

U.S. GOV. PRINTING OFFICE: 1972 O - 300-000

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 92<sup>d</sup> CONGRESS  
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 118—PART 2

JANUARY 26, 1972 TO FEBRUARY 2, 1972

(PAGES 1241 TO 2446)

Port estimated their revenue loss at \$500,000.00 per month.

Port estimated \$4,140,000.00 loss per month to local economy.

*Stockton*

Estimated loss export-import tonnage, 200,000 tons per month—General cargo.

Port estimated their revenue loss at \$460,000.00 per month.

Port estimated \$3,600,000.00 loss per month to local economy.

*Eureka*

Estimated loss export tonnage 53,550 tons per month.

Thirty day loss in pulp shipments—5,000 tons export with a dollar value of \$900,000.00.

Six million board feet of logs and lumber tied up at dock awaiting shipment.

Port estimated \$749,700.00 loss per month to local economy.

*Redwood City*

Estimated loss export-import tonnage 5,000 tons per month—Bulk cargo.

Port estimated their revenue loss at \$10,000.00 per month.

Port estimated \$50,000.00 loss per month to local economy.

*Benicia*

Estimated loss export-import tonnage 30,000 tons per month—General cargo.

Port estimated their revenue loss at \$60,000.00 per month.

Port estimated \$540,000.00 loss per month to local economy.

*Richmond*

Estimated loss export-import tonnage 5,000 tons per month—General cargo.

Port estimated their revenue loss at \$30,000.00 per month.

Port estimated \$60,000.00 loss per month to local economy.

REPORTS FROM AGRICULTURE, INDUSTRY AND BUSINESS

*Agriculture*

*Feed and grain:*

78,000 tons of alfalfa products unable to ship.

82,000 tons of rice unable to ship.

25,000 tons of wheat unable to ship.

10,000 tons of safflower-general feeds unable to ship.

10,000 tons of tallow unable to ship.

Most of the above commodities are an unrecoverable loss to the industry.

There is also the fear that tie up will cause loss of customers.

Situation becoming critical. Driers will be clogged by August 15th. Driers at terminals must be used by practically all grains as they arrive wet. Terminals are almost filled to maximum today.

*Prunes*

600 tons of prunes on docks—\$250,000.00 value; quality deteriorating.

*Raisins*

\$500,000.00 value of raisins on docks; quality badly affected by lack of storage.

*Almonds*

\$1,000,000.00 value of almonds on dock—no cold storage; problem of rancidity; may be total loss.

*Walnuts*

\$150,000.00 value—same problem as almonds.

*Dried fruits*

No dollar value. Shipments must move within next month for Christmas trade.

*Citrus*

Lemon-orange exports are being curtailed approximately 40 to 50 percent.

*Cotton*

\$14,000,000.00 caught at dockside. Storage costs estimated at \$2,600.00 per day.

*Cane sugar*

65,000 tons raw sugar tied up.  
Estimated loss at end of August to sugar industry 292,000 tons of production—\$42,900,000.00.

C. H. Sugar Co.—925 employees laid off—\$28,400.00 daily payroll.

Shortages of baling wire, jute bagging, packing cartons creating additional problems. Lack of canned bulk pineapple creating major problem to canning industry due to need before fruit cocktail can be processed. Canning exports to Europe-Asia completely shut off. This is a major movement thru California ports.

AUTOMOBILE INDUSTRY (FOREIGN IMPORTS)

*Toyota Imports* average 3500 cars per month at Benicia. Distributor has laid off 40 employees, salary loss \$20,000.00 per month. Dealers are starting lay offs.

*Datsun Imports*—No lay offs to date. Will commence if strike continues.

*British Motor Car Imports*—Normal imports 2500 cars monthly Bay Area. No reports of lay offs to date. Diverting to Vancouver, B.C. No cars have arrived to date due to port congestion.

*Volkswagen Imports*—Normal import 3,500 cars per month. Diverted to Mexico and Canada—3 to 4 week delay. Car costs higher due to added transportation costs.

All distributors and dealers facing shortage of parts. Will become critical problem if strike continues.

DOMESTIC

*Ford Motor Company* reports drastic cut in profits due to air shipment costs to Hawaii to satisfy customer need for parts.

LUMBER INDUSTRY

Complete halt of wood pulp, chips, lumber and log exports. Loss running into millions of dollars per month. Lay offs in industry will become heavy if strike continues.

Georgia Pacific reports lay offs this week of 100 employees—payroll loss \$20,000.00. Estimate 100 more next week.

MANUFACTURING INDUSTRY

Many plants now feeling impact of strike as supply of imported materials cut off. Some are attempting to divert shipments to Mexico-Canada ports. If stocks not replenished, lay offs will start this month.

COFFEE IMPORTERS AND PROCESSORS

Unable to move coffee thru Ensenada. Trying Vancouver, but congestion there will delay shipments. No real problems to date.

VEGETABLE OIL COMPANIES

Will shut down shortly due to lack of imports.

