carnegie Commission and others, but it did take into account size of institution, giving smaller colleges a larger share than their enrollments alone would warrant. This formula reflected widespread doubts among Congress members about the usefulness of aid simply tied to enrollments. Many felt institutions should receive direct aid only to the extent they met a clear national objective such as taking in and providing special services for needy students receiving federal student aid. The formula also reflected the concern of many about the financial plight of small colleges (Gladieux and Wolanin, 1976: 99, 188).

The path to the passage of the community-college and occupational-education provisions of the 1972 Amendments was by no means straightforward. The bill passed by the Senate had a section dealing with community colleges but not postsecondary vocational education, while the reverse held true for the House bill. The Senate community college provisions were based on a bill - the Comprehensive Community College Act of 1969 - introduced by Sen. Harrison Williams (D-N.J.) at the prompting of the American Association of Junior Colleges. The House vocational education provisions stemmed from the efforts of Representatives Albert Quie (R-Minn.) and Roman Pucinski (D-Ill.), the latter a long-time friend of vocational education. The bill that emerged out of the House-Senate conference embodied both the post-secondary vocational-education and community college provisions, the result

of a straight one-for-one trade between the House and Senate conferees (Gladieux and Wolanin, 1976: 92-93, 102, 142, 175). The Administration played very little role, despite President Nixon's (1970: 38A) strong endorsement of community colleges and vocational education. The Office of Education, which had been assigned the task of formulating proposals for Congress, failed to do so, seemingly because of lack of interest. And President Nixon's 1971 message to Congress on higher education (Nixon, 1971) made no mention of community colleges or postsecondary vocational education (Gladieux and Wolanin, 1976: 77).

The Carnegie Commission seems to have played a very important role in fanning the growing national interest in community colleges. Its recommendation that an effort be made to put two-year colleges within commuting distance of 95 percent of the population (Carnegie Commission, 1970b: 1, 51-52) was enthusiastically endorsed by the American Association of Junior Colleges (U. S. House of Representatives, 1971a: 1014) and the Education Commission of the States (1971c: 35). Furthermore, the Commission's recommendation that high school graduates should be encouraged to break the "academic lockstep" by not going on to college was repreatedly echoed in the Congressional hearings on the 1972 Amendments (U. S. House of Representatives, 1971a: 87, 270, 357, 358).

Labor and, especially, business played very peripheral roles in Congressional consideration of federal aid to community colleges and postsecondary vocational education. Despite business enthusiasm for both (Business Week, 1972: 48; and Rhine, 1972: v), the statement submitted by the National Association of Manufacturers made no mention of community colleges and vocational education and the statement by the Chamber of Commerce carried only one sentence on the two topics: "Support should be given to states to assist them in planning for the establishment of community colleges with

adequate provision for occupational programs" (U. S. House of Representatives, 1971a: 1043-1047, 1140-1141). The AFL-CIO, which also enthusiastically supported community colleges and vocational education (AFL-CIO, 1970: 16; 1971: 36), submitted the following statement to Congress:

> The AFL-CIO has long had a particular concern for community colleges which, by bringing higher education within commuting distance of the students, greatly increases the accessability of post-high-school education for low-income students, students from minority groups, and students from workers' families. There is much in H. R. 7248 [one of the precursors of the 1972 Amendments] to strengthen this important component of American higher education (U. S. House of Representatives, 1972a: 1053).

The Wider Ideological and Political Context

This discussion of the climate of higher education policy debate in the period 1966 to 1972 will be organized under the same broad topics as the discussions for the periods 1945 to 1958 and 1959 to 1965, namely, the questions of access, aid to institutions, community-college and vocational education, and coordination and planning.

1. The Question of Access

As before, the discussion of access will concern views of why access to higher ecucation should be increased, who should be in higher education, what are the barriers to access, and what are the means of removing them. These topics will be taken up in that order.

Who should be in college and why: Arguments in favor of greater access were usually couched in terms of equality of opportunity. There was little of the variety of justification found in the 1950's and early 1960's, when manpower shortages, the Russian challenge, the need to combat urban social pathologies, and the benefits of investment in human capital were routinely invoked in calls for an expansion of higher education access. To be sure, statements did appear referring to such old themes as talent loss (Carnegie Commission, 1968: 18), but these appeals were more to tradition than to vibrant concerns of the present. The hegemonic, if not almost exclusive, theme was equality of opportunity. It was a theme that was invoked by not only Lyndon Johnson but also Richard Nixon. In his February 22, 1971 message to Congress on higher education, President Nixon (1971: 40A) stated his commitment to equality of educational opportunity:

> I repeat the commitment...that no qualified student who wants to go to college should be barred by lack of money. The program which I am again submitting this year would benefit approximately one million more students than are currently receiving aid. It would assure that Federal funds go first, and in the largest amounts, to the neediest students, in order to place them on an equal footing with students from higher-income families....
>
> At the present time, a young person whose family earns more than $15,000 a year is almost five times more likely to attend college than a young person whose family earns less than $3,000.

The dominance of the theme of equality of opportunity was reflected in the triumph of an expansive definition of who particularly should be in college. Virtually all seemed to agree that it should be those who are "qualified." No further mention was made of restricting acess to the talented, as was common in the 1950's and, to a considerably lesser extent, the first half of the 1960's. The new standard, moreover, was interpreted in a manner that would allow for wide access to college. The 1968 Democratic party platform would allow for "as much education and training as [a citizen] desires and can master" (Congressional Quarterly, 1968: 1037). Richard Nixon (1970: 37A) stated quite similar sentiments:

> There is much to be proud of in our system of higher education. Twenty-five years ago, two Americans in ten of college age went to college; today, nearly five out of ten go on to college; by 1976, we expect seven out of ten to further their education beyond secondary school.

Discussions about equality of educational opportunity in this period as in the ones before continued to focus on Black and lower-class youth, but women, Hispanics, Indians, and older adults also became of concern to policymakers. This increased attention was no doubt largely due to the new militance of these groups, although this went unstated by policymakers. Hispanics and Indians were discussed in the 1968 Democratic and Republican

platforms and the 1972 GOP platform (Congressional Quarterly, 1968: 990, 1035-1036; 1972: 1058) and by the Carnegie Commission (1970a: 2). The party platform statements were largely couched in terms of education generally but are presumably applicable to higher education. The concern for women showed up in strong statements by the 1972 Democratic platform (Congressional Quarterly, 1972: 1052) and the Newman Commission (Newman, 1971: 51, 80), as well as Congress itself, in the form of Title IX of the 1972 Education Amendments.

The triumph of the theme of equality of opportunity carried a great irony, however. Just as equality of opportunity was closing out competing themes, it was being undercut by statements, often issued by champions of equality of opportunity, that had a contrary effect. For example, the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education (1970a: 29) made a very strong statement in favor of equality of opportunity:

> Today we can no longer place any domestic priority for unmet needs above the elimination of inequality of opportunity in the United States. The Commission believes that a commitment to adequate support for better educational systems, to comprehensive student aid, and to removing the consequences of discrimination is truly basic to the nation's future. The greatest asset of any nation is its people.

Yet, almost in the same breath, the Commission stated that, while it supported universal <u>access</u>, it opposed universal <u>attendance</u> (Carnegie Commission, 1970a: 11):

> We do not believe that each young person should of necessity attend college. Quite the contrary. Many do not want and will not want to attend, and it cannot be shown that all young persons will benefit sufficiently from attendance to justify their time and the expense involved. We should resist efforts to create a "captive" audience in our colleges. We should avoid pressures from family and society which impose college attendance on young

> people who would not voluntarily choose to attend. We therefore oppose universal attendance as a goal of American higher education and believe that noncollege alternatives should be made more available and more attractive to young people. We favor, on the other hand, universal access for those who want to enter institutions of higher education, are able to make reasonable progress after enrollment, and can benefit from attendance.

The fear that many poorly motivated students were entering higher education was widely shared (Newman et al., 1971: 4-9; and Nixon, 1971: 41A). As it happens, this fear led the Carnegie Commission (1972b: 62) to call for programs that would discourage poorly movivated students from entering or remaining in college by using such means as annual interviews with students and improved high school counseling.

The most important aspect of the redefinition of the notion of equality of educational opportunity, however, was the coupling of equality of opportunity with the differentiation of educational programs. This will be explored below under the section dealing with community colleges and vocational education.

How to increase access: The barriers to access by qualified students that were most often mentioned were much the same as before, except for the conspicuous absence of lack of space, a major concern in the late 1950's and early 1960's, and the addition by the Carnegie Commission (1970a: 3) of age and quality of early schooling. Otherwise, the barriers mentioned in both 1966 - 1972 and earlier periods were family income, aspirations, racial or ethnic background, and proximity to higher education institutions (Carnegie Commission, 1970a: 2-3; Education Commission of the States, 1971a: 3-4, 9-10; and U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1969: 6-7).

The means usually proposed to overcome these barriers to access included several important innovations, which will be discussed below, but many were quite familiar. As before, much stress was put on adequate student aid and improved programs for the identification and guidance of promising youngsters. Moreover, the recurrent enthusiasm for tax relief flared up dramatically again, with the Senate passage of a bill in 1967, but it died down in subsequent years. Some opposition to scholarships continued, but with very little of the strength it had in the 1950's and early 1960's.

The innovations included proposals for extensive remedial education in both high school and college, special allowances to allow needy students to attend expensive higher education institutions, loans with repayment contingent on adult income, and most importantly, a federal guarantee to all students of a certain floor amount of financial resources for higher education. The last proposal came to fruition in the form of the Basic Educational Opportunity Grants (BEOG's) established by the 1972 Education Amendments. The proposal for a federal guarantee had many different sources and, consequently, many different versions. (For a discussion of this, see pages 53 and 54 above). Nonetheless, there was a clear central tendency to these various proposals: the notion of a guarantee or "entitlement", that the federal government would commit itself to a certain level of financial resources for all students. If students could not raise this much on their own, then the federal government would make up the remainder. This guarantee was intended to have two effects: one was to heighten the aspirations of high school students by providing them an assurance that they could finance college if they wanted to go (U.S. House of Representatives, 1971a: 132); the other was to maximize student freedom to choose among colleges in order

to spur innovation (Carnegie Commission, 1972a: 3).

The programs proposed for remedial education included improvements in elementary and secondary education, provision of pre-college tutoring and counselling, and remedial education in college (Carnegie Commission, 1970a: 5-7, 13-14; and Education Commission for the States, 1971a: 73-74). As it happened, the 1968 Higher Education Amendments set up a program of special Services to the Disadvantaged to provide tutoring and remedial education to students who were enrolled in or accepted for college, and the 1972 Education Amendments established Educational Opportunity Centers to identify college prospects and provide tutoring and counselling.

The proposal for special allowances to allow needy students to attend college appeared in a bill submitted by then Senator Walter Mondale (D-Minn) and in a bill submitted by the Nixon Administration. Mondale wanted to insure access not just to postsecondary education per se but to a full range of institutions by basing scholarship awards in part on costs of attendance (Gladieux and Wolanin, 1976: 91-92). The Administration proposal called for setting up a special "cost of education" loan program to allow low income students to attend expensive institutions (U.S. House of Representatives, 1971: 85). Both proposals proved controversial (U.S. House of Representatives, 1971a: 235-237, 325-326, 570), so no such provision appeared in the 1972 Amendments.

Proposals for loans with repayment contingent on adult income were quite popular at the time. This idea had been advanced for years by Milton Friedman and others, but the idea first drew national attention in 1967 when the Panel on Educational Innovation of the President's Science Advisory Committee called for an "Education Opportunity Bank". Versions of this

REFLECTIONS ON THE POLITICS OF FEDERAL HIGHER EDUCATION POLICYMAKING

Two of the most striking features of the postwar growth of federal involvement in higher education have been the degree of change in the justifications for that involvement and the peripheral role played by powerful outside groups, especially business and labor, in the policymaking process. The change in justification is especially marked on the issue of access. Policymakers did not come to rely primarily on the goal of equality of opportunity as a justification of greater access until the mid- to late 1960s. Prior to this, they preferred to draw on more economically oriented justifications of greater access: manpower shortages, talent loss, the specter of the Russian challenge, and the social and economic returns to greater investment in human capital. The reliance on these justifications did not mean that the goal of equality of opportunity was deemed unimportant; many policymakers in fact invoked this goal as well. Rather, what often seems to have been at work was an attempt to use "hardheaded" reason to advance the goal of equality of opportunity in a time of political reaction. These stalking-horse justifications are usually dispensed with in times when egalitarian forces are at their peak. Thus, in the 1940s and mid- to late 1960s, the primary argument for increased access was simply that it was necessary to the goal of equality of opportunity. Other justifications were used, but it was their role this time that was peripheral.

The 1970s have been another period of weakness for egalitarian forces, but the result has been different from the 1950s. The goal of equality of opportunity has not been muted--in fact, it is invoked as often or more than in the 1960s--but it has been fundamentally recast. As in the Progressive era, equality of opportunity has been equated with differentiation, with tailoring an indi-

vidual's education to his or her supposed needs and abilities. Community colleges and particularly vocational education have been advanced as increasing access because they supposedly offer a place in higher education for the person of poor ability or nonintellectual interests.

Business and labor involvement in higher education policymaking has been surprisingly minimal given the importance of higher education to their interests and to national life. Both have clearly indicated that higher education is instrumental to major purposes of theirs--whether securing research, adequately trained employees, or social mobility for their children (American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations, 1970: 16-17; Council for Financial Aid to Education, 1975: 3-5; and Davis, 1980: 1-2). Furthermore, labor has frequently appeared before Congress in support of higher education legislation. Various major business associations (the Conference Board, Committee for Economic Development, Council for Financial Aid to Education) have issued many reports on higher education (Davis, 1980), and business has contributed large amounts of money to higher education ($508 million in 1977-78) (Council on Financial Aid to Education, 1979: 5). Nevertheless, a careful study of the history of several major federal higher education policy decisions turns up little evidence that either business or labor has played a central role in higher education policymaking.

Labor's peripheral involvement may be due to the fact that higher education is not very central or attainable for many union members or their children. This may explain why labor has been much more involved in the passage of legislation concerning elementary and secondary education than in legislation affecting higher education.

Business' relative uninvolvement in higher education politics may stem from the fact that the normal working of higher education policymaking insures that its interests will be met. The federal government has not had to be pressured to pour money into research and the training of scientific and technical personnel but has done this as much because of its own interest in a strong military and a growing economy. By providing more jobs and greater tax receipts, a growing economy meets two overriding interests of government officials: social stability and growing revenues that allow the government to finance itself and expand (Block, 1977: 15).

Higher education institutions may be led in similar ways to serve business goals. Like businesses in a highly competitive market, higher education institutions cannot exert great control over the demand for their services or products. They are thus left very open to government and business requests for services, such as research or training programs. Higher education institutions are also vulnerable in their relationship to students. Students have many colleges and programs to choose from and are loath to enroll in a particular college or program if they are unlikely to find jobs once they graduate. In order to insure the employability of their graduates, colleges have to tailor their programs to the needs of those who do control access to jobs, which in this case usually means business. Higher education could escape this unhappy situation if it were the direct employer of many or could secure the widespread imposition, especially by law, of credentials requirements. The fact that the Western European universities seem to have greater power over the economic fates of their graduates than do American institutions may be the basis of their greater autonomy from market forces, although not necessarily from other external imperatives.

NOTES

I would like to thank Benjamin Davis and John Gennari for research help, Maureen Scully, Louise Epstein, John Gennari, and Jan Lennon for typing and correcting the manuscript, and Jerry Letendre and Benjamin Davis for proofreading the same.

1. The best known studies were conducted by three long-term research studies: the Conservation of Human Resources Project, the National Manpower Commission, and the Commission on Human Resources and Advanced Training. The Conservation of Human Resources Project was founded by Dwight Eisenhower, then president of Columbia, with aid from fourteen major corporations (such as duPont and RCA) and the Ford Foundation. It conducted a large number of studies on the causes of the inadequate performance of many soldiers during World War II, the factors responsible for superior intellectual performance, and changes in the social role of work. The National Manpower Commission also began at Columbia in 1950, as a Ford Foundation-initiated spinoff from the Conservation of Human Resources Project. It published a large number of studies on student deferments, the development and utilization of skilled and scientific manpower, and the labor-force roles of women and Blacks. (For brief histories and bibliographies of both research projects, see Ginzberg, 1958: 9-12, 176-178; and Spring, 1976: 81-92.) The Commission on Human Resources and Advanced Training was established in 1949 by the Conference Board of Associated Research Councils (comprising ACE, SSRC, the National Research Council, and the American Council of Learned Societies) with Rockefeller Foundation support (Wolfle, 1954: xi-xiii. Its final report was America's Resources of Specialized Talent (Wolfle, 1954). In addition to the efforts of these research projects, there were innumerable publications on manpower supply and demand by the National Science Foundation, the National Research Council of the National Academy of Science, the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and a host of professional organizations.

2. Estimates of the relative cost of educating students at two- versus four-year colleges are quite variable. For example, should the costs of graduate education, faculty research, a large library be excluded in computing the cost of educating lower-division students at a university, or do these indeed contribute to the quality of their education (Liaison Committee, 1955: 414)? For various estimates of the comparative costs of education at two- and four-year colleges, see Liaison Committee (1955: 426-440; 1960: 154-163) and Froomkin (1970: 39-46).

3. It should be noted that educating students at two-year as versus four-year colleges often results in lower costs for state governments but not for local governments, which have long shouldered a hefty proportion of community-college budgets.

4. In fact, the fear that if community colleges became four-year colleges they would de-emphasize vocational education led the Carnegie Commission (1970b: 16) to recommend that "public two-year colleges should be actively discouraged by state planning and financing policies from converting to four-year institutions."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alford, Albert. "Education's new landmark legislation." American Education, 8 (August-September, 1972), pp. 4-8.

Alford, Albert. "The Education Amendments of 1976." American Education, 13 (January-February, 1977), pp. 6-11.

Alterman, Richard. Manpower Policy and Individual Need in the Development of Federal Aid to College Students. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan, School of Education, 1973.

American Council on Education. A Call for Action to Meet the Impending Increase in College and University Enrollment. Washington, D.C.: the Council, 1954.

American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations. Statements Adopted by the AFL-CIO Executive Council. Washington, D.C.: AFL-CIO, 1970.

American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations. Statements Adopted by the AFL-CIO Executive Council. Washington, D.C.: AFL-CIO, 1971.

Bendiner, Robert. Obstacle Course on Capitol Hill. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964.

Berdahl, Robert. Statewide Coordination of Higher Education. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1971.

Block, Fred. "The ruling class does not rule: Notes on the Marxist theory of the state." Socialist Review, 33 (May-June, 1977), pp. 6-28.

Bowles, Samuel and Herbert Gintis. Schooling in Capitalist America. New York: Basic Books, 1976.

