

At the same time we are facing growing shortages in the postbaccalaureate fields such as the teaching and health professions.

We know that we are being trite when we say buildings must be provided in which to teach and teachers must be provided to meet the classes held in these buildings. We also know it is harping on an old theme to say that the richest nation in the world cannot afford to neglect its most valuable asset: human resources.

Nonetheless, space, personnel, and financial assistance to deserving students are three major problems of education today. To even hold our own, let alone to improve our position, will require large allocations of funds, with a substantial contribution coming from the Federal Government.

We are not unaware of the strain upon the national budget today, but we do believe the provision of educational opportunities for those who can benefit from them is of paramount importance and is the one area in which skimping must not take place.

To mention a few specific systems among the amendments, we believe a 75-percent Federal sharing in fiscal 1968 of section 2, title I, community service and continuing education programs should be continued. We wish to stress the importance of new ideas, of innovation in the fields of community service, and continuing education.

We would like to see this committee write clarifying language into the legislative history of this measure that would serve as a guideline for the Commissioner in implementation of several sections of this bill.

Our requests for clarification is brought about because of our interest in one of our Educational Foundation projects. The Educational Foundation since 1962 has had an experimental project which we call our college faculty program.

Its purpose is to search out qualified women who, for one reason or another, have been otherwise occupied but who are in a position to be trained to enter college teaching. This has been a small project, originally funded by the Rockefeller Brothers Fund.

It is now being supported by the association's membership and through solicitation of our friends. After our own screening of applicants we have assisted these women in finding the institution which they prefer for their particular field and have assisted them with grants.

These grants have varied in size depending on need and whether the applicant lives near a university, and so forth.

In the period 1962 to 1965 we supported the training of 125 women from 11 States. Well over 90 percent of these women are now employed in teaching, administration, or research at the higher educational level.

Because of this original success the program was extended to 12 additional States through the efforts of our own membership. In the first year of this extension 35 women are now in graduate school preparing for work in higher education.

Our present problem is to secure sufficient funds to make grants to even a reasonable proportion of those who apply to us for assistance.

Our query to this committee would be whether a project of this type operated solely by an organization such as our own could be