GENERAL COMMENTS

Daily dollar loss as shown is expected to increase as present available stock is consumed.

Unemployment will rise weekly but rate of increase should not be great. Outcome in part dependent on movements thru Canadian and Mexican ports.

Daily loss in import-export estimated at 131,000 short tons.

Total estimated loss in shipments thru California ports amounts to 4,107,000 short tons as of August 5, 1971.

There is an estimated one-half million tons of products tied up in California ports.

*Projected loss to California economy*

Daily -----	\$17, 500, 000
Weekly -----	122, 500, 000
Monthly -----	525, 000, 000

INNOVATIONS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. MONDALE, Mr. President, recently the American Association of State Colleges and Universities convened a

task force on innovations in higher education, chaired by Chancellor G. Theodore Mitau, with the Minnesota State college system.

The very thoughtful and interesting position paper they submitted in January strongly supports the creation of the National Foundation of Post-Secondary Education and suggests some revisions or clarifications of the national foundation as passed by the Senate in the higher education amendments.

As a strong supporter of the need for a national foundation, I ask unanimous consent that this very useful and creative position paper be printed in the RECORD. I commend it to the attention of Senators.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL FOUNDATION FOR INNOVATION AND CHANGE IN POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION: SOME REFLECTIONS ON THE PROVISIONS OF A NATIONAL FOUNDATION IN S. 659

This paper address itself to the concept of a national foundation so urgently needed to make the educational changes necessary to translate the rhetoric of the 1960's into behavioral reality for the 1970's and 1980's. It speaks to our colleagues in the educational community and to the men and women in leadership positions throughout the nation who wish to bring a new excellence to higher education. If we succeed in attracting others to this cause we believe the students of this nation will be well served.

Preoccupation with the student assistance program and other facets of the higher education package has to this point absorbed significant energies of the educational community. It is the position of the authors of this paper that the foundation has not yet obtained the kind of intellectual support and attention it deserves. While this paper does not attempt to present a detailed design for the National Foundation, it does seek to address itself to the conceptual nature of such a foundation and the reasons that make its establishment so imperative.

SOME OBJECTIVES OF A NATIONAL FOUNDATION

Some major objectives for the National Foundation for Post-secondary Education would be:

To stimulate major organizational and curricular innovation and change in post-secondary education through federal funding;

To serve as a link between the research and development functions of the proposed National Institute of Education (NIE) and those institutions which seek to implement the appropriate models or designs;

To collect, evaluate, and disseminate information on major innovations, structural changes, and curricular developments;

To provide a new mechanism of federal support for institution-initiated designs for change, free from burdensome and restrictive restraints, bureaucratic guidelines, and externally imposed directives;

To assist post-secondary institutions to move more rapidly and effectively toward development of Management Information Systems (MIS) and Planning Programming Budgeting Systems (PPBS) that would enhance their decision-making capabilities;

To make it possible for institutions to advance their abilities to delineate their missions, to establish priorities, and to respond more effectively and imaginatively to regional and community needs;

To enable institutions to meet presently unmet educational needs of students for new careers and professions and to accommodate constituencies that do not fit into the conventional campus settings or curricula.

What is envisaged in our perception of the

foundation is a new kind of federalism in higher education—a federal funding pattern that acknowledges and respects the creative impulse and competence of the leadership of this country's educational units, and restrains itself primarily to reviewing, auditing, and to holding accountable those who undertake pioneer efforts with foundation support.

This kind of mutual trust and cooperative relationship will maximize the benefits of federally provided "risk capital" urgently necessary if the educational community is to meet its responsibilities in the difficult years ahead.

#### CRITICISMS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

To no one's surprise and despite a record of considerable achievements—as measured by traditional standards—American's colleges and universities will continue to be vigorously and often quite properly charged with a multitude of inadequacies, missed opportunities, or outright failures. Such attacks come from the left, the right, and from the moderate middle.

Students charge that educational institutions fail to teach them how to handle ideas and how to deal with rapid change; with separating them from rather than involving them in life; with being overly concerned about facts and degrees rather than with the application of knowledge towards the solution of social problems; and for being bureaucratically impersonal and insensitive to the diversity of individual needs.

Some critics of American colleges and universities indict education for encouraging passivity and compliance rather than freedom and participation, while others condemn what they consider to be excessive campus permissiveness. Educational institutions are accused of being stubbornly insensitive or even hostile to demands for an end to racism, militarism, violence, and poverty, and for subordinating the primary business of scholarly learning to a shallow social activism.

Legislators and other elected officials, viewing education from a different perspective, are often no less critical. They charge our institutions with overly expensive and expensive building programs, with costly salary demands, with excessively small teaching loads, and with producing too many graduates in areas where demand is low.

Desire for change cuts across a wide spectrum of ideology and conviction, of class and race, of age and experience, of the academic and non-academic. While motivations may vary and perspectives differ, the theme is similar: the time is propitious for initiating significant and far-reaching reforms and innovations in post-secondary education.

