APPENDIX 2

"The Federal Government's Remaining Role in Education"

A conversation between Dr. Samuel Halperin, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Legislation, and Mr. Harold Howe II, U.S. Commissioner of Education.

THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT'S REMAINING JOB IN EDUCATION*

HALPERIN: Looking at the legislative authorities of the U.S. Office of Education as of August 1968 we see that this Federal agency is empowered to spend, if appropriated, some $8 billion annually under programs covering virtually every area of education. These authorizations affect, in a major way, higher education, educational research, elementary and secondary education, teacher training, vocational education, education of the handicapped, adult education, student financial aid, community services, library programs, and many other areas. Thus, it is no exaggeration to say that, with only slight modifications, the programs now on the statute books could address virtually any education problem in our society.

Except possibly in the education of the handicapped, these Federal undertakings are not what might be called general support programs. Instead they tend to be, in varying degrees, of a categorical nature. That is to say, the Congress has agreed upon particular national educational priorities which call for Federal resources and has enacted programs accordingly.

HOWE: It seems to me that the priority that most clearly reflects the educational thrust of the Johnson Administration has been the focus on disadvantaged people and on using education as the instrument to solve the problems of disadvantaged people. And I think the programs that you have been describing can be seen, in very large proportion, in that context.

The funds that have been appropriated for support of these programs are by no means adequate to do the job, nor has there been adequate time to complete that job. But a very effective start has been made, and it seems to me that there is need now for two major new directions in Federal education programs.

One of these directions can be suggested by the word "consolidation"--some kind of pulling together of existing programs so that they relate better to each other; so that they have more flexibility; so that they are more convenient for the people who use them; so that administrative problems that arise from multiple application forms, filing deadlines, and that kind of thing are simplified. Both administrative and legislative action are needed so that efforts in teacher training, for instance, are related to the efforts of local school districts in educating disadvantaged children and so that curricular reform and other measures by school districts to serve those children are reflected in the teacher training programs of the colleges and universities.

---

*Transcript of a tape-recorded conversation, on July 31, 1968, between Dr. Samuel Halperin, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; and U.S. Commissioner of Education Harold Howe II.

think there is the possibility of bringing about more efficient combinations of these Federal programs. In saying this I do not mean to suggest that the relative degree of disorder which exists is anybody's fault. It has developed historically, growing out of the mechanisms by which the Congress enacts programs and the manner by which an administration formulates and proposes them. Apparently there are those who imagine that this disorderly picture justifies criticism of the Congress or the Administration. I don't feel that way about it at all. Rather, it is the natural result of historical development.

The second point I would make in regard to the Federal activities of the future has to do with the organization of the Federal establishment in education itself. The Johnson Administration, in introducing all these new programs, has introduced them across the board in the Federal Government. You find them in the Office of Economic Opportunity, in the Labor Department, in aspects of the Model Cities Program related to education, in the Arts and Humanities Endowments, in the National Science Foundation, in the Appalachia programs, in a whole variety of agencies. Whereas the Federal Government has looked at the complexities of transportation and organized a new Department to deal with them or the problems of the cities and organized the new Department of Housing and Urban Development, education has simply mushroomed all over the Government. It seems to me that one of the major tasks for the future is an organizational housecleaning and re-ordering of the Federal role in education.

There are many proposals around, and one of them is that there be a Cabinet-level Department of Education. Another is that the education function in HEW be escalated by the establishment in the Department of an Under Secretary for Education. Personally, I would lean toward the former.

HALPERIN: It seems to me that one can't do a very adequate job on the first problem--in the area of consolidation and coordination--without paying attention to the second. You can cut down the number of categorical grant programs, perhaps, and you can simplify forms. But you cannot ordinarily get any consistent, Government-wide policies for, let's say, fellowships or stipends, or for the Federal matching share for the construction of facilities, or for the problems of campus planning, without some rather fundamental changes. University administrators today are beside themselves trying to put together campuses with funds from NIH, the Office of Education, National Science Foundation, NASA, HUD, and so on. Therefore, I put a very high priority on a major reorganization across-the-board--not merely an elevation of the Office of Education, but a broad restructuring of Federal education enterprises in order to get at the problems of individual program improvements and consolidations.

It is important to note that the Federal budget for education has tripled under President Johnson to a current level of over $12 billion. Only about $3.7 billion of that sum is administered by the U.S. Office of Education. Therefore, I do not think you can get a really effective Federal policy in the field of education--one which maximizes the benefits of Federal investments for the recipients and for the Nation as a whole--unless you can coordinate both the planning and operations of the thirty or so major Federal agencies that now operate literally hundreds of education programs with little or no collaboration or communication among them.

HOWE: I think this is an important point, and I would add as a footnote that I don't believe you are advocating (nor would I) that all of the programs of all these various agencies be pulled together into a single Department of Education. I would foresee instead the development of an across-the-board planning capability that brings about some inter-relationship of these programs; so that when decisions affecting educational institutions are made unilaterally in NASA or the Atomic Energy Commission there is a knowledge about what other agencies are doing about the same matters.

A good example of this point is found in graduate fellowships. Last year several agencies had independent budgets for fellowships and dealt independently with the Bureau of the Budget on the matter. When their decisions were added to the decisions of other agencies acting independently in the same fashion, the result was severe impact on the colleges that none of the individual agencies intended.

HALPERIN: We should add, of course, that Congress legislates in the same relatively isolated and piecemeal fashion. For example, the cuts made by the Space Committee in fellowship and building programs in the educational area were not known to most of the Members of the Congress who preside over the Department of Defense's programs in the field of education, or to the Members of the Education and Labor Committee or the Labor and Public Welfare Committee who legislate in related areas.

