

tion. The National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children stated in 1966 and 1967:

"In distinguishing classrooms that favorably impressed our consultant-observers from those that appeared poor, the explanatory factor most frequently observed was the quality of relationship—the rapport—between teacher and child . . . In speaking of this ingredient, the observers were not alluding merely to the techniques of teaching . . . (but to) the subtle aspects of mutual understanding, commonness of purpose and warm human contact . . . If a crucial ingredient for changing the quality of education is the attitude of teachers . . . it follows that broad scale reorientation of teacher behavior should receive a high priority in the use of Title I funds."

Certainly the schools have relied upon the universities in the training of teachers, but often the relationship between the two has been limited with no follow-up plan developed. Universities have developed institutes to which teachers have come, but seldom have we had the opportunity to work with a group of teachers from one district over a long period of time. None of the legislation gives us the opportunity to initiate wide range programs.

The Teacher Corps portion of the Higher Education Act deals directly with the problem of staffing disadvantaged area schools. Otherwise that Act does not deal with teacher education. Yet, in the long run, America must depend on the universities as the primary source of trained teachers. Even the criticisms leveled against the educational establishment will not be answered significantly unless teacher training programs are included in any prospective innovations.

Perhaps it should be added here that many of us in the University have worked as consultants to business corporations and have watched the growth of non-university based programs in education. The Advisory Committee report mentioned earlier would strengthen non-university involvement in teacher training even more. Further, it is quite possible that professors themselves have strengthened the prestige of agencies other than their own universities. Ironically, government and university guide-lines inhibit us from accepting "over-load" pay from a government sponsored project on our own campus. This practice has benefited business corporations and newly developing research organizations. They can hire professors as consultants quite freely, while these very professors are not permitted to work with their colleagues on university projects and receive commensurate compensation. One either must work on a colleague's project sufficiently to warrant release from a portion of teaching load or he takes his "over-load" consulting time away from the university. In no small way does this prevent us from developing an all-university, interdisciplinary approach to critical educational problems. This also gives advantages to non-university organizations which are denied to the university. All of these ideas suggest that the Sub-Committee on Education has a responsibility to lend its support to the strengthening of the nation's universities. It is this committee to whom we look for leadership in making it possible for universities to better prepare educational personnel for the disadvantaged youth.

To this end we recommend that the Higher Education Act of 1965 be amended in 1967 to include a new Part D entitled *Strengthening University Teacher Training Programs*. This recommendation is designed to accomplish the following:

1. To enable universities to contract with agencies or organized groups, or otherwise engage in recruitment programs designed to discover potential candidates for teacher education programs, and to establish special programs designed to remedy deficiencies that usually prevent these candidates from meeting entrance requirements.

*Discussion:* It is difficult to tap resources within the deprived community. There are many youths who would like to enter teacher training projects, but cannot meet requirements. They need special courses to qualify them to begin the regular training curriculums.

2. To strengthen college and university training programs designed to train educational personnel for work in educationally deprived schools.

*Discussion:* Field work and internship programs could be funded as well as other innovative programs.

3. To encourage universities to take the initiative in contracting with Boards of Education in partnership ventures designed to concentrate massive university resources in a complex of schools constituting a district, provided that the joint projects serve the function of improving the total school situation, from community involvement to pupil performance, and contribute to the theory and practice of training school personnel.