

CR-5961

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

INTERVIEW WITH HAROLD HOWE, II
COMMISSIONER, OFFICE OF EDUCATION

HISTORY OF U. S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Friday 12 July 1968

Interviewer: Jack Broudy

vi

1 BY MR. BRODIE:

2 Q Mr. Howe, you were sworn in as U. S. Commissioner of
3 Education on January 5, 1966. This means that for the past
4 two and a half years you have been at the center of the great
5 expansion of the Office of Education and have administered its
6 many programs to improve the education of the nation's chil-
7 dren.

8 How would you describe the major goals and achieve-
9 ments of your administration today?

10 A Well, it seems to me that the major goals and
11 achievements of the Office of Education really have to be set
12 within a broader context of goals and achievements of educa-
13 tion in general, and I think that from this point of view
14 there is a unique aspect to the efforts of the Johnson Admin-
15 istration in education.

16 In effect what the Johnson Administration has done,
17 led by the President and supported by Secretary Gardner and a
18 variety of other persons throughout the Administration, has
19 been to take the position that in order to solve the problems
20 of people -- people who are unemployed or unemployable;
21 people who can't make a success of things in American society;
22 people whose children don't succeed in the schools as the
23 schools have traditionally been operated; people who are dis-
24 criminated against and don't get a fair chance in America --
25 in order to solve the problems of people who have these

vt
1 particular handicaps and difficulties, we need to use educa-
2 tion as a major instrument of social change, and to use it
3 with Federal initiatives rather than just State and local in-
4 itiatives.

5 Now, it seems to me that the position of the Johnson
6 Administration has been totally different from that which
7 characterized the most recent previous period of American
8 history when a Federal Administration addressed itself vigor-
9 ously to solving the particular problems of people.

10 That last great period of social effort on behalf of
11 the depressed citizens of our country was the period of the
12 Franklin D. Roosevelt years. During those Roosevelt years
13 all sorts of solutions to the problems of people were proposed
14 but few involved education. Instead, they were largely econ-
15 omic in nature. It was during those Roosevelt years that the
16 national administration did things for the farmer; did things
17 for the unemployed man by creating Federal projects to give
18 him a job in the P.W.A. and the W.P.A.; did things for the
19 older person or the unemployed or unemployable person through
20 the beginning of the Social Security Administration. All these
21 kinds of efforts of the Roosevelt years did address themselves
22 to the problem of people, but because of the circumstances of
23 the problem of the times, a very low priority was placed on
24 education.

25 I think the only two education programs I can think

vt
1 of in those years were the Civilian Conservation Corps, which
2 had some educational component although it was mostly a job
3 enterprise, and the National Youth Administration. You find
4 a totally different picture when you come into the Kennedy and
5 Johnson years, and particularly the Johnson years -- the years
6 in which most of the action took place, even though many of
7 the ideas may have originated during the Kennedy years.

8 In those Johnson years, the major thrust of the new
9 programs to solve the problems of people has been on education.
10 This is especially true for the Department of Health, Educa-
11 tion, and Welfare, but it is also true for a variety of other
12 agencies in the Federal government.

13 One way to look at this development is with the
14 perspective that the total Federal expenditure on all forms
15 of education in the first year of President Johnson's incum-
16 bency in the Presidency was about \$5 billion. This year, the
17 comparable figure is somewhere near \$12 billion, greater than
18 a doubling of the Federal commitment to education.

19 That doubling is made up of a great variety of pro-
20 grams. Some of them were devoted to such matters as helping
21 higher education or strengthening various components of educa-
22 tion that have to do with international affairs or with de-
23 fense. But the major concentration was on education programs
24 newly enacted and devised to do something about the problems
25 of people who -- given traditional approaches -- can't seem to

vt

1 fit into America or whose problems the rest of America doesn't
2 seem to be able to solve.

3 What we have had in these Johnson years is an array
4 of diverse new enterprises, some of them administered by those
5 of us in the Office of Education; some of them administered
6 by the Office of Economic Opportunity (I cite as examples Head-
7 start and the Job Corps); some of them administered in the
8 Labor Department, where a program like the Manpower Develop-
9 ment and Training Act, with close to half a billion dollars a
10 year, retrains people so that they will be employable; some
11 of them administered in Housing and Urban Development, a
12 totally new department in the Johnson years with responsibility,
13 for example, for the program for Model Cities, each of which
14 has a major education component.

15 What I am saying is that the Johnson Administration
16 has come up with a whole galaxy of new approaches to using
17 education to make people successful in the American society.

18 Now, if you focus this down into the United States
19 Office of Education, and particularly into the last four or
20 five years, you come to a dividing line -- a line dividing the
21 period of responsibility of Commissioner Francis Keppel and
22 the period of my responsibility.

23 I came aboard as Commissioner in December of 1965,
24 and Frank Keppel left at that time. I think the great contri-
25 bution of Frank's years to the leadership of the office,

vt

1 and the contribution of the office itself was to bring about
2 the legislative program which in the subsequent years we have
3 had the opportunity to administer.

4 The great legislative breakthroughs of the first
5 session of the 89th Congress were the achievement of Frank
6 Keppel -- and, as he would certainly say, a good many others.
7 He took the lead in negotiating with the Congressional Commit-
8 tees in defining the details of these legislative enactments,
9 in working back and forth between the Administration and the
10 Congress, and indeed in working with a great variety of organi-
11 zations concerned about and interested in the Federal role in
12 education.