Thus, there is a cumulative effect on the Nation's campuses, brought about not with malice and certainly not with forethought---a cumulative and unforeseen effect produced by a lack of knowledge of what other people are doing and lack of overall policy and legislative cohesion.

I certainly do not favor gathering every education-related program together under a common agency. I do advocate a very careful study, followed by relatively swift Executive and Congressional action, of ways to pull together the major programs whose essential function is the strengthening and support of educational institutions, as distinct from the mission-oriented tasks that every Federal agency must necessarily carry out.

In this reorganization that we are both talking about one should look at education broadly. We are looking at manpower and we are looking at training of various types. We are also involved with overall science policy and with the humanities and the arts. We must consider education in a very catholic sense.

I would also add to your two top priority issues for future attention a third. In my mind, it is the third in time as well as in importance, but it needs to be looked at--and planned for.

As I said at the outset, our programs today are of a categorical nature. And while we want some pulling together and some greater simplification and a greater flexibility for these programs, we also have to ask ourselves about the extent to which the Federal role should ultimately be supplemented to include some sort of institutional aid in both higher education and in elementary and secondary education--institutional aid with relatively few Federal priorities, recognizing that educational costs are spiraling, recognizing that there is a limit to the fiscal capacity of the States and local communities that perhaps has not yet been reached but that is an increasing burden in both a political and an economic sense? Should the Federal Government do something in these areas to provide across-the-board aid?

HOWE: It seems to me we ought to address this broad topic you have introduced separately for elementary and secondary education on the one hand and higher education on the other.

Let's talk for a minute about elementary and secondary education.

Historically, there has been a sort of unsuccessful reach for some form of general aid to elementary and secondary education. A number of Presidents have brought this up. A number of Senators and Congressmen from time to time have proposed bills, some of which have even passed one House of the Congress. But general aid has always foundered either on grounds of fear of Federal control or on anxieties about church-state relations, or both.

HALPERIN: Plus some related issues such as integration and the question of interstate equalization. The timing of any particular program may make a difference, too. Witness the fact that once upon a time you could get a great deal of support for classroom construction per se. Today, with the new militancy in the teaching profession, enthusiasm for general aid differs greatly among different educational groups. A school construction program, once viewed as "general aid" in most people's eyes, is clearly less acceptable today than it was just ten or fifteen years ago.

H The reason, of course, is simply that the militant teaching profes on would want to be sure that any major new funding included the possib ity of raising salaries with Federal funds--something which is not suppor d by existing programs.

But you introduced an idea that needs to be discussed in the context of general aid to elementary and secondary education, and that is the idea of equalization.

There is quite a bit of equalization in existing programs, particularly Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. It is not a major effect in terms of redressing balances; it just reaches in that direction.

HALPERIN: Nor was it a major intention in that legislation.

HOWE: That is of course true, but I think we still confront the fact that per-pupil support in our more fortunate States--our more industrialized States, our States with higher levels of production and higher levels of employment and higher levels of income--that per-pupil expenditures there are more than double those in the poorer States.

HALPERIN: To be specific, the latest figures we have indicate a per pupil expenditure of $413 in Mississippi and $1,125 in New York.

HOWE: Close to triple. Those figures, of course, include existing Federal expenditures in both places. Without Federal funds the disparity would be even greater.

Such a difference by itself creates a lack of equal educational opportunity in places where expenditures are lower. And yet the youngsters in the low-expenditure States are citizens of the United States just as the children from the more affluent States are.

One of the general principles that the Johnson Administration has pushed into the Nation's thinking has been the idea that there should be equality of educational opportunity for citizens of the United States regardless of where they happen to be born and where they happen to live. And this disparity in expenditure denies that equality.

So it seems to me that any general aid program which may emerge has to run the political hazard of not providing much support in some places in order to provide a great deal of support in others. That is what equalization is all about. Obviously some kind of compromise will be

necessary in a general aid program--a compromise that brings some support to all places but that redresses, at least in part, the imbalance we have been discussing.

I think also that a Federal program of general aid with an equalization feature in it cannot achieve its objectives if, within the States, Federal money is distributed through traditional channels in such a way as to deny pupils who happen to live in the central city the kind of special and additional compensatory support necessary to make their education successful. The Federal Government must concern itself not just with the distribution of Federal funds among the States but also with the way in which these funds are, in turn, distributed by the States.

HALPERIN: I certainly agree that we need not only inter-State equalization but also intra-State equalization. The Carnegie-funded Syracuse studies and others indicate that existing State equalization programs are woefully inadequate. To use Federal resources in the future merely to compound the injury would be an ironic climax to the excellent progress that has been made in education in recent years.

Besides inter-State equalization and intra-State equalization there is a third consideration I should like to add. It is the notion of somehow designing a Federal program in such a way that it would act as an incentive to greater State and local effort. This, of course, is an idea which has been around a long time. And yet it seems to me that we have to do more about it. The Intergovernmental Advisory Committee on Government Relations indicates that there is untapped fiscal capacity in the States and localities. I would hope we could design a general aid program to act as an incentive to tap these resources in return for larger amounts of relatively unfettered Federal funds.

This whole general aid approach is, of course, fraught not only with the political difficulties you mentioned but, it seems to me, with the possibility that we may have a new outbreak of bitter church-state conflict. The Johnson Administration, legislating on what some people have called the "child benefit" or the "public trustee" theory--in which all funds have flowed directly only to public schools--has avoided church-state confrontations by the corollary principle that non-public school students were entitled to certain types of benefits. This system of getting Federal funds to all pupils, both public and private, opened a new era of interfaith and inter-school cooperation. But this principle applies most easily to categorical programs directed by the Congress to particular purposes over and above the normal programs which schools provide.