Notwithstanding the disparity of viewpoints, there is a compelling consensus that major changes must be made. Much that was appropriate for the industrial society and its student generations may not suffice for the post-industrial age or the so-called technocratic age and its educational requirements. Patterns, methods, and materials developed in an earlier era may no longer be relevant for the life-style and problems of contemporary society.

#### CHALLENGES FOR CHANGE

Widely discussed reports and findings prepared under the auspices of the Carnegie Commission, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the AASCU point up some of the challenges to be met and changes to be made.

The traditional concept that college education occurs between the ages of 18 and 22, on a campus, in a classroom, with a lecturer is being rightly questioned. Students can learn in a variety of ways throughout their lifetimes both on and away from a campus.

Rigid lockstep patterns of courses, sequences, and attendance regulations may not be conducive to effective learning.

Educational opportunities for women, returning veterans, the older student, the

working student, or the unusual student should be made more accessible.

Much more needs to be done to reach the Blacks, Chicanos, and Indians, the urban and rural poor, both to enhance the quality of their personal lives and to afford them opportunity for a more productive and meaningful life.

Traditional grading practices should be replaced with competency-based evaluations that attest to what a person knows rather than how many credits he has earned as a result of attending fifty minute classes three times per week for four years.

The over-professionalization of learning has resulted in an emphasis of narrow specialties taught by highly credentialed faculty needs to be balanced by interdisciplinary approaches, by a problem-solving orientation, or by the use of "teachers" from business, government, labor, the arts—men and women who have expertise in a field but who do not possess degrees customarily required for college teaching.

The need to enrich our educational options forces our imagination to develop alternatives to vocations presently over-supplied, not only for those now enrolled in our colleges but also for those who failed to complete their education because they found the traditional curricula uninspiring or purposeless. The interest in public service, the dedication to the advancement of knowledge, and the eagerness to improve the quality of life—motivations so widely shared by many young men and women—are enormously valuable resources for the kind of social reconstruction that our nation can ill afford to waste.

In educational programs there should be a renewed emphasis upon the development of the ability to work with people of different backgrounds, social settings, cultural attachments, political interests, and intellectual viewpoints for the purpose of bridging the chasms of class and caste, of races, and of generations as our society attempts to reintegrate the polarized sub-cultures of dis-sent.

Emerging efforts to measure and quantify educational outcomes and resource expenditures must be further refined and implemented on a much broader basis if priorities are to be realistically established. The vast literature of educational reform has tended to be isolated from the parallel literature relating to increased accountability, systems management, and program budgeting. There is a need to consider thoughtfully the massive task of developing strategies for institutional modernization.

In order to eliminate unnecessary duplication, while providing diverse experiences, there will need to be developed more effective patterns of inter-institutional cooperation through consortia, "common markets," and shared resources and personnel.

The humane approach to the revitalization of the educational community should involve the recognition of the enormous task of re-directing professional energies which may involve the retraining or updating of faculties—many of them middle-aged—who in their careers are now faced with a sudden loss of their own academic identity or future. This will necessarily require the budgeting of resources for re-education in order to reduce the inevitably heavy stress and anxiety induced by the climate and strategies of change.

While much remains to be done—indeed to be started—there is nonetheless some evidence of the academy's willingness to translate the ideas of reform into reality. Thus, the often repeated charge that the higher education community is unable or unwilling to change is not quite accurate. A few examples may be cited.

The California State College System, among others, has initiated projects that could lead to extensive use of the external degree.

Three national open universities are being planned—North American Open University, Campus Free College, and the National University.

The University of Wisconsin at Green Bay has developed academic programs around the problems of ecology.

Major experimentation is occurring at the Governor's State University and Sangamon State University in Illinois, within the University Without Walls Consortium, at Evergreen State College in Washington, Empire State College in New York, the University of Northern Colorado, as well as in Hawaii, Florida, New Jersey, and Texas.

In Minnesota, as well as in other states, some colleges are developing new career options. Students entering such careers, whether in health care or human services, business systems, or environmental controls, might be the type of men and women who would be eager to enlist their competencies to battle pollution in the air, in water, and on land; who would want to assist in the rehabilitation of victims of drug addiction; who would wish to help rebuild our cities, towns, and neighborhoods; who would work to improve our law enforcement and criminal justice administration; who would wish to strengthen management systems in business or government; or who would be able to offer constructive guidance to the disillusioned and disheartened victims of social injustice.

Far from pointing towards the stereotyped view of vocationalism these new careers would challenge the idealism of our young men and women by demonstrating to them how they can enlist the discipline of skill and the dignity of work not merely for materialism but in behalf of causes and commitments that transcend personal gain or acquisition. Rather than diverting students from their genuine concern for the fulfillment of the American promise these new careers might offer a bridge between aspiration and action, between the ideal and the possible.

