

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 052 685

HE 002 289

AUTHOR Whaley, W. Gordon, Ed.
TITLE Journal of Proceedings and Addresses of the
Association of Graduate Schools in the Association
of American Universities (21st, New York City,
October 22-23, 1969).
INSTITUTION Association of American Universities, Washington,
D.C.
PUB DATE 70
NOTE 138p.
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.65 HC-\$6.58
DESCRIPTORS *Conference Reports, *Educational Change, *Federal
Government, Financial Support, *Graduate Study,
International Education, Negro Students, *Problems,
Research, Testing
IDENTIFIERS *Association of Graduate Schools

ABSTRACT

The proceedings open with an editorial "Time for Change," by Dean W. Gordon Whaley who warns that unless graduate education examines not only the nature of its successes and does everything it can to enhance them, but also the reasons for the failures and alienations and does its utmost to remove those, it will be headed for extinction. This is followed by presentations given at three panel discussions: (1) graduate education in a changing world; (2) federal responsibilities to the university and university responsibilities to the federal government; and (3) graduate education and the black student. Next come the reports of the Committees on: (1) Policies in Graduate Education; (2) International Education; (3) Research and Research Administration; (4) Student Aid; and (5) Testing. The proceedings conclude with a brief report on Association business, the Association's Constitution, Association officers 1949-1970, and a list of member institutions, graduate deans and addresses. (AF)

ED052685

MAY 10 1971

*Journal of
Proceedings and
Addresses
of the Association of
Graduate Schools
in the Association
of American
Universities*

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.

Twenty-First Annual Conference
New York City - October 22-23, 1969

HE 000 289

ED052685

JOURNAL OF PROCEEDINGS AND ADDRESSES

Journal of Proceedings and Addresses
of the
Twenty-first Annual Conference
of the
Association of Graduate Schools
in the
Association of American Universities

NEW YORK CITY, OCTOBER 22-23, 1969

W. Gordon Whaley, Editor

OFFICE OF THE DEAN OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS
AUSTIN, TEXAS

Until September 30, 1970,
copies of preceding issues of
the Journal of Proceedings may
be obtained from
The University of Texas Press
Box 7819
Austin, Texas 78712

Price: \$2.50 per copy, prepaid

After September 30, address inquiries and requests
for copies to: Dean William P. Albrecht
Graduate School
The University of Kansas
Lawrence, Kansas 66045

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
OFFICERS AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE	vii
DELEGATES AND GUESTS ATTENDING THE CONFERENCE	1
AN EDITORIAL: <i>Time for Change</i> <i>Dean W. Gordon Whaley</i>	4
INTRODUCTORY NOTES BY THE PRESIDENT	10
PANEL DISCUSSIONS	
<i>Graduate Education in a Changing World</i> <i>Dean John Petersen Elder, Dean George K. Fraenkel,</i> <i>Dean W. Donald Cooke, Dean Sanford Elberg</i>	11
<i>Federal Responsibilities to the University and University</i> <i>Responsibilities to the Federal Government</i> <i>Dean George Winchester Stone, Jr., Dr. Charles V. Kidd,</i> <i>Dean Robert M. Bock, Dr. Louis Levin,</i> <i>Dean J. Boyd Page</i>	34
<i>Graduate Education and the Black Student</i> <i>Dean David R. Deener, Professor Hollis Lynch,</i> <i>Mr. John H. Bracey, Jr., Dean Wade Ellis</i>	55
REPORTS OF COMMITTEES	
Committee on Policies in Graduate Education <i>Dean Ernest Sirluck</i>	85
Committee on International Education <i>Dean S.D.S. Spragg</i>	89
Committee on Research and Research Administration <i>Dean Michael J. Brennan</i>	92
Committee on Student Aid <i>Dean W. Donald Cooke</i>	93
Committee on Testing <i>Dean W. Donald Cooke</i>	99

ASSOCIATION BUSINESS	
AAU-AGS Activities	106
AAU Council on Federal Relations	109
Report of the Editor of the <i>Journal of Proceedings</i>	112
Financial Report of the Treasurer	113
Report of the Committee on Nominations	115
Amendment to the Constitution	116
Committees for 1969-70	117
Actions and Announcements	118
CONSTITUTION OF THE ASSOCIATION OF GRADUATE SCHOOLS	121
OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION OF GRADUATE SCHOOLS: 1949-1970	123
MEMBER INSTITUTIONS, DEANS, AND ADDRESSES	125
INDEX	131

ASSOCIATION OF GRADUATE SCHOOLS

OFFICERS AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

1968-69

President—Frederic Bohnenblust
Vice-President—Bryce Crawford, Jr.
Secretary-Treasurer—Daniel Alpert
Member-at-Large and Editor of
the *Proceedings*—W. Gordon Whaley
Past-President—John Perry Miller

1969-70

President—Bryce Crawford, Jr.
Vice-President—W. Donald Cooke
Secretary-Treasurer—Michael Brennan
First Member-at-Large and Editor of
the *Proceedings*—W. Gordon Whaley
Second Member-at-Large—William M. Protheroe
Past-President—Frederic Bohnenblust

*THE TWENTY-FIRST
ANNUAL CONFERENCE
of the
ASSOCIATION OF GRADUATE
SCHOOLS*

THE Twenty-first Annual Conference of the Association of Graduate Schools in the Association of American Universities took place in New York City, October 22-23, 1969. General sessions were held at the Biltmore Hotel, with Dean Frederic Bohnenblust presiding.

DELEGATES ATTENDING THE CONFERENCE

ALBRECHT, WILLIAM P., Dean, University of Kansas
ALPERT, DANIEL, Dean, University of Illinois
ANDREWS, F. N., Vice President for Research and Dean, Purdue University
ARMITAGE, RICHARD, Dean, Ohio State University
BAKER, ROBERT H., Dean, Northwestern University
BARTOO, JAMES B., Dean, Pennsylvania State University
BAUMER, ELMER F., Associate Dean, Ohio State University
BELL, R. E., Dean, McGill University
BOCK, ROBERT M., Dean, University of Wisconsin
BODDY, FRANCIS M., Associate Dean, University of Minnesota
BOHNENBLUST, FREDERIC, Dean, California Institute of Technology
BOLLIER, E. P., Associate Dean, Tulane University
BRENNAN, MICHAEL J., Dean, Brown University
BROOKS, THEO., Assistant Dean, Michigan State University
BROWN, SANBORN C., Associate Dean, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
CLARK, ROGER G., Assistant Dean, University of Illinois
COLLINS, ROBERT O., Associate Dean, University of California, Santa Barbara
COOKE, W. DONALD, Dean, Cornell University
CRAWFORD, BRYCE, JR., Dean, University of Minnesota
CROWE, C. LAWSON, Dean, University of Colorado

DEENER, DAVID R., Provost and Dean, Tulane University
 DELEHANTY, GEORGE E., Associate Dean, Northwestern University
 ELBERG, SANFORD S., Dean, University of California, Berkeley
 ELDER, J. P., Dean, Harvard University
 ELKINS, KEITH, Assistant Dean, Washington University
 ELLIS, WADE, Associate Dean, University of Michigan
 FRAENKEL, GEORGE K., Dean, Columbia University
 FROST, STANLEY B., Vice Principal for Planning and Development,
 McGill University
 HOBSTETTER, JOHN N., Dean, University of Pennsylvania
 HOWELL, BENJAMIN F., JR., Assistant Dean, Pennsylvania State
 University
 HUBBARD, PAUL, Associate Dean, University of North Carolina
 JONES, LYLE V., Vice Chancellor and Dean, University of North
 Carolina
 KAUVAR, GERALD G., Assistant Dean, University of Illinois
 KIMBALL, ALLYN K., Dean, Johns Hopkins University
 KINSMAN, ROBERT S., Associate Dean, University of California,
 Los Angeles
 KOOB, CHARLES, Assistant to the Dean, Stanford University
 LAGEMANN, ROBERT T., Dean, Vanderbilt University
 LEGMAN, PAUL, Assistant Dean, New York University
 LEMONICK, AARON, Dean, Princeton University
 LORAM, IAN C., Associate Dean, University of Wisconsin
 LURIE, HAROLD, Associate Dean, California Institute of Technology
 MASON, CHARLES M., Assistant Dean, University of Iowa
 MAU, JAMES, Assistant Dean, Yale University
 MCCARTHY, JOSEPH L., Dean, University of Washington
 MCCASHLAND, BENJAMIN W., Assistant Dean, University of Nebraska
 MCCRONE, ALISTAIR, Associate Dean, New York University
 MCKINNEY, JOHN C., Dean, Duke University
 MILLS, RUSSELL C., Associate Dean, University of Kansas
 MINOR, ANDREW C., Associate Dean, University of Missouri
 MORROW, RALPH E., Dean, Washington University
 MOSES, LINCOLN E., Dean, Stanford University
 MUELDER, MILTON L., Vice President for Research Development
 and Dean, Michigan State University
 NOBLE, THOMAS A., Associate Dean, Yale University
 O'CONNOR, JAMES P., Vice Provost and Dean, Catholic University
 of America
 O'KANE, DANIEL J., Associate Dean, University of Pennsylvania
 PAGE, J. BOYD, Dean, Iowa State University
 PHELPS, REGINALD H., Associate Dean, Harvard University

POLLACK, FRED H., Associate Dean, Brown University
PROTHEROE, WILLIAM, Associate Dean, Ohio State University
RANDALL, DALE B. J., Associate Dean, Duke University
ROBEY, RICHARD C., Associate Dean, Columbia University
ROGERS, LORENE L., Associate Dean, University of Texas
RUDE, ERIC R., Associate Dean, University of Wisconsin
SARICKS, AMBROSE, Associate Dean, University of Kansas
SCAFF, ALVIN H., Dean for Advanced Studies, University of Iowa
SHULL, HARRISON, Dean, Indiana University
SNYDER, HAROLD R., Associate Dean, University of Illinois
SPRAGG, S. D. S., Dean, University of Rochester
SPRIESTERSBACH, D. C., Vice President for Research and Dean,
University of Iowa
SPURR, STEPHEN H., Dean, University of Michigan
STONE, GEORGE WINCHESTER, JR., Dean, New York University
STRIDER, ROBERT L., Associate Dean, Johns Hopkins University
SULLIVAN, KEVIN, Associate Dean, Columbia University
SUTTON, H. ELDON, Associate Dean, University of Texas
TAYLOR, DONALD W., Dean, Yale University
THOMAS, MORGAN D., Associate Dean, University of Washington
THUNE, LELAND E., Associate Dean, Vanderbilt University
VEIS, ARTHUR, Assistant Dean, Northwestern University
WARSHAW, MYRON, Assistant Dean, New York University
WEST, VINCENT I., Associate Dean, University of Illinois
WHALEY, W. GORDON, Dean, University of Texas
WHITEHEAD, W. D., Dean, University of Virginia
YAMAGUCHI, HARRY G., Associate Dean, Indiana University

GUESTS ATTENDING THE CONFERENCE

BRACEY, JOHN H., JR., Lecturer in History, Northern Illinois University, and Graduate Student, Northwestern University
KIDD, CHARLES V., Director, Council on Federal Relations of the Association of American Universities
LEVIN, LOUIS, Executive Associate Director, National Science Foundation
LYNCH, HOLLIS, Professor of History, Institute for African Studies, Columbia University

AN EDITORIAL

Time For Change

IN the normal course of events, if indeed there is such a thing these days, this will be my final editorial appearance on the pages of these *Proceedings*. I believe virtually everyone in our member institutions has become convinced that there are great difficulties and large deficiencies in higher education, many of them residing in graduate education. If one looks at the developments behind the recent tragic events at many universities, one sees a long-term failure to meet certain needs. I shall not attempt to analyze the situation as it applies to the educational scene in general, but I shall try to put some of it in perspective as it pertains to graduate education.

Before doing so, however, I would like to make one general point. The early and mid-twentieth century view that a baccalaureate degree and then, in many instances, a graduate degree was a desirable goal for an increasingly large segment of our population led many individuals to pursue degrees when a college education was not necessarily the best preparation they could have for fruitful, rewarding lives, much less a graduate education. Some number would have been better off in other types of educational and training programs. Hence a serious confusion arose regarding the purposes of the university and the graduate school, to say nothing of a dilution of the quality of both. We stand, as a consequence of these and other factors (some of which we were totally unprepared for), on the brink of destruction of the educational system. Unless we find means of readjusting it to the needs of the people, we are going to be observers of that destruction. Needless to say there are always requirements for some changes in purpose and emphasis in our system of higher education to cope with the problems of the moment and the future. But the higher educational system can only cope with certain of these problems in direct ways. It must make its contribution to the others in a much less direct manner by providing objective leaders who are truly educated individuals. Against this background let me concern myself specifically with certain aspects of the state of graduate education.

As I am sure you are aware, graduate education in this country has been in existence roughly a century. American scholars began about 1817 to pursue higher studies in Germany on a quite different basis from any academic programs offered in American institutions. The research design met with such favor that those setting up the Johns Hopkins University in 1876 chose to make it a wholly graduate in-

stitution. Recently I have listened to a number of predictions that it will become necessary to separate graduate education, with its elements of devotion to the development of intellectual strength, from the rest of the university and either establish a series of separate graduate institutions or seek some new types of institutions in which the development of intellectual strength will be the central purpose, uncompromised by all the other issues, important as some of them may be. I might add that the institution in the United States which has increased its standing most dramatically in the last decade is an independent graduate institution. There are moments when I would like to achieve more peace of mind by participating in a separation of graduate education from the rest of the concerns of academic institutions, but as a general principle I view education as a continuum, and I sense that the problems arising from its further fragmentation could be of even greater magnitude than the problems over which I am expressing concern.

The effects of American absorption of the German research training made such an impact that a group of prominent American educators, as they are wont to do, called a conference. The presidents of Harvard, Columbia, the Johns Hopkins University, The University of Chicago, and The University of California extended to nine of their sister institutions an invitation to meet February 27-28, 1900, in Chicago. Their invitation is worth quoting, for it highlights the basic problem of maintaining quality in an endeavor that is undertaken by different sorts of institutions in widely separated locations.

This invitation is prompted by a desire to secure in foreign universities, where it is not already given, such credit as is legitimately due to the advanced work done in our own universities of high standing, and to protect the dignity of our Doctor's degrees. It seems to us, for instance, that European universities should be discouraged from conferring the degree of Doctor of Philosophy on American students who are not prepared to take the degree from our own best universities, and from granting degrees to Americans on lower terms than to their native students.

There is reason to believe that among other things the deliberations of such a conference as has been proposed will (1) result in a greater uniformity of the conditions under which students may become candidates for higher degrees in different American universities, thereby solving the question of migration, which has become an important issue with the Federation of Graduate Clubs; (2) raise the opinion entertained abroad of our own Doctor's degree; (3) raise the standard of our own weaker institutions.

As you probably recognize, this was the founding act of the Association of American Universities. Concern with the reputation of American Ph.D.'s abroad is, of course, a thing of the past, but the con-

cept of a research-oriented degree that is not designed to encompass application of knowledge to practical problems or impart advanced skills has continued to dominate the entire world of graduate education. While this single idea has ruled the philosophy of the Doctor of Philosophy degree, an endless variety of types of training has come to be included in Ph.D. programs—now awarded by some 300 institutions in this country. Obviously a great majority of our Ph.D.'s are not Ph.D.'s in the initial sense.

If you think I am going to make a plea for returning any substantial part of graduate education to the nineteenth-century European principle of a narrowly defined research degree, you are mistaken. But neither can I subscribe to an Anything Goes philosophy. The rigid adherence to the first philosophy and the facile promotion of the second are, in my opinion, both responsible for getting us into this mess. What I feel we must do is to determine the purposes of graduate education and decide which of them are best served by the Ph.D. in updated form and which purposes would be far better served if some degree programs were differently structured and titled to reflect the fact that they serve different purposes. The simple truth is that in 1970 we have more needs than we had in 1900.

I would outline the basic purposes of graduate education as follows:

1. To meet the continuing obligation to increase knowledge, heighten the motivation of and deepen the insights of a limited number of individuals who can be expected to produce ideas whether they be for resolving the ills of our society, guiding its future, or simply adding to the rich store of knowledge that comprises our civilization.

2. To assure the advanced professional training of individuals who then can deal effectively with the requirements of a rapidly changing social order. Comprehensive high-level training is being increasingly called for. It is not enough, say, to have someone trained in how to cope with water pollution who does not also have a comprehensive knowledge of biological science and sociology.

3. To devote some resources to broadening the background and enhancing the skills of persons who have neither the desire (nor perhaps the capacity) to become leaders in expanding knowledge or the management of societal efforts, but to provide them with specific advanced training so that they may constitute the manpower for a vast middle-range of occupations that undergird our society.

The pertinence of degree structures to these basic purposes deserves some comment. The Ph.D. degree could (and should, I feel) meet the need for providing the basic increase in knowledge. If Ph.D. programs were not so diluted by serving purposes for which they are not suited, they could, in a multitude of fields, with some essential re-working, meet this basic purpose.

The Ph.D. could also meet part of the requirements of the second purpose—increasing the knowledge and the competence of many of those who become society's managers. But somewhere within the perspective of this purpose, there ought to be a separation between the Ph.D. program, with its emphasis on research, and the sort of doctoral program that would impart a broad spectrum of knowledge but attach to it a specific requirement that would ensure competence in practice within a specific professional area. For myself, I see this purpose met by a group of quite different sorts of doctoral programs—Doctor of Arts, Doctor of Science, Doctor of Education, Doctor of Business Administration, Doctor of Engineering, etc.

Many such programs exist and many more are now in course of development in institutions which are members of this Association and elsewhere.

Such programs and their relation to academic degree structures generally are the subject of Stephen Spurr's report prepared for the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education entitled *Academic Degree Structures: Innovative Approaches*. I should like to stress, however, that the precise nature of these programs and their relation to graduate education generally needs careful evaluation in the interest of establishing in the public mind the degree of equivalence and the character of the separation of them from the Ph.D. program. In my view the emphasis on such degree programs would be first, comprehensive understanding of existing knowledge, then training to apply it to specific tasks. Such degrees could, in my opinion, be available in a pattern that makes this the capstone for those wishing careers in practicing their professions rather than in unfolding knowledge *per se*. I would eliminate the narrowly defined research component from such degree programs and devote support funds for research to a smaller number who will and can do real, primary research.

I think the distinction between the Doctor of Philosophy degree and these other Doctoral degrees should be made clear, and I feel the holders of the other doctorates would probably profit by more exposure to existing knowledge in the library, in the laboratory, in conferences or otherwise than they would profit by spending their time writing what are all too often second-, third-, and fourth-rate research dissertations, though I quite agree with Dr. Spurr that an expository thesis or dissertation might be a useful requirement.

The design of these degrees would necessarily have to be left to the experts in the different fields and will necessarily vary to some extent from institution to institution, but I think the concept is reasonable and long overdue. I am, in fact, willing to postulate that enough high-ranking institutions will now move in this direction to assure the ac-

ceptance of such degrees. Needless to say the psychological and other factors of acceptance of these degrees as the equivalent to the Ph.D. will have to be taken into consideration. But, after all, this is 1970—not 1900. The mismatches of training and purpose are the roots of the trouble, and the problem of degree-psychology needs be explored both by the users of the product and the suppliers—namely the graduate schools. Both the hard facts and the psychology would suggest, I am certain—in fact already have been suggested—both a limitation of Ph.D.'s and some such series of alternative doctoral degrees as I have outlined.

The third purpose—the need to design advanced education for those who primarily need it in terms of possession of skills—could with some modifications be met by Master's degree programs. Such modifications might or might not retain some research component, but the expectation would not be, in any circumstance, for original research but for carefully guided secondary research.

A revolution in degree structure will not, by itself, be enough, of course. While one of my main concerns is that the present attitudes of some students not defeat the purpose of graduate programs, it behooves us, I believe, to look deeper into what we are doing to see where we can improve our programs to meet the needs of this generation of students. Progress is going to require serious thought about how opportunities can be broadened for less privileged individuals. Watered-down degrees are surely not the answer, and some of the danger in the re-structuring that I have mentioned lies in the very fact that there will be a great temptation to try to solve this thorny problem by that easy way out. We must leave the way open for hitherto less privileged individuals to make their marks with the most advanced degrees we can offer. But I think it unlikely that many such individuals will go the whole route until we have improved opportunities for them with restructured Master's degrees, and, in some instances, simply made advanced university offerings available to them, even though they may not formally be degree candidates at all. Most of all, we need to become more sensitive to meeting these needs by realistic planning and counseling. Implementing some of these ideas will require putting plainer labels on the various offerings in advanced education and standing by them. American institutions, and society as well, are clearly afflicted with status disease while at the same time proclaiming egalitarian principles in every aspect of education. The position of the Doctor of Philosophy degree is perhaps the best illustration we have: since it represents the pinnacle of academic success, it is thus clamored for and provided by an increasing number of institutions.

Many academic institutions have come to understand something

about their crucial role in society as a whole, and many are preparing to meet some of the challenges. The time is long overdue, it seems to me, when those responsible for the organization and administration of graduate education should look carefully at what has happened to graduate education since the beginnings of this organization in 1900. In the various conclaves of this Association at which it has been my privilege to sit I have found the central concern to be with housekeeping and how to maintain orderly procedures. These things have their place, and the whole structure of graduate education would fall apart were they not handled with some efficiency. But their place is secondary to a concern with the questions of how we ought to be developing the intellect available to us and what patterns are most suitable to bring about the various developments that seem essential.

If retraining and the updating of very advanced knowledge are to be accepted as functions of graduate education, we are going to have to begin to separate some aspects of graduate education from formal degree programs. If we are to make the facilities and the knowledge in our graduate schools available for retraining individuals periodically we are going to have to put some effort into dealing with people who may not be directly interested in advanced degrees and quite probably come up with various certification procedures. One reaction to this suggestion will be to attempt to relate all this to existing patterns of continuing education and extension work, but useful as these are, they are generally not sufficiently advanced or broad enough in scope to deal with the sort of re-education that is now required. I am not arguing for any replacement of continuing education or extension work as it is commonly understood. I am arguing for some cooperative efforts which would introduce advanced facilities and knowledge that now exist almost wholly only as components of graduate degree patterns.

I have been assembling for another publication a group of essays aimed at describing the current state of affairs in graduate education. The contrast among the views is very sharp. It highlights very substantial successes and failures so miserable as to induce alienation. I would suggest in my parting remarks that we examine the nature of the successes and do what we can to enhance them. But I would also suggest that we examine equally closely the character of things responsible for the failures and alienations and attempt to do some intelligent planning not only to remove some of them but to make clear the means by which graduate education can meet its obligations where it has been failing.

I will go further and predict that we are headed for extinction if we do not do so.

W.G.W.

INTRODUCTORY NOTES BY THE PRESIDENT

PRESIDENT Bohnenblust opened the meeting with a statement that he would make no formal address but instead would report throughout the meeting on various matters of active interest to the Association as they related to the structure and topics of the meeting. Thus, as had been done the year before, he substituted a summary of the committee reports for extended presentation by each chairman. From the principal topics in the reports he selected nine for informal discussion at the Association luncheon. The nine chosen were (1) governance of the university, (2) the draft situation, (3) international education, (4) variety and concept of graduate degrees, (5) communication between universities and the public, (6) financial aid to disadvantaged students, (7) role of teaching assistantships, (8) graduate education in a changing world, and (9) relationships among the AAU Council on Federal Relations and the AGS and CGS Committees on Federal Support of Graduate Education. President Bohnenblust urged the groups to report the substance of their discussions directly to the Chairman of the AAU Panel on Presidential Priorities, President James Hester. Following the meeting three of the chairmen of the luncheon groups made written reports: Dean Stanley B. Frost on the possibility and desirability of other advanced (meaning non-Ph.D.) degrees; Dean W. Donald Cooke on financial support for graduate students from minority groups; and Dean Daniel Alpert on the governance of the university.

At the business session President Bohnenblust offered an opportunity for brief general discussion of the committee reports and the recommendations of the Committee on Student Aid were formally considered at that time. For a summary of the discussion of all of the recommendations of the Committee on Student Aid and those voted as formal resolutions by the Association, see p. 96. Other resolutions passed by the Association are found on p. 118. Receipt and discussion of the report of the Secretary-Treasurer, the Editor of the *Proceedings*, the Nominating Committee, the *ad hoc* Committee on Joint Membership and related AAU-AGS activities, and the constitutional amendment are reported with other Association business on pp. 106 to 116.

PANEL DISCUSSION: GRADUATE EDUCATION IN A CHANGING WORLD

[Remarks were presented by Dean John Petersen Elder, Dean George K. Fraenkel, and Dean W. Donald Cooke. Dean Sanford Elberg was Chairman. A general discussion, a summary of which follows the panelists' remarks, concluded the session. At Dean Allyn Kimball's request, plans were laid and Dean Daniel Alpert distributed mimeographed copies of the panelists' remarks in November.—ED.]

CHANGING DEMANDS IN GRADUATE EDUCATION (Topic a)

DEAN JOHN PETERSEN ELDER

"Thinking again?" the Duchess asked with another dig of her sharp little chin. "I've a right to think," said Alice sharply, for she was beginning to feel a little worried. "Just about as much right," said the Duchess, "as pigs have to fly."

"Peter agreed to cast us adrift on topic a." Thus in characteristic latitude did our licentious dean from Berkeley, writing to George Fraenkel, describe his charge to me. I accept the reefs ahead, though for a graduate dean these days to navigate with any confidence is about as tricky a business as the aerial capability of pigs.

One word in my title—remember it was imposed—may put you off: "Demands." It doesn't me, for recent events have persuaded me that graduate schools ought to be facing up to valid "demands" or, if you prefer, to demanding issues and needs. The demands may make themselves felt in fractured, or even fracturing, forms; they usually are put vaguely and sloppily; generally they are cast in an intolerably arrogant style. Not all of them by any means are worthy of much or any attention. But the majority of them, I am convinced, express a deep dissatisfaction with our American society—with our Vietnam abroad and with our poverty and racism at home—and they constitute a sharp and winning call to the University to come closer to students' intellectual and spiritual wants. I speak, not of disruptive radical students and their shrill shrieks, but of the mass of "moderate" students and their moving appeals.

If we even suspect (*nefandum*) that our traditional indifference to the immediate concerns and activities of the world around us, an indifference which we like to term objective neutrality, just might begin to border on an immorality; if we were for a moment to stop asking

"What is wrong with today's students?" and turn the question on ourselves and on our curricula and programs, we might then be more loyal to our venerable goals of serving Man and State and World. And perhaps even God.

Today among our students, and especially among many of our ablest students, there is a widespread demand for a greater intellectual freedom, for new forms of learning, and for an easy entrance into areas of experience which our traditional offerings simply in fact do not provide or in spirit tolerate. The consequent strain between old ideals and new realities is literally pulling apart our ancient structures. We cannot just shore them up or readjust them. We *need* our old buildings, and shall go on needing them. But we need some *new* buildings, too.¹

Here I should like to talk about three matters that seem to me of demanding importance. The first is the fact that the traditional programs in the humanities virtually ignore pressing problems and, related, the fact that the behavioral sciences virtually ignore history and the arts. The second has to do with student-conducted courses. The third with black graduate students and with Black Studies. That I do not speak about the natural sciences does not mean that I think that all is in order in that area or that to essay a dialogue with scientists is about as possible as with the deaf, but only that I know too little about that realm. I count on Bryce Crawford's laconic help.

Now to the first. As a humanist I ruefully admit that too often we humanists stick to our literature or paintings or other artifacts without much regard to the kind of culture which produced them. Our methodology should be broader. We need some of the tools of the anthropologist, sociologist, and psychologist.

The sociologist, for his part, too often cares so little about cultural history—indeed *knows* so little about history—that he fails to hammer out "a meaningful pattern of sociocultural change from the empirical data" (Brian Stock, "The Poverty of Philology," *ACLS Newsletter*, April, 1969).

If these indictments are at all fair, what to do about them?

As for the social sciences, I have no specific proposal for them, save the reasonably impertinent one that their professors read history and then use what they have read; their students of course will then do likewise.

¹I have learned much from the articles by Renee Chotiner (see esp. p. 28) in the Harvard Committee of Fifteen's *Interim Report on the Causes of the Recent Crisis*, 9 June, 1969.

As for the humanities, while, as I said, I see much merit in encouraging *some* of our students in this area to learn something about anthropology and sociology and to apply this knowledge, I "spue out of my mouth" the notion that we humanists should teach our subjects with an eye always cocked on today's social problems, e.g. Palestrina and the ghetto (c.f. humble Praeneste), the Wife of Bath and pollution, Catullus and diminishing natural resources, Michelangelo and the loss of privacy, or the Burial of the Count Orgaz and urban overcrowding.

In fine, I emphatically reject the road of "relevance," the thought "that the study of the humanities should be transformed into a mental and physical hygiene which will, in some way or other, initiate the student into the deepest and darkest mysteries of life," to use the words of an astringent reviewer of *Daedalus'* issue on "The Future of the Humanities" (in *Encounter*, Sept. 1969, pp. 43-45). I agree, too, with that reviewer that "relevance" seems mostly to mean only what *some* consider to be "the correct moral and political stance towards such questions as the Viet Nam war, Black Power, and 'pig fascism.'" Finally, like that reviewer, I am saddened, indeed depressed, that many humanists today feel positively guilty over their past failure to bow before "the superior intuition of their students" and to salute "relevance"—on all fours—*procumbere humi prostratum!*

Much saner are the proposals of Dean Predmore (*Proceedings of the Eighth Annual Meeting, Council of Graduate Schools*, 1968, pp. 148ff.): colloquia devoted to the relation of a discipline in one major area to other disciplines in other major areas or, in the same direction, a one-term broadening course for students in the humanities (e.g. Humanistic Biology, Science and Human Values) or, better yet, a required minor field outside the area of the major field.

Perhaps you will say that interdisciplinary programs fill this need. Sometimes they do. But sometimes they are face-saving devices, with each of the two proud departments still rigidly asking for most of its customary requirements.

We need to offer students more freedom in crossing departmental lines. Jenks and Riesman declared a discipline to be only an administrative category and, while it is true that each discipline has its own tools and methodology, they were basically right, in the sense that if a discipline became a department, that was mostly a matter of priority, prestige, and luck. Then came financial strength, and entrenchment.

I am not attacking the concept of departments, but urging that *some* students be permitted greater flexibility in combining different departments in their Ph.D. programs. I would graciously leave departments their budgets, their say in the appointment of impermanent and permanent faculty, and of course their control of departmental Ph.D. programs.

But not all students wish to pursue the traditional departmental Ph.D. program. Some will want to mix humanities with social sciences or perhaps even natural sciences, and their proposals may not be silly. For the admission of this group, I would have a faculty committee established which would judge the student's abilities and the worth of his proposed program. This committee might assign the admitted student two advisors (from different areas) for his first year, and at the end of this year—my thoughts here are only in rough shape—the student himself would propose to the faculty committee the names of three or four faculty members with whom he would work out a formal program for the Ph.D. This program would be reported to the dean. (Obviously I admire Cornell's Special Committee policy.)

Such an alternative route to the Ph.D., you may say, is only a wholesale extension of our *ad hoc* system. Yes, but a generous and earlier emancipation, to meet the enlarged intellectual scope some of our students plainly call for.

Another demand heard a good deal these days is for student-conducted courses.

After having quickly admitted that such courses aren't likely to make any sense in some cases, e.g. where a course concentrates on tools and methodology, let me say two things. First, we shouldn't condemn the notion *per se* without having experimented with it. Second, I myself can see a good deal of virtue in the proposition that we permit, even encourage, second- or third-year students to band together and run their own seminar, inviting in from time to time—if professorial pride will stoop—guest professors. And for credit. Such a “community” affair would, in many instances, seem more profitable than lone “independent study” (for credit).

To close, I set down a few sparse comments on black graduate students and on Black Studies. (I apologize for repeating what some of you may have heard me say more briefly on these matters last summer at happy Lake Arrowhead; these matters, though, are so pressing that iteration will do no harm. Further, I realize that someone else at this meeting will talk on the same business; so much the better that we have two sets of comments.)

To start with our record, it is atrocious: 11.5 percent of Americans are black, but only 1.7 percent of all students now in graduate schools are black Americans, and of all the Ph.D.'s awarded over the country between 1964 and 1968, only .7 percent went to black Americans!

But there is no point in our becoming neurotically guilt-ridden over the record (and thus wasting time). Rather, we should squarely face

up to the fact that our record since the Civil War has been abominable, and start moving, and moving fast and massively and on an unprecedented scale.

The first thing to do, having freely recognized the validity of "black experiences" and counting them a great American resource, is to find out *facts* about the Afro-American world. We must be very serious about the quality of our scholarship; we *must* not end up with ideological claptrap. We must probe the role of blacks in American history and economics and sociology and the arts, not to use this new knowledge just to advance political and social change but to enable *all* of us to revise and fill out what we have called up to now American history or economics, etc.

As to priorities, an undergraduate program in Afro-American Studies must precede a graduate program. So should a scholarly Research Center. We simply do not *know* enough yet to set up a respectable Ph.D. program in this field. More, I should, certainly at the start, tie an undergraduate Black Studies concentration to a traditional discipline like history or economics, to give it an academic home.

But even if we could set up a solid Ph.D. program in Black Studies now or soon, our heavy need will remain for black students in *traditional* Ph.D. programs, and hence the urgency of energetic recruiting in all fields. My bet is that the blacks themselves will mostly swing to the traditional Ph.D. programs, and that when we shall have set up a Ph.D. program in Black Studies, its takers will be preponderantly white, i.e. the blacks will probably be more practical than the whites.

To face head on the question of black professors in Afro-American programs, I cannot myself see that it is of any importance whether the teachers be black or white. What matters is quality, not pigmentation. What is important, however—a different business—is the recruitment of black faculty in *all* fields. Obviously I'm a chiliastic integrationist.

Finally, a word about black students' participating in the selection of faculty in Afro-American programs, a word which through you I direct to the blacks themselves.

In these programs, as in all others, we can only ensure academic excellence by leaving to scholars with extended *training* within a field the final decisions about who will be nominated for permanent or temporary appointments. To follow the other course, to let black students sit in on faculty appointments, would ultimately be self-defeating—the surest guarantee of mediocrity for the program—since no serious scholar, black or white, would care to expose himself to the variable winds of black favor or contempt. He simply wouldn't come to the university under such uncertainties.

CHANGES IN UNIVERSITY STRUCTURE
CREATED BY CHANGING DEMANDS IN
GRADUATE EDUCATION

DEAN GEORGE K. FRAENKEL

The title of this paper implies that any forthcoming changes in graduate education are sufficiently well developed to permit a discussion of the modifications of university structure that would be required to implement the educational changes. I do not believe this yet to be the case, and thus do not believe it would be particularly instructive to attempt to discuss the relation between university structure and the changing demands in graduate education at this time. On the other hand, the changes taking place in the structure of many of our institutions may well alter the universities as we know them, and these changes will have a profound, although perhaps indirect, effect on graduate education.

I will therefore proceed to describe the structural changes that have taken place at Columbia University in the last year and a half. Presumably, Dean Elberg thought that knowledge of our experience might be useful to other graduate deans. I hope this will prove to be so, but each university has its own unique organization, traditions, and special interest groups, and it would be presumptuous of me to assume that what has been worked out at Columbia would be applicable elsewhere. Rather than attempting to generalize, I will therefore confine my remarks to the state of affairs at Columbia. To do so I will first have to acquaint you with more detail about our institution than many of you might otherwise care to know. I beg your indulgence. Let me start by giving a brief description of the organization of the University at the time Mark Rudd became a national figure by leading his band of students into Hamilton Hall on April 23, 1968.

Columbia University consists of sixteen schools or faculties. In addition, there are three affiliated institutions: Barnard College, which is a four-year undergraduate college for women; Teachers College, which offers graduate education only; and the College of Pharmaceutical Sciences. Cooperative arrangements also exist with Union Theological Seminary. These affiliated institutions have their separate boards of trustees and are separate legal and financial entities. I will not be concerned with them, and will confine my remarks almost exclusively to the collection of sixteen schools or faculties in what is spoken of as the Columbia Corporation. Three of these, the Faculties of Political Science, Philosophy, and Pure Science, which are referred to collec-

tively as the Graduate Faculties, and form the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, have responsibility for all of the Ph.D. and most of the M.A. degrees awarded. The Faculties of Columbia College and of the School of General Studies are responsible for nonprofessional undergraduate instruction. Columbia College is the undergraduate college for men, and the School of General Studies is an adult coeducational institution. The remaining eleven schools or faculties offer professional degrees, mostly at the graduate level, but a few also offer undergraduate degrees. Five of the sixteen faculties—the College, General Studies, and the three Graduate Faculties—include twenty-eight departments that make up the arts and sciences.

Columbia is not as large as is often supposed. There are approximately 12,000 full-time registered degree candidates. Of these, only about 4,000 are undergraduates, with 2,700 in Columbia College. There are 3,100 full-time degree candidates in the Graduate Faculties, and 4,700 in the eleven professional schools. In addition, there are about 3,000 part-time degree candidates and 2,300 special categories students. Approximately 1,100 B.A. and B.S. degrees are awarded each year. There are 550 M.A.'s awarded, 500 Ph.D.'s, and 2,200 professional degrees, of which most are graduate degrees. Columbia is perhaps unique among American institutions in the relatively small proportion—approximately one quarter—of undergraduates.

Many of the Faculties of the University are quite small (the smallest has only a dozen or so members); the largest (outside of the Medical Center) has about 250 members. Before the crisis of the Spring of 1968, the Faculties did not meet together. Even the five separate Faculties responsible for instruction in the arts and sciences did not meet together. There was thus no mechanism to generate faculty responsibility or leadership even within the Graduate Faculties as a whole, to say nothing about faculty responsibility or leadership with respect to problems of University-wide concern.

There was, however, an entity with University-wide responsibilities. The central governing body under the Trustees and in addition to the central administration was, until May of 1969, the University Council. First established in May of 1890 when the Columbia Corporation consisted of five faculties, it has consisted in recent years of the dean and two elected members from each faculty, including the affiliated institutions, as well as representatives from the central administration. Thus in this "senatorial" as distinct from "congressional" type of representation, the smallest and largest units contained equal representation. It should also be noted that at Columbia membership in a faculty is restricted to persons with the rank of assistant professor or above, and that a member of the instructional staff is not a member of one of the Faculties of the University unless he is specifically appointed

to a particular Faculty by the Trustees on nomination by the Faculty. Some faculties are composed only of persons with tenure, and a person may belong to several Faculties. Of the 68 members of the Council, 28, or 41 percent, were officers of administration, and 40 were members of the faculties. This heavy weighting of administration and tenure faculty in the Council became a very important issue to students and members of the junior instructional staff.

The University Council was charged with forwarding its opinion to the Trustees about actions of the various faculties, with the submission of proposals to increase the efficiency of University work, and with considering any question in regard to the conduct of administrators or faculty. It had the power to correlate the work of the different Faculties, and to prescribe "by concurrent action with the appropriate Faculty" the conditions for the award of degrees. Despite its broad powers, the Council became an ineffective body. It usually met only four times a year. Its actions were perfunctory, and concerned almost exclusively with housekeeping details.

It appeared to the University Community that the administration was content with the Council. It could never cause them any trouble. Some of the members of the faculty were unhappy about it, but not sufficiently so to do anything effective for reform. They learned. But too late.

Following eviction of the sit-ins, and the uncontrolled police action against thousands of onlookers, on the night of April 30, 1968, demands sprang up for a "restructuring" of the University. Some of the students demanded a "Joint Thing" consisting of equal numbers of students and faculty with wide-ranging and essentially complete powers, and many of the faculty called for a Faculty Senate. Junior faculty demanded a voice. Administrators were roundly denounced, and there were calls for a restructured University in which administrators were to be part of a civil service with no more than clerk-like responsibilities. The more radical students struck for a liberation school, with the conduct of classes determined by participatory democracy—one man, one vote, with students and instructor weighted equally.

The main burden of planning for a new structure fell to the Executive Committee of the Faculties, a group of faculty members, mostly with tenure, originally selected by a dubious procedure during a stormy meeting of most of the Faculties of the University following the police action. The Trustees also set up a Trustee Committee to examine the need for restructuring, and the Provost's Office developed a set of independent proposals. Two groups of students, one working as a research staff for the Executive Committee of the Faculties, and one working independently, produced alternate plans.

What was thought to be the most significant question, and the one that had to be decided first, was whether there should be a unicameral or bicameral structure: Should there be one legislative body representing faculty and another representing students, or should there be a single body composed of both faculty and students? Other questions thought to be of importance were: What representation should be given to the junior members of the instructional staff? And to the junior administrative, library, and research staffs? And how should the representation be apportioned among all these different groups and among the more than sixty departments of instruction, sixteen faculties, and affiliated institutions? Last, but not least by any means, was the question of what powers should be given to any new legislative body. And what role was to remain for the administration, and for the Trustees?

A unicameral structure was decided upon by the Executive Committee of the Faculties. It was argued that if students were in a separate body, they would frequently be ill-informed, and would be more likely to adopt the techniques of confrontation, than if they were included in a single legislative body together with faculty and administration. And if the students were in a single body, what would this body's functions and power be? Students thought it would just be another case of "Mickey Mouse." But others argued strongly for a Faculty Senate, so as to provide a means for representing the views of the faculty, together with a separate Student Senate. (I should mention that student councils had existed in many divisions of the University, and there was a University-wide group, the Columbia University Student Council, but they had all become unrepresentative and ineffective.)

The University Senate that was finally proposed by the Executive Committee of the Faculties and was then adopted by the University consists of 101 members apportioned on what might be called "class" lines. There are nine members of the administration, fifty-seven officers of instruction, twenty-one students, and fourteen representatives divided among the affiliated institutions, the research, administrative, and library staffs, and the alumni. Of the fifty-seven officers of instruction, forty-two are tenured members of the Faculties, and fifteen are junior faculty. The junior faculty has been defined to consist of all persons without tenure who are appointed to give full or part-time instruction. Teaching assistants and visitors are included. The wisdom of an apportionment along class lines, or of the particular proportions adopted, or of the definition of junior faculty, was not clear to many. The possibilities of voting within the Senate by class and of making backroom deals among the different classes suggests that even the pre-World War II French Chamber of Deputies was perhaps simple by comparison. Yet it was argued that these classes exist, and if

they were not to be represented formally, they would band together informally.

The apportionment of the different classes among the various units of the University was also a complex problem. The forty-two tenured faculty representatives have been apportioned among the sixteen faculties in proportion to the number of tenured members in each faculty, with at least one representative from each faculty and with no more than five representatives from any one faculty. More complicated schemes were adopted for the other classes. It was argued, but to no avail, in some divisions, and particularly within the Graduate Faculties, that the department rather than the Faculty is the natural unit of apportionment, and some large departments in the arts and sciences are distinctly under-represented in the scheme adopted when compared to professional schools consisting of a single small department. Particular concern was expressed about the difficulty of electing students on a faculty-wide rather than a departmental basis. This difficulty was partially overcome in the Graduate Faculties by providing for the indirect election of student representatives. Delegates are elected, in proportion to the number of students within a department, to sit on a constituent assembly which then elects the appropriate number of its members as representatives to the Senate. Provision was made that an election for membership in the Senate would not be valid unless a minimum of forty percent of the eligible voters in the electing category participated in the election, thus giving at least minimum assurance that truly representative Senators would be elected.

Now a word about the powers of the University Senate. It has, to begin with, absorbed all the powers previously assigned to the University Council. In addition, subject to the reserve power of the Trustees and certain other provisions, the Senate is a policy making body which may consider all matters affecting more than one Faculty. It is charged with developing and reviewing plans concerning education and physical development and the fostering of policies for cooperation with the neighboring community. It is to work for the advancement of academic freedom, the protection of faculty interests, and the promotion of student welfare, and has a role in the granting of honors. It is also to promulgate and enforce a code of conduct for faculty, students, and staff, i.e., discipline and its enforcement. In addition, the Senate is to initiate and review policies to govern the University's relations with outside agencies for research, instruction, and related purposes. Matters such as classified research and relations with agencies like the Institute for Defense Analyses are covered by this provision. The Senate is empowered to review by broad categories the University budget after its adoption, but any recommendation for a change in budgetary appropriations requires Trustee concurrence.

A number of other powers delegated to the Senate require concurrence by the Trustees. Although such provisions are intended as a safeguard, it is clear that the Trustees may be unwilling to overrule the Senate on certain matters for fear of incurring another upheaval within the University. Boards of Trustees and Regents throughout the country will be faced with similar problems so long as the extent of discontent and campus political activity among students and younger faculty remains at its present high level. At Columbia the difficulty is partly constitutional. In a certain sense there are now two University-wide policy making groups, the Trustees and the Senate—a House of Lords and a House of Commons, but unlike the House of Lords, the Trustees have legal responsibilities and their role can never be reduced to that of a rubber stamp.

The usual host of standing committees of the Senate has been established, each with a specification as to the number of persons from the various classes—administrators, tenured faculty, students, etc.—and provision has been made for some of the committees to include members from outside the Senate. The most important committee is the 13-member Executive Committee. Its members are the President and Vice President of the University, seven tenured faculty members, two junior faculty members, and two students. It is chaired by one of the tenured faculty members.

A word is perhaps in order at this point about the Board of Trustees. "On October 31, 1754, in the twenty-eighth year of the reign of George II, a royal charter was granted by Letters Patent to the Governors of the College of the Province of New York, in the City of New York, in America, creating a Body Corporate to erect and maintain a college to be known as King's College for the Instruction and Education of Youth in the Learned Languages and Liberal Arts and Sciences." After the American Revolution, the name of the College was changed and certain modifications were made by the Legislature of the State of New York, and in 1810 the Charter was further amended. The Charter delegates full authority and responsibility for the conduct of the University to the Trustees, and provides that they be a self-perpetuating body of twenty-four members none of whom may be a member of the instructional staff. The Board did, however, establish an arrangement by which six of its members would be alumni trustees with six-year terms.

The Trustees are required to "work with" the Executive Committee of the Senate in the nomination of six Trustees, the selection of a President, and the selection of a Vice President. The Trustees themselves have also been engaged in taking steps that will lead to modification of the composition of the Board.

One of the most difficult matters has been the enforcement of campus discipline. I will not make any attempt to review the older procedure except to say that discipline was delegated by the Trustees to the President, who in turn delegated it to the deans subject to his review. Most disciplinary cases had involved academic matters, violation of parietal rules, and the occasional hi-jinks, and were usually handled by the deans in a fatherly way. In the middle of the troubles of the Spring of 1968, new disciplinary procedures were established that for the first time (except for infractions of dormitory rules) involved students and faculty in the disciplinary process. These new rules, and the handling of discipline within the University with the implied delegation of his authority by the President, as well as the civil cases arising out of campus arrests, were a source of strong disagreement between the then President Grayson Kirk and many on the campus. Later an extensive although still incomplete set of "Interim Rules" was worked out; they will remain in effect until a permanent set can be established. Although a permanent rule-making committee was constituted a year ago, their work is still not finished. The present rules apply only to students; the problem of handling faculty and staff infractions has not yet been fully dealt with.

The new disciplinary system suffers from the lack of a body of precedents, and from the lack of experience of the members of the judicial bodies. But perhaps the most important deterrent to the proper functioning of the new procedures has been the unwillingness on the part of a significant fraction of the University Community to enforce disciplinary sanctions. At the other extreme, there are, of course, some who want extreme penalties exacted, but typically such persons are like the "law-and-order" contingent in the country as a whole: they disregard the law in their obsession with "order." There is an inability or unwillingness to understand why a legal structure is required, what it is intended to do, and how it must operate. In this respect, the University Community reflects the entire country, from the President of the United States on down. It is the duty of the University Senate to promulgate and enforce a code of conduct. This will undoubtedly be a difficult assignment.

A word is in order about how the Senate was set up. The Executive Committee of the Faculties submitted a proposal to the University Community in March, 1969, after nine months of work. The establishment of the Senate before the end of the academic year was considered to be of paramount importance, and this required a vote by the entire University Community followed by approval by the Trustees of a set of revised University Statutes establishing the Senate, and, finally, a complicated election of members to the Senate. The Executive Committee of the Faculties was reluctant to provide the campus with pre-

liminary versions of their proposal. They were afraid that the defects inherent in a preliminary document would cause enough adverse criticism to jeopardize acceptance of the entire proposal. Perhaps they also feared criticism directed at the proposal by the many small constituencies that could never jointly be satisfied with all the elements of any proposal. Although hearings had been held to obtain the views of any and all on the campus, and there were meetings with some of the student groups that had views on restructuring, most of which were self-appointed, adequate study and debate of the final document was not possible. There are real difficulties, however, in carrying out constitutional reform quickly in a community that had very recently been torn apart by violent upheaval.

The Senate met for the first time on the next-to-last day of the Spring term, and has met once this Autumn. It is much too early to hazard a guess as to how well it will function. It is certain, however, that many students, faculty, and, particularly, administrators will devote endless time to the Senate. Able persons may thus be unwilling to become Senators.

It is hoped that the Senate will provide a forum, particularly for students and junior members of the faculty, that had not hitherto existed, and that its actions will be more responsive to the views of the University Community as a whole than the actions of the University Council in the past. In this way, the causes of many grievances will, it is hoped, be eliminated, and actions and policies not condoned by the campus will be prevented. Students, faculty, and staff will be educated about the workings of, and the problems of, the University, and the administration will become more thoroughly aware of a variety of campus views than had hitherto been possible.

On the other hand, there are many who fear that the wishes of the Community as a whole, or at least as these views are proportionately represented on the Senate, will not be in the best interests of the University and that we will suffer from student control in the way that universities in other countries have suffered. There are those who also believe that the Senate will behave irresponsibly, will consume inordinate time, and will render decision-making extremely difficult if not impossible. They fear decisions will be made so slowly that nothing will be accomplished, and that the Senate will be beset with factional struggles of both an academic and political nature.

And how does the new Senate affect graduate education? There has not been a direct effect at Columbia, and it is unlikely that there will be one. But graduate education at Columbia and elsewhere will be profoundly influenced by the many currents developing in the universities and in society. Structural format, however, is unlikely to play a decisive role in the outcome.

We are all familiar with these developing currents. They stem more from those in the undergraduate divisions and from society at large than from those involved with any aspect of graduate education. The function of the university is being questioned and so, in particular, is the function of graduate education. The university has been oversold: Society has expected salvation from us; and our response has been to diffuse our purpose. Graduate education especially has been oversold, and nationwide, in my opinion, we suffer from overcapacity and overproduction. Our inability to solve the world's problems on the one hand, and the existence of overprofessionalism, and overspecialization and sterility in a few disciplines on the other, has caused a wave of anti-scholarly sentiment from both inside and outside the intellectual community. Many have rallied to this call. I believe that far too much of the cry for "relevance" in the universities is only a guise for anti-intellectualism.

These are the influences that will most alter graduate education. It is difficult for me to imagine that, because of the forces now at work, graduate education will be able to receive support adequate for its needs. And it is difficult for me to imagine that these forces will not lead to graduate education *intentionally organized* to be of a poorer quality than that to which we have aspired.

PLANS AND PRIORITIES FOR THE FUTURE

DEAN W. DONALD COOKE

In preparing this talk about the future of graduate education, it would have been easy to summarize three recent reports that have dealt with the subject. In the past year, the National Science Board, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Carnegie Commission have all looked into the future of graduate education. A common theme running through these reports is an extrapolation of past growth into the future and an estimate of the future cost. The justifications for such expansions are only casually discussed without serious question as to whether such an enormous expenditure of funds will have a beneficial or detrimental effect on society. I do not believe that the three reports have faced the difficult basic questions related to the future of graduate education in the United States. Perhaps the problem is one of perspective.

Over the past decades, graduate education in the United States has developed from an anemic by-product of undergraduate education to a multibillion-dollar operation. During this period, the nation's graduate schools have produced the scientists, academicians, and teachers

who have greatly increased the scholarly and technological level of the country, and have made possible the vast expansion of higher education.

I believe, however, that this system which has been so successful is beginning to show strains from its rapid growth, and unless serious academic and social questions are faced, the financial and human cost of continued expansion may not be worth the price.

I would like to discuss some questions that I believe have a bearing on future planning. The first question has to do with the present capacity of graduate schools versus the number of available students.

There is a widely held view in some quarters that the rapid growth in graduate enrollments has saturated the educational facilities and that the nation's graduate schools are having difficulty in accommodating all the college graduates who desire to undertake advanced study. There is evidence, however, that the opposite situation prevails and that there is a shortage of potential graduate students not only from the point of view of quality but in total numbers.

The severe competition for graduate students among institutions, the rapid inflation of the level and duration of financial offers, the availability of travel funds which allow prospective students to visit the campus, the appearance of traveling faculty recruiting teams, and the breakdown of formal agreements of graduate schools on recruiting practices all indicate that the majority of institutions are unsuccessful in obtaining the number of students they desire.

There are a variety of factors that have led to the present situation. The number of institutions offering advanced degrees has increased enormously in the past decade and the established universities have placed greater emphasis on graduate education. This expansion has been encouraged by the distribution of government fellowships to an ever increasing number of institutions. Another important factor has been innovations such as the Centers of Excellence Program funded by the National Science Foundation, and Project Themis supported by the Department of Defense for the purpose of developing additional graduate level programs. The inclination of government agencies to favor smaller or developing institutions in awarding research contracts could also be included. These programs were initiated at a time when established institutions were having difficulty in recruiting students and has undoubtedly contributed to a worsening of the situation.

The proliferation of graduate schools has resulted from the fact that institutions without graduate programs feel compelled to increase their academic stature by embarking on programs of advanced study. For example, the number of doctoral granting institutions has risen from 185 to 280 in the period 1955 to 1968.

A recent study, "Trends in Doctoral Chemical Education" by R. H. Linnel and D. S. Chapin, in the *Journal of Chemical Education*, indicates some of the problems that can develop in patterns of graduate education. Over the period 1963 to 1967, the number of new graduate students in chemistry remained essentially unchanged. However, the number of institutions granting doctoral degrees in Chemistry rose from 141 to 172. The study notes that in the academic year 1966-1967, 89 Chemistry departments experienced a decline in the enrollment of new graduate students. Despite this fact, government programs are available for further development of graduate programs in Chemistry.

Undoubtedly an expanded base for graduate education will be needed at some future time but the question of appropriate timing does not seem to have been considered. From a population viewpoint alone, there is a need for caution. During the period 1960 to 1970, in the population age 20 to 24, there was a large increase from 11.1 to 17.2 million, or 55 percent. Extrapolations from 1970 to 1990, however, present a very different picture. The maximum estimated growth is from 17.2 to 21.9 million, or 27 percent for this 20 year period, while the minimum growth rate indicates a population of 18.3 million or a growth of only 6 percent by 1990.

The competition among academic institutions for graduate students has important scholarly implications. It is generally believed that the Ph.D. degree represents the highest mark of scholastic achievement. While the statement is correct, its implications are false. Almost any college graduate can obtain admission to some graduate school which has more funds than students. A judicious choice of field of study combined with persistence and a desire to succeed will most likely result in the attainment of a doctorate.

In one sense, massive government support for students has had a debilitating effect on graduate education. For many college graduates the decision to go on to graduate study is easier than trying to face the harder decision of a choice of a job and career. Since support money is freely available, remaining in the academic womb is an easier course of action for the student and they drift into advanced study. This is hardly a situation that encourages a student body dedicated to scholarly pursuits.

The second point that I would like to discuss deals with the question as to whether the present production of new doctorates is sufficient to meet the demand. The reason most frequently cited for expanding graduate education is the future need for large numbers of college and university teachers.

As we know, in the mid-fifties a number of committees, particularly the prestigious Committee of Fifteen, predicted "an appalling personnel problem" in the staffing of academic situations. This Committee pre-

dicted, for example, that the percentage of college teachers who held a doctorate would decline from the 1955 level of 40 percent, to 20 percent by 1970. In actuality, the percentage rose continuously, rather than declined, and in 1962 the percentage of college teachers with a Ph.D. stood at 50 percent.

Despite the fact that the predictions were incorrect, the reports were widely circulated and affected the actions of foundations and government agencies and became ingrained in academic thinking.

In 1960, Berelson felt that the magnitude of the crisis was exaggerated. His warning failed to prevent the expansion of existing programs and the rapid proliferation of new graduate schools.

More recently in 1967, Alan Cartter predicted that by the mid-seventies, every new faculty opening in a four year college or university could be filled with a doctorate and still the academic world could not provide employment for more than 45 percent of the new doctorates that would expect to pursue a teaching career. It should be noted that doctorates of the mid-seventies are already entering our graduate schools.

It might be argued that a large pool of vacancies exist at the junior college and high school level. However, there is a question as to whether the specialized research and scholarly orientated Ph.D. programs are the most appropriate ways to prepare such teachers and whether the lives of these highly trained young people would be totally frustrated by their immersion in a nonuniversity situation.

There is some evidence that the academic job market for new Ph.D.'s is already becoming tighter. The rapidly increasing number of Ph.D.'s has resulted in a recent and significant change in faculty recruiting patterns. In many fields, new Ph.D.'s are experiencing considerable difficulty in locating teaching positions at the college or university level. In Chemistry, a department which is in the developing stage has no difficulty in finding 100 to 200 applicants for an assistant professorship. Recently a Department of English in a good university, after announcing that openings were available for three assistant professors, was inundated, at last count, with 600 applications. Obviously the situation varies from area to area and the supply of new Ph.D.'s is still inadequate in some fields of study. But it should be remembered that there are something like 150,000 Ph.D.'s in the pipeline. That should worry all of us.

Scientists who would be unable to find academic positions have other options but it is difficult to imagine that appreciable numbers of doctorates in the Humanities could find positions outside of academia that would offer them an opportunity to use scholarly training.

Another reason often used to justify expansion of graduate programs in the sciences is the need of industry for new doctorates. It

is difficult to establish the magnitude of such needs and the question is generally discarded.

A recent report of the American Institute of Physics presents the results of a survey of approximately 1,200 Ph.D.'s in Physics who received their degrees between September 1967 and September 1968. Of those surveyed, 29 percent indicated that they had not received a single job offer by mid-summer 1968. Part of this problem may be that many of the new graduates had applied solely for teaching positions in a tight market place and may have obtained industrial positions if they had sought them. Nonetheless the data indicates some basis for concern when one is considering expansion of facilities and the funding of new graduate centers.

The recruiting of new baccalaureates by the chemical industry has essentially disappeared because such a high percentage of students proceed to graduate school. Since the work must be done, Ph.D.'s are replacing baccalaureates and in many aspects they are overtrained for the tasks that they are assigned. There is probably a greater shortage of trained technicians in the chemical industry than there are doctorates.

Even though there is at least some question about the need for vastly increased numbers of Ph.D.'s, the idea has become so ingrained in the thinking of academic people that it is currently an accepted conventional wisdom. The fact that the rationalization fits the plans and aspirations of so many does much to keep it alive.

The National Science Board in a 1968 report, "Toward a Public Policy for Graduate Education in the Sciences" presented the position that the availability of increased doctorates will generate an increased need. There is no doubt that any new doctorate will obtain some kind of a job. There is, however, the possibility that there is a basic flaw in this line of reasoning and the generated "need" will actually be artificially generated.

If the number of new doctorates increases and if positions do not exist that can fully use the skills for which they have been trained, they will still be hired, but for positions which require lower levels of training. Since doctorates will be available for these positions, they will be preferred over applicants that do not have such degrees and eventually the degree requirements for these positions will escalate without an equivalent increase in the challenges of the jobs. Such a situation can lead to increasing numbers of students entering graduate school to obtain advanced degrees which become a necessity for obtaining a reasonable position.

Graduate degrees may thus deteriorate in a fashion similar to the undergraduate degree which is frequently used as a "human sorting-out process" for establishing requirements for positions. For many

positions, one needs a college diploma—and I mean the diploma not the education. It often doesn't matter what was studied, how well or where it was done. The piece of paper is the important thing. We know of the large number of people in their mid-thirties, a dozen years after the start of their graduate study, still working on a Ph.D. thesis—a thesis in which they have long since lost interest and which is now a psychological burden, but they continue the struggle for the magic piece of paper.

Down this path lies disaster for graduate education and we already have our feet on the road.

The third topic I would like to discuss is the driving forces for expansion. Hopefully the discussion will provide an understanding of the dimensions of the problem. Different groups have different reasons for investing funds in graduate education.

What does society expect from the support of graduate education? Major advantages that accrue to society by expansion of graduate enrollment are the attainment of manpower needs which are essential for economic expansion, a supply of competent faculty members for educational institutions, and the accomplishment of basic research and scholarly endeavors.

Universities have a somewhat different view of graduate education. A major reason that universities maintain or expand graduate enrollments is to increase the academic status of the institution. Institutional publicity on their connections with Nobel Laureates and the reaction of most universities to the Carter Report are indications of the search for enhanced prestige.

Another important by-product of graduate education in universities is the availability of teaching assistants.

As for colleges and developing universities, the driving force for the initiation of graduate programs is again an attempt to increase academic status. There are great pressures from both administrators and faculties to expand the graduate operation in developing universities and to initiate advanced programs in four-year colleges. Another factor which exerts a strong influence is the difficulty that institutions without research programs have in retaining their more research-orientated faculty members. It is also true that the availability of a research program will allow college faculties to stay closer to the forefront of knowledge in their fields. Faculty members have still a different outlook. The commitments of departmental faculties to expansion of graduate programs is based on competition for the enhancement of their position in relationship to their counterparts in other institutions. The expansion of graduate education is frequently used as a vehicle for increasing faculty size with the probability that by

doing so the number of well-known faculty (on which departments are judged) will be increased.

As for the student, graduate programs offer the opportunity to pursue a career of his choice and an enhanced financial future.

From the foregoing discussion, it is debatable whether the reasons that society maintains graduate educational programs are coincident with those of the academic institutions' faculty and students. Since advanced study is rarely if ever financially self-sustaining, society either directly or indirectly supports the endeavor. When the needs of society for technical manpower and scholars are unfilled, the expansion of graduate education is readily defensible. If, on the other hand, these needs are being met, questions should arise and the justification for the support resides in other advantages that accrue to society such as the generation of new knowledge.

If the priorities of society are different from those of academic institutions, it does not necessarily follow that what is good for universities is also good for society. In fact, it may be that to allow universities to pursue their goals in an unlimited fashion would have a deleterious effect on the social structure.

The striving of universities for excellence and the competition for academic status undoubtedly has the advantage of developing strong institutions. The overall gain for society by one university building up its status by attracting faculty and students away from other high-level institutions is not immediately obvious.

Thus, there are many forces from academic institutions unrelated to the direct needs of society which exert considerable pressures for expansion of graduate education.

Last, I would like to touch briefly on the topic of educational priorities as related to graduate education.

While it is difficult to extrapolate the cost of graduate education in the United States, the figure is undoubtedly high. The National Science Board Report estimates that the total cost of graduate education will be 22 billion dollars by 1981-1982 compared to the current level of 7 billion. This estimate would require a considerably larger share of the Gross National Product.

Such large increases in commitments to graduate education will undoubtedly result in closer scrutiny of expenses and a comparison with other programs, particularly in educational areas. For example, at present a higher percentage of college graduates go on to graduate school than high school graduates go to college, and young people without college degrees will be increasingly competing against those who have advanced degrees with a result that the present socio-economic gap will increase. In such a situation one could argue that funds should be diverted from the support of graduate students to

community colleges until a more favorable balance is reached between post-high school and post-baccalaureate study. Such a move would decrease the socioeconomic gap between the haves and the have nots.

Another example of an educational problem that could compete with funds for expanded graduate education is the fact that many highly capable high school graduates do not go to college. A study (Project Talent, Office of Education) shows that for those in the top fifth of their high school class, 95 percent of those in the top 20 percent of the socioeconomic group go to college, compared to only 50 percent of those in the lower 20 percent of the socioeconomic group. If there are limitations on funds, the loss of this talent must be compared to the expansion of graduate education. This is particularly true when the undergraduate or his family bears the cost of his education while the graduate student is paid some \$20,000 in tuition, fees, and stipends to pursue a doctorate.

Under these circumstances, if the future needs of society for scholars is not critical; if universities expand their commitments to graduate study to increase their own status; and if graduate students are either satisfying their own whims or their desire for future financial benefits, there is some reason to expect the cost of graduate education to be borne by the universities and the students who are the primary beneficiaries rather than through Federal funds. Unfortunately the university's contribution to nonservice financial aid comes at the expense of the undergraduates, particularly by those undergraduates who do not go on to graduate study.

Since it is unreasonable to expect graduate students to remain financially dependent on their parents, a Federally financed loan program could be a reasonable mechanism for supplying a substantial portion of the educational cost. Such a system might have other advantages. At Cornell, students who pay tuition from their own pockets have a lower attrition rate than those who hold prestigious fellowships.

All advanced civilizations have nurtured and supported their scholars, and in the recent past our society has done so. But there will always be a point, when the bill becomes larger and larger, that questions are justifiably asked.

I suppose what I am saying is that changes—they might be called reforms—should be made in graduate education. Self-initiated reform is difficult and rarely occurs when decision-making processes are so diffuse. Changes will either be made by the educational institutions, or we will face the grim prospect of having someone else make them for us. Rather than reform, we may well face major surgery.

We have the recent example of the medical profession which resisted change and eventually society had its say.

I hope that we will choose a different course of action.

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

Dean Allyn Kimball asked Dean Elder whether Dean Cooke's remarks reflected the thinking behind a recent decision made at Harvard to reduce the size of the graduate student body. Dean Elder replied that this was partially true, that in some areas—notably the Humanities, Social Sciences, and Modern Languages—the number of students had increased to some detriment of those areas; the Physical Sciences, however, were less guilty, because they had limitations on their growth by the available amount of laboratory space. In addition, the cuts were a means of planning ahead for an increasingly gloomy financial future, he felt.

Dean Joseph McCarthy asked Dean Elder to give some of his criteria for deciding where cuts should be made. Dean Elder replied that the decisions would be based on (1) the ratio of staff to graduate students, (2) facilities available, (3) growth in the number of students compared to growth in staff and facilities, and (4) endowed, restrictive funds available to the department.

Dean Robert H. Baker reported that in addition to the rising number of Ph.D.'s being produced, his university was also hiring fewer postdoctoral students, as well as relying more and more heavily upon graduate students for undergraduate teaching. This last fact he felt to be a possible factor in student complaints about quality of instruction, as well as further affecting the manpower situation by reducing the number of Ph.D.'s hired.

These conditions, however, contrasted with his own discovery that within his own department (Chemistry) none of the previous year's doctoral graduates had been unable to find employment, which caused him to wonder if the situation was as serious as described by Dean Cooke.

In the discussion that followed, Dean Cooke expressed his concern that new Ph.D.'s would increasingly find themselves, not unemployed, but employed in positions which were frustrating or irrelevant to their training.

Dean C. Lawson Crowe asked if the projected increase to 11 million undergraduates by 1975 would not necessitate some expansion in graduate education. Dean Cooke agreed.

Dean F. N. Andrews commented that industry representatives are finding it easier to recruit new Ph.D.'s than previously.

The discussion then turned to changing degree requirements. It was pointed out that jobs previously given to physicists were presently going to engineers, to which Dean Pollak added that he felt that the trend towards placing Ph.D.'s in jobs formerly filled by baccalaureates indicated that (1) jobs were more complex and required more education and (2) present advanced degree requirements did not include sufficient applied training for these jobs.

Dean W. Gordon Whaley commented that he felt Dean Cooke's remarks to be more an indictment of the unresponsiveness of the university to changing requirements in the social structure than concern about an excess of Ph.D.'s in a given field. Of greater importance, he felt, is the need to evaluate efforts in terms of which areas could provide the new knowledge and additional education to solve pressing social problems. Thus rather than reducing the size of the graduate education effort, he felt a reassessment of priorities in order. Dean Elder cited the shift from humanities to the social sciences as an indication that this is already underway. Dean George K. Fraenkel concurred that the university's response to the needs of society in both research and education is extremely

important, but he expressed concern that part of Dean Whaley's suggestion of shifting emphasis might distort the fundamental concept of the Ph.D. in that it would become more and more used for purposes for which it was not designed.

Dean Whaley agreed that the Ph.D. should not be compromised by being forced to serve the wrong purposes and that more emphasis is needed on other doctoral degrees designed to meet the growing demands.

Dean Alpert commented on the Ph.D. as offered in professional areas and expressed his concern that though it often had a high degree of relevance, the factor of excellence needed to be assured. Dean Fraenkel added that in many professional schools the problem of status still exists to some extent and suggested this situation might be helped by integrating the professional school faculty with the undergraduate teaching faculty in certain circumstances and placing professional school appointments to some extent within the purview of people in the liberal arts disciplines so that more criteria of excellence might be employed in faculty appointments and that the professional school faculties become more involved with undergraduate instruction and some nonprofessional graduate instruction when appropriate.

Dean J. Boyd Page suggested that an examination of trends in Ph.D. beginning salaries might be a better indication of the future needs of graduate education than study of current supply and demand with extrapolation from it, and he cited several examples of his point.

PANEL DISCUSSION: FEDERAL
RESPONSIBILITIES TO THE UNIVERSITY AND
UNIVERSITY RESPONSIBILITIES TO THE
FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

[Remarks were presented by Dean George Winchester Stone, Jr.; Dr. Charles V. Kidd, Director, Council on Federal Relations, Association of American Universities; Dean Robert M. Bock; and Dr. Louis Levin, Executive Associate Director, National Science Foundation. Dean J. Boyd Page was Chairman. A few notes on the outcome of some of the legislation discussed during the question period have been inserted by the panelists and appear in italics.—ED.]

DEAN GEORGE WINCHESTER STONE, JR.

You will soon recognize that the tone of what I have to say differs somewhat from the dire analysis of our last speaker, Dean Cooke. Others on this panel will speak on various topics, but I would like to confine my comments to a single one. First a few premises about graduate education, premises which you will all probably recognize, maybe somewhat iterative, but in this world of change and uncertainty they provide, I think, one or two bedrock concepts with which, perhaps, we all agree.

Premise One: Aim. I expect we all agree with Dean Pittendrigh—as he noted at the meeting of the CGS last year—that the aim of a university is to preserve, to advance, and to disseminate knowledge. Further, the aim of the Graduate School of Arts and Science is to prepare the student for independence in scholarship, in research, or in teaching. In sum, I expect our sole purpose is to produce the self-sustaining scholar. This preparation requires the faculty, the facilities, the finances, the options, and, no doubt, above all, attitudes.

Premise Two: The Graduate School in the National Interest. We may also believe that the well-being of the future of the country depends a good deal upon the progress of graduate education—that is, upon the development of the qualified to become self-sustaining scholars who can preserve and advance and disseminate knowledge—in the sciences, the social sciences, and the humanities. The world does not need, I think, more and more Ph.D.'s, but a flood of well-educated men. Hence my emphasis upon the qualified in graduate education. With this comment, support for and facilitation of the process, it seems to me, are terribly important for the individuals in-

voiced, for the institutions, and for the nation. I emphasize graduate education because I feel that undergraduate education is spreading out more and more thinly, and in the United States the B.A. degree is now about the equivalent of what a high school diploma was thirty years ago.

Premise Three: Recruitment. I find, however, a unique relationship between the undergraduate schools and the graduate schools. I expect we would all agree that the undergraduate college is the great recruiting ground for graduate students. In the undergraduate colleges, therefore, teaching, leadership, and maintenance of an intellectual curiosity are probably the most important elements of American education. Therefore, the more self-sustaining scholars we can produce or nurture along, who are capable of inspirational teaching, the better off we will be. Many of them will start by teaching in the undergraduate schools—attitude, capability! Attitude, capability! Attitude, capability!

Premise Four: Private and Public Schools. The sustaining of and progress of graduate schools in the private sector of American education is as important as that for the graduate schools in the public sector. The country needs the options of both kinds. Financial support is apt to be more difficult for the private than for the public schools because of the narrower base upon which they stand.

Premise Five: Preservation of Sources of Philanthropy. Facilitation of sources for private philanthropy in this country must be maintained. The present Federal legislation for tax reform, which derives its formula on the basis of source of income rather than function of a foundation or intent of a giver, needs seriously to be studied before crippling legislation is passed. [Study has been made, legislation has been passed based upon source of income, as recommended by the Treasury Department. So far, at least, it appears not to be crippling, although it may inhibit some philanthropy. G.W.S., 4 April 1970.]

Premise Six: Need for Federal Support. Even with a relatively unfettered philanthropy, the present escalation of costs in all fields will demand increased individual and institutional Federal support, certainly for private graduate schools and probably for state ones also. Such increased support is all, I think, in the national interest.

To remark in the light of these six propositions—aim, national interest, recruitment, private versus public sectors, enabling philanthropy, and the need for Federal support—that the matter is extremely complicated by present legalisms regarding religious and secular institutions, state responsibilities, the present priorities in Federal spending—military, domestic, foreign, amortizing old debts, outer space, defense, and so forth—by the present climate of campus anarchy, public uncertainty as to the function, the privileged or non-privileged character of higher education, urban crises, race problems,

and the like, just emphasizes the agonizing throes in which we all find ourselves. The basic issue in our pluralistic system seems to be to recreate confidence in our educational institutions and to accord them a high priority which they must have in the national interest.

Attitude, again, becomes all important. I recall in 1945 sitting at a dinner next to the President of Iowa State and hearing him remark how cheerfully the state legislature appropriated huge funds to the universities of Iowa because Iowa State scientists had developed a hybrid corn which would triple the yield in the field in a time when farm labor had been reduced three-fold by the war. The legislative attitude of confidence spread to all activities there at Iowa State and through the state. This is a dramatic and practical instance. A spillover of restored confidence to all disciplines now, it seems to me, is called for. Trustful attitudes can be developed, I believe, by presentation of clear and viable programs, even of programs which do not have a direct application to today's living.

I have long thought that two of the major problems of our time are bigness and speed. Bigness is best handled and administered by some significant division of labor. So for the bigness of the topics that face us this afternoon, for my nickel's worth, let me divide the problem with my fellow panelists and concentrate upon a single one, which depends upon the interrelation between Federal and university responsibilities.

This problem is of great interest to me and to many of our graduate programs here at New York University. Its solution depends upon an attitude of confidence I would like to promote, namely, in what I would like to call creative internationalism. If the future of the country depends upon the continuing success of graduate education, the next major leap, it seems to me, in the development of graduate education is international graduate education. This is especially important amid the gigantism of world affairs today and the interlocking nature of international economy, the foreign politics of every nation, and the cultural enrichment to every individual which each nation can in a pluralistic world provide.

We have for the last ten years been running headlong into the resurgence of fierce nationalism—linguistically, culturally, politically, and economically. The claims of each national interest can be understood, and common denominators can doubtless be found, and the conditions at least for a peaceful understanding and acceptance can be established amid the conflicting interests now being pleaded in an abundance of alien tongues.

My hope is for a five percent oversupply of excellent professors in my graduate school in most departments, so that by regular rotation (not necessarily on a sabbatical leave basis) of scientists, social scien-

tists, linguists, and humanists, into research and teaching afield—by that I mean abroad to Western Europe as well as to developing countries—the attitudes, new knowledges, and trends of thought in university centers abroad can become a part of their thinking. I hope to establish, for NYU at least, in Rome, London, Paris, Madrid, Beirut, Pakistan, India, Japan, Mexico, and Brazil, the opportunities for exchange whereby excellent professors there become accredited with us and we with them, in hopes that they can look for some sort of rotation on a visiting basis; we have it regularly with Germany now. But to make this operate in a more than window-dressing way, I seek funds to facilitate the circulation and return of any graduate student to the home base of any professor who has caught up his imagination, who has gotten him interested in the kind of research he himself is doing, by his enthusiasm, his expertise, and his capability, to finish *there* his graduate work, to finish up his dissertation abroad under the man who has gotten him very much interested in it, and to receive his degree from us.

I hope we might thus actually create an international community of scholars, not just in the languages or literatures, but in sociology, anthropology, physics, chemistry, and the other disciplines. The machinery for effecting this interchange is formidable. It relates to visas, to different standards of living costs, replacements, and taxes, but it is not impossible to bring off step by step, little leap by little leap, and country by country. Language ability, of course, is a key factor, but education is a long-term affair and the ultimate creation of an international community of scholars to which we would contribute measurably will be a boon to our national interest, perhaps by 1984.

Herein, parochialism is unimportant. That NYU should try this is not as important as that graduate schools all over the country should try this; and, of course, some graduate schools do have this sort of thing. Federal support, however, is all important; and this brings me to the nub of my argument concerning the interrelation of Federal and university responsibilities. The legislation for such a program is on the Federal books already, through the Kennedy-Fulbright-Hayes Act for educational international exchange. This Act allows for and encourages, and theoretically supports, the free flow of ideas, of teaching materials, and of personnel, yet *no significant funds* have been appropriated either in the Johnson or so far in the Nixon administration.

The universities can and, I think, should bear responsibility, in the national interest, for urging this program. The Federal Government has defaulted in its responsibilities in this area. It has seen and faced other priorities. One hope is for a revision of priorities, which is overdue, so that this eminently sensible Act of Congress will be imple-

mented by the necessary funds. The basic issue here, as I see it, under the general rubric of mutual relationship between the universities and the Federal Government is the need for the universities massively to act as the government's loyal opposition and to keep the pressure on for a major revision of priorities. Here is one opportunity that seems to me to be productive as far as graduate schools of arts and science are concerned.

DR. CHARLES V. KIDD

I appreciate this opportunity to meet with you particularly because I have recently taken on a new job. The Association of American Universities has set up a Council on Federal Relations, and I am the Director of the new undertaking. My principals--the Executive Committee of the AAU--have directed me to pay particular attention to the problems facing graduate education and to work closely with the graduate deans. I view this not as an obligation but as a pleasurable prospect.

I would like to talk with you briefly about the current and prospective short range relationships between universities and the Federal Government.

The first point that I want to make is that these relationships are becoming more pervasive and more complicated. Over the past few years, the primary relationship between the two has been in the area of research grants and contracts, fellowships and traineeships. These are obviously still important, and many new problems and patterns are emerging in this field. For example, it is quite possible that mission relevance will be defined in much narrower terms in the future than was true in the past. The days when basic research could get a free ride on the coattails of defense, NIH, and the other mission agencies may be drawing to a close. This shift, which has already occurred to a substantial degree, has a number of important implications. [*After this talk was given, it appeared that Section 203 of the Defense Procurement Authorization bill might be dropped, but as of May, 1970, the outlook is clouded. C.V.K.*] One of these is that the difficult task of sustaining an adequate level of basic research may become even more difficult. NSF may be unable to pick up research dropped by DOD and other agencies without a series of jolting discontinuities. The F.Y. 1971 budget of NSF, for example, will pick up some of the research which DOD can no longer support, but not all of it. And in the case of AEC, the decision to go ahead with the Batavia machine means a reduction of about 20 percent in other AEC research support. One dramatic consequence of this is the decision to shut down the Princeton-Penn accelerator.

Priority choices not only in particle physics but in other research fields are likely to be difficult and disturbing for several years to come.

In the manpower field, a general reappraisal is taking place. It is now generally accepted that the demands for Ph.D.'s are not infinite, and that a continuing review of supply and demand in terms of numbers, job requirements, and the nature of advanced training is in order. The job market is shifting. The traditional research Ph.D. will certainly have to be supplemented by a teaching-oriented degree—after half a century or more of discussion. Of course, the Federal Government is an important factor in all of this because it is a direct employer, because its research expenditures have a lot to do with the volume and nature of academic and industrial demand, and because the nature of more general Federal aid to higher education will have a lot to do with the capacity of the graduate schools to adapt to new demands.

Over the past few years, Federal support for higher education other than research has grown by leaps and bounds while the research support has remained almost constant. A question of central importance is how the research-oriented Federal support is to evolve into a broader system of Federal support for all functions of higher education. In my judgment, this question will never be answered neatly. We will evolve and adapt in a fashion that no one will find fully satisfactory, but which will in our usual pragmatic fashion get the job done without generating intolerable political strains.

In this connection, a consensus is emerging on the need to give very high priority to Federal support for disadvantaged students. Five years ago, this priority was less urgent. This is what I mean by the probability that we will have a pragmatic adaptation.

Where support of graduate students will fit into the total picture is not clear. The fact is that all forms of support for graduate students have shrunk, and now about 30,000 students are aided, as contrasted with 50,000 in 1968. [*The President sent to Congress on March 19, 1970, a message on higher education which mentioned support for graduate students only in vague terms. In April, 1970, the President stated that the administration agreed that graduate students should be supported by fellowships as well as loans, but it is not certain that the Bureau of the Budget heard him. C.V.K.*]

Clearly, the major strategic decisions with respect to the volume of and eligibility criteria for student aid, the volume of funds and eligibility criteria for construction of student and academic facilities, and the availability of general institutional support will have a significant influence upon the evolution of our system of higher education. Basic questions of educational philosophy, as well as the interests of

millions of students and hundreds of institutions, are involved as answers to these questions are sought.

Another way in which the Federal Government will increasingly impinge upon universities is as one agent of society in dealing with urgent domestic problems. There is the obvious prospect that the universities will be pressed to lend their faculties and other resources to the solution of these problems, and the universities must respond. Over the years ahead, I would guess that how the universities are to accommodate to these pressures will be an increasingly critical question. You all face this problem. How is the university to be relevant, but not so relevant that it becomes a job shop rather than a university?

Finally, the Federal Government as a political entity affects universities. The more involved the Federal Government is as a patron of universities, the more will it view universities politically and the more potent will these political forces be. [*After this talk was given, Vice President Agnew began his low and witless attack on universities—students, faculty, and administration. C.V.K.*]

In conclusion, it is clear that the future of universities will be shaped by many forces. But for the purposes of discussion I would point out one which has not been strongly emphasized. That is, the institutional commitment of the faculty, which has been seriously eroded, in part by the nature of the Federal research support system. There must be stronger consensus than now exists among the faculty of many universities that the university is worth something and worth fighting for.

The prospects for survival of these universities in a form that will permit them to do for society what society will over the long run ask of them is otherwise bleak.

DEAN ROBERT M. BOCK

I take as my premise that the university devotes itself to higher education, to creative research and scholarly activities, and to public service, and intends to spend a significant fraction of its efforts in each of these. With this as a basis, the warning note sounded by Dean Cooke can be taken as an opportunity to redirect our efforts so that we can accomplish these goals.

The statistics of our last decade reveal we have practiced excessive reproduction. Each of us worked with a goal of producing more university professors in our own image, who then produced more university professors in our own image. This explosive population growth was not necessarily an ideal behavior in terms of accomplishing the true goals of scientists and scholars.

Now we see a situation where we can alter our behavioral patterns with a type of *birth control* of academic scientists. Perhaps we will be able to devote a substantial portion of our time to the retraining and modernization of ourselves and our colleagues for which over the past decade we all have cried.

We should at this time examine the challenges and opportunities that our students will face so that we can adapt our scholarly activities and prepare our students for both the challenges and the opportunities. We should now find time for public service and do it in a manner which is acceptable both to our conscience, our colleagues, and our community. I believe if we do this, then the chaos of overproduction of one stereotype of the academic scientist will be largely averted; and we will be able to change this time of stress into a time of opportunity.

As a setting for some questions that I would like to raise, I am going to read 20 or so lines from a speech which was delivered one year ago this month. I considered keeping the speaker anonymous, but perhaps it will be more thought provoking if you realize that this was a speech given by Richard Nixon one year ago this month [October, 1968]. I will quote several paragraphs that pertain to some of our problems of today.

If the free world maintains scientific superiority, the growth of science will support the growth of economic and political freedom. Faced with the dynamic possibilities of science, the current administration is hobbled by the static philosophy that technological potentials are limited, that we have reached a technological plateau. American scientists have been confronted with shortsighted cutbacks, not only in the space program, but also in over-all American research and developmental efforts.

The American scientific community is demoralized by the present administration's wavering attitude toward research and development. The sudden decline in the Federal commitment over the last four years coincided with a 20 percent increase in the number of United States scientists. These new men of science, often trained through the Eisenhower administration National Defense Education Act, thus face a contraction of opportunity in the research and developmental field. Some of them are now turning to other fields. Scientific activity cannot be turned on and off like a faucet. The withdrawal of support disperses highly trained research teams, closes vital facilities, loses spinoff benefits, and disrupts developmental momentum.

The current administration has even struck at the lifeline of our future progress of science education. NASA, for example, has cut its graduate student grant from 1300 to 50. The Defense Department cut aid to colleges by \$30 million. The National Science Foundation budget was decreased one-fifth, and the National Institute of Health funds were reduced by an estimated 25 percent. Especially hard-hit in the reduction is aid for post-doctoral students who serve a secondary role as graduate student instructors.

The decline of science education is the most damaging indictment of present administration policies. It threatens to cripple the national effort in science for years to come. Apart from scientific manpower, fund reductions are idling masses of equipment purchased at great cost in previous years. In the name of economy, the current administration has cut into muscle. The United States must end this depreciation of research and development in its order of national priorities.

It is obvious that the accomplishments of the goals stated a year ago have been difficult. The administration has found that either the priorities have changed, the situation has altered, or their interpretations of these words were not those that an academic scientist reads into them. The problem of deciding on the order of national priorities is a very serious problem. Let me assure you that within the Federal Government there are very concerned individuals who are working hard attempting to devise structures that will establish priorities on an orderly, rational basis in order to maximize the use of our scientific and educational capabilities.

You will benefit more by reading some of the documents that have been developed in the past year than from anything I can say in a matter of a few minutes. Let me recommend for your reading a document which was released during the past month from the Office of Science and Technology. It is authored by Irwin L. Bennett, Jr., who is the director of the NYU medical center. It is entitled, *Some Suggestions for Improving the Administration of Federal Programs of Support for Academic Science*. He does not lay out a fixed solution, but examines the many challenges for decision-making, the sources of information available to the decision makers, the need for variety, the need for well defined missions by the mission-oriented agencies, and the justification for fundamental science and for its stable support. He attempts to identify the necessary complex mixture of decision-making authority and stable funding that will permit healthy survival of academic science.

Among the recommendations that are made by Bennett are that we maintain our strongly mission-oriented agencies—such as Environmental Science Services Administration, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Department of Agriculture, and their research and education facets—but define these missions and the manner in which they may overlap with the missions of such important agencies as the National Science Foundation. He proposes that we stabilize planning by adopting a three-year planning basis where funding is associated with a cost index and geared to the ability of our economy to invest in long range scientific improvement. Step funding is recommended so that if, in times of emergency, it becomes necessary to withdraw support, institutions

have an opportunity to decide whether they will use this step funding to slowly phase out their activities, to accomplish the most essential parts, or whether the most productive use of funds is to spend at full scale until the activity is disbanded.

Bennett has some definite criticism of parts of the Miller bill. He feels that the formulas developed are just formulas. They are not flexible, are too all-inclusive, and do not encourage assessment of quality. There is a significant danger that the enactment of the Miller bill would weaken in the long run the academic science of the nation. This short-term infusion of capital into academic science with insufficient flexibility, quality assessment, and adaptability built into it may, in fact, be a reduction of opportunity for the long-term future.

It is interesting to evaluate how national decisions on science are made and how priorities are established.

Is the role of the Bureau of Budget as a key policy-making body a temporary role that has been brought about by a series of emergencies? The emergency Executive-Legislative agreement to reduce spending brought the Bureau of the Budget into a more powerful policy-making, decision-making position. That crisis has passed, but we see another case arising where fear of inflationary trends again allocates powerful decision-making activity to the Bureau of the Budget. Do they have the necessary mechanism for making quality judgments, for reaching decisions on very short notice that are optimum for the long-range benefits of the country?

What is the role of university attitudes and policies on inflationary trends? Certainly we are influenced by inflation. We have many components of our budget that are fixed in dollar amounts and are not keyed to costs, but do the teachings and attitudes of universities have a real impact on inflationary trends?

In Europe recently public attitude for hard-goods production and industriousness in West Germany has helped control inflationary trends. When such an attitude changed suddenly, as it did in Czechoslovakia, it was demonstrated that the lack of incentives fed the flames of inflation.

