

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 037 170

HE 001 391

TITLE Recommendations for National Action Affecting Higher Education. A Joint Statement.

INSTITUTION American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Washington, D.C.; National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, Washington, D.C.

PUB DATE Jan 70

NOTE 15p.

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-\$0.25 HC-\$0.85

DESCRIPTORS *Federal Aid, *Federal Programs, *Higher Education, Institutional Role, *Policy, Social Responsibility, State Colleges, *State Universities

ABSTRACT

At their annual meetings in November 1969, the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges and the American Association of State Colleges and Universities adopted a "Statement of Policy Positions." Their recommendations call for: immediate funding of, first, existing federal programs providing institutional aid, then enactment of new programs; tax credit and student-loan indenture proposals; campus, rather than federal, responsibility for minimizing disruption; support for public policies against discrimination in use of public funds for educational purposes; strong opposition to a ceiling on indirect costs of federally sponsored activities and to mandatory cost sharing; full funding and expansion of the grant program and the direct loan program for academic facilities and housing; expansion of international programs; university involvement in solving social and environmental problems; support for federal-state-university cooperation and federal payment for the ROTC program. (AF)

ED037170

A Joint Statement

THIS STATEMENT OF POLICY
POSITIONS CONCERNING

*Recommendations
for National Action
affecting
Higher Education*

WAS ADOPTED BY
THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE
UNIVERSITIES AND LAND-GRANT COLLEGES
AND
THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE
COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

IN SESSIONS HELD DURING

NOVEMBER 1969

IN CHICAGO, ILL., AND
ATLANTA, GA.

January 1970

A Note On "Federal Aid"

The term "Federal aid" is commonly used, and is used in this document, as a general term covering all the multiplicity of purposes for which Federal funds flow to institutions of higher education or those attending them. The reader should keep in mind, however, that the term "Federal aid" is inaccurate and misleading as applied to many of these programs. Where the Federal Government, in fulfillment of a clearly defined and asserted national responsibility, uses the services, facilities and personnel of colleges and universities to accomplish this purpose, the term "Federal aid" is not applicable. Indeed when the payment for this use is inadequate to cover its cost, as it frequently is, colleges and universities are supplying fiscal aid to the national government rather than the reverse. Colleges and universities have a responsibility for the national welfare which exceeds that of most other institutions in our society, and on which they are uniquely able to discharge. Willingness to give whole-hearted cooperation in programs of national importance should not, however, obscure the fact that the flow of "aid," both in terms of accomplishment and in fiscal terms, is a two-way flow. Cooperation in the national interest is a better word for it.

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.

HE 001 391

THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION
OF
STATE UNIVERSITIES
AND
LAND-GRANT COLLEGES

consists of 114 public and land-grant universities and colleges located in each of the 50 states, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia. Together, these institutions grant more than one-fourth of all the doctoral degrees awarded by American institutions of higher education.

Founded in 1887, the Association is the oldest organization of institutions of higher education in this country. It is a completely independent organization that determines its own policies and procedures by action of delegates representing all member institutions in annual convention.

Officers

Chairman of the Executive Committee

President Fred H. Harrington
University of Wisconsin, Madison

President of the Association

President Richard A. Harvill
University of Arizona, Tucson

President-Elect of the Association

President Wilson H. Elkins
University of Maryland, College Park

Executive Director of the Association

Ralph K. Huitt
National Center for Higher Education
One DuPont Circle, N.W.,
Suite 710
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 293-7120

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF
STATE COLLEGES
AND UNIVERSITIES

consists of 268 institutions and 16 statewide systems of state colleges located in 45 states, the District of Columbia, Guam, and the Virgin Islands.

Approximately 1.6 million students—or over one out of five college students in the United States—attend the type of institution represented by the Association. These institutions are the fastest growing degree-granting institutions in the nation.

The membership includes comprehensive state colleges and regional state universities which have developed from single-purpose teachers colleges, newly-established institutions, technological institutions, and former municipal universities and junior colleges which have become state institutions.

Officers

President of the Association

President Hilton C. Buley
Southern Connecticut State College
New Haven, Connecticut

President-Elect of the Association

President Darrell Holmes
Colorado State College
Greeley, Colorado

Treasurer of the Association

President William B. Langsdorf
California State College
at Fullerton
Fullerton, California

*Executive Director and Secretary
of the Association*

Allan W. Ostar
National Center for Higher Education
One DuPont Circle, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 293-7070

CONTENTS

	Page
I. Needed: Not More Studies But Action	1
II. Institutional Grants Program	4
III. Aid to Individuals in Obtaining Post-High-School Education	5
(A) Tax Credit for Tuition and Fees	6
(B) Student Loan Indenture Proposal (Educational Opportunity Bank)	7
IV. Responsibility for Minimizing Disruption in a Time of Institutional and Societal Change ...	10
V. Discrimination in the Use of Public Funds for Educational Purposes	13
VI. Indirect Costs of Federally Sponsored Activities	13
VII. Mandatory Cost Sharing	14
VIII. Academic Facilities, Housing	14
(A) Academic Facilities	14
(B) College Housing and Related Facilities ..	14
IX. International Programs	15
X. Improving Conditions of Urban and Rural Life	16
XI. Natural Resources and Environment	16
XII. Research and Extension on Agriculture and Related Fields	17
XIII. Extending the Resources of Higher Education	17
XIV. Establishment of New Federal Degree-Granting Authority and Institutions	18
XV. Intergovernmental Cooperation: Unique Character of Higher Education	19
XVI. Officer Education Programs	19
XVII. Selective Services	21
XVIII. Conclusions	21

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR NATIONAL ACTION AFFECTING HIGHER EDUCATION

I. *NEEDED: NOT MORE STUDIES BUT ACTION.*

The needs and future of higher education have been subject to analysis in recent years and months as never before. The process continues. Study after study, recommendation after recommendation, task force report upon task force report follow each other in confusing multiplicity.

But the times call for action.

The nation's economically, ethnically, and culturally disadvantaged are properly calling for an end to discussion about making equal access to post-high school educational opportunity available to all who seek and can benefit from it.

The problems of urban and rural poverty and blight demand attention, as do those of air and water and other environmental pollution.

The needs of the people call for a great expansion of the numbers of trained personnel in the whole range of the health professions, and for continued advances in research and in making the results of research available in practice.

Adults not in position to become full-time students are eager to improve their knowledge, both for cultural and vocational purposes.

Costs of attending college spiral as institutions, caught between rising costs, spurred by inflation on the one hand and inadequate private, state, and local support on the other, find no solution available except to increase their charges to students.

The need and demand for education to promote international understanding is greater than ever before, but the International Education Act remains unfunded. Inadequate funds for technical assistance in developing the human resources of developing countries have been further reduced.

There is general agreement among all those who have studied the problems of providing genuine equality of educational opportunity and of making the unique resources of higher education available for solution of the urgent problems of our times, that the Federal government must play a larger role in the financing of education at all levels.

The need is for a balanced program of federal assistance which will encourage the increase, rather than decrease, of non-Federal resources available from public and private sources. A balanced pro-

gram involves specific aid to disadvantaged students in the form of grants, work-study programs, low-interest loans, and special assistance of various kinds. It involves Federal aid for higher education facilities, for fellowships, for support of professional schools (particularly in the health professions). It involves expanded support for research, for adult education and community services, for developing colleges, and for institutional support for colleges and universities to keep down their spiraling charges to students.

With the exception of a program of general institutional support, the framework for providing all these essential forms of aid already is on the statute books, though it may need revision, consolidation, and rationalization.

The *primary problem*, except for badly needed institutional support, is one of *funding*—not more studies, task forces, committee reports, and the raising of expectations the lack of fulfillment of which leads to disillusionment with the capacity of our democratic society to respond through orderly processes of government.

The following will illustrate some of the funding gaps in programs duly authorized by Congress after careful consideration by committees having jurisdiction:

Higher Education Facilities Grants. Annual authorization in excess of \$900 millions, including \$50 million for graduate facilities. Funding: \$33 million for degree-granting institutions and private junior colleges (with 75 per cent of all enrollments) and \$43 million for public two-year colleges; nothing for graduate facilities.

Educational Opportunity Grants. This program, designed to give genuine educational opportunity to those most economically disadvantaged, was funded at a level to permit fewer than 100,000 *new* grants. At a minimum, 200,000 could be effectively used.

National Defense Student Loan Fund. Authorization, \$375 million. Funded at \$229 million, but full appropriated funds not released for use.

National Defense Education Act, College Teacher Fellowships. Authorized: 7,500 new fellowships annually. Funded to provide 3,000; a reduction of 50 per cent from earlier appropriated levels.

Community Service and Continuing Education

Act. This act was intended to be the major vehicle for enlisting the resources of colleges and universities in solving urgent community problems, and providing opportunity for further education for adult citizens. Authorization, \$50 million. Funding, \$9.5 million.

College Housing Loan Program. Present authorization for *direct loans: in excess* of \$1 billion. Amount authorized to be released during current fiscal year for direct loans; about \$60 million, supplemented by about \$240 million in interest subsidies on private-market loans.

International Education Act. Authorized, by overwhelming majorities in both Houses of Congress, \$90 million annually. Appropriations to date: zero.

Aid to Developing Colleges. Authorized, \$50 million. Appropriations: \$30 million.

The above are but examples. The situation is similar with respect to a wide range of other programs.

The conclusions are clear.

Except for Federal assistance to keep down mounting charges to students which are increasingly pricing higher education out of reach of more and more students and their families, ample legislative authority exists to make a major advance.

The first priority is to fund existing programs.

The first priority among new programs is to provide institutional support for colleges and universities so they can provide quality education for all who can benefit from it at reasonable charges to students.

The National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges and the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, who join in this statement, have proposed specific legislation to this end, (the Miller-Daddario Bill) which is now before the Congress. It enjoys the support of the Association of American Colleges, whose membership includes virtually all the nation's private colleges. It has the support of the Association of American Universities, including the nation's leading graduate and research universities, public and private. Other major national organizations have endorsed the principle of institutional support.

Such a program is badly needed not only to keep

down rising charges, but also to correct the imbalance between emphasis on research and instruction created by past Federal concentration on research.

The country is increasingly bewildered by the flood of studies, proposals, and re-proposals being put forward. Some of these are excellent, some mere nostrums and panaceas. The proliferation of new proposals while major gaps exist between promise and performance in existing programs is a major factor in the disillusionment and disaffection of many of our young people.

The path to great achievement in social, cultural, and economic advance is well marked. It is the education of all Americans to their highest potential and the fullest use of the special resources of our colleges and universities in research and public service.

The times call for action.

II. INSTITUTIONAL GRANTS PROGRAM.

As we noted, the greatest unmet need in Federal support for higher education is an *institutional* support program through which flexible, predictable funds are made available to colleges and universities on a continuing basis. These Associations urge that such a program is vital to the welfare of the nation and is needed *now*. Further, we believe that the institutional grants program should be initiated in the natural and social sciences where there already exists a solid base of experience in relations between the Federal agencies and the academic community.

We are mindful of the need for institutional grants in the arts and the humanities, as well as in the natural and social sciences. However, the long experience with programs in the sciences and wide acceptance of Federal participation in them, together with the existence of a substantial and experienced administrative staff in the National Science Foundation, suggests that new and comprehensive institutional support may best be started in those fields.