Brock, Stephen. "A comparative study of federal aid to higher education: The Higher Education Act of 1965 and Project Upward Bound." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Cornell University, 1968.

Brumbaugh, A. J. and Redding, S. Sugg, Jr. "Recent developments in state and regional planning of higher education." The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 301 (September, 1955), pp. 32-40.

Burkett, Lowell. "Latest word from Washington." American Vocational Journal, 51 (February, 1976), p. 9.

Burris, Val. "Toward an historical understanding of the new middle class." Unpublished paper, Department of Sociology, University of Oregon, 1978.

Business Week. "The job gap for college graduates in the '70s." Business Week (September 23, 1972), pp. 48-58.

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. Quality and Equality: New Levels of Federal Responsibility for Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1968.

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. A Chance to Learn: An Action Agenda for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970a.

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. The Open Door Colleges: Policies for Community Colleges. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970b.

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. Less Time, More Options. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971a.

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. The Capitol and the Campus: State Responsibility for Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971b.

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. Institutional Aid. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972a.

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. The More Effective Use of Resources. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972b.

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. A Digest of Reports of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974.

Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education. The Federal Role in Postsecondary Education: Unfinished Business, 1975-1980. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.

Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education. Selective Admissions in Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.

Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education. Next Steps for the 1980s in Student Financial Aid. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1979a.

Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education. Fair Practices in Higher Education: Rights and Responsibilities of Students and their Colleges in a Period of Intensified Competition for Enrollments. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1979b.

Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education. Three Thousand Futures: The Next Twenty Years for Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. More than Survival: Prospects for Higher Education in a Period of Uncertainty. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. The States and Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976.

Cheit, Earl. The New Depression in Higher Education: A Study of the Financial Conditions at 41 Colleges and Universities. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

College Entrance Examination Board. On Further Examination: Report of the Advisory Panel on the Scholastic Aptitude Test Score Decline. New York: the Board, 1977.

Commission on Financing Higher Education. Nature and Needs of Higher Education. New York: Columbia University Press, 1952.

Committee for Economic Development. The Management and Financing of Colleges. New York: the Committee, 1973.

Conant, James Bryant. Education in a Divided World. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1948.

Conant, James Bryant. The Citadel of Learning. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1956.

Conant, James Bryant. Slums and Suburbs. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961.

Conant, James Bryant. Shaping Educational Policy. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964.

Congressional Quarterly. Congressional Quarterly Almanac. Washington, D. C.: Congressional Quarterly, Inc., 1945-1979.

Congressional Quarterly. Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report. Washington, D. C.: Congressional Quarterly, Inc., 1980.

Congressional Quarterly. Congress and the Nation: Vol. I, 1945-1964. Washington, D.C.: Congressional Quarterly, Inc. 1965b.

Congressional Quarterly. Congress and the Nation: Vol. II, 1965-1968. Washington, D.C.: Congressional Quarterly, Inc., 1969b.

Congressional Quarterly. Congress and the Nation: Vol. III, 1969-1972. Washington, D.C.: Congressional Quarterly, Inc. 1973b.

Congressional Quarterly. Congress and the Nation: Vol. IV, 1973-1976. Washington, D.C.; Congressional Quarterly, Inc., 1977b.

Conrad, Herbert and Ernest Hollis. "Trends in tuition charges and fees." Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 301 (September, 1955), pp. 148-164.

Council for Financial Aid to Education. Guidelines for Corporate Support of Education. New York: the Council, 1975.

Council for Financial Aid to Education. Corporate Support of Higher Education, 1978. New York: the Council, 1979.

Cross, K. Patricia. "The role of the junior college in providing post-secondary education for all." In U. S. Office of Education (Ed.), Trends in Postsecondary Education. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1970.

Davidson, Carter. "Government support of private colleges and universities." Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 301 (September, 1955), pp. 112-121.

Davis, Benjamin. "American higher education, 1945-1980: Corporate action and opinion." Unpublished paper, Huron Institute, Cambridge, Mass., 1980.

Education Commission of the States. Postsecondary Education Opportunity. Denver, Colo.: the Commission., 1971a.

Education Commission of the States. "Federal higher education legislation." Higher Education in the States, 2 (March, 1971b), pp.

Education Commission of the States. "Community and junior colleges in perspective." Higher Education in the States, 2 (April, 1971c), pp. 33-36.

Education Commission of the States. "Comprehensive planning for postsecondary education." Higher Education in the States, 2 (April, 1971d), pp. 37-41.

Education Commission of the States. "Vocation as 'calling'." Higher Education in the States, 2 (November, 1971e), pp. 173-185.

Education Commission of the States. Policy Positions, 1965-1977. Denver, Colo.: the Commission, 1977.

Education Commission of the States. 1978 Policy Recommendations. Denver, Colo.: the Commission, 1978.

Education Commission of the States. 1979 Policy Recommendations. Denver, Colo.: the Commission, 1979.

Education Policies Commission. Education of the Gifted. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1950.

Educational Policies Commission. Higher Education in a Decade of Decision. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1957.

Ehrenreich, Barbara and John Ehrenreich. "The professional-managerial class." In Pat Walker (ed.), Between Labor and Capital. Boston: South End Press, 1979.

Eulau, Heinz and Harold Quinley. State Officials and Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970.

Faltermeyer, Edmund. "Let's break the go-to-college lockstep." Fortune (November, 1970), pp. 98-103, 144, 147.

Farrell, Allan. "Report of the President's Commission: A critical appraisal." In G. Kennedy (Ed.), Education for Democracy. Boston: Heath 1952, pp. 97-104.

Fatters, William, George Sunteman, and Samuel Peng. Fulfillment of Short-term Educational Plans and Continuance in Education. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1977.

Finley, Grace. Business and Education: A Fragile Partnership. New York: National Industrial Conference Board, 1973.

Finn, Chester, Jr. Scholars, Dollars and Bureaucrats. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution, 1978.

Folger, John, Helen Astin, and Alan Bayer. Human Resources and Higher Education. New York: Russell Sage, 1970.

Froomkin, Joseph. Aspirations, Enrollments, and Resources. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1970.

Gardner, John. "From high school to job." Pp. 11-20 in Carnegie Corporation, Annual Report. New York: Carnegie Corporation, 1960.

Gardner, John. Excellence: Can We Be Equal and Excellent Too? New York: Harper & Row, 1969.

Ginzberg, Eli. Human Resources: The Wealth of a Nation. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1958.

Gladieux, Lawrence and Thomas Wolanin. Congress and the Colleges. Lexington, Mass.: Heath, 1976.

Gleazer, Edmund. "Alternative missions for higher education in the 1980s." In U. S. Senate, Committee on Labor and Human Resources,

Gouldner, Alvin. The Future of Intellectuals and the Rise of the New Class. New York: Seabury, 1979.

Gray, Robert. "Campus Outlook: more turmoil." Nation's Business (August, 1969), pp.

Guzzardi, Walter. "The uncertain passage from college to job." Fortune (January, 1976), pp. 126-129, 168-172.

Harris, Norman C. "Skilled manpower and the community junior college." In G. Kerry Smith (Ed.), Current Issues in Higher Education: Higher Education in An Age of Revolutions. Washington, D.C.: Association for Higher Education, 1962.

Harris, Norman C. and John Grede. Career Education in Colleges. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.

Harris, Seymour. "Millions of B.A.'s, but no jobs." Pp. 62-67 in Gail Kennedy (Ed.), Education for Democracy. Boston: Heath, 1952.

Havighurst, Robert. "Social implications of the report of the President's Commission on Higher Education." Pp. 62-67 in Gail Kennedy (Ed.), Education for Democracy. Boston: Heath, 1952.

Henderson, Algo. "The market for college graduates: A review." Pp. 72-80 in Gail Kennedy (Ed.), Education for Democracy. Boston: Heath, 1952.

Henry, David. Challenges Past, Challenges Present: An Analysis of American Higher Education since 1930. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.

Hodgson, Godfrey. America in Our Time. New York: Vintage, 1976.

Hollinshead, Byron. "Colleges of freedom." Pp. 90-96 in Gail Kennedy (Ed.), Education for Democracy. Boston: Heath, 1952.

Hutchins, Robert. "Double trouble: Are more studies, more facilities, more money the key to better education?" Pp. 81-89 in Gail Kennedy (Ed.), Education for Democracy. Boston: Heath, 1952.

Jencks, Christopher, Susan Bartlett, Mary Corcoran, James Crowe, David Eaglesfield, Gregory Jackson, Kent McClelland, Peter Mueser, Michael Olneck, Joseph Schwartz, Sherry Ward, and Jill Williams. Who Gets Ahead? The Determinants of Economic Success in America. New York: Basic Books, 1979.

Johnson, Lyndon. "Remarks upon signing the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963." Higher Education 20 (January-February, 1963), pp. 3-4.

Johnson, Lyndon. "January 12, 1965 message to Congress on education." Pp. 1374-1377 in Congressional Quarterly, Congressional Quarterly Almanac, 1965. Washington, D.C.: Congressional Quarterly, Inc., 1965.

Karabel, Jerome. "Community colleges and social stratification." Harvard Educational Review, 42 (November, 1972), pp. 521-562.

Karen, David. Access to Higher Education: From the 1920s to the 1970s. Cambridge, Mass.: Huron Institute, 1979.

Kennedy, John F. "January 29, 1963 message on education to Congress." Pp. 975-979 in Congressional Quarterly, Congressional Quarterly Almanac, 1963. Washington, D.C.: Congressional Quarterly, Inc., 1963.

Kerr, Clark. The Uses of the University. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1963.

Liaison Committee of the Regents of the University of California and the California State Board of Education. A Restudy of the Needs of California in Higher Education. Sacramento, Calif.: State Department of Education, 1955.

Liaison Committee of the Regents of the University of California and the California State Board of Education. A Master Plan for Higher Education in California, 1960-1975. Sacramento, Calif.: State Department of Education, 1960.

Lombardi, John. The Resurgence of Occupational Education. (Topical Paper #65). Los Angeles: Eric Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, 1978.

Lombardi, John. The Decline of Transfer Education. (Topical Paper #70). Los Angeles: Eric Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, 1979.

Mayer, Martin. "Everything is shrinking in higher education." Fortune (September, 1974), pp. 123-125, 190-198.

McConnell, T. R. A General Pattern for American Public Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.

McGuiness, Aims, T. Harry McKinney, and Richard M. Millard. The Changing Map of Postsecondary Education: State Postsecondary Education Commissions (1202): Their Origin, Development, and Current Status. Denver, Colo.: Education Commission of the States, 1975.

Medsker, Leland. The Junior College: Progress and Prospect. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.

Millett, John. Financing Higher Education in the United States. New York; Columbia University Press, 1952.

Millett, John. "Recent developments in financing higher education." Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 301 (September, 1955), pp. 205-210.

Morrill, J.L. "Higher education and the federal government." The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 301 (September, 1955), pp. 41-45.

Morsch, William. State Community College Systems: Their Role and Operation in Seven States. New York: Praeger, 1971.

Mushkin, Selma. "Public financing of higher education." Pp. 82-106 in American Council on Education (Ed.), Universal Higher Education: Costs and Benefits. Washington, D.C.: the Council, 1971.

Nasaw, David. Schooled to Order: A Social History of Public Schooling in the United States. New York: Oxford University Press, 1979.

Newman, Frank, William Cannon, Stanley Cavell, Audrey Cohen, Russell Edgerton, James Gibbons, Martin Kramer, Joseph Rhodes, and Robert Singleton. Report on Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1971.

Nixon, Richard. "March 19 message to Congress on higher education." Pp. 37A-39A in Congressional Quarterly, Congressional Quarterly Almanac, 1970. Washington, D.C.: Congressional Quarterly, Inc., 1970.

Nixon, Richard. "February 22 message to Congress on higher education." Pp. 40A-41A in Congressional Quarterly, Congressional Quarterly Almanac, 1971. Washington, D.C.: Congressional Quarterly, Inc., 1971.

Olivas, Michael. The Dilemma of Access: Minorities in Two-Year Colleges. Washington, D.C.: Howard University Press, 1979.

Olson, Keith. The G. I. Bill, the Veterans, and the Colleges. Lexington, Ky.: University Press of Kentucky, 1974.

O'Neill, June. Sources of Funds to Colleges and Universities. Berkeley, Calif.: Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, 1973.

Perkins, John A. "Government support of public universities and colleges." The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 301 (September, 1955), pp. 101-111.

President's Commission on Higher Education. Higher Education for American Democracy. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1947.

President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School. Second Report to the President. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1957.

President's Panel of Consultants on Vocational Education. Education in a Changing World of Work. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1963.

Rhine, Shirley. Technician Education - Who Chooses It? New York: National Industrial Conference Board, 1972.

Sexton, John. "Minority admissions programs after Bakke." Harvard Educational Review, 49 (August, 1979), pp. 313-339.

Spring, Joel. The Sorting Machine: National Educational Policy since 1945. New York: McKay, 1976.

Squires, Gregory. Education and Jobs: The Imbalancing of the Social Machinery. New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Books, 1979.

State University of New York. Stature and Excellence: Focus for the Future, The Master Plan, Revised 1964. Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York, 1964.

Sundquist, James. Politics and Policy: The Eisenhower, Kennedy and Johnson Years. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1968.

Thomas, Norman. Education in National Politics. New York: McKay, 1975.

Trytten, M. H. "Meeting manpower needs." Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 301 (September, 1955), pp. 17-21.

U. S. Bureau of the Census. Historical Statistics of the United States: Colonial Times to 1970. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1975.

U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Toward a Long-Range Plan for Federal Financial Support for Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: the Department, 1969.

U. S. House of Representatives, Committee on Education and Labor. Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963: Report to Accompany H.R. 6143, (H. Rept. 310). Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1963.

U. S. House of Representatives, Committee on Education and Labor. Partnership for Learning and Earning Act of 1968. Hearings before the General Subcommittee on Education on H.R. 15066, 90th Cong., 2d sess. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1968.

U. S. House of Representatives, Committee on Education and Labor. Higher Education Amendments of 1971, Hearings before the Special Subcommittee on Education, 92d Cong., 1st sess. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1971a.

U. S. House of Representatives, Committee on Education and Labor. Higher Education Act of 1971: Report to accompany H.R. 7248 (H. Rept. 92-554). Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1971b.

U. S. House of Representatives, Committee on Education and Labor. Vocational and Occupational Education, Hearings before the General Subcommittee on Education, 94th Cong., 1st sess. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1975.

U. S. Library of Congress, Legislative Reference Service. Federal Educational Activities and Educational Issues before Congress. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1951.

U. S. Library of Congress, Legislative Reference Service. Federal Aid to Students for Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1956.

U. S. Library of Congress, Legislative Reference Service. Enactments by the 88th Congress Concerning Education and Training, 1963-1964. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1964.

U. S. National Center for Education Statistics. Fall Enrollment in Higher Education, 1973. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1975.

U. S. National Center for Education Statistics. Digest of Educational Statistics, 1979. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1979.

U. S. Office of Education. The National Defense Student Loan Program: Basic Facts. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1960.

U. S. Office of Education. The National Defense Student Loan Program: A Two-Year Report. Washington, D.C.; Government Printing Office, 1961.

U. S. Office of Education. "The Vocational Education Act of 1963." School Life, 46 (March-April, 1967), pp. 3-12.

U. S. Office of Education. Opening (Fall) Enrollment in Higher Education, 1963. (U.S.O.E. Circular #728). Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1965.

U. S. Office of Education. "The Higher Education Act of 1965." American Education, 2 (January-February, 1966), pp. 16-22.

U. S. Senate, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Science and Education for National Defense, Hearings before the Education Subcommittee, 85th Cong., 2d sess. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1958a.

U. S. Senate, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. The National Defense Education Act of 1958: A Summary and Analysis of the Act Prepared by the Staff. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1958b.

U. S. Senate, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963: Report, together with Individual and Minority Views. (S. Rept. 557). Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1963.

U. S. Senate, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Hearings on S. 600 [Higher Education Act of 1965], 89th Congress, 1st session. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1965.

Valien, Preston (U. S. Office of Education). "The Higher Education Amendments of 1968." American Education, 5 (December-January, 1969), pp. 10-11.

Venn, Grant. "The Vocational Education Amendments of 1968." American Education, 5 (December-January, 1969), pp. 8-9.

West, Elmer. Background for a National Scholarship Policy. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1956.

Wilson, Logan. "Will there be too many college graduates?" School and Society, 81 (April 2, 1955), pp.

Wolfle, Dael. America's Resources of Specialized Talent. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1954.

Wriston, Henry. "How to finance higher education in the future." The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 301 (September, 1955), pp. 196-204.

APPENDIX A
SYNOPSES OF FEDERAL HIGHER EDUCATION LEGISLATION

Brief Summaries

The following list cannot claim to be exhaustive, but it encompasses the major initiatives. Particularly important acts, which will be discussed in the next section, are given an asterisk.

1862 (1) First Morrill Act.
Provided grants of federal land to states to be used for establishing colleges specializing in agriculture and mechanical arts (Congressional Quarterly, 1965b: 1196).

1887 (2) Hatch Act.
Establishes system of agricultural experiment stations.

1890 (3) Second Morrill Act.
Authorized federal grants to states for operation of land-grant colleges. Amount of money distributed raised substantially by amendments in 1907 (Nelson Amendment), 1935 (Bankhead-Jones Act), 1961, etc. (Congressional Quarterly, 1965b: 1196).

1937 (4) National Cancer Act.
This act was the first to authorize a program of grants for research and to set up fellowships within the Public Health Service's National Institute of Health (Congressional Quarterly, 1965b: 1123).

1944 (5) Public Health Service Act of 1944 (PL 78-410).
While mostly concerned with consolidating all the various federal laws affecting the PHS, this act also authorized the PHS to give grants for research on all types of diseases and impairments. Subsequent legislation expanded the PHS both in its responsibilities and size, principally by adding new divisions (such as the National Institute of Mental Health) to the National Institute of Health. These divisions were empowered to make grants to outside groups for research and training programs as well as conduct their own inhouse research and training programs (Congressional Quarterly, 1965b: 1129-1132, 1134, 1145).

1939 - 1945 (6) War-time training programs using college facilities.
These included the Army Specialized Training Program, the Navy V-12 Program, and the Engineering, Science, and Management War Training Unit (Henry, 1975: 43-46).

1944 (7) Servicemen's Readjustment Act -- "GI Bill" (PL 78-346).
Provided for a wide variety of benefits, but the most famous are those concerning education, both higher and below: payment of educational costs (tuition, books, and supplies) and a subsistence allowance for up to 48 months of training (Olson, 1974).