13 Among those organizations were the National Educa-
14 tion Association, the various Catholic groups, the organiza-
15 tions of higher education, and a number of others.

16 I think that it's very clear that it was Frank
17 Keppel's work, with support and interest from the White House
18 and from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare,
19 which brought about a whole new plateau of legislation for
20 which the Office of Education was responsible.

21 The major supports of that achievement are to be
22 found in certain large legislative enactments, and I think
23 perhaps the most significant of these was the Elementary
24 Secondary Education Act of 1965. That Act really brought the
25 Federal government into the affairs of elementary and

vt

1 secondary schools on a vigorous basis for the first time,
2 though to be sure there had been up to that point a number
3 of Federal enactments (such as the National Defense Education
4 Act or the various pieces of vocational education legislation)
5 which provided for Federal responsibilities related to ele-
6 mentary and secondary education.

7 It was only with the passage of the Elementary-Sec-
8 ondary Education Act of 1965, and its funding at a level close
9 to a billion and a half dollars in the same year that it was
10 enacted, that the Federal government was brought into the
11 affairs of the elementary and secondary schools in a broad,
12 coherent, truly significant fashion.

13 You find a somewhat different picture with higher
14 education in that the Federal government had been in the af-
15 fairs of colleges and universities for quite a period of
16 time, providing a great deal of research money to graduate
17 levels of education and providing some fellowship and student
18 support money under the National Defense Education Act. But
19 again, with the enactment of the Higher Education Act of 1965
20 you find a totally new reach on the part of the Federal govern-
21 ment in support of such matters as the training of teachers,
22 the library interests of higher education, and fellowships
23 and scholarships and loans; so that here again was a break-
24 through, although it was a breakthrough in an area more
25 accustomed to Federal initiative than elementary and

vt

1 secondary education had been.

2 I think that another observation ought to be made
3 here about the difference between the Federal role as develop-
4 ed through Frank Keppel's activities in elementary and second-
5 ary education on the one hand and higher education on the
6 other, and that is that most of the new money that would flow
7 from the enactments which Frank Keppel helped to get through
8 the Congress for elementary and secondary education could be
9 described as "change" money. That is, it was money aimed at
10 helping the States and local school districts bring about new
11 levels of activity, changes in programs, different kinds of
12 services. This money was not designed to pick up the going
13 cost of institutions as they were but instead to bring about
14 changes in those institutions so that they would be more up-
15 to-date and thus serve certain groups better (particularly
16 those children who happened to come from poor families.) The
17 objectives were institutional change, curricular change, organ-
18 izational change, with an idea to helping the elementary and
19 secondary schools meet the problems of modern America.

20 On the other hand, the higher education funding
21 embodied in the new legislation of the early 1960's was not so
22 much "change" money but instead a kind of bread and butter
23 support for the usual activities of colleges and universities.
24 The Higher Education Facilities Act, which during my years as
25 Commissioner has been funded in a major way, was developed as

1 a program simply to build buildings for colleges and univer-
2 sities so that they could expand. But this is not a change
3 enterprise in terms of new styles and methods of education
4 as much as it is a system for making available more education
5 of the same kind as existed before.

6 The same thing can be said of the student support
7 legislation that came in the early Johnson years. Programs
8 for student loans; for work-study support of students in col-
9 lege (that is, funds given to the institutions to cover jobs
10 that would enable some students to work their way through col-
11 lege); and educational opportunity grants, which were direct
12 scholarship assistance to students designed to make college
13 possible for students who otherwise couldn't go. Support of
14 these sorts of student assistance efforts did not represent
15 "change" money except in the sense that they were in major
16 part directed toward making college possible for a segment of
17 the American population which previously had been denied that
18 opportunity.

19 So there's that kind of change involved in the
20 education effort that we administer in the Office of
21 Education but not so much a change which involves new curriculum,
22 organization of the colleges, and the kind of thing I
23 had in connection with the Elementary Secondary Educa-
24 tion Act.

25 An interesting exception to this observation about

vt

1 change in higher education is the program called Title III of
2 the Higher Education Act, the developing institutions program.
3 This program devotes about \$30 million a year toward change in
4 a specific group of institutions, institutions that have not
5 reached their full potential, that have the capacity for change
6 but that need a little infusion of ideas and funds to be able
7 to make themselves more effective institutions.

8 But with that exception there is not a great deal
9 of "change" money in higher education.

10 While I've been observing that Frank Keppel's years
11 were years of developing the new legislation and getting it
12 in place, I think the two and a half years that I've been in
13 the Office of Education have been the years of the first im-
14 plementation of the programs which all this new legislation
15 made possible. And that implementation has involved numerous
16 internal changes in the Office of Education, a major reorgani-
17 zation and a whole series of new relationships with organiza-
18 tions and groups outside the Office of Education -- organiza-
19 tions and groups with which we became increasingly involved,
20 largely because the new legislation that we were trying to
21 put into actual operation created a whole set of new relation-
22 ships. During these two and a half years the back and forth
23 between the Office of Education on the one hand, and various
24 organizations interested in education -- including the various
25 State Departments of Education and a number of local education

vt

1 agencies, particularly the larger cities and the superinten-
2 dents of those larger cities -- this back and forth has grown
3 and grown and created a major burden of communications, a
4 major demand for a sort of diplomacy, in dealing with those
5 who are interested in the new Federal role in education and
6 with those who are suspicious of it, critical of it, and
7 worried lest this new Federal role in education somehow come
8 to be a controlling role.