More nearly adequate funding should be provided immediately for project grants in the arts and humanities. We believe such grants can be of special benefit to the culturally and economically disadvantaged. After a period of experience with expanded project grants through the National Foundation for the Arts and the Humanities, these disciplines might then be included in a formula for general institutional support.

Bills for the establishment of a National Institu-

tional Grants Program have been introduced in both the Senate and the House of Representatives, and H.R. 11542 has been overwhelmingly approved by the House Committee on Science and Astronautics after extensive hearings spanning two sessions of the Congress in which the principle of institutional support was strongly endorsed by almost all witnesses. The bill, as refined through public debate, is admirably suited for the initiation of this urgently needed program. We commend Representatives George P. Miller, Emilio Q. Daddario, and others for their sponsorship of this proposal, and strongly urge its early passage in the House and its serious and early consideration in the Senate.

III. AID TO INDIVIDUALS IN OBTAINING POST-HIGH-SCHOOL EDUCATION.

As indicated above, these Associations believe that a balanced program of assuring access to post-high-school educational opportunity includes support to institutions to keep charges to students down, combined with direct aid to individuals facing particular economic, ethnic, or cultural disadvantages. The Congress has established a substantial and varied program of aid, including Economic Opportunity Grants, N.D.E.A. loans, work-study programs, and support of special services to disadvantaged students. It also includes pre-college assistance and encouragement, as exemplified by the Upward Bound, Talent Search, and other programs. Special aid to developing colleges also involves particular attention and support to institutions which serve a high percentage of disadvantaged students. The Guaranteed Student Loan Program falls into a slightly different category, as it is designed to ease the burden on middle-income families caused by increases in college charges substantially in excess of the increases in real income and those attributable to inflation. It serves a useful purpose, though the necessity for it will be diminished if measures to increase public support and encourage private voluntary support are taken to keep down charges to students.

These Associations supported the enactment and urge the full implementation of all the above programs. One hundred per cent Federal financing should be provided for the N.D.E.A. Student Loan Program, in order that needy students may not suffer from institutional incapacity to find matching money.

The Associations, however, **STRONGLY**

OPPOSE two proposals which have been widely advocated under the rubric of student aid. They are discussed below:

TAX-CREDIT AND STUDENT-LOAN INDENTURE PROPOSALS

Proposals for a direct deduction from income taxes owed the Federal government because of tuition and required fees paid colleges and universities have attracted substantial support because of several assumptions, all incorrect.

More recently, widespread publicity has been given a proposal to solve the fiscal problems of higher education by a sharp increase in charges to students coupled with the privilege of borrowing from the Federal government the increasingly substantial sums required, with repayment by the borrower in the form of a special added income tax over 30 to 40 years. Both these proposals are unsound from the standpoint of public policy, educational policy, and fiscal policy. They are discussed separately below:

(A) *Tax Credit for Tuition and Fees*

Three assumptions, the first two contradictory and the third untrue, are made in advancing such proposals:

The first is that they will provide relief to hard-pressed parents. A second is that they provide a way around the problems related to direct Federal aid to non-public institutions and would, therefore, provide a substantial flow of Federal tax dollars to these and other institutions. A third is that they are so devised as to limit sharply or eliminate aid to the most affluent and to give the greatest aid to those in lower income brackets (though admittedly none at all to those who pay no income tax). The first two assumptions are obviously contradictory. If institutions raise fees to collect tax dollars, parents will get no relief. If parents get substantial relief, institutions will not be aided.

The third assumption is untrue. Despite limitations on benefits in terms of gross taxable income, the most recent version of this proposal advanced before Congress allows families with taxable incomes of up to \$25,000 to receive full benefits, and those with incomes substantially in excess of this amount to receive some benefits. Those with capital-gain incomes well in excess of the stated limitation would, of course, receive special treatment, while those with incomes chiefly from

tax-exempt sources would benefit without limitation as to total, as compared to taxable, income.

While percentage benefits are theoretically higher for lower-income families, actual dollar benefits steadily diminish at the lower end of the income scale, and vanish entirely for those who pay little or no taxable income but nevertheless sacrifice heavily for their children's future, in terms of income paid out and loss of family earnings. Indeed, this proposal has been correctly described as an "upside down scholarship."

These Associations view the tax-credit proposal as inequitable from every standpoint and unsound from that of fiscal policy, educational policy, and national policy in general. The Treasury Department, whose estimates on first-year cost of such a proposal are in the neighborhood of \$2 billion annually, has ably stated the objections from the standpoint of national fiscal policy, as has the distinguished Chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee.

Proponents of this legislation have made it clear that its essential purpose is to give tax support to educational institutions proportional, to some extent at least, to the fees charged students. Since the fees would have to be raised to provide the additional income desired, the benefit would flow to the college, not the taxpayer. To the extent that fees are raised, students from low-income families would find their educational costs increased rather than decreased. Institutions with low tuition charges would be placed under pressure to increase them in order to collect Federal aid by this route. Institutions which wish to engage in discriminatory practices and still enjoy Federal support would be encouraged to do so.

These Associations take the position that, to the extent that Congress finds it in the national interest to provide either general or specific-purpose support from public funds to institutions of higher education, ways can and should be found for doing this which retain the principle of public accountability for the expenditure of public funds, which are fiscally and educationally sound, and which do not in their operation discriminate against large groups of students and institutions. The tax-credit approach does not meet these standards.

(B) *Student Loan Indenture Proposal (Educational Opportunity Bank)*

This proposal, described by its proponents as an "Educational Opportunity Bank" or a "National

Youth Endowment Fund," can, in fact, be more accurately described as one through which the student is asked to enter into a special Federal income-tax indenture for most of his working life in order to permit colleges and universities to recapture approximately the full cost of educational services through sharp increases in required charges. Its most glaring defect from the standpoint of public policy is that it proposes to shift to the student the cost, at an escalating rate, of higher education. Whatever the allocation between the individual and society of the benefits of higher education, it is clear that the primary benefit is to society. The argument that the privilege of borrowing large sums with deferred repayment will somehow increase educational opportunity for the economically and educationally disadvantaged will not bear analysis for several reasons; rather, it would, under the name of equality of opportunity, enable a low-income student to start life with a heavy added Federal claim on his income, while freeing the more affluent from similar responsibility.

The policy of escalating student charges in all types of institutions would raise economic barriers against low-income and educationally disadvantaged students in institutions which will now admit them and which they can attend at relatively low cost. It would not, however, permit them to attend institutions which are prepared neither to relax their admissions standards nor to expand their enrollments in any substantial degree. The highly qualified student from a low-income family can, in general, already attend college through a variety of scholarship programs for the talented. The problem of the educationally disadvantaged student involves a variety of factors. High admission standards, reluctance to borrow, need of his family for income, and lack of motivation are all elements in his disproportionately low participation in post-high-school education. These problems will not be solved by extending the privilege of borrowing theoretically to enable the student to shop around for a college which will grant him admission, in competition with other students with fewer academic and other handicaps.

The Educational Opportunity Bank proposal poses many other major questions, to which answers have not been forthcoming. Its fiscal solvency is clearly dependent on attracting an equal balance between those whose future incomes will be high

and those entering low-income professions to permit continued lendings to those whose repayments will be less than their loans. Yet, to be fiscally attractive to those entering high-income occupations or with family resources which assure high incomes, terms must be such that a large fiscal outlay by the Federal government seems a prerequisite. If the charges of all colleges are escalated sharply, present ability of the vast majority of students to finance their own education through family aid and earnings will disappear, and heavy borrowing will become for increasing numbers the only avenue of access to higher education. The Educational Opportunity Bank particularly belies its title with respect to young women seeking higher education. The burden imposed by the combined loans of husband and wife could impose harsh strains on a new family. Marriage would involve a substantial reverse dowry.

Economists who have analyzed the proposal since it was first put forward in specific form by the Panel on Educational Innovation have pointed out:

1. Although the intent of the proposal is that students should pay for their own education through long-term borrowing, the initial effect will be to require a sharp increase in Federal taxes or a sharp decrease in Federal expenditure for other public programs. One or the other would be needed to avoid the inflation caused by billions of dollars in borrowing anticipated, with no counterbalancing flow of repayments in the early years.

2. While the proposal was also presented as being of particular assistance to private institutions, and as one not intended to reduce present sources of non-Federal support to higher education, the analysis referred to suggests that private institutions will be relatively worse off under operations of the Bank unless states reduce their support of public colleges and universities and force increases in student charges. Our Associations are committed to the belief that Federally-sponsored programs should enable public and private institutions to hold down the cost of education to students and their families, thereby making educational opportunity more widely available to all. Proposals to this end are outlined elsewhere in this document.

Higher education in the United States has been the means of providing genuine equality of opportunity for increasing numbers of young men and women because the American people have recognized that education is primarily a social responsibility. They have supported our colleges and uni-

versities both directly through public channels and indirectly through voluntary support encouraged by special tax treatment, thus keeping down the financial barriers to education. The philosophy that financing education is primarily the responsibility of the student is directly contrary to this great and sound tradition.

IV. RESPONSIBILITY FOR MINIMIZING DISRUPTION IN A TIME OF INSTITUTIONAL AND SOCIETAL CHANGE.

Resort to confrontation, destruction, and violence has become an increasingly disturbing phenomenon in American life. The demands for, and the necessity of, societal change challenge the capacity of all our institutions to adjust to new conditions through orderly processes while protecting fully the freedom to dissent.

Destruction, violence, and confrontation have occurred in relation to issues involving urban problems, church problems, business, industrial and labor problems, civil rights and educational problems at all levels, to name a few. Young people, including college and university students, have been prominently involved in many of these activities. That they have also been much more heavily identified with efforts to accomplish needed change through orderly procedures is less well known because less publicized.

No level of government and no type of public or private organization has been demonstrably more successful than others in dealing either with the problems of violent confrontation, or in accelerating the processes of orderly and needed change which are basic to a reduction of tension and conflict. All have been relatively unprepared to cope with violence, all relatively slow to change.

Colleges and universities were particularly vulnerable to confrontation and violence, because they had experienced relatively little of it. Mechanisms for governance and for orderly resolution of grievances which they thought adequate proved in some cases inadequate in the test. College and university regulations, and civil laws and procedures, were in many instances found to be defective both to protect the innocent and punish the guilty.

The American tradition and practice has been substantially that the preservation of public order has been left to local authority, supplemented by state authority when needed, with Federal law and authority resorted to only when other remedies

were clearly inadequate. The involvement of local civil authorities has been relatively infrequent with respect to members of the college and university community, where respect for the rights of others and the use of internal disciplinary mechanisms have normally sufficed.

It is perhaps a tribute to the high esteem in which the American public holds its institutions of higher education that many proposals have been made and some enacted into law for Federal intervention in matters of campus disturbances. Since "news" is by definition a deviation from the past or the expected, it is perhaps a tribute to the historic ability of the university community to conduct its affairs in a peaceful manner that communications media have focussed so intensively on every instance of campus disruption and so little on the widespread instances of orderly change, or of both responsible and equitable dealing with disruption when it occurs.

These Associations believe that it is no more desirable or appropriate for the Federal government to pass special laws dealing with campus disruption than to pass special laws dealing with disruption in municipalities, counties, states or in hospitals, museums, community theaters, farms, or in elementary and secondary schools—public and private—all involved in some aspects of Federal programs.