The new Minnesota Metropolitan State College, which opens its pilot program in February, 1972, will implement many of the innovations mentioned above. An example of the positive reaction to the kinds of innovations planned at Minnesota Metropolitan State College is found in a recent public opinion poll conducted by the *Minneapolis Star*. Despite the fact that the metropolitan area includes 31 post-secondary institutions—including numerous programs offered by the University of Minnesota to its 40,000 students in Minneapolis and St. Paul—a significant public demand for new educational options and structures becomes immediately apparent. Of those interviewed 72% thought the new college would fulfill a need not now being met; 90% thought the plan to operate twelve months a year, on week-ends, and at times convenient to working men and women was a good idea; 80% favored the intention to rely heavily upon faculty who are professionals in their fields, but who do not possess the traditional academic credentials.

Although beginning efforts have been made to respond to such eagerness for greater educational diversity and more individualized instruction in post-secondary institutions, the number of students reached represents a very small fraction, not only of the millions presently enrolled in our institutions but also of the millions yet unreached. If educational opportunity is to be further extended and if those millions are to be involved, some radical reforms at the very core of center of the educational enterprise will have to be introduced. An example of such reform is seen in the following excerpt from the planning document of one of this nation's newest colleges.

We begin with the view that admission to the college, assessment of competency, and advising about educational and career prob-

lems, while conceptually distinct, are functionally and operationally interrelated. They are phases of one's total education which may occur simultaneously or in different sequence for different students. A major aspect of one's education is to learn how to assess one's capacities and achievements, determine one's interests, set appropriate goals, establish appropriate means for achieving the goals, and then begin to utilize those means efficiently. We would argue that a truly educated person is one who can undertake these tasks for himself, and that formal institutions of education exist to aid him in learning how to carry on these functions but not to carry on for him. As we stated above, each individual must be the major partner in designing his own education—throughout his lifetime. A college and all its resources—human, programmatic, physical—exist to support the individual student in learning how to design and implement his own education. But a college cannot do the educating.

Administratively the college will place responsibility for admissions, competency assessment, and advising under a coordinator and a staff of professionals, including some full-time and community faculty, and specialists in such areas as student financial aid. This staff will replace the traditional student services staff.

When a student applies for admission to the college our first response will be to determine whether or not he is one for whom the college is intended. We accept responsibility to counsel with those whose educational needs can be better met in other institutions so that they will take full advantage of those institutions. To that end we propose that with the cooperation of other metropolitan area post-secondary institutions we establish an admissions review committee made up of representatives of those institutions. This committee would review applications . . . and counsel with those applicants who should enroll elsewhere. The college pledges itself to cooperate fully with such a committee and hopes that representatives of the private colleges, the junior colleges, the University . . . and the area vocational-technical schools will be appointed to serve their respective institutions.

Upon admission each student will be assigned a faculty advisor from the full-time professional faculty and an Educational and Career Advising Committee (ECAC) made up of his advisor and such full-time and community faculty members as are appropriate to the student's interests and goals. Immediate responsibility for assisting the student to develop his goals and design his procedures for reaching those goals will lie with the advisor and the ECAC. They will also direct the competency assessment process for the student, making full use of the professional staff.

We believe that the competency assessment process—both initially and throughout a student's affiliation with the college, including the assessment which will culminate in his receiving a degree—should be individually structured to make it possible for the student to have a complete opportunity to demonstrate his real competencies. The function of assessment is not to fail students but to make sure they have the skills, attitudes, and understanding which are appropriate to their educational and career goals.<sup>1</sup>

#### OBSTACLES TO REFORM

The fact that innovations of such scope and magnitude are found in so few institutions attests to the complex nature of forces, settings, and obstacles that confront those engaged in the management of fundamental and responsible change.

Decision-making in the college of the 1970's

is—or should be—a shared process involving all segments of the campus. The days are gone when a president could impose institutional policies, priorities, or innovations. While highly desirable, such shared decision-making requires carefully developed processes that are formulated and implemented systematically and at considerable cost in human and fiscal resources.

In the present era of austerity many institutions can no longer rely on rapidly increasing enrollments to provide the ready resources to add faculties and programs with which to innovate. Opportunities for change and for institutional flexibility are further diminished by the rapidly spreading spending limitations in many states as well as by widespread legislative and fiscal practices that stress line-item and incremental budgets aimed at expenditure by objects rather than by programs.

To undertake major change requires that institutions establish priorities, measure probable outcomes, and estimate expenditures. To accomplish these objectives with the desired degree of sophistication and accountability, expensive management information systems are required. Many institutions, while desirous of adopting such informational resources, find it simply impossible to acquire the necessary equipment and personnel.

Traditional methods of rewarding and promoting faculty members do not encourage major institutional change. In recent years, a faculty member has been judged in terms of his contribution and loyalty to the discipline rather than to the institution. His reputation is made, and hence his salary and rank increased, through scholarly publication. Advancement involves moving to a larger, more prestigious department. Trained as a specialist, his interest has often tended to be focused upon his subject matter and profession rather than upon the more general teaching-learning process.