1950 (8) National Science Foundation Act (S 247, PL 81-507).
Passed after similar bills failed to pass or were vetoed in each of the preceding four years. As finally enacted, the NSF Act authorized the foundation to (1) make grants and loans for pure and applied research in the natural sciences, mathematics, and engineering; (2) award scholarships and graduate fellowships; (3) maintain a roster of scientific and technical personnel; (4) undertake military research; (5) coordinate its program with other public and private research projects; and (6) aid the interchange of information among scientists in the U.S. and other countries. Amendments in the years subsequent substantially broadened the NSF's functions, particularly in science education (Congressional Quarterly, 1965b; 1199-1200)

1950 (9) College Housing Act of 1950.
Authorized 50-year, low-interest government loans to public and private colleges for construction of dormitories. (Congressional Quarterly, 1965b: 1199).

1950 (10) Korean War GI Bill (PL 82-550).
Less generous than World War II GI Bill in that the amount paid per person was lower and the allowable duration of training was shorter (Olson, 1974).

1954 (11) Cooperative Research Act (PL 83-531).
Authorized the U.S. Office of Education (USOE) to make contracts and establish cooperative arrangements with colleges to conduct joint research on educational problems (Congressional Quarterly, 1965b: 1200)

1956 (12) Health Research Facilities Act (S 849, PL 84-835).
Provides grants for construction of health research facilities at medical schools, universities, hospitals, and so forth (Congressional Quarterly, 1965b: 1138-1139, 1143, 1145)

1956 (13) Health Amendments Act (S 3958, PL 84-911).
Among other things, provides for (1) traineeships for graduate training in public health; (2) traineeships for training of professional nurses for jobs in teaching and administration; (3) grants to states for training of practical nurses (Congressional Quarterly, 1965b: 1138-1139, 1149)

1958 (14) (Public Health Schools) (HR 11414, PL 85-544).
Provides for operating subsidies to 11 existing schools of public health. Subsequent amendments enlarge eligibility to other kinds of schools if offer public health courses and add a program of grants to improve courses and instruction (Congressional Quarterly, 1965b: 1138, 1141, 1143, 1149)

1958* (15) National Defense Education Act (HR 13247, PL 85-864).
This act concerns not only higher education but also elementary and secondary education. The major titles are as follows, with those affecting higher education listed first: (a) Title II (loans): establishes first federal program of undergraduate and graduate student loans. (b) Title IV (fellowships): creates a new program of graduate fellowships particularly directed to increasing the supply of college teachers. (c) Title VI (foreign languages): establishes first federal program to subsidize establishment and operation by colleges of modern foreign language and area studies centers and of training institutes for K-12 modern foreign languages. (d) Title VIII (vocational education): first federal program to support training of highly skilled technicians and to funnel substantial federal vocational education funds to junior colleges. The following title is mostly concerned with elementary and secondary education but is also of relevance to higher education: (e) Title V (testing and guidance): establishes program of grants to the states and to establish high school testing, counselling, and guidance programs and program of contracts with colleges to run training institutes for high school guidance and counselling personnel. The following provisions are of less relevance to higher education: (f) Title III: funds for strengthening K-12 math, science, and modern foreign language instruction; (g) Title VII: research on use of audiovisual devices (e.g. TV) for educational purposes; (i) Title X: administrative provisions, improved collection of educational statistics, advisory committees, including scholars in sciences and humanities. (For text of NDEA, see U.S. Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, 1958b:23-48. For summaries of its provisions, see Congressional Quarterly, 1958: 217-220; 1965b: 1200-1201.) The NDEA was subsequently amended in 1963 (NDEA Amendments), 1964 (NDEA Amendments), 1965 (Higher Education Act and Elementary and Secondary Education Act), 1966 (Higher Education Amendments), 1968 (Higher Education Amendments), 1972 (Education Amendments). All of these acts will be briefly summarized below, except for the 1963 Amendments (quite minor) and the ESEA (unrelated to higher education).

1962 (16) Mental Retardation Facilities Construction Act (Title I of 51576, PL 88-164).
Provides for (a) grants for construction at medical schools of centers for research on human development and of clinical facilities for treatment of mentally retarded and (b) grants for training of specialists in treating and caring for mentally retarded (Congressional Quarterly, 1965b: 1147).

1962 (17) (Training teachers of mentally retarded and handicapped children) (Title III of 51576, PL 88-164)
Expands existing programs of grants for training teachers of mentally retarded and deaf children (PL 85-926, PL 87-276) to include teachers of other kinds of handicapped children (Congressional Quarterly, 1965b: 1147)

1963 (18) Vocational Education Act of 1963 (PL 88-210, Part A). While largely directed to high school vocational education, this act drops the provision in previous vocational education acts that restricted eligibility to programs of "less than college" grade. Furthermore, it earmarks a third of the funding for vocational education of persons who have completed or left high school and for construction of area vocational education facilities. As a commentary by the U.S. Office of Education notes (1964:7), the effect of this earmarking is to set aside funding for postsecondary education.

1963* (19) Higher Education Facilities Act (HR 6143, PL 88-204). This act is especially noteworthy for it is the first to provide for federal financing of the cost of constructing or rehabilitating undergraduate and graduate academic facilities (as distinguished from residential facilities, which have been aided by the 1950 College Housing Act): (a) Grants for undergraduate facilities (Title I): Notable features are (1) that 22 percent of funds are reserved for public community colleges and technical institutes and (2) that (only for four-year colleges) grants must lead to an expansion of enrollment capacity and can only be used for construction or rehabilitation of libraries or facilities for science, math, engineering, or modern foreign languages. (Along with a prohibition on use for religious purposes, this stipulation was intended to defuse the then bitter church-state separation issue.) (b) Grants for graduate academic facilities (Title II): As in Title I, there is a prohibition on use for religious purposes, events for which admission will be charged, athletics and recreation, but there is no restriction to certain disciplines. (c) Loans for undergraduate and graduate academic facilities (Title III): Same restrictions as under Title II. (For a summary of the act, see Congressional Quarterly, 1963:194, 1965b:1212. For text of bill, see 77 Stat. 363-379.) The Higher Education Facilities Act was subsequently amended in 1965 (Higher Education Act), 1966 (Higher Education Amendments), 1968 (Higher Education Amendments), and 1972 (Education Amendments).

1963 (20) Health Professions Education Assistance Act (HR 12, PL 88-129). The act has two major provisions: (1) establishing a program of grants for construction or rehabilitation of teaching facilities for medicine, dentistry, and related fields (optometry, osteopathy, pharmacy, podiatry, nursing, and public health); and (2) establishing a program of federal loans, administered by the schools, for students of medicine, dentistry, and osteopathy, and (due to an act in 1964) optometry. Similar bills had been introduced in Congress every year since 1951 but had failed. This act put into law most of the earlier proposals, but it was stripped of two provisions: a program of scholarships (which Kennedy had asked for in 1961 and 1962) rather than loans; and a program of partial loan forgiveness for medical, dental, and osteopathic graduates who subsequently practiced in an area with a certified shortage of health personnel (Congressional Quarterly, 1963: 216-217, 221; 1964: 267).

1964 (21) Nurse Training Act (HR 1124, PL 88-581)
This act added a new title (VIII) to the Public Health Service Act, with the following provisions: (1) establishes a program of grants for construction and rehabilitation of nursing schools (with about one-third going to collegiate schools and two-thirds going to associate-degree and diploma schools): (2) establishes a program of grants to encourage schools to expand their capacity; (3) establishes a student loan program, with a provision for cancellation of up to 50 percent of the loan, depending on how long a student eventually works in the profession; (4) reauthorizes and expands an expiring program for advanced training of professional nurses (those who teach or serve in an administrative or supervisory capacity). (For a summary of act, see Congressional Quarterly, 1964: 244-245; for text, see U.S. Library of Congress, 1964: 109-117).

1964 (22) National Defense Education Act Amendments, 1964 (PL-88-665)
Aside from markedly raising the authorizations for the various titles, the following notable changes are made: (1) Title II (Student loans): (a) the maximum for graduate and professional students is raised to $2500 a year and $10,000 in the aggregate from $1000 and $5000 (which remain the ceilings for other students) (sec. 2056). (b) Special preference for students "with superior academic background" is retained, but the concern for students who are interested in K-12 teaching or who have a superior capacity or preparation in the sciences or modern foreign languages is dropped. (sec. 207). (c) Students who are not carrying full-time loads but are carrying at least half-time loads are made eligible, and their repayment terms are eased (sec. 205(b)). (d) College teachers and private school teachers and not just public school teachers are eligible for partial cancellation of their loans (sec. 205(b)(3)). (2) Title IV (Graduate fellowships): (a) Their number is raised in steps from 1500 to 7500 in fiscal year 1968. (b) The preference for persons interested in getting a doctorate and entering college teaching is changed into a requirement. Furthermore, divinity students are explicitly barred (sec. 402(c) and (d)). (c) The restriction to those in new or expanding programs is largely removed (sec. 402(a)). (3) Title V (Guidance, counseling, and testing): States will be aided in establishing programs for testing, counseling, and guidance in not only junior and senior high schools, as before, but also now in junior colleges and elementary schools. Furthermore, the guidance and counseling programs are to be concerned not only with advising students of what courses are best suited to them and with encouraging highly able students to finish high school and go on to college but also "to advise students in their decisions as to the type of educational program they should pursue, the vocation they should train for and enter, and the job opportunities in the various fields" (sec. 502). (4) Title VIII (area vocational education): No change. (5) Title VI (Language development): The K-12 teacher training institutes are expanded to include not only teachers of modern foreign languages but also library personnel, educational media specialists, and teachers of history, geography, reading, English, and "culturally, economically, socially, and educationally handicapped youth" (sec. 602, 1101). (For text of act, see U.S. Library of Congress, 1964: 120-127. For summary, see U.S. Library of Congress, 1964: 120; and Congressional Quarterly, 1964: 260-264).

1964 (23) Economic Opportunity Act (S 2642, PL 88-452)
Almost all provisions have very little, if anything, to do with higher education, but sections 121 to 126 provide for the establishment of the college work-study program. At this time, the program was explicitly intended to "stimulate and promote the part-time employment of students in institutions of higher education who are from low-income families and are in need of the earnings from such employment to pursue courses of study at such institutions"(sec. 121). In addition to being from low-income families and in need of the earnings, students have to be enrolled full time or accepted for full-time enrollment and "capable, in the opinion of the institution, of maintaining good standing in such course of study while employed under the program" (sec. 124(c)). (For text of work-study provisions of the Educational Opportunity Act, see U.S. Library of Congress, 1964: 98-100. For summary of work-study provisions, see U.S. Library of Congress, 1964: 94; Congressional Quarterly, 1964: 211). The work-study program was amended by the Higher Education Act of 1965, which transferred it to the U.S. Office of Education and reduced the requirement that students be from low-income families to a preference that this be the case (Congressional Quarterly, 1965 : 296).

1964 (24) Civil Rights Act (PL 88-352)
Most of the act, of course, is not concerned with higher education, but there are two provisions of importance. (1) The Attorney General is given the power to file suit against a college if he receives a complaint from a student or his or her parents claiming that "he has been denied admission to or not permitted to continue in attendance at a public college by reason of race, color, religion, or national origin"(sec. 407). (2) Any federal department or agency maintaining a program of financial assistance to any outside program or activity is directed to issue rules that will ensure (e.g. by terminating grants to offending institutions) that "no person in the United States shall, on the grounds of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance" (secs. 601-602). (For text of these provisions, see U.S. Library of Congress, 1964: 165. For summary, see U.S. Library of Congress, 1964: 163).

1965 (25) Medical Library Assistance Act (S 597, PL 89-921)
Establishes program of grants for construction or improvement of nonprofit medical library facilities, for improvement of library holdings, for training of medical librarians, for research in medical library science, and for support of biomedical publications (Congressional Quarterly, 1969b: 673).

1965 (26) Health Professions Educational Assistance Act, Amendments (HR 3141, PL 89-290)
In addition to extending and raising the authorization for the provisions for construction grants and student loans in the 1963 act, this act also makes some important changes and additions: (1) Student loans: It amends the student loan provisions to add full-time students of podiatry, pharmacy, and surgical chiropody to those eligible (who already include students of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, and optometry). Furthermore, after being defeated in 1963 and 1964, partial cancellation of loans was authorized for medical, dental, and optometric students who practice in an area with a certified shortage of health personnel. (2) Scholarships: It establishes a program of grants for scholarships to schools of medicine, osteopathy, dentistry, optometry, pharmacy, and pediatry. These scholarships are to be awarded to low-income students who could otherwise not afford to pursue the course of study, (3) It established a new program of grants to schools of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, optometry, and pediatry to assist them in improving and expanding their programs and, in some cases, in simply meeting their operating costs (Congressional Record, 1965 : 333-334; 1969b: 671-673).

1965* (27) Higher Education Act of 1965 (HR 9567, 5600, PL 89-329)
This act initiated a large number of new and important programs and significantly amended previous legislation, but it is most noteworthy for its provisions regarding student aid, particularly the creation of the first federal program of undergraduate scholarships. Briefly listed below are the act's main provisions: (a) Student aid (Title IV): (1) Establishes a program of scholarships ("educational opportunity grants") for "qualified high school graduates of exceptional financial need." (2) Establishes a number of means for identifying able but needy high school students to attend post-secondary schools. (3) Establishes a program to expand loan funds, by developing new means of insuring loans, and to pay part of the interest rate for certain students. (4) Transfers the OEO work-study program (enacted in 1964) to USOE and weakens the requirement that students be from low-income families by reducing it to a preference. (5) Amends the NDEA loan provisions (Title II) in a number of ways, by permitting total loan cancellation if students teach in schools with high concentration of low-income children. (b) Community service (Title I): Establishes a new program of grants to develop studies, seminars, and adult education programs with an emphasis on urban problems, such as housing, health, and crime. (c) College library assistance (Title II): Establishes a new program of grants to colleges to improve their library resources, to train librarians, and to conduct research on library science. (d) Strengthening developing institutions (Title III): Establishes a program of grants to colleges that are "struggling for survival and isolated from the main currents of academic life," largely two-year colleges (for which 22 per-

cent of the grants are earmarked) and - although not stated but clearly intended - Black four-year colleges (e) Teacher programs (Title V): (1) Establishes a National Teacher Corps, modelled on Peace Corps, whose members are to be sent to schools with high concentrations of low-income students. (2) Establishes program of fellowships for graduate study in education and of grants to colleges to develop or streng - then graduate education programs. (f) Undergraduate course improvement (Title VI): Establishes program of grants for purchasing instructional equipment (laboratory, audio-visual, etc.) and for training in use of educational media equipment. (g) Amendments to Higher Education Facilities Act (Title VII):: Increases authorization levels and removes some restrictions on the use of grants (most notably, the 1963 act's requirement that grants be used only for the construction of libraries or facilities for science, math, engineering, and modern foreign languages). (h) General provisions (Title VIII): Among other things, defines higher education institution as including non-profit business schools and technical institutions. (For summaries of act, see Congressional Quarterly, 1965 : 294-297; and U.S. Office of Education, 1966. For text of act, see 79 Stat. 1219-1270.) The Higher Education act was amended by the 1966 and 1968 Higher Education Amendments and the 1972 Education Amendments.

1965 (28) National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act (HR 7743, PL 89-287)
The vocational loan program was part of the Administration's higher education bill, but Congress decided to treat it seperately. Nonetheless, it has essentially the same provisions as the insured loan program in the Higher Education Act, although the target population is students enrolled in business, trade, technical, and other noncollegiate postsecondary schools. As with Title IV, Part B of the Higher Education Act, the federal government would encourage state and private loan insurance plans, provide federal insurance if such a program were unavailable in a state, and provide direct federal loans if loans could not otherwise be obtained at reasonable rates. The act represents the first extension of federal student aid to profit-making (proprietary) schools (Congressional Quarterly, 1965: 309; 1969b: 740).

1965 (29) Elementary and Secondary Education Act (PL 89-10)
The act is almost wholly concerned with elementary and secondary education, but it does establish regional educational laboratories for conducting research, training teachers, and so forth (Congressional Quarterly, 1965 : 271, 275; 1969b: 712-713).

1966 (30) Higher Education Amendments of 1966 (HR 14644, PL 89-752)
This act is of relatively minor significance, since it is largely concerned with extending and expanding various provisions of the National Defense Education Act (1958), Higher Education Facilities Act (1963), and Higher Education Act

(1965). However, it has a few noteworthy provisions: (a) an amendment to Title I of the Higher Education Facilities Act (grants for undergraduate academic facilities) increasing the portion earmarked for public two-year colleges and technical insitutes from 22 percent to 24 percent; (b) an amendment to Title II of the National Defense Education Act (student loans) making loan recipients who become full-time teachers of handicapped children eligible for up to 100 percent cancellation of their loans (Congressional Quarterly, 1966: 298-299; 1969b: 724).

1966 (31) Veterans' Readjustment Benefits Act -- "Cold War GI Bill" (PL 89-358)
Authorizes a permanent program of educational and other benefits for veterans who served after January 31, 1955 (Congressional Quarterly, 1969b: 724).

1966 (32) Allied Health Professions Personnel Training Act (HR 13196, PL 89-751)
Establishes a new program to encourage allied health training and amends existing educational programs for doctors, dentists, and nurses (the Health Professions Educational Assistance and Nurse Training acts): (1) Allied health training: (a) Establishes a program of grants to build or rehabilitate training centers at junior colleges and four-year colleges. Centers receiving grants are required to increase the enrollment by a certain percentage and maintain that level for ten years. (b) Establishes a program of grants to improve the educational programs of allied health training centers which also carries the stipulation that enrollments must be increased by a certain amount. (c) Establishes programs of grants for traineeships and for development of new curricula for new types of health technologists. (2) Loans for doctors, dentists, and optometrists: Amends the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act (1963) to allow for more liberal loan forgiveness for those who practice in rural areas and to change the method of financing loans from one relying on direct federal aid to one which, while it leaves the terms unchanged for students, relies more on private capital and requires smaller outlays from the federal government. (3) Nursing scholarships: Establishes a program of grants to nursing schools for scholarships to undergraduates of "exceptional financial need" and a program of contracts with state agencies and other organizations for programs to encourage people to enter nursing (Congressional Quarterly, 1966: 335-337; 1969b: 681-683).

1967 (33) Education Professions Development Act (HR 10943, PL 90-35)
Extends and amends Title V (teacher programs) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 and creates several new teacher-training programs: grants to state agencies to attract and train teachers and teacher aides in areas with a shortage; grants for preservice and inservice training of teachers; and fellowships and

other training for college teachers. The amendments to Title V largely involve increasing state and local control over the disposition and use of Teacher Corps members (Congressional Quarterly, 1969b: 727).

1968 (34) Higher Education Amendments (S 3769, PL 90-575)
The act amends three important acts - the National Defense Education Act (1958), the Higher Education Facilities Act (1963), and the Higher Education Act (1965) - and adds six entirely new education programs. The most noteworthy provisions are the following: (a) Amendments to student assistance programs (Title I): (1) educational opportunity grants: increases the maximum amount from $800 to $1000 and creates a new program of grants for remedial and other special services (Special Services for Disadvantaged Students) to be administered along with the existing Upward Bound and Talent Search programs; (2) insured student loans: eliminates the postgraduation subsidization of interest payments for students with family incomes of less than $15,000, merges the HEA insured loan program and the Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act (1965) program, and makes a number of other changes designed to encourage greater participation by the banks (which had not lent as much as hoped); (3) college work-study: program to USOE from OEO and, for the first time, makes students in public and private vocational schools eligible (secs. 133, 139): (5) Establishes a new program for grants to encourage cooperative education. (4) direct (National Defense) loans: proprietary school students are made eligible for the first time; eliminates special consideration for students with superior academic backgrounds (secs. 174 (a), 175); (b) Other changes to the Higher Education Act of 1965 (Title II): developing institutions: (a) the set aside for junior colleges under Title III is raised from 22 to 23 percent (sec. 222); (2) new programs: establishes new programs of grants to encourage interinstitutional cooperation ("Networks for Knowledge"), education for public service, establishing law school clinical programs, and improving graduate programs (both by improving their quality and by increasing their number and size (sec. 1002 (a)); (c) makes minor amendments to the community service, college library assistance, and undergraduate-instruction improvement programs (Titles I, II, VI) (c) Amendments to the Higher Education Facilities Act: Construction grant recipients are no longer required to try to expand their enrollment size, and a new program of federal subsidization of interest costs on construction loans from private sources is established. (d) Campus disturbances: Requires colleges to cut off federal student and to students involved in campus disruptions (sec. 504). (e) Study of postsecondary access: Requires President to submit "proposals relative to the feasability of making available a post-secondary education to all young Americans who qualify and seek it" (sec. 508). (For text of the act, see 82 Stat. 1014-1063; for summaries, see Valien, 1969, and Congressional Quarterly, 1968: 491-492, 1969b: 729-731.)

1968 (35) Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 (PL 90-576)
With regard to postsecondary education, this act amends the Vocational Education Act of 1963 in a number of important regards: (a) It explicitly, rather than implicitly, identifies students in postsecondary schools as an important target population (sec. 101); and (b) It reduces the set aside for the vocational education of "persons who have completed or left high school and who are available for study in preparation for entering the labor market" from 33 1/3 to 25 percent, but it implicitly excludes area vocational school construction from eligibility for this funding. (For text of the law, see 82 Stat. 1064-1098; for a summary, see Venn, 1969).

1968 (36) Health Manpower Act (S 3095, PL 90-490)
Extends and amends all of the important existing health manpower and research acts: Public Health Service Act (1944), Health Research Facilities Act (1956), Health Professions Educational Assistance Act (1963), Nurse Training Act (1964), and the Allied Health Professions Personnel Training Act (1966).

1969 (37) Emergency Insured Student Loan Act (HR 13194, PL 91-95)
Provides for federal payment of up to 3 percent in interest (in addition to the 7 percent students are paying) on loans made by commercial lenders under the insured loan program of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (Congressional Quarterly, 1969: 244-248; 1973b: 596).

1970 (38) Health Training Improvement Act (S 3586, PL 91-519)
Amends the Allied Health Professions Personnel Training Act of 1966 and extends it through fiscal year 1973, and amends the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act of 1963 (Congressional Quarterly, 1970: 601).

1971 (39) Health Professions Educational Assistance Amendments (HR 8629, PL 92-157)
This act makes major amendments in the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act of 1963 and extends it through fiscal year 1974 (Congressional Quarterly, 1971: 527-528).

1971 (40) (Amendments to the Nurse Training Act of 1964) (HR 8630, PL 92-158)
This act extends, with some amendments, existing programs to train nurses (Congressional Quarterly, 1971: 534).

1972* (41) Education Amendments of 1972 (S 659, PL 92-318)
This "omnibus" education act establishes new programs and modifies existing ones in ways that have important consequences both for higher education and for elementary and secondary education. Briefly listed below are the provisions of its ten titles: (1) Title I (Higher Education): This title is divided into 12 parts, which amend Titles I through XII of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (hereafter HEA). The most important changes are the establishment of the "basic educational opportunity grants" (BEOGs), the establishment of the first major funding program explicitly directed to community colleges and postsecondary vocational educational programs, the creation of grants to encourage state post-

secondary planning, and the provision of emergency aid to institutions in financial distress. (2) Title II (vocational education): The vocational education programs are extended through fiscal year 1975. (3) Title III (administration of education programs): Establishes the National Institute of Education--as part of a new Education Division of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare--and a program of grants and contracts for the improvement of postsecondary education. (This program eventually became known as the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE)). (4) Title IV (Indian Education): Provides funds for improving the education of Indian children and adults and establishes and Office of Indian Education within the Office of Education. (5) Title V: Establishes support for "ethnic heritage studies programs," consumer education, and education of children of migrant workers. Furthermore, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (1965) is amended to put vocational instruction, guidance, and counselling on an even footing with traditional academic education. (6) Title VI: Requires that a study be made of youth camp safety. (7) Title VII (Emergency School Aid): Provides funds to help desegregating elementary and secondary school districts. (8) Title VIII (school busing): Prohibits the use of federal funds for school busing, except under certain circumstances. (9) Title IX (Prohibition of Sex Discrimination): Prohibits sex discrimination in federally funded educational activities. (10) Title X (Assistance to Institutions of Higher Education): Establishes the first federal aid program that subsidizes general instruction expenditures rather than just construction or research expenses. (For text of act, see 86 Stat. 235-381. For summaries, see Alford, 1972, and Congressional Quarterly, 1973b: 582-593).

1976 (42) Education Amendments of 1976 (S 2657, PL 94-482)
Another omnibus bill, this act extends and amends legislation concerning both higher education and elementary and secondary education. Briefly listed below are the provisions of its five titles. (1) Title I (Higher Education): Extends and amends virtually all of the titles of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (as amended in 1972). The most notable additions are the following: (a) Community colleges and occupational education: The program to encourage postsecondary vocational education that was established by the 1972 Education Amendments is repealed (sec. 176 (c)). The program to stimulate community college expansion is amended to encourage community colleges to better serve "nontraditional"--handicapped, elderly, female, and part-time--students (sec. 177). The definition of "community college" is changed to drop the requirement that institutions provide both academic and vocational programs; only academic programs are now required (sec. 178). (b) Academic facilities: The requirement that 24 percent of the funds for constructing academic facilities be set aside for public two-year colleges is changed to a requirement that this be the minimum (sec. 162 (b)). (c) Lifelong education: A new part is added to the Higher Education Act that provides for the encouragement of lifelong education (sec. 101). (d) Remedial education: A program of grants for Service Learning Centers at postsecondary schools is created to provide remedial and other social services for disadvantaged students (sec. 124). (e) Loan defaults: The guaranteed (insured) and direct (NDSL) loan programs are

tightened up in order to cut down on the skyrocketting rate of default (secs. 127, 130). (f) Interest subsidy: The rules on eligibility for loan interest subsidy are amended to raise the family income ceiling from $15,000 to $25,000 (sec. 127). (g) Consumer education: Colleges receiving federal student aid are required to send to incoming students "consumer information" on available financial aid and the real cost of attending the institution (sec. 131). (h) Teacher training: Because of the teacher surplus, most of the existing programs for teacher training (Title V of the HEA) are eliminated, except for the Teacher Corps and the training program for vocational educators (secs. 151-153). (i) Graduate fellowships: Eligibility is broadened to persons other than those preparing to teach at the postsecondary level (sec. 171(b)). (2) (Vocational Education): This title makes the first major overhaul of the federal vocational education program since the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968. The changes that are of particular relevance to higher education are the following: requiring broadened participation by groups representing postsecondary education, in vocational education planning; reducing from 25 to 15 percent the set aside for postsecondary vocational education from block grants to the states for vocational education; and strengthening federal support for career education. (3) Title III (Extension and Revisions of Other Education Programs): Most of the programs bear little relation to higher education. However, two parts of this title are of interest: one directs the Commissioner of Education to gather, analyze, and disseminate information on career trends and successful career education programs and authorizes grants to the states to develop and expand career education programs for persons of all ages (Part C); the other establishes grants to improve vocational guidance and counselling (Part D). (4) Title IV (General Education Provisions): The provisions of this title concern various administrative procedures of the federal education agencies. The most noteworty are the following: a statement of the new research priorities of the National Institute of Education (basic educational skills; school finance and management; improvement of equality of opportunity; career education; and dissemination of research results) (sec. 403 (a)); a prohibition on cutting off funds to higher education institutions for failure to meet an admission quota (sec. 408). (5) Title V (Technical and Miscellaneous Provisions): The most significant provision is one requiring a study of the effectiveness of vocational education and of the impact of federal aid (sec. 523 (b)). (For text of the law, see 90 Stat. 2081-2241. For summaries, see Alford, 1977; and Congressional Quarterly, 1976: 569-576).

1976 (43) (Health manpower act) (HR 5546, PL 94-484)
This act made the first major changes in federal aid to medical education since the Health Professions Educational Assistance Amendments of 1971 (Congressional Quarterly, 1976: 525-527).

1977 (44) (Career education) (HR 7, PL 95-207)
This act establishes a small program of grants for postsecondary career education demonstration projects, and it increases the funding for grants to encourage career education in elementary and secondary schools (Congressional Quarterly, 1977 : 515).

1978 (45) Middle Income Student Assistance Act (S 2539, PL 95-566)
This act makes a number of amendments to the Higher Education Act that are mostly directed to helping "middle-income" families finance higher education. The two most important changes are, first, making students from families with incomes between $16,000 and $25,000 eligible for basic educational opportunity grants (BEOGs) and, second, totally removing the family income ceiling, previously set at $25,000, for eligibility for federal subsidy of the interest on guaranteed (insured) loans (Congressional Quarterly, 1978: 569).

1979 (46) (Extension of aid to nursing schools and amendments to other aid to health professions education) (S 230, PL 96-76)
This enactment extends the Nurse Training Act for one year through fiscal year 1980 and makes a number of minor amendments to other health programs (Congressional Quarterly, 1979: 507).

1979 (47) (Higher education program extension) (HR 4476, PL 96-49)
This act extends higher education programs through fiscal year 1981 (in order to allow careful consideration of a comprehensive reauthorization bill in 1980) and makes a number of minor amendments to the Higher Education Act. It raises interest rates allowed on guaranteed (insured) student loans and allows increased basic educational opportunity grant (BEOG) payments to self-supporting students (Congressional Quarterly, 1979: 497-498).

Detailed Description of Selected Acts

1. The National Defense Education Act of 1958 (PL 85-864)

Student loans: The National Defense Student Loan (NDSL) program provides for grants to the colleges, which in turn select the recipients. Eligible are both undergraduate and graduate students who are in need, are "capable, in the opinion of the institution, of maintaining good standing," and are or will be attending school full-time (sec. 205 (b)(1)). "Special consideration" shall be given, however, to "(A) students with a superior academic background who express a desire to teach in elementary or secondary schools, and (B) students whose academic background indicates a superior capacity or preparation in science, mathematics, engineering, or a modern foreign language" (sec. 204 (4)). Students can borrow up to $1000 a year and $10,000 overall (sec. 205(a)). For borrowers who become full-time teachers in public elementary or secondary schools, up to 50 percent of the loan obligation is cancelled, at a rate of 10 percent per year (sec. 205 (b)(3)). (As was recognized at the time, this last provision in essence establishes a partial scholarship for prospective public school teachers.)

It should be noted, however, that the strongly meritocratic cast of the National Defense Student Loan (NDSL) program was seemingly tempered by the U.S. Office of Education as it developed guidelines for implementing the NDEA student loan program. An informational pamphlet giving the "basic facts" about the NDSL raises a rhetorical question - "Does the 'special consideration' clause mean that only students with high academic achievement will be considered in making loans?" - and then answers it as follows (U.S. Office of Education, 1960: 5):

> No. The Student Loan Program is designed to encourage students with college ability who are in need of financial assistance to enter or remain in college. In making a loan, the financial aid officer of a participating institution must first determine the extent of the student's financial need. He then considers whether the student should be given "special consideration" because of superior academic background in science, mathematics, engineering, or modern foreign

> languages, or because of the student's plans to teach in elementary or secondary schools. Except for students who fall into the "special consideration" category, the financial aid officer should use the criterion of high academic achievement only when, because of a shortage of funds, he must choose between, let us say, two students who have the same financial need.

The pamphlet then goes on to state that it is up to individual higher educational institutions to determine a would-be borrower's capacity for maintaining good academic standing (U.S. Office of Education, 1960: 3):

> The Act states that a student is eligible for a loan when he is capable, in the opinion of the institution, of "maintaining good standing" in his course of study. The institution has the responsibility for determining if a student is academically in "good standing," i.e., making normal and satisfactory progress toward a certificate or degree. Academic probation, when the student is permitted to continue in attendance at the institution, is not necessarily to be considered evidence of a failure to maintain the good standing required by the act.

In any case, a study by the U.S. Office of Education seems to indicate that those students who should have been given special consideration (prospective teachers and students with a superior capacity or preparation in the sciences, etc.) received 74.4 percent of all loans and 68.3 percent of all loan funds approved as of the end of fiscal year 1959 (U.S. Office of Education, 1961: 18, 21).

Graduate fellowships: This program was not the first federal fellowship program ever to be established. Federally-funded fellowships had already been established by such laws as the National Cancer Act (1937), Public Health Service Act (1944), Atomic Energy Act (1948), and the National Science Foundation Act (1950). What was new was a focus on the training of prospective college teachers without regard to field, rather than the training of prospective researchers in the natural sciences. Eligible were full-time students in graduate programs that are (a) new or have been expanded, (b) substantially further the objective of increasing the number of geographical dispersion of facilities for training college-level teachers, and (c) give preference in admission to persons interested in college teaching (sec. 403(a)). The number of fellowships authorized is 1000 for fiscal year 1959 and 1500 each for fiscal years 1961 and 1962.

The stipend begins at $2000 for the first year and rises to $2400 in the third, with allowances made for the number of dependents. The college attended also receives a cost-of-education payment of up to $2500 per person per year (secs. 402, 404).

The fellowship program differs from the loan program in a number of interesting ways. It is not restricted to those who are needy. There is no preference given to students in certain fields. There is no statement specifying how able students have to or should preferably be, beyond the mild requirement that in order to retain their awards students must be "maintaining satisfactory proficiency in, and devoting essentially full time to, study or research in the field in which such fellowship was awarded" (sec. 405). The program's lack of an explicit and rigorous aptitude standard may simply reflect the fact that graduate students are presumed to be a highly selected group as it is. The no-need feature, however, may be an indication that this program was impelled more by manpower than social-welfare goals, while the reverse held true for the loan program. This may also explain in part why the fellowship program did not restrict eligibility to students in only certain fields. Programs motivated by a delimited and "selfish" interest of the federal government, such as manpower and research programs, generally seemed to encounter much less opposition in this period than did programs aimed at more global and reform-oriented goals, such as equalizing educational access or expenditures. Such programs - most notably, the repeated proposals of general federal aid to education - invariably attracted the opposition of advocates of state's rights or separation of church and state (Congressional Quarterly, 1965b: 1195). Thus, because the fellowship program seemed to have a clear relevance to a major national need, its advocates did not have to resort to restricting it to fields for which some plausible "national defense" need could be construed.

Modern foreign languages: The NDEA provides for contracts with colleges to (a) establish and operate centers for instruction in certain modern foreign languages

and in disciplines necessary to understanding the areas in which these languages are used, (b) to operate training institutes for elementary and secondary school teachers of modern foreign languages, and (c) to pay stipends to those who undertake advanced training in order to teach modern foreign languages. The modern foreign languages that are eligible are those for which the U.S. Office of Education determines "(1) that individuals trained in such language are needed by the Federal Government, or by business, industry, or education in the United States, and (2) that adequate instruction in such languages is not readily available in the United States" (sec. 601(a)) (my emphasis).[1]

Area vocational education programs: Title VIII of the NDEA establishes a program grants to the states for programs "to provide vocational education to residents of areas inadequately served and also to meet defense requirements for personnel equipped to render skilled assistance in fields particularly affected by scientific and technological developments" (sec. 801). An area vocational education program is in turn defined as "a program consisting of one or more less than college-grade courses... which is designed to fit individuals for useful employment as technicians or skilled workers in recognized occupations requiring scientific or technical knowledge" (sec. 307 (d)). Although it might not seem so, community colleges were eligible for funding under this title, and in fact, they did receive funding (President's Panel of Consultants on Vocational Education, 1963: 25, 141).

Testing and guidance: Title V of the NDEA establishes a program of (a) grants to the states to develop programs for testing, counseling, and guiding high school students and (b) contracts with the colleges to establish training programs for high school counselors. The testing program is intended to "identify students with outstanding aptitudes and ability"; the guidance and counseling program is intended "(A) to advise students of courses of study best suited to their ability, aptitudes, and skills, and (B) to encourage students with outstanding aptitudes and ability to complete their secondary school education,

take the necessary courses for admission to institutions of higher education, and enter such institutions" (sec. 503(a)).

2. The Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963

The Higher Education Facilities Act (hereafter HEFA) was the first act to provide aid for the construction of academic facilities (classrooms, laboratories, and libraries), without restriction on type of college eligible. Previous laws of this type had been restricted to aid for residential facilities (the 1950 College Housing Act) or, if for academic facilities, to specific kinds of colleges, such as medical schools (Health Research Facilities Act of 1956). The official purpose behind the HEFA is stated as follows:

> Sec. 2. The Congress hereby finds that the security and welfare of the United States require that this and future generations of American youth be assured ample opportunity for the fullest development of their intellectual capacities, and that this opportunity will be jeopardized unless the Nation's colleges and universities are encouraged and assisted in their efforts to accomodate rapidly growing numbers of youth who aspire to a higher education. The Congress further finds and declares that these needs are so great and these steps so urgent that it is incumbent upon the Nation to take positive and immediate action to meet these needs through assistance to institutions of higher education, including graduate and undergraduate institutions, junior and community colleges, and technical institutes, in providing certain academic facilities.

The provisions of the HEFA are as follows.

Grants for undergraduate facilities (Title I): The appropriation is to be divided into two portions. Part of the appropriation--22 percent--is earmarked for "public community colleges and public technical institutes," with each state receiving an allotment based on its relative per-capita income and number of high school graduates. The remainder--78 percent--if for other higher education institutions, with each state's allotment based on its relative high school and college enrollments. The maximum federal share of construction costs is 33-1/3 percent in case of four-year colleges but 40 percent in the case of two-year colleges (sec. 102, 103(a), 104(a), 401(d)).