This view does not spring from self-righteousness, illusion, or timidity. No occupational group in American life is more opposed to campus disruption, has more to lose from its occurrence, is more conscious of the fact that mistakes have been and will be made, than college and university administrators.

It is cold realism and hard experience which causes us to say that any substantial degree of direct Federal intervention with respect to campus disturbances is counter-productive of the common objective of minimizing them. Detailed Federal legal prescriptions and procedures are invitations to prolonged court procedures following institutional action. Mandatory and severe Federal penalties against particular classes of students (because recipients of Federal assistance) create manifest injustices in situations in which it is crucial that justice *be* and *be seen to be equitable* in terms of the degree of the offense, and no other criteria. Colleges and universities are not *in fact* free to move promptly under their own regulations and procedures if bound to use a different set of regu-

lations, procedures, and penalties by Federal law. By the same token, state and local civil authorities and courts are *not in fact free* of outside pressures, if they know that identical penalties assessed against young men guilty of identical offenses may automatically result in far heavier Federally-imposed penalties in one case, and none in the other.

Even the relatively mild proposal that all institutions of higher education be Federally required to prepare disciplinary regulations or lose all Federal funds inevitably carries with it both the implication that the many will be punished for the sins of the few and that Federal prescription of detailed regulations may follow. Is the Federal government to require codes of regulations for disturbances in cities, counties, and states? Shall we cut off water supplies from Federally-impounded lakes to cities which have not found the solution to confrontations over the local control of schools? Or should they be required to see that no one involved in a municipal confrontation is permitted to use the Federally-aided water system?

Colleges and universities have been challenged to act. *They have acted.* Penalties have been assessed, after hearings in accordance with due process. In recent months, most colleges and universities have revised their regulations, both with respect to protecting individual rights and to punishing those who resort to violence. State and local laws have, in many instances, been similarly revised and clarified to remove ambiguities as to public buildings and property. A great deal of experience has been gained, directly and vicariously, in dealing with the relatively new problem of disruption.

More importantly, many colleges and universities have undertaken substantial revision of their internal governance, in response to student requests for a real voice in policies that directly affect them.

Campus disruptions will continue, as they will in other areas of American life. No amount of reform or change will satisfy the small minority whose purpose is to destroy the university, rather than to accomplish needed reforms. The degree of disruption and confrontation may depend substantially on developments in American society wholly outside the control of the college or university as such. However, the content and application of university regulations and the authority for enacting and enforcing laws against disruptive activities *wherever they occur* are and should be the responsibility of those who have responsibility for campus gover-

nance, and state and local legislation and law enforcement. We have faith that if this continues to be the case, the destruction-bent minority will be increasingly isolated and ineffective.

V. DISCRIMINATION IN THE USE OF PUBLIC FUNDS FOR EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES

Member institutions of the Association support public policies against discrimination in the use of public funds for educational purposes, and believe these policies should apply equally in their use to all types of institutions, public and private. They note with regret that the Civil Rights Act of 1964 does not uniformly apply this standard because of the failure to include a provision against discrimination because of religion in Title VI of the Act, which applies to non-public as well as to public colleges and universities. They also note that Title IV of the Act, which requires a survey of the extent of discrimination in education to be made by the U.S. Commissioner of Education, applies only to public institutions and does not apply to discrimination in the use of public funds by non-public institutions receiving them.

It is, therefore, our position that the Civil Rights Act should be amended to ban the use of public funds by institutions which discriminate in the admission of students or employment of staff because of religion, and that, pending such amendment or new educational legislation, the use of tax funds should be barred to institutions which discriminate because of religion. If there is reasonable ground for exception to this rule, such as might be involved in programs of public welfare, rather than of an essentially educational, character—such as the school lunch program—such exceptions should be made by explicit exemption from the general rule.

VI. INDIRECT COSTS OF FEDERALLY-SPONSORED ACTIVITIES.

Indirect costs of Federally-sponsored activities are real costs that, unless fully reimbursed, constitute a serious drain on the resources of the college or university—resources that are required for carrying out their primary institutional function and for the conduct of programs where Federal support is limited or lacking. The Associations strongly oppose imposition of any arbitrary ceiling on recovery of indirect costs for the reasons contained

in a study made for the Congress this year by the General Accounting Office.

VII. MANDATORY COST-SHARING.

The Associations stenuously object to the mandatory cost-sharing concept, with respect to Federally sponsored research programs. Simply equity dictates that institutions making available their physical and human resources to assist in the attainment of national objectives receive the full costs for doing so, especially when the cost sharing reduces their ability to contribute to the attainment of other, and equally important, national objectives.

VIII. ACADEMIC FACILITIES, HOUSING.

(A) *Academic Facilities.* A report issued in the fall of 1969 by a U.S. Office of Education Task Force estimated a deficiency of 68 million feet of assignable academic space in our colleges and universities as of the fall of 1968, and a need for a net addition of 241 million square feet of assignable space to handle enrollment increase projected by 1977. The Task Force estimated a need for a commitment of \$2.8 billion annually from 1970 through 1974. Federal authorizations for facilities aid include authority for direct grants of up to 50 per cent of cost of facilities, for direct loans, and for interest subsidy on loans made in the private market. These Associations supported the interest subsidy proposal as a means of expanding the facilities-aid program in a time of temporary budget stringency as a *supplement* to the direct loan program and the grant program. The Administration proposed, with respect to degree-granting institutions, to eliminate the grant program in the fiscal 1970 budget and to eliminate the direct-loan program for all institutions.

We recommend full funding of the grant program and the direct-loan program to the extent of the authorization provided in law. The interest subsidy program, substantially more costly in the long run than the direct-loan program, should be used only as an emergency supplement.

(B) *College Housing and Related Facilities.* The committee cited above estimated a requirement for residential, dining, and related facilities for an additional 750,000 students by 1977, at a cost of \$7.9 billion. Authorizations exist for more than \$1 billion in direct Federal loans, and money available

is being increased substantially each year by repayments into a revolving fund. Although the present interest rate for the direct loan program involves a slight subsidy because of prevailing high interest rates, the program up to the end of fiscal 1969 has shown a profit to the Federal government in excess of expenditures. Again as a supplement to the direct program in a time of budget stringency, the Congress authorized a supplemental interest subsidy program for private loans. During fiscal 1970, the direct loan program was reduced from its past \$200 million level to approximately \$60 million, the more costly interest subsidy program (over the years) being substituted for, rather than used as a supplement to, the direct program. *The direct loan and grant program should be rapidly expanded and the interest subsidy program held to its original purpose as a supplement, if needed.*

IX. INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS.

More than any other nation, the United States of America stands to benefit from programs in the international area. These include domestic programs provided under the National Defense Education Act and envisioned under the International Education Act, educational and cultural exchange programs (such as those authorized by the Fulbright-Hays Act), and technical assistance to developing nations under the Foreign Assistance Act.

Failure to fund the International Education Act and cutbacks in technical assistance programs are discouraging. On the other hand, steps to place university relationships in technical assistance on a sounder basis and to give greatly increased emphasis on helping developing nations build the educational and professional competence they need to move forward, under the leadership of Administrator John A. Hannah, are hopeful signs, as is the renewed spirit of bi-partisanship in support of international activities.

Democracy has everything to gain from the free exchange of people and ideas and the free movement of international commerce. It has much to lose from a policy of indifference to the plight of millions in other countries who look to us for assistance in improving their conditions of life.

Out of the conviction that knowledge of the history, culture, languages, and problems of other peoples of the world is essential to the sound education of American citizens today, our institutions have in recent years greatly expanded their

offerings in internationally-related fields. Particularly at the undergraduate level, and substantially at other levels, this expansion has been financed by non-Federal sources of income, including state legislatures, student fees, and private donors. We intend to continue this emphasis.

National support and national leadership are essential, however if college and university-related international educational and cultural exchange and technical assistance programs are to be adequate to the interests and responsibilities of the United States. Both the national interest and responsibility are clear.

X. IMPROVING CONDITIONS OF URBAN AND RURAL LIFE.

The problems of our center cities, linked as they are with conditions of poverty, inadequate education, and unemployment, are properly a major focus of public concern. These problems, it is clear, are also inextricably linked with those of poverty, inadequate education, and lack of suitable employment in non-urban, non-metropolitan areas, where 29 percent of the population includes 41 percent of those classified as below the "poverty" line.

Member institutions of these Associations have a traditional role of concern for and action related to the conditions of the citizenry. This concern is now intensified and expanded by the tremendous problems of a rapidly urbanizing society. Member institutions of these Associations are heavily involved in research, educational, and public service programs designed to improve the conditions of rural and urban life. The chief limitation on their ability to respond to urgent requests for expert assistance is lack of resources for this purpose, particularly as related to urban problems.

XI. NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT.

The member institutions of these Associations share the general informed concern for the need for conservation and intelligent utilization of our natural resources and for the abatement of the increasing pollution of our natural environment. For this reason, we have welcomed the Water Resources Research Act, the Sea Grant College and Program Act, and the programs established in the Department of the Interior, the Public Health Service, and

the Environmental Sciences Service Administration in the Department of Commerce aimed at the understanding and abatement of air and water pollution.

These programs, as were those for continuing education and public service, were initiated during a period of budget constriction for domestic programs, and should be funded consistently high with their priority at the earliest possible time.

Further, we urge continuing emphasis in the administration of the Sea Grant College and Program Act on the importance of broad, flexible institutional awards.

XII. RESEARCH AND EXTENSION IN AGRICULTURE AND RELATED FIELDS.

The cooperative programs of research and education in agriculture and related fields between the Federal government and Land-Grant institutions have been conspicuously successful. Indeed, these programs have been a major factor in the development in the United States of the most productive and efficient agriculture in the history of mankind.

It is recognized that the consumer is the principal beneficiary of these programs. Consequently, it is in the public interest to maintain a level of Federal financial support which will enable these programs to make their maximum contribution to the nation's agriculture and ultimately to the consuming public.

The Associations are concerned that Federal support in recent years has lagged substantially behind rising costs, requiring the states to carry an increasing proportion of the cost of these cooperative efforts. Major long-range studies of both agricultural research and extension programs have been made by joint committees of the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges. The recommendations of these committees offer sound and constructive suggestions for reorienting and expanding both programs.

XIII. EXTENDING THE RESOURCES OF HIGHER EDUCATION.

The Congress has recognized the great need for Federal action to make available the resources of our colleges and universities toward the solution of problems of national and international concern. We applaud the enactment of such legislation as Title I

of the Higher Education Act of 1965, the State Technical Services Act, the Regional Medical Programs Act, legislation affecting the Department of Housing and Urban Affairs, the Law Enforcement Act, and the Smith-Lever Act establishing the Cooperative Extension Service, which has furnished the example inspiring many of the more recent programs. Through the implementation of programs of continuing education and extension authorized by these and other acts, the Congress enables universities to bring their unique resources to bear on the needs of communities and individuals for assistance in solving the multiple problems associated with rapid urbanization, technological change, social change, and the needs of the professions, agriculture, labor, business, industry, the delivery of health service, and the Federal government.

Truly significant progress cannot be expected from these programs until it is possible to fund them at levels commensurate with the needs they were established to help satisfy.

