

many people went into the writing of these proposals. Why could these three agencies not adopt a common set of guidelines which would serve all purposes well? One joint site visit should suffice. By the time we finish an exercise of the kind I have just described, I sometimes think that the greatest threat to the survival of mankind—particularly the higher education segment of mankind—is not the hydrogen bomb but suffocation by the mountains of paper which must be handled in even the simplest proposal. Coordination of the effort of the several agencies involved in the same kind of project is one of our greatest needs.

On another front, the proliferation of agencies which control federal funds for the support of higher education makes it virtually impossible to plan and seek support for a massive and fundamental effort in teacher education or, for that matter, in any other phase of our programming. Although some improvement has been recognizable, we have yet to find a way to bring together all the funding agencies appropriate to major proposals. While education may be central to the solution of many problems which present themselves in our cities, they are not educational problems alone. Our social agencies, our psychological services, our health program, our housing, among many other factors, contribute to these problems and all must be coordinated if basic solutions are to be found. At the present time, may I reiterate, it is almost impossible to bring all of the concerned agencies together in support of a major proposal. I can not emphasize too strongly the need for coordination at the highest levels, and I suspect this must be accomplished through some form of legislation.

Again, I do not believe that the presently proposed legislation corrects a very real evil which has developed in our institutions, partly as a result of federal support programs. I refer to the practice of granting most federal money on the basis of projects involving a few people, or one individual. The need is for institutional grants, to be made within prescribed areas of activity, over which the institution will have much more control than is presently the case. In many of our institutions the professor is becoming a private entrepreneur. He is putting all of his emphasis upon his personal research and upon the acquisition of additional research monies. As a result, he is virtually independent of his institution or control by his administration. The by-product of this system is that the professor, in too many cases, is putting all of his emphasis upon the discovery of knowledge, usually in a very narrow field of study, and is backing away from the teaching function and from the application of his acquired knowledge to the solution of problems. May I urge you to consider the possibility that greater gains could be made in the long run if more of the grants were made on an institutional basis, thus leaving a certain amount of control over the expenditure of this money and over college and university personnel in the hands of the institutions. Again may I revert for an example to the problems of our cities. As I indicated earlier, these problems are so complex and so many-faceted that the isolated project approach is relatively ineffective. Ten isolated projects are equally ineffective unless overall planning is done by the institution and the problem attacked in some kind of unified manner. The institution which is devoting its attention to the study and solution of urban problems can do a better job if research and program monies come to that institution directly rather than to several members of the faculty or several groups of faculty members on the project basis.

Lest I be misunderstood, may I hasten to add that I am not proposing that the federal government lift all controls over the expenditure of its funds. I would oppose this vigorously. However, I believe the general controls and accounting could be maintained and at the same time more positive results could be obtained through the institutional grants system. It seems to me that the institutional grants procedure would minimize special program accounting and control problems, while providing a more effective tool for promoting the utilization of university and grantor support in producing an excellent program. Such institutional grants should be based on some share of the university's total effort, as evidenced by its accounting for its functions. Detailed program accounts could be used as a measure of total effort in specific directions and would serve as a basis for determining eligibility for and the amount of grants. Once awarded, such support should be available for us without restriction except as to general purpose. We in higher education would hope that a system of block grants may be developed in such areas as education, service programs, and scientific research. In the longer term, it would be our view that the institutional program should become the general base for academic grants, thus increasing the university's