To receive a grant, higher education institutions must apply to the U.S. Office of Education, with approval dependent on whether certain conditions are met, especially the following (sec. 108): First, the academic facilities to be constructed can only be ones "designed" for use as libraries or for instruction or research in the natural sciences, mathematics, modern foreign language, or engineering (sec. 106). This originated in a precursor of the HEFA--HR 8900, the proposed "College Adacemic Facilities and Scholarship Act of 1962"--as a device to defuse the controversy over federal aid to private schools by tying it to an overriding national interest, in this case national defense (Congressional Quarterly, 1962: 236; 1963: 199).[2] Second, the academic facilities must result in an "urgently needed" expansion of enrollment capacity (sec. 106). Finally, the application has been approved and recommended by the appropriate state commission. This state commission--which is to be an existing or new agency that is "broadly representative of the public and of institutions of higher education (including junior colleges and technical institutes) in the State"--would be in charge of determining the procedures by which a state's allotment is to be distributed and accounted for (sec. 105). This requirement of a state commission and state plan to oversee the disbursement of federal aid was well-established in the case of vocational education, but this is the first major higher education act to contain such a provision.

Grants for graduate facilities (Title II): Provides for grants to institutions of higher education and boards of "cooperative graduate centers" (like the one at the City University of New York) to cover up to one-third of the costs of constructing or rehabilitating graduate facilities. The disbursement of funds does not involve any system of allotments and state commissions. In deciding on applications by institutions, the Office of Education is to consider the extent to which a project will "increase the supply of highly qualified personnel critically needed by the community, industry, government, research, and teaching" and will "aid in

attaining a wider distribution throughout the United States of graduate schools and cooperative graduate centers" (sec. 202(c)(2)).

A notable feature of this title, unlike the one concerning undergraduate facilities, is that it puts no restriction on the uses to which graduate facilities can be put. This is a bit perplexing, since religiously affiliated universities are eligible. It may be, however, that graduate education was seen as necessarily in the interest of national defense and thus somehow not subject to the issue of church-state separation.

Loans for undergraduate and graduate facilities (Title III): The Office of Education is authorized to make loans directly to institutions of higher education to cover up to three-fourths of the cost of constructing academic facilities. The loans can allow up to 50 years for repayment and carry low interest rates.

General provisions(Title IV): Institutions of higher education are defined as public or nonprofit private institutions that admit only students who have a high school diploma and that offer either bachelor's degree programs, two-year academic programs or two-year technical or semi-professional programs. The term "public community college or technical institute" is defined as

> an institution of higher education which is under public supervision and control and is organized and administrated principally to provide a two-year program which is acceptable for full credit toward a bachelor's degree or a two-year program in engineering, mathematics, or the physical or biological sciences which is designed to prepare the student to work as a technician and at a semi-professional level in engineering, scientific or other technological fields which require the understanding and application of basic engineering, scientific, or mathematical principles of knowledge, and, if a branch of an institution of higher education offering four or more years of higher education, is located in a community different from that in which its parent institution is located (sec 401(g)).

The definitions above are noteworthy in two regards. First, there is no provision for two-year colleges whose programs are not directed toward college transfer or preparing technicians or semiprofessionals. That is, two-year colleges that pri-

marily offer academic (but nondegree-credit) or vocational (but nontechnical) courses are seemingly not eligible. Second, two-year branches of four-year colleges are eligible for funding if they are in communities different from their parent institutions. This provision would help states--such as Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Indiana--with large networks of two-year branches. Finally, the act requires that grants and loans cannot be used to construct facilities to be used for religious purposes, athletics or recreation, or events for which admission is charged to the general public (sec. 401(a)(2)).

3. The Higher Education Act of 1965

The following analysis of the act's contents will concentrate on Titles III, IV, and VII.

Student aid (Title IV): The "educational opportunity grant" provisions authorize $70 million a year for fiscal years 1966-1968 for grants to the colleges, which in turn select the recipients. Eligible are students who are or will be full-time undergraduate students, show "evidence of academic or creative promise and capability of maintaining good standing," are "of exceptional financial need," and "would not, but for an educational opportunity grant, be financially able to pursue a course of study at such institutions of higher education" (sec. 404(b)). A student may receive up to $800 or one-half of the financial aid he or she is receiving from all sources, public or private, excluding work-study; however, students in the top half of the class get another $200 (sec. 402).

A number of important features of these provisions should be noted. First, the scholarships are quite explicitly directed to low-income students. This is indicated by the use of the term "educational opportunity grant" and the requirement that students be "of exceptional financial need," but it is made most evident in the testimony of the U.S. Commissioner of Education, Francis Keppel, in the Senate hearings on the Higher Education Act (U.S. Senate, 1965: 276):

> The present proposal is designed to encourage the State efforts by providing basic support for the student from a very poor family who might not be able to qualify for a State scholarship. It functions as a complementary rather than a competing program. The proposed legislation would provide scholarships to students from the poorest families--well below the income level of those that primarily benefit from State programs. As has been pointed out, this proposal is not designed alone to reward the academically gifted. Although recipients will have to be academically eligible to enter college, the primary concern is to focus upon extreme financial need.

In addition, the scholarship program does not put much emphasis on academic aptitutde, despite the bonus for those in the top half of the class. Unlike the original NDEA loan program provisions--which gave preference to students "with a superior academic background who express a desire to teach in elementary or secondary schools" or "whose academic background indicates a superior capacity or preparation in science, mathematics, engineering, or a modern foreign language" (sec. 204(4))--the scholarship provisions in the Higher Education Act give no preference to students with particular interests or abilities and impose the rather minimal stipulation that the recipient give "evidence of academic promise and capability of maintaining good standing." Finally, a ceiling is put on how much financial aid students can take in the form of a scholarship, because of the strong feeling on the part of many Congressmen (especially in the House) that students not get a "free ride" (Alterman, 1973: 95-96; and Congressional Quarterly, 1965: 300). The Higher Education Act broke new ground in addressing the needs of low-income students in another area in addition to the new scholarship program. The act requires that colleges applying for scholarship funding agree to "make vigorous efforts to identify qualified youth of exceptional need and to encourage them to continue their education beyond secondary school." Suggested actions are working with high schools to encourage their students and, to the extent feasible, making conditional commitments for educational opportunity grants to qualified students in grade eleven or below (sec. 407(a)(3)). In addition, the act provides for contracts with outside organizations for the purpose of

> (1) identifying qualified youths of exceptional financial need and encouraging them to complete secondary school and undertake postsecondary educational training,
> (2) publicizing existing forms of student financial aid, including aid furnished under this part, or
> (3) encouraging secondary school or college dropouts of demonstrated aptitude to reenter educational programs, including post-secondary programs (sec. 408(a)).

While the scholarship program was directed to quite needy youth, the new insured loan program and the newly amended work-study program were intended to address the needs of middle-income students. In the case of the insured loan program, this intent was made clear by Francis Keppel in his testimony before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare (1965: 278):

> This program of guaranteed loans is designed to enable the middle-income family to spread the increasingly heavy costs of a college education over a longer, less burdensome period of time. It seeks to do so by creating greater interest in long-term lending for education on the part of banks and other commercial lenders who are subject to examination by an agency of the Federal Government or any State....Thus, the "price squeeze" becomes increasingly onerous for middle-income families whose children do not qualify for financial aid through such programs as the National Defense Education Act, Title II or programs for student employment. To cover average annual expenses for college students, these families must make cash payments of nearly $10,000 during a 48-month period....To cite these facts is not to contend that these middle-income families should be relieved of responsibility for paying the costs of higher education for their children. It is rather to suggest that this heavy concentration of expenses should be spread out over more than the 4 years of college through the "loan of convenience" described in part B of title IV. Helping the middle-income student and his family to bear the heavy brunt of college costs would seem to have a reasonable claim on a share of our national commitment to offer every child the fullest possible educational opportunity.

The insured loan program would help middle-income students by encouraging the expansion of state and nonprofit private loan-insurance programs (which, in turn, would increase the availability of private loans for students by insuring lenders against default) and by paying interest costs for students with family incomes under $15,000. President Johnson had originally proposed that the federal government directly insure the loans. Objections by the American Bankers Association and the United Student Aid Funds (a nonprofit private loan insurance program) that this program would drive out existing State and private nonprofit loan insurance programs led Congress, however, to recast

the federal program into one of encouraging these programs and, only when necessary, directly stepping in to insure loans (Alterman, 1973: 97, 105; Congressional Quarterly, 1965 : 299-300; and U.S. Senate, 1965: 1011, 1094-1095).

Developing institutions (Title III): This program was originally directed to four-year colleges, particularly Black colleges, but Congress also made two-year colleges eligible (sec. 310(b)). The particular concern with Black colleges is never explicitly stated in the act. However, the higher education spokesmen testifying in the Congressional hearings on the Higher Education Act often matter-of-factly stated that the "developing colleges" provisions would particularly help Black colleges (U.S. Senate, 1965: 354, 675), and the commentary by the Congressional Quarterly analysis (1965: 270) states: "The aid program for small colleges was directed principally at impoverished Negro colleges." The primary reasons given for including junior colleges under the developing institutions program were that these colleges had an important role in expanding access to higher education, especially by lower income youth, and in absorbing rapidly increasing enrollments. (For more on these points, see the discussion on the growing interest in junior colleges in the section on the politics of the 1959-1965 period.)

Amendments to the Higher Education Facilities Act (Title VII): Aside from increasing the authorization for the grants programs, this title also makes two notable changes in the HEFA. It repeals the stipulation that the grants to undergraduate academic facilities can only be used to construct facilities designed for use as libraries or for teaching and research in the natural sciences, mathematics, engineering, and modern foreign languages (sec. 701(a)). While the general stipulations prohibiting use for religious purposes and so forth are left unchanged, this repeal does seem to indicate the weakening of the controversy over religious institutions. The second

change is to allow states to use unused portions of allotments for public two-year colleges to construct facilities at four-year colleges and vice-versa (sec. 701(a),(b)).

4. The Education Amendments of 1972 (PL 92-318, 86 Stat. 235-381)

The following description will focus on Titles I (Higher Education Act amendments), X (establishing a new program of assistance to institutions of higher education), and IX (prohibiting sex discrimination). The remaining titles largely concern elementary and secondary education and are of little direct relevance to higher education in any case.

a. Title I (Amendments to Higher Education Act)

This section, which runs 90 pages, amends the Higher Education Act of 1965 (hereafter HEA) and incorporates into it the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 and certain provisions of the National Defense Education Act of 1958. The title is divided into 12 parts (A through L), which amend Titles I through XII of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (as amended in 1966 and 1968). Most of the changes made are quite minor, but some are of enormous significance. Part D, which amends Title IV (student assistance), establishes the basic education opportunity grants and makes other important changes. Part J creates a new Title X that establishes the first major funding program that is explicitly directed to community colleges and postsecondary occupational education. Part C establishes emergency help for higher education institutions in financial distress. Part L adds a new section to Title XII that provides grants to encourage states to establish postsecondary education commissions (often known as "1202" commissions after the section providing for them). These four parts will each be described in turn, except for Part C. Its provisions will be discussed along with those of Title X (new programs of assistance to institutions of higher education).

Undergraduate Student Aid (Part D): The principal changes made in Part D of Title I are the creation of (a) a program of "basic educational opportunity grants," (b) a program of grants to encourage states to establish undergraduate scholarship programs, (c) a program of "Education Opportunity

Centers" to encourage low-income students to enter and stay in college, and (d) a new funding mechanism for the still-faltering insured loan program. These four major changes are discussed in greater detail below, along with a number of more minor changes in student-aid programs.

The new "basic educational opportunity grants" (BEOG) are based on the proposition that all students are entitled to a certain amount of financial assistance for postsecondary schooling, whether from the federal government or another source. The primary source should be the student's family, but to the extent that it cannot help, the federal government would step in. All students who have been accepted for enrollment or are in good standing would be granted $1400, minus the amount their family could reasonably be expected to contribute.[3] This grant would be subject to a number of restrictions, however. The program would not take effect unless certain minimum amounts were appropriated both for the "basic" educational opportunity grants and for the "supplementary" educational opportunity grant (SEOG), work-study, and direct student loan programs. Furthermore, the basic opportunity grants are not to exceed one-half the cost of attending the particular institution in which the student is enrolled or to exceed the difference between the cost of attendance and the expected family contribution. The new basic opportunity grants do not replace the educational opportunity grants established by the Higher Education Act of 1965. The latter are renamed "supplementary educational opportunity grants," and they continue to be directed to students "of exceptional financial need" who show "evidence of academic or creative promise and capability of maintaining good standing" (sec. 413C(a)(2)*).[4,5]

The grants to states to encourage them to establish undergraduate scholarship programs provide for paying up to 50 percent of the cost. The programs would provide grants of no more than $1500 to full-time undergraduate students. The funds would be allotted according to the number of students enrolled in the higher education institutions in each state (sec. 415*).

The "Educational Opportunity Centers," like the already existing Upward Bound and Talent Search programs, are "designed to identify qualified students from low-income families, to prepare them for a program of postsecondary education, and to provide special services for such students who are pursuing programs of postsecondary education" (sec. 417A(a)*). The Centers are to serve "areas with major concentrations of low-income populations" by providing information on what financial and academic assistance is available, helping prospective college students with preparing applications for admission, providing counseling, tutorial, and other services, and coordinating the efforts of institutions offering postsecondary education to admit educationally disadvantaged persons (sec. 417(b)(4)*).

The new funding mechanism for the insured loan program involved setting up a Student Loan Marketting Association to buy students' loan notes from lenders. It was hoped that this new mechanism would increase the volume of commercially made student loans by allowing lenders a means by which to avoid tying up their capital for long periods of time. Since its establishment by the Higher Education Act in 1965, the guaranteed student loan program had never fulfilled the government's expectations for it, in part because lenders had not found the allowable interest rate and the administrative requirements very attractive. Nonetheless, another attempt is made to revitalize the program in the hope that it could yet be used as an alternative to the direct loan program, with its huge drain on the government budget.

In addition to the major changes above, Part D of Title I of the Education Amendments also makes a number of other changes in the student-aid programs. The work-study program is amended to include part-time students and to shift eligibility from students coming from "low-income families" who are "capable, in the opinion of the institution, of maintaining good standing" to students "with the greatest financial need" who "show evidence

of academic or creative promise and capability of maintaining good standing" (secs. 135D and E). The NDEA loan program (now known as the National Direct Student Loan program) is amended to restrict forgiveness to teachers in Armed Forces schools and to teachers of children who are handicapped, in Head Start preschool programs, or in schools with a high concentration of disadvantaged fellow students (sec. 465*). Prior to this, all teachers in public and nonprofit private schools at all levels had been eligible for loan forgiveness, although distinctions were made in the amount of loan forgiveness according to the type of teaching.

Community colleges and occupational education (Part J): This part creates a new Title X to the Higher Education Act. This new title provides for grants to establish and expand community colleges and encourage postsecondary occupational education, and it creates a Community College Unit and a Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education within the Office of Education. The two grants programs are to be informed by state community-college and occupational-education plans to be developed by the state postsecondary education commissions encouraged by section 1202 (see below).

The community college program authorizes grants for establishing or expanding community colleges, altering or modifying their educational programs, and developing statewide plans for the expansion or improvement of community colleges (secs. 1001, 1013, 1014*). Grants for establishing community colleges should be for ones in areas "in which there are no existing community colleges or in which existing community colleges cannot adequately provide postsecondary educational opportunities for all of the residents thereof who desire and can benefit from postsecondary education" (sec. 103(a)*). In addition to helping them to meet the needs and interests of the communities they serve, the grants for expanding community colleges or altering their programs are also intended to help

them "provide educational programs especially suited to the needs of educationally disadvantaged persons" (sec. 1014*). The grants for developing statewide community-college plans are to underwrite efforts to designate areas lacking "access to at least two years of tuition-free or low-tuition postsecondary education within reasonable distance," set forth a plan for "making available, to all residents of the state, an opportunity to attend a community college," establish how much and what kind of aid is necessary to meet this plan, and determine how to most efficiently use existing and new academic facilities (sec. 1001(a)*). As used by the community college program, the term community college means a public or nonprofit private institution that offers both academic and occupational programs. Included are not only junior colleges, but also postsecondary vocational schools, technical institutes, and four-year colleges. In previous acts, community colleges were defined as institutions organized principally to provide two-year college-transfer or technical-education programs. (See, for example, section 401(g) of the Higher Education Facilities Act.) Either an academic or a vocational program was required, but not both. Furthermore, the vocational program required was one of technical education--one directed to preparing skilled technicians--rather than one also including preparation for less skilled occupations. The inclusion of four-year colleges was not new, however. Branches of public four-year colleges had been defined as public community colleges by the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963. This time, however, four-year colleges and not just their two-year branches are seemingly eligible. In any case, the inclusion of four-year colleges was not without struggle. They were included at the behest of the big state universities with two-year branches (Gladieux and Wolanin, 1976: 102).

The occupational-education provisions authorize grants both to establish

and operate occupational-education programs and to devise state plans to guide such programs. The definition used for postsecondary occupational education is "education, training, or retraining . . . for persons sixteen years of age or older who have graduated from or left elementary or secondary school... which is designed to prepare individuals for gainful employment as semi-skilled or skilled workers or technicians or subprofessionals in recognized occupations (including new and emerging occupations), or to prepare individuals for enrollment in advanced technical education programs, but excluding any program... generally considered professional or which requires a baccalaureate or advanced degree" (sec. 1060(2)*). The grants to establish and run programs would be not only for postsecondary occupational programs but also for programs

> for infusing occupational education . . . into elementary and secondary schools on an equal footing with traditional academic education, to the end that every child who leaves secondary school is prepared either to enter productive employment or to undertake additional education at the postsecondary level, but without being forced prematurely to make an irrevocable commitment to a particular educational or occupational choice. (sec. 1057)(a)(3) and 1056(b)(1)(D))

As the U.S. Office of Education commentary on the 1972 amendments points out (Alford, 1972:6-7), this goal fits in quite nicely with the call for "career education," which had been made recently by the U.S. Commissioner of Education, Sidney Marland. The state plans for which grants are provided would be much like those for the community colleges and would also be drawn up by the same body, the state postsecondary education commission established under section 1202 (below). There are a number of interesting differences, however. For example, the occupational education planning would have to involve the "active participation" of not only the state agency with responsibility for community colleges but also other groups: state agencies and groups concerned with other types and levels of education (vocational, higher, elementary and secondary, adult); state agencies concerned with

employment, security, manpower development, and economic development; representatives of business and labor; and persons familiar with the occupational education needs of minority groups, the disadvantaged, and the handicapped (sec. 1056(b)(2)*).