XIV. ESTABLISHMENT OF NEW FEDERAL DEGREE-GRANTING AUTHORITY AND INSTITUTIONS.

In recent years, many efforts have been made, some successfully, to authorize the granting of advanced academic degrees by Federal agencies or establishments. We believe these efforts arise from basic confusion as to the nature of a university, the significance and meaning of the academic degree, and the resources of the non-Federal academic establishment.

The basic characteristic of the university as a center for the advancement of knowledge is one of free inquiry, free exchange of the results of research with other scholars in the field, and free criticism. Another characteristic is the opportunity offered for educating men and women in the processes and methods of research. The academic degree is a recognition of educational attainment and research accomplishment under conditions of free inquiry, exchange, and criticism. Its use by agencies or institutions, which are not, and cannot, become universities in this sense of the term is a misuse which is both undesirable and unnecessary.

XV. INTERGOVERNMENTAL COOPERATION: UNIQUE CHARACTER OF HIGHER EDUCATION.

The Associations strongly support activities designed to improve cooperation between the Federal government and state and local governments and to increase the capacity of state and local governments to provide the quality and variety of public services needed in our complex society.

They emphatically call attention, however, to the unique character of higher education as an instrumentality of society. All the states have, by constitutional or legislative action, placed responsibility for governance of public universities and colleges under the control and direction of governing boards separated from direct channels of state administrative and political control. Private institutions have historically enjoyed this status.

In recent years, national legislative proposals have been made which would have the effect of authorizing the administrative branch of the Federal government to require that staffs of both public and private universities and colleges engaged in Federally assisted programs be placed under state merit systems, channeling Federal funds for higher education through state administrative agencies having no jurisdiction under state constitutions or law, by-passing state legislative authority, and assigning planning responsibility for higher education within the states to agencies created for entirely different purposes.

Since inadvertance or lack of awareness of the issues and relationships involved apparently have been responsible for violation in proposed legislation of this sound principle, the Associations respectfully call it to the attention of Congressional committees, Federal agencies dealing with educational legislation, and the Advisory Committee on Intergovernmental Relations.

XVI. OFFICER EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Public and Land-Grant universities and colleges have, from their founding, held to the philosophy that their responsibilities include provision of opportunity for advanced education for a wide range of occupations in private and public life. Other institutions have increasingly shared that philosophy and responsibility.

As a result, leadership in every phase and field of American life has come from individuals from a

wide range of backgrounds: institutional, regional, economic, ethnic, social.

In only one area, that of preparing officers for the Armed Services, has the Federal government established its own institutions of higher education. However, for many years the vast majority of regular and reserve officers for the Armed Services have come from non-Federal colleges and universities. The two Associations believe that (1) it is appropriate for institutions of the type represented in their membership to offer courses and programs of interest to those wishing to serve as officers in the Armed Services, as they do for other occupational fields, and (2) that it would be highly undesirable for officer education to be restricted to the service academies.

With respect to the Reserve Officers' Training Corps program as such, controversies over issues such as the amount of credit for course work, jurisdiction over the selection of instructors, and the nature and content of the curriculum have arisen in a relatively small number of institutions. The Department of Defense has indicated a recognition of the desirability of certain reforms and a greater degree of flexibility in program. This points to the probability that most institutions involved or desiring to be involved in officer-education programs will find it possible to conduct them through the R.O.T.C.

Colleges and universities make a most substantial financial contribution to officer-education through the R.O.T.C. program. They provide, without charge to the Federal government, classroom, office, and other facilities and departmental support. Although the question of at least partial reimbursement for these costs has been under discussion for more than 20 years, no action has resulted.

Meanwhile, the problem becomes increasingly critical as enrollments and pressures on use of facilities rise, accompanied by sharp reductions in funds available from governmental and private sources for needed new construction.

The Associations commend the generally constructive report of the Special Committee on R.O.T.C. named by the Secretary of Defense, and endorse in particular its recommendations (1) for amendment of the R.O.T.C. Revitalization Act to indicate the cooperative nature of R.O.T.C. curriculum development as between institutions of higher education and the Armed Services and (2) for Federal payment of the full institutional costs of

the R.O.T.C. program. The Associations are hopeful that the fixing of specific responsibility for R.O.T.C. matters at the Department of Defense level in the office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary (Education) will improve liaison with higher education and expedite early action on needed administrative and legislative changes.

The Associations strongly recommend that Advisory Panels on R.O.T.C. of both the Department of Defense and the several Armed Services include representatives of the major institutional organizations in higher education.

XVII. SELECTIVE SERVICE.

The Associations commend the President and the Congress for the authorization and establishment of procedures under the present Selective Service Act providing for one year of maximum vulnerability to call and for a random selection system of determining order of induction, within the established prime age group. This will enable young men to plan their future with more certainty and also eliminate the heavy impact of the former "oldest first" rule on graduate and professional education, while assuring that students deferred for higher education will be subject to call in the same proportion as other qualified registrants.

XVIII. CONCLUSION.

There is, as Shakespeare said, a time for all things. The time has come in higher education for a cessation of new studies and pronouncements on the national role in higher education and for a real beginning of *action* to implement programs on whose objectives there has long been general agreement. With the exception of a national program of general institutional support to colleges and universities, authorizing legislation both to provide access to higher education for the disadvantaged and to make available the resources of higher education toward solving many of the most pressing problems of our time has long been on the statute books.

The times call for action.

MEMBER INSTITUTIONS OF
THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE UNIVERSITIES
AND LAND-GRANT COLLEGES

AND
THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF
STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

ALABAMA

Alabama A & M University
Alabama State University
Auburn University
Florence State University
Jacksonville State University
Livingston State University
Troy State University
University of Alabama
University of Montevallo
University of South Alabama

ALASKA

University of Alaska

ARIZONA

Arizona State University
Northern Arizona University
University of Arizona

ARKANSAS

Agricultural, Mechanical
and Normal College
Arkansas A & M College
Arkansas Polytechnic College
Arkansas State University
Henderson State College
Southern State College
State College of Arkansas
University of Arkansas

CALIFORNIA

California State College
at Bakersfield
California State College
at Dominguez Hills
California State College
at Fullerton
California State College
at Hayward
California State College
at Long Beach
California State College
at Los Angeles
California State College
at San Bernardino
California State Polytechnic
College—Kellogg-Voorhis
California State Polytechnic
College
Chico State College
Fresno State College
Humboldt State College
Sacramento State College
San Diego State College
San Fernando Valley
State College
San Francisco State College
San Jose State College
Sonoma State College
Stanislaus State College
University of California
University of California
at Berkeley
University of California
at Davis
University of California
at Los Angeles

COLORADO

Adams State College
Colorado State College
Colorado State University
Fort Lewis College
Metropolitan State College
Southern Colorado
State College
University of Colorado
Western State College
of Colorado

CONNECTICUT

Connecticut Agricultural
Experiment Station
Central Connecticut
State College
Eastern Connecticut
State College
Southern Connecticut
State College
University of Connecticut
Western Connecticut
State College

DELAWARE

Delaware State College
University of Delaware

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

District of Columbia
Teachers College
*Federal City College

FLORIDA

*Florida A & M University
Florida Atlantic University
Florida International
University
Florida State University
Florida Technological
University
University of Florida
University of North Florida
University of West Florida

GEORGIA

Albany State College
Armstrong State College
Augusta College
Columbus College
Fort Valley State College
Georgia College
at Milledgeville
Georgia Institute of
Technology
Georgia Southern College
Savannah State College
University of Georgia
Valdosta State College
West Georgia College

GUAM

University of Guam

HAWAII

University of Hawaii

IDAHO

Boise State College
Idaho State University
Lewis-Clark Normal School
University of Idaho

ILLINOIS

Chicago State College
Eastern Illinois University
Governors State University
Illinois State University
Northeastern Illinois
State College
Northern Illinois University
Sangamon State University
Southern Illinois University
University of Illinois
Western Illinois University

INDIANA

Ball State University
Indiana State University
Indiana University
Purdue University

IOWA

Iowa State University
University of Iowa
University of Northern Iowa

KANSAS

Fort Hays Kansas State College
Kansas State College
of Pittsburg
Kansas State Teachers College
Kansas State University
University of Kansas
Wichita State University

KENTUCKY

Eastern Kentucky University
Morehead State University
Murray State University
Kentucky State College
University of Kentucky
Western Kentucky University

LOUISIANA

Francis T. Nicholls
State College
Grambling College
Louisiana Polytechnic Institute
Louisiana State University
McNeese State College
Northeast Louisiana
State College
Northwestern State College
Southeastern Louisiana College
Southern University

MAINE

Aroostook State College
Farmington State College
Fort Kent State College
Gorham State College
Maine Maritime Academy
University of Maine
University of Maine—Orono
Washington State College

MARYLAND

Bowie State College
Coppin State College
Frostburg State College
Maryland State College
Morgan State College
St. Mary's College
of Maryland
Salisbury State College

Towson State College
University of Maryland

MASSACHUSETTS

Boston State College
Bridgewater State College
Fitchburg State College
Framingham State College
Lowell State College
Massachusetts College of Art
Massachusetts Institute
of Technology
Massachusetts Maritime Academy
North Adams State College
Salem State College
University of Massachusetts
Westfield State College
Worcester State College

MICHIGAN

Central Michigan University
Eastern Michigan University
Ferris State College
Grand Valley State College
Lake Superior State College
Michigan State University
Northern Michigan University
University of Michigan
Wayne State University

MINNESOTA

Bemidji State College
Mankato State College
Moorhead State College
St. Cloud State College
Southwest Minnesota
State College
University of Minnesota
Winona State College

MISSISSIPPI

*Alcorn Agricultural &
Mechanical College
Delta State College
Jackson State College
Mississippi State College
for Women
Mississippi State University
Mississippi Valley
State College
University of Mississippi
University of
Southern Mississippi

MISSOURI

Central Missouri
State College
Harris Teachers College
Lincoln University
Missouri Southern College
Missouri Western College
Northeast Missouri
State College
Northwest Missouri
State College
Southeast Missouri
State College
Southwest Missouri
State College
University of Missouri

MONTANA

Eastern Montana College
Montana College of Mineral
Science & Technology
Montana State University
Northern Montana College
University of Montana
Western Montana College

NEBRASKA

Chadron State College
 Kearney State College
 Peru State College
University of Nebraska
 Wayne State College

NEVADA

University of Nevada
 at Las Vegas
University of Nevada
 at Reno
University of Nevada System

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Keene State College
 Plymouth State College
University of New Hampshire

NEW JERSEY

College of North Jersey
 Glassboro State College
 Jersey City State College
 Montclair State College
 Newark State College
 Paterson State College
 Richard Stockton State College
Rutgers, The State University
 of New Jersey

NEW MEXICO

Eastern New Mexico University
New Mexico State University
University of New Mexico
 Western New Mexico University

NEW YORK

City University of New York
 Cornell University
 State University College
 at Brockport
 State University College
 at Buffalo
 State University College
 at Cortland
 State University College
 at Geneseo
 State University College
 at New Paltz
 State University College
 at Old Westbury
 State University College
 at Oneonta
 State University College
 at Oswego
 State University College
 at Plattsburgh
 State University College
 at Potsdam
State University of New York
 *State University of New York
 at Albany
State University of New York
 at Buffalo
State University of New York
 at Binghamton
State University of New York
 at Stony Brook