Fiscal austerity, levelling enrollments, the surplus of teachers, and defensive reactions to student power combine to make many faculty members more protective of their authority, their roles, and their courses, thus reinforcing their commitment to the *status quo*. Quite obviously change is threatening at any time, but it is particularly unsettling in periods of exceptional insecurity.

Agencies and institutions external to the campus tend to discourage fundamental restructuring of education through requirements and processes of their own. For example, graduate schools influence undergraduate curricula through their admission requirements and course prerequisites, both generally determined by research-oriented scholars. Coordinating and planning agencies, many of them newly established, may constitute bureaucratic constraints difficult to overcome. Accrediting agencies reflecting "guild and establishment" sometimes tend to employ consultants and examiners not known for their inclination to take risks with the unknown or the experimental.

In view of these and other obstacles to change there is strong inclination to make minor adjustments in course requirements, create special innovative units that reach few students and have limited impact, or to embrace "fads" that give the illusion of reform while having little inherent merit or significance.

Given the resistance that institutions encounter in their efforts to remake themselves, funding constitutes an important facet of the affective impetus.

No longer can educational institutions anticipate the necessary massive infusion of money from private sources. The Council for Financial Aid to Education reported in 1971, for instance, that private gifts to American colleges and universities showed the first average annual decrease in more than a

decade. Total contributions from alumni, foundations, corporations, and other private sources were down \$20 million from the 1968-69 level. Foundation support declined by 8.2 percent. Alumni and corporate giving remained relatively steady while non-alumni gifts were down by 4.2 percent. Furthermore, private funds tend to be directed toward private institutions:

43.4% of all private support in 1969-70 went to 61 major private universities as did 49.2% of all foundation support of higher education.

72.4% of all private support went to private schools while 19.1% went to state institutions and 1.8% to junior colleges.

69.1% of all foundation support went to private institutions, while 22% went to state institutions and 0.5% went to junior colleges.<sup>2</sup>

Moreover, gifts from the private sector—individuals, foundations, and businesses—have traditionally been used not to restructure institutions but to expand and enrich existing collegiate programs, provide scholarships for students, endow professorial chairs, and construct buildings.

#### THE NEED FOR FEDERAL FUNDING

The federal government alone is in the position to undertake the task of funding educational reform to the extent and on the scale necessary to result in fundamental innovative change affecting millions of students. Not only is such a role a natural part of the federal concept, but there is a long record of distinguished precedents. In science, health, and agriculture, Washington has provided, through national foundations, institutes, or other instrumentalities, the kind of support level considered essential. In education, too, the federal government has played a major role. When there existed a national need for expanding facilities, educating returning servicemen, aiding needy students, or funding scientific research, Congress was expected to respond and aid.

Once again, as education faces its current crisis, Congress considers an educational funding package of vital and historic importance. The first component of this broad-gauged set of proposals provides for continued federal support for student aid. In recent years, the National Defense Student Loan of 1958, the 1964 College Work-Study Program, and the Higher Education Act of 1965 enabled thousands of students to obtain an education.

These programs, with appropriate revisions, need to be continued and expanded. Innovations designed to serve students—particularly those from disadvantaged backgrounds—have little value if such individuals are unable to meet rising costs of education.

A second part of the proposed package includes support for the on-going programs and operations of post-secondary institutions. While there are differences of opinion about the appropriate formulae for funding, the need for federal assistance to institutions has received strong endorsements. Without such aid some institutions may actually be forced to increase their tuition and fees, further limiting educational options for many students.

A third element in the federal education package is the proposed National Institute of Education (NIE). The fundamental objective of NIE will be the improvement of education through concerted and priority-conscious research and development. In addition to basic research, the NIE would be authorized to employ its resources to address specific problems in education.

There is little question concerning the need for research and development at all levels of education. Between 1950 and 1969 less than

<sup>1</sup> "Minnesota Metropolitan State College, Prospectus II" (November, 1971), pp. 33-35.

<sup>2</sup> *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (April 5, 1971), pp. 4-5.

one billion dollars were invested in R and D projects. Moreover, according to the Rand Report,<sup>3</sup> when education is compared with major industries it ranks thirteenth in expenditures for research and development.

#### THE NATIONAL FOUNDATION IN S. 659

What is contended in this paper is that a National Foundation for Innovation and Change in Post-Secondary Education would significantly enhance and balance a comprehensive federal approach to funding education. The kind of foundation proposed here, rather than competing in any way with other federally supported programs or agencies, would fulfill a need not met by existing programs. Such a foundation would provide the catalytic role in major institutional reform—not change for the sake of change nor the mere tinkering that frequently passes for innovation, but the implementation of desired fundamental, conceptual, or structural re-direction of an institution's growth and development.

Organizationally the proposed foundation, as presently designed in S. 659, includes the following:

A fifteen member Post-Secondary Education Board is to be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate, with a chairman designated by the President from among the appointed members.

The term of office of board members will be six years and each board member will be ineligible for reappointment for two years following the expiration of their sixth year.

The board will establish general policies for, and review the conduct of, the foundation, and will meet at least four times a year.