Postsecondary education planning (Part L): This part adds a section to Title XII of the Higher Education Act. This new section encourages states to establish state postsecondary education commissions by providing grants to underwrite their expenses, but it also requires states to establish them if they wish to receive federal funding for community colleges and occupational education under Title X (see above). These commissions are not only to draw up the state plans for community colleges and occupational education required by the new Title X but also to make studies and plans concerning higher education overall "so that all persons within the state who desire and who can benefit from postsecondary education may have an opportunity to do so" (sec. 1203(a)*). These commissions are to be "broadly and equitably representative" of the general public and of postsecondary education as a whole (including proprietary schools, area vocational schools, technical institutes, and branches of four-year colleges) (sec. 1202(a)*).

National Commission of Financing Postsecondary Education: Section 140 (Part D of Title I of the Education Amendments) establishes this commission with the task of submitting a report by April 30, 1973 that examines the recent financial crisis in higher education and evaluates the impact, costs, and benefits of both existing and alternative forms of assistance to higher education. Certain alternative programs are specifically mentioned as candidates for assessment including income tax credits and loan programs that are repaid on the basis of a percentage of one's future income (sec. 140(c)(2)(C) and (D)). The commission is also asked to suggest "national uniform standards for determining the annual per student costs of providing postsecondary education" for

students in various kinds of institutions (sec. 140(d)). This commission is noteworthy in that it is the first federal "blue-ribbon" commission to examine higher education since the 1957 President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School.

b. Title X (Assistance to Institutions of Higher Education)

This title establishes the first federal program of aid to colleges that underwrites general instructional expenditures rather than construction and research costs. This is done by adding sections to Title IV (student assistance) and Title IX (graduate education) to the Higher Education Act, as newly amended. The new program allocates institutional aid on the basis of four factors: the number of students receiving basic educational opportunity grants, the number receiving other forms of federal student aid (supplementary opportunity grants, work-study funds, and direct loans), the number of postbaccalaureate students, and the number of students receiving veterans' benefits.[6]

In addition to this aid, the Education Amendments also provide--in Part C of Title I--for emergency aid to institutions in financial distress. Eligible are public and nonprofit private institutions that offer two- or four-year academic programs (sec. 122(c)). (This would seem to exclude technical institutes, area vocational schools, and so forth.) The justifications given for this emergency aid are that higher education serves the national interest ("a resource which significantly contributes to the security, general welfare, and economy of the United States") and that there is considerable evidence that many institutions are in financial distress, in part bacause of their efforts to enlarge educational opportunities and improve the quality of education (sec. 122(a)).

c. Title IX (Prohibition of Sex Discrimination)

This title prohibits exclusion, on the basis of sex, from participation in and the benefits of federally funded educational programs at all levels, with the

prohibition backed up by the threat of cutting off funding. In regard to admissions, the title applies to undergraduate, graduate, and professional programs, but there are a number of important exceptions: private undergraduate institutions, educational institutions controlled by religious organizations whose tenets are in conflict with this title, and public undergraduate institutions that have always admitted only students of one sex (sec. 901(a)(1),(3), and (5)).

NOTES TO APPENDIX A

1. Nasaw (1979: 193-194) states that the foundations supported the establishment of various international institutes in the 1950s (such as the Harvard Russian Research Center) as much to assist the global spread of American corporations, by meeting the need for experts on foreign areas, as to support the struggle against Communism. If this is true, this may indicate that the same holds for the National Defense Education Act language development provisions, which are directed as much to the needs of business as to those of the federal government.

2. It should be noted that the stipulation does not state that the federally funded academic facilities can only be used for certain purposes. The wording was explicitly intended to lessen its restrictiveness (Sundquist, 1968: 209). In addition, it should be noted that the restriction that grants be used for only certain kinds of facilities was not imposed on the two-year colleges. This may have been because the only public two-year colleges were eligible and thus the issue of church-state separation would not come up. However, Rep. Thomas P. O'Neill (D.-Mass.), now Speaker of the House, stated that the unrestricted status of grants to community colleges was "due mainly" to the efforts of several people (whom he names) belonging to the Massachusetts Regional Community College Board (Congressional Record - House, November 6, 1963, p. 20065). O'Neill said nothing beyond this, and there was no response by other Congressmembers.

3. The Education Amendments list a number of criteria that the U.S. Commissioner of Education is to take into account in drawing up a schedule of "expected family contribution." These are listed below:

> (I) The Amount of the effective income of the student or the effective family income of the student's family.
> (II) The number of dependents of the family of the student.
> (III) The number of dependents of the student's family who are in attendance in a program of postsecondary education and for whom the family may be reasonably expected to contribute for their postsecondary education.
> (IV) The amount of the assets of the student and those of the student's family.
> (V) Any unusual expenses of the student or his family, such as unusual medical expenses, and those which may arise from a catastrophe. (sec. 411(a)(3)(B)(ii)*).

The third and, perhaps, the fifth criteria give evidence of the considerable Congressional concern with the plight of students from middle-income families. In the hearings on the Education Amendments, many members of Contress stated that middle-income families, especially those with more than one child in college, were having increasing difficulty in meeting rapidly rising tuition costs (U. S. House of Representatives, 1971a: 92, 235, 315).

4. The asterisk on the section number indicates that the number refers to a section of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended by the section cited here, and not to a section of the Education Amendments. The section cited in the text is part of a 13-page long amendment to the HEA that is made by section 131 of the 1972 Education Amendments. Asterisks will be used in the text whenever a similar circumstance holds.

5. The requirement that the BEOGs could not be funded until the appropriations for the other student aid programs reached a certain level was added by Congress in order to ensure that the Nixon Administration did not starve the existing student-aid programs, which were highly popular with Congress (Gladieux and Wolanin, 1976: 182-186). The limitation that at most half of the cost of attendance could be covered by a BEOG was added at the insistence of the Republican members of the Senate. Their demand reflected the feeling that the federal government should not provide a "free ride" to students (an attitude about federal scholarship that was prevalent in the 1950s and early 1960s) and the fear that without the half-cost limitation, low-cost public institutions would be much more attractive than private institutions (Gladieux and Wolanin, 1976: 102). The requirement that the BEOG could not exceed the difference between the cost of attendance and the family's expected contribution was motivated simply by a fear that students might receive an unfair "windfall" (Gladieux and Wolanin, 1976: 182).

6. The relation between these factors and the shares finally received by institutions is not straightforward, however. The first two factors are measured in such a way as to give more money per person to smaller schools. Furthermore, the allocation formula in which the first three factors are entered gives considerably more weight to the first two factors. Finally, no funding on the basis of the number of students receiving BEOGs can occur unless appropriations for the BEOGs reach at least half of the authorized level. This complicated formula reflected the complex array of forces on the question of institutional aid. For more on this, see the discussion on pp. 56-57.

Current Fund Income by Source of Income, all Institutions of Higher Education (Public and Private), United States: 1930-1977

Table 1 all Institutions
Table 2 public Institute
Table 3 private Institute

Table 1. Current Fund Income by source of Income, all institutions, United States, 1930-1977 (in millions of dollars)

	Federal government	% of total	State government	% of total	Local government	% of total	Student tuition and fees[a]	% of total	Endowment earnings	% of total
1930	20.6	3.7	← 150.8 →			27.2	144.1	26	68.6	12.4
1940	38.9	5.4	151.2	21.1	24.4	3.4	200.9	28	71.3	9.9
1950	524.3	22.1	491.6	20.1	61.7	2.6	410.9	17.3	96.3	4.1
1952	451.0	17.6	611.3	23.8	72.0	2.8	467.0	18.2	112.9	4.4
1954	419.5	14.1	751.6	25.3	88.2	3.0	587.1	19.8	127.5	4.3
1956	493.9	13.6	891.6	24.6	106.9	2.9	779.0	21.5	145.0	3.9
1958	712.4	15.2	1156.5	24.7	129.4	2.8	1010.5	21.6	181.6	3.9
1960	1040.9	17.9	1389.3	23.9	151.7	2.6	1256.0	21.6	206.7	3.6
1961										
1962	1542.1	20.6	1689.1	22.6	191.2	2.6	1625.5	21.8	232.3	3.1
1963										
1964	2170.7	22.6	2133.7	22.2	240.4	2.5	2050.4	21.4	266.2	2.8
65										
1966	2671.8	20.9	3032.0	23.7	373.2	2.5	2962.3	23.1	318.5	2.5
1967	3061.2	20.9	3378.0	23.0	439.2	3.0	3380.7	23.1	325.1	2.2
1968	3363.3	19.9	4219.7	24.9	505.7	3.0	3897.5	23.0	364.0	2.2
1969	3702.1	18.4	4861.5	25.6	614.5	3.2	4409.6	23.2	413.2	2.2
1970	3564.8	16.1	5844.5	26.5	781.4	3.5	5106.6	23.1	447.3	2.0
1971	3634.1	15.5	6211.5	26.5	844.1	3.6	5916.7	25.2	457.2	1.9
1972	3531.4	13.4	7196.4	27.4	1000.4	3.8	6465.2	24.4	483.9	1.8
1973	3600.8	13.0	7607.3	27.4	1239.6	4.2	6865.1	23.5	515.2	1.8
1974	3519.5	11.5	9182.2	30.0	1263.1	4.1	7382.7	24.2	576.9	1.9
1975	5029.9	14.0	10990.7	30.6	1430.2	4.0	7281.6	20.3	717.5	1.9
1976	5777.2	14.6	12255.9	30.8	1617.2	4.1	8171.9	20.6	687.5	1.7
1977	5769.4	13.2	12952.6	29.6	1631.4	3.7	9101.0	20.8	765.2	1.7

a includes total student aid

Table 1 cont.

	b		c		d		
	private gifts	% of total	sales + services	% of total	other	% of total	Total
1930	26.1	4.7	--		--		554.5*
1940	40.4	5.6	32.8	4.6	155.3	21.7	715.2
1950	118.6	5.0	112.0	4.2	559.2	23.5	2374.6
1952	149.8	5.8	136.4	5.3	561.7	21.9	2562.5
1954	191.3	6.4	165.5	5.6	635.6	21.4	2966.3
1956	245.5	6.8	192.4	5.3	774.5	21.3	3628.8
1958	325.0	6.9	246.7	5.3	913.2	19.5	4675.5
1960	383.2	6.6	290.3	5.0	1094.7	18.8	5812.8
1961							
1962	450.8	6.0	356.5	4.8	1378.9	18.5	7466.5
1963							
1964	551.5	5.8	428.7	4.5	1749.8	18.2	9591.3
1965							
1966	651.1	5.1	402.7	3.1	2439.8	19.1	12796.2
1967	767.7	5.2	691.3	4.7	2592.5	17.7	14632.2
1968	850.8	5.0	811.5	4.8	2900.2	17.1	16910.4
1969	918.4	4.8	1282.4	6.7	2982.6	15.7	18974.3
1970	1523.0	6.8	1921.5	8.7	2906.3	13.2	22075.4
1971	1203.8	5.1	1866.9	7.9	3304.6	14.1	23446.0
1972	1209.7	4.6	3114.6	11.9	3315.2	12.6	26253.1
1973	1823.4	6.2	3460.2	11.9	3473.1	11.9	29184.7
1974	1430.9	4.7	3467.8	11.3	3734.2	12.2	30557.3
1975	1747.5	4.9	3779.9	10.5	4977.3	13.8	35967.7
1976	1917.0	4.8	3839.7	9.7	5432.4	13.7	39763.2
1977	2107.2	4.8	3659.8	8.3	7275.5	16.6	45715.6

* includes current income for which not enough information was given to allow proper classification.

Sources:

1930-60, 1962, 1964, 1966, 1967, 1968 -- Sources of Funds to Colleges and Universities, J.A. O'Neill, Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, 1973, pp. 28-29.

1969-77 -- "Financial Statistics of Institutions of Higher Education: Current Funds, Revenues and Expenditures," P.E. Hertzing and N.J. Brandt, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), 1970-79.

b includes philanthropic sponsorship of research

c includes "related activities."

d includes auxiliary enterprises and recovery of indirect costs.

Table 2. Current Fund Income by source of Income, all public institutions, United States, 1930-1977 (in Millions of dollars)

	Federal government	% of total	State government	% of total	Local government	% of total	Student tuition, Fees[a]	% of total	endowment earnings	% of total
1930	←		164.2			→ 62.9	32.5	12.4	6.3	2.4
1940	36.5	10.3	143.5	40.5	24.2	6.8	55.0	15.5	6.7	1.9
1950	246.1	19.9	463.9	37.4	60.4	4.9	107.1	8.6	8.8	0.7
1952	221.0	16.1	575.7	41.8	70.6	5.1	122.6	8.9	12.1	0.9
1954	217.0	13.1	729.7	44.2	86.4	5.2	158.5	9.6	14.7	0.9
1956	267.4	13.2	865.1	42.6	104.0	5.1	236.8	11.6	16.3	0.8
1958	392.5	14.8	1128.9	42.5	[illegible]	4.7	307.6	11.6	15.9	0.6
1960	546.4	16.7	1353.1	41.3	147.3	4.5	373.9	11.4	19.7	0.6
1961										
1962	771.0	18.6	1640.6	39.6	184.2	4.4	483.0	11.6	22.6	0.5
1963										
1964	1053.8	19.6	[illegible]	38.7	230.4	4.3	648.3	12.1	27.4	0.5
[illegible]										
[illegible]	1376.2	18.6	[illegible]	39.8	[illegible]	4.2	[illegible]	13.3	30.2	0.4
[illegible]7	1585.0	18.4	[illegible]	39.1	414.0	4.8	[illegible]	13.9	31.2	0.4
	1853.5	17.8	4153.4	39.9	[illegible]	4.6	[illegible]	14.1	[illegible]	0.3
969	1566.0	13.9	4782.5	42.5	[illegible]	5.2	[illegible]	15.1	[illegible]	[illegible]
1970	[illegible]	15.1	[illegible]	41.6	730.0	5.2	[illegible]	14.4	50.0	[illegible]
[illegible]	2003.4	13.0	[illegible]	39.5	[illegible]	5.3	[illegible]	16.7	54.9	0.4
[illegible]	2036.5	11.8	7044.9	[illegible]	[illegible]	5.5	2767.8	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	12.6	[illegible]	42.3	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	0.4
1974	[illegible]	11.7	[illegible]	44.4	[illegible]	5.9	3228.6	16.0	76.9	0.4
1975	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	45.5	[illegible]	5.7	[illegible]	13.1	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	4031.1	14.9	11958.3	44.6	1499.5	5.6	3477.6	13.0	97.0	0.4
[illegible]	[illegible]	14.5	[illegible]	44.6	[illegible]	5.2	[illegible]	13.1	[illegible]	0.5

a includes total Student Aid

table 2 cont.

	Private Gifts[b]	% of total	Sales + services[c]	% of total	Other[d]	% of total	total
1930	2.7	1.0	--	--	--	--	261.2*
1948	5.1	1.4	20.3	5.7	62.9	17.7	354.3
1950	19.4	1.6	64.3	5.2	269.1	21.7	1238.9
1952	26.2	1.9	79.1	5.7	268.1	19.5	1375.3
1954	38.6	2.3	93.8	5.7	312.9	18.9	1651.4
1956	48.5	2.4	111.4	5.5	391.1	19.3	2030.9
1958	68.8	2.6	139.3	5.2	477.7	18.0	2656.4
1960	85.5	2.6	168.2	5.1	582.6	17.8	3276.7
1961							
1962	98.4	2.4	202.2	4.9	745.4	18.0	4147.4
1963							
1964	113.9	2.1	241.8	4.5	975.3	18.2	5368.7
1965							
1966	159.8	2.2	210.0	2.8	1378.3	18.6	7397.7
1967	195.7	2.3	414.5	4.8	1495.1	17.3	8622.4
1968	217.1	2.1	503.4	4.8	1693.0	16.3	10412.0
1969	221.8	1.9	672.5	6.0	1686.3	15.0	11254.3
1970	360.0	2.6	800.2	5.7	2120.0	15.1	14050.0
1971	399.3	2.6	1256.0	8.1	2221.5	14.4	15382.1
1972	517.6	3.0	1660.9	9.6	2230.2	12.9	17267.2
1973	375.1	2.1	1113.3	6.1	2378.9	13.1	18163.7
1974	430.7	2.1	1341.8	6.6	2594.4	12.8	20195.4
1975	463.9	1.9	1496.3	6.3	3045.4	12.9	23619.1
1976	616.4	2.3	1850.7	6.9	3329.3	12.4	26829.9
1977	684.5	2.3	2139.7	7.3	4235.4	14.4	29454.7

* includes current income for which not enough information was given to allow proper classification.

Sources:

1930-60, 1962, 1964, 1966, 1967, 1968 -- Sources of Funds to Colleges and Universities, J.A. O'Neill, Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, 1973, pp. 30-31.