9 To clarify what I mean by this whole new area of
10 relationships in which the Office of Education has been in-
11 volved, perhaps the best illustration is to say something
12 about our relationships with the States. The States legally
13 have the authority to operate elementary and secondary educa-
14 tion in the United States. That's a Constitutional matter
15 and there is no argument about it. I think the States have
16 been concerned that these new programs and the infusion of
17 funds that go with them might in some way diminish the role of
18 the States, might in some way seem to say that the Federal
19 government wanted to control education.

20 It was partly for that reason that a particular pro-
21 vision was written into the Elementary Secondary Education
22 Act of 1965. Title VI of that Act says that the U. S. Com-
23 missioner of Education is prohibited from engaging in activi-
24 ties -- and this is a paraphrase of it -- engaging in activi-
25 ties which would involve him in the control of the

vt

1 organization, the personnel, the curriculum, and other essen-
2 tial matters relating to local schools. In other words, it's
3 all right for the Commissioner to make sure that the funds
4 Congress makes available are passed on to States and local-
5 ities, but within the broad terms set by Congress he can't
6 narrow the limits so as to get into curriculum or personnel
7 or organization of the schools.

8 We have always felt that this was a wise and reason-
9 able prohibition; even if it had not been there I don't believe
10 that the Office of Education would have engaged in any
11 activities leading to control over those significant elements
12 which are essentially State and local matters.

13 But there is clearly some feeling on the part of
14 some chief State school officers that this danger still exists,
15 in spite of the legislation I cited, and I think that there have
16 been an interesting series of abrasions in our relationships
17 with the States over the past two or three years.

18 It's impossible to understand these abrasions with-
19 out understanding that in addition to responsibility for
20 administering the educational programs set up by the Congress,
21 the Office of Education has also had responsibility for ad-
22 ministering Title VI of the Civil Rights Act. We no longer
23 have that responsibility. It was removed from the Office
24 in the spring or summer of 1967, but for two years of my
25 administration and for a year or two of Frank Keppel's,

vt

1 that responsibility was directly in the Office of Education.

2 In order to carry through the responsibility for
3 Title VI, which says that no Federal money can flow to any
4 agency practicing discrimination, the Office of Education had
5 to enter into the internal affairs of States and local school
6 districts and had to ask all sorts of questions about pupil
7 assignment, teacher assignment, and organization of the
8 schools..

9 These questions were not asked in order to enter
10 into such affairs for purposes of educational change. They
11 were asked for the purpose of finding out whether or not there
12 was discrimination, as defined by Title VI. If there was
13 discrimination as so defined, it was the Office of Education's
14 business then to require local school districts to change the
15 discriminatory practices before Federal monies could be
16 allowed to flow.

17 But States, and indeed local school districts,
18 didn't always appreciate this fine distinction. Thus, deep
19 feelings were aroused as we had to work with local school
20 districts (in the South particularly) in getting them to
21 abandon the dual school system, since it was discriminatory,
22 and since funds could not flow while the residue of the dual
23 system still existed.

24 Those feelings were based to at least some degree
25 on the proposition that the Office of Education was

vt

1 interfering in local affairs, and thus we found, and still
2 find, I think, that there is a great deal of suspicion about
3 the Federal role in terms of its program activities.

4 The suspicions aroused by enforcement of Title VI
5 of the Civil Rights Act naturally and easily transferred
6 themselves over into suspicions about administration of pro-
7 grams. The States, for instance, have been critical of and
8 concerned about the efforts of the U. S. Office of Education
9 to evaluate education programs. We have made considerable
10 effort in the past several years to mount testing programs
11 which might give us some reliable information on what the
12 results were of the large new Federal investments.

13 By and large, the States have resisted our efforts
14 to get these testing programs started, feeling that these were
15 inappropriate exercises for a Federal agency to be carrying
16 out in local school districts, and as of this time, anyway,
17 we don't have in being a really comprehensive and effective
18 effort to get a clear, factual look at the effects of Federal
19 programs.

20 I don't want to blame our inability to do that
21 entirely on the States, because some of it grows from our own
22 shortcomings in being able to design and organize an effective
23 evaluation effort. But had the States been more cooperative
24 or had we been more successful in eliciting their coopera-
25 tion, whichever way you want to look at it, I'm sure we would
have had in being at the present time a better evaluation

vt

1 effort.

2 In connection with this relationship of the Office
3 of Education to the States, there's another very broad factor
4 that needs to be kept in mind. It is that the Federal pro-
5 grams which we now administer from the Office of Education
6 are categorical in nature. That is, they are not aid programs
7 over which the States have complete options. And the same
8 can be said of our programs that provide money directly to
9 local school districts.

10 Instead, these Federal programs have declared, pur-
11 poses, purposes set into the law by the Congress of the United
12 States, and for which money is appropriated in order to ac-
13 complish those purposes.

14 Now, there's a great deal of feeling on the part of
15 State officials in particular that a much more attractive form
16 of aid from the Federal government would be what is described
17 as "general aid" instead of categorical aid.

18 The argument of the States is that they not only
19 have responsibility for the operation and planning of educa-
20 tion within each individual State, but that they know best
21 what the needs of the State are and that therefore all the
22 Federal government should do is give the States some money
23 and let the States decide what is to be done with it; allowing
24 the States freedom to use it to pay teacher salaries, build
25 additional buildings, provide for additional materials and

vt

1 books, institute educational change, and pursue any other pur-
2 pose that the State might have in mind as advancing education.