NORTH CAROLINA

Appalachian State University
 East Carolina University
 Elizabeth City State University
 Fayetteville State College
North Carolina A & T
 State University
 North Carolina Central University
North Carolina State University
 Pembroke State University

University of North Carolina
 at Asheville
University of North Carolina
University of North Carolina
 at Chapel Hill
 Western Carolina University
 Winston-Salem State College

NORTH DAKOTA

Dickinson State College
 Mayville State College
 Minot State College
North Dakota State University
University of North Dakota
 University of North Dakota
 Ellendale Center
 Valley City State College

OHIO

Bowling Green
 State University
 Central State University
 The Cleveland State University
Kent State University
Miami University
Ohio State University
Ohio University
 University of Akron
 University of Toledo
 Youngstown State University
 Wright State University

OKLAHOMA

Central State College
 East Central State College
Langston University
 Northeastern State College
 Northwestern State College
Oklahoma State University
 Southeastern State College
University of Oklahoma

OREGON

Eastern Oregon College
Oregon State University
 Oregon Technical Institute
 Southern Oregon College
University of Oregon

PENNSYLVANIA

Bloomsburg State College
 California State College
 Cheyney State College
 Clarion State College
 East Stroudsburg
 State College
 Edinboro State College
 Indiana University
 of Pennsylvania
 Kutztown State College
 Lock Haven State College
 Mansfield State College
 Millersville State College
Pennsylvania State University
 Shippensburg State College
 Slippery Rock State College
 West Chester State College

PUERTO RICO

University of Puerto Rico

RHODE ISLAND

Rhode Island College
University of Rhode Island

SOUTH CAROLINA

Clemson University
South Carolina State College
University of South Carolina

SOUTH DAKOTA

Black Hills State College
 Dakota State College
 Northern State College
South Dakota State University
 Southern State College
University of South Dakota

TENNESSEE

Austin Peay State University
 East Tennessee
 State University
 Memphis State University
 Middle Tennessee
 State University
Tennessee A & I
 State University
 Tennessee Technological
 University
University of Tennessee

TEXAS

East Texas State University
 Midwestern University
 North Texas State University
Prairie View Agricultural
& Mechanical College
 Southwest Texas State College
 Stephen F. Austin
 State University
 Texas A & I University
Texas A & M University System
Texas Southern University
Texas Tech University
 Texas Woman's University
University of Houston
University of Texas System
University of Texas
 at Austin
 West Texas State University

UTAH

Southern Utah State College
Utah State University
University of Utah

VERMONT

Castleton State College
 Johnson State College
 Lyndon State College
University of Vermont

VIRGINIA

Clinch Valley College
 George Mason College
 University of Virginia
 Longwood College
 Madison College
 Mary Washington College

Norfolk State College
 Radford College
University of Virginia
 Virginia Commonwealth
 University
Virginia Polytechnic
Institute
Virginia State College

VIRGIN ISLANDS

College of the Virgin
 Islands

WASHINGTON

Central Washington
 State College
 Eastern Washington
 State College
 The Evergreen State College
University of Washington
Washington State University
 Western Washington
 State College

WEST VIRGINIA

Bluefield State College
 Concord College
 Fairmont State College
 Marshall University
 Shepherd College
 West Liberty Institute
 of Technology
 West Virginia University

WISCONSIN

Stout State University
University of Wisconsin
University of Wisconsin
 at Madison
 Wisconsin State University
 at Eau Claire
 Wisconsin State University
 at La Crosse
 Wisconsin State University
 at Oshkosh
 Wisconsin State University
 at Platteville
 Wisconsin State University
 at River Falls
 Wisconsin State University
 at Stevens Point
 Wisconsin State University
 at Superior
 Wisconsin State University
 at Whitewater

WYOMING

University of Wyoming

Italics are members of NASULGC

* Members of both Associations

gram involves specific aid to disadvantaged students in the form of grants, work-study programs, low-interest loans, and special assistance of various kinds. It involves Federal aid for higher education facilities, for fellowships, for support of professional schools (particularly in the health professions). It involves expanded support for research, for adult education and community services, for developing colleges, and for institutional support for colleges and universities to keep down their spiraling charges to students.

With the exception of a program of general institutional support, the framework for providing all these essential forms of aid already is on the statute books, though it may need revision, consolidation, and rationalization.

The *primary problem*, except for badly needed institutional support, is one of *funding*—not more studies, task forces, committee reports, and the raising of expectations the lack of fulfillment of which leads to disillusionment with the capacity of our democratic society to respond through orderly processes of government.

The following will illustrate some of the funding gaps in programs duly authorized by Congress after careful consideration by committees having jurisdiction:

Higher Education Facilities Grants. Annual authorization in excess of \$900 millions, including \$50 million for graduate facilities. Funding: \$33 million for degree-granting institutions and private junior colleges (with 75 per cent of all enrollments) and \$43 million for public two-year colleges; nothing for graduate facilities.

Educational Opportunity Grants. This program, designed to give genuine educational opportunity to those most economically disadvantaged, was funded at a level to permit fewer than 100,000 *new* grants. At a minimum, 200,000 could be effectively used.

National Defense Student Loan Fund. Authorization, \$375 million. Funded at \$229 million, but full appropriated funds not released for use.

National Defense Education Act, College Teacher Fellowships. Authorized: 7,500 new fellowships annually. Funded to provide 3,000; a reduction of 50 per cent from earlier appropriated levels.

Community Service and Continuing Education

Act. This act was intended to be the major vehicle for enlisting the resources of colleges and universities in solving urgent community problems, and providing opportunity for further education for adult citizens. Authorization, \$50 million. Funding, \$9.5 million.

College Housing Loan Program. Present authorization for *direct loans: in excess* of \$1 billion. Amount authorized to be released during current fiscal year for direct loans; about \$60 million, supplemented by about \$240 million in interest subsidies on private-market loans.

International Education Act. Authorized, by overwhelming majorities in both Houses of Congress, \$90 million annually. Appropriations to date: zero.

Aid to Developing Colleges. Authorized, \$50 million. Appropriations: \$30 million.

The above are but examples. The situation is similar with respect to a wide range of other programs.

The conclusions are clear.

Except for Federal assistance to keep down mounting charges to students which are increasingly pricing higher education out of reach of more and more students and their families, ample legislative authority exists to make a major advance.

The first priority is to fund existing programs.

The first priority among new programs is to provide institutional support for colleges and universities so they can provide quality education for all who can benefit from it at reasonable charges to students.

The National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges and the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, who join in this statement, have proposed specific legislation to this end, (the Miller-Daddario Bill) which is now before the Congress. It enjoys the support of the Association of American Colleges, whose membership includes virtually all the nation's private colleges. It has the support of the Association of American Universities, including the nation's leading graduate and research universities, public and private. Other major national organizations have endorsed the principle of institutional support.

Such a program is badly needed not only to keep

down rising charges, but also to correct the imbalance between emphasis on research and instruction created by past Federal concentration on research.

The country is increasingly bewildered by the flood of studies, proposals, and re-proposals being put forward. Some of these are excellent, some mere nostrums and panaceas. The proliferation of new proposals while major gaps exist between promise and performance in existing programs is a major factor in the disillusionment and disaffection of many of our young people.

The path to great achievement in social, cultural, and economic advance is well marked. It is the education of all Americans to their highest potential and the fullest use of the special resources of our colleges and universities in research and public service.

The times call for action.

II. INSTITUTIONAL GRANTS PROGRAM.

As we noted, the greatest unmet need in Federal support for higher education is an *institutional* support program through which flexible, predictable funds are made available to colleges and universities on a continuing basis. These Associations urge that such a program is vital to the welfare of the nation and is needed *now*. Further, we believe that the institutional grants program should be initiated in the natural and social sciences where there already exists a solid base of experience in relations between the Federal agencies and the academic community.

We are mindful of the need for institutional grants in the arts and the humanities, as well as in the natural and social sciences. However, the long experience with programs in the sciences and wide acceptance of Federal participation in them, together with the existence of a substantial and experienced administrative staff in the National Science Foundation, suggests that new and comprehensive institutional support may best be started in those fields.

More nearly adequate funding should be provided immediately for project grants in the arts and humanities. We believe such grants can be of special benefit to the culturally and economically disadvantaged. After a period of experience with expanded project grants through the National Foundation for the Arts and the Humanities, these disciplines might then be included in a formula for general institutional support.

Bills for the establishment of a National Institu-

tional Grants Program have been introduced in both the Senate and the House of Representatives, and H.R. 11542 has been overwhelmingly approved by the House Committee on Science and Astronautics after extensive hearings spanning two sessions of the Congress in which the principle of institutional support was strongly endorsed by almost all witnesses. The bill, as refined through public debate, is admirably suited for the initiation of this urgently needed program. We commend Representatives George P. Miller, Emilio Q. Daddario, and others for their sponsorship of this proposal, and strongly urge its early passage in the House and its serious and early consideration in the Senate.

III. AID TO INDIVIDUALS IN OBTAINING POST-HIGH-SCHOOL EDUCATION.

As indicated above, these Associations believe that a balanced program of assuring access to post-high-school educational opportunity includes support to institutions to keep charges to students down, combined with direct aid to individuals facing particular economic, ethnic, or cultural disadvantages. The Congress has established a substantial and varied program of aid, including Economic Opportunity Grants, N.D.E.A. loans, work-study programs, and support of special services to disadvantaged students. It also includes pre-college assistance and encouragement, as exemplified by the Upward Bound, Talent Search, and other programs. Special aid to developing colleges also involves particular attention and support to institutions which serve a high percentage of disadvantaged students. The Guaranteed Student Loan Program falls into a slightly different category, as it is designed to ease the burden on middle-income families caused by increases in college charges substantially in excess of the increases in real income and those attributable to inflation. It serves a useful purpose, though the necessity for it will be diminished if measures to increase public support and encourage private voluntary support are taken to keep down charges to students.

These Associations supported the enactment and urge the full implementation of all the above programs. One hundred per cent Federal financing should be provided for the N.D.E.A. Student Loan Program, in order that needy students may not suffer from institutional incapacity to find matching money.

The Associations, however, **STRONGLY**

OPPOSE two proposals which have been widely advocated under the rubric of student aid. They are discussed below:

TAX-CREDIT AND STUDENT-LOAN INDENTURE PROPOSALS

Proposals for a direct deduction from income taxes owed the Federal government because of tuition and required fees paid colleges and universities have attracted substantial support because of several assumptions, all incorrect.

More recently, widespread publicity has been given a proposal to solve the fiscal problems of higher education by a sharp increase in charges to students coupled with the privilege of borrowing from the Federal government the increasingly substantial sums required, with repayment by the borrower in the form of a special added income tax over 30 to 40 years. Both these proposals are unsound from the standpoint of public policy, educational policy, and fiscal policy. They are discussed separately below:

(A) *Tax Credit for Tuition and Fees*

Three assumptions, the first two contradictory and the third untrue, are made in advancing such proposals:

The first is that they will provide relief to hard-pressed parents. A second is that they provide a way around the problems related to direct Federal aid to non-public institutions and would, therefore, provide a substantial flow of Federal tax dollars to these and other institutions. A third is that they are so devised as to limit sharply or eliminate aid to the most affluent and to give the greatest aid to those in lower income brackets (though admittedly none at all to those who pay no income tax). The first two assumptions are obviously contradictory. If institutions raise fees to collect tax dollars, parents will get no relief. If parents get substantial relief, institutions will not be aided.