When one talks about "general aid"--and if one wants to avoid religious and inter-community strife--it is politically necessary to find a way to assure that some benefits--even if they are not always

proportional or equitable--continue to flow to all the children in the community, regardless of whether the school they attend is public or private.

It is particularly difficult to accomplish this in a general aid bill because under such a program it is not feasible to maintain control over how the funds shall be spent--for books, for instance, or for equipment or for other programs in which non-public school children can participate. If, for example, the bulk of general aid funds flow, as intended, into teachers' salaries, it is difficult to see how private school students' interests can be served or protected.

HOWE: I quite agree, and I think that another qualification that needs to be made is that some people see general aid as the only form or the ideal form which Federal support of the schools should take. And it seems to me that this view is wrong--that while general aid should round out the picture of Federal aid, the rest of the picture should also remain. The broad categorical programs which address themselves to a whole variety of particular objectives which may not be met or even approached by the schools unless these categorical programs remain in place are in my view a first priority for Federal support.

So I think that in the future those who are designing general aid need to be very careful not to damage the categorical programs but to continue them at adequate levels and to move to general aid only in a budget which will allow the continuation of the categorical programs as general aid gets started.

HALPERIN: There are other reservations that need to be borne in mind in the design of a general aid program. Certainly we are painfully aware that many people look upon general aid not only as a convenient way to avoid the dictates of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 but also as a means to avoid having to come to grips with the problem of racial imbalance, particularly in our northern cities.

I don't really believe that we can design a general aid program that in and of itself does away with racial imbalance. To try to do so would involve a contradiction in terms. Unless one assumes that the money flowing to the recipients will generally be used for good purposes and good effects one shouldn't go in the direction of a general aid bill at all.

To get at the problems of racial imbalance, desegregation and genuine integration will probably require new types of categorical programs--or at least new provisions in existing categorical programs--which offer an incentive, a bonus or "carrot" if you will, for those school systems and those communities that wish voluntarily to move in the direction of true racial and economic integration.

HOWE: In line with this, it seems to me that a program for school construction, which we don't have at the present time except in a very small way through the School Assistance for Federally Affected Areas Program, could have an element of general aid in it and yet also contain some of the characteristics you have just outlined.

A program for school construction could apply to all school districts in the country, but include provision for payments to school districts with very special problems, such as those in the big cities or those that are rurally isolated. Similarly, such a new program could also place a premium on cooperation between, or among, several school districts, thereby introducing the possibility of a city cooperating with the suburbs around it to develop certain kinds of specialized facilities. Or as another option, regular school facilities which would have the effect of reducing racial isolation could be given premium levels of Federal support.

This kind of program would be tough to handle politically, but if it had a broad general component of a percentage of payment toward construction costs and then additional percentages of payments where these important public purposes are met, it would at the same time help all school districts and give special help where special needs exist and where there is a willingness to attack the problems the Kerner Commission has identified.

HALPERIN: I'd like to return to an earlier thought. We introduced this general aid discussion as a kind of third priority, or something to be done at a later stage.

In my view, the most important thing this Nation should do in the next several years is to put realistic and substantially greater funding into existing programs at the same time that we make them broader and more flexible and seek to consolidate them.

It seems to me that in the absence of sizable amounts of new money we can expect some erosion of these programs. Many school districts do not benefit substantially from the programs now, and for what they do get they have to go through a great deal of what they call "red tape and bureaucracy." Such grievances are intolerable when the payoff is relatively small. When these grievances are cumulated, I think there is a very real chance that regardless of the Administration in power, there will be a tendency on the part of the Congress and the political electorate to wipe out such programs and to replace them with some sort of undirected, block-grant or non-criteria-laden program.

Thus, I was particularly glad to hear your point about the necessity for general aid as a supplement to, rather than a replacement of, existing programs. In the short run, this requires a commitment to appropriate much

more money, since an essentially status quo operation is not politically viable.

Moreover, it isn't viable in an educational sense either. We cannot really expect to reach and teach the disadvantaged, for example, under Title I of ESEA with only a little more than $100 per-pupil per year, which is about what we are spending today. We cannot really hope to make much of a dent in the high school dropout problem--thirty percent of our youth, a million young people a year--with the less than $10 million for an anti-dropout program which was appropriated by the Congress. We cannot really reach many of the young people who need to go on to post-secondary education with as few as seventy thousand Educational Opportunity Grants a year.

Everything we have been talking about has to be done on a substantially larger scale, both in order to have integrity in the programs and also to find out if they will truly work. At present we just don't really know. It is going to take time, but it is also going to take a substantially larger investment simultaneously.

HOWE: I thoroughly agree with the need for a substantially larger investment. And, being a realist, I am aware that a substantially larger investment in education on the domestic scene is going to be in competition, direct competition, with a whole galaxy of other important domestic causes. People today are expecting a great deal more from their government than they once did. They want greater effort toward control of the environment: conservation, air pollution, water resource management, and the like. They want government help in transportation and in housing and in the replanning and rebuilding of the cities. And they want it in education. And each of these has it's own claim on new dollars that the American taxpayer may be willing to give to his government to serve him.

This means that education is going to be in tough competition. I think that education will meet that competition to the degree that it is able to make a strong case for success in what it is doing.

This in turn argues strongly for the investment of funds in research, for effective dissemination of existing knowledge, and for effective evaluation of the programs that we have. And, therefore, as perhaps a first priority in the investment of any new funds, I would seek funds for those activities and for beginning to get a feedback from them. I believe that over time that feedback will build the confidence which will bring additional funds into major areas of service such as those under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

And I believe that right now, by any reasonable measurement, the funding for research and demonstration and evaluation in education by the Federal Government is minimal.

