

institutional plans. Moreover, as the personnel move, so does the research project.

I therefore see no merit in separate advisory councils and titles as far as institutional grants for development are concerned except as they apply to the distinction between undergraduate and graduate education. Inevitably, such an approach will only increase the confusion of application processing and evaluation.

Incidentally, while I am in favor of the amendment which would orient such grants to the academic rather than the fiscal year, even greater benefits would come from (1) an amendment which would increase the timespan of the support where institutional development is at stake and (2) insