

ED 027 848

HE 000 687

By- Archie, William C.

Foundations and Higher Education: Innovation and Redirection.

American Association for Higher Education, Washington, D.C.

Pub Date 3 Mar 69

Note-5p.; Paper presented at the American Association for Higher Education's 24th National Conference on Higher Education, Chicago, Ill., Mar 2-5, 1969.

EDRS Price MF-\$0.25 HC-\$0.35

Descriptors-\*Cooperative Planning, \*Foundation Programs, \*Higher Education, \*Innovation, Social Responsibility

Change and innovation are needed in every aspect of life, and education is no exception. Foundations have done a great deal over the last hundred years for higher education. In 1966-1967, as in other years the largest share of private support for public higher education came from foundation grants. Private philanthropy has also aided immeasurably in the creation of Negro higher education as well as higher education for women. However, it is the institutions and not the foundations that must come up with innovative ideas. Foundations are very interested in innovations, though many continue to support tired and weary projects. It is necessary for foundations and educators to get together to exchange ideas for the edification of both parties. Educational institutions through consortia or other means are increasingly trying to work cooperatively to provide a better education for an area region or state. It might be useful for the foundations to get together with a consortium, or consortia to benefit from the thinking of a wide group of educators who have been working together for some time. Though it is important to involve the students, it is essential to involve the faculty in real life situations. Foundations should insist that the programs they support are relevant to the needs of society, which means that they are relevant to the students. (AM)

Section 9  
Monday Morning, March 3

FOUNDATIONS AND HIGHER EDUCATION: INNOVATION AND REDIRECTION\*

William C. Archie  
Executive Director  
Mary Reynolds Babcock Foundation  
Winston-Salem, North Carolina

Nearly everybody who thinks at all is agreed that we are living in a world of rapid and continuing change: A techno-computer and ever-increasing cybernetic age. We also appear to be overwhelmed and in our frustration, we clamor for change. Why?

The answer could be as long as one would care to make it, or as short as this sentence: The world and every nation within it are in a grand mess, and we got that way by doing what we have been doing for the last hundred years or more. Nations are angry with nations; people angry with people; unrest and riot characterize many of our inner cities and many of our collegiate campuses. In short, we seem to be going to hell in a hurry. Even though that is surely an oversimplification, is it not self-evident that we must find some new ways of doing things and perhaps we had better do some things that we have never previously done at all. It would not be easy to separate "brand new" things from new ways of doing things.

Specifically, isn't it clear that we must seek desired and needed change, new directions in a thousand ways if we are to improve the lot of man; i.e., the human condition.

On all sides, innovation is needed to lessen the tension among nations, among people. Competent and compassionate people of great imagination are needed to find ways of feeding the world, of controlling population, of controlling inflation, of reducing armaments and reducing wars. And, in this audience, perhaps most would agree that education must change. It is changing, of course, but not at nearly enough places and not fast enough.

The role of the innovator is crucial, but it is not often that the innovator, without many allies, can bring off a redirection. Politics and education are inseparable, in public institutions particularly, but in private institutions also.

And if change is to become actuality, we must sooner or later get down to particulars: what do we want to change and why? Clearly, the big things that need to be changed are related to the problems of racial tension, world tensions, over-population, food supply, and war. In short, it seems to me that the big problems are all related to man, and his failure to deal effectively with other men. Jean Paul Sartre has put it pretty well, if cynically, when he said that "hell is other people."

\*Paper presented to Section 9 on "How can higher education and private foundations more fruitfully combine efforts to provide needed innovations and redirections?" at the 24th National Conference on Higher Education, sponsored by the American Association for Higher Education, Chicago, Monday morning, March 3. Permission to quote restricted

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE  
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Monday Morning, March 3

Please think of these few paragraphs as a completely unsatisfactory introduction to the problem of change and to the more specific question to which I was asked to address myself: "How can Foundations and Institutions of Higher Education combine their efforts to be more fruitful in bringing about innovations and redirection?"