HALPERIN: Educational research and development, dissemination, and evaluation would be among my major priorities, too. I would like to follow up on your first priority in educational research by saying that I think in the years ahead a Federal goal should be stated as a percentage of our education budget.

We have all been talking in recent years--with justification, I think--about insufficient educational research. At the present time of the $12 billion spent by the Federal Government in education, substantially less than one percent is for educational research and related efforts. Of the Office of Education budget, only about 2.5 percent goes into educational research. I would like to suggest to an incoming Administration that, for the reasons you have stated so well, we ought to set a national goal of ten percent of our education budget for research, development, and evaluation; a goal to be reached in stages over, let's say, five years.

My second suggestion for a priority for investment of new funds is the whole area of teacher training, and inservice training broadly conceived to include the subprofessional aides, the administrators, the school board members, the supervisors, the directors--all of the policy-makers in the field of education. Obviously, people are the core of any system, and this is true in education as well as elsewhere.

The largest single professional group in the United States today is that encompassed by the field of education---almost 3 million persons. Yet we are training or retraining only a small fraction of these people each year. There is a tremendous turnover because of retirement and new job opportunities outside education. It seems to me that we ought to put a large investment into the teacher training area in the years ahead. And to hazard a goal or a target, I would suggest that we ought to aim at retraining ten percent of our teaching force annually. I think the current training level is about one to two percent through the various Federal programs. States and localities are unable to expand their commitments to the retraining of teachers because of the tremendous pressures for salary increases. But unless there is adequate retraining, the across-the-board salary increases may not be justified. So I think it's a reasonable goal to state specifically on the part of the Federal Government that we aim---through sabbaticals, fellowships, institutes, and other training programs---to provide ten percent of our teaching force with some kind of educational experience each year.

HOWE: That makes very good sense. And of course one of the great achievements of the Johnson Administration is the Education Professions Development Act, which provides most of the authority needed to do the job you have described, although one or two amendments might well be added to it. For example, school board members are not now included, contrary to the original suggestion by the Administration. Elements of added flexibility of this kind could advantageously be placed in this Act.

B[illegible]he basic legislation is excellent. It has a very nice balance in it. It creates a Federal role, it creates a State role, and it addres[illegible]es itself to a local school district role in the training of people to ser[illegible] education, a desirable element omitted in previous legislation. A big window has been opened by this legislation, and there are all sorts of opportunities as a result.

I think one of the major administrative responsibilities of the Office of Education in the years ahead will involve making imaginative use of this new authority.

HALPERIN: With regard to your last comment on the immaginative use of that authority, it's interesting to note that most of us are very proud of the Teacher Corps. We feel that it has great promise and that the program should be expanded substantially.

But under the Education Professions Development Act many new kinds of "teachers' corps" are possible---new types of teacher training and retraining efforts. Thus, I hope that they will be generously funded in the years ahead.

I would like to add a footnote to an earlier point you made about dissemination: I feel very strongly---and many Members of the Congress do as well--that in this huge country of ours, with 21,000 operating school districts and more than 2,000 colleges, many, many things are going on right now that are effective, that are promising, that are adaptable by others. But communications in a country as large as ours are terribly difficult. I would hope that special efforts would be made in the years ahead to disseminate widely to the taxpaying public--to the lay policy-makers, as well as to the professionals--the results of programs at all levels of education. We certainly have the authority to do this both in our new legislation and under the general charter establishing the Office of Education in 1867.

HOWE: The dissemination function includes a wide variety of activities, and not the least of them are the processes of letting the people know, of developing markets, of demonstration. Education hasn't thought this way enough.

HALPERIN: Possibly there might be an activity somewhat analogous to the system of agricultural experiment stations, and particularly to the work of the county agents. We of course have the regional educational laboratories, but it may be that we need to look more carefully at dissemination models that would reach all over the country, using non-educators and sub-professionals, as well as the more traditional groups.

HOWE: And now to give this conversation a balance I don't think it has at this point, let's have some general discussion about higher education. I think of one or two observations that can be made. First of all, higher education activity is widely dispersed throughout the Federal Government and therefore needs to be examined in the light of our earlier conversation about the need for planning capacity to get at the problem of impact of the many separate Federal programs on individual institutions.

Secondly, I'd say that the types of assistance provided by the Federal Government to higher education tend, to some degree, to be less change-oriented than the types of assistance the Federal Government provides to elementary and secondary education. Our scholarship grants, work-study funds, and similar support measures do help a different type of student to get into the higher educational institution than the traditional college student from the upper economic stratum.

But programs like these, and the programs which build buildings, and those which promote research activity in our educational institutions--and these are the major components of support: buildings, research, and student aid--don't address themselves much at all to institutional change. We can speculate that perhaps it is because neither the Federal Government nor indeed other agencies have thought about this very much--or at least done much about it--that students around the country are themselves seeking institutional change in a variety of ways.

There are some small programs that do reach for change. Title III of the Higher Education Act could be described as addressing itself to improving quality and to bringing about institutional change. But I think the broad generalization still holds.

So I think it would be constructive if those people responsible for the future Federal role in education would explore something analogous to Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act for higher education, a foundation-like function addressed to change, addressed to picking up the bright ideas that have surfaced in the world of higher education and giving them some backing from Federal sources.

That type of activity has been carried out in our society more commonly by private sources than by public sources, largely through foundations. And I think there is a promising Federal role here.

Then there is the whole broad question of what should be the shape of any general or operational aid to higher education. Higher education institutions are facing increasing unit costs. It costs more money to educate each student in every college every year. This is largely a function of rising faculty salaries, but other costs as well.

