

Dr. MARLAND. I think it is also an educational instrument and belongs in education.

Mr. GIBBONS. Is it a program, though, that should be controlled by the elementary school people or is it one that should be controlled by the higher education people?

Dr. MARLAND. I wouldn't care. It could be either way, just so it is managed by educators. We happen in our situation to have a very good relationship with the three institutions that we work with in Pittsburgh—Carnegie Tech, the University of Pittsburgh, and Mount Mercy College—all equal participants, and each training upward of 50 youngsters a year, coming in at the sophomore level, going to junior level and graduating.

The authority, the responsibility, the initiative in our case happens to rest pretty much with the public schools, but by agreement with the colleges, the man who directs it, for example, is our man, and it could be just as good and just as workable if the man who runs it is their man.

But there has to be freedom to exercise initiative. The institution that is to run this program ought to be the institution that receives the money. We have had no major difficulties with the community action program on Upward Bound. It is a good process. It is compatible. But it is not particularly relevant.

Upward Bound is an education program and deals with youngsters who are underachievement, who are poor, who are three-time losers and wouldn't get into college without this program. It happens that last year's graduating class of 40 at Carnegie Tech has 39 now in college and succeeding. It is paying off. It is a good investment. It is sound and it is 100 percent educational.

Mr. GIBBONS. Let me ask you about the Neighborhood Youth Corps program now. This is operated by the Labor Department. Some of them operate within your schools and some operate without your schools.

What do you think the Congress should do about the Neighborhood Youth Corps program?

Dr. MARLAND. I think it should maintain it. It is somewhat different from education and, therefore, I say it is logical, if Congress so views it, to leave it where it is, legislatively, in the Department of Labor and OEO, the combination.

It is essentially an opportunity for relevant work experience for young people. We try to make it for those in our schools also an educational experience. We built in quite a bit of counseling. We built in quite a bit of work related to the teaching and learning of the child.

For example, one going through the vocational program will go to work in that and work in a print shop, if we are going to be printers, or work at typing if they are going to be stenographers, or they will work at custodial work or painting if they are in that field.

But we don't think it is primarily an educational program. It is essentially an opportunity for young people to earn money, do relevant work, and stay in school. It, I think, could be funded in the way it is now being funded and remain perfectly right.

Mr. GIBBONS. I don't want to monopolize this discussion from other members of the committee.