

Landmark legislation for higher education

"Congress curbs busing," read the headlines last week. What Congress actually did, in the words of Health, Education and Welfare Secretary Elliot L. Richardson, was pass a bill that is "truly a landmark in the history of higher education."

The omnibus bill, on its two-year trip to the President's desk, did pick up some strange riders—a constitutionally questionable 18-month delay of contested court-ordered busing and a \$2 billion program to help communities desegregate elementary and secondary schools. But basically, the Education Amendments Act of 1972 is about higher education.

With the President's expected signature, the bill authorizes more than \$19 billion to be spent during the next three years. On a complicated basis, every institution of higher education will be eligible for a share of \$1 billion per year to be used as it wishes. Of this, 45 percent will be given to the schools on the basis of the number of students attending who receive Federal aid. Another 45 percent will be distributed according to the amount of Federal student aid money each school receives. The remaining 10 percent will be based on the number of graduate students enrolled. For those institutions in severe financial trouble, the Commissioner of Education will have \$40 million to be used as emergency grants.

Student aid programs already in existence will be extended for three years and a Student Loan Marketing Association will be created to buy, sell and hold student loans and increase the amount of guaranteed loans a student can borrow. Half-time students and students at accredited postsecondary vocational schools will also become eligible for Federal aid.

The bill provides for matching grants to states that increase their appropriations for scholarships based on need and authorizes \$50 million per year for new scholarships. On a three-year basis, \$850 million will be used to help states design, establish and conduct postsecondary occupational educational programs. Another \$275 million in matching grants will be used to establish new community colleges and expand existing colleges.

In the true omnibus fashion, the authors of the bill have attempted to provide something for everyone. Veterans, for instance, should find it easier to get into college. Those schools that increase their veteran enrollment by 10 percent and maintain a full-time office of veterans affairs will receive \$300 per year per veteran with an extra \$150 for each veteran in a special remedial



R. Guillumette Picture

program. The bill also makes funds available to state and local agencies for furthering Indian education and for developing ethnic heritage studies programs.

Any graduate school or public institution that discriminates against women in enrollment or employment policies will be ineligible for Federal funds. With the exception of military academies, all public colleges and universities will have to become coeducational within seven years if they want to continue receiving Federal money.

In addition to making funds available to almost every institution of higher education and every student who cannot afford the cost of his education, the bill also establishes a new educational research agency. The National Institute of Education, within HEW, will study educational questions with special emphasis on the learning process.

... recommendations for higher education

One group, the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education in Berkeley, Calif., is already studying these problems—especially the question of future finances. The commission predicts that by 1980 higher education will cost \$51 billion a year. This is based on a 50 percent increase in enrollment and a 3.4 percent increase in cost of student per year. Federal funding may eventually provide as much as 60 percent of this money, but the remaining 40 percent will have to come from tuition, fees and state and private financing. Filling this gap seems unlikely considering recent economic decline, inflation and the financial problems that many universities are already facing.

This week in San Francisco, Clark Kerr, chairman of the Carnegie Commission, released a commission report with recommendations on how higher education can help itself. The report, *More Effective Use of Resources: An Imperative for Higher Education*, was released at the meeting of the Associ-

ation of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges. It will be published this month by McGraw-Hill.

The report explains how the rate of increase of total annual expenditures of institutions of higher education can be reduced in the 1970's by 20 percent. By 1980 the expenditures could level off at \$41.5 billion instead of the predicted \$51 billion per year. The first step, the commission says, is to reduce the total number of years of student training. Many programs could be accelerated by reducing the number of reluctant attendees (students who attend college more because of social and parental pressure than because of personal preference). These reductions should cut expenditures by at least 10 percent.

A more effective use of resources could take care of the other 10 percent reduction. For example, the commission suggests halting the creation of new Ph.D. programs except under special circumstances, and concentrating Ph.D. training and federally funded research in fewer institutions. Consortia could be established among institutions and some could merge.

The report recommends that campuses be kept at a minimum effective size with more educational alternatives off-campus through open universities and credit by examination. Student-faculty ratios could be reduced in some cases without a resultant loss in teaching quality. Also, the commission says, faculty teaching loads should be reexamined. Some institutions require that instructors put in 18 classroom hours per week. Others require only six.

The commission, however, warns against cuts in necessary maintenance, cuts in library expenditures for books and journals and cuts in student aid without at least making loans available.

The commission's final recommendation is that "higher education should undertake internally the constructive actions necessary to get more effective use of resources and not wait for less constructive—and sometimes destructive—actions to be required because of external initiative." □