The board will also make annual reports to the President regarding foundation activities and the status of post-secondary education in the United States, including recommendations for reform.

The Foundation Director will be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate, and will serve at the pleasure of the President.

The Director will make available to the board information and assistance deemed necessary to enable the board to carry out its functions.

The foundation is also authorized to make grants to, and contracts with, institutions of higher education (and combinations of such institutions) and other public and private educational institutions and agencies to improve post-secondary educational opportunities in several broad areas.

#### SUGGESTED REVISIONS TO STRENGTHEN THE NATIONAL FOUNDATION

Leaving aside questions of detail and form, the authors of this paper respectfully suggest that the objectives of the foundation might be better served if the proposed model could be adapted to incorporate the following major additions and considerations.

Composition of the Foundation Board: The foundation should include representatives from the academic community, from business, the professions, the arts, labor, as well as from ethnic and racial minorities. Regional Advisory committees or boards under the National Foundation should reflect the same types of constituencies. This would greatly increase the likelihood that both academic and experiential points of view can be brought into the operations of the foundation. It should be emphasized that the people selected to serve in this capacity would comprise a working board and should not surrender their autonomy and their judgment to the staff created to serve them. Such regional boards could work

within the framework of general policies set by the National Foundation, but would have in addition the enormous advantage of local contact and local knowledge:

**Institutional Accountability in Place of Federal Guidelines:** An agency that sponsors innovation and change must, in its own organization, style, and leadership, reflect the spirit of the programs it supports. There is within the concept of the National Foundation opportunity for a new spirit of federalism. Customary requirements of narrow guidelines, bureaucratic procedures, and externally imposed restraints should be abandoned.

Most colleges and universities have already established their own institutional research and budget offices, committed to detailed reporting. Mechanisms of external consultation and of internal accountability also exist. Without threatening the independence of private sector institutions, certain minimal standards of accountability and consultation are not only defensible but essential.

**Funds to the Institution—not to the Department, Program, or Professor:** Funds awarded for innovative change should be granted to the president of the institution (and the consultative and decision-making process which he heads) with review by the governing board. In this manner funds allocated can have an impact upon the totality of institutional change. While technically grants have been made to institutions and their presidents, traditionally both federal and private fund sources have expected presidents to delegate responsibility for the grant to individuals or sub-systems within the institution. Frequently these funds have supported individual research projects, responding to "individual entrepreneurship" rather than to "institutional entrepreneurship."

While funding for research is indispensable for the discovery and sharing of new knowledge, such a pattern of support has often not served to meet either the needs for change delineated in this paper or the objectives of the foundation. More importantly, funds of this nature do little to affect the teaching-learning patterns for millions of students enrolled in undergraduate education. While some shifts have probably occurred during the last three years, statistics from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare indicate that, from the Office of Education, 52 institutions received 91% of the research and development project support distributed between 1963 and 1967. Black colleges received approximately .5% of these funds while junior and community colleges received only 2% of the monies. If institutional change is to be accomplished, both significantly and broadly, funding must go to the president of the institution as the chief corporate officer rather than to individual faculty members or departments.

**Review of Innovative Proposals:** In an effort to remove the "heavy hand" of federal guidelines and directives and in order to stimulate creative innovations at the level of the institution, it is suggested that the foundation provide block-types of grants in response to applications made by institutions through the office of their president.

In selecting proposals for funding and in making its awards, the foundation should consider the regional committee's comment and weigh the inherent merit of the proposal based upon such considerations as the imaginativeness of the design, evidence of movement through the consultative processes of the institution, and demonstrated awareness of applicable professional literature and research findings.

#### CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS: A NEEDED PERSPECTIVE

However promising the vision, however impressive the design, it would be presumptuous to suggest that the concept of the foundation offers simplistic solutions to the

complex problems facing post-secondary education; there are no panaceas in the realm of social engineering.

This paper has not attempted to address itself to the desirable or proper distribution of students within the post-secondary educational spectrum—vocational-technical schools, community colleges, state colleges, and universities, the private institutions or the public. We are confident that—short of Platonic wisdom—a diversity of effective options, more adequate funding, better planning, and good counseling offer the best immediate possibilities for reconciling the interests of those who seek learning for learning's sake with those who wish to apply their learning to the more immediate and practical concerns of career objectives.

Moreover, when this paper refers to accountability, program budgeting, and management information services such references should not be misconstrued as subordinating the values of learning to considerations of efficiency, productivity, and costs in a manner that fails to apprehend the multi-variate configuration of the educational enterprise.

To some, the terms of innovation and change have become code words or symbols for a blatant anti-intellectualism, thinly concealing outright hostility to the life of the mind and the dictates of conscience.

The notion of change and innovation as understood by the authors of this paper acknowledges the evolving quality of knowledge, the interdependence of man, the essential value of human diversity, and man's unending quest for intellectual, artistic, and moral self-realization. That higher education, despite its enormous accomplishments, faces serious problems in meeting such challenges in the next decade or two cannot be doubted.