1967-77 -- "Financial Statistics of Institutions of Higher Education: Current Funds, Revenues and Expenditures," P.E. Mertins and N.J. Brandt, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare National Center For Education Statistics (NCES), 1970-79.

b includes philanthropic sponsorship of research

c includes "related activities"

d includes auxiliary enterprises and recovery of indirect costs

Table 3

Current Fund Income by Source of Income, all private institutions, United States, 1930-1977 (in millions of dollars)

	Federal government		State government		Local government		Student tuition & fees[a]		Endowment earnings	
	-	% of total		% of total		% of total		% of total		% of total
1930	← 7.2 →					2.4%	111.6	38.0	62.3	21.2
1940	2.4	0.7	7.7	2.1	0.2	0.1	145.9	40.4	64.6	17.9
1950	278.3	24.5	27.7	2.4	1.3	0.1	303.8	26.7	87.5	7.7
1952	230.0	19.4	35.6	3.0	1.4	0.1	344.7	29.0	100.8	8.5
1954	202.5	15.4	21.9	1.7	1.8	0.1	425.7	32.6	112.8	8.6
1956	226.5	14.2	26.5	1.7	2.9	0.2	551.9	34.5	128.8	8.1
1958	319.9	15.8	27.6	1.4	3.5	0.2	703.0	34.8	165.8	8.2
1960	494.5	19.5	36.1	1.4	4.5	0.2	832.1	34.8	177.0	7.4
1961										
1962	771.1	23.2	48.5	1.5	7.0	0.2	1142.6	34.4	[illegible]	6.3
1963										
1964	1117.0	26.4	55.9	1.3	10.0	0.2	1402.0	33.2	[illegible]	5.6
1965										
1966	1296.7	24.0	85.2	1.6	7.4	0.1	1975.7	36.6	288.3	5.3
1967	1476.2	24.6	86.5	1.4	25.1	0.4	2183.3	36.3	291.9	4.9
1968	1509.6	23.2	66.2	1.0	21.1	0.3	2424.6	37.3	[illegible]	5.0
1969	953.8	14.3	78.8	1.2	34.2	0.5	2710.2	41.7	364.8	5.5
1970	1520.0	19.2	100.0	1.3	41.0	0.5	3010.0	35.1	400.0	5.1
1971	1630.7	19.2	138.1	1.6	46.6	0.5	3553.6	39.4	396.4	4.6
1972	[illegible]	12.7	151.5	1.8	46.3	0.5	3637.3	42.7	425.7	5.0
1973	1130.5	12.1	173.4	1.9	65.9	0.7	[illegible]	41.8	450.1	4.8
1974	1157.3	11.7	220.3	2.2	67.2	[illegible]	4154.0	42.0	499.9	5.1
1975	[illegible]	15.9	249.8	2.2	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	37.6	511.4	5.5
1976	2476.1	19.2	297.5	2.3	117.4	0.9	4644.4	36.5	590.5	4.6
1977	1737.1	13.6	298.0	2.1	112.5	0.8	5253.9	36.7	666.6	4.7

a includes total student aid

Table 3 cont.

	b		c		d		
	Private gifts	% of total	Sales + services	% of total	other	% of total	total
1930	23.4	8.0	--	--	--	--	293.3*
1940	35.3	9.8	12.5	3.5	90.4	25.0	360.9
1950	99.3	8.7	47.7	4.2	290.1	25.5	1135.7
1952	123.6	10.4	57.3	4.8	293.7	24.7	1187.1
1954	152.7	11.6	71.7	5.4	322.8	24.5	1314.9
1956	197.1	12.3	81.0	5.1	383.3	24.0	1597.8
1958	256.2	12.7	107.5	5.3	435.6	21.6	2019.1
1960	297.7	11.7	122.1	4.8	512.2	20.2	2536.1
1961							
1962	352.3	10.6	154.4	4.6	633.5	19.1	3319.0
1963							
1964	427.7	10.4	186.8	4.4	774.6	18.3	4228.7
1965							
1966	491.4	9.1	192.8	3.6	1061.0	19.6	5395.5
1967	572.1	9.5	276.7	4.6	1097.3	18.3	6010.4
1968	633.7	9.7	307.9	4.7	1207.1	18.6	6554
1969	610.1	9.2	609.9	9.2	1297.2	19.5	6659.0
1970	700.6	8.9	440.0	5.6	1600.0	21.4	7710.0
1971	804.5	9.4	610.9	7.2	1534.1	18.0	8514.9
1972	885.8	10.4	727.3	10.9	1494.1	17.5	8517.8
1973	926.9	9.9	1098.9	11.8	1568.0	16.8	9308.6
1974	1022.3	10.1	1123.0	11.4	1695.2	16.8	9990.2
1975	1137.8	10.2	1211.9	10.8	1917	17.0	11172.5
1976	1333.6	10.1	1339.1	10.4	2053.1	15.9	12868.7
1977	1424.7	10.0	1500.0	10.3	2440.1	21.3	14360.9

* includes current income for which not enough information was given to allow proper classification

Sources:

1930-60, 1962, 1964, 1966, 1967, 1968 -- Sources of Funds to Colleges and Universities, J.A. O'Neill, Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, 1973, pp. 32-33.

1969-77 -- "Financial Statistics of Institutions of Higher Education: Current Funds, Revenues and Expenditures," R.E. Perkins and [illegible] Brandt, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) [illegible]-79.

b includes philanthropic sponsorship of research

c includes "related activities"

d includes auxiliary enterprises and recovery of indirect costs.

proposal,often dubbed the "Zacharias Plan", after the panel's chairperson, soon appeared from a number of different sources, including the Carnegie Commission (1968: 27-29) and the Rivlin Committee (U.S. Department of Health Education and Welfare, 1969: 32). Common to all these proposals was the idea that, rather than repay a certain fixed amount of interest, borrowers could pay a certain small percentage of their annual incomes over a long period. It was hoped that this feature would remove the hesitation of many students, particularly those from low income backgrounds or facing uncertain prospects, to take out loans. Furthermore, in some versions, the plan constituted a kind of income redistribution scheme. In any case, despite the interest, no action was taken on the idea, in large part because of the hostility of the public higher education institutions and questions about the practicability of the plan (Gladieux and Wolanin,1976: 49-50).

2. Aid to Institutions

Considerable attention was given in the late 1960s to federal aid to institutions. While this was not new, the form and purpose of that aid were. In the 1940s and 1950s, colleges turned especially to the state governments for the massive funding needed to finance large-scale expansion. In the early 1960s, the focus of attention shifted to the federal government, but the aid called for was for specific purposes, such as the construction of classrooms. By the late 1960s, however, the focus was still on federal aid, but the calls were now for aid to be used for general operating expenses.

Many different reasons were given for why such institutional aid was necessary, but the most prominent were the financial plight of higher education institutions, particularly the private colleges, the fact that higher education as a whole and certain programs in particular (especially graduate education) are a national responsibility, and the responsibility of the federal government to make up for the costs imposed by federal programs on higher education institutions.

(See Carnegie Commission, 1972a: 13-13, for a description of the various rationales). The most important argument, however, was clearly the one concerning the financial crisis of higher education. This crisis, which is discussed on p. 55, struck higher education with little warning and, apparently, great ferocity.

Federal aid to cover operating expenses was in good part demanded because it was seen as the next logical step in the development of public aid to higher education. State aid had been thoroughly tapped. Federal aid for specific purposes had been instituted and brought to full flower. What remained was federal aid that would be like state aid in its subsidy of not just capital expenditures but also general operating costs. Considerable controversy existed, however, over the specific form this new federal aid to institutions should take. The various proposals advanced are discussed in the section on federal higher education policymaking.

3. Community Colleges and Vocational Education

Calls for expansion of community colleges and their vocational education programs had been building since the late 1950's, but they now reached full cry. The Carnegie Commission (1970b: 1, 52) called for the establishment by 1980 of 230 to 280 new open-door, low-tuition, "comprehensive" public community colleges. This number, it estimated, would be sufficient to bring community colleges within commuting distance of about 95 percent of the population. Furthermore, the Commission (1970b: 1, 26-27) called for a major expansion of postsecondary vocational education programs, with community colleges being the major sites for this, rather than area

vocational schools or other noncollegiate postsecondary institutions. These calls were enthusiastically echoed by many members of Congress (U.S. House of Representatives, 1971), the Education Commission of the States (1971b: ; 1971c: 34-36), and the American Association of Junior Colleges (U.S. House of Representatives, 1971a: 1011, 1014). It is testimony to its influence that the Educational Commission and the AAJC, as well as many members of Congress, specifically mentioned the Carnegie Commission's recommendations.

The call for more community colleges and larger vocational education programs was motivated by many of the same reasons that were current in the late 1950's and early 1960's. Community colleges were viewed as particularly capable of expanding access to higher education, economically absorbing increased enrollments and diverting them away from four-year colleges, and providing vocational education. However, a new reason for interest in community colleges had appeared -- a desire to curb student political disaffection -- and the reasons for interest in vocational education had changed.

The community college was advanced as a means of reducing student disaffection because it seemed to offer qualities that were absent at the large four-year institutions, which were the scenes of much student unrest. One of these qualities is contact with the "real" world. As President Nixon (1970: 38A) put it,

> They serve as a meeting ground for young and old, black and white, rich and poor, farmer and technician. They avoid the isolation, alienation, and lack of reality that many young people find in multiversities or campuses far away from their own community.

Another quality community colleges have is a strong emphasis on vocational education, which several observers saw as a solution to student unrest (Carnegie Commission, 1971a: 11; Gray, 1969; and U.S. House of Representatives, 1971b: 74).

Community colleges were also gaining increasing attention for their important role in postsecondary vocational education, which was now commanding much interest. Community colleges were assigned this role, because it was perceived that four-year colleges were less likely to encourage vocational education.[4]

The rising interest in postsecondary vocational education stemmed from reasons both old and new. Among the old reasons were the desire to meet the needs of students with poor academic records or disadvantaged backgrounds (U.S. House of Representatives, 1968: 311-312, 446) and to eliminate manpower shortages in technical and semi-professional occupations (Nixon, 1970: 38A; Rhine, 1972: v; and U.S. House of Representatives, 1968: 35). Among the new reasons was a desire to relieve the underemployment of bachelor's degree holders.

The labor market of college graduates in the early 1970's attracted considerable attention from both government and business (Business Week, 972; Education Commission of the States, 1971d: 37; Faltermayer, 1970: , 102; Newman et al., 1971: 34-35; and U.S. House of Representatives, 1971a: idem, 1971b: 74, 82). Among the factors feeding this interest was a f the consequences the mass frustration of high aspirations would have ial order (Business Week, 1972: 50). The solution preferred in s was increased attention to vocational education, as can be is exchange between U.S. Representative John Dellenback (R-Ore.)

and Elliot Richardson, then Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (U.S.House of Representatives, 1971a: 92):

> Rep. Dellenback. Last year the Bureau of Labor Statistics reported to our subcommittee that the Nations's manpower needs would require only about 20 percent of a given age group to have a college degree. Some of the statistics we have indicate we are about there now. In the term of Federal programs and priorities, as you see them and as they are in the budget, what percentage of our youth do you feel should attend a college or university to obtain a baccalaureate degree?
> Secretary Richardson. I don't think I could give a good answer to the question on the proportion that should go through a 4-year program. But I think we can certainly agree that proportion is probably higher than it needs to be for two reasons, at least. One is that not enough prestige and recognition is attached to the pursuit of career education, often in 2-year colleges, rather than the pursuit of a liberal arts bachelor's degree in a 4-year college. Second, the result of a so-called lock-step process that keeps students in college for 4 years. is inappropriate for many who only find their motivation and need for higher education at a later point in life, perhaps. So what we would like to do...is to create greater flexibility among types of institutions that are available to encourage career education and to provide opportunities for spacing out the process of education over the lifetime.

While new roles were being added to the community college's repertoire, old roles were bing redefined. One of the most important instances of this concerned the role in expanding access to higher education that had been assigned to community colleges by a wide variety of groups including state officials (Education Commission of the States, 1971c: 33-34; and Eulau and Quinley, 1970: 120-121), the Carnegie Commission (1970a: 12; 1970b: 15), and the Newman Commission (1971: 58). The role in expanding access was now tied to, rather than just associated with, the diversion of students away from four-year colleges. As the Carnegie Commission (1970b:15) states:

> Within the system of higher education, the community colleges should follow an open-enrollment policy, whereas access to four-year institutions should generally be more selective. Thus the community colleges will play a crucial role in the provision of universal access. The Commission believes that public community colleges should admit all applicants who are high school graduates or persons over 18 years of age who are capable of benefiting from continuing education programs. Without such open-admissions policies, the community colleges will not provide equality of opportunity to the maximum extent possible, nor will they play the role we believe they should play in a universal access system.

Several observers of higher education - most notably, U.S. Representative John Brademas (U.S. House of Representatives, 1971a:228-229) and the Newman Commission (1971: 59, 79) - noted that a major result of this joining of selective four-year colleges and open-access two-year colleges within the same system is the creation of stratification, along class and racial lines, within higher education. As the Newman Commission (1971: 59) states,

> A...consequence of assigning to the junior colleges the role of screening students to see which are capable of "more advanced work" is the stratification of higher education along class and racial lines. There is already a tendency for junior colleges to enroll the student whose father is a skilled, semiskilled, or unskilled worker, and the 4-year colleges to enroll the student whose father is in a professional or managerial position. Black students already represent a higher percentage of community college enrollments than they do of 4-year college enrollments.

In fact, the Newman Commission (1971: 79) goes on to caution against relying on community colleges as the main entry to higher education for minority students:

> Community colleges should be viewed as an important, but not as the sole, avenue of entry to higher education for minority students. Dropout rates for all students at these colleges are high, and the climate of low expectation undermines the confidence of many minority students in their academic abilities. The value of the Associate of Arts credential is yet unproven. Moreover,

> minority enrollment all across the spectrum of colleges and universities is important not only because of higher persistence rates of minority students at 4-year colleges, but because of their need for improved access to graduate schools and to fuller participation in American life generally.

The movements to increase community-college and vocational-education enrollments did not proceed without obstacles. For one, students resented being shunted from the path leading to an academic degree. Frank Roberts, an Oregon state representative and a member of the board of a community college, noted this resistance: (U.S.House of Representatives, 1971a: 218):

> While we offer college transfers to students who might wish to take them, an inordinate percentage of them wish to. In spite of what we can do in terms of counseling and offering other opportunities, about 60 percent of our students are currently in college transfer programs.

Many advocates of community colleges and vocational education decried this resistance and attributed it to a "fixation" with getting a college degree. This charge was not new - it had been often made in the early 1960's - but it was now made much more commonly. Furthermore, it now had a very prominent advocate, Richard Nixon (1970: 37A):

> Too many people have fallen prey to the myth that a four-year liberal arts diploma is essential to a full and rewarding life, whereas in fact other forms of post-secondary education - such as a two-year community college or technical training course - are far better suited to the interests of many young people.

The fixation with a college degree was attributed to a variety of causes, including overambitious parents, a negative attitude toward manual work, and unnecessary requirements for college credentials for hiring and promotion (Carnegie Commission, 1971a: 10, 14; Faltermayer, 1970: 101, 103; and Newman et al., 1971: 38-42).

Despite the obstacles, the movement for greater differentiation within

higher education was able to marshall some persuasive arguments in its favor. One was the thesis that equality of opportunity is not only compatible with but in fact requires differentiation; another concerned the damage wrought by the educational "lockstep".

The argument that equality of opportunity does not require equal education has a venerable lineage going back to the Progressive era, but it had been in eclipse during the 1960's. By the early 1970's, however, it enjoyed a considerable revival. The Education Commission of the States (1971a: 80) restated this argument in forceful terms:

> With the major enrollment increases in the future coming from the lower half of the population economically and in terms of ability (judged by traditional criteria), it becomes progressively more important to recognize that post-secondary education is not confined to liberal arts four-year institutions... It is critically important, if student aid is to provide opportunity commensurate with ability and societal needs, that we plan in terms of access not necessarily to individual institutions but to systems of post-secondary education both public and private.

The Carnegie Commission also made very similar statements. In addition to making a distinction between universal access and universal attendance, the Commission (1970a: 13) recommended that "each state plan to provide universal access to its total system, but not necessarily to each of its institutions, since they vary greatly in their nature and purposes."

Criticism of the academic "lockstep," in which a majority of high school graduates go on to college, seemingly stemmed from a number of concerns and expressed itself in a variety of proposals that seemed to have little direct relation to the desire to divert more students into community colleges and occupational programs. The concerns included student protest, the seeming lack of strong academic motivation and sense of direction of many students, student demand

for new educational options, apparent changes in the skill demands of jobs, and excessive increases in the credentials demanded for jobs. The solutions offered included more oppotunitiies for pre-college work experience, deferred admissions, expanded extension and non-collegiate educational opportunities, less reliance on educational credentials in hiring and promotion, and requiring students to apply and be accepted before they could move from sophmore to junior year or master's to doctoral work (Carnegie Commission, 1971a: 1-2, 7-10, 13-15, 19-20; and Newman et al., 1971: 5-9, 41-43, 67-71, 75-76). Still, it is noteworthy that several of these proposals entailed an expansion of vocational education and, in any case, an increased likelihood that fewer would go on to get college degrees.

4. Coordination and Planning

In the period 1966 to 1972, interest in state coordination and planning rose quite noticeably. From 1964 to 1969 alone, the number of states with some form of coordinating body other than a voluntary association, rose from 35 to 46 (Berdahl, 1971:35). The reasons given for increased state regulative activity largely turned around the following goals: increasing equality of opportunity, providing diversity within higher education, correcting imbalances between manpower supply and demand, encouraging the establishment of community colleges and the expansion of occupational education, preventing community colleges from becoming four-year colleges, improving transfer articulation, and reducing duplication and waste of resources (Carnegie Commission, 1971b: 26; Education Commission of the States, 1971c: 34; idem, 1971d: 37-38; and Eulau and Quinley, 1971: 121-124).

Federal Higher Education Policymaking

The character of higher education policymaking has changed considerably since 1972. The key concern for policymakers is retrenchment. Higher education institutions are facing the possibility of precipitous drops in enrollments in the next ten to twenty years, so they are scrambling for new markets, particularly among "non-traditional" students (Carnegie Council, 1980). The plight of middle-income students has come to the forefront, so much so that some influential observers fear that federal student-aid programs will totally lose their focus on low-income students (Carnegie Council. 1979a: 1-2). Affirmative-action programs have been under severe attack from a variety of quarters, to the point that they are now often dismissed as "reverse discrimination."

Several higher education acts have been passed in recent years, but they have lacked the sweep and importance of the 1972 Education Amendments. Virtually no legislation was passed until 1976, when new education amendments and a health manpower act were enacted. The education amendments create a few new programs and otherwise change existing higher education programs here and there. The additions and revisions are of minor significance, except in two cases: the aid for post-secondary vocational education that was established 1972 is repealed; and the family-income ceiling on eligibility for subsidy of the interest on guaranteed loans is raised from $15,000 to $25,000. The first change occurred without fanfare and clear reason; the second was a response to the much discussed plight of middle-income students. In 1978, the Middle Income Student Assistance Act passed. Its primary contributions are to totally remove the family-income ceiling for eligibility for federal subsidy of loan interest and to make students from families with incomes between $16,000 and $25,000 eligible for basic educational opportunity grants. In 1980, the higher education programs were reauthorized and revised. Most noteworthy are provisions to increase the interest rates on student loans, the size of basic educational opportunity grants, and the amount of educational costs they cover.

The Middle-Income Student Assistance Act existed in odd counterpoint to a tuition tax credit bill (HR 12050) that attracted considerable support in 1978. The two bills, which reflected the considerable concern in Congress about the growing burden of tuition on middle-income families, were seen as alternatives to each other. The Carter Administration - like the Johnson Administration - flatly opposed tuition tax credits, so it strongly pushed the Middle Income Student Assistance Act instead. The elimination of the family-income income ceiling on eligibility for interest subsidy on guaranteed loans seems odd in view of the concern about "middle income" families. In fact, Carter had proposed not that the ceiling be eliminated but that it be raised from $25,000 to $40,000. Congress decided to eliminate the ceiling altogether, however, arguing that this move would eliminate the cost of income-reporting requirements and would increase the number of families eligible by only two percent. Critics warned, however, that this move would reduce the amount of loans going to low-income students; banks prefer high-income students because they are more likely to repay their loans. Furthermore, with all students now eligible for interest subsidy, banks would encourage students to take out guaranteed loans because they require only one yearly bill to the government, covering many loans rather than periodic, individual billing (Congressional Quarterly, 1978: 568-571).