There are many answers no doubt to this question and I have no illusion that I shall be giving you the "gospel". Happily, before trying to write down these scattered thoughts, I did ask six of America's most thoughtful educators to tell me briefly and spontaneously how they thought Foundations and educational institutions could work together more effectively. I am grateful to these people. I shall not quote them here, but they deserve a lot of credit or blame for what is said. The first thing that must be noted is that Foundations, or private philanthropy, have done a great deal over the last hundred years for higher education. For example, I'm sure you need not be told that in 1966-67, as in other recent years, the largest share of private support for public higher education came from foundation grants.<sup>1</sup> More dramatically, private philanthropy hastened the day in two segments of higher education that surely would not have come as early without philanthropic help.<sup>2</sup> Professors Curti and Nash in their book published by the Rutgers University Press (1965), after considerable documentation, had this to say:

"The creation of Negro higher education was an example of the way in which philanthropic dollars and new ideas worked together to produce innovation. As in the education in the case of women, philanthropy implemented democracy by enlarging the opportunities of social groups previously excluded from the campus. For the Negro, a college education opened an avenue for success and respectability, but it was especially significant as an opportunity for him to demonstrate that his capabilities, and consequently his rights, were no different than those of other Americans."

To those of you who would like to know more about how philanthropy has been effective in the shaping of American higher education to 1965, I commend to you this book. History, of course, is not our topic here today. Let us turn rather to today and tomorrow and talk about how Foundations and educational institutions can be more fruitful by combining their efforts in perhaps new ways.

The shortest answer to this question (and maybe the best) is the following: It is surely the responsibility of the Foundations to make it abundantly clear through annual reports and in other ways that they will be receptive to and will support innovative ideas; and it is clearly the responsibility of the educational institutions to present to the Foundations their innovative ideas. And, although there will be exceptions, it must be noted that it will be the educational institutions that will come up with the ideas and not Foundations.

Otherwise said: Foundations should "accept education on its own terms," in other words, the Foundation should look to the educators themselves to assert the

<sup>1</sup>Study of Voluntary Support for Public Higher Education, P.5

<sup>2</sup>Curti and Nash: Philanthropy in the Shaping of American Higher Education, Rutgers, 1965, p.185.

Section 9  
Monday Morning, March 3

-3-

conditions under which innovative education will flourish at their institutions. Foundations are listeners. They are not reformers, but they are catalysts; not backers but limited participants. They are not critics, but communicants. Foundations, of course, can be suggestive and provocative and some of them have been, particularly those Foundations which have sufficiently large and competent staffs (of sufficient curiosity) to become aware of the best institutions of higher education in this country. Such Foundations achieve an overview of what is going on in the world of higher education more clearly, perhaps, than could any one educational institution. Even so, my experience in higher education and in Foundation work, which now covers an effective working period of at least twenty-five years, indicates that what I have learned about the two institutions are true and correct. Foundations in their annual reports, and in other publications, to a far greater degree than is true now, should make very clear to educational institutions that the Foundation is indeed interested in innovative ideas in higher education and not only interested in them, but will always welcome a good idea, will consider it seriously, and will indeed negotiate with the institution toward the possible end of support. It is a sad fact that many Foundations say that they are interested in innovation, but continue to support tired and weary things. What is worse came out last week in Alan Pifer's testimony before a Congressional Committee. Mr. Pifer (President of the Carnegie Corporation) reported that of the 249 Foundations worth ten million or more, only about one-third publish annual or biennial reports. This is inexcusable.

Perhaps this is the time to say that in the Foundation world, and perhaps in the educational world, we shall have difficulty in defining an innovation. What is an innovation, and how is it innovative? What is the difference between an innovation which offers a reasonable opportunity for sound investment, and the innovation which merely offers an opportunity for high risk investment of doubtful lasting value? Such questions will cause us all trouble, but we must struggle with them and not give up merely because we will have difficulty in arriving at satisfactory answers.

One of the better ideas that came from my brief survey was that Foundations and educators need to get together more frequently for an exchange of ideas than is now the case. There is, of course, no dearth of talk between Foundation representatives and educators. All over the country and particularly in New York City, there is a stream of educators of one kind or another, plying back and forth between their campuses to the Foundations in New York, particularly the top half dozen. What does not happen often enough, I suspect, is that Foundation trustees and professional workers do not get together with a group of educators for the sole purpose of exchanging ideas and for the education of both parties. Such meetings would not only make it clearer to both sides what the other's interests are, but it would surely save a lot of time, both for the Foundations and for the educators.