No foundation support, whether it be public or private, can ever guarantee that America's post-secondary institution will in fact make the adaptations that need to be made. At best, funds for innovation and change can only offer these institutions the possibilities for greater service to man and to the nation.

Indeed, more important than the survival of particular educational institutions or the continued application of particular ways of doing education is the important realization that our colleges and universities are not ends in themselves.

Still, in an era of competing priorities and of sharpened competition for scarce resources, education continues to represent this nation's most promising hope for a better quality of life and for a renewed commitment to human brotherhood at home and abroad.

With the assistance of a national foundation, American post-secondary education can proceed with greater confidence to help rebuild the nation by helping new generations and new types of students discover ever-widening dimensions of skills and of competence, of realities and of abstractions, of beauty and of intellect, of compassion and of courage.

Ashby, Eric. *Any Person, Any Study: An Essay on American Higher Education*, The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1971).

"Assembly Lists 85 Theses to Stimulate Academic Reforms," Report of the Assembly on University Goals and Governance, *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, Vol. V, no. 15 (January 18, 1971).

Berg, Ivar E. *Education and Jobs: The Great Training Robbery* (Praeger Publishers, New York, 1970).

Bowen, William G. *The Economics of the Major Private Universities*, The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1968).

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. *A Chance to Learn: An Action Agenda for*

<sup>3</sup> Rand Corporation, *National Institute of Education: Preliminary Plan for the Proposed Institute* (Rand Corporation: Santa Monica, California, 1971), p. 5.

*Equal Opportunity in Higher Education* (McGraw-Hill, New York, March 1970).

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. *Less Time, More Options: Education Beyond the High School* (McGraw-Hill, New York, December 1970).

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. *New Students and New Places: Policies for the Future Growth and Development of Higher Education* (McGraw-Hill, New York, October 1971).

Cheit, Earl F. *The New Depression in Higher Education: A Study of Financial Conditions at 41 Colleges and Universities*, The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1970).

Chickering, Arthur W. *Education and Identity* (Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, 1969).

Cohen, Audrey C. *College For Human Services: A New Concept in Professional Higher Education for Low-Income Adults* (College for Human Services, New York, 1971).

Cohen, Audrey C. *Women and Higher Education: Recommendation for Change* (College for Human Services, New York, August 1970).

Crowl, John A. "100 Institutions Facing Financial Disaster," *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, Vol. VI, no. 1 (September 27, 1971).

Dunham, E. Alden. *Colleges of the Forgotten Americans: A Profile of State Colleges and Regional Universities*, The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1969).

*Education Beyond High School: The Regents Planning Bulletin*. Regents of the University of the State of New York (The State Education Department, Albany, April 1971).

*Educational Research and Development in the United States*, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, Hendrick D. Gideonse, Bureau of Research (U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1969).

Erickson, Eric. *Identity, Youth and Crisis* (Norton, New York, 1968).

Eurich, Alvin C. *Campus 1980, The Shape of the Future in Higher Education* (Academy for Educational Development, New York, 1968).

Eurich, Alvin C., Lucien B. Kinney and Sidney G. Tickton. *The Expansion of Graduate and Professional Education During the Period 1966 to 1980* (The Academy for Educational Development, April 1969).

*Federal Support to Universities and Colleges, Fiscal Years 1963-1966*, Office of Science and Technology, National Science Foundation (U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., December 1968).

Feldman, Kenneth A., and Theodore M. Newcomb. *The Impact of College on Students* (2 vols.) (Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, 1970).

Ferrin, Richard I. *A Decade of Change in Free-Access Higher Education* (College Entrance Examination Board, New York, 1971).

Folger, John K., Helen S. Astin and Alan E. Bayer. *Human Resources and Higher Education: Staff Report of the Commission on Human Resources and Advanced Education* (Russell Sage Foundation, New York, 1970).

"Full Text of Carnegie Commission's Report on Federal Aid," *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, Vol VI, no. 12 (December 13, 1971).

Gaff, Jerry G., and associates. *The Cluster College* (Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, 1970).

Harclerod, Fred F., H. Bradley Sagen and E. Theodore Molen, Jr., *The Developing State Colleges and Universities: Historical Background, Current Status, and Future Plans* (American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Washington, D.C., October 1969).

Harvey, James. *Reforming Undergraduate Curriculum: Problems and Proposals*, Report 4 (Eric Clearinghouse on Higher Education, Washington, D.C., March 1971).

Hodgkinson, Harold L. *Institutions in Transition: A Profile of Change in Higher*

*Education*, The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1971).

Jacobson, Robert L. "Gifts to Colleges Dip, First Time in Ten Years," *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, Vol. V, No. 26 (April 5, 1971).

Jaffe, A. J., Walter Adams and Sandro G. Meyers. *Negro Higher Education in the 60's* (Praeger, New York, 1968).

Jencks, Christopher, and David Riesman. *The Academic Revolution* (Garden City, N.Y., 1969).