HALPERIN: And obviously enrollments are going to double.

HOWE: Enrollments are going up while this increasing cost is impinging on the institutions. And many of them are in deep trouble.

We don't know the exact dimension of this trouble. One of the constructive moves directed by President Johnson is a study to devise a long-range plan for the financing of higher education. None of us knows what will emerge from that. But obviously a major job for a future Administration is that of picking up the results of this study and doing something constructive with them. And I suspect that one of the results of the study may be some suggestion about how the Federal Government could encourage more private and State support for higher education and, at the same time, make a contribution to the operational costs of running a college or university. My own inclination is to suggest that the Federal Government give a priority to increases in student aid programs so that segments of the society now denied a higher education can have increased hope of receiving one. If the Government does this, then the way to provide operating aid to institutions might be to give an unrestricted grant for every student on a Federally supported scholarship. We do this already for graduate fellowships, and I think it would work in four-year colleges and community colleges.

HALPERIN: The difficulties that beset general aid in the elementary and secondary area, of course, are to at least some degree also present in the higher education area. To be sure you don't have the church-state issue to the same extent. But there is a tendency on the part of many policy-makers, both in and out of the Congress, to want to control the results of Federal aid. We can't have this. If we believe in the ability and the know-how of the institution, then we just have to go ahead and authorize some general aid at whatever time that is fiscally feasible, regardless of opposition from those who fear that general aid in any form, at any level, means "money down a rat hole," or other pejorative expressions. I do think this notion runs counter to the concept of grants for innovation.

Perhaps in the years ahead we must try to find an increased or new role for the Federal Government that couples the encouragement of innovation with an appropriate response to the increasing outcry of the institutions for operating money.

HOWE: I think there is a very good analogy here to what we were saying about elementary and secondary education. We were saying there that the categorical programs should grow and should continue to be supported when general aid comes in. I think we ought to say exactly the same thing about higher education. Student aid programs should grow and continue. The programs that support special research of particular interest to the Federal Government ought to grow and continue. But at the same time, the Federal Government in the future needs to think about the problems of the institution as such.

By and large the Federal Government has tended to look at the institution from the point of view of what purposes it can accomplish for the Government without worrying too much about what happens to the health of the institution while it is serving Federal ends.

Uncle Sam makes it possible for a lot more people in the United States to get a higher education, because that's a significant national objective. And we back a variety of specialties because they are needed either by the Federal Government or by the economy, or by some aspect of public service in the States and localities. But we have not thought enough about the capacity of the institution to keep its balance while doing all these things to serve important national objectives. It is into that picture that I would put the problem of operating costs of these institutions and the capacity to at least stay alive and healthy while picking up these categorical aid programs that the Federal Government provides.

HALPERIN: While we're talking about what might lie ahead for higher education, I wonder if your priorities and your sense of timing would match mine.

I would say that in the next couple of years, as more funds---hopefully--become available, my own set of priorities would emphasize continuing the thrust of the Johnson Administration to ensure equality of educational opportunity, particularly for minority groups and for the poor, regardless of their race.

I think that this can be stated in a kind of a declaration of rights: that any student of ability should be enabled to go on to the post-secondary institution of his choice, whether a technical institute or a business school or a college. And I think the goal ought to be stated in terms of some numbers. For example, for an additional one billion dollars a year we can help an additional two million students--the equivalent of some forty percent of those now enrolled in college--to go on to further education after high school.

I think that's the kind of a statement of a goal that we need. That would be my first priority.

HOWE: Yes, I fully agree. And, of course, one must take into account the fact that higher education today is, to a degree, a segregated enterprise. Most of our high quality institutions have a relatively small proportion of minority group people in them, and there is an important job to do in somehow achieving throughout the higher education spectrum a better representation of minority group people.

HALPERIN: Speaking further about higher education, I would say that either simultaneously or as the next priority we ought to give attention to more adequate funding of some of our broader categorical programs, for example, the programs to improve college library and instructional resources. This is one way that you get at quality. This is one way you can change the institution. At the same time you exercise some Congressional discretion as to where the funds go.

I also think the Federal Government should do something special for graduate education. This is the fastest growing part of higher learning, and it's also the most expensive part. Here again, we do have on the statute books in a variety of Federal agencies the necessary tools, but we do not now have the funding in institutional aid or institutional development programs or institutional excellence programs---they are called different things in NASA and NSF and NIH. Hopefully, we will have a new program in the Office of Education under the pending Higher Education Amendments of 1968*. Particularly through the fellowship programs, with their accompanying cost-of-education allowances, we have an ideal mechanism to help graduate education simply by raising these allowances. Through these two mechanisms it seems to me we can do a great deal to help the graduate schools meet their financial crisis.

HOWE: Let me point out that some thinking has already developed about increasing the cost-of-education allowances. Many agencies have had a part in that thinking. It's ready to move. All that is necessary, really, is a planning move by the Bureau of the Budget to standardize these cost-of-education allowances at a higher level. And it could be done in many ways. For example, it could be phased in over a period of three, four, or five years by adding $500 a year to the allowance, which now runs around $2,500, and build it up to $3,500. In this fashion, an institution could get some funds for its own development as it takes in a graduate student but that can happen only if the amount is raised appreciably.

It's pretty important to point out that in the graduate schools which indeed have the special problems you outline, the cost of education of an individual graduate student may run as high as $10,000.

HALPERIN: Perhaps five to ten times that of an undergraduate.

HOWE: Yes. So when an institution takes in a graduate student with Federal support and gets a $2,500 cost-of-education allowance, it may be losing as much as $7,500 on the deal.