The third assumption is untrue. Despite limitations on benefits in terms of gross taxable income, the most recent version of this proposal advanced before Congress allows families with taxable incomes of up to \$25,000 to receive full benefits, and those with incomes substantially in excess of this amount to receive some benefits. Those with capital-gain incomes well in excess of the stated limitation would, of course, receive special treatment, while those with incomes chiefly from

tax-exempt sources would benefit without limitation as to total, as compared to taxable income.

While percentage benefits are theoretically higher for lower-income families, actual dollar benefits steadily diminish at the lower end of the income scale, and vanish entirely for those who pay little or no taxable income but nevertheless sacrifice heavily for their children's future, in terms of income paid out and loss of family earnings. Indeed, this proposal has been correctly described as an "upside down scholarship."

These Associations view the tax-credit proposal as inequitable from every standpoint and unsound from that of fiscal policy, educational policy, and national policy in general. The Treasury Department, whose estimates on first-year cost of such a proposal are in the neighborhood of \$2 billion annually, has ably stated the objections from the standpoint of national fiscal policy, as has the distinguished Chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee.

Proponents of this legislation have made it clear that its essential purpose is to give tax support to educational institutions proportional, to some extent at least, to the fees charged students. Since the fees would have to be raised to provide the additional income desired, the benefit would flow to the college, not the taxpayer. To the extent that fees are raised, students from low-income families would find their educational costs increased rather than decreased. Institutions with low tuition charges would be placed under pressure to increase them in order to collect Federal aid by this route. Institutions which wish to engage in discriminatory practices and still enjoy Federal support would be encouraged to do so.

These Associations take the position that, to the extent that Congress finds it in the national interest to provide either general or specific-purpose support from public funds to institutions of higher education, ways can and should be found for doing this which retain the principle of public accountability for the expenditure of public funds, which are fiscally and educationally sound, and which do not in their operation discriminate against large groups of students and institutions. The tax-credit approach does not meet these standards.

(B) *Student Loan Indenture Proposal (Educational Opportunity Bank)*

This proposal, described by its proponents as an "Educational Opportunity Bank" or a "National

Youth Endowment Fund," can, in fact, be more accurately described as one through which the student is asked to enter into a special Federal income-tax indenture for most of his working life in order to permit colleges and universities to recapture approximately the full cost of educational services through sharp increases in required charges. Its most glaring defect from the standpoint of public policy is that it proposes to shift to the student the cost, at an escalating rate, of higher education. Whatever the allocation between the individual and society of the benefits of higher education, it is clear that the primary benefit is to society. The argument that the privilege of borrowing large sums with deferred repayment will somehow increase educational opportunity for the economically and educationally disadvantaged will not bear analysis for several reasons; rather, it would, under the name of equality of opportunity, enable a low-income student to start life with a heavy added Federal claim on his income, while freeing the more affluent from similar responsibility.

The policy of escalating student charges in all types of institutions would raise economic barriers against low-income and educationally disadvantaged students in institutions which will now admit them and which they can attend at relatively low cost. It would not, however, permit them to attend institutions which are prepared neither to relax their admissions standards nor to expand their enrollments in any substantial degree. The highly qualified student from a low-income family can, in general, already attend college through a variety of scholarship programs for the talented. The problem of the educationally disadvantaged student involves a variety of factors. High admission standards, reluctance to borrow, need of his family for income, and lack of motivation are all elements in his disproportionately low participation in post-high-school education. These problems will not be solved by extending the privilege of borrowing theoretically to enable the student to shop around for a college which will grant him admission, in competition with other students with fewer academic and other handicaps.

The Educational Opportunity Bank proposal poses many other major questions, to which answers have not been forthcoming. Its fiscal solvency is clearly dependent on attracting an equal balance between those whose future incomes will be high

and those entering low-income professions to permit continued lendings to those whose repayments will be less than their loans. Yet, to be fiscally attractive to those entering high-income occupations or with family resources which assure high incomes, terms must be such that a large fiscal outlay by the Federal government seems a prerequisite. If the charges of all colleges are escalated sharply, present ability of the vast majority of students to finance their own education through family aid and earnings will disappear, and heavy borrowing will become for increasing numbers the only avenue of access to higher education. The Educational Opportunity Bank particularly belies its title with respect to young women seeking higher education. The burden imposed by the combined loans of husband and wife could impose harsh strains on a new family. Marriage would involve a substantial reverse dowry.

Economists who have analyzed the proposal since it was first put forward in specific form by the Panel on Educational Innovation have pointed out:

1. Although the intent of the proposal is that students should pay for their own education through long-term borrowing, the initial effect will be to require a sharp increase in Federal taxes or a sharp decrease in Federal expenditure for other public programs. One or the other would be needed to avoid the inflation caused by billions of dollars in borrowing anticipated, with no counterbalancing flow of repayments in the early years.

2. While the proposal was also presented as being of particular assistance to private institutions, and as one not intended to reduce present sources of non-Federal support to higher education, the analysis referred to suggests that private institutions will be relatively worse off under operations of the Bank unless states reduce their support of public colleges and universities and force increases in student charges. Our Associations are committed to the belief that Federally-sponsored programs should enable public and private institutions to hold down the cost of education to students and their families, thereby making educational opportunity more widely available to all. Proposals to this end are outlined elsewhere in this document.

Higher education in the United States has been the means of providing genuine equality of opportunity for increasing numbers of young men and women because the American people have recognized that education is primarily a social responsibility. They have supported our colleges and uni-

versities both directly through public channels and indirectly through voluntary support encouraged by special tax treatment, thus keeping down the financial barriers to education. The philosophy that financing education is primarily the responsibility of the student is directly contrary to this great and sound tradition.

IV. RESPONSIBILITY FOR MINIMIZING DISRUPTION IN A TIME OF INSTITUTIONAL AND SOCIETAL CHANGE.

Resort to confrontation, destruction, and violence has become an increasingly disturbing phenomenon in American life. The demands for, and the necessity of, societal change challenge the capacity of all our institutions to adjust to new conditions through orderly processes while protecting fully the freedom to dissent.

Destruction, violence, and confrontation have occurred in relation to issues involving urban problems, church problems, business, industrial and labor problems, civil rights and educational problems at all levels, to name a few. Young people, including college and university students, have been prominently involved in many of these activities. That they have also been much more heavily identified with efforts to accomplish needed change through orderly procedures is less well known because less publicized.

No level of government and no type of public or private organization has been demonstrably more successful than others in dealing either with the problems of violent confrontation, or in accelerating the processes of orderly and needed change which are basic to a reduction of tension and conflict. All have been relatively unprepared to cope with violence, all relatively slow to change.

Colleges and universities were particularly vulnerable to confrontation and violence, because they had experienced relatively little of it. Mechanisms for governance and for orderly resolution of grievances which they thought adequate proved in some cases inadequate in the test. College and university regulations, and civil laws and procedures, were in many instances found to be defective both to protect the innocent and punish the guilty.

The American tradition and practice has been substantially that the preservation of public order has been left to local authority, supplemented by state authority when needed, with Federal law and authority resorted to only when other remedies

were clearly inadequate. The involvement of local civil authorities has been relatively infrequent with respect to members of the college and university community, where respect for the rights of others and the use of internal disciplinary mechanisms have normally sufficed.

It is perhaps a tribute to the high esteem in which the American public holds its institutions of higher education that many proposals have been made and some enacted into law for Federal intervention in matters of campus disturbances. Since "news" is by definition a deviation from the past or the expected, it is perhaps a tribute to the historic ability of the university community to conduct its affairs in a peaceful manner that communications media have focussed so intensively on every instance of campus disruption and so little on the widespread instances of orderly change, or of both responsible and equitable dealing with disruption when it occurs.

These Associations believe that it is no more desirable or appropriate for the Federal government to pass special laws dealing with campus disruption than to pass special laws dealing with disruption in municipalities, counties, states or in hospitals, museums, community theaters, farms, or in elementary and secondary schools—public and private—all involved in some aspects of Federal programs.

This view does not spring from self-righteousness, illusion, or timidity. No occupational group in American life is more opposed to campus disruption, has more to lose from its occurrence, is more conscious of the fact that mistakes have been and will be made, than college and university administrators.

It is cold realism and hard experience which causes us to say that any substantial degree of direct Federal intervention with respect to campus disturbances is counter-productive of the common objective of minimizing them. Detailed Federal legal prescriptions and procedures are invitations to prolonged court procedures following institutional action. Mandatory and severe Federal penalties against particular classes of students (because recipients of Federal assistance) create manifest injustices in situations in which it is crucial that justice *be* and *be seen to be equitable* in terms of the degree of the offense, and no other criteria. Colleges and universities are not *in fact* free to move promptly under their own regulations and procedures if bound to use a different set of regu-

lations, procedures, and penalties by Federal law. By the same token, state and local civil authorities and courts are *not in fact free* of outside pressures, if they know that identical penalties assessed against young men guilty of identical offenses may automatically result in far heavier Federally-imposed penalties in one case, and none in the other.

Even the relatively mild proposal that all institutions of higher education be Federally required to prepare disciplinary regulations or lose all Federal funds inevitably carries with it both the implication that the many will be punished for the sins of the few and that Federal prescription of detailed regulations may follow. Is the Federal government to require codes of regulations for disturbances in cities, counties, and states? Shall we cut off water supplies from Federally-impounded lakes to cities which have not found the solution to confrontations over the local control of schools? Or should they be required to see that no one involved in a municipal confrontation is permitted to use the Federally-aided water system?

Colleges and universities have been challenged to act. *They have acted.* Penalties have been assessed, after hearings in accordance with due process. In recent months, most colleges and universities have revised their regulations, both with respect to protecting individual rights and to punishing those who resort to violence. State and local laws have, in many instances, been similarly revised and clarified to remove ambiguities as to public buildings and property. A great deal of experience has been gained, directly and vicariously, in dealing with the relatively new problem of disruption.

More importantly, many colleges and universities have undertaken substantial revision of their internal governance, in response to student requests for a real voice in policies that directly affect them.

Campus disruptions will continue, as they will in other areas of American life. No amount of reform or change will satisfy the small minority whose purpose is to destroy the university, rather than to accomplish needed reforms. The degree of disruption and confrontation may depend substantially on developments in American society wholly outside the control of the college or university as such. However, the content and application of university regulations and the authority for enacting and enforcing laws against disruptive activities *wherever they occur* are and should be the responsibility of those who have responsibility for campus gover-

nance, and state and local legislation and law enforcement. We have faith that if this continues to be the case, the destruction-bent minority will be increasingly isolated and ineffective.

V. DISCRIMINATION IN THE USE OF PUBLIC FUNDS FOR EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES

Member institutions of the Association support public policies against discrimination in the use of public funds for educational purposes, and believe these policies should apply equally in their use to all types of institutions, public and private. They note with regret that the Civil Rights Act of 1964 does not uniformly apply this standard because of the failure to include a provision against discrimination because of religion in Title VI of the Act, which applies to non-public as well as to public colleges and universities. They also note that Title IV of the Act, which requires a survey of the extent of discrimination in education to be made by the U. S. Commissioner of Education, applies only to public institutions and does not apply to discrimination in the use of public funds by non-public institutions receiving them.