Katz, Joseph, Harold A. Korn, Carole A. Leland and Max M. Levin. *Class, Character, and Career: Determinants of Occupational Choice in College Students* (Institute for the Study of Human Problems, Stanford, California, April 1969).

Keniston, Kenneth. *The Uncommitted: Alienated Youth in American Society* (Delta, New York, 1966).

*Manpower Report of the President: A Report on Manpower Requirements, Resources, Utilization and Training*, Department of Labor (U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., March 1970).

Medsker, Leland L. and Dale Tillery. *Breaking the Access Barrier: A Profile of the Two-Year Colleges*, The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1971).

*Minority Student Access to Higher Education, Ford Foundation* (New York, September 1970).

Mitau, G. Theodore. "New Career Curricula for the 1970's: A Challenge to America's State Colleges and Universities," Speech given at 1971 National Conference of American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Washington, D.C., (October 11-13, 1971).

*New Dimensions for the Learner: A First Look at the Prospects for Non-Traditional Study*, Report of the Commission on Non-Traditional Study, Samuel B. Gould, Chairman (New York, 1971).

Panos, Robert J., and Alexander W. Astin. "Attrition Among College Students," *American Educational Research Journal*, Vol. 5, no. 1 (January 1968).

*Priorities in Higher Education*, Report of the President's Task Force on Higher Education (Hester Commission) (U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., August 1970).

Rand Corporation. *National Institute of Education: Preliminary Plan for the Proposed Institute* (Rand Corporation, Santa Monica, California, February 1971).

*Report of the President's Commission on Campus Unrest* (Scranton Commission), no. 277 (Commerce Clearing House, Inc., Washington, D.C., September 29, 1970).

Sanford, Nevitt. *Where Colleges Fail* (Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, 1967).

Silberman, Charles S. *Crisis in the Classroom: The Remaking of American Education* (Random House, New York, 1970).

Spurr, Stephen H. *Academic Degree Structures: Innovative Approaches: Principles of Reform in Degree Structures in the United States*, The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1970).

Sweet, David E., and Douglas R. Moore. "Minnesota Metropolitan State College: Prospectus II" (unpublished planning document), St. Paul, November 1971.

Task Force on Higher Education, *Report on Higher Education* (Newman Report), Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education (U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1971).

Taylor, Harold. *Students Without Teachers: The Cases in the University* (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1969).

Trent, James W., and Leland L. Medsker. *Beyond High School* (Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, 1968).

U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. *Occupational Manpower and Training*, Bulletin 1701

(U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1971).

U.S. 92nd Congress, 1st Session, House Committee on Education and Labor, Select Subcommittee on Education, *To Establish a National Institute of Education*, Hearings on H.R. 33, H.R.3606 and other related bills (U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1971).

U.S. 92nd Congress, 1st Session, House Committee on Education and Labor, Special Subcommittee on Education, *Higher Education Amendments of 1971*, Hearings on H.R. 32, H.R. 5191, H.R. 5192, H.R. 5193, and H.R. 7248, bills to amend and extend the Higher Education Act of 1965 and other acts dealing with higher education (U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1971).

U.S. 92nd Congress, 1st Session, Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, *Education Amendments of 1971*, Report on S659, To amend the Higher Education Act of 1965, the Vocational Education Act of 1963 and related acts, and for other purposes (U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1971).

U.S. 92nd Congress, 1st Session, Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Subcommittee on Education, *Education Amendments of 1971*, Hearings on S. 659, To amend the Higher Education Act of 1965, the Vocational Education Act of 1968, and related acts, and for other purposes (U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1971).

Willingham, Warren W. *Free-Access Higher Education* (College Entrance Examination Board, New York, 1970).

Wirtz, Willard. "Ugly Idealism in Education," Speech given at 1971 National Conference of American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Washington, D.C., October 11-13, 1971.

#### JACK DOLPH'S REVENGE

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, recent press reports have indicated that Mr. Jack Dolph, commissioner of the American Basketball Association, is going to allow his teams to raid college campuses and sign student athletes to play professional basketball. Mr. Dolph blames his activities on the failure of Congress to comply immediately with his request for an antitrust exemption for professional basketball. Of course, Mr. Dolph's idea is that all college coaches will bring pressure to bear on Congress to allow the leagues to merge. In short, it's blackmail.

The idea that Congress should jump every time an owner of a professional sports team whistles is nothing new. I can remember very vividly the cries which resulted in the spectacle of the football merger bill with its monopoly benefits and undemocratic restrictions on players.

While Mr. Dolph's loud protestations are an obvious attempt to blackmail Congress, I hope the people of this country and their Representatives turn the tables on him. I hope the people of this country will agree with my strongly held belief that as soon as a boy is professionally qualified to play basketball, in college or not, he should be allowed to play professionally for money. Coach McGuire of the Marquette team summed up my convictions on this matter very well when he said, in substance, that he could not recommend to his players that they finish college before playing professional ball. He said he had had a hard look into the "cupboards" of many of his boys and