3 The Federal government, on the other hand, has taken
4 the position (in devising these new legislative programs and
5 in administering them) that there are certain national prior-
6 ities in education; that these can be identified; and that
7 it's the business of the Administration and the Congress to
8 figure out what are the most important directions for change
9 in education and then to provide Federal money which will
10 bring the national priorities and the directions for change
11 together and allow the change to come about in terms of
12 national priorities.

13 A very good example of this is found in the largest
14 single elementary secondary education program which we ad-
15 minister in the Office of Education, Title I of the Elementary
16 and Secondary Education Act.

17 Title I creates eligibilities for Federal funds in
18 every school district in the land -- or practically every
19 school district in the land. And that program says, in ad-
20 dition, that these funds have to be used for the particular
21 purpose of improving the educational opportunities of children
22 who live where there are high concentrations of poverty.

23 Now, the Act doesn't restrict in any narrow way
24 what the local school district can do with t's money, but it
25 does say that the money can't be used to pay the regular bills

vt
1 of the school district even in those concentrations of poverty.
2 What has to happen is that the school district must pay its
3 regular bills for teacher salaries, buildings, and equipment,
4 and then use the Federal money for an add-on -- for services
5 over and above what it normally would provide. And it must
6 also continue to provide what it normally would provide at
7 the usual level, not cutting down on its local services and
8 substituting Federal money for local.

9 In other words, this money is "change" money, as I
10 said earlier: Money that can't be used just to relieve the
11 local taxpayer and money that is focused on the educational
12 problems of the children of poor people. This is the kind of
13 categorical aid which, it is argued by those who have advanced
14 these Federal programs, is addressed to a national priority.
15 And there seems to me to be a good deal of common sense in that
16 argument. The children who have been unsuccessful in school,
17 the children who have been ill-served by the schools, happen
18 to be the children who come from poor families; the places
19 where there are the largest classes, the least inexperienced
20 teachers, the smallest supply of textbooks, the leanest
21 school libraries and a variety of other features that you can
22 point to in the schools as they exist. These places are the
23 places where the children of poor families go to school.

24 The Federal government has taken the position that
25 it ought to focus its aid to raise the sights of those

vt

1 schools, to add on to their capabilities and perhaps to make
2 a higher proportion of those children successful in schools
3 than now is the case.

4 Or you can cite other examples of categorical aid:
5 Such a program as Title II of the Elementary Secondary Educa-
6 tion Act, which says this is money for library books and text-
7 books, and that's what it has to be used for. And if the
8 States would prefer to use it for science laboratory equip-
9 ment they are forbidden to do so.

10 In other words, there has been a system of prior-
11 ities set up, and we are in a position of administering cate-
12 gorical and not general aid at this time. The only general
13 aid administered by the United States Office of Education
14 that has any major impact at all is the program which provides
15 funds to what we call "Federally impacted areas." That is,
16 places where there are very large Federal installations, like
17 Washington, D. C. itself, or a place where there might be a
18 big atomic energy plant or an Army base. We recognize that
19 there are lots of children who show up in those places because
20 of the Federal installations, thereby imposing special burdens
21 on the local school system, and that we therefore ought to
22 provide general aid to those particular local school systems.

23 We administer a program of close to half a billion
24 dollars a year in connection with "Federally impacted areas."
25 Our view of it is that while Federal impact is a reality, the

vt

1 Federally impacted areas program has gotten out of hand, that
2 it's extremely popular in the Congress because it does bring
3 some direct general aid into a number of school districts in
4 many Congressional areas. The record will show that we have
5 tried regularly to reduce the level of this program and have
6 been unsuccessful in doing so. In fact, the President's re-
7 commendations to cut the program have been ignored by the
8 Congress for the past several years; and the Congress has in-
9 stead put in additional amounts of money.

10 Even in this very tight budget year that we're going
11 through right now, the Congress just passed a supplemental
12 appropriation a short time ago adding some \$90 million to
13 that program; and for the budget for Fiscal '69, again a very
14 tight budget year during which there has to be a \$6 billion
15 expenditure cut in the Federal government, the House of Re-
16 presentatives two weeks ago voted a \$138 million addition to
17 this program. So here's a good illustration of the Congres-
18 sional attitude toward that program even in a tight budget
19 year.

20 Another totally different aspect of the Office of
21 Education which ought to be mentioned in reviewing the changes
22 and experiences of the past two and a half years is the fact
23 that the Office has undergone considerable reorganization in
24 that period of time.

25 That observation needs to be said against the fact

vt

1 that in the latter few months of Frank Keppel's year the Of-
2 fice of Education underwent a total reorganization. At the
3 time that the major new educational legislation was going
4 through the Congress, there was a growing awareness both
5 in HEW and indeed in the rest of the Administration -- the
6 White House and the Bureau of the Budget -- that the then
7 organization of OE was not adequate to handle the new programs
8 about to be given it.

9 Thus there was a total reshuffling of the organiza-
10 tion of the Office in the summer of 1965. When I came here
11 that reshuffling had just been completed. Instead of having
12 a whole series of officials reporting to the Commissioner,
13 we had four new Associate Commissioners of Education, each
14 heading a major bureau responsible for major segments of the
15 program.