*Since enacted as Title X of the Higher Education Act; see Public Law 90-575, October 16, 1968.

Let's turn to other areas and consider the education of the handicapped, and then perhaps vocational education, which I think needs considerable discussion here.

Why don't you start with the handicapped?

HALPERIN: In the area of the handicapped we not only have a host of programs, but one particular program--Title VI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act--which is, it seems to me, almost a true "general aid" program. It provides funds to the States to support the operating costs of virtually any educational service or program for the handicapped. One might therefore conclude that it would be possible to build upon existing authority to design programs that would reach particular target groups--for example, the deaf-blind or the multiply-handicapped.

Here, too, we ought to state an over-all goal for the next five to ten years, for example, that we will reach and teach and provide the necessary ancillary services to all of the handicapped children of the Nation.

One-tenth of all of our children are estimated to be physically or mentally handicapped and to need some sort of special attention. Yet, we are serving only about two million of these children today. Three million are not served at all. And among the two million who are receiving some sort of special service, the adequacy of service obviously leaves much to be desired.

So I would say that here again a useful device for the next Administration would be to set a specific numerical goal. Under the Johnson Administration we made fantastic progress in getting started in each and every one of these areas. Now I think we have to measure our objective and pace ourselves so that we are sure to reach it.

HOWE: Yes, not only has the Johnson Administration gotten some very effective legislation in place for the benefit of the handicapped, but it has also moved forward on funding for this legislation in very tight budget years, when money was hard to find because of all sorts of national commitments. There has been a significant move percentage-wise in what has happened in our appropriations for handicapped legislation.

The budget of the Office of Education in moving from Fiscal '68 to '69 has reflected close to a 50 percent increase in the money being made available for education of the handicapped. And although as we approach our Fiscal '70 budget we are not talking about that large an increase, we are nevertheless talking about some increase while the

'70 budget for the Office of Education as a whole may remain rather stable or even decrease.

I would mention another point, too, which relates not just to the handicapped but more broadly to our earlier conversation about elementary-secondary education. That is the very great achievement of this Administration in getting the idea of early childhood education generally accepted around the country. The Head Start program supervised by the Office of Economic Opportunity and the focus of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act on early childhood education, as well as the Follow Through Program, are all evidence of this.

HALPERIN: And the various Day Care Programs under Social Security and welfare legislation, too.

HOWE: Right. These efforts have awakened people and gotten them ready to move. There is now a real opportunity for a much broader program of early childhood education. What we know about children--about the way they grow and develop and achieve success in school--indicates that this is an eminently sensible move.

I bring this up in the context of the handicapped because I think that an effective move in early childhood education may lead to much earlier identification of physical and mental handicaps and a much higher percentage of solutions to those problems. The result in the long haul may be lower levels of investment in the handicapped if early identification and diagnosis and early treatment can be developed through Federal initiative working with States and localities.

I would tie early childhood education, first of all, to the disadvantaged population; secondly, to this notion of early identification of handicaps and thirdly, to service of the entire population. I think that future Administrations are in a firm position to move in these directions as a result of what has already been accomplished.

Let me add, finally, that adequate services to handicapped children (as well as to the disadvantaged) depend absolutely on categorical programs. There is little likelihood that general aid programs will help these children. Future planners of the education role of the Federal Government must keep this in mind.

HALPERIN: To go on now to a new subject--vocational education--this is the area in which the Federal Government was doing most before the advent of the Johnson Administration. The momentum was continued and, in 1963, important steps were taken to modernize and update vocational education programs. Since 1963 there has been a substantial increase in vocational enrollments. Now, in 1968, the Congress of the United States

is about to pass the most far-reaching reworking, expansion and extension of vocational education in our Nation's history.*

Nevertheless, I would suggest that by and large we have been something less than completely sympathetic to the needs of our young people in this area.

We have been so strongly oriented to the colleges and to the disadvantaged very young in recent years that we have tended to understate the needs of the four-fifths of our young people who do not graduate from college, and the three-fifths of our young people who never see the inside of a college.

We know that vocational education has been and can be a dumping ground for young people. It can be a dead-end street. The new legislation brought into being under the Johnson Administration, and some of the funding which has begun to flow since 1964, does indeed provide substantial opportunities to make a meaningful bridge between the school and the first job, to bring industry and business into a partnership with the schools so that our young people will have a realistic understanding of the world of work outside of the classroom.

I would hope that using the new legislation, possibly with further developments in the area of guidance and counseling, we would move with more vigor in vocational and technical education. In other areas I have suggested a goal; I will suggest one here, too: We have about 7.5 million people enrolled in vocational education today. I think it is entirely realistic as well as important to suggest that in 1975 or so we should have tripled these enrollments--about 21 or 22 million Americans of all age groups in vocational and occupational education. This is going to require several billion dollars more than we are now putting into the enterprise. But considering the importance of the labor force in the growth of the American economy I can think of few better investments.

HOWE: I would like to make several comments on vocational education. I quite agree that the levels of investment need to be very much changed, as you suggest. But as they are changed I am concerned lest the United States develop two entirely separate systems of education, one labeled as vocational and the other labeled as the regular or general system of education.

It seems to me that both in legislation and in administration of the new Act that you cite, efforts have to be made to avoid this separateness. I think there should be an infusion of a major vocational component into the normal high school and junior high school education programs across the country and that the new money that comes into vocational education

*See Vocational Education Amendments of 1968, Public Law 90-576, October 16, 1968.

ought to encourage the pulling together of vocational education with the usual public school system rather than increasing their separateness.

I would also pick up your point about the wider involvement of business and industry and in finding ways to give them an input into the affairs of vocational education. I think it is really the job of industry and business to define the skills that are needed. That is where the people are going to be employed. And I don't see enough back and forth between industry and business and the world of education.