In the end, the critics seem to have proved right. The volume of guaranteed loans tripled between 1977 and 1980, with much of the rapid growth seemingly due to the fact that many upper-income parents took advantage of the interest subsidies to take out loans that were not needed to meet educational costs. This situation has provoked much concern in Congress as it has considered the 1980 Education Amendments. Although no resolution was reached, one proposal that has attracted considerable attention would require all those taking out loans to eventually pay back the government's subsidy of the interest accrued while they were

in college. This change would constitute an ironic continuation of the central flaw in the previous policy: the solution offered to the problems attendant to letting all students, regardless of family income, get interest subsidies is to deny interest subsidies to all students, again regardless of background (Congressional Quarterly, 1980: 1188, 1810-1811).

An often neglected side of legislative politics is the appropriation process, and here higher education has fared badly. Federal higher education expenditures grew only 7 percent a year from 1973 to 1979, in comparison to 23 percent a year from 1966 to 1973 (U.S. National Center of Education Statistics, 1979: 166-167). This drought in financing is reflected in the fate of several programs. The Basic Educational Opportunity Grants had difficulty taking root. Funding started at only $122 million in fiscal year 1974--an amount so small that only freshmen were made eligible and the maximum grant was set at $450--but it did rise to $905 million in 1976 and $1.936 billion in fiscal year 1979 (Finn, 1978: 68). The cost-of-education supplements also established by the 1972 Education Amendments have never been funded, except in the case of veterans (Finn, 1978: 127). The grants for community colleges have also never been funded, and the aid for occupational education was repealed in 1976.

If the legislative process has not created much drama in the last few years, the executive and the judiciary have. The regulations for Title IX of the 1972 Education Amendments, which prohibits sex discrimination in higher education, have been steadily rolling out of HEW since 1974. The regluations--which cover admissions, financial aid, academic hiring, and athletics--have provoked considerable controversy over whether HEW has overstepped the congressional intent behind Title IX. Interestingly, the greatest outcry has been over the requirement that girls and women must be provided equality of opportunity in such areas as athletic facilities, coaching, and scholarships (Congressional Quarterly, 1974: 438; 1975: 661-665; 1976: 567; and 1979: 464). Similar controversy has

attended the writing of regulations governing the "1202" state postsecondary planning commissions mandated by the 1972 Education Amendments (Gladieux and Wolanin, 1976: 243-244; and McGuinness, McKinney, and Millard, 1975).

The Supreme Court also made a striking entrance in recent years in the shape of its DeFunis (1974) and Bakke (1978) cases. The first holds interest only in that it was heard. The decision simply held that DeFunis' case was moot since he was admitted to law school anyway and was only months from graduation. The Bakke case did lead to a definite decision, although one weakened by the fact that it commanded the assent of only five of the nine justices. The majority opinion, written by Justice Lewis Powell, stated that a diverse student body was a justifiable aim in admissions. Race could be considered as a factor in admission decisions, but it could not be used to prevent any individual from competing for all seats (Congressional Quarterly, 1974: 738; idem, 1978: 556; and Sexton, 1979: 319-320). The long-term impact of the Bakke decision remains to be seen, in good part because of major ambiguities in the terms in which it is couched (Sexton, 1979:327-336), but it has already had a chilling effect on affirmative-action programs.

The Wider Ideological and Political Context

The categories of access, aid to institutions, community-college and vocational education, and coordination and planning prove to be as useful in interpreting the political and ideological cross currents of the period since the passage of the 1972 Education Amendments as of the periods before. However, a new category, which will be placed last, must be added, that of concerns about the maintenance of academic standards.

1. The Question of Access

Who should be in college and why: The dominance of equality of opportunity as a justification of efforts to improve access to higher education continued in this period. Its now almost taken-for-granted character is evident in the following statement by the Committee for Economic Development (1973: 20).

> Education beyond high school is often an important factor in determining an individual's chances of achieving economic success and of attaining the life-style to which he or she may aspire. Equality of postsecondary educational opportunity, therefore, is essential to providing each person a fair chance to move into and along the mainstream of socioeconomic life. But individuals from higher socioeconomic backgrounds currently attend colleges and universities at rates that exceed by as much as nine to one those of individuals from the least-advantaged backgrounds. Our recommendations on financing higher education are designed to diminish this disparity.

Along with this continuity of justification, there has been considerable continuity in the groups whose access is of concern. Women and minority-group members are still the focus of attention (Carnegie Council 1980: 134; Education Commission of the States, 1977: 47; and idem, 1979: 51). In fact, women have scored major gains in the last eight years. The 1974 Education Amendments established grants to improve and expand educational programs and activities for women in education (Congressional Quarterly, 1974: 446). In 1975, most of the regulations governing the administration of Title IX of the 1972 Education Amendments were published. Congress did not repeal them despite fears that

their broad interpretation and tough enforcement of the title would lead it to do so (Congressional Quarterly, 1975: 661-663). The 1976 Education Amendments took steps to end sex stereotyping in vocational education (Congressional Quarterly, 1976: 574, 575).

In the case of minorities, the earlier expansion of concern to include nonwhite groups other than blacks has been consolidated. Considerable mention is made of Hispanic Americans and Indian Americans. This is to be welcomed, but still it is noteworthy that Blacks receive little direct mention. For example, the 1976 Republican platform, in its section on "Equal Rights and Ending Discrimination," mentions discrimination, minorities in general, Hispanic Americans, Indian Americans, Puerto Ricans, ethnic Americans and women, but never mentions Blacks; similarly, the Democratic platform mentions women, racial equality, American Indians and Puerto Ricans but not Blacks in its section on "Civil and Political Rights" (Congressional Quarterly, 1976: 908-909, 860). This absence of direct mention of Blacks may simply reflect how well established their place is in discussions involving these topics. However, it may also indicate that, in the face of the seeming intractability of racial oppression in this country, "benign neglect" has quietly crept in.

Another symptom of a policy of benign neglect may be seen in the Carnegie Foundation's (1975: 113-118) interpretation of the requirements of its "universal access" model. Even under a fully funded universal access system, the Foundation expects that in the year 2000 the enrollment rates of 18 to 24 year olds from families with incomes above the median will be 50 percent higher than those of youths from families with incomes below the median. The reasons given for this prognosis are not wholly unreasonable: differences in age of marriage, number and timing of children, educational aspirations, and so forth. Nevertheless, it is striking that only seven years earlier the Carnegie Commission (1968: 27-28) could declare:

> By the year 2000, the Commission believes that opportunities can and must be totally free of the last vestiges of limitations imposed by ethnic grouping, or geographical location, or age, or quality of prior schooling....By the year 2000, there should be no barrier to any individual achieving the occupational level which his talent warrants and which his interest leads him to seek. Equalizing educational opportunity for the individual citizen could lead to a percentage of minority persons at the higher occupational and professional levels generally roughly equivalent to their percentage of the population.

Noteworthy changes were also occurring in the form of additions to the list of groups whose education was of concern. One of the most important was middle-income students. This group has long been of concern to policy makers, with the previous peak of concern being in 1971. Another resurgence of concern began in 1976 and resulted in a major reorientation of the federal student aid program. The 1976 Democratic platform gave evidence of this shift in the following declaration: "In higher education, our Party is strongly committed to extending postsecondary opportunities for students from low- and middle-income families" (Congressional Quarterly, 1976: 861). This innocuous statement marks the first time middle-income students have been treated as a group whose access to higher education is fundamentally at risk. The magnitude of this shift can be seen by comparing the statement above with the statement by Richard Nixon that is quoted on page 62.

The growing concern with middle-income students gave birth to a number of important legislative changes. The 1976 Education Amendments raise the family income ceiling for interest subsidy on guaranteed student loans from $15,000 to $25,000 and require that the educational expenses for siblings be taken into account in calculating the expected family contribution under the basic opportunity grant program (Congressional Quarterly, 1976: 570, 572). The 1978 Middle Income Student Assistance Act expands eligibility for the basic opportunity grants to include families with incomes between $15,000 and $25,000 and eliminates the $25,000 family income ceiling for guaranteed loans and

interest subsidy on them (Congressional Quarterly, 1978: 569).

Another group whose education has recently been of concern is "non-traditional" students, for example, men and women in the paid labor force, housewives, retirees, and dropouts. These students had been of little interest to higher education in past years, but they have taken on new lustre as enrollments have dropped among recent high school graduates. Edmund Gleazer, President of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, describes his conversations with policy makers on the subject of the future of community colleges (Gleazer, 1979: 2-3):

> I found that legislators and educational planners were preoccupied with the matter of declining elementary and high school enrollments. The decreases, of course, were expected to take their toll eventually in the community college....I countered the no growth talk by identifying some important new markets. The large number of women in their twenties and thirties and forties and over moving into our institutions to qualify for skilled employment or to satisfy an interest in learning, or both. The large numbers of workers retiring in their early fifties who wanted to continue to have a good job and needed retraining for income as well as personal needs. The growing number of older people who have paid taxes throughout their lives to support these institutions for their children and who now wanted to use them for their own learning interests.

The "gifted" are the final group that has been added to the list of those whose education is of concern. Most of the attention devoted to them has been in legislation involving elementary and secondary education. The 1974 Education Amendments authorizes grants to local school districts to develop and operate special programs for the gifted and talented and authorizes the National Institute of Education to do a study of gifted children (Congressional Quarterly, 1974: 445). The 1978 Elementary and Secondary Education Act amendments set up grants to state and local education agencies to develop programs meeting the special needs of gifted and talented children (Congressional Quarterly, 1978: 559). Nonetheless, a similar interest in the "gifted" seems to have been developing in the case of higher education. For example, Representative James

O'Hara (D-Michigan), the chairman of the House Postsecondary Education Subcommittee, proposed that the special educational opportunity grants be shifted from aiding extremely needy students to aiding ones with exceptional academic promise (Congressional Quarterly, 1976: 579). Furthermore, in his February 28, 1978 message to Congress on education, President Carter declared (Congressional Quarterly, 1978: 41E): "No able student should be denied a college education because his or her family cannot afford tuition, room and board" (my emphasis). The use of the word "able" is striking, because since the mid-1960s most policymakers have used the word "qualified" to delimit the students of concern to them.

How to increase access: The barriers to access that have received the most attention in the last eight years have been lack of money and of an adequate precollege education. The solutions offered are also familiar: expanded compensatory efforts and student aid programs.

The compensatory effort that has received the most attention is affirmative action in admissions. Affirmative action programs have received much attention, in part because of the DeFunis (1974) and Bakke (1978) decisions. Relatively little mention has been made of programs to identify, counsel, or tutor college prospects, perhaps because major efforts in this direction were incorporated in the 1972 Education Amendments. The 1976 Education Amendments did establish, however, grants for Service Learning Centers at postsecondary institutions to provide remedial and other services to "disadvantaged" students.

Calls for tough affirmative action efforts have come from many quarters, but the tide has clearly been running in the other direction. For example, the 1976 Education Amendments prohibit cutting off funds to higher educational institutions for failure to meet an admissions quota (see 408). To be sure, the Carnegie Council (1977: 13) has explicitly called on colleges to pursue affirmative action policies involving special efforts in the areas of recruit-

ment, admission, compensatory education, and financial aid. Race and non-English-language background are to be considered in deciding on individuals if they indicate prior social discrimination or educational disadvantage, direct knowledge of special cultural patterns and experiences, or probability that the person will provide specially needed services (such as medical care in underserved areas) to society. Nonetheless, a number of important qualifications are imposed on this support for affirmative action. One involves standards (Carnegie Council, 1977: 14):

> No student should be admitted who cannot meet the general academic standards set for all students. These standards should be set...at the minimum level at which there is a reasonable chance of success in completing the coursework without reduction in academic or professional standards.

The Council does provide, however, an imaginative means of determining the proper level: looking at the level about 10 years back, when admissions competition was less intense but qualified students were being graduated. (Carnegie Council, 1977: 15). Another important qualification involves quotas:

> No numerical quota for any component should be set, but rather goals should be established that may change over time as conditions change and may be exceeded or remain unmet depending on the composition of the body of applicants in any one year. (Carnegie Council, 1977: 15)

In a footnote to this statement, the Council describes the differences between a quota and a goal and then states: "We believe it is important to note and to maintain these differences."

The student aid proposals made in the last eight years have not broken new ground. The Carnegie Council has called for a new program of federal grants to set up state "tuition equalization plans" to provide aid to all undergraduates, regardless of need, attending private colleges. Otherwise, however, it has repeated the Carnegie Commission's (1968: 27-30) call for loans with repayment contingent on income and has proposed some minor changes

in existing programs: shifting the basic opportunity grants to covering non-instructional expenses; having tuition and fees be picked up by much expanded state scholarship programs; and requiring recipients of federal and state opportunity grants to contribute significantly to their college expenses from their own earning (Carnegie Council, 1975: 27-37, 42-47; 1979: 5-14). The more important development with regard to student aid, then, has been not so much the form the aid should take as who its recipients should be. The rise in concern about the plight of middle-income students in the last few years has seemingly threatened, if not washed away, the previous focus on helping the neediest.

2. Aid to Institutions

Many observers of the general financial state of higher education have been in a panic in the last few years. Much of this turns around the consequences of the rapidly shrinking number of high school graduates. Almost all enrollment projections for higher education predict small increases at best, and several predict decreases on the order of 25 to 50 percent over the next ten to twenty years (Carnegie Foundation, 1975: 41). The Carnegie Council's own projections have ranged between an estimate in 1975 that enrollments would rise 5 to 25 percent to an estimate in 1980 that they would decline 5 to 15 percent by the year 2000 (Carnegie Foundation, 1975: 41-43; Carnegie Council, 1980: 152). The institutions that are likely to be hardest hit by the demographic downturn are the less selective private liberal arts colleges and private two-year colleges (Carnegie Council, 1980: 60-61). Given how dire the situation may be for many colleges, the Carnegie Council's solutions seem rather mild. It has called for increased state aid to private institutions, state help in closing weak programs and instituions, establishment of state "tuition equalization plans" for private college students, strengthened federal support of university-based research, greater managerial efficiency, insti-

tutional cooperation, and intensified recruitment -- consonant of course with quality -- by colleges (Carnegie Council, 1980: 110, 118-127, 130-133).

3. Community Colleges and Vocational Education

Most of the attention given to community colleges in this decade has been for their role in vocational education. Community colleges have come to be seen by many educational policy makers, community college leaders, and state education officials as institutions first for vocational and then for transfer education (Lombardi, 1979: 1-2, 22-23; U.S. House of Representatives, 1975: 461,664). As in the early 1970s, one of the most important forces behind this turn away from emphasis on transfer education has been the fear that the labor market cannot smoothly absorb the large numbers graduating from college. Commissioner of Education John Ottina stated the reasons for concern (U.S. House of Representatives, 1975: 20):

> In the next decade, 10 million college graduates will enter a labor force from which only 4½ million persons will depart. Furthermore, a lack of new job opportunities in 1970 required 85 percent of college graduates to accept jobs previously filled by individuals with fewer credentials. It is therefore hardly surprising that evidence is now surfacing that correlates worker dissatisfaction with the highly credentialed young employee.

His concern was not purely personal, for it has been echoed by other sources, especially business; in almost all cases, statements of this concern have been coupled with calls for more vocational education (Finley, 1973: 10; Guzzardi, 1976: 128; and U.S. House of Representatives, 1975: 525).

Community colleges are clearly the dominant force in postsecondary vocational education, but their lock on this has recently come under challenge. In the face of declining enrollments from their traditional constituencies, many four-year schools have been poaching on community-college turf by offering their own occupational programs; this has, in turn, provoked furious criticism by community college leaders (Harris and Grede, 1977: 89-96; and U.S. House of

Representatives, 1975: 371-378, 459, 464). However, an accommodation may be developing in the form of "two-plus-two" programs in which four-year colleges take in community college transfers and provide the last two years leading to a baccalaureate degree in applied arts and sciences (Harris and Grede, 1977: 93).

As in the early 1970s, supporters of increased postsecondary vocational education have had to face the fact that students have often been resistant to being shifted to vocational programs. Again, this resistance has been attributed to a fixation with getting a college degree (Finley, 1973: 10; and Mayer, 1974: 190). Furthermore, the idea of alternatives to "lockstep" education, especially lifelong or recurrent education, has been advanced as a legitimation for more differentiated education (Finley, 1973: 12; and Guzzardi, 1976: 129).

4. Coordination and Planning

The installation of new mechanisms for coordination and planning has continued at a rapid rate in the last eight years. Driving this increasing rationalization of academic development and decision making has been the need to cope with such factors as the changing size and composition of enrollments, increasing costs coupled with intensifying competition for financial resources, continued inequalities in educational access and opportunities, and increasing numbers of fly-by-night programs (Education Commission of the States, 1979: 51-52, 57). In fact, interest in coordination and planning has become so strong that the Carnegie Council has been led to warn against overregulation. It has favored, instead, reliance on market forces, the state budgetting process, and planning by state boards with advisory and not operating powers to assure coordination (Carnegie Foundation, 1976: 11-13, 17-20; and Carnegie Council, 1980: 120,123).

5. Academic Standards

A broad-based movement concerned with the seeming deterioration of academic standards began to form around 1975. This diffuse movement has been

fueled by a variety of concerns: the appearance of studies finding large numbers of functional illiterates even among recent high school graduates, and employer complaints about how poorly prepared their recent employees' are (Congressional Quarterly, 1975: 642; Education Commission of the States, 1978: 24; and Finley, 1973: 10, 11); a steady decline in average scores on the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) and graduate admissions tests and the increasing number of college students to be found in remedial courses (Carnegie Council, 1980: 98; Congressional Quarterly, 1975: 642; 1976: 567; 1977: 449, 524-526; and Education Commission of the States, 1978: 24-25); and, finally, a steady rise in grade point averages in college (Carnegie Council, 1979: 25, 27; 1980: 100; College Entrance Examination Board, 1977: 29, 47; and Mayer, 1974: 192).

The response to this seeming decline in standards has taken a wide variety of forms. Efforts have been made to improve basic-skills (3R) instruction, require passage of a minimum competency test before entering a higher grade or graduating from college, and cutting back on grade inflation by reporting the average grade in the class along with an individual's grade. The movements for basic-skills instruction and minimum-competency testing have particularly attracted attention because, in addition to meeting public concern over educational standards, they also meet other concerns. One is the desire of state and local public officials to make schools more efficient and thus reduce pressure on tax revenues; another is the desire of minority-group parents to hold schools accountable for the education of their children (Education Commission of the States, 1978: 24-25).

The federal and state governments have strongly pushed basic-skills instruction and minimum-competency testing. The 1976 Education Amendments made basic skills one of the priority areas for the National Institute of Education's research program (sec. 403). The 1978 Elementary and Secondary

Education Act amendments establish grants to improve basic-skills instruction and to develop minimum standards of proficiency and direct the National Institute of Education to conduct a national assessment of educational programs every five years (Congressional Quarterly, 1978: 558-559). Proposals have even been made for federal establishment or at least encouragement of national minimum educational standards; however, these proposals have proved quite controversial, attracting cries of federal interference (Congressional Quarterly, 1977: 525-526).