16 But during the time that I've been Commissioner
17 two new bureaus have been added to the four original ones
18 that were created in the 1965 reorganization. One of these
19 new bureaus was the Bureau of Education of the Handicapped,
20 which incidentally was added by the Congress over the ob-
21 jections of Secretary Gardner and myself. The education of
22 the handicapped is extremely popular on the Hill and has a
23 highly organized lobby behind it, and even though the programs
24 we administer for the benefit of the handicapped did not seem
25 large enough in dollars or pervasiveness to justify a bureau,
the Congress legislated one anyway.

vt

1 The second new bureau we initiated ourselves, al-
2 though I believe its initiation would have been supported by
3 the Congress. I speak of the Bureau of Education Professions
4 Development. This new bureau came about as the result of the
5 passage in June of 1966 of the Education Professions Develop-
6 ment Act, a piece of legislation designed to pull together
7 many of the Office of Education's training authorities in
8 order to make them more flexible and to give the Office the
9 capacity to support the training of all kinds of persons who
10 serve education -- not just teachers but administrators,
11 teacher aides, college personnel of all kinds, including ad-
12 ministrators in the colleges, and a variety of others.

13 Another element of flexibility contained in that
14 Act was the broadening of the kinds of organizations that
15 could receive grants for training purposes. Before the Act
16 was passed by the Congress and signed by the President, the
17 authority we had largely involved giving grants to institu-
18 tions of higher education. Under this new Act we can now give
19 training grants to local educational agencies and to States.
20 And this to me makes a great deal of sense in that it makes it
21 possible for those who use certain categories of personnel to
22 be directly engaged in the training of them, rather than to
23 have that training done by institutions that don't actually
24 employ them.

25 Having this new authority and having a year for

vt

1 planning it before the first budget appropriations on its
2 behalf were made by the Congress, we organized during that
3 year the Bureau of Education Professions Development. This
4 Bureau has now been placed in operation and staffed and along
5 with the Bureau of Handicapped is one of the six operating
6 bureaus in the Office of Education.

7 Another organization which has been added to the
8 Office of Education activities is the Institute for International
9 Studies. There's some background here which perhaps de-
10 serves mentioning. When President Johnson gave his Smithson-
11 ian Address in the fall of 1965 on international education
12 affairs, there followed a task force to see how the general
13 principles stated in his address might be really placed in
14 operation in the government.

15 I happened to serve on that task force, though I
16 was not yet Commissioner of Education. When I became Commis-
17 sioner in June of '65 the task force had just completed its
18 report, and the initial efforts were made to get the Inter-
19 national Education Act funded.

20 One of the new organizational efforts to be made in
21 connection with the International Education Act was to set up
22 within HEW a center for educational cooperation, and Secretary
23 Gardner decided that this center should not be located in the
24 Office of Education but should be established directly in the
25 Secretary's Office under the Assistant Secretary of Education,

1 Paul Miller, who came to HEW largely for the purpose of ad-
2 ministering the International Education Act and the new center.

3 But the Congress never appropriated any money for
4 the International Education Act, and the appropriations action
5 of the Senate in the fall of 1967 was simply to ask for an-
6 other study of the whole area of international education be-
7 fore any funding was provided for the International Education
8 Act.

9 So in order to provide some kind of a center for
10 international education affairs the Office of Education moved
11 during the winter of 1968 to set up this Institute of Inter-
12 national Studies. It is not large enough to be considered a
13 bureau in the Office of Education but it does have an Assis-
14 tant Commissioner in charge of it, Dr. Robert C. Leestma, who
15 came to OE from the State Department, and it provides a
16 focus for all of the international concerns in education of
17 the Office of Education. It administers four major programs.
18 The Foreign Language and Area Studies Program is at a level
19 of somewhere around \$20 million a year. The Teacher Exchange
20 Program accounts for about \$2 million a year, the Inter-
21 national Education Development Program for about \$1 million,
22 and training programs in the U. S. for AID participants for
23 about \$1 million.

24 In addition, the Institute carries, for the OE,
25 responsibility for providing program and recruitment services

to international organizations in the education field. It also supports the development of studies of foreign education as a service to the government and the academic community.

This new endeavor seems to me a very hopeful one.

As the Office of Education has tried to operate the new programs for which it so suddenly became responsible, and as it has been going through the development of a whole series of new "outside" relationships at the same time that it has had a reorganization within itself, it has experienced a major difficulty with what I would call the problem of coordination.

I see this problem of coordination on three different fronts: on the front of the Office of Education itself, on the front of the Federal government at large, and on the front of the ~~local school or State~~ local school district or State.

Let me talk about each of these separately.

Within the Office of Education itself, we have some 75, to use a round number, different programs which we administer. Each has its own appropriation; each has its own purposes set up by the Congress; each has its own funding; and each has in one fashion or another its own persons responsible for it and administering it in the Office of Education.

Now, these 75 different programs necessarily overlap in a great variety of ways, and they could make duplicative investments. There was also the possibility, it seemed to us,

vt

1 that they could make planned investments, that they could
2 exert greater impact by working together. So what has happen-
3 ed in the last two and a half years is that we started ad-
4 ministering all these new programs without very much relation-
5 ship between or among them and that in the last year or even
6 six months we've begun to develop internal coordination so
7 that these programs work together.