It is, therefore, our position that the Civil Rights Act should be amended to ban the use of public funds by institutions which discriminate in the admission of students or employment of staff because of religion, and that, pending such amendment or new educational legislation, the use of public funds should be barred to institutions which discriminate because of religion. If there is reasonable ground for exception to this rule, such as might be involved in programs of public welfare, rather than of an essentially educational character—such as the school lunch program—such exceptions should be made by explicit exemption from the general rule.

VI. INDIRECT COSTS OF FEDERALLY-SPONSORED ACTIVITIES.

Indirect costs of Federally-sponsored activities are real costs that, unless fully reimbursed, constitute a serious drain on the resources of the college or university—resources that are required for carrying out their primary institutional function and for the conduct of programs where Federal support is limited or lacking. The Association strongly opposes imposition of any arbitrary ceiling on recovery of indirect costs for the reasons contained

in a study made for the Congress this year by the General Accounting Office.

VII. MANDATORY COST-SHARING.

The Associations strenuously object to the mandatory cost-sharing concept, with respect to Federally sponsored research programs. Simply equity dictates that institutions making available their physical and human resources to assist in the attainment of national objectives receive the full costs for doing so, especially when the cost sharing reduces their ability to contribute to the attainment of other, and equally important, national objectives.

VIII. ACADEMIC FACILITIES, HOUSING.

(A) *Academic Facilities.* A report issued in the fall of 1969 by a U.S. Office of Education Task Force estimated a deficiency of 68 million feet of assignable academic space in our colleges and universities as of the fall of 1968, and a need for a net addition of 241 million square feet of assignable space to handle enrollment increase projected by 1977. The Task Force estimated a need for a commitment of \$2.8 billion annually from 1970 through 1974. Federal authorizations for facilities aid include authority for direct grants of up to 50 per cent of cost of facilities, for direct loans, and for interest subsidy on loans made in the private market. These Associations supported the interest subsidy proposal as a means of expanding the facilities-aid program in a time of temporary budget stringency as a supplement to the direct loan program and the grant program. The Administration proposed, with respect to degree-granting institutions, to eliminate the grant program in the fiscal 1970 budget and to eliminate the direct-loan program for all institutions.

We recommend full funding of the grant program and the direct-loan program to the extent of the authorization provided in law. The interest subsidy program, substantially more costly in the long run than the direct-loan program, should be used only as an emergency supplement.

(B) *College Housing and Related Facilities.* The committee cited above estimated a requirement for residential, dining, and related facilities for an additional 750,000 students by 1977, at a cost of \$7.9 billion. Authorizations exist for more than \$1 billion in direct Federal loans, and money available

is being increased substantially each year by repayments into a revolving fund. Although the present interest rate for the direct loan program involves a slight subsidy because of prevailing high interest rates, the program up to the end of fiscal 1969 has shown a profit to the Federal government in excess of expenditures. Again as a supplement to the direct program in a time of budget stringency, the Congress authorized a supplemental interest subsidy program for private loans. During fiscal 1970, the direct loan program was reduced from its past \$200 million level to approximately \$60 million, the more costly interest subsidy program (over the years) being substituted for, rather than used as a supplement to, the direct program. *The direct loan and grant program should be rapidly expanded and the interest subsidy program held to its original purpose as a supplement, if needed.*

IX. INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS.

More than any other nation, the United States of America stands to benefit from programs in the international area. These include domestic programs provided under the National Defense Education Act and envisioned under the International Education Act, educational and cultural exchange programs (such as those authorized by the Fulbright-Hays Act), and technical assistance to developing nations under the Foreign Assistance Act.

Failure to fund the International Education Act and cutbacks in technical assistance programs are discouraging. On the other hand, steps to place university relationships in technical assistance on a sounder basis and to give greatly increased emphasis on helping developing nations build the educational and professional competence they need to move forward, under the leadership of Administrator John A. Hannah, are hopeful signs, as is the renewed spirit of bi-partisanship in support of international activities.

Democracy has everything to gain from the free exchange of people and ideas and the free movement of international commerce. It has much to lose from a policy of indifference to the plight of millions in other countries who look to us for assistance in improving their conditions of life.

Out of the conviction that knowledge of the history, culture, languages, and problems of other peoples of the world is essential to the sound education of American citizens today, our institutions have in recent years greatly expanded their

offerings in internationally-related fields. Particularly at the undergraduate level, and substantially at other levels, this expansion has been financed by non-Federal sources of income, including state legislatures, student fees, and private donors. We intend to continue this emphasis.

National support and national leadership are essential, however if college and university-related international educational and cultural exchange and technical assistance programs are to be adequate to the interests and responsibilities of the United States. Both the national interest and responsibility are clear.

X. IMPROVING CONDITIONS OF URBAN AND RURAL LIFE.

The problems of our center cities, linked as they are with conditions of poverty, inadequate education, and unemployment, are properly a major focus of public concern. These problems, it is clear, are also inextricably linked with those of poverty, inadequate education, and lack of suitable employment in non-urban, non-metropolitan areas, where 29 percent of the population includes 41 percent of those classified as below the "poverty" line.

Member institutions of these Associations have a traditional role of concern for and action related to the conditions of the citizenry. This concern is now intensified and expanded by the tremendous problems of a rapidly urbanizing society. Member institutions of these Associations are heavily involved in research, educational, and public service programs designed to improve the conditions of rural and urban life. The chief limitation on their ability to respond to urgent requests for expert assistance is lack of resources for this purpose, particularly as related to urban problems.

XI. NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT.

The member institutions of these Associations share the general informed concern for the need for conservation and intelligent utilization of our natural resources and for the abatement of the increasing pollution of our natural environment. For this reason, we have welcomed the Water Resources Research Act, the Sea Grant College and Program Act, and the programs established in the Department of the Interior, the Public Health Service, and

the Environmental Sciences Service Administration in the Department of Commerce aimed at the understanding and abatement of air and water pollution.

These programs, as were those for continuing education and public service, were initiated during a period of budget constriction for domestic programs, and should be funded consistently high with their priority at the earliest possible time.

Further, we urge continuing emphasis in the administration of the Sea Grant College and Program Act on the importance of broad, flexible institutional awards.

XII. RESEARCH AND EXTENSION IN AGRICULTURE AND RELATED FIELDS.

The cooperative programs of research and education in agriculture and related fields between the Federal government and Land-Grant institutions have been conspicuously successful. Indeed, these programs have been a major factor in the development in the United States of the most productive and efficient agriculture in the history of mankind.

It is recognized that the consumer is the principal beneficiary of these programs. Consequently, it is in the public interest to maintain a level of Federal financial support which will enable these programs to make their maximum contribution to the nation's agriculture and ultimately to the consuming public.

The Associations are concerned that Federal support in recent years has lagged substantially behind rising costs, requiring the states to carry an increasing proportion of the cost of these cooperative efforts. Major long-range studies of both agricultural research and extension programs have been made by joint committees of the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges. The recommendations of these committees offer sound and constructive suggestions for reorienting and expanding both programs.

XIII. EXTENDING THE RESOURCES OF HIGHER EDUCATION.

The Congress has recognized the great need for Federal action to make available the resources of our colleges and universities toward the solution of problems of national and international concern. We applaud the enactment of such legislation as Title I

of the Higher Education Act of 1965, the State Technical Services Act, the Regional Medical Programs Act, legislation affecting the Department of Housing and Urban Affairs, the Law Enforcement Act, and the Smith-Lever Act establishing the Cooperative Extension Service, which has furnished the example inspiring many of the more recent programs. Through the implementation of programs of continuing education and extension authorized by these and other acts, the Congress enables universities to bring their unique resources to bear on the needs of communities and individuals for assistance in solving the multiple problems associated with rapid urbanization, technological change, social change, and the needs of the professions, agriculture, labor, business, industry, the delivery of health service, and the Federal government.

Truly significant progress cannot be expected from these programs until it is possible to fund them at levels commensurate with the needs they were established to help satisfy.

XIV. ESTABLISHMENT OF NEW FEDERAL DEGREE-GRANTING AUTHORITY AND INSTITUTIONS.

In recent years, many efforts have been made, some successfully, to authorize the granting of advanced academic degrees by Federal agencies or establishments. We believe these efforts arise from basic confusion as to the nature of a university, the significance and meaning of the academic degree, and the resources of the non-Federal academic establishment.

The basic characteristic of the university as a center for the advancement of knowledge is one of free inquiry, free exchange of the results of research with other scholars in the field, and free criticism. Another characteristic is the opportunity offered for educating men and women in the processes and methods of research. The academic degree is a recognition of educational attainment and research accomplishment under conditions of free inquiry, exchange, and criticism. Its use by agencies or institutions, which are not, and cannot, become universities in this sense of the term is a misuse which is both undesirable and unnecessary.

XV. INTERGOVERNMENTAL COOPERATION: UNIQUE CHARACTER OF HIGHER EDUCATION.

The Associations strongly support activities designed to improve cooperation between the Federal government and state and local governments and to increase the capacity of state and local governments to provide the quality and variety of public services needed in our complex society.

They emphatically call attention, however, to the unique character of higher education as an instrumentality of society. All the states have, by constitutional or legislative action, placed responsibility for governance of public universities and colleges under the control and direction of governing boards separated from direct channels of state administrative and political control. Private institutions have historically enjoyed this status.

In recent years, national legislative proposals have been made which would have the effect of authorizing the administrative branch of the Federal government to require that staffs of both public and private universities and colleges engaged in Federally assisted programs be placed under state merit systems, channeling Federal funds for higher education through state administrative agencies having no jurisdiction under state constitutions or law, by-passing state legislative authority, and assigning planning responsibility for higher education within the states to agencies created for entirely different purposes.

Since inadvertance or lack of awareness of the issues and relationships involved apparently have been responsible for violation in proposed legislation of this sound principle, the Associations respectfully call it to the attention of Congressional committees, Federal agencies dealing with educational legislation, and the Advisory Committee on Intergovernmental Relations.

XVI. OFFICER EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Public and Land-Grant universities and colleges have, from their founding, held to the philosophy that their responsibilities include provision of opportunity for advanced education for a wide range of occupations in private and public life. Other institutions have increasingly shared that philosophy and responsibility.

As a result, leadership in every phase and field of American life has come from individuals from a

wide range of backgrounds: institutional, regional, economic, ethnic, social.

In only one area, that of preparing officers for the Armed Services, has the Federal government established its own institutions of higher education. However, for many years the vast majority of regular and reserve officers for the Armed Services have come from non-Federal colleges and universities. The two Associations believe that (1) it is appropriate for institutions of the type represented in their membership to offer courses and programs of interest to those wishing to serve as officers in the Armed Services, as they do for other occupational fields, and (2) that it would be highly undesirable for officer education to be restricted to the service academies.

With respect to the Reserve Officers' Training Corps program as such, controversies over issues such as the amount of credit for course work, jurisdiction over the selection of instructors, and the nature and content of the curriculum have arisen in a relatively small number of institutions. The Department of Defense has indicated a recognition of the desirability of certain reforms and a greater degree of flexibility in program. This points to the probability that most institutions involved or desiring to be involved in officer-education programs will find it possible to conduct them through the R.O.T.C.

Colleges and universities make a most substantial financial contribution to officer-education through the R.O.T.C. program. They provide, without charge to the Federal government, classroom, office, and other facilities and departmental support. Although the question of at least partial reimbursement for these costs has been under discussion for more than 20 years, no action has resulted.

