

sional and subprofessional or semiprofessional, or whatever phrase you wish to use, which are also dealt with in the higher education bill title V.

Is there any way, in the design of these new educational careers, in which they are being related to each other to provide a ladder, a vertical ladder, so you can go from nonprofessional status to B.A.'s to M.A.'s, to less than Ph. D.'s, to your Ph. D., and also to provide a lateral ability from one vertical here to another related vertical, so you would fill in the interstices both vertically and laterally and close up the rungs of the ladder somewhat so a person can, by application and work and on-the-job training, work up all the way to the top of the professional ladder and cross over and get on another professional ladder, if he chooses to do so?

How are these programs, in effect, being related to each other?

Mr. HOWE. I think we would regard very sympathetically new programs suggested to us by higher education that would have the kind of effect you are suggesting here. The programs which would allow for the experience in the subprofessional category give some recognition for the experience and not necessarily require the person who is attempting to move from the subprofessional to the professional category to take a good many steps backward to pick up a lot of requirements for which his experience might substitute.

What is involved in accomplishing this is not only institutional but also adjustment by professions which set their own standards and acceptance by them of more flexible arrangements for entering the profession. Typically, professions have not behaved that way. They have tended to seek more rigidities in defining their professions than to seek flexibility.

We don't want to suggest any major crash program to change the profession. We want to back interesting experiments that will lead toward the flexibility you are talking about.

Mr. SCHEUER. Would it help—and, as I see it, a lot of these new careers and new degrees, degree designs, are sort of growing topsy—if somewhere in the Office of Education, there were a separate bureau or division of career development that would relate both laterally and vertically these new careers you are describing on a professional as well as subprofessional level to the full ladder vertically and horizontally? Is there not some need of coordination, some central agency that could relate all of these new careers to the whole world of subprofessional or professional group programs—a Bureau of Career Development to give an overall design and overall purpose, interrelationship to these new careers?

Mr. HOWE. We are considering some possibility of this kind. We are looking at the problem of administrative organization in the Office of Education related to the new act we are suggesting here. As we bring in wider authority for training and as we look toward what we hope will be increased funding for training purposes in 1969 and 1970, it is clear to me we have to make some administrative adjustments.

Exactly what they ought to be we are not zeroed in on, but I know we will be making some to get at the purpose you are talking about, whether in the form of a new bureau or some other arrangement, I am not sure.