

STATEMENT OF DR. THOMAS F. JONES, PRESIDENT, UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

For some time now a number of institutions of higher learning in the South have been disturbed about the allocation of fellowships under Title IV of the National Defense Education Act of 1958. There can be little doubt that the more prestigious institutions of our nation have been favored. The recently announced allocations for the academic year 1967-68 indicate some evidence of a trend away from the imbalance in the awards, but it is apparent that unless corrective measures are taken, the more prestigious institutions will continue to be favored at the expense of those of us who are striving to develop into graduate schools which meet the needs of the regions we serve.

According to the U.S. Office of Education, the objectives of the National Defense Graduate Fellowship Program are to increase the numbers of well-qualified college and university teachers and to develop and expand the capacity of doctoral studies nationwide. Admittedly, the program has increased the nationwide output of well-qualified college and university teachers and helped to develop and expand the nationwide capacity of doctoral studies. It is doubtful, however, that the current methods of administering the Act are the best and most appropriate for the purpose of promoting a wide geographical distribution of doctoral programs, *a purpose which is notably absent from the Office of Education's statement of purposes and objectives* in its correspondence regarding these fellowships of this past year.

The major cause for concern is the disparity between the relative output of baccalaureate degrees in each state and the percentage of total NDEA Fellowships awarded. The attached tables illustrate both this disparity and the gap between the percentage of awards and the percentage of population by state. It is apparent that the awards are not being made in an effort to achieve the wide geographic distribution as originally intended by the legislation. In fact, for the academic year 1966-67, 25 of the institutions ranked top in terms of size and prestige each received 95 fellowships, or about 50 per cent of the total awards. This year, these same institutions will be receiving a total of 2,064 fellowships, or 34.4 per cent of the total. In addition to the stipends paid directly to NDEA fellows, it is worthy of note that support money in the amount of \$2,500 is provided for each student. While we are delighted to see graduate education as a whole supported, we must note that the distribution of fellowships and support funds in such a disproportionate manner cannot help but make these already prestigious institutions larger (but not necessarily better) and further aggravate the already undesirable gap between them and those of us historically in less fortunate circumstances.

One of the most alarming indications is that at least until 1969-70 all institutions will receive "*not less than 75 per cent*" of the number of fellowships allocated for initial use in 1966. Such additional allocations will be made on the basis of each institution's application for 1966 fellowships and *will not require a new application.*" (The underlining is mine.) The big question, of course, is in what manner the Director's Office of NDEA Title IV makes free use of "not less than 75 per cent." This year's awards indicate strict adherence to this clause. Administration of the Act under these conditions inevitably has the tendency to enlarge the strong institutions instead of developing the less strong.

It would be unrealistic, indeed, to make too much of comparisons in this manner. However, the question is not whether we are as strong as so-and-so, but more importantly, are we or are we not worthy of support?

We are not only worthy of support, but we, the rapidly emerging institutions, *must* be supported in developing our graduate schools. We, most of us, are removed geographically from the prestigious institutions. Because there is no strong positive witness of record to graduate study, our young people think in terms of completing the baccalaureate and taking a job, instead of going on to graduate study. *The percentage of those who continue to graduate school is far below national averages.* Furthermore, those who go away tend to stay away and thereby do not contribute to the development of our backward economy. Strengthening of our graduate schools will rapidly correct both of these regional problems. Our schools and colleges will be better staffed and our economy will have a fighting chance to move into the national mainstream.

The next question, then, is whether the existing method of distribution is fulfilling the original purposes of increasing the number of persons preparing for and entering professional careers as college or university teachers and to expedite their training, encouraging the development and full utilization of the