How much of our inflationary trend is psychological or sociological in its basis, and how much of it comes from diverting our funds into production of goods not available for public purchase? Have the demands of our society reached such a high level that we are, in fact, seeking goods which are not available and are willing to pay prices that feed the fires of inflation?

This is a good time to review our policies and our planning for academic science and graduate education. Certainly, when the financial pinch comes, you look to your allocation of priorities more than ever. We have another year ahead, and perhaps several, before mechanisms

are established in which a more orderly, controlled growth of academic science can again be undertaken.

Do we need new policies or new administrative structures in order to answer the questions now facing us?

Are the missions and priorities of NIH, AEC, NASA, and USDA clearly identified in terms of both the scope and breadth, the time scale on which they are to plan, and the relative priority and obligations of their in-house activities as compared to the university activities?

What is the rationale and justification from the Federal viewpoint, the university viewpoint, and the state government or trusteeship of a university with regard to matching moneys?

Do current policies encourage or discourage long-range planning? For example, if a university does an outstanding job of looking forward to the development of capabilities in education and research for marine problems, or for problems of the environment, if they plan well, recruit staff, organize, and fund programs on state or donor funds, will they be penalized for good planning because the matching money mechanisms insist that Federal contributions must be matched after the fact rather than before the fact? Can we establish a dialogue that considers a greater span of time and compares the investment of the particular institution to the total goals of the program?

In times of severe financial stresses, who can judge the merits of new missions for Federal Laboratories? How justifiable is the proposal of the Atomic Energy Commission to use its substantial resources at Argonne as a national center for fundamental research on computing or a regional center for the environmental sciences? The AEC at Oak Ridge has mounted a vigorous and successful venture into basic biology. They have developed capabilities like a hardware-oriented national institution of health and have done an outstanding job.

Is there within the Federal Government a mechanism for an overview on the optimum allocation of resources?

Can universities agree on priorities for Federal support by fellowships and cost-of-education supplements? Would we prefer to support a smaller number of individuals at a stipend adjusted to the purchasing power that prevailed when the NSF and NIH fellowship levels were established?

Do we recommend that the increased cost of graduate education be offset by adjusting the cost-of-education supplements? With no change in dollars, this would cause perhaps 15 to 20 percent reduction in the number of graduate students supported. Even if there were a broad university consensus on priorities, can we effectively cause alteration of the cost-of-education supplement and student stipend levels?

Can we identify in a reasonable manner what manpower needs

and opportunities will be after the several year lag time between entry into the academic pipeline and delivery to the scene of opportunity? Are there mechanisms by which we can cooperate to avoid the disruption of over-supply, the disenchantment of training for opportunities that do not exist?

The substantial number of bachelor's degree holders and first- and second-year graduate students who were recently inducted into the armed forces should be returning to our campuses a year from now.

With a decrease in total armed forces and a continuing armed forces turnover almost a million men per year will be returning to the civilian scene. What will these men be doing? What are their career expectations? Do they seek university education? What fraction of them do? How should they be advised? Do we have mechanisms for contacting them with sufficient lead time that they can think, contact universities, learn of the variety of opportunities, and begin their planning? Perhaps we should redistribute our efforts so that we can better serve these returning servicemen and so that we can engage in activities of career enrichment for the professionals who are now in industry or government.

If we look at the rapidly changing science and technology and its challenge to local government, state government, and industry, there is a great need for bringing to them new tools, new concepts. We should not restrict ourselves to the academic practices of the past decade.

DR. LOUIS LEVIN

To be the cleanup man after a group of speakers who have touched on most of the important points is not going to be easy. Some of the points I wanted to make have been developed by the preceding speakers so I will try to omit those that overlap too much with what has already been said. In thinking about the title given us, I interpreted it rather literally. And I started just as Dr. Kidd evidently did, that is, trying to decipher what we mean by "the government" and what we mean when we say "the university." I came out about like he did.

However, I also started with the premise voiced here by Dean Stone. This was the one with which he presumed we would all agree—and I am sure we do agree—namely, that the universities collectively are a national resource of very great importance, not only to the government *per se* and to the agencies which constitute it but, more significantly, they are of enormous consequence to the people of the country, to the total society—the body politic as it were. And it is in this context that I decided to consider this title, "Responsibilities of the Universities to the Government." Thus I assume the responsibilities we are talking about are to the people of this country as a whole

rather than to the individual governmental agencies which are supposedly there simply to serve the society of which we are all a part. In that sense we are all in the same game. One other qualification. As may be evident, I intend to confine my remarks to the portion of the title that refers to "Responsibilities of the Universities to the Government." With regard to the other half of the title—"the Responsibilities of the Government to the Universities"—for today's purposes I will let you tell us what these are and what they should be.

In thinking about this assignment, the major topics that occurred to me probably are not new to you. As a matter of fact, this noon when I came into the dining room downstairs and saw the discussion titles you had assigned yourselves, it occurred to me that possibly I should go back home because, quite obviously, you were discussing some of the very same issues that I had thought of bringing to you. So I guess we are all thinking along the same lines.

I should like to emphasize that what I will be saying is not directed particularly at you who come from a select group of universities, but that is not to say that all of you can exempt yourselves from all of the points I will try to make. Rather, what I will say about universities will be in the context that we in the government have to use in thinking about such institutions. There are in this country some 450 universities that are involved in graduate education to a greater or lesser degree. About 200 of these operate at the Ph.D. level. The rest are involved in graduate education at least to the Master's level. Nearly all of these are also engaged in undergraduate education. What I will be saying is about universities in this sense rather than with regard to the particular group of institutions which constitute your Association. As I go through the several points I want to make, you will recognize that some are not aimed at you. But some are—and I leave it to you to pick out those that apply to your particular institution.

The first responsibility of universities that I would emphasize is that of striving toward excellence as a prime goal. This is certainly not always the case or, at least, it is frequently not evident. There are many who appear to be willing to settle for something less than high quality and who don't seem perturbed about it. The situation is exemplified by a phrase nowadays commonly and widely heard. The phrase is "equality of opportunity" for higher education. But in most instances—in most usages of the phrase—equality of opportunity seems to be equated with quantitative opportunity—that is, with opportunity simply to attend a post-secondary institution, whether university, college or community college and usually without even much lip service with respect to the quality of such institutions.

It is my belief that this sort of approach does not necessarily imply equality of opportunity for education. Equality of opportunity to me means not only being able to attend a college or a university, but also to be able there to obtain a high quality education. Of course, I would agree that the quantitative aspect is a very important one but the qualitative aspect is of equal consequence.

Adequate consideration of quality standards is particularly critical for graduate level education. I am sure that you who are involved in graduate training at the better institutions will agree that not all Ph.D. programs in this country are equivalent in quality and that not all Master's degrees are equal, and, in fact, that in many institutions the Master's degree has become a consolation prize which doesn't have a great deal of meaning. Of course, a similar comment would apply equally to undergraduate education. It is my belief that these matters need better recognition and, where possible, rectification.

In short, it is necessary that somehow we try to achieve higher standards of quality in higher education and particularly so in graduate education which now doesn't even have the benefit of significant accreditation mechanisms.

A second and related point is that universities should exercise greater responsibility and care in defining their individual objectives and should engage in better and more realistic planning to achieve such objectives. Again, my point is more directly aimed at what I would term the aspiring and emerging universities, but it also refers to some of those which are established. In these turbulent times when there are many pressures for change on the university, it seems more important than ever that each institution should carefully and realistically consider and define its role and objectives and that it prepare a realistic plan for achievement of the stated goals. These important attributes are frequently missing or incompletely developed. For example, to what extent is graduate level training to be emphasized and what attention should be paid to the undergraduate level? How good are these programs and how can they be improved? Is the institution to confine its activities to particular fields or areas or will it attempt to be all things to all men? How are the necessary resources to be obtained so as to permit some hope of achievement of the established goals?

One frequently gets the impression that some universities, though they may claim they have definite plans and goals, nevertheless are quite willing quickly to alter them to take advantage of new programs developed and announced by one or another Federal agency. It is hard to avoid the impression that if money becomes available for something new and different, there are institutions ready to accept this money without much debate and seemingly to be quite willing to

change their plans and their directions simply to get the support that has become available.

In this general connection, our experience with our science development programs has been an interesting one. There have been many instances of institutions which had submitted proposals but which have not received grants. Many of these then told us that even though no grant had been forthcoming, one of the fine results had been that we had "forced" them to go through a serious planning operation which had been very productive. Now, I think it is fair to ask why should we have to "force" an institution to go through a planning exercise? Why should not the university, of its own initiative, decide what its strengths and weaknesses are, where it wishes to go, what it wants to become, and how it can realistically achieve its goals?

Another interesting point which has come out of these programs is that relatively few institutions have included development of social sciences in the plans submitted to us. There are several possible reasons for this. A frequently cited one is that university administrations have been unwilling to gamble on their social sciences, preferring to assume that the "hard" sciences are the most salable way of getting support. One begins to wonder, then, does this mean that they are willing to forget about the development of social sciences and to leave them as second-rate areas simply because money is presumed to be more readily available for other disciplines?

To summarize this point, I think that a most important, and frequently neglected, obligation of the university is to define its intended role and objectives and to do so in a realistic manner. It takes resources to achieve most such goals and with limited resources one cannot do everything. Once realistic goals and objectives have been established, the universities should plan and work toward their achievement and should not permit themselves to be easily sidetracked by inducements from outside the institution. If this were more frequently the case, one would have greater confidence that we are proceeding in an orderly manner toward improved higher education.

Another obligation or responsibility is the necessity to be willing to entertain change and innovation. This may sound like a contradiction of what I have just said but I don't think it necessarily is. It is often said that universities are citadels of conservatism. The faculty says it about the administration and the administration says it about the faculty and the students say it about both. Undoubtedly there is some inherent resistance to change in universities, but change must come with time and with circumstances if institutions are to serve the needs of the nation. It is evident that such changes should be consistent with the long-range objectives of the institution and should not be in-

roduced without careful consideration. But that doesn't mean that they should be debated interminably.

A case in point is the very considerable discussion during recent years about the values and roles of the Ph.D. and Master's degrees and about the need for new types of advanced degrees for "practitioners." Although a handful of universities evidently have reached conclusions about these matters, it is my understanding that most institutions remain on dead center. Moreover, the principal reason appears to be inherent conservatism—resistance to change within the institution or, at least, in some segments of it.

Another point I would make is that which relates to the obligation of the university to improve its organization, management, and governance. With respect to the very difficult and delicate problem of governance, it obviously would be desirable to achieve a better and more clearly understood delineation of administration-faculty-student relationships. I am sure I need not remind this group about this matter. But I can tell you that, viewed from the outside, the current picture is one of disarray, of student unrest, of splits and schisms among faculty, and of seeming inability of many institutions to manage their affairs in an orderly fashion. Obviously, this gives the impression—and perhaps it is correct—of reduced effectiveness of the institution. But whether or not this is so, the public image is nevertheless created. I need not remind you, I am sure, that this image undoubtedly operates to your disadvantage with governors, with legislators, with the Congress of the United States, and, I would presume, with private donors.

As you know, many members of Congress, impressed by this image, have raised questions about whether the Federal Government should provide support to institutions that can't govern themselves, that can't control their students, that don't seem to know what they are doing. They may be overstating the case. Nevertheless, the damage is being done and it operates to your disadvantage and, consequently, to the disadvantage of all of us. And it leads to other effects that have also been mentioned here by previous speakers. There is no doubt that the image of disarray has contributed to the introduction of legislation that, from your point of view, certainly is undesirable, to say the least. Such intrusion upon your rights as a consequence of campus unrest and the seeming inability of institutions to govern themselves is not something that may happen in the future—it is here now. It happened last year, and there are a variety of equivalent riders being attached to appropriation bills this year. Though one doesn't know now how they will fare, I will be most surprised if there won't be some more of the student and faculty punishment clauses which you will have to accept along with the money you get from the Federal Government.

Improvement in management is needed in other contexts too; for example, in relation to the actual business operation of the institution. Again, one gets the impression of loose and somewhat unmanaged enterprises. I might cite the lack of central knowledge about acceptance of postdoctoral people, the loose approaches to institutional management and control of proposal submission, tacit encouragement of private entrepreneurship, the apparent unwillingness to pass judgment on quality of work proposed by faculty members, and so on.

The chaos that occurred last year in many institutions when the expenditure limitation had to be applied is instructive in this connection. The circumstances were such that the universities, in effect, were forced to control and manage their total government grant money. The chaotic consequences on many campuses were obviously the result of the fact that these institutions previously had not been controlling grant expenditures at all. Rather, there was a clear impression, not of a unified community, but rather of a large number of private entrepreneurs within the university, each independently controlled and with little or no central management. I have been told by a number of university administrators that one of the beneficial fallouts of this crisis was that they finally had been forced to start locking into and managing their own operations, at least insofar as grant money is concerned. I presume we can conclude that it is indeed still true that an ill wind blows some good.

Another responsibility of universities—in fact of all higher education—that could well be discharged more effectively is that of making their needs and desires more clearly known—of speaking with a unified voice. Dr. Kidd has already touched on this. I should like to underline the point.

We have many universities and many colleges and they all speak with different voices. They have banded together in a great many organizations, frequently overlapping, and these often speak with different voices. The individual institution itself speaks with different voices. There is the voice of the administration, that of the faculty, that of the students, and sometimes that of the trustees. There is no sense of unity and it becomes difficult at times to discern who speaks for whom and who wants what, except that it is reasonably clear that all want more.

The sum of all this for the listener is perplexity. Who is really speaking and whom should one take seriously? Clearly, the present situation is that in this nation there is no single unified voice—no united stance—for higher education or for graduate education. I don't need to remind this group that that is just plain bad politics.

In a related connection, I would make the point that the universities—and higher education in toto—might better exercise the respon-

sibility to provide effective translation of the values and the roles of higher education and of the institutions which provide it, of the importance and consequences of academic science, and so on, to the general public, to the state legislatures, to the Congress of the United States, and to all concerned. I believe it is safe to say that there has been relatively little organized effort to enlighten the people who control the sources of the funds and who create the legislation that you are seeking. Much more effective approaches are needed to indoctrinate these people and groups with respect to the role and importance of higher education, graduate education, science, and so on. I would venture to guess that few, if any, of the institutions represented here today have ever taken the time or trouble to specifically invite the pertinent Congressional delegation to the university; to show them what is going on on that particular campus; to attempt to demonstrate to them that the funds received from the Federal Government have produced important consequences and what such consequences have been, how they have helped the institution, and how dependent the institution is on such funds. If any of you have done so, I applaud you, but I haven't heard of many.

These, then, are the points I would make. Before I stop, however, let me hasten to admit that I am aware that it is very easy to stand here and to declaim that these things ought to be done and those improvements ought to be made. I know that it is much easier to say them than it is to do them. Having said this, I can retreat to the old Will Rogers' story about World War I when the German submarines in the Atlantic were becoming such a real menace. You may recall that he suggested that the problem could be eliminated by raising the temperature of the Atlantic to the boiling point. However, when asked how this could be done, his reply was "Don't ask me about procedures; I am only in policy determination." That is somewhat the position I am in at this moment.

I realize that most of you, probably all of you, were undoubtedly quite aware of all these points I have made before I mentioned them; and I am sure that most of you are working hard at trying to improve matters. I hope you are. I wish you good fortune in your efforts.

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

Dean Paul Legman asked the panelists to discuss the nature and effects of the reductions both in direct and indirect aid (tax exemption, etc.) from the Federal Government to the universities. Dr. Kidd discussed the pending legislation in regard to foundations and spoke about aspects of the proposed Tax Reform Bill and expressed the hope that none of the measures under consideration would, in final form, hamper those sources of indirect aid unduly. [See Dean Stone's note in regard to the outcome of legislation on foundations which amounted to a 4% tax on net investments.] In regard

to direct appropriations, he felt that prospects were not good. He declared that he felt "we are faced with a period of stringency, and there is no way out of this for the next couple of years." The indicated course of action, he felt, is to fight as hard as one can on specific matters to insure either a minimum decrease in the various areas or, if possible, some expansion. He declared that he felt some of the restrictive measures that are appearing in various appropriation bills in regard to reporting requirements and institutional penalties for student unrest were really as dangerous as the shortage of money and ought to be fought against with equal vigor. Later in the discussion Dr. Levin cited other examples of restrictive amendments to various bills and mentioned specifically an amendment to the Department of Defense Authorization Bill. [*When the bill was passed later, the amendment was not enacted, Dr. Levin reported.*]

Dr. Kidd and Dr. Levin both spoke to the questions Dean Bock had raised about the role and powers of the Bureau of the Budget. Dr. Levin said, "Obviously, the Bureau of the Budget has a good deal of power, and I believe it is fair to say that its power has been increasing in recent years. The Bureau of the Budget is an arm of the President of the United States. It is in a central position and represents the President as well as advising him. It does not do anything the Administration doesn't want done. It has an active and important voice with respect to what executive agencies may do, with regard to fiscal matters and budgetary matters as well as legislative matters. So the Bureau is in a central policy position and a very powerful one at that."

Dr. Kidd agreed and said he felt that the problem is not to decrease the power of the Bureau of the Budget but to supplement and establish countervailing forces and countervailing voices within the Executive Office of the President to bring to bear substantive expertise and sensitive understanding of issues.

Dr. Levin continued: "The Bureau is not really a kind of evil institution as some seem to think. I have known many Bureau of the Budget people, and particularly there are some who are concerned with science, whom I know quite well. I can assure you that in arriving at their decisions, in helping to develop administration policy, they seek advice, they seek instruction and information, they seek counsel and guidance, they seek inputs from the university, from the scientists at the university, and from university administrators. I don't think anybody needs to be hesitant about going to the Bureau of the Budget if one has a point to make or pertinent information to provide. They are not hidden away or cloistered, and they are amenable to listening and learning. They are quite a good group of people—a very intelligent group."

Dean Fraenkel raised a series of searching questions about the current status of the mission-oriented agencies and how the narrowing interpretations of their missions were affecting the overall funding patterns of the government. He cited the Department of Defense Appropriations Bill as a case in point. In the current wording of the bill no funds may be used to carry out any research project or study unless such project or study has a direct and apparent relationship to a specific military function or operation. He also spoke of the suggestions that some of the funds removed from mission-oriented agencies would be added to the National Science Foundation budget, but he observed that this had not seemed to take place. He felt that also raised the question about the need to make a case for the real

utility of graduate education in the unapplied areas as well as in the mission-oriented areas, and he spoke about the serious situation of the social sciences and humanities areas.

In regard to the first part of the query, Dr. Kidd replied that it was a fundamental question relating to what business the Department of Defense is in. He said he felt the Department of Defense understands and would fight to sustain a relationship with the universities in the various areas of basic research relating to DOD missions for many reasons. He pointed out that in the August debate of the DOD Authorization Bill in the Senate there were numerous expressions of opinion that it wasn't research that was in question but rather that too much of it was being done in the Department of Defense, and he reiterated the point that there was considerable interest in transferring some of the research funds to NSF, but of course this meant crossing several different government channels.

Dr. Levin also discussed the support of academic research by mission agencies. He declared, "Congress can, of course, inhibit support of such work by specific legislation such as the Mansfield Amendment. But academic research can also suffer as a consequence of budgetary decisions by the Executive Branch or by Congress followed by priority decisions of the agencies themselves. I remind you that on the basis of their own judgments of priorities in relation to budget levels, DOD and other agencies for the past couple of years have already been pulling out of certain areas of basic research which are not, they say, as directly related to their missions as other things; for example, for the past several years support for high energy physics, astronomy, and plant biochemistry has been reduced to a considerable extent by DOD, by NIH, and other agencies. This has been more a consequence of simple budgetary constraints rather than of specific Congressional mandate as in the case of the amendment you speak of. This then, may be the other side of the coin—the disadvantage of having too much academic research riding along on the coattails of agency missions. When things get tight, either the agency itself or the Congress can reduce these items because from the point of view of the agency mission, the basic research is the most readily expendable. When, as is now the case, one has a qualitative prohibition added on top of the budgetary problem, the situation indeed can become very difficult."

[As of early April, 1970, the effects of the "Mansfield Amendment," Sec. 203 of Military Procurement Authorization Act (P.L. 91-121, passed November 19, 1969), are indeed making themselves felt. The Department of Defense agencies have been constrained to re-examine all research projects supported at colleges and universities. As a consequence, a considerable number of projects have been judged to be insufficiently relevant "to a specific Military function or operation" to permit further support. Investigators have been or are being notified that funding of such projects will cease. The exact aggregate amount of support being terminated is as yet unknown.]

In addition, other agencies, whether because of budget reductions, or changing priority emphasis, or because of anticipation that a similar injunction may be applied against their programs, also appear to be leaning more toward direct relevancy.

On the basis of this reaction plus certain reductions in the FY 1971 budgets of several agencies, the requested research project budget for NSF includes a small increase intended to help cope with increased proposal

pressure expected as a consequence of withdrawn funding from other agencies. Additionally, late in March, 1970, the House Committee on Science and Astronautics ordered to be reported to the full House its recommended authorization for the National Science Foundation for Fiscal Year 1971. The recommended authorization, higher than the request in the President's budget, includes an additional \$10 million ". . . to support academic science projects being terminated by various mission agencies. . . ."

It should be noted, however, that no appropriation for NSF for FY 1971 has yet been enacted and at this writing, in early April, 1970, it is not possible to predict the final level of the appropriation. L.L.]

PANEL DISCUSSION:
GRADUATE EDUCATION AND THE
BLACK STUDENT

[Remarks were presented by Dean David R. Deener; Hollis Lynch, Professor of History, Columbia University; and John H. Bracey, Jr., Lecturer in History, Northern Illinois University. Dean Wade Ellis was moderator of the panel. Following their remarks the panelists exchanged views among themselves and then a general discussion period followed. A summary of the general discussion follows the panelists' remarks and exchange of views.—ED.]

DEAN WADE ELLIS

As you have seen by your program, this item has the title, "Graduate Education and the Black Student." In order to avoid giving you any wrong impressions, I have not visualized that this program would answer any questions, nor would it provide any solution, nor would it lay down any prescribed methods of action. What we are going to try to do is to discuss this problem and then try to enlist your activity because it is inside your offices and inside the offices of the university where there are the real resources for solving or for attacking this problem and making some progress towards a solution. Those resources lie, as I say, in your offices, in our offices, and in our universities; and the solutions are not here.

I have been very pleased to have President Bohnenblust suggest to me that Dean Deener of Tulane University would be a good representative of the deans group here. I, myself, have enlisted the cooperation and support of the other two gentlemen. I'll tell you about all of them now so that we can proceed without interruption once we get started. Since you all know Dean Deener, I'm not going to introduce him.

John Bracey is at present a Lecturer in History at the Northern Illinois University. He is a graduate of Roosevelt University in Chicago and is nearing completion of requirements for the Ph.D. degree in History at Northwestern University and is therefore known to at least a few of us. His specialty is Afro-American History. He is a member of the first large group of black students who went to Northwestern some years ago. In a discussion with him this morning over breakfast, I discovered that he has also been quite active in some of the affairs which you've heard about at Northwestern.

The gentleman to my left is Professor Hollis Lynch, Professor of History at Columbia University here in New York City. Before as-

suming his present position, he was Professor of History at the State University of New York at Buffalo and Director of its Black Studies Program. Earlier, he was Professor of History at Roosevelt University in Chicago and at Ife University in Western Nigeria. He took his baccalaureate degree at the University of British Columbia and Doctor's degree in the School of Oriental and African Studies at the University of London.

The format which we are following is this: First, these gentlemen will make formal presentations to you. At the end of their formal presentations, they will interchange ideas among themselves without any participation on the part of the audience. There will then be a coffee break, which I hope you will use to discuss among yourselves what kinds of questions you would like to propose to these gentlemen; and after the coffee break, we'll assemble again and at that point, you may ask as many questions as you like until our time runs out.

PRESIDENT BOHNENBLUST: I thought you were supposed to give answers at that time!

DEAN ELLIS: That would be delightful.

MINORITY STUDENTS IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL: A DEAN'S VIEW

DEAN DAVID R. DEENER

Rather than propose at the outset a thesis relating to the black student and the graduate school, I am going to ask a question. From a dean's viewpoint, are the problems involving black students really any different from the general set of problems involving all and any students, minority and majority, with which deans and graduate departments have grappled for the past decade or so? I will spend the bulk of the time allotted to answering this question in the negative—that the problems of black students are not really any different. There may be some matters of degree involved, but not essentially matters of kind.

Then, toward the end of my remarks, I will perform the customary decanal pirouette and appear to argue directly in the opposite. What I will assert in conclusion is this. Though the problems are not different, a set of answers being proposed differs radically from the traditional academic solutions to these problems. And further, that dis-emboweled, this set of answers reveals an educational philosophy quite alien to that which has fashioned graduate scholarship for the past century or so in the United States, in British universities, and, I suspect, in Western Europe as well.

Let me now perform a Caesarean and divide my main remarks into three parts: first, problems relating to admissions; second, problems involving financial aid and assistance; and third, problems concerning curriculum and academic performance.

Perhaps a few words of caution, of caveat, are in order. The dean's view to be presented is, of course, largely determined by the particular character of Tulane University and the particular experience of its graduate school. May I recall for you that Tulane is a private university, on the small side as far as students and faculty go and, unfortunately, even on the smaller side as far as endowment goes! Its graduate school is young, having developed largely in the past quarter century since World War II. The graduate school at Tulane has averaged about 1,100 full- and part-time students over the past five years. It gives me great pause to know that many of you administer more graduate teaching assistants than Tulane has total students in its graduate school. Furthermore, Tulane's graduate school is basically liberal arts and sciences oriented. There are several professional degree programs at Tulane, but they are not offered through the graduate school. Finally, Tulane, taken as a whole, does not have any large numbers of black, disadvantaged, or any other kind of minority students so-called, either at the graduate or undergraduate level. It is true that in terms of Ph.D.'s awarded to Negroes, Tulane, according to the recent Ford Foundation survey, is above the national average. That does not say much, because the national average is very low. Despite all this, Tulane is one of the major sources of Ph.D.'s in the deep South.

With the above as background, let me now turn to the three problem areas mentioned earlier.

First, admissions. The general admissions situation with respect to black students can be stated something like this. At the present time, on the basis of the usual admissions criteria—that is, college academic records, specific recommendations and GRE or similar test scores—Negro applicants do not fare very well in comparison to most applicants. But this is not an unusual situation. Most deans, and I am sure most departments, have faced the situation of foreign students who, in one way or another, on the basis of the above complex of admissions criteria simply do not fare very well. In other areas of the country (and Tulane does have some experience with this), persons of Latin American heritage or Mexican American heritage exhibit just the same characteristics; namely, on the basis of the above admissions criteria, the group on the whole does not compare too favorably with many other applicants.

And this is not a problem confined to "minority" students. So-called majority students, especially from small liberal arts colleges, or per-

haps from some of the newer state colleges or satellite universities, often present the same problem. That is, a student will do fairly well in his college, but, particularly with respect to Graduate Record exams, his scores simply do not stack up compared to others. Thus, I conclude that in the area of admissions and admissions criteria, black students have not presented an especially unusual or novel situation. Graduate schools have faced similar situations in the cases of foreign students, students from different cultural backgrounds, and students from different educational backgrounds.

Now, what has been the traditional response of a dean, a department chairman, or department graduate admissions committee in this situation? By and large, the tendency has been to go with the percentages and grant admission to those applicants who present a cluster of criteria that objectively ranks on the higher side rather than to those ranking lower. This is the traditional response. It is the response that made the Yanks and even made the Mets! The rationale is simple: to go with the percentages will mean, by and large, that the body of students admitted will be better, do better, and turn out to be better Ph.D.'s. And it is this traditional response—going with the percentages on the basis of the customary admissions criteria—that is being questioned by black students.

Now, to financial aid. Generally, the same criteria used for admissions have been used to determine who gets financial assistance. Clearly, this practice works more to the disadvantage of the disadvantaged because there is usually less financial aid available than there are positions in a graduate school. Hence, if the same criteria is used for the parceling out of financial aid, the black student at the present time stands to fare even worse. Yet the traditional response of graduate deans or departmental committees would be to go with the percentages, and try to put the graduate school's money on those students who figure to have a better chance of making a success of their graduate work. Again, I would argue, this is not a special problem nor a novel one. Certainly, larger graduate schools and graduate departments have for a couple of decades at least consistently faced the situation of having a pool of applicants in which there is a top group, perhaps a fifth or a third, whose credentials indicate the probability of good to outstanding graduate work, a middle group who look like good bets to finish a Ph.D., and a last group, few of whom would likely make it to the prelim stage. In this situation, the traditional response is to place the money on the top group, and if any is left over to pass it on to the middle group. But, unless a department needed bodies to teach at (or TA's to amuse undergraduates) very little money would be placed in the bottom group even if the funds were available. As in the case of admissions, it is this traditional re-

sponse—going with the percentages—that is being questioned when financial assistance to black or other minority students is involved.

The third problem area to be discussed concerns curriculum, academic performance, and academic standards. This is a broad area, presenting a range of problems. I would propose to focus on but two, both of which are rather crucial. The first involves the Black Studies programs that have been widely advocated. The problems here, I believe, are not really much different than those encountered in any so-called area program.

At Tulane, we have struggled for about 25 years over what should be the character, what should be the academic rationale for the University's Latin American Studies Program, and what should be its relationship to the traditional departmental disciplines. Other universities have Far Eastern programs, Russian programs, American Studies programs, Judaic Studies programs, all of them cutting across the traditional academic disciplines, and all of them posing problems of academic and institutional rationale. I can only mention the solution arrived at for Latin American Studies at Tulane; namely, to use the traditional disciplinary techniques and methods, that of the historian, the political scientist, or the anthropologist, but to apply these techniques to the particular empirical data provided by the Latin American area.

May I suggest that Black Studies programs present the same kind of problems as do the area programs mentioned above. And may I further argue that the traditional approach to the problems presented by these programs may also be applied to Black Studies. In Black literature courses, for example, there is of course a different set of empirical data. Still, is there need to change or abandon tested techniques of literature interpretation simply because the author happened to be this man rather than another? Similarly, in political science, Black Politics can be a good, exciting course. It is very revealing to apply the techniques of the political scientist to the internal politics of the black community, and to the politics of the black community in the nation since (and even before) the Civil War.

The second problem related to curriculum and academic performance, which I would like to mention, involves students who are granted admission to graduate school, but with entrance credentials not as high as normally required. It is often found that such students do not proceed at the normal pace through graduate school. Also, they may require some remedial course work. And in some instances, for whatever reason, they may not complete certain of the usual graduate degree requirements. A variety of students may fall into this category. Some may indeed be black. Others may be foreign students. Not a few are students who would be classified as "majority," but whose

undergraduate background has not provided them adequate preparation for graduate work.

Graduate schools have attempted a number of solutions for this problem of less-than-the-normal rate of academic performance. Many graduate schools that have admitted a large number of foreign students have experimented with certificate programs for these students who cannot or will not complete a Ph.D. program, or will not complete a Master's thesis. In recent years, there have been proposed graduate degree programs for students who are not research-minded enough to undertake a Ph.D. I have in mind here the M.A.T. and the Doctor of Arts programs. A third approach to this particular problem of academic performance is the "qualifying year" for persons whose undergraduate background suggests that they ought not to be asked to take a full graduate course load at the beginning of their graduate career.

To the extent that black students fall into the category of those students not presenting the usually expected admissions credentials and to the extent that they also do not proceed at the usually expected rate in graduate school, obviously there results a very real, a very human problem. But again, I will submit, this is neither a new nor unusual problem. Several solutions to the problem have been attempted. Regardless of the particular solution, however, I believe that most graduate deans feel that there must be a "make it or break it" point somewhere along the line for the graduate student. Perhaps I am overplaying the role of the devil's advocate, but I sometimes detect the suggestion that the "make it or break it" point ought not apply in the case of some black and other minority students.

It is now time to perform the decanal pirouette advertised at the outset of my remarks. Before doing so, a short summary of the argument to this point appears in order. In the three areas of admissions, financial aid and assistance, and curriculum and academic performance, I have argued that the problems presented by black and other minority students at the graduate level are not especially novel or unique. And further that traditional solutions to these problems have been evolved. It is true that these solutions may not satisfy all black and other minority students; it is equally true that these same solutions do not satisfy all so-called majority students either. But the point of the pirouette is not to emphasize the dissatisfaction with these traditional solutions. Rather, it is to focus on the appearance of a new set of academic solutions to these problems that in my opinion rests upon an educational philosophy radically different from that which has shaped graduate scholarship in the past.

This new educational philosophy which permeates the demands made by some black and other minority students links together three propositions or premises.

The first of these propositions holds that one purpose of education is to fit a person for his place in life. This premise by itself is certainly one that few would argue with. The second proposition holds that the higher the education the higher the place one can attain in life. If this second premise is accepted, then it is easy to proceed to the third proposition. This proposition views higher education essentially as a means of access to the upper half of the better life in the United States. It looks upon higher education not so much as a quest of knowledge but rather as a method for gaining greater economic and social benefits for an individual, or a group.

It is not too difficult to relate the above three propositions to the aspirations of any economically disadvantaged group, including black and other minority students. Consider the situation of the black community. The black community constitutes somewhat over 10 percent of the nation's population but only 1 percent of students in graduate schools. Given these figures, it is patent that higher education is not performing the function of providing a means of access for the black community to the better positions in American society.

This so-called "failure" of higher education to perform the function of providing access to societal position can no doubt be easily demonstrated for virtually any economically disadvantaged group. But to give first priority to remedying this "failure" is to insist upon a radical change in the purpose and function of higher education. It stresses the university as a mechanism whereby any group in society may achieve proportional equality and makes the quest for knowledge a derivative function. I am not arguing that such a change in higher education is right or wrong; I am simply insisting that it is a radical change in function.

This radical change results from the application of the interest group theory to higher education. In the modern analysis of politics, according to the interest group theory the body politic is split up into various interest groups, and each group has a vested right and opportunity to make the best out of any instruments in society to better its place. The university and higher education are seen as simply instruments which any group is entitled to use to fulfill its material expectations.

The big question before, then, is this. What happens if the university does not fulfill the expectations of groups within society? The events of the mid and late 1960's provide eloquent answer: Change the nature of the university!

This clamor for change has not come from black or other minority students alone. Indeed not. It has arisen from within the ranks of the so-called majority students, from among the faculty, and from administrative officials concerned with academic and student affairs. Perhaps more importantly, it is also heard in circles outside the university, such as business circles, alumni groups, educational foundations, government agencies, and legislative bodies. And to a certain extent, the university, particularly its graduate education segment, has helped bring on the clamor for change. Since the early 1950's, graduate education has sought and accepted more and more Federal money to support research and training programs. Once universities and graduate schools accept public funds on whatever pretext, they inevitably involve themselves in the political problem of their relationship to public policy. I do not think there is any escape from this. To accept public funds is necessarily to become tied to public policy; this is a basic lesson of American political life.

It is but one small step from the acceptance of public funds to the explicit use of the university in an attempt to frame or alter public policy. In my view the Vietnam situation represents a clear case where the university is being used as an instrument to make pronouncements in favor of or against a particular public policy. In short, the late 1960's has seen the university and particularly higher education become openly politicized.

Now, I've argued with my own students and faculty that "you're too darned lazy to go out and form a political party, so you want to turn the university into one!" I think this could very well happen. But let me quickly add that I am not arguing that the black student question has caused this. Rather the black student and minority student questions have come up in a context where the university, which formerly was supposed to be objective in the sense of seeking scholarship, has now become viewed as instrumental. Scholarship is to be applied for a purpose, whether it's community involvement, individual or group betterment, this, that, or the other. It has now become politicized for four or five different reasons that happen to have come together at once, and, for better or worse, all students, not simply black students, are now caught up in the process.

GRADUATE SCHOOL AND THE
BLACK STUDENT:
A BLACK PROFESSOR'S PERSPECTIVE

PROFESSOR HOLLIS LYNCH

Those of you who heard Dean Ellis's introduction of me might wonder about my qualifications to talk on the subject I'm supposed to talk on today. You will recall that I have not at all studied in this country. I studied in Canada and England, and I've been in this country as a university teacher since 1966, but this is only my second year at a full university. I can only plead that as yet black academics are a precious rare commodity, particularly in Northern universities and, secondly, my own intense interest in this whole question. I thought, therefore, this was an opportunity for me to acquaint myself with this very important question.

I suppose a starting point for all of us here, and indeed presumably the main reason for the conference, is the fact that as we all know, are all agreed, black students are grossly under-represented forming, according to The Ford Foundation's recent report last year, only 1.7 percent of the total enrollment at American graduate schools of arts and sciences, while again, as we all know, blacks form 11.5 percent of the total population.

The marked increase in the proportion of black students at the undergraduate level, again, as you no doubt are all aware, is supposed to be an 85 percent increase the last four years, 1964 to 1968, which brought the black undergraduate proportion up to 6 percent. But this simply has not yet been reflected at the graduate level.

The problem, again, presumably as we all know, becomes even more serious when we consider that less than 50 percent of the black students in graduate schools in fact achieve the Ph.D.

The black professor, if he has an iota of social conscience, is bound to be intensely concerned about this. I think he is bound to be more so in view of the fact it's precisely because of the black student movement and presumably the black thrust for assertion that he finds himself in the position that he is today.

With all due respect to Columbia, and Dean Fraenkel whom I see here, Columbia was not likely outside of this to be interested in black professors. After all, we have been around for some time. Some of us did have the formal qualifications, yet we know the major institutions showed very little interest in us. So we want to feel a special responsibility, therefore, in seeking to devise means of rectifying this gross inequity.

For instance, when I joined Columbia's History Department this summer, I was astonished, perhaps still naive, to find there was only one black graduate student in the History Department and that Columbia was successful in attracting only one other graduate student in the History Department, a black student, this year. It seems to me this meager result hardly represented a major effort on the part of one of the country's major departments of History. If it was not a major effort, the question arises, "why not?" Are my colleagues in the History Department insensitive to the feeble attempts, feeble indeed when compared with the enormity of the problem, belatedly to provide black Americans as a group a competitive chance in the society? I don't really think so. There are few in the department, if any, who might be described as insensitive or indifferent to the problem.

On the other hand, as we all know, most professors are busy, often self-absorbed people who are not prepared to pursue an idea aggressively; namely, I mean the idea here being an aggressive pursuit of black students as graduates. Thus, it's not my impression here that it's a question of being insensitive to the general problem. In theory—and this is the crux of the matter it seems to me—we are all, most of us here, most anyone you talk to would admit that really something should be done about this, that this gross inequity should be set right. The problem is that having said that, we don't go about devising new, creative means of implementing our conviction. My impression is, while most universities, perhaps most deans, most professors, are in principle committed to the idea of a larger proportion of black graduate students, in practice, a good deal more might be done. This would involve finding new and creative ways of recruiting and, secondly, sometimes abandoning rather conventional standards.

I don't happen to agree with Dean Deener's analysis of the situation. I think that the black problem in the United States is a very special problem, should be regarded as a national problem, and concerted efforts should be made to meet this problem. I take it that most of us here are acquainted with the really special problems that are faced by black people, stemming from hundreds of years of humiliation and degradation. I don't think it would be useful simply to look at blacks as another ethnic group. Any one of us who's acquainted with the problems of black people know this is a special and very deeply rooted problem which cannot be solved by conventional means. This is a national problem. It has been, in a sense, a national disgrace; and very special methods would have to be used to attempt to solve it. It seems to me that while most institutions are making some efforts, they are so conventional that they are not producing the kinds of results that are desirable.

I'm fully aware of such programs as the Intensive Summer Studies Program in which Columbia, my own university, Harvard, and at least one other takes part and this has borne some fruit. I'm aware that some institutions have their own programs for seeking to discover and attract black students, but I don't think most of the major institutions have found a way of really advertising themselves to black students who can benefit from their graduate programs. I don't know what the answer is exactly, but I feel that more and better ways have to be found simply by letting black students who can benefit from graduate programs know that the major institutions are very much interested in them because, again, perhaps as we're all aware, there are many black students who are still very wary about applying to major graduate schools in the country simply because of what has obtained in the past, you see.

There has been no incentive for black students to go to a university, particularly for the black students from the South. The black student lucky enough to go through a major urban institution might, by the end of his career, have a better picture of the new, at least partial responsiveness of such institutions as Columbia, Harvard, and Yale, but for many bright, black kids Harvard and Columbia and Yale are still considered entirely outside of their reach. Even when they might succeed in getting to these places, they don't apply.

You might say this is partly the fault of bad counseling, but I think the responsibility is also that of the institution to advertise itself and to try and persuade, try and reach as many black students as possible and persuade them of its deep interest.

This might take the form of officers of the institution visiting black colleges and speaking to black students. It might even take the form of advertisement and literally advertising in media which reach the black students.

I am not, as I indicated, optimistic about a major breakthrough in this, precisely because my feeling is that most institutions, most administrations, have already convinced themselves that they're doing as much as they can; and this might be true, except that they're doing it in the conventional way.

As a black professor, it seems to me black professors have a very crucial role to play, and blacks on campus as a group would have to continue to apply as much pressure as we can to make the administration devise creative ways. Let me illustrate some of what I'm saying by a recent experience of mine. A black student wrote to the Department of History expressing her interest in attending Columbia. The letter was turned over to me. I replied with a nice long letter giving her encouragement, telling her as much as I could about the University and

the department, and I got back from her a very gratifying long letter. I simply want to read to you the first two paragraphs. She says:

"After receiving your letter of September 22, my interest in Columbia University as a possible prospect for graduate study has greatly increased. [And, notice, she writes well!]

"I have written several schools in regard to a possible doctoral degree program in Afro-American History. However, most of the information that I have received has been to inform me that there is as yet, either no Afro-American Studies program or only an Afro-American Studies program on the undergraduate level. Perhaps my letters have been misinterpreted to mean that I am seeking a university which offers a doctoral degree in Afro-American Studies. This is not the case."

One can envisage this kind of thing happening to black students, many of whom are not as persistent as they might be. They write to a department. They then get shunted around, nobody answers, and they lose interest.

I think it's a burdensome road for black professors, but perhaps there's no way of avoiding this and we have to take on this role. One of the things we have to do, frankly, is to sensitize our colleagues in the department. They're not bad men. They're simply conventional men who, as I said before, are absorbed with their own problems and don't see that this is a major social and indeed a national problem. This is the way in which the university can help to solve what is a national problem. This is one of the major contributions which the university could make towards meeting this national problem, a problem that has severely tarnished your image, corrupted your body politic.

Secondly, it seems to me, the black professor would have to work closely with his colleagues, other black professors in the university, as well as black students to continue to remind the administration of their responsibilities. It seems to me this is the only way you're going to get consistent and persistent effort. And, also, as it were, to go out in the field. It seems to me we have to in getting around the use of conventional standards, and this is perhaps something I ought to say a word or two about.

I think we all recognize that there are good, bright kids who attend poor institutions and that, as a result, what shows up in the results stemming from the Graduate Record Examination gives no clue as to the innate ability or innate intelligence, I would presume, of these students, but rather of their achievement and, as Dean Deener has said, we tend to take the line of least resistance.

Clearly, we have to devise means of seeking to test the basic intelligence of students wherever possible and indeed of setting up more

elaborate remedial programs. It might mean an extra year, but it will be worthwhile.

It seems to me that black students and black professors could be very helpful in attempting to discover this kind of student. Sometimes they are older, well motivated students who have not done well on the conventional scores (which I'm told are culture bound).

A third way in which we might seek to apply pressure (as unfortunately my impression is that this is the only thing that administrators and universities respond to) would be to try to sensitize too the various professional organizations. It seems to me that some ways have to be provided of seriously impressing on the national professional organizations the seriousness of this problem, of viewing it as a national problem in which the university cannot remain aloof.

I do not accept the view of the university as an ivory tower organization or institution whose function or purpose is to seek after the illusive truth. The university has to reflect, has to be responsive, it seems to me, to the problems of a national nature.

Going contrary to what Dean Deener has said, if we view this as a national problem, if this disharmony which exists, if the rift which exists now in the American society is to be healed, then the sooner at all levels we press toward creating some kind of harmony, the better for us as a nation.

Therefore, if we view it as a serious national problem, now a widely accepted view, it seems to me that we ought to concentrate on the problem, including the university itself. I know the idea of a quota is repugnant to most academics, but it seems to me that we cannot really get around the idea. We perhaps need some kind of substantial quota for blacks; that is, giving some kind of preference to blacks.

If we don't view the problem in this way, then this very serious problem will continue.

I, for one, would like to see—I know administrators would complain that their resources are limited—most of the major institutions seriously attempt to admit as much as 20 percent black students of your incoming graduate students over the next decade.

It seems to me if we don't attack it in this way, this very serious problem will continue to be with us for a long time.

A BLACK STUDENT VIEWS THE GRADUATE SCHOOL EXPERIENCE

LECTURER JOHN H. BRACEY, JR.

I looked at the program and I see that Northwestern has four representatives. I would like to feel, with some modesty, that this is in response to my being announced in advance as being on the program! I'll look upon Dean Baker and his colleagues as being a truth squad! "While we have that damn Bracey around, we'd better correct what he's going to say about the school this time!" I say that in jest, of course. I'm sure you all were going to come anyway. The only thing I can offer—I assume you all know the facts about who's where and who's not where and this kind of thing—is my feelings having just come through the graduate experience in Northwestern, about what has to be done if you want to have a meaningful graduate experience.

First of all, I'm not going to duck any notions about politics. I consider myself politically a nationalist, a black nationalist, and I feel that one should commit oneself intellectually, politically, and so forth, to working out the self-determination of black people in this country in whatever form that may take.

I have no illusions about going to a university and saying, "I'll pursue knowledge and write an objective history of something, or an objective this or an objective that!" I'm not interested in that, and I didn't go to school for that particular reason. But even with my nationalistic predilections, one can have a meaningful graduate experience if certain things take place.

I will tell you, giving details of my personal experience, the things that were wrong at Northwestern, as an example of what can be wrong and the kinds of solutions that should be applied.

Financially I had no problems. There were only three black graduate students in History and we all had a lot of money. So, I couldn't say I was starving to death and this kind of stuff. There are always the sad hustlers who want a black to speak on this and speak on that, so you can make it, you know. So, money wasn't a problem. Deans have the same kind of setup, you know! But the personal atmosphere in which one has to study was a problem. There were only about five or six of us as graduate students—I think Dean Baker can correct me during the question period on this—and they brought in about 60 or 70 black undergraduates in 1966 for the first time. I found myself spending 40 hours a week at a minimum as a father figure to black undergraduates because there wasn't a single black counselor anywhere in the whole

school. The only older black figures on campus to these black kids were black graduate students. I can't tell a freshman kid who's just had a traumatic experience in class where a teacher has told him, "All black kids must have rhythm; why don't you write about music!" not to punch the teacher out this time. you know, not to storm out, not to drop out, but I must sit there and listen to him for hours while he works out his frustrations. He has a white academic adviser, but how can he possibly go to a white academic adviser and tell him that the problem at Northwestern is white people? You can't tell this to your white adviser because he *is* the problem. So, black graduate students, myself and all the other ones, had to spend a whole lot of time sitting around in the cafeteria and sitting around in dormitory rooms and sitting around in my apartment and so forth, listening to the problems of young black undergraduates. I'm not saying I wouldn't have liked to have done that, but at the same time carrying a full course load, one is in an awful kind of jam timewise, and one's academic work will tend to reflect this, more or less. I would say that Northwestern has been most generous in putting up with my extracurricular endeavors.

This is my personal opinion, you know, but the only way to solve this kind of problem is to have throughout the university black authority figures at all levels of all colleges—in the graduate school and everywhere else to which black kids can go to take their problems to relieve this burden from black graduate students.

You find that most student unrest tends to gravitate around black graduate students because they're the ones everybody looks to. They push us you know, because sometimes we don't want to be giving too much of our time when in effect we're trying to get our thing together. This will mean you will have to have some increase in the hiring of black personnel, throughout the university, any kind of personnel. For example, at Northwestern, the cooks in the cafeteria served as authority figures, and we would sit around the cafeteria talking to the cook and busboys, who were older people, just to have this kind of black community. This can only be solved, you know, by increasing the number of people at these and other levels at the university.

Further, you have to have adequate university housing and recreational facilities. At Northwestern, we had to damn near wreck the place just to get a building in which to sit down and talk to each other because, prior to that, everybody assumed we wanted to talk to white people all the time, which we didn't. We just wanted to get together like everybody else does and pursue our own little jokes and tell our own in-crowd stories and what not, and we needed a place to do that, and nobody would recognize that until a power move was made. This is all part of this personal atmosphere which the graduate student has to have to function.

You have to have this personal atmosphere too in terms of intellectual atmosphere. Some kind of training program in racism for white graduate students should be set up because I found my first seminars were filled with all kinds of very highly trained people, from very important schools, who were as thoroughly racist and as thoroughly obnoxious as they could possibly be. They kept coming up to me, like I was a famous person, to say what the black community thinks. Now, how do I know what the black community thinks? What does the white community think? I mean, you walk into your class and this guy's a friend and he wants to get along with you, and he says, "What does the black community feel about Martin Luther King?" Who am I to tell what the black community feels? I don't know what the black community feels about Martin Luther King! I'm just one person! I'm not a walking manifestation of some black experience or something, you know, and to have to spend half of one's time in a graduate seminar just telling people you're not Paul Robeson, Du Bois, and everybody rolled into one takes a lot of time; and it wears you out, intellectually.

You've got to understand that the basic curriculum, the basic orientation of the graduate school seminars, especially in the social sciences, are just stifled by all kinds of presuppositions about blacks that don't hold up at all.

We had a very good course in the History of the South. There wasn't a single book by a black author. *There wasn't a single book by a black author!* How can you possibly study the South from 1830 to the present without any book by a black author and the bulk of the blacks in this country have always lived in the South?

It was an honest mistake. I called it to the professor's attention, and he said, "I never thought about it!" It hadn't occurred to him that with all these blacks down there, somebody might have written a book worthwhile considering in the course in a graduate seminar. The same thing on slavery. We had a seminar on slavery. Not one book by a black person on slavery. How can you possibly talk about slavery without having at least one ex-slave having something to say about it? Once again, it was an honest mistake. They had never considered it. They had never thought about it. "That's a pretty good idea! I guess we could use Frederick Douglass next time!" If I hadn't been there, these kids would have had a course on slavery by all white authors and would have walked out living experts on slavery! "We know, we read Elkins on slavery and we read Stamp on slavery and we read this on slavery!" The universities are full of white "experts" on black people.

Just in the curriculum itself, then, you've got to provide some kind of orientation course of some sort—maybe some group therapy session. Why not substitute it for that silly little get-together party that you give

for graduate students? Have them sit down and hold hands or something and vibrate around so they can all see that everybody is people, too—this kind of stuff—and then maybe they can begin to work out these things in a reasonable kind of way. I'm quite serious about this. If you have been to graduate school, you know they have one get-together party for each department and you stand around and everybody makes light crap chit-chat about nothing and you try to brown-nose all the professors so you can get A's and stuff, and it's a complete waste of time!

Why not make it a meaningful experience? You're going to waste an hour anyway, so you might as well get something out of it. You know, you could do that.

In terms of intellectual atmosphere (and this could get me into a lot of trouble with my black friends), do not cater to any kind of black demands for a black orientation in the sciences. There's no such thing as black physics! There's no such thing as black chemistry! And, no such thing as black mathematics! If any black student comes to you and wants that, you tell him, "I'm very sorry; that does not exist!" and hold to that. Hold to that! Don't patronize black students by yielding to things that you know to be nonsense! Don't do that. That's patronizing. The worst liberal in the world is one who will agree with everything you say! If you tell him, "America is a racist society and has never done anything right!", he will say, "That's right!" Now, why would he believe that? He must have somebody or something back there he believes in, so why would he cater to something like that, except that he's being patronizing. He's assuming that I don't have the insight and, the reasoning ability that he has to grasp a historical situation and to make value judgments and to exaggerate or, you know, to use words in political ways like everybody else.

So, be intellectually honest. This will get you into a lot of trouble, but you've got to be intellectually honest and don't patronize black students just to keep them quiet. That gets you into a lot of trouble later on because when these kids find out you've been handing them a lot of stuff, they'll really be mad! When they take over a city and nobody knows anything about business administration, public administration, how to set up a transportation system, and all they know about is Malcolm's *Autobiography*, and so on, they're going to come back looking for the people that palmed this stuff off on them! You're not going to solve the problem by setting up all black this and all black that. That's not what black people need.

As a nationalist, I believe in developing a potential nation of black people that can have every kind of people every other nation has. There's not a nation anywhere in the world that's made of social scientists! Or historians! It takes all kinds of people, all kinds of training

to be qualified, and if you really want to do any kind of service to black students, you go out and get people in physics and get people in medicine. The number of black doctors in this country is abominable. Go out and get some people in the technical field and don't worry about whether you can set up a black history course so we can learn about our heritage and stuff like this, but teach us how to function in a modern technological society. We'll have the political stuff. We'll get control of that. I've got a survey course in Afro-American History, and when they come out of that, they'll know where they're going to go when they finish. I'm not going to deny that. I use my course the same way you use Western Civilization. You teach people to fit into your nation. In my course I teach these kids to fit into a nation. They can be doctors, lawyers, Indian chiefs, but they'll know which nation they belong to.

But you've got to get the people into these technical areas so that they can come out and perform some kind of service—not just stand around rapping about Ghana, Songhay, Mansa Musa and Ancient History, and all that, which is nice—but it's not going to build anything. It's not a lasting kind of thing. It's a stop-gap kind of approach. In terms of professionalism, in terms of career opportunities, there's a complete lack of steering blacks towards any kind of professional benefits. Most professional associations are like religious cults in which there's a priesthood and all kinds of initiates that go through ceremonial rites, but you've got to get some blacks in there and kind of blacken up these things a little bit.

Like this group here! You don't even have a good black caucus that convenes here. Ellis is all by himself! Now, how can he take over the meeting and tell you what's happening if he's only one cat! He has to go out and find us to give him some support! I was looking around and thinking there must be a couple of black deans somewhere, but he's it! You've got to blacken up these meetings a little bit, add some soul to it. I guess that's a good scientific term. Get a little softness into these meetings. They're kind of cold and hard and you sit here and, like Dr. Deener, have a very rational approach, but it's got no soul to it, you know! But, it's very rational. If the world was really that rational, you know, there'd be some black people out there, right! We're 11 percent of the population and there's no blacks out there, so if this cold hard rational approach is really going to work, there should be a black every eleventh dean. But, that cold hard rational approach doesn't always do it. You have to fire up your activities with a little enthusiasm, like we have at Northwestern, and Dean Baker can tell you, if I'm about to be attacked from that quarter, that we had to kind of put a fire under things to get things moving around Northwestern. They were using very logical approaches so we had to heat them up a

little bit, get things on the move, and you have to do this yourself. We can't do it all the time. I'm tired now!

I spent four years at Roosevelt, and we organized a Black History Program there in 1963. Now, that's really being out of it! This is five years before anybody thought about it. We had to fight then.

Then I went to Northwestern. I spent three years as a graduate student at Northwestern in and out of the administration building, meeting people across conference tables, getting people out of jail, going down to stand in front of this and that, carrying this and that sign. You know, I've just about had it! I want to sit down and write a book, or something, and be a scholar. I want to be a black historian, not a warrior of some sort. And, I shouldn't have to be in that role. You should take this responsibility off of me. You should make it possible for me to study, like anybody else. This is what your responsibility is. It's not for me to clear away all these things for you so you can sit there and say, "I wish we'd have thought about that ourselves!" You've got to start, you know, stirring up yourselves and start taking creative approaches to all these problems.

Another relatively minor problem that black graduate students face is they always seem to get left out when it comes to research grants and all kinds of things like travel funds. Now, they kind of push us around because they want to show us off. If you have a black, you send him to all these meetings and he wears his name tag with the university in big letters! You know, big black letters! But, you've got to find a way so that blacks have the same access to the same kinds of research grants as anybody else, and this gets to the point of how do you evaluate who does what?

When you're bringing in blacks, if you look at the standard kinds of reference there, a lot of blacks don't meet this kind of qualification. My own record, speaking personally, once again is very second rate. I'm always surprised I'm not put out each year. I'd sit there and say, well, gee, I'm still here so I go back and register again and I keep registering and finally I made it through some kind of way. But, based on the record of all kinds of grades, all kinds of wonderful test scores, I haven't raised all that much hell. I could, because I could work much better if I could get out of these buildings and people would let me study in peace, but one can't. I mean, the situation doesn't exist where black students can really study in peace, and I imagine the school was gambling on that.

You can't use these kinds of criteria. If you want black kids to come into the graduate school, chances are they'll have a very checkered record in terms of grades. If you're in History, you'll like some courses maybe, like African History, maybe you'll like European or something, but the rest of the stuff you just say, "Well, so much for it!" Not that

you don't know much about it, not that you're not interested, but it doesn't touch you. You've got other things and a lot more important things, so you spend your three hours credit out on the street maybe organizing something somewhere else and kind of slide off courses that aren't germane to your immediate concern, and this will show up in your record.

Test scores will also tend to be lower basically because many blacks never even hear of the test until the day before the deadline when they have to sign up to take it. Sometimes there are kids that come to Northwestern that never knew some kind of test existed. They have never even heard of Scholastic Aptitude Tests; the high school counselor never even told them about them. It's just a revelation to them. They never saw anything like it before. Then they're plopped down in front of this, and they say you have to go through it and fill in all these little blanks. I learned that if you know how these tests work, you don't have to blacken in the whole blank. It's an electronic test, and you just blacken in the space and you can save ten or fifteen minutes just by hitting the space slightly without sitting there filling in the blank. But the first time you take it, you're convinced you've got to fill in the whole square exactly. So, you sit there and fill in all that square, and people are flying through the test and you're sitting there filling in this little square. It's a cultural thing because the people who are experienced in taking tests know how to do some of those games and what gimmicks you can use.

You also learn tricks like whether the test is being graded on the number you attempt, or whether it's on a total number, so you know whether to guess on that one, and you can get a higher percentage sometimes by guessing. Say, you've got three to one on it, so try it if you've got three to one on the last ten if you're going to have ten. But if it's based on the number you attempt and they figure out your percentage that way, you don't guess. You complete the sure ones first, then you go back and catch the other ones. But you have to learn this through experience with tests, and a lot of black kids don't have this experience. You've got to take this into account.

You've also got to take into account that a lot of black people basically, and this is a cultural thing, are more effective verbally than they are in writing. They're very much more verbal. There are kids who can't write a paragraph worth a hoot, but they can stand up and run down to you for five hours anything you want to talk about, in detail. They can talk their master's thesis to you; they couldn't write it down in any kind of way. You'd complain about run-on sentences, or sentence structure, or syntax, and so forth, but in terms of their knowledge and their grasp of the knowledge, they can talk it to you very effectively. You've got to take this into account. You've got to give

them credit for a verbal ability that is prevalent in the black community but that's not used to the same extent in the white community. The best orators tend to be blacks. Malcolm and Martin Luther King are the two best speakers this country has produced in the past twenty years. It's because they've come from a people that have used oral methods and have to relate in an oral and verbal way. You've got to take these kinds of things into consideration in dealing with black graduate students.