One of the problems we confront and that future Administrations will confront is that of somehow crossing this gap. Whenever we bring before the Congress proposals for allowing Federal grants to flow to business and industry for purposes of training teachers--for training them right within business and industry so that they will know what they should teach their students that will be pertinent to the jobs youngsters will have available to them--we run into a roadblock.

We find that a number of educational organizations are, as a matter of principle, opposed to Federal grants to private industry for purposes of this training function or for purposes of curriculum development, or really for purposes of any kind of constructive interaction. And I think a future Administration has got to find a way to persuade people that such arrangements are not a threat to the public schools in any sense but rather comprise an added resource to the public schools. The new vocational legislation as now written opens the door between business and education. I hope that it passes and that future administrations make vigorous use of it.

Third, I think we ought to use this conversation about vocational education to register our general concern for the community college and junior college. The fact that such institutions are in part avenues to the later years of college and the baccalaureate degree must be put against the fact you mentioned earlier that only twenty percent of the people are now getting this degree. In short, the community college has open to it a role that goes far beyond being a half-way house to a four-year institution.

The two-year institution is the most rapidly growing component of the higher education spectrum in terms of new institutions being built and of the numbers of students going into post-secondary education.

Yet there are gaps in the Federal support of community colleges. I think the new Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 offer real opportunity to fill those gaps; so it is possible that with adequate funding we may have almost all the legislation we need.

The Higher Education Facilities Act offers opportunities for supporting the construction aspects of those new community colleges.

So far, however, we have neglected the curricular development side and teacher training aspects of community college operations. We have the legislation to do both these things, but we don't have the funds, and we don't have the leadership at the present. It seems to me that additional funds for vocational education over the next five years ought to be so planned and administered that they take account of those gaps and needs.

HALPERIN: I'm glad that you touched on the community college question because I think there is a bridge there to contemporary politics which can help win public acceptance for increased Federal aid to education.

There is at this moment in history what can only be regarded as an unfortunate tendency on the part of many people to reject Federal programs on the grounds that they are allegedly aimed only at the poor or the black or the neglected. And we hear grumblings like, "What do you have to do to get some of your own Federal money back from your Government?" I think Federal support, while it must necessarily give priority to the disadvantaged--regardless of whether that disadvantage is physical or mental or racial or educational or cultural--should also aim at making it clear that the Federal education programs are intended for all of the people of the country.

It seems to me that vocational and technical education, particularly with a community of junior college component, touches a deep-rooted desire of the American people: better education for their youngsters as a path to a better job and a better economic future. If we build a closer alliance between our vocational and technical programs and the junior and community college movement, we will go a long way toward overcoming what I detect as a disaffection on the part of some members of the taxpaying public with programs they feel are not benefitting them. Apparently they either do not see their children as being candidates for the full baccalaureate degree or they do not see their children benefitting from programs addressed to the educationally and culturally disadvantaged. The community college-technical school movement can bridge this gap.

HOWE: I would add that higher levels of literacy are going to become an increasing requirement for vocational education. There is thus some likelihood that the production of those higher levels of literacy will increasingly become the job of the secondary schools and that this will tend to thrust a larger proportion of the vocational education component onto the community colleges.

I hope if that happens that those who are devising the new programs in these colleges, and those who are devising support for them on the Federal side, will keep in mind the need for flexibility. The great thing

about the community college now is that it hasn't solidified. It can be all kinds of things at the same time. It can offer six-week courses to develop a very special skill. It can take in a person who needs literacy training and give him that, if he's an adult or if he has finished high school or if he has dropped out of high school. It can offer a specific two-year program leading to an intermediate degree.

There is a tendency among community colleges to see as the basic measurement of excellence the movement of a very high proportion of their graduates into four-year institutions. It seems to me that we need to help the community colleges to develop a concept of excellence in other sorts of services and to take pride in them; so that we avoid the danger that is now so evident among some community colleges of wanting to lose their identity as vocational and technical training places and transform themselves into four-year colleges. I suppose after they were four-year colleges for a period of years they would want a graduate school!

While I think we need well-planned, high-quality, widely-available services at the graduate level, we certainly don't need every community college to follow that course. We are going to need in the years ahead the service of a growing number of community colleges to a major proportion of the population.

I believe that the most recent prognosis I saw was something to the effect that in 1975 about 75 percent of the population would be graduating from high school.

HALPERIN: We're at about 71 percent now.

HOWE: We may be up to 80 or so by 1975. That means a very great demand for these new community colleges. That prospect raises the question of whether in the future the Federal Government won't have to find a more flexible method than it now has for helping institutions to get started.

Most of our legislation today is written to provide aid only to higher education institutions that already exist. This stipulation is, in fact, set in law by the Congress. Institutions either have to have received accreditation or provisional accreditation of some carefully defined kind. In any case, there are relatively few Federal resources to help the people lacking a vocational and technical college to get one established. They have to do it entirely on their own initiative, with their own resources. And frequently the places where such services are particularly needed have insufficient economic base to do the job.

HALPERN: That point suggests another to me, namely, that we really do not now have a planning capability or a program that would enable us to know when, for example, support ought to be extended to an emerging new community college or emerging new graduate school because there was a genuine need or when, alternatively, the availability of Federal funds would merely proliferate programs, produce non-economic institutions, and cater to particular community whims which may not be soundly based in educational terms.

We hear a great deal, for example, about the desire of virtually any community of any size to have its own community college for reasons of "civic pride." That may be a caricature and exaggeration, but it is no exaggeration to say that at the present time we have no mechanisms for deciding when scarce Federal funds ought to go to an institution and when they should not.