8 For example, we have begun to develop jointly
9 planned projects that pull the funds of Title III of the
10 Elementary and Secondary Education Act together with research
11 funds. Or we have developed agreements between the Bureau of
12 the Handicapped and the Bureau of Education Professions
13 Development. And those agreements are set up in such a way
14 that there's an exchange of information and an exchange of
15 policy papers and indeed a joint action on training programs
16 and support programs so that money from these two bureaus,
17 although administered under separate authorities, is brought
18 together in a coordinated way and does more good in the
19 local places where the money may be invested on the one
20 hand in improving services to the handicapped in the schools
21 and on the other hand in improving training in some higher
22 education institutions for people who will work in these
23 schools.

24 But I think we have a long way to go in the Office
25 of Education in bringing about coordination among our many

vt

1 programs. You can cite a number of areas in which our sev-
2 eral bureaus tend to have a considerable interest and you can
3 easily point to the fact that there is inadequate coordination
4 around each of those areas.

5 Take, for example, the whole business of early child-
6 hood education. This is an area of major concern and interest
7 for us because we are convinced that one of the ways that we
8 may overcome the handicap that children from poor families
9 acquire is to get to them earlier than the normal school years
10 and start building back the strengths that they have begun to
11 lose by even age four.

12 Now, the Bureau of Research is investing in and en-
13 couraging experiments in curriculum and in demonstration ef-
14 forts and in teacher training that might make preschool educa-
15 tion more effective.

16 The Bureau of Education Personnel Development plans
17 a major commitment to the training of people who will serve
18 in preschool activities of a variety of kinds -- not just
19 teachers, but teacher aides and curriculum planners and other
20 persons who might serve in special schooling arrangements for
21 the early years.

22 And the Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education
23 -- which administers Follow-Through, a special program design-
24 ed to pick up children who have had early childhood education
25 and make sure that it is not wasted -- has a similar interest

1 in knowing what's going on in early childhood education. In-
2 deed, some significant proportion of the funds of Title I of
3 the Elementary and Secondary Education Act administered by the
4 Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education is invested in
5 early childhood education affairs. And so it goes. We could
6 easily point I think to interest of other bureaus and agencies
7 in the Office of Education in early childhood education.

8 But we have no automatic mechanism to cause joint
9 planning and communication among all these parties interested
10 in that major topic. And we certainly have a certain amount
11 of duplicative effort and insufficient coordination of the in-
12 vestments and the planning that we are doing.

13 I think we ought to try to make a major effort over
14 the next year or so to do something about that.

15 Then if you broaden the problem of coordination out-
16 side the Office of Education you find very much the same kind
17 of problem as you reach into the rest of the Department of
18 Health, Education, and Welfare and indeed into the whole Fed-
19 eral establishment interested in one way or another in educa-
20 tion.

21 Using this same example of early childhood educa-
22 tion, there's no question about the concern for education felt
23 by the welfare programs and the interest they have in day
24 care centers for mothers, so that mothers can go get a job
25 rather than being on welfare -- there's no question about the

vt

1 interest of the Children's Bureau, another agency of HEW;
2 there's no question but what the National Institute of Health
3 is interested in child development and in basic research in
4 early child development and basic research in learning during
5 early childhood; there's no question but what all these agen-
6 cies right within HEW need to know about and coordinate their
7 activities with the early childhood education concerns of the
8 Office of Education.

9 And then you reach outside HEW and you find that the
10 largest single enterprise in early childhood education in the
11 Federal government has nothing to do with HEW at all, but is
12 Operation Headstart under the umbrella of the Poverty Program,
13 OEO. And the back and forth between HEW and OEO, although in
14 existence and although useful, is certainly far from perfect.

15 So that within the Federal government, again here
16 using just one example, there are tremendous problems of co-
17 ordination of the multiple programs that cut across each other
18 because they have certain common denominators of interest.

19 I think perhaps the best way to illustrate the prob-
20 lem of coordination in the Federal government is to go to the
21 third area I mentioned, the problem of coordination in local
22 school districts. And the best illustration is the large
23 city, because there's no large city within the United States
24 that doesn't have rights to very significant elements of many
25 many Federal programs. And yet, those large cities confront

vt

1 right within the Office of Education a whole system of separate
2 application forms, separate deadlines, separate evaluation
3 reports, and separate dates for making grants relating to
4 their elementary and secondary schools alone.

5 And then you get over into the rest of HEW and the
6 rest of the Federal government and those large cities confront
7 a confusing, inflexible, highly bureaucratized structure which
8 to them could not be better devised to make it impossible for
9 them to get the full benefit of the programs that exist.

10 It seems to me that the efforts of the last two and
11 a half years have been directed primarily at finding administrative
12 machinery at the Federal level, at the State level, and
13 at the local level to get at these problems of coordination.
14 It seems to me also that these efforts have been only partly
15 successful.

16 My view is that there is a real need for the consol-
17 idation of the Federal programs and that until they are con-
18 solidated under fewer authorities so that cities can deal with
19 one or two instead of six different agencies, these programs
20 are going to continue to have coordination problems of a major
21 kind.

22 We tried in the Office of Education to express our
23 response to this problem when we set up the Education Profes-
24 sions Development Act. Prior to that Act there were a half a
25 dozen different places you went in the Office of Education if
you wanted to get money for training purposes if you happened

vt
1 to be operating a teacher training institution. Now we have
2 set up one centralized agency within the Office of Education.

3 But that is only a small answer to a big problem
4 because there are still all sorts of Federal agencies which
5 make training grants for all kinds of purposes to an institu-
6 tion of higher education. Probably the Federal government will
7 never reach a single source arrangement, but consolidation of
8 legislation, consolidation of funding, and better coordination
9 arrangements at the Federal level can do a great deal.

10 I think that the next phase ought to involve con-
11 solidation of legislation, and in my personal view it would be
12 a great advance for the elementary and secondary schools in
13 the cities and elsewhere if the Federal government were able
14 to pull together much of its elementary and secondary educa-
15 tion support in a variety of categorical programs into a single
16 piece of legislation involving insofar as possible a single
17 state plan and the arrangements for sending monies from the
18 States through to local school districts in a single yearly
19 grant.

20 Whether that is something that can be worked out re-
21 mains questionable, because there are all sorts of special
22 vested interests, and one of the interesting examples of such
23 vested interests arises from the special groups who have par-
24 ticular rights in connection with segments of training money
25 - for example, the vocational education teachers, the

vt

1 librarians, the counselors, the teachers of special subject
2 areas who believe that they should definitely get an accustomed
3 amount of the training funds.

4 And there's an interesting question of whether the
5 consolidation of legislation and funding would then create a
6 situation in which these vested interests would tend increas-
7 ingly to try to pull that consolidation apart so that they
8 could protect their own preserves. This is one of the issues
9 that we face as we look at this whole business of possibly
10 making things simpler for the people we serve.

11 Shifting from extensive explanations about the prob-
12 lems we confront in elementary and secondary education, let me
13 spend a moment on the role of the Office of Education in higher
14 education. Perhaps a point to make here is that whereas the
15 Office of Education has the largest role in the Federal govern-
16 ment by a long shot in elementary and secondary education, it
17 shares with a great many agencies of government concerns about
18 higher education. I don't mean to indicate that it doesn't
19 share with others in elementary-secondary, but the balance is
20 different.

21 In higher education the Office of Education administers
22 perhaps a billion and a half to \$2 billion worth of programs
23 that have to do with higher education, whereas the Federal
24 contribution in that area is three or four or five times that.
25 In other words, we're a minority partner.

vt

1 But you look right within the Office of Education
2 itself and close to two-fifths of our annual budget is in the
3 realm of higher education. What this does is to place us in a
4 position of providing broad support in two major areas: one,
5 support for construction of buildings, and second, support for
6 fellowships and student aid of all kinds.

7 I have mentioned these in detail earlier in these
8 observations; so I'll simply say here that it seems to me the
9 Office of Education has more of an impact on the undergraduate
10 years of higher education and somewhat less of an impact on
11 the graduate years, although it does administer a major grad-
12 uate fellowship program, and that the other agencies of the
13 government tend to have more of an impact on the graduate years
14 and less of an impact on the undergraduate, although again
15 there are exceptions.

16 But the Office of Education in the years I have been
17 here has been increasingly a member of a major and growing
18 conversation in the Federal government about the appropriate
19 role of the Federal government in the support of higher educa-
20 tion. Involved have been the White House, the Secretary's
21 Office, a variety of agencies, N.S. F., N. I. H. and others,
22 the Arts and Humanities Endowments. This conversation kind of
23 came to a head in the budget planning for Fiscal 1969. There
24 was a strong feeling on the part of a number of individuals
25 concerned with higher education in government that the

vt

1 Federal government should go in for what might be described
2 as a general aid program for higher education in the Presi-
3 dent's Fiscal '69 budget.

4 The people who believed in this thought that the case
5 was clear that higher education was in serious financial
6 trouble, that all segments of it needed some kind of general
7 support, that indeed it was time to adopt new legislation
8 on this front. There were others who believed that whereas
9 the institutions of higher education across the country were
10 in increasingly serious financial trouble, that there was not
11 a clear line of policy to follow in how the Federal govern-
12 ment should help them solve that difficulty without doing
13 violence to the institutional structure of higher education
14 in the United States and that a good deal more planning and
15 thinking was necessary before a totally new program was
16 launched for the support of higher education.

17 This argument was settled by the President's Educa-
18 tion Message that came out in February of 1968 and that
19 directed the Secretary of HEW to conduct a study to discover
20 a new strategy for the financing of higher education in the
21 United States and to define a new Federal role in that fi-
22 nancing. At this point we should enter in this record the
23 statement from the President's Message:

24 "The programs I am presenting to the Congress today
25 are aimed at solving some of the problems faced by our

vt

1 colleges and universities and their students in the years ahead.
2 But accomplishing all these things will by no means solve the
3 problems of higher education in America.

4 "To do that, we must shape a long-term strategy of
5 Federal aid to higher education: A comprehensive set of goals
6 and a precise plan of action.

7 "I am directing the Secretary of Health, Education,
8 and Welfare to begin preparing a long-range plan for the sup-
9 port of higher education in America.

10 "Our strategy must:

11 -- Eliminate race and income as bars to higher
12 learning.

13 -- Guard the independence of private and public in-
14 stitutions.

15 -- Ensure that State and private contributors will
16 bear their fair share of support for higher education.

17 -- Encourage the efficient and effective use of ed-
18 ucational resources by our colleges and universities.

19 -- Promote continuing improvement in the quality of
20 American education.

21 -- Effectively blend support to students with sup-
22 port for institutions.