I found myself much more at home in a seminar which was a free wheeling kind of thing than one in which we had to present these very formal, stiff papers with footnotes and citations. I could cite sources, but what the heck. I just fed it back to them. You get a better response and learning experience in the more informal situation.

Another consideration in terms of the black graduate experience is (and this is really your problem, not mine, except that I'm a teacher now so it will probably be my problem soon) that with the large number of black undergraduates (they're coming in in larger numbers) out of the ghetto areas, West Side and South Side of Chicago, out of Harlem and Bedford-Stuyvesant, they are getting rougher every year, and the militants the first year at Northwestern were hard put to stay in front of the freshman class.

It took us two years when we came in in '66 to organize an all black student group. It took us two years! We had to argue whether we should have an all black group or a mixed group. It took two and a half years to organize to take over the administration building. It took that long to convince people this was not a heinous crime that they would all be put on the rack for, to take over the administration building, hold it, and get some demands, and give it back.

When one black girl was accosted by a white fellow, the freshman class that came in the next year after the takeover of the building didn't hold a vote or anything. They immediately confronted the fraternity of the offending fellow. I mean, they didn't stop. While we were down there trying to tell them "Why don't we discuss it and hold it, maybe think about it, and everybody sleep on it," these cats were out the door going down the street. They didn't want to hear discussion. If you didn't go with them, then you had no leadership post. The ones that are coming in under them are rougher than they are.

The ones that are coming in next year are going to be even rougher. If you don't believe me, look at the high schools now. The black kid coming out of the high school will not listen to any kind of reasonable answers to anything, and he's the kind of people you're going to be getting in the graduate schools in 1971, '72, '73, and '74. You've got to figure out some way to get ready for them, without compromising your basic integrity. You've got to be honest with yourself, but you've

also got to realize that these kids may not fully appreciate your honesty! They'll basically see you as all white people, not to mean any offense, but they will. You come in and say, "You have to take these requirements" and it will be historiography or something or other; and you have to read about how Gibbon wrote *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* as an exercise in historiographical methods or something; and they'll look around and if they're really mad—they might, you know, just walk out of the whole program. But if they decide to stay around, they'll find someone to try to get around it in some kind of way, but they'll be convinced that you're some kind of racist and the program is racist and what are they doing there anyway, and you've got to deal with this kind of stuff. There will be some who, upon seeing this kind of thing, will immediately organize ten or fifteen people to throw this course out and put in another course on the historiography of Black Reconstruction. Why not study that?

You can kind of get the jump on them by proposing that yourself ahead of time, and by being prepared with alternatives that will fit in with the kids' needs ahead of time because you can learn just as much about how to write a history book by studying Du Bois' *Black Reconstruction* as you can by studying Gibbon's *Decline and Fall*. I guess nobody ever thought about it, right? You can learn just as much about the structure of poetry by reading LeRoi Jones as you can reading Shakespeare. It's just nobody thought about it! So you've got to be able to make these adjustments yourself so at least to have the appearance that you've got some concern, so the black graduate students won't think their whole learning experience is a war with the university, which is how some people have felt.

This was my general attitude at Northwestern for the first couple of years. I was more or less at odds with the University, and it was a battle to see who would win kind of a thing and everything was viewed in terms of power. Grades were a power question, not related to as an academic thing, and your standing in the class is a power question and not an academic thing, and how you got along with people was based on power. It's a hell of a way to try and pursue an education! I won't go on any longer. I've given you enough to think about. But, a kind of a closing thought is that you can take my words and my experiences and use them and try to do something about these things if you want to or not, but if you don't, the kids are going to be coming anyway and you'll have these problems. I think it's always better to be forewarned. Forewarned is better than forearmed, or forewarned *is* forearmed.

Black people are moving now, and you're not going to stop them because you're not ready to meet their demands, or you're not ready to give them what they think is relevant learning experience. A lot of you, unfortunately, two years from now, may be reading want ads

trying to find small white schools way off in Alaska, Canada, and so forth to get away from this black plague that afflicted you, but there again, those are your problems!

THE PANELISTS' DISCUSSION

DEAN ELLIS: I had a lot of reactions to the things all these gentlemen have said, but most intensely to John Bracey's statement, and I want to share just two of them with you.

One, he was talking about having formed at Roosevelt College in Chicago a black history group in 1963. I went to a black undergraduate college—it was Negro in those days—and in 1924, as an undergraduate, in that Negro college we had to organize our own black history study group. There was no course!

The second thing that John was talking about is black freshmen in your universities. I am from a university where we've just had a take-over of our administration building by some hundred or so students, almost exclusively non-blacks, and, for John's information, I'll tell you that over 50 percent of them were freshmen, so it's not only the black freshmen coming in who are going to give you trouble.

Now, according to format, we are supposed to let these gentlemen chew each other out a bit before the question period.

DR. LYNCH: I think one of the fundamental questions that was raised by Dean Deener's presentation was the whole question of how we view the black question and perhaps Dean Deener might want to respond to the way I view it, that this is a long, deep-seated national problem. From my point of view—the black point of view—I don't think you can see this as simply an ethnic group, or power group seeking more power. We have to see this as a national problem, and, as educators, we're dealing with one small part of that problem. I think our assumptions here are quite different and perhaps you might want to respond to that.

DEAN DEENER: I think an interest group, whether it be ethnic, economic, or otherwise, will always attempt to identify what it conceives to be its self-interest with the national interest. This is the general tactic of a pressure group. For example where it's labor, it's in the interest of labor that the solution be in a manner which is favorable to labor. I'm not trying to castigate; I'm simply saying this is what any decent, self-respecting, pressure group does. If they didn't argue that their self-interest was in the national interest, they would lose before they started.

Now, I don't know that the problem is so much the black community or the Negro community taking this position. It's the response of other pressure groups within the university and within the society that's important in this respect—I think, John, you used a term "power" factor—I believe my thesis that the university is becoming politicized had eloquent substantiation in Professor Lynch's and Mr. Bracey's remarks.

Politics is the allocation of scarce resources, and this is the problem that the graduate school is faced with in any given year. If 20 percent of your students have to be black; money will have to be reallocated, and that means taking it away from other groups who have expectations built up in the past, and you're going to have a fight within both your universities and government on this.

I think this is it, Mr. Lynch. I'm not trying to say you shouldn't believe what you believe; all I'm trying to say is that there will be other pressure groups who will say, "Our self-interest is also in the national interest," and this is what politics is all about. Unfortunately, because higher education is a means of access to economic goods and power, the university has become one of the principal sites for this struggle. It's outside the political parties as such any more. It has moved over to the university, and we have to live with it.

I think John is perfectly right, that if you don't look ahead a little bit, you're going to have some sad experiences. What is useful about Mr. Bracey's remarks, I think, is that he has put his finger on some things to remember; namely, that not all areas of scholarship necessarily have to have the adjectives "black" or "white" put on them, and I think this is very important.

DR. LYNCH: I was going to say there's a moral to this whole question that you're not prepared to face up to, and it seems to me that perhaps there is some hope in that the younger generation would probably not agree with you, but there doesn't seem to be among them any resistance to the idea of increased black representation on campus precisely because they see this as a moral question.

I think that white students on campus—although I'm subject to correction on this because I'm still learning the American scene—welcome this corrective move and would probably be in favor of programs which would lead to vastly increased black representation on campus.

MR. BRACEY: I more or less disagree with Hollis on that. The only substantial body of white students who welcome more blacks on campus are the white left because they view blacks as allies. The bulk of white students always come up with what the kids this year call "the little brother argument."

"These are white kids, the white Italian kid, the white Polish kid, or the white Irish kid, who've got a little brother they want to go to Columbia too, and "If you give the money to the blacks, what about my little brother? He worked just as hard in high school. How come he didn't get in, but a black who flunked out of DeWitt Clinton or some place is in there on a scholarship?"

You've got to deal with this. This is a very hard, cold, political thing, and this is why I appreciate Mr. Deener's analysis. I always end up agreeing with the conservatives because we both know this is a power thing. They've got the power and they ain't getting up off of it, and we know they've got it and we're going to try and get it.

Morality, you know, is who wins; that's the moral side, right? If we win, there will be a moral issue involved. If they win, there will be a moral issue involved. Morality is always on the side of the victor, so I wouldn't worry about appealing to the conscience of white students.

At Northwestern, happily, the white kids were largely indifferent. They were so apathetic, there wasn't even a decent white backlash. They tried to get a petition out after we took over a building in '68 to repudiate the demands the university conceded and so forth. It took them about two days and they got about 300 or 400 signatures, mostly from the fraternities who always hope you'll leave Northwestern anyway. The bulk of the 7,000 kids couldn't have cared less one way or the other. If you don't take over their particular house and disrupt their TV looking or hold up the trains going

up to Squaw Valley or stop the half fares on the airlines so they can fly down to Ft. Lauderdale, they're totally indifferent.

They say, "Oh, the blacks took over the building! Will classes still be held the same time?"

"Yeah!"

"Well, we're going to class. Don't worry about it then!"

You find a different reaction in a large public school because these kids are there with public funds. At Northern Illinois where I am now, there's a very strong reaction on the part of the lower class white kids when blacks make demands. They formed a counter group right away, and there have been openly fascistic letters in the daily paper. One guy said, straight out, "Hitler was right! We Aryans are superior people and we deserve to keep the blacks down and any blacks who come here and raise any Cain, we're going to crush them," and this cat signed his name, Joe Crouch, and said this right in the paper. He was recruiting members for the American Nazi Party from the Northern Illinois campus. He wasn't getting very good results, but he was open.

But this was at a public school; at Northwestern, you'd never find that kind of thing. The bulk of the kids are at such a high social level that you're not going to touch them. They're not worried about you. You know, Rockefeller's son goes there and David Susskind's daughter. Now, you ain't going to move into David Susskind's neighborhood! So you're in the same class as Rockefeller's son. Do you think you're going to move in next to where his father lives, wherever that is? You're not going to take over Standard Oil just because you've got a Ph.D.! You just come on in there and learn what you can learn; that's the way upperclass white kids do it.

The white left, of course, see us as allies because basically they confuse black revolutionary rhetoric with basically bourgeois values.

Remember, the true black revolutionaries in this country you haven't heard a word from, because they're not talking! The ones you hear from are basically striving, lower class blacks who've figured out the best way to get things is to shout and scare people by threatening all kinds of stuff.

You see, the people that burn down the buildings are not the ones in the college. It's middle class kids who are in these colleges. Stokely Carmichael never burned down a building in his life, or Rap Brown either, and you know, nobody at Northwestern is doing that either.

The others, though, will go up there and raise all kinds of hell with: "We're going to overthrow this and overthrow that" because it turns you people on and then you give us more money and give us buildings and stuff.

You know, maybe I shouldn't be saying so much and should be keeping this secret, but you never can tell, some of them might be serious.

DEAN ELLIS: Dave has said that he wants to ask John another question. If you don't mind, I'm going to take a few minutes of your time for this, then we'll go ahead.

DEAN DEENER: John, you used a term "black nationalism" and I'm wondering what you meant by that. I've discussed this with some blacks at Tulane, and one view is that it's really an instrumental concept; namely, that there cannot be integration until first of all there is a parity between blacks and whites, and then you can have free and easy mixing.

The second view is more a separate nation concept, something like apartheid in South Africa. It states that what black nationalism means really

is a separate nation in which you would never complain because there are no black deans out here, but rather there should be another deans meeting which would be all black.

The question I should like to ask you—and Professor Lynch may want to speak to this—has to do with the black proportion of total population as a guideline for quotas in higher education. Does this mean the proportion you speak of would mean the proportion of the metropolitan area you are in? For example, if a metropolitan area is 60 percent black, then should the universities in that area have 60 percent black students?

Is this what is meant, that this proportion would vary from area to area?

MR. BRACEY: Now, in response to the first question, I will deliver the first commercial of the day!

Two learned colleagues, August Meier and Elliott Rudwick of Kent State University, and I have just completed a book on black nationalism which will be available in your bookstore in December 1969. It's by Bobbs-Merrill Publishing Company* and it's called, *Black Nationalism in America*, and it has 555 pages of all sorts of answers.

But, a short definition. My view of black nationalism is that basically nationalism in black America stems from what I feel is the position of colonial subordination that blacks have in relationship to white America. This is true in Asia and in Africa and in the West Indies. Black nationalism is a response, which takes many forms, to a situation of colonial subordination.

It can take a religious form, in terms of religious separatist churches; it can take cultural forms such as the need for black history, wearing African clothes, and so forth; it can take political forms, like black control of the black community and black teachers and black this and black that.

As to the ultimate goals, I'm completely open-ended, because the ultimate goals in nationalism vary. There are some people who think that nationalism should be used as a ploy to integrate; that is to say, if you look very carefully, more integration has taken place since the black power slogan than before. From '54 to '64 when blacks were saying, "We want to be part of white America!", they weren't getting very far, but as soon as Stokely jumped up and said, "To hell with white America. We don't want no part of it!", whites began to integrate.

We were brought into places we didn't want to go! I'm now at Northern Illinois. They didn't want me there four years ago when they said they wanted to integrate Northern Illinois. I said I didn't want to go to a white school.

And, look at TV commercials. Blacks said they didn't want to be part of white culture, but now they're all over TV! You see, then, black nationalism could be a ploy to integrate, but, in the long run, it could be a number of things.

It could be a separate black nation based on, say, five states in the South. It could be based upon a nation made up of local city governments or regional governments, like Indonesia, for example. Indonesia is a nation consisting of a string of islands which are strung across many thousands of miles of ocean. A black American nation could be a string of cities strung across 2,000 miles of American landscape. You could have that as a nation with regional autonomy with a separate government and so forth, like in the Jewish situation in Medieval Europe, cantons, and so forth. It might

*Available from publisher or campus bookstore—\$3.25 paper bound, \$8.50 hard bound.

take the form of local separate cities with group control. This is where this question of local control comes in. In local areas, I feel that when you have a strong black population, you might have a complete black take-over of institutions in these areas.

For example, on the South Side of Chicago a number of junior colleges have been completely taken over by blacks. On the West Side, a junior college which is now Malcolm X College is completely taken over by blacks. They just went in and said, "This is ours! We want it! If you want to stay, fine; if you don't want to stay, please go! And we hope you don't want to stay," and they left. You can do this when you have a predominantly black population in a ghetto and the college is right there in the ghetto.

This is a problem which Chicago is having with the University of Illinois at Chicago Circle campus. They built it a little too close to the black community, and now they're getting tremendous pressure from the black community, on what they originally set up to be a major high-level research institution, to admit a very large percentage of black freshmen to this campus. They're obviously not going to be doing research, but it's a question of priorities there, and it will have to be decided on the basis of political power generated in that particular situation.

In terms of the proportion of things, I have no quota figure. I don't think every school in this country should have ten percent black students. I don't want to see black people strung out all over the country like that. I think in areas where blacks are the predominant ones in the population and they can command administrative control over institutions, they should take this control and use it to the fullest benefit. In some areas, say in Utah and North Dakota, you don't see blacks there, so who wants to go to North Dakota anyway just to integrate the state?

DR. LYNCH: I just want to say I agree completely with Dean Deener and John Bracey that results at the university in practice are going to come by free applications of power plays through political action, which means the universities can continue to expect disruptions. My plea was that while this is going to be so in practice, that those of you in positions of at least some power might take some broader view of the problem and view it as a national problem, but I have no illusions that in practice, whatever results are achieved, would stem from displays of sustained political power.

As to the question of whether or not there should be proportionate representation of black students in the cities, it seems to me that we all know many American cities are becoming, at least in the inner city, predominantly black. I believe it is said that in the next ten years or so as many as twelve American cities would have more than 50 percent of black population in the city, and it seems reasonable to expect that this population would be reflected in the schools.

DEAN ELLIS: As moderator of this group, I want to put in my two cents worth at this point. The first point I want to make is blacks can do a great deal more than talk about the problems of blacks, programs for the advancement of blacks, and organization of panels to discuss blacks.

You don't do us any favors, and I now say we don't do us any favors because I'm also one of you, we don't do us any favors by giving the blacks a chance to make their real contribution to this nation. The only place where you have begun to tap this vast resource, which has been through the crucible, is in sports, entertainment, and Vietnam, and, in every one of these places, we have made spectacular contributions to this society, and we will

make spectacular contributions to this society in every place where we force you to give us a chance.

Two, we stand as graduate schools at the apex of the education complex in this country. It does not become us at all to stand and complain about the quality of the product of those institutions which are our sources unless we, at the same time, exert ourselves mightily to support and encourage those institutions as they strive to reach their own goals, to define their own goals and to make progress in reaching them. It does not become us to talk about the quality of the black institution unless we exert ourselves from the top to improve those institutions.

If you ask me how you're going to do it, I'll tell you that I don't know, but I *do* know how the graduate schools can contribute to the support of four-year colleges throughout the regions they serve and throughout the nation because I have been involved in precisely this activity at the University of Michigan for two and a half years now. I know how to do it. I know it can be done and I am doing it, with the support of the University and its faculty.

This is a subject for a different talk, but it can be done, and I'm throwing this out not for you to think about but in your teeth. It does not become us to stand and complain about the quality of our entering students, unless we are exerting ourselves to our full capacities to support the institutions which are our sources.

SUMMARY OF GENERAL DISCUSSION

Dean Sanborn C. Brown began by questioning whether recruiting of good potential graduate students from Southern universities for high quality Northeastern institutions would result in a loss to the South and an injury to black education, as some black Southern educators had told the recruiting teams. Dean Deener, speaking from the point of view of the predominantly white universities in the South, answered that when black students were offered several choices they usually chose the Northeast in preference to remaining in Southern graduate schools. Thus he would consider recruiting by Northeastern institutions not to be in the best interests of graduate education in the South, black or white. Mr. Bracey felt such practices as Dean Brown outlined should be continued and he contended that the black graduate student should seek the best education he can, wherever it might be. He also disagreed with the notion that larger numbers of blacks are served when students remain in the South. He pointed out that sometimes the number of black students at a Northern or Northeastern institution might be greater than the whole black student body at a small, black Southern college. As a consequence, a larger number might be well trained with some eventually returning to other sections of the country, including the South. Professor Lynch agreed with Mr. Bracey, saying that the students should make their own choices. The results might lead to the Southern institutions' bringing their programs to competitive levels or at least to discontinuing inferior ones, either of which effort could only improve the situation. Dean Ellis added that another dimension was being overlooked—the limitations on professional advancement in the black Southern institutions. Any improvement in their status, he felt, will depend not only on increased support but also on greater opportunities for professional advancement.

Dean George K. Fraenkel turned the discussion from the desirability of recruiting black students from the South to the question of whether there should be raiding of Southern Negro colleges for staffing courses. He also raised the related matter of whether courses with black cultural relationships, such as Afro-American History, needed black instructors. Mr. Bracey replied that he felt essentially the same situation obtained with seeking black professors as with black students. The best interests of neither the individual nor the group could be best served by leaving them in inferior institutions. Dean Ellis commented that one solution to the problem of small, Southern, primarily black colleges would be to recommend them to white students as a professional possibility.

Dean Elmer F. Baumer expressed concern that industry programs to hire qualified black B.A.'s were removing many qualified black students from graduate school altogether. Dean Deener questioned the concept of a black brain drain from the South as illusory so long as the black intellect is of little consequence in the social and political life of the South; as the black intellect begins to play a bigger role in the South, then the concept of a brain drain becomes important. Dean Baumer replied that he had in mind a siphoning off of graduate school potential in the country in general, not just the South. Dean Daniel Alpert commented on Dean Baumer's concern over the choice of industry training over professional education and contended that a person wanting professional or administrative training would do better to choose industry, for he felt the quality of their training programs was often substantially higher than that of many professional schools.

Professor Lynch returned the discussion to Dean Fraenkel's question about staffing black courses. He felt, first of all, that the black community could not provide jobs and opportunities for all trained blacks. Thus, there would be no serious drain on the black community if blacks were to be sought in larger numbers to staff new courses. Second, blacks going into such positions would ultimately train some number of people who would go back into the black community, and, finally, such staffing is desirable because it is difficult for whites to understand fully the black point of view. He felt the black scholar oftentimes has a vitally different and perhaps a truer, more honest perspective than the white scholar.

Mr. Bracey made the point that the question of black teachers was only half the issue. Black students are so alienated from white Americans that communication between black students and white teachers is almost impossible. He declared that in research in the area of black studies the question was somewhat different. White researchers are certainly capable, but interpretations almost inevitably have to be made by blacks.

Dean Robert H. Baker substantiated Mr. Bracey's account of black student relations at Northwestern and commended him on his efforts in behalf of black student relations there. He touched on the paradoxical situation in which for years no attempt had been made to identify blacks specifically, but rather a genuine effort had been made to be color blind, as he put it. However, with the changed temper of the times, he felt Northwestern had made progress in increasing the number of its black graduate students and in helping them with their problems. He credited Mr. Bracey with giving substantial help on the latter.

Dean Joseph McCarthy cited the rapidly growing number of community colleges and asked the panel to comment on the preparation of teachers for these colleges, many of which will likely have large black populations. Mr.

Bracey responded that the only way to provide necessary teachers is to increase the number of black graduate students. The source for black college teachers should essentially be the same as for white teachers: the graduate schools (not colleges of education). He also mentioned tapping potential sources of black B.A.'s such as postal workers who are actually capable of becoming teachers if further education were possible and made accessible.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON POLICIES IN GRADUATE EDUCATION

THE Committee discussed the range of problems facing graduate education and selected those upon which it seemed most useful to report now.

New Grading Practices

Numerous colleges are exploring innovation and improvement in grading of courses, self-evaluation or class evaluation of performance, or elimination of grades. Under some conditions, the assignment of a grade in a course may detract more from the performance of the student who is striving to develop new skills or concepts in this course than the grade is worth as a performance indicator. The Association of Graduate Schools approves of controlled experiments and carefully thought out attempts to improve educational opportunity and to enhance the effectiveness of our educational process. Accompanying such innovation there will be many recommendations for change, some of which could be accomplished only by increasing graduate student support far beyond what is available today, and by the construction of educational facilities which would require many years to accomplish. For the foreseeable future there will continue to be inadequate opportunities in certain areas of graduate education, and continued competition for assignment to particular openings in a university, or to particular universities. To use wisely the current capabilities of graduate education systems and the great diversity of training available, we must seek improved means of communicating to departments and admissions officers the needs and aptitudes of students. Reliable information is needed to evaluate whether a particular opportunity is suited to the experience and potential of each unique, individual applicant.

Thus, innovative practices of grading and evaluation of undergraduate performance bring with them a challenge for improving criteria for admissions and for distribution of educational opportunity and financial support. It is essential that departments and admissions officers give clear advice to potential student applicants and to their undergraduate teachers. Form letters of recommendation for a graduate student should be developed to elicit the necessary information describing his needs and capabilities. Graduate schools or the Association should develop a letter of advice to those faculty members charged

with the responsibility of recommending students for particular graduate opportunities.

It should be brought home to students and faculty alike in all colleges that there is serious competition for the limited graduate support available and that current prospects for increasing these funds are far below the need. It should also be emphasized that there is a great variety of opportunity in any major university and that admissions officers and departmental admissions committees can accomplish their tasks properly only if they receive all pertinent information. When students have understood these realities, they are more likely to choose wisely from among the several options often given them for grading systems. If the student is at a disadvantage in admission and fellowship competitions because his college does not provide grading or academic ranking data, he will need to encourage those who write letters of recommendation to transmit more factual information. Positive and coordinated action by colleges and the Association is needed if we are to allocate our limited resources most effectively.

Junior Colleges

The growth of junior colleges during the past few years, and the possible consequences of this phenomenon for future policies of the Association and many of the institutions which hold membership in it, need study. The principal question has to do with the possible obligation of member institutions to provide new programs at the graduate level designed specifically to prepare young scholars for careers on the faculties of two-year junior and community colleges. Heretofore, our emphasis has clearly been on doctoral programs preparing future university professors, teachers in the liberal arts colleges, and research personnel in government and industry. Most AGS institutions have given relatively little attention to the Master's degree in recent years, and national funding agencies have likewise focused their attention and their funds largely on doctoral programs for the ablest students.

Junior and community colleges, however, are being founded at a truly remarkable rate in all corners of the continent—a thousand junior colleges now enroll 25 percent of all students in higher education—and much has been written recently about the need to design programs which would prepare people for teaching careers in them. It is alleged that the Ph.D. represents more preparation than will be needed in these new institutions, and that the heavy research emphasis of the Ph.D. is inappropriate for their needs in any case.

Various alternatives have been proposed. One is the development of a different kind of doctoral degree, such as the Doctor of Arts; another is a two-year Master's program with a closely supervised intern-

ship, such as the Master of College Teaching degree. At least two conferences have been devoted to the appropriateness of the so-called "sixth-year" specialist's certificate to the needs of junior colleges.

While the Committee believes that all member institutions should be sensitive to the staffing needs of junior and community colleges and should recognize their importance in a rapidly expanding system of higher education, the pressures and demands for highly trained researchers and the obligation to limit admission to many AGS graduate schools have established priorities which most cannot in good conscience abandon at the present time. AGS institutions are urged, nevertheless, to support and cooperate with those graduate schools, within or without the AGS, which may want to meet clearly visible needs by designing new patterns of preparation for junior college teaching. It should also be recognized that a considerable number of Ph.D. graduates from AGS institutions will find careers in the rapidly growing publicly-supported graduate schools which ought to take advantage of the special opportunities afforded by the junior and community college movement. AGS institutions should lend all possible support in working with these institutions to establish sound and innovative programs which will earn wide recognition in our society.

The Current Character of the Ph.D.

Concern with the nature, structure, costs, and quality of graduate and professional degree programs continues to mount, as is evidenced by the various statements on advanced degree programs issued by the Council of Graduate Schools. A recent Policy Statement of the CGS, entitled "The Nature and Naming of Graduate and Professional Degree Programs" (1969), calls the Ph.D. degree "the mark of highest achievement for preparation of graduate scholarship and research." This characterization is in keeping with the meaning assigned the Ph.D. degree by the Association of American Universities in 1904. But the enormous expansion of higher education has brought many changes affecting the structure of Ph.D. programs as they exist today, and others are occurring. We mention only a few. The language requirement has undergone transformation, and in some cases has been abolished. Ph.D. programs may or may not require a minor field. In certain disciplinary fields, the Ph.D. program may focus on a specialized sub-area and not pretend to cover even a major portion of the field. The oral defense of the dissertation has become a formality in many instances, and is sometimes waived. Emphasis on the Ph.D. as the "union card" for college teaching continues, even though alternative graduate programs have been developed. Emphasis on postdoctoral training is also increasing. Above all, skyrocketing costs threaten

the ability of universities to continue to place adequate resources in support of quality Ph.D. programs.

What have been the effects of these and other developments on the structure and character of the Ph.D. program? Does the Ph.D. awarded by our programs taken in the aggregate as they are at present offered merit description as "the mark of highest achievement for graduate scholarship and research"? Should the concept of the Ph.D. degree as the highest earned research degree be revised?

Such questions as these deserve extended consideration, and the Committee suggests that AGS undertake a broad inquiry into the changes that have occurred in the structure and character of the Ph.D. program, and the effects of these changes on the concept of the Ph.D.

RICHARD ARMITAGE
ROBERT M. BOCK
DAVID R. DEENER
GEORGE K. FRAENKEL
ERNEST SIRLUCK, *Chairman*

[The report of the Committee on Policies in Graduate Education was accepted.]

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

IN its 1968 report to the AGS membership this committee urged that the Association attempt to encourage several definitive research studies with respect to foreign graduate students who come to American universities: the predictors of successful or unsuccessful performance in graduate work; the performance of foreign students in American graduate schools as compared with American students in the same programs; comparisons of the characteristics of foreign students who return to their home countries as against those who do not; the difference being a foreign student in the United States makes to a graduate student after he returns and picks up his career and his personal life, etc.

To be worthwhile such studies should be well enough designed and generously enough supported to be definitive and not simply add another two or three isolated pebbles to the already sizable pile of limited and inconclusive studies which exist. For these reasons our committee urged that AGS attempt to encourage an appropriate agency or agencies to support a program of research in this area, with sufficient resources to undertake such a program with adequate funding, expertise, and staff.

Our committee has considered the AGS Executive Committee response to our report (1968 *Proceedings*, p. 93) and has concluded first, that it feels it would be inappropriate for this committee to approach possible sponsoring agencies. We believe that such approaches and negotiations should more appropriately be made in the name of AGS by its Executive Committee. Second, we are not convinced that it would be appropriate or desirable for our committee to attempt to develop those research areas which we have identified "in more detail" as suggested by the Executive Committee. It seems to us that we have attempted to identify certain areas which clearly need large scale, extensive, definitive research. We have stated in general the things that we feel it would be important to know about foreign graduate students who come to this country, and we feel that we have been perhaps as specific as one could or should be at this stage. A research agency or group which might undertake the planning and execution of one or more of these studies would presumably have the competence and the interest to ask more appropriate detailed questions, to design the re-

search studies, and to choose the appropriate instrument or instruments to get the answers desired. An AGS committee might be useful to such an enterprise in an advisory role, but we believe that since it is not itself conducting the study it should not prescribe in detail how the study should be carried out.

To summarize, we again urge that the AGS through its Executive Committee, and perhaps in cooperation with CGS and the so-called National Liaison Committee, undertake explorations and discussions with appropriate agencies, with a view toward interesting them in supporting or undertaking one or more of the studies we have suggested.

In a quite different area of international education, we have noted with considerable interest the report of the ACE Commission on International Education which appeared in the *ACE Bulletin on International Education* of April 25, 1969. This report, which was the outcome of several months' deliberation by a prestigious committee, is dominated by two topics (a) increasing the American people's understanding of other cultures, and (b) educational activities abroad, and thus reflects that committee's feelings about present top priorities for this country and its educational institutions in the field of international education.

An additional shift in priorities, which we noted in our 1968 report, has become increasingly apparent over the past months. This is a shift in amount and intensity of concern away from bringing foreign students to our universities and toward a marked increase in efforts to make educational opportunities available for disadvantaged young persons in our own country. The actions of federal agencies, state legislatures, and the universities themselves during the past several months have indicated that this trend is indeed a strong one. Wise and judicious balance is often difficult to achieve in educational affairs, but we urge that American universities and those agencies which help to support graduate education make it possible to achieve a reasonable balance between the continuation of programs of support for foreign graduate students while at the same time markedly increasing opportunities for disadvantaged domestic students. Our facilities, faculties, and funds should enable us to do both.

Finally, this committee views with deep concern the severe reduction which has taken place in the Fulbright program for graduate students. We view the cutback as serious not only because of the damaging effect on the Fulbright program itself, but also because it may reduce the willingness of foreign governments to strengthen their own fellowship programs for American graduate students. We urge that

AGS join with CGS and other educational associations which are making strong representations with respect to the cutback.

GUSTAVE O. ARLT
DAVID R. DEENER
REGINALD H. PHELPS
LORENE L. ROGERS
ROBERT E. TSCHAN
S. D. SHIRLEY SPRAGG, *Chairman*

[The report of the Committee on International Education was accepted. For proposed plans to carry out recommendations of the Committee in regard to a survey of the effectiveness of American universities to foreign students, see President-elect Bryce Crawford's remarks on p. 120.]

REPORT OF
THE COMMITTEE ON
RESEARCH AND RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION

LAST year the Committee on Research and Research Administration addressed its report to three closely related problems: reduction in Federal research support, the changing structure of Federal research support, and the problem of communication between universities and the "public." Since critical difficulties entailed by the first two were viewed as consequences of the third, the Committee concentrated on the broad issue of poor communication between the universities on the one hand and government, taxpayers, and alumni on the other. The Committee called for AGS-sponsored conferences with Federal officials and for university-sponsored conferences with State officials.

Formation in 1968 of the AGS Committee on Federal Support of Graduate Education, with the understanding that action on suggested conferences would become part of the work of the new Committee, appeared to satisfy this need, at least in part. The Committee on Research and Research Administration, rather than seeking out new topics of much less concern on which to report, wishes to re-emphasize the importance of effective communication between universities and the "public" and to encourage the Committee on Federal Support of Graduate Education to bring before the AGS concrete recommendations for action at an early date.

F. N. ANDREWS
J. B. PAGE
D. C. PRIESTERSBACH
F. T. WALL
V. K. WHITAKER
M. J. BRENNAN, *Chairman*

[The report of the Committee on Research and Research Administration was accepted.]

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON STUDENT AID

IN response to an inquiry addressed to all AGS Deans, the Committee received a number of letters suggesting topics for its consideration. Many of these topics involved large issues and deep problems for which the Committee had no ready solution. In some cases, the Committee concluded that the issues and problems posed in these letters were so highly personalized to the individual institution and so dependent upon the circumstances and position of each institution that it could say nothing that would be generally applicable to, and appropriate for, all institutions. The Committee noted that many of the problems that continue to be of grave concern to graduate deans have been thoroughly discussed and explored in previous reports of the Committee; these previous reports still seem quite timely and valuable. Each of the topics discussed below was suggested by several deans in response to the Committee's inquiry.

Financial Aid for Disadvantaged Students

Since no significant amounts of Federal funds are presently available specifically for the support of culturally disadvantaged graduate students, financial support for such students must come from university sources. Some graduate schools are able to support all or nearly all graduate students who are admitted. Those universities in this fortunate position should seek to achieve enough flexibility in the management of their fellowship programs to enable them to extend appropriate financial support to the culturally disadvantaged students. Such students might be given preference for nonservice appointments, for example, since they may be less well prepared to receive service appointments as teaching assistants or research assistants, especially in their first year of graduate study. Other universities, who can support only a fraction of their graduate students, usually award fellowships and other forms of aid on a competitive basis. These universities vary greatly in the extent to which they can depart from academic merit as the basis for these awards. The Committee agreed that all institutions should seek to achieve enough flexibility in the management of financial aid to graduate students to permit awards to culturally disadvantaged students who might not be able to win such support on a strictly competitive basis, but who appear to have the capacity to perform well in graduate study and research.

The Committee also noted that both the definition and measurement of academic merit are extremely difficult. It recommends that the

AGS give its support to the introduction of Federal programs of financial aid to disadvantaged students on a frankly experimental basis.

Need as a Criterion for Financial Support for Graduate Students

The steady decline in the sources of funds for the support of graduate students has led some graduate deans to consider need as a criterion for graduate awards. This practice is still rather uncommon, however, since the tradition has been fairly well established in recent decades that need should not be considered in the award of graduate fellowships and assistantships. When financial need is taken into account, it is the income and financial resources of the student and his spouse that are regarded as pertinent. The graduate student is considered to be an adult who is responsible for his own affairs, and thus the parental income is not considered relevant. The Committee noted that need may in fact be taken into account more frequently than is generally recognized, as in decisions to provide supplementation, or in decisions to award NDEA Title IV fellowships to married students with children to give them the benefit of dependency allowances which they would not receive if they were offered service appointments instead. On the basis of the limited information available to it, the Committee concluded that consideration of need was becoming more widespread, that graduate deans have a keen interest in this matter, and that a survey of methods and practices now in use in the member institutions would be of great interest to graduate deans. Therefore, the Committee recommends that such a survey be made.

Federal Support of Graduate Students

The Committee noted with regret the continued decline in Federal funds for fellowship and traineeship programs for graduate students. Since the budgetary outlook remains bleak, with further decreases in fellowship support in prospect, the Committee urges an expansion of the loan program for graduate students. The Committee believes that no able, well-motivated graduate student should have to curtail his program of graduate study because of lack of financial support. However, given the urgent financial needs in many areas of public life, the large increase in graduate enrollment in recent years (some 60 percent of college graduates eventually go on to advanced study), and the pressures on the Federal budget, the Committee cannot urge that a top priority be given to an expansion of programs for graduate fellowships and traineeships. An expansion of a program of loans to graduate students would make it possible for the determined and dedicated student to continue his education.

The Committee noted that increases in student stipends and institutional allowances have been recommended by the Federal Inter-agency Committee on Education (FICE) in its report, "A Study of Predoctoral Student Support." The Committee endorses these recommendations by FICE.

Common Manual of Procedures and Regulations for Federal Fellowships and Traineeships

The Committee noted that its predecessors have repeatedly recommended that the several Federal agencies adopt a common manual of procedures and regulations for Federal fellowship and traineeship programs. No action has been taken to date, nor has any reply been received from the agencies. The advantages of such a common manual are clear and obvious, but the recommendations of previous committees have had little effect. The Committee recommends that this recommendation be formally adopted by the AGS and formally transmitted to the agency heads (the principal ones are the Office of Education, the National Science Foundation, and the National Institutes of Health), and that a formal reply be requested. The Committee hopes that a way can be found to eliminate the largely trivial differences in forms, reports, and procedures which cause all of us so much needless difficulty in the operation of these programs.

The Committee noted in particular the desirability of standard rules in all agencies to govern supplementation. It recommends that no supplement be allowed for the first year of any Federal award.

Teaching Assistants—Their Role and Function

Graduate deans continue to be concerned about many aspects of the role of teaching assistants in the universities. We note that the Committee report for 1967 contained a lengthy discussion of these matters, a discussion that still seems fresh and timely. Most of the old problems remain with us, and several new ones have appeared on the scene.

The present Committee agreed that many thorny problems exist in member institutions with regard to the selection, appointment, remuneration, supervision, and training of teaching assistants. We also recognize that graduate students have many legitimate complaints about these matters, and that injustices do exist. Therefore, the Committee recommends that graduate deans encourage the formation of Graduate Student Associations or other organizations to provide a focus for constructive discussion of the role and function of teaching assistants and a mechanism for handling any legitimate grievances.

Dean Elder was unable to attend the meeting from which this report emanated. The Committee wishes to thank Dr. Gustave Arlt and Mr. James Eshelman for allowing us to use a conference room at the Council of Graduate Schools headquarters in Washington, D.C.

E. J. DUNBAR
J. P. ELDER
JAMES P. O'CONNOR
HAROLD LURIE
W. DONALD COOKE, *Chairman*

[The report of the Committee on Student Aid was accepted. Action on the Committee's recommendations is summarized below.]

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

Discussion of the recommendations in the Report of the Committee on Student Aid was deferred until the business meeting, when Dean Cooke, on behalf of the Committee, presented four of them as formal resolutions. Two were passed with only minor revisions of wording and appear below as formally passed by the Association. The other two were the subject of some discussion. Since they were not approved, only a summary of the discussion follows although they were proposed in formal wording, also.

In regard to the resolution that "under the present circumstances, priority over other types of support be given to an expansion of loan programs for graduate students" Dean Cooke presented as a rationale: (1) that fellowship money was going to be extremely difficult to obtain in the next few years, (2) a loan program could handle larger numbers of graduate students than outright grants, and (3) there was some unanimity of feeling that graduate students shouldn't necessarily expect four years of support. Dean Kimball determined that the Committee intended "other types of support" to mean nonservice support, i.e. fellowships and traineeships, but Dean Protheroe objected that categorizing support in those terms raised difficulties for certain types of research grants, ostensibly nonservice support, which had been subject to certain tax rulings. Dean Fraenkel raised the question whether the resolution on the very face of it wouldn't favor the sciences where there are research grants and be much harder on people in the humanities and other nonscience areas. Furthermore, he felt that such a recommendation might be interpreted as meaning that the deans favored putting all the money into loans. He agreed that it would be desirable to have more money available in loan funds but that the effect of the recommendation could be to damage the already precarious fellowship programs. Dean Baker pointed out that the problem lies in getting money in general, and he did not feel this a persuasive way to get more total money or to be able to support any more students. He agreed that loan funds might eventually result in making more money available as loans are repaid, but this would not help in the next four to five years. Further, he felt it would be the recipients who would be bearing the burden rather than the total tax-paying public. "I happen to believe that it is an obligation of the whole society to foster this level of higher education rather than that of the individual recipients of support." Dean Fraenkel then suggested that the

focus of the resolution be on the idea that any expansion of support be in terms of loan funds. He mentioned that a forgivable component be added to the loans, in agreement with Dean Baker's thoughts about the nature of loan funds.

Dean McCarthy suggested that perhaps the thing to do would be to single out the loan programs for concentration and simply suggest that they be expanded and not mention other types of support.

After further discussion it became clear that a satisfactory wording could not seem to be arrived at and that there was, in effect, no substantial agreement on what the resolution should focus on. Therefore, on Dean Paul Hubbard's motion, the resolution was tabled by a vote of 24 to 13.

Dean Cooke explained that the Committee's recommendation that "no supplement be allowed for the first year of any Federal award" arose from the Committee's concern that so many institutions are competing for graduate students when they have more money than students. Restriction of supplementation for the first year only was suggested since many graduate programs have teaching requirements. Dean Fraenkel said he understood why the Committee was making a proposal of this nature, but he felt there were great difficulties in carrying it out. If a university gives single graduate students special dormitory accommodations, or married students inexpensive housing, this is an important type of subsidization or supplementation which would never come under this particular sort of rule. The cost of living in different areas is different and must be accounted for. He pointed out that NSF had worked on definitions of supplementation for some time. He felt that rather than having a fixed rule which allowed no supplementation the amount of supplementation could be strictly controlled.

Dean Spragg urged defeat of the resolution on the basis that the recent change of the NDEA fellowships to a calendar year basis has placed a large number of first-year graduate students at a considerable economic disadvantage. A \$2400 first-year NDEA fellowship shrinks to \$1800 if he holds it during the academic year. It puts it below a typical teaching assistantship and puts Federal fellowships and traineeships in an unfavorable light for the first-year student. Dean Spragg felt that \$1000 was probably too much supplementation, but he did think that a department or graduate school should have the flexibility to provide modest supplementation to make an NDEA fellowship at least as attractive as a teaching assistantship. Dean Benjamin F. Howell spoke against the wording of the resolution. He remarked that a large number of fellowships and traineeships are given to students in their second and third years of graduate study, and he felt it would be regrettable if these students are prevented from receiving the supplementation that other students are receiving at the same level. Dean Cooke, explaining that the intention of the Committee was to rule out supplementation for beginning graduate students, then suggested changing the wording of the resolution from "first-year fellowships" to "fellowships for beginning graduate students."

Dean West asked to speak against the resolution in its entirety. He declared that the various Federal agencies have recognized that Federal stipends are too low and that among recommendations in the FICE report there is discussion of trying to increase the size of programs by keeping stipends low and allowing supplementation according to institutional rules where that is dictated by the cost of living or other circumstances.

Dean Stone also felt the resolution should not be passed and reminded the group of the morning's panel discussion in which special financial considerations need be made in some cases, and he cited the existence of many Martin Luther King fellowships.

At that point the question was called, and a clear majority voted against the resolution.

The Association approved the following recommendations of the Committee on Student Aid as formal resolutions with minor changes in the original wording:

Be it resolved, that

the members of the Association of Graduate Schools in the Association of American Universities, the Canadian members abstaining,

(1) support the initiation of Federal programs of financial aid at graduate level to needy, ethnic minority students on an experimental basis

(2) recommend that a common manual of procedures and regulations for Federal fellowship and traineeship programs be adopted.

[These recommendations were forwarded to the Executive Committee for action and transmittal to appropriate persons.]

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON TESTING

THE purpose of the Committee is to provide liaison between the AGS and the GRE Board which formulates policy and supervises its execution with respect to the Graduate Record Examinations and the Graduate School Foreign Language Tests. Each year the AGS appoints one new member to the GRE Board who serves for a term of four years. The four AGS appointees who are currently members of the GRE Board constitute the membership of the AGS Committee on Testing. The Board met on two occasions during the past year to review the operational aspects of the testing programs, to receive reports on various projects, completed and continuing, to consider proposals for new projects, and to review the financial status of the program. What follows is an account of some of the major activities in which the Board has recently been engaged.

Review Panels

The GRE Board has long been interested in devising means for involving members of the various academic disciplines in evaluations of the Advanced Tests which might contribute to systematic efforts to improve them. At its meeting in September 1968, it entertained a proposal for subjecting various Advanced Tests to review by panels of scholars selected jointly by the GRE Board and by the appropriate professional associations. ETS was authorized to make arrangements for such reviews of up to five of the tests during the past academic year. The fields selected for review, in accordance with suggestions by members of the Board, were economics, engineering, history, and political science. In addition, it was decided to appoint a panel in German since an Advanced Test in this field had been authorized and it was decided that discussion of the sort expected of the panels would provide a good basis for designing the new test. The panel in the field of political science also had a rather special status since the American Political Science Association had already decided to conduct a review of the Advanced Test in that field and the panel, as finally constituted, represented a merger of the independent initiatives of the APSA and the GRE Board.

The panels included the chairman and sometimes one additional member of the appropriate Examination Committee plus approximately five faculty members jointly agreed on by the Board and the appropriate professional association. A member of the Board typically

sat with the panel as an observer and members of the ETS staff were available to provide technical and logistical support.

The panels met for one day (in the case of the Political Science Panel, for two days). They were provided in advance with copies of the Advanced Tests and the Aptitude Test plus material providing historical and interpretive background information. They were invited to criticize the tests in terms of their usefulness in making admissions decisions and to make suggestions as to how they might be improved. The panel reports were submitted to the GRE Board, to the professional association, to the Examination Committees, and to ETS.

The panels were useful in providing an avenue of communication between those involved with the design and development of the tests and with the determination of GRE program policy on the one hand, and leading educators in the fields which the tests are intended to serve on the other. Problems on both sides were aired and a clearer understanding was attained of the lines along which the tests must be modified if they are to achieve wider acceptance. In addition, the attention and interest of the professional associations and, through them, of the fields they represent were focused on the Advanced Tests under circumstances which we hope will lead to a greater degree of continued involvement.

Despite these genuine benefits deriving from the review program, the Board decided against extending it at this time to embrace all the Advanced Tests. Review panels have, however, been authorized in instances where professional associations take the initiative in requesting them. In addition, more searching evaluation of the Advanced Tests will be encouraged through providing more time for the Examination Committees to consider the philosophical bases of the tests on which they work, through the greater involvement of consultants from the field in the work of the Committees, and through arranging for sessions at professional meetings where the existing tests and modifications planned for the future will be discussed.

Plan for a Restructured Testing Program

As a further expression of its interest in fitting the GRE tests as precisely as possible to the need of graduate departments for better information on which to base admissions decisions, the GRE Research Committee directed ETS to prepare a proposal for restructuring the testing program. After review by the Research Committee and subsequent revision, a paper embodying such a proposal was presented to the Board in September 1969 for its acceptance in principle.

In general, the proposed new structure would permit greater flexibility in both the Aptitude and the Advanced Tests which can be utilized to achieve types of testing which are more exactly tailored to the

demands of subject-matter areas and of particular disciplines. Thus, in the case of the Aptitude Test, it is proposed to shorten somewhat the time allotted to traditional aptitude testing of the sort providing Verbal and Quantitative scores and to use the time so saved for measuring relatively broad dimensions of ability and knowledge which are likely to be of interest to several related disciplines. Thus, for example, while a Quantitative score having the same meaning as the one now reported will continue to be available, an additional test of quantitative ability operating at a much higher level could be offered for students heading for graduate study in mathematics or physics. Similarly, a test of writing ability might be offered for students planning to enter the humanities. All candidates will be expected to take the traditional Quantitative and Verbal tests. The content of the remainder of the Aptitude Test will be determined for each student by his intended major field. The particular types of material to be made available through the variable portion of the Aptitude Test will be determined only after extensive consultation with members of graduate faculties who are familiar with the requirements of the various disciplines.

The Advanced Tests will be redesigned in such a way that, within defined limits, separately timed subtests can be offered within the scope of any one of the Advanced Tests. This innovation will make it possible for a given Examination Committee to offer its test in one of three different forms: (1) it could continue with a unitary test producing a single score as do most of the present Advanced Tests; (2) it could subdivide its test in such a way as to produce several subscores, the number of such subscores being determined largely by considerations of score reliability; (3) it could devise a test providing a core test to be taken by all candidates and several optional tests of which each candidate would choose one. The choice of format will probably depend to a large extent on the structure of the field concerned, on the extent to which students in a field have a common educational experience, and on kinds of use departments in the field are likely to make of the test scores.

At its September meeting, the Board accepted the paper as representing in general the lines along which it wished to see restructuring of the testing program proceed. ETS will now take steps to circulate the paper more generally among the Examination Committees, the professional associations, and other segments of the graduate school community, in an effort to obtain the reaction of various interested groups to the proposed course of action. At the same time it will prepare detailed schedules for accomplishing the work entailed in the proposal together with cost estimates for consideration by the Board at its March meeting when a final decision on how to proceed will be made.

Planning for the 1970's

At the request of the Research Committee, the ETS staff produced a paper outlining a structure within which GRE program research might be organized over the next decade. The proposed context for research was deliberately conceived along far-reaching lines on the ground that the concern of the Board should properly be with the flow of students from the undergraduate schools, through the graduate admissions process and the educational experience of graduate study, and out into professional life. It is true that the tests operate at only a single point in this continuum, but the total process *is* a continuum and it will never be properly understood in any one of its parts unless an effort is made through research to understand it better in its totality.

The paper attempted to do three things: first, to describe the flow of students into and through graduate study and the factors affecting the process throughout its course; second, to identify subgroups among the totality of students which would be particularly deserving of special study; third, in discussing various stages of the flow of students, to indicate briefly some of the things which are already known, some of the research techniques and methods which are available and appropriate, and some of the types of study that might be relevant to the solution of particular problems.

The paper was accepted by the Board as providing a sound basis on which to establish a coherent research program. It will be used in the future as a map to be followed in establishing research priorities, as a means of ensuring proper articulation among the various aspects of the Board's research programs, and as a vehicle through which the Board's research interests can be communicated to the graduate community at large and to various sources of research talent. Plans are under way to disseminate it widely among those who need to know what is afoot in graduate education, who might contribute to the sharper definition of the research plan itself, or who might lend assistance in carrying it out.

Survey of Admissions Policies and Practices

It is quite evident that, while many graduate schools conduct intensive studies of their own admissions procedures, there is little systematic information on such matters which cuts across schools. Such information, if it were available, would be useful in two ways: for graduate schools it would permit the evaluation of their own admissions systems in the light of what other schools were doing; ideas might be exchanged to the great benefit of all concerned; second, from the viewpoint of the GRE program, knowledge of admissions practices in general might lead to a better understanding of how the tests could be made to contribute more significantly to sound admissions decisions.

On the recommendation of its Services Committee, the Board decided to undertake an intensive study of policies and practices related to admissions and fellowship award at the graduate level. The approach to gathering data was to have two prongs: first, CGS member schools would be asked to respond to a fairly detailed questionnaire about the policies governing their admissions and about the procedures whereby students were admitted; then, in a limited number of schools, case studies would be conducted involving campus visitations by teams consisting of graduate admissions officers and ETS staff members.

Although plans for disseminating the results of these activities have not been finally approved, it is expected that the information so gathered will be made widely available through publication and through discussion at several workshops organized on a regional basis. Out of the workshops, it is hoped, will emerge one or more publications summarizing the outcome of the study and the reactions of the participants to the data they have considered.

As of the date of the 1969 AGS meeting, the questionnaires are in the hands of the schools and a start has been made on the case studies to be conducted at cooperating schools.

Graduate School Foreign Language Tests

A point of interest regarding the foreign language requirement is reflected in the experience for 1968-69 with candidate volume. A total of 31,000 candidates were tested, representing a decline of some 4 percent over the previous year. This decline marks the reversal of a trend which, until last year, had been consistently upward. Oddly enough, the decrease in number of candidates was accompanied by an increase in the number of schools using the test (from 123 to 160, or 30 percent). Volume estimates for this year have been considerably reduced from earlier estimates and registration for the November administration seems likely to justify this move.

The explanation for the trend just noted is not clear, but it would appear to be associated with the move in many schools to give greater autonomy in determining language requirements to the departments. The response to this on the part of many departments seems to be to abandon the requirement.

During the past year extensive developmental work was carried on in order to raise the number of test forms at the program's disposal. New forms in French, German, and Spanish were introduced and much of the work was completed on a new form of the Russian test. All new forms follow the new design which involves a single science option rather than separate options in physical and life sciences.

Preparatory work was carried out leading to the introduction of the new national system for administering the tests which will go

into effect with the November 1 testing. Under the new system, candidates will register directly with ETS and will take the tests at centers established under ETS direction. Under the former institutional arrangements, the schools assumed the responsibility for registering candidates and for making supervisory and other administrative arrangements.

During the fall of 1968, two articles by the program staff were published in *Foreign Language Annals*. One presented the results of a survey of the nature of the foreign language requirement at various schools. The other summarized information regarding the pass-fail score established at a number of schools utilizing the tests. Such information has in the past frequently been requested by schools seeking guidance in the establishment of standards for evaluating the performance of their students on the tests. The reprints of both articles were disseminated widely among graduate faculty members and others likely to be interested in foreign language testing.

MICHAEL J. BRENNAN
 BRYCE CRAWFORD, JR.
 JOHN L. LANDGRAF
 JOHN A. WINTERBOTTOM
 W. DONALD COOKE, *Chairman*

[The report of the Committee on Testing was accepted by the Executive Committee on behalf of AGS.]

APPENDIX

GRADUATE RECORD EXAMINATIONS BOARD

February 1970

	<i>Term Expires</i>
Joseph L. McCarthy, Dean, Graduate School, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington 98105	1973
Richard L. Predmore, Professor of Romance Languages, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina 27706	1973
Allen F. Strehler, Associate Dean, Graduate Studies, Carnegie-Mellon University, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213	1973
Darwin T. Turner, Dean, Graduate School, North Carolina Agricultural and Technical State University, Greensboro, North Carolina 27411	1973

- Mina Rees, President, University Graduate Division, The City University of New York, New York, New York 10036 1972
- Michael J. Brennan, Dean, Graduate School, Brown University, Providence, Rhode Island 02912 1972
- Stanley Frost, Vice Principal (Professional Affairs), McGill University, Montreal 2, Canada 1972
- S. D. Shirley Spragg, Dean, Graduate Studies, University of Rochester, Rochester, New York 14627 1972
- *Wayne C. Hall, Fellowship Director, NAS-NRC-NAE, Washington, D.C. 20418 1971
- Bryce Crawford, Jr., Dean, Graduate School, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455 1971
- *Edward C. Moore, Chancellor, The Board of Higher Education, Boston, Massachusetts 02111 1971
- *Stephen H. Spurr, Vice President, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104 1971
- Gustave O. Arlt, President, The Council of Graduate Schools in the United States, Washington, D.C. 20036 1970
- Milton C. Kloetzel, Vice President, Research and Graduate Affairs, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, California 90007 1970
- Carroll L. Miller, Dean, Graduate School, Howard University, Washington, D.C. 20001 1970
- *Herbert D. Rhodes, Dean, Graduate College, University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona 85721 1970
- H. Frederic Bohnenblust, Dean, Graduate Studies, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, California 91109 1970
- * Executive Committee

AAU-AGS ACTIVITIES

At the annual meeting the year before, then President John Perry Miller reviewed various proposals for cooperation on issues of mutual concern to AAU and AGS. In reporting on progress of several of these activities, President Bohnenblust asked Dean Joseph McCarthy to present a report of the *ad hoc* Committee on Joint Membership, related the results of that committee's suggestions to the AAU Committee on Membership and subsequent transmittal to the AAU, and reviewed the initial contacts with the new AAU Council on Federal Relations, which began operation in July.

Report of the ad hoc Committee on Joint Membership

Dean McCarthy reported that he and Dean Robert H. Baker had had a preliminary meeting in Washington after which they scheduled a session with the AAU Committee on Admission. Although President Novice Fawcett, Chairman of the AAU committee, could not attend, his associate, Mr. Kenneth Krause, met with them and they were joined by a representative from the American Council on Education who was working with the new evaluation of graduate programs and institutions. A subsequent meeting was planned but was not held because a first draft print-out of the ACE study was not yet available. Dean McCarthy and Dean Baker drew up a series of six recommendations. With President Bohnenblust's approval, they transmitted them to President Fawcett, who, in turn, presented them with his committee's recommendations to the AAU at their Fall meeting which directly preceded the AGS meeting. The recommendations were as follows:

1. That in general the AAU move with deliberate speed toward the broadening of its membership so as to include a substantially increased fraction of the high quality institutions in the United States granting the Ph.D. degree;
2. That if possible membership be offered this year to four institutions: [*designated*];
3. That if it is not feasible to proceed to offer membership to all these institutions, then it is desirable that membership be offered to at least two and preferably three institutions;
4. That if membership cannot at this time be offered to all four of these institutions, then consideration be given next year to admitting those institutions which are not admitted this year;
5. That institution A and institution B be added to the list of institutions which desirably would be offered membership next year;

6. That the AAU Committee on Membership undertake consideration of these matters again next year with the representatives of the Association of Graduate Schools.

President Bohnenblust reported favorable reception of the suggestions and related that some modifications were discussed regarding the balance between public and private institutions and geographical distribution. No vote was taken on addition of members at the AAU meeting, but a mail ballot was announced.

[The mail ballot resulted in the AAU's extending membership to the University of Southern California, Case-Western Reserve University, the University of Maryland, and the University of Oregon.]

The AAU Council on Federal Relations

President Bohnenblust described the activation of the Council on Federal Relations as perhaps the most significant event of the year and declared that he felt it would help greatly in establishing good rapport between AGS and AAU. He and Dean Daniel Alpert attended the first meeting of the Council in May and he and Dean Crawford attended the second meeting.

The Council began full time operation in July. The executive officer of each member institution appoints one representative to the Council. In addition there is a ten-member Steering Committee selected by the Executive Committee of AAU. Five of the members of the Steering Committee must be AAU presidents. The President and Vice-President of AGS are invited to attend and participate in the Council meetings.

Chancellor Alexander Heard is Chairman of the Council and the Steering Committee. Dr. Charles Kidd serves as Director and maintains a full-time office in Washington. He has offered his assistance to AGS at any time.

President Bohnenblust mentioned that the newly created AGS Committee on Federal Support of Graduate Education and a similarly constituted committee of CGS will be urged to work with and through the Council. Later President-elect Crawford announced that the Committee on Research and Research Administration and the Committee on Student Aid would be discontinued for the time being with their functions being assumed by the Committee on Federal Support of Graduate Education. There was a brief discussion about recommending that the President of the Association and the Chairman of the Committee on Federal Support of Graduate Education be empowered to speak for the group in the event expression of opinion on pending legislation or related matters arose and would require reply before action could be taken by the Committee or the Association as a whole. Since the Council will be speaking for the AAU institutions as a whole,

such needs should be explored in terms of the Council, Dean D. C. Spriestersbach remarked. President-Elect Crawford suggested that rather than voting a formal motion there simply be an understanding that when Dr. Kidd or the Council felt it useful for a voice to come from AGS directly, and the time factor made impossible consideration by the Committee or the Association as a whole, the President and the Committee chairman would undertake to speak.

Membership of the AAU Council on Federal Relations is appended.

Other Actions

Other plans for interactions with AAU that have been continued are invitations to the AGS President and Vice-President to attend the AAU semiannual meetings and the extending of invitations to the outgoing and incoming presidents of AAU and Chancellor Heard to attend the AGS annual meeting. The recommendation that the AGS hold its annual meeting prior to the AAU Fall meeting was followed and President Crawford announced the 1970 meeting for October 22-23, the week preceding the AAU Fall meeting.

APPENDIX

COUNCIL ON FEDERAL RELATIONS

ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN UNIVERSITIES

March 1970

- Paul F. Maeder, Associate Provost, Brown University, Providence, Rhode Island 02912
- Robert F. Bacher, Provost, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, California 91109
- *Frederick E. Balderston, Vice President of Planning and Analysis, University of California, Berkeley, California 94720
- Herman D. Stein, Provost, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio 44106
- Clarence C. Walton, President, Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C. 20017
- John T. Wilson, Vice President and Dean of Faculties, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois 60637
- Saul B. Cohen, Dean, The Graduate School, Clark University, Worcester, Massachusetts 01610
- Thurston E. Manning, Vice President for Academic Affairs, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado 80302
- Douglass Hunt, Vice President for Finance, Columbia University, New York, New York 10027
- Donald Cooke, Dean of Graduate Studies, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York 14850
- John C. McKinney, Dean, Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina 27705
- Charles P. Whitlock, Assistant to the President, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138
- Eldon Johnson, Vice President, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois 61803
- Richard B. Curtis, Assistant Dean for Research and Advanced Studies, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana 47405
- J. Boyd Page, Vice President for Research and Dean of Graduate School, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa 50010
- Duane C. Priestestersbach, Vice President for Research and Dean of Graduate School, University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa 52240
- William Bevan, Vice President and Provost, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland 21218

Francis H. Heller, Dean of Faculties, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas 66044

Michael J. Pelczar, Jr., Vice President for Graduate Studies and Research, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland 20740

Robert A. Albery, Dean of Science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139

Milton E. Muelder, Vice President, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan 48824

*A. Geoffrey Norman, Vice President, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104

William G. Shepherd, Vice President of Academic Administration, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

*Vernon E. Wilson, Vice President for Academic Affairs, University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri 65202

Merk Hobson, Executive Vice Chancellor, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska 68508

Paul E. Bragdon, Vice President for Public Affairs, New York University, New York, New York 10003

C. E. Bishop, Vice President, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27514

J. Roscoe Miller, Chancellor, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois 60201

Gordon B. Carson, Vice President for Business and Finance, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio 43210

N. Ray Hawk, Dean of Administration, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon 97403

Eric Walker, President, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania 16802

*David R. Goddard, Provost, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104

Lyman Spitzer, Jr., Chairman, University Research Board, Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey 08540

Frederick N. Andrews, Vice President for Research and Dean of Graduate School, Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana 47907

Robert L. Sproull, Vice President and Provost, University of Rochester, Rochester, New York 14627

Norman H. Topping, President, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, California 90007

William F. Miller, Vice President for Research, Stanford University, Stanford, California 94305

John C. Honey, Vice President for Governmental Affairs, Syracuse University, 303 Administration Building, Syracuse, New York 13210

John McKetta, Executive Vice-Chancellor, University of Texas,
Austin, Texas 78712

*Clarence Scheps, Executive Vice President, Tulane University, New
Orleans, Louisiana 70118

Nicholas Hobbs, Provost, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennes-
see 37203

A. R. Kuhlthau, Associate Provost for Research, University of Vir-
ginia, Charlottesville, Virginia 22903

George W. Farwell, Vice President for Research, University of
Washington, Seattle, Washington 98105

Thomas H. Eliot, Chancellor, Washington University, St. Louis,
Missouri 63130

Charles A. Engman, Vice President for Administration, University
of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin 53706

Alfred Fitt, Special Advisor on Government Policy, Yale University,
New Haven, Connecticut 06520

* Member of Steering Committee

REPORT OF THE EDITOR OF THE *JOURNAL OF PROCEEDINGS*

The *Journal of Proceedings and Addresses* of the Twentieth Annual Conference of the Association of Graduate Schools in the Association of American Universities was published in July, 1969.

One thousand copies were printed. Of these, 522 were distributed as follows: Deans of AGS institutions, 100; Presidents or chief executive officers of AAU-AGS institutions, 50; Libraries of AGS institutions, 50; Deans emeriti of AGS institutions and Associates of AGS, 12; Deans of CGS institutions (excluding AGS members), 251; education associations, foundations, and governmental agencies, 26; foreign libraries, 44; individuals assisting with the *Proceedings*, 9.

In addition to those distributed to the Association and on a complimentary basis, as of August 31, 1969, orders had been placed for 480 copies, of which 174 are standing orders and 108 were placed by the Graduate Deans for their associates and faculties.

Expenses

Stenotype Copy	\$ 642.00
Tape Recordings	241.31
Editorial Assistance	615.00
Printing	2,637.82

\$4,136.13

Receipts

Sale of copies September 1, 1968-August 31, 1969 less unpaid invoices and University of Texas Press handling charges	\$ 212.03
--	-----------

[On September 30, 1970, Dean William P. Albrecht will take over as Editor of The Journal of Proceedings and Addresses. Any matters relating to the Proceedings after that time should be addressed to him at the Graduate School, The University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas 66045. Ed.]

FINANCIAL REPORT OF THE TREASURER

SEPTEMBER 30, 1968 TO SEPTEMBER 30, 1969

Comparative Balance Sheets

<i>Assets, September 30</i>	<i>1969</i>	<i>1968.</i>
Cash in banks		
Checking account	\$ 2,841.62	\$ 5,408.83
Savings accounts	28,852.23	27,481.40
Total Assets	\$31,693.85	\$32,890.23
<hr/>		
<i>Fund Equity</i>		
Balance, October 1	\$32,890.23	\$32,502.32
(previous year)		
Cash Increase (Decrease)	(1,196.38)	387.91
(exhibit B)		
Balance, September 30	\$31,693.85	\$32,890.23

Comparative Statements of Cash Receipts and Disbursements

	<i>Year Ended September 30, 1969</i>	<i>Year Ended September 30, 1968</i>
<i>Receipts</i>		
Luncheon Tickets—Convention	\$ 597.35	\$
Dues from member institutions	5,500.00	5,500.00
Sales of <i>Proceedings</i>	212.03	1,807.80
Interest from savings accounts	1,370.83	1,393.80
Total Receipts	\$ 7,680.21	\$ 8,701.60
<hr/>		
<i>Disbursements</i>		
Office of the President		
Postage and telephone	200.00	58.16
Office of the Secretary-Treasurer		
Postage	56.00	186.24
Secretarial and bookkeeping service	110.00
Auditing	35.00
Bank service charge—printed checks	4.78
Printing—Annual Meeting		
Program, tickets, name tags	283.13	213.79
Stenographic service—Annual Meeting	642.00	511.95
Tape recording—Annual Meeting	241.31
Other convention expenses	1,863.77	670.31
Printing <i>Proceedings</i>	2,637.82	2,156.69
Editorial expenses on <i>Proceedings</i>	615.00	603.00
Represent AGS at IIE conference	47.30

Financial Report continued

Represent AGS at Council on Evaluation of Foreign Student Credentials	47.46
Petty Cash advance 1969 meeting	25.00
Committee expenses:		
Executive	516.51	1,090.93
Policies in Graduate Education	700.10	1,780.00
Student Aid	466.15	191.60
Research and Research Administration	21.50
International Education	682.87
<i>ad hoc</i> Committee on Graduate Educa- tion and Teacher Preparation	59.57
Membership Committee	472.34
	<hr/>	<hr/>
Total Disbursements	\$ 8,876.59	\$ 8,313.69
Cash Increase (Decrease)	(1,196.38)	387.91

[The report was accepted.]

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON NOMINATIONS

The Committee on Nominations reported the following nominations for the offices of the Association of Graduate Schools for 1969-70: for President, Bryce Crawford, Jr., University of Minnesota; for Vice-President, W. Donald Cooke, Cornell University; for Secretary-Treasurer, Michael Brennan, Brown University; for First Member-at-Large, W. Gordon Whaley, University of Texas; for Second Member-at-Large, William M. Protheroe, Ohio State University; for Editor of the *Journal of Proceedings*, William F. Albrecht, University of Kansas.

STANLEY B. FROST
JOHN PERRY MILLER
SANFORD S. ELBERG, *Chairman*

[*The report was accepted and the slate of officers elected unanimously.*]

AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

Dean Daniel Alpert presented the results of a proposed modification of Article V of the Constitution of the Association. At the Executive Committee meeting of the Association held on May 8, 1969, it was proposed that Article V be modified to include an additional Member-at-Large on the Executive Committee and to extend the term of office. As circulated to member institutions, the modified Article read:

Article V

President-Elect (who shall serve as Vice-President),
The officers of the Association shall be a President, a ~~Vice-President~~,
and a Secretary-Treasurer, *and shall be elected annually.*

two Members-at-Large
These three, the immediate Past-President, and ~~one other person~~
shall constitute the Executive Committee.

The Members-at-Large shall serve two-year terms, one to be elected each year.

The officers, members of the Executive Committee, and members of other committees that may be appointed shall be selected as individuals and not as institutions.

Dean Alpert reported that 39 replies were received, all affirmative. President Bohnenblust informed the group that the vote on the proposed change was submitted to and approved by the Association of American Universities, as required by the Constitution, on October 21, 1969.

COMMITTEES FOR 1969-1970

POLICIES IN GRADUATE EDUCATION

George Fraenkel, *Chairman*
Stephen Spurr
Aaron Lemonick
H. W. Magoun

INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION
(to serve jointly with appointees from
CGS)

Wade Ellis, *Chairman*
S.D.S. Spragg
Lorene L. Rogers

COMMUNICATION WITH THE PUBLIC

D. C. Priestestersbach, *Chairman*
John McKinney
John Honey
C. W. Minkel
C. D. Cornell
Charles V. Kidd
(Council on Federal Relations)

COMPUTERS IN GRADUATE EDUCATION

Harrison Shull, *Chairman*
Francis M. Boddy
Daniel Alpert
Sanborn Brown
Lyle V. Jones

TESTING

Michael Brennan, *Chairman*
Bryce Crawford, Jr.
Joseph McCarthy
Donald W. Taylor
John A. Winterbottom
(Educational Testing Service)

MEMBERSHIP

Joseph McCarthy, *Chairman*
Robert Baker

NOMINATIONS

Joseph McCarthy, *Chairman*
J. Petersen Elder
Sanford Elberg

FEDERAL RELATIONS

Saul Cohen
John McKinney
Richard Curtis
Michael Pelczar

John Honey
F. N. Andrews
D. C. Priestestersbach
Milton Muelder

(All are members of the AAU Council on Federal Relations)

Charles V. Kidd (Council on Federal Relations)
Members of the Executive Committee

ACTIONS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

After presenting his reports as Secretary-Treasurer, Dean Daniel Alpert made the following recommendations: (1) that the books hereafter be audited by an auditing firm rather than impose the task on members of the Association and (2) that records of only the past seven years be retained. [*At Dean Alpert's request Mr. Maynard Britchford, Archivist at the University of Illinois, reviewed the AGS records and prepared a set of recommendations on their disposition. Dean Alpert will store the records until final disposition is decided upon. Ed.*]

The change in Article V of the Constitution as approved by AGS with the concurrence of AAU is indicated on p. 116.

Dean Joseph McCarthy, Chairman of the Resolutions Committee, presented the following resolutions:

Whereas, Dean W. Gordon Whaley is now retiring from the post of Editor of the *Proceedings* of the Association of Graduate Schools in the Association of American Universities; and

Whereas, during his period of nearly a decade of service the *Proceedings* have been edited with efficiency, elegance, and, in particular, with stimulating and inspiring commentary from Editor Whaley,

Be it resolved, that

the members of the Association of Graduate Schools in the Association of American Universities record their thanks to Dean Whaley and his associates at the University of Texas for these outstanding contributions.

Whereas, Dean Daniel Alpert is now retiring from the post of Secretary-Treasurer of the AGS; and

Whereas, he has served in this capacity for the last several years with steady efficiency, perception, forethought and, indeed, with continuing acumen concerning fiscal affairs, therefore

Be it resolved, that

the members of the Association of Graduate Schools in the Association of American Universities in this meeting now assembled record their sincere thanks to Dean Alpert and his associates at the University of Illinois for their many contributions in carrying out their responsibilities of the office of Secretary-Treasurer of the AGS.

Whereas, this Twenty-first Annual Conference of the Association of Graduate Schools in the Association of American Universities is now approaching adjournment, and

Whereas, this meeting has proved to be informative, stimulating, and effective in providing for further discussion and congenial interaction among those with decanal responsibilities; and

Whereas, during the past year many contributions to graduate education have been made from and in relation to the AGS, therefore

Be it resolved, that

members of the AGS at this meeting assembled express to President Frederic Bohnenblust, AGS officers and committee men and to Associate Deans John L. Landgraf and Alistair McCrone with associates at New York University, our sincere thanks for their useful service to all in carrying through the arrangements for this excellent meeting and many other significant contributions to graduate education.

Whereas, provision of general institutional support for institutions of higher education is urgently needed and passage of H.R. 11542 (The Miller Bill) would represent a substantial step towards this goal,

Be it resolved, that

the Association of Graduate Schools in the Association of American Universities, its Canadian members abstaining, endorse the proposed legislation which would establish a national program of institutional grants. If the bill becomes law, the Association of Graduate Schools, together with the Association of American Universities, will cooperate in studies of its operation as a guide to alteration as experience is gathered.

[*A similar resolution was passed by the AAU at their meeting the day before.*]

In addition to resolutions presented by the Resolutions Committee, Dean W. Donald Cooke presented four recommendations from the Committee on Student Aid for formal consideration. Discussion of and action on these recommendations follows the report of the Committee on Student Aid on pp. 96-98.

Upon conclusion of presentation of the resolutions and an informal query about enrollment increases (or decreases) President Bohnenblust turned the meeting over to President-Elect Bryce Crawford.

Dean Crawford explained several changes in the constitution of the Association committees, the full membership of which he would

designate at a later date. In order to utilize the opportunity afforded by the new AAU Council on Federal Relations and consolidate several of the AGS activities dealing with Federal support, the Committee on Research and Research Administration and the Committee on Student Aid have been discontinued and their functions will be taken over by the Committee on Federal Support of Graduate Education.

The *ad hoc* committees on Selective Service and Postdoctoral Appointments will not be continued. The Committee on Testing will consist of the appointed members from AGS of the Graduate Record Examinations Board. No separate report will be expected from the group.

Newly constituted will be a Committee on Communication with the Public.

On the strong recommendation of the Committee on International Education, Dean Crawford asked Dean Wade Ellis to head the AGS component of a joint AGS-CGS Committee on International Education which will devise the dimensions and explore the appropriate agencies to carry out a full scale survey of the effectiveness of American universities to foreign students.

The 1970 Annual Meeting will be held in Montreal at the Hotel Bonaventure on October 22 and 23.

THE CONSTITUTION
of
THE ASSOCIATION OF GRADUATE SCHOOLS
in the
ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN UNIVERSITIES

I. NAME

This organization is called THE ASSOCIATION OF GRADUATE SCHOOLS IN THE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN UNIVERSITIES.

II. PURPOSE

It is founded for the purpose of considering matters of common interest relating to graduate study and research.

III. MEMBERSHIP

It is composed of member institutions of the Association of American Universities as of 1948.

Other institutions which have high standards of graduate work at the doctoral level may be added.

IV. MEETINGS

The Association shall hold an annual conference at such time and place as the Executive Committee may direct.

V. OFFICERS

The officers of the Association shall be a President, a President-Elect (who shall serve as Vice-President), and a Secretary-Treasurer, and shall be elected annually.

These three, the immediate Past-President, and two Members-at-Large shall constitute the Executive Committee. The Members-at-Large shall serve two-year terms, one to be elected each year.

The officers, members of the Executive Committee, and members of other committees that may be appointed shall be selected as individuals and not as institutions.

VI. PROGRAM

The Executive Committee shall prepare a program for each meeting.

VII. VOTING POWER

At each conference, each member institution may have any number of representatives, but each member institution shall have a single vote cast by the graduate dean or that officer designated as its representative.

VIII. LIMITATION OF POWERS

No act of the Association shall be held to control the policy or line of action of any member institution. All actions shall be reported to the Association of American Universities.

IX. DUES

Dues are to be determined annually by the Association of American Universities after consultation with the Executive Committee of the Association of Graduate Schools, and shall be collected by the Association of American Universities.

X. ADOPTION AND AMENDMENTS

This constitution shall become effective upon approval in writing by the graduate deans or officers responsible for graduate work in two-thirds of the member institutions of the Association and by approval of the Association of American Universities.

Amendments to this constitution may be adopted by a two-thirds vote of the member institutions of the Association and shall become effective when approved by the Association of American Universities.

OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION OF
GRADUATE SCHOOLS
1949-70

1949-50

President—Arthur R. Tebbutt; Vice-President—Hugh S. Taylor;
Secretary-Treasurer—N. Paul Hudson

1950-51

President—Hugh S. Taylor; Vice-President—William R. Dennes;
Secretary-Treasurer—N. Paul Hudson

1951-52

President—William R. Dennes; Vice-President—Henry E. Bent;
Secretary-Treasurer—Carl Tolman

1952-53

President—Henry E. Bent; Vice-President—N. Paul Hudson;
Secretary-Treasurer—Carl Tolman

1953-54

President—N. Paul Hudson; Vice-President—David L. Thomson;
Secretary-Treasurer—Carl Tolman

1954-55

President—David L. Thomson; Vice-President—Harold W. Stoke;
Secretary-Treasurer—Ralph E. Cleland

1955-56

President—Harold W. Stoke; Vice-President—Ralph A. Sawyer;
Secretary-Treasurer—Ralph E. Cleland

1956-57

President—Ralph A. Sawyer; Vice-President—Leonard B. Beach;
Secretary-Treasurer—Ralph E. Cleland

1957-58

President—Leonard B. Beach; Vice-President—C. A. Elvehjem;
Secretary-Treasurer—Lewis M. Hammond

1958-59

President—Walter F. Loehwing; Vice-President—A. R. Gordon;
Secretary-Treasurer—Lewis M. Hammond

1959-60

President—J. Petersen Elder; Vice-President—Frederick T. Wall;
Acting Secretary-Treasurer—J. Homer Herriott

- 1960-61*
President—Frederick T. Wall; Vice-President—Moody E. Prior;
Secretary-Treasurer—Everett Walters
- 1961-62*
President—Moody E. Prior; Vice-President—Roy F. Nichols;
Secretary-Treasurer—Everett Walters
- 1962-63*
President—Roy F. Nichols; Vice-President—John C. Weaver;
Secretary-Treasurer—Lewis E. Hahn
- 1963-64*
President—John C. Weaver; Vice-President—R. Bruce Lindsay;
Secretary-Treasurer—S. D. S. Spragg
- 1964-65*
President—R. Bruce Lindsay; Vice-President—Sanford S. Elberg;
Secretary-Treasurer—S. D. S. Spragg
- 1965-66*
President—Sanford S. Elberg; Vice-President—Joseph L. McCarthy;
Secretary-Treasurer—S. D. S. Spragg
- 1966-67*
President—Joseph L. McCarthy; Vice-President—John Perry Miller;
Secretary-Treasurer—S. D. S. Spragg
- 1967-68*
President—John Perry Miller; Vice-President—Frederic Bohnenblust;
Secretary-Treasurer—Daniel Alpert
- 1968-69*
President—Frederic Bohnenblust; Vice-President—Bryce Crawford, Jr.;
Secretary-Treasurer—Daniel Alpert
- 1969-70*
President—Bryce Crawford, Jr.; Vice-President—W. Donald Cooke;
Secretary-Treasurer—Michael Brennan

MEMBER INSTITUTIONS, DEANS, AND ADDRESSES
THE ASSOCIATION OF GRADUATE SCHOOLS

Brown University—Graduate School
Providence, Rhode Island 02912
401-863-2831
Dean Michael J. Brennan

California Institute of Technology—Graduate Studies
Pasadena, California 91109
213-795-6841
Dean Frederic Bohnenblust

Case Western Reserve University—Graduate Studies
Cleveland, Ohio 44106
216-368-4400
Dean Frank H. Hurley

Catholic University of America—Graduate Studies
Washington, D.C. 20017
202-529-6000
Dean James P. O'Connor

Clark University—Office of the Graduate School
Worcester, Massachusetts 01610
617-793-7711
Dean Saul B. Cohen

Columbia University—Graduate School of Arts and Sciences
New York, New York 10027
212-280-2861
Dean George K. Fraenkel

Cornell University—Graduate School
Ithaca, New York 14850
607-256-4603
Dean W. Donald Cooke

Duke University—Graduate School
Durham, North Carolina 27706
919-684-3913
Dean John C. McKinney

Harvard University—Graduate School of Arts and Sciences
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138
617-868-7600 (ext. 2782)
Dean John Petersen Elder

Indiana University—Graduate School
Bloomington, Indiana 47405
812-337-8852
Dean Harrison Shull

Iowa State University—Graduate College
Ames, Iowa 50010
515-294-4531
Acting Vice-President for Research and Dean K. J. Frey

Johns Hopkins University—Faculty of Arts and Sciences
Baltimore, Maryland 21218
301-366-3300 (ext. 611)
Dean George E. Benton

Massachusetts Institute of Technology—Graduate School
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139
617-864-6900, Ext. 4869
Dean Irwin W. Sizer

McGill University—Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
Montreal, Canada
514-392-5106
Acting Dean R.V.V. Nicholls

Michigan State University—Graduate School
East Lansing, Michigan 48824
517-355-0300
Vice-President for Research Development and Dean Milton E.
Muelder

New York University—Graduate School of Arts and Sciences
Washington Square, New York, New York 10003
212-598-2276
Dean George Winchester Stone, Jr.

Northwestern University—Graduate School
Evanston, Illinois 60201
312-492-7264
Dean Robert H. Baker

Ohio State University—Graduate School
 Columbus, Ohio 43210
 614-422-1679
 Vice Provost for Graduate Affairs and Dean Arliss L. Roaden

Pennsylvania State University—Graduate School
 University Park, Pennsylvania 16802
 814-865-6323
 Dean James B. Bartoo

Princeton University—Graduate School
 Princeton, New Jersey 08540
 609-452-3035
 Dean Aaron Lemonick

Purdue University—Graduate School
 Lafayette, Indiana 47907
 317-749-2144
 Vice-President for Research and Dean F. N. Andrews

Stanford University—Graduate Division
 Stanford, California 94305
 415-321-2300 (ext. 2496)
 Dean Lincoln E. Moses

Syracuse University—Graduate School
 Syracuse, New York 13210
 315-476-5541
 Executive for Graduate Programs Dr. James W. Harrison

Tulane University—Graduate School
 New Orleans, Louisiana 70118
 504-865-7711 (ext. 7500)
 Dean David R. Deener

University of California—Berkeley
 Berkeley, California 94720
 415-642-5472
 Dean Sanford S. Elberg

University of California—Davis
 Davis, California 95616
 916-752-0650
 Dean Allen G. Marr

University of California—Irvine
 Irvine, California 92664
 714-833-7100
 Acting Dean Keith E. Justice

University of California—Los Angeles

Los Angeles, California 90024

213-825-4383

Dean Horace W. Magoun

University of California—San Diego

La Jolla, California 92037

714-453-2000

Graduate Studies Dean Herbert F. York

University of California—Santa Barbara

Santa Barbara, California 93106

805-961-2277

Associate Dean Robert O. Collins

Associate Dean Brian M. Fagan

University of California—Santa Cruz

Santa Cruz, California 95060

408-429-2301

Associate Dean S. M. Williamson

University of Chicago

Chicago, Illinois 60637

312-MI-3-0800 (ext. 3013)

Provost John T. Wilson

University of Colorado—The Graduate School

Boulder, Colorado 80304

303-443-2211 (ext. 7401)

Dean C. Lawson Crowe

University of Illinois—The Graduate College

Urbana, Illinois 61801

217-333-0034

Dean Daniel Alpert

University of Illinois at Chicago Circle—The Graduate School

Chicago, Illinois 60680, Box 4348

312-663-3320

Acting Dean Jan Rocek

University of Illinois at the Medical Center—The Graduate College

Chicago, Illinois 60680

312-663-7686

Dean Stephen B. Binkley

University of Iowa—The Graduate College

Iowa City, Iowa 52240

319-353-5534

Vice-President for Educational Development and Research and

Dean D. C. Spriestersbach

- University of Kansas—Graduate School
Lawrence, Kansas 66045
913-864-3301
Dean William P. Albrecht
- University of Maryland—Graduate School
College Park, Maryland 20742
301-454-3141
Dean Michael J. Pelczar, Jr.
- University of Michigan—Horace H. Rackham School of Graduate
Studies
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104
313-764-4400
Dean Stephen H. Spurr
- University of Minnesota—Graduate School
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
612-373-2966
Dean Bryce Crawford, Jr.
- University of Missouri—Graduate School
Columbia, Missouri 65201
314-449-9236
Dean John C. Murdock
- University of Nebraska—Graduate College
Lincoln, Nebraska 68508
402-472-2875
Dean Norman H. Cromwell
- University of North Carolina—Graduate School
Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27514
919-933-1319
Dean Lyle V. Jones
- University of Oregon—Graduate School
Eugene, Oregon 97403
503-686-5128
Dean Leona E. Tyler
- University of Pennsylvania—Graduate School of Arts and Sciences
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104
215-594-7236
Acting Dean D. J. O'Kane
- University of Rochester—University Council on Graduate Studies
Rochester, New York 14627
716-275-4279
Dean S. D. S. Spragg

University of Southern California—Graduate School
Los Angeles, California 90007
213-746-2251
Dean Charles G. Mayo

University of Texas—Graduate School
Austin, Texas 78712
512-471-7213
Dean W. Gordon Whaley

University of Toronto—School of Graduate Studies
Toronto 5, Canada
416-928-2387
Dean W. Douglas Baines

University of Virginia—Graduate School of Arts and Sciences
University Station, Charlottesville, Virginia 22903
703-924-3437
Dean W. Dexter Whitehead

University of Washington—Graduate School
Seattle, Washington 98105
206-543-2100
Dean Joseph L. McCarthy

University of Wisconsin—Graduate School
Madison, Wisconsin 53706
608-262-1044
Dean Robert M. Bock

Vanderbilt University—Graduate School
Nashville, Tennessee 37203
615-322-2651
Dean Robert T. Lagemann

Washington University—Graduate School of Arts and Sciences
St. Louis, Missouri 63130
314-863-0100 (ext. 4551)
Dean Ralph E. Morrow

Yale University—Graduate School
New Haven, Connecticut 06520
203-436-2526
Dean Donald W. Taylor

INDEX

- AAU-AGS activities, 106-108; *ad hoc* committee on joint membership, 106; Council on Federal Relations, 107; other actions, 108.
- AAU Council on Federal Relations (membership), 109-111.
- Association of Graduate Schools, actions and announcements, 118-120; committees (1969-1970), 117; constitution, 121-122; delegates and guests, 1-3; financial report, 112-114; membership directory, 125-130; officers and executive committee (present and incoming), vii; officers since 1949, 123-124.
- Bracey, John H., Jr., a black student views the graduate school experience, 68-77.
- Changes in university structure created by changing demands in graduate education (George K. Fraenkel), 16-24.
- Constitution, amendment of Article V, 116.
- Federal responsibilities to the university and university responsibilities to the Federal government (panel discussion), 34-51.
- Graduate education and the black student (panel discussion), 55-77.
- Graduate education in a changing world (panel discussion), 11-33.
- Graduate Record Examinations Board (membership), 104-105.
- Graduate school and the black student: a black professor's perspective (Hollis Lynch), 63-67.
- International education, 89-91 and 120.
- Journal of Proceedings*, report of the editor, 112.
- Kidd, Charles V., Federal responsibilities to the university and university responsibilities to the Federal government, 38-40.
- Levin, Louis, Federal responsibilities to the university and university responsibilities to the Federal government, 45-51.
- Lynch, Hollis, graduate school and the black student: a black professor's perspective, 63-67.
- Manual of procedures and regulations for Federal fellowships and traineeships (resolution), 98.
- Minority students in the graduate school: a dean's view (David R. Deener), 56-62.
- Needy, ethnic minority students, financial aid on an experimental basis (resolution), 98.
- Nominations, report of committee, 115.
- Notes (introductory) by the President, 10.
- Plans and priorities for the future (W. Donald Cooke), 24-31.
- Policies in graduate education, 85-88; current character of the Ph.D., 87; junior colleges, 86; new grading practices, 85.
- Student aid, 93-96; common manual of procedures and regulations for Federal fellowships and traineeships, 95; disadvantaged students, 93; need as a criterion for Federal support, 94; teaching assistants, 95.
- Testing, 99-104; graduate school foreign language tests, 103; planning for 1970's, 102; policies and practices, 102; restructured test program, 100; review panels, 99.
- Time for Change*, an editorial, 4-9.