Meanwhile, the problem becomes increasingly critical as enrollments and pressures on university facilities rise, accompanied by sharp reductions in funds available from governmental and private sources for needed new construction.

The Associations commend the generally constructive report of the Special Committee on R.O.T.C. named by the Secretary of Defense, and endorse in particular its recommendations (1) for amendment of the R.O.T.C. Revitalization Act to indicate the cooperative nature of R.O.T.C. curriculum development as between institutions of higher education and the Armed Services and (2) for Federal payment of the full institutional costs of

the R.O.T.C. program. The Associations are hopeful that the fixing of specific responsibility for R.O.T.C. matters at the Department of Defense level in the office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary (Education) will improve liaison with higher education and expedite early action on needed administrative and legislative changes.

The Associations strongly recommend that Advisory Panels on R.O.T.C. of both the Department of Defense and the several Armed Services include representatives of the major institutional organizations in higher education.

XVII. SELECTIVE SERVICE.

The Associations commend the President and the Congress for the authorization and establishment of procedures under the present Selective Service Act providing for one year of maximum vulnerability to call and for a random selection system of determining order of induction, within the established prime age group. This will enable young men to plan their future with more certainty and also eliminate the heavy impact of the former "eldest first" rule on graduate and professional education, while assuring that students deferred for higher education will be subject to call in the same proportion as other qualified registrants.

XVIII. CONCLUSION.

There is, as Shakespeare said, a time for all things. The time has come in higher education for a cessation of new studies and pronouncements on the national role in higher education and for a real beginning of *action* to implement programs on whose objectives there has long been general agreement. With the exception of a national program of general institutional support to colleges and universities, authorizing legislation both to provide access to higher education for the disadvantaged and to make available the resources of higher education toward solving many of the most pressing problems of our time has long been on the statute books.

The times call for action.

MEMBER INSTITUTIONS OF
THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE UNIVERSITIES
AND LAND-GRANT COLLEGES

AND
THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF
STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

ALABAMA

Alabama A & M University
Alabama State University
Auburn University
Florence State University
Jacksonville State University
Livingston State University
Troy State University
University of Alabama
University of Montevallo
University of South Alabama

ALASKA

University of Alaska

ARIZONA

Arizona State University
Northern Arizona University
University of Arizona

ARKANSAS

Agricultural, Mechanical
and Normal College
Arkansas A & M College
Arkansas Polytechnic College
Arkansas State University
Henderson State College
Southern State College
State College of Arkansas
University of Arkansas

CALIFORNIA

California State College
at Bakersfield
California State College
at Dominguez Hills
California State College
at Fullerton
California State College
at Hayward
California State College
at Long Beach
California State College
at Los Angeles
California State College
at San Bernardino
California State Polytechnic
College—Kellogg-Voorhis
California State Polytechnic
College
Chico State College
Fresno State College
Humboldt State College
Sacramento State College
San Diego State College
San Fernando Valley
State College
San Francisco State College
San Jose State College
Sonoma State College
Stanislaus State College
University of California
University of California
at Berkeley
University of California
at Davis
University of California
at Los Angeles

COLORADO

Adams State College
Colorado State College
Colorado State University
Fort Lewis College
Metropolitan State College
Southern Colorado
State College
University of Colorado
Western State College
of Colorado

CONNECTICUT

Connecticut Agricultural
Experiment Station
Central Connecticut
State College
Eastern Connecticut
State College
Southern Connecticut
State College
University of Connecticut
Western Connecticut
State College

DELAWARE

Delaware State College
University of Delaware

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

District of Columbia
Teachers College
*Federal City College

FLORIDA

*Florida A & M University
Florida Atlantic University
Florida International
University
Florida State University
Florida Technological
University
University of Florida
University of North Florida
University of West Florida

GEORGIA

Albany State College
Armstrong State College
Augusta College
Columbus College
Fort Valley State College
Georgia College
at Milledgeville
Georgia Institute of
Technology
Georgia Southern College
Savannah State College
University of Georgia
Valdosta State College
West Georgia College

GUAM

University of Guam

HAWAII

University of Hawaii

IDAHO

Boise State College
Idaho State University
Lewis-Clark Normal School
University of Idaho

ILLINOIS

Chicago State College
Eastern Illinois University
Governors State University
Illinois State University
Northern Illinois
State College
Northern Illinois University
Sangamon State University
Southern Illinois University
University of Illinois
Western Illinois University

INDIANA

Ball State University
Indiana State University
Indiana University
Purdue University

IOWA

Iowa State University
University of Iowa
University of Northern Iowa

KANSAS

Fort Hays Kansas State College
Kansas State College
of Pittsburg
Kansas State Teachers College
Kansas State University
University of Kansas
Wichita State University

KENTUCKY

Eastern Kentucky University
Morehead State University
Murray State University
Kentucky State College
University of Kentucky
Western Kentucky University

LOUISIANA

Francis T. Nicholls
State College
Grambling College
Louisiana Polytechnic Institute
Louisiana State University
McNeese State College
Northeast Louisiana
State College
Northwestern State College
Southeastern Louisiana College
Southern University

MAINE

Aroostook State College
Farmington State College
Fort Kent State College
Gorham State College
Maine Maritime Academy
University of Maine
University of Maine—Orono
Washington State College

MARYLAND

Bowie State College
Coppin State College
Frostburg State College
Maryland State College
Morgan State College
St. Mary's College
of Maryland
Salisbury State College

Towson State College
University of Maryland

MASSACHUSETTS

Boston State College
Bridgewater State College
Fitchburg State College
Framingham State College
Lowell State College
Massachusetts College of Art
Massachusetts Institute
of Technology
Massachusetts Maritime Academy
North Adams State College
Salem State College
University of Massachusetts
Westfield State College
Worcester State College

MICHIGAN

Central Michigan University
Eastern Michigan University
Ferris State College
Grand Valley State College
Lake Superior State College
Michigan State University
Northern Michigan University
University of Michigan
Wayne State University

MINNESOTA

Bemidji State College
Mankato State College
Moorhead State College
St. Cloud State College
Southwest Minnesota
State College
University of Minnesota
Winona State College

MISSISSIPPI

*Alcorn Agricultural &
Mechanical College
Delta State College
Jackson State College
Mississippi State College
for Women
Mississippi State University
Mississippi Valley
State College
University of Mississippi
University of
Southern Mississippi

MISSOURI

Central Missouri
State College
Harris Teachers College
Lincoln University
Missouri Southern College
Missouri Western College
Northeast Missouri
State College
Northwest Missouri
State College
Southeast Missouri
State College
Southwest Missouri
State College
University of Missouri

MONTANA

Eastern Montana College
Montana College of Mineral
Science & Technology
Montana State University
Northern Montana College
University of Montana
Western Montana College

NEBRASKA

Chadron State College
Kearney State College
Peru State College
University of Nebraska
Wayne State College

NEVADA

University of Nevada
at Las Vegas
University of Nevada
at Reno
University of Nevada System

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Keene State College
Plymouth State College
University of New Hampshire

NEW JERSEY

College of North Jersey
Glassboro State College
Jersey City State College
Montclair State College
Newark State College
Paterson State College
Richard Stockton State College
Rutgers, The State University
of New Jersey

NEW MEXICO

Eastern New Mexico University
New Mexico State University
University of New Mexico
Western New Mexico University

NEW YORK

City University of New York
Cornell University
State University College
at Brockport
State University College
at Buffalo
State University College
at Cortland
State University College
at Geneseo
State University College
at New Paltz
State University College
at Old Westbury
State University College
at Oneonta
State University College
at Oswego
State University College
at Plattsburgh
State University College
at Potsdam
State University of New York
**State University of New York*
at Albany
State University of New York
at Buffalo
State University of New York
at Binghamton
State University of New York
at Stony Brook

NORTH CAROLINA

Appalachian State University
East Carolina University
Elizabeth City State University
Fayetteville State College
North Carolina A & T
State University
North Carolina Central University
North Carolina State University
Pembroke State University

University of North Carolina
at Asheville
University of North Carolina
University of North Carolina
at Chapel Hill
Western Carolina University
Winston-Salem State College

NORTH DAKOTA

Dickinson State College
Mayville State College
Minot State College
North Dakota State University
University of North Dakota
University of North Dakota
Ellendale Center
Valley City State College

OHIO

Bowling Green
State University
Central State University
The Cleveland State University
Kent State University
Miami University
Ohio State University
Ohio University
University of Akron
University of Toledo
Youngstown State University
Wright State University

OKLAHOMA

Central State College
East Central State College
Langston University
Northeastern State College
Northwestern State College
Oklahoma State University
Southeastern State College
University of Oklahoma

OREGON

Eastern Oregon College
Oregon State University
Oregon Technical Institute
Southern Oregon College
University of Oregon

PENNSYLVANIA

Bloomsburg State College
California State College
Cheyney State College
Clarion State College
East Stroudsburg
State College
Edinboro State College
Indiana University
of Pennsylvania
Kutztown State College
Lock Haven State College
Mansfield State College
Millersville State College
Pennsylvania State University
Shippensburg State College
Slippery Rock State College
West Chester State College

PUERTO RICO

University of Puerto Rico

RHODE ISLAND

Rhode Island College
University of Rhode Island

SOUTH CAROLINA

Clemson University
South Carolina State College
University of South Carolina

SOUTH DAKOTA

Black Hills State College
Dakota State College
Northern State College
South Dakota State University
Southern State College
University of South Dakota

TENNESSEE

Austin Peay State University
East Tennessee
State University
Memphis State University
Middle Tennessee
State University
Tennessee A & I
State University
Tennessee Technological
University
University of Tennessee

TEXAS

East Texas State University
Midwestern University
North Texas State University
Prairie View Agricultural
& Mechanical College
Southwest Texas State College
Stephen F. Austin
State University
Texas A & I University
Texas A & M University System
Texas Southern University
Texas Tech University
Texas Woman's University
University of Houston
University of Texas System
University of Texas
at Austin
West Texas State University

UTAH

Southern Utah State College
Utah State University
University of Utah

VERMONT

Castleton State College
Johnson State College
Lyndon State College
University of Vermont

VIRGINIA

Clinch Valley College
George Mason College
University of Virginia
Longwood College
Madison College
Mary Washington College

Norfolk State College
Radford College
University of Virginia
Virginia Commonwealth
University
Virginia Polytechnic
Institute
Virginia State College

VIRGIN ISLANDS

College of the Virgin
Islands

WASHINGTON

Central Washington
State College
Eastern Washington
State College
The Evergreen State College
University of Washington
Washington State University
Western Washington
State College

WEST VIRGINIA

Bluefield State College
Concord College
Fairmont State College
Marshall University
Shepherd College
West Liberty Institute
of Technology
West Virginia University

WISCONSIN

Stout State University
University of Wisconsin
University of Wisconsin
at Madison
Wisconsin State University
at Eau Claire
Wisconsin State University
at La Crosse
Wisconsin State University
at Oshkosh
Wisconsin State University
at Platteville
Wisconsin State University
at River Falls
Wisconsin State University
at Stevens Point
Wisconsin State University
at Superior
Wisconsin State University
at Whitewater

WYOMING

University of Wyoming

Italics are members of NASULGC

* Members of both Associations