It would also help if the educators would read Foundation annual reports. And may I cite one little example: In 1967 the annual report of the Mary Reynolds Babcock Foundation spoke forthrightly to two points: (1) The Directors of the Foundation had declared a moratorium on brick and mortar grants primarily because the Directors felt that the Foundation could not be creative, with its limited funds, by distributing modest grants of \$10,000 to \$20,000 around the country to build this or to build that. (2) In the same report, it was made clear that the Foundation was finding it increasingly difficult to deal with requests for assistance in individual community efforts: libraries, hospitals, allied arts councils, child day-care centers, and so on and so on.

Monday Morning, March 3

Despite these two clearly stated prohibitions, the Foundation continues to receive week after week, and sometimes day after day, requests for brick and mortar and for individual community efforts. Clearly, the people who wrote the proposals had not read our annual report. We distribute automatically about five hundred copies of the report, and have never turned down a request. Even so, the fact that people do not read reports probably reflects poor or non-existent development staffs rather than unconcern.

Foundations do occasionally get together, particularly an elite group which meets in New York probably once a month or so. There are no doubt sporadic efforts here and there on the part of Foundations to get together, but generally Foundations do not meet together, either to understand more clearly what the real needs are, or to encourage a greater responsiveness on the part of educational institutions to the need for change.

Educational institutions, on the other hand, are getting together more and more. I do not know how many consortia there are across the country involving multiple institutions trying to work together cooperatively to provide a better education for a state, an area or region. This suggests perhaps that one of the finest things that Foundations can do would be to get together with a consortium or with consortia from time to time to benefit from the thinking of a wide group of educators who have been working together for some time.

One of the new movements in higher education, of course, comes as a result of trying to become more relevant and this new movement is expressed in an increasing and growing number of efforts here and there called by different names which will get students into the cities or into real life situations which will aid in defining a vocation for the student, while exposing him to the realities of life. Nothing seems more irrelevant to me than to think that students can continue to live as they did twenty-five or forty years ago in splendid isolation, although they may actually reside within the city limits or within a stone's throw of metropolitan areas of 250,000 and up. I am not at all proud to tell you that I went to a school located about twenty miles from a metropolitan center of a couple hundred thousand people, and that for four years, my response to the city was negligible and such response as there was was one hundred percent social: that is, dances, basketball games, girls, et cetera. I think we can no longer afford this kind of luxury and more and more educational institutions believe it. One of my respondents suggested that if it is important to get the students into real life situations, it may be even more important to get more faculty into real life situations. A handful of academic personnel across the country, particularly from the larger and wealthier institutions, and particularly in the areas of science and social science, have been maybe excessively in the marketplace. For the most part however, ninety-five percent or more of our academic people still regard the academic community as their own little world and appear to have no desire to go beyond it. May I say that as far as the Foundation I represent is concerned, it has been my experience that the way we try to stay alive in innovative ways is to stay related to those "innovative" institutions across the country. There are a handful or more of such institutions which historically and traditionally have sparked new ideas and provided many opportunities for innovation. I can think of no institution which has done this better than Antioch, and it could be that Antioch has overdone it.

Section 9

-5-

Monday Morning, March 3

To summarize briefly: It is the Foundation's responsibility to state clearly its policy with respect to innovation, and that educational institutions should come up with the ideas. Educational institutions should find new ways of attracting the interest of a Foundation. Precious few Foundations to my knowledge get very excited any more about putting up a building whether it be a library or steam plant. Requests for funds to increase the book stock or to add to the library, as important as these things are, do not arouse a great deal of interest. Foundation trustees easily tire of engaging in the problems of yesteryear. It seems to me that nearly all Foundations are now seeking to support those things which will indeed lead to some kind of effective change. This makes it hard on everybody, but nobody ever said it would be easy.

Finally, Foundations should insist that the programs they support are relevant to the needs of society, which means of course that they are relevant to the needs of the students. In my view every grant to education, as to other things, should be measured by its avowed purpose to make education more relevant, and thus to improve the human condition. The students are clamoring for it, in short raising hell for it; some faculty are clamoring for greater relevance; and even some presidents are. But not nearly enough.