23 "Such a strategy will not be easy to devise. But we
24 must begin now. For at stake is a decision of vital importance
25 to all Americans."

vt

1 That study is going on as these observations are
2 being set down. It will become a firm recommendation sometime
3 in the fall of 1968 and hopefully will lead to a new plateau of
4 support for higher education on the part of the Federal govern-
5 ment.

6 One of the major arguments that will have to be work-
7 ed out as this study progresses is in answer to the question of
8 what the balance of Federal support should be as between insti-
9 tutional aid on the one hand and student aid on the other.

10 There are those who believe that perhaps the best way
11 to bring about institutional aid to solve the problem of the
12 individual institution's budget is to provide enough student
13 aid so that the institution can charge higher tuition and solve
14 its own budget problem.

15 There are those, on the other hand, particularly
16 those in the public universities and colleges, who think that
17 the proper route to solution of higher education's difficulties
18 is by some new form of direct aid to the institution which is
19 not necessarily collected from the individual student.

20 In any case, that study is now under way and should
21 represent useful progress toward allowing the next Administra-
22 tion to devise a totally new system of support for higher ed-
23 ucation.

24 The study is being conducted in public. Its draft
25 papers will be discussed with a variety of associations and

vt

1 individuals interested in the future of higher education. It
2 is beginning by analyzing all of the major responsible sugges-
3 tions that have been made for new forms of Federal involvement
4 in higher education.

5 It is being conducted under the leadership of the
6 Assistant Secretary of HEW for Program Planning and Evaluation.

7 Now, switching signals, both higher education and
8 elementary and secondary education benefit from and participate
9 in the results of the education research program administered
10 by the Bureau of Research in the Office of Education. This
11 particular bureau of the Office reaches across the full spec-
12 trum of concerns about education and doesn't limit itself to
13 any particular aspect. The Bureau of Research has a responsi-
14 bility, therefore, which is very hard to define since it must
15 select limited investment targets for limited funds. The
16 Bureau has received during my administration considerable
17 criticism from many sources and at the same time has attracted
18 the confidence of the Bureau of the Budget and the interest
19 of the Congress.

20 In the current year we received from the Bureau of
21 the Budget a 20 percent increase in the funding of the Bureau
22 Research, raising the total amount for which it would be respon-
23 sible from \$81 million to \$146 million. At the same time the
24 Budget Bureau asked for a major study of the priorities being
25 used by the Bureau of Research and a look at its planning

vt

1 capabilities and systems for developing those priorities.

2 That study is going on and I am sure will benefit the
3 administration of that Bureau and benefit the decision-making
4 process which sets the focus for the Federal investment in
5 research and education.

6 Obviously that investment in research has to focus to
7 some degree on basic research in such education-related disci-
8 plines as psychology and sociology and a variety of other
9 areas. In addition, it has to place considerable investments
10 in the results of that basic research activity. It has to
11 develop new programs and demonstrate them, and it has to carry
12 the cost of disseminating new programs.

13 It has to reach to preschool and post-doctoral
14 activities and everything in between. Therefore, it's an ex-
15 tremely comprehensive program. It's a program in which there
16 are many, many difficult choices, because it embraces the
17 whole world of education.

18 In order to bring additional clarity to this whole
19 problem of the role of research in education in the Federal
20 government, the President's science advisor this past winter
21 invited a special panel to take a look at education research,
22 not just in the Bureau of Research in the Office of Education
23 but very broadly across the United States.

24 That panel is chaired by Dr. Frank Westheimer of
25 Harvard University and is going vigorously about its task and

vt

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

will probably have some interesting recommendations for the President's science advisor sometime in the next year. Anybody concerned about the research function in education should certainly check in with the membership of the group.

Finally, let me mention one interesting area of concern which has continually come across my horizon during the several years I've been in the Office of Education. And that is what should be the relationship of the Office of Education to all the other education activities in the Federal government, and indeed the question of whether the Federal government would be better served by some kind of escalation of the Office of Education and some pulling together of the many, many education programs that exist around the government under a broader responsibility, perhaps by establishing an Undersecretary for Education, in the Department of HEW or indeed possibly a Cabinet Department of Education.

It's hard to know what the best solution to this problem is, but it seems to me that there are a number of observations that have to be made about it.

First of all is the fact that the Office of Education by itself now administers in dollars programs larger than those of eight Cabinet Departments. Its reach goes to every college and university in the United States and to every elementary and secondary school system, and a variety of institutions in between.

vt
1 It is the major Federal agency concerned with the se-
2 cond largest industry in this country, the largest being de-
3 fense. Therefore, it would seem sensible to make some major
4 reorganization.

5 Just in terms of leadership, the Office of Education
6 ought to be an agency which has the capability of attracting
7 a person like a John Gardner to its leadership. It's not now
8 that kind of agency. It's too low in the hierarchy.

9 Whether it should be within HEW or perhaps an inde-
10 pendent enterprise with Cabinet status outside of HEW seems to
11 me a hard question to answer. I think the measure of the
12 answer is really whether the interconnections with health and
13 welfare programs within HEW are sufficiently meaningful so that
14 the Office of Education ought to stay in that shop. My own
15 judgment is that those interconnections, while having some mean-
16 ing, are not meaningful enough to argue that there is a good
17 basis for keeping education within HEW. Consequently, if I had
18 to make a policy choice on the matter I would recommend that
19 the Office of Education become an independent governmental
20 agency with Cabinet status.

21

22

23

24

25