HOWE: We have reviewed the major aspects of the Federal role in education in our earlier conversation about elementary and secondary education and the relationship of categorical programs to general aid, then in our subsequent conversation about higher education in that same relationship, and then in these special thrusts into vocational education and education of the handicapped. One area we have missed is the very broad one, which, for want of a better phrase, I will call adult education, but which isn't really that. It's the idea that Americans in this complex society will need increasingly to be engaged in education all their lives.

The Federal Government is already involved in the support of a variety of enterprises which contribute to lifelong education opportunity. Contributions now made by the Federal Government include major support to public libraries and support for the development of a new kind of non-commercial or public broadcasting system which will be an education device although not institutionally based.

It occurs to me that the museums of the country are really in this same category, and have not captured major attention from the Federal Government. The President addressed a letter not long ago to the Council for the Arts and Humanities asking that group to advise him on what the Federal role might be in relation to museums. And I think one of the opportunities before the Federal Government in the years immediately ahead is to respond to the report that will be forthcoming shortly about this matter.

There are, of course, some very specific programs directed at adult literacy and the decreasing but still large proportion of adults who don't have adequate basic literacy to undertake vocational or other programs that will get them started.

I think the Federal Government at this point has moved in this area by bits and pieces rather than thinking about it as a total package.

HAPERIN: What might be called an Adult Opportunity Act has been suggested in this connection--something that would tie together the continuing needs for new forms of education, cultural development, recreation, and that would enhance the cultural literacy of our population.

The concept takes in some of the elements you mentioned, with possibly a specific recommendation for some sort of research and development institute that would push information science, communications science, ways to handle the information explosion, better non-commercial television, and library services of all types, particularly library services that would reach into homes and into disadvantaged neighborhoods.

It could also include mid-career development--ways in which the adult could change his job with appropriate training, possibly under a broadened Manpower Development and Training Act or some other type of adult education.

It could take in specialized needs, such as those of the housewife who has raised her children and wants to return to the labor force (not necessarily into education, where we now have the Education Professions Development Act, but somewhere else), some way that she can get the necessary retraining or continuing adult education; the needs of the retired, of senior citizens, of people who have finished one career as business executives or as Army officers and who need special resources and programs to help with the start of a new career.

Obviously, this is quite a major area. Thus far, we have inched into it. We now need to step up the pace considerably.

Another dimension of this subject occurs to me. We do have the program of adult basic literacy, of course. But to my way of thinking, we have not done what we should have done. We still have 23 million Americans with less than an eighth grade education. We have eleven million functional illiterates with less than a sixth grade education. And we are spending under $50 million a year on this particular social and economic problem. We ought to expand that commitment many fold.

Ultimately, we ought to look also at the sixty million or so Americans without a high school education. While they may not occupy the same priority as some of the things we've been talking about today, in developing a rounded picture we should ask ourselves whether high school equivalency programs and various other specialized opportunities might not be made available to this population, not only to bring about more gainful employment, but for personal satisfaction, for creative adjustment to society, for more satisfying relationships with their fellowman.

HOWE: To touch on another point in this look to the future and the job that remains to be done, I would raise the problem of the distribution of educational resources in the U.S.A. Although States are increasingly doing a more effective job of planning for new educational services in places where these are in short supply, it occurs to me that there are opportunities for the Federal Government to be of assistance in a number of different ways.

We know that more and more people are moving toward metropolitan centers and will continue to do so in the years ahead. Yet, the costs of providing such people with adequate educational services are much higher at all levels than are the costs in rural and suburban areas. One typical result is that we are getting more colleges in those places where there are fewer people while we confront a shortage of post-secondary education services in the cities, where land and buildings are expensive and operating costs higher.

Shouldn't the Federal Government devise a program to pay a larger percentage of central city construction costs than the percentage it pays outside the city? Shouldn't the Federal Government find the means to help new institutions get started in the places where the great concentrations of people are to be found?

These concentrations of people do not pose problems just for the States. More and more, the metropolis cuts across State boundaries. The economic and social pressures which cause the migrations that in turn create the metropolis are far beyond State control.

There clearly seems to be a need for the Federal role to include a planning and financing component to help meet the educational challenges created by these migrations. Some Federal programs, such as Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, already have this effect. But more remains to be done at all levels of education.

Finally let me mention a couple of items that have not been a part of our conversation but that must be kept on the agenda for the future:

(1) Forward funding - The Federal Government's fiscal cycle is badly out of phase with the planning cycle of the schools. As a result, States and school districts do not learn what appropriations they will actually get until long after they have had to make commitments for the use of the appropriations. If someone were to start out to design a system for the maximum inconvenience of the schools, he might well come up with the arrangement we now have. Forward funding, under which the President and Congress would consider funding of Elementary-Secondary programs a full year ahead, would solve this problem. Many higher education programs now have this arrangement. All education programs should have it.

(2) International Education - One of the failures of the past few years has been the inability of the administration to get Congressional backing for the International Education Act. This Act, growing from the President's Smithsonian speech of September 1965, holds great hope for improved training of all sorts of specialists vitally needed by American Government and by business---specialists with knowledge of language, economics, government, health, education, engineering, and a variety of other fields as they apply to the problems of particular parts of the world in which the United States has national interests. The study now underway at the direction of the Appropriations Committee may lead the way to favorable action in the future. The Act must be kept alive, and appropriations for it should be a high priority matter.

(3) Education in special fields - Particularly in health and in conservation, the years ahead will see major new manpower needs. Medical education requires a complete re-study to make it more efficient. New specialities will develop related to control of the environment. The Federal Government must take its share of responsibility in these areas of education.

GPO 868-426

# #