

EXHIBIT 3

Distribution of awards for institutions receiving 95 awards for 1966-67¹

Name of institution	1967-68	1966-67	1965-66	1964-65	1963-64	1962-63	1961-62	1960-61 ²
Stanford University.....	85	95	17	18	14	23	23	26
University of California at Berkeley.....	85	95	13	12	10	14	14	12
University of California at Los Angeles.....	85	95	18	15	7	12	12	7
University of Colorado.....	80	95	12	18	5	16	19	14
Yale.....	85	95	23	15	5	0	0	0
University of Florida.....	80	95	20	21	15	14	13	12
Northwestern.....	85	95	15	10	19	18	9	3
University of Chicago.....	85	95	23	23	22	23	11	28
University of Illinois.....	85	95	21	12	19	22	23	13
Indiana University.....	85	95	29	22	22	17	21	30
Johns Hopkins.....	75	95	17	22	21	14	7	16
Harvard University.....	85	95	19	12	0	0	0	0
University of Michigan.....	85	95	2	12	14	21	21	27
University of Minnesota.....	85	95	28	18	14	19	19	28
Washington University (St. Louis).....	72	95	26	15	12	12	12	13
Columbia University.....	85	95	16	11	7	9	6	11
Cornell University.....	85	95	15	14	27	21	18	10
University of Rochester.....	72	95	25	17	20	10	16	11
University of North Carolina.....	85	95	15	11	14	19	18	27
University of Oregon.....	75	95	33	23	28	22	25	26
Pennsylvania State University.....	80	95	17	8	4	7	9	5
University of Pennsylvania.....	85	95	18	12	13	9	15	20
University of Texas.....	85	95	15	17	17	23	22	14
University of Washington.....	85	95	17	6	18	11	22	29
University of Wisconsin.....	85	95	36	20	12	22	27	19

¹ The numbers of awards for the years 1967-68, 1966-67, 1963-64, 1962-63, and 1961-62 were taken from compilations sent out by the Office of Education. The numbers of awards for the other years were compiled by this office from lists of awards by fields published by the Office of Education.

² Figures are not available for 1959-60.

EXHIBIT 4

NDEA, TITLE IV—PROPOSED CORRECTIVE LEGISLATION

In order to achieve more effectively the purposes of the Act, it is recommended that it be amended to require the Office of Education to follow the procedure set out below in allocating and approving fellowships to institutions:

1. The total number of fellowships for the year would be allocated among states according to a two-criteria formula. This formula should reflect the need, state by state, for training college teachers; so, the two criteria would be:

First, the number of bachelor degrees awarded by all higher institutions in the state in the most recent year for which data are available, since this reflects the flow of students who need teachers.

Second, the per cent of the state's college teachers in bachelor degree institutions who do not have the Ph.D., or appropriate terminal degree, since this reflects the need to upgrade the training of teachers now in college positions.

Using this formula a figure would be determined for each state which would be announced as the maximum number of fellowships that could be allocated.

2. The maximum number of fellowships that any single institution could receive would be announced as a single figure, which would be no more than one per cent of the total number of national fellowships.

3. Institutions would be invited (as at present) to submit proposals by academic department or program. These proposals would be evaluated by panels selected from the appropriate fields as at present. The Office of Education would then determine the number of proposals to accept with the total number of fellowships kept within the maximum by state and by institution. Because of the maximum and the possible failure of institutions to propose a sufficient number of approved programs it might be provided that the office of Education should carry over to the following year any unused funds for fellowships. For example, if fellowships fall 300 short of the allocation for the year the total available for all states in the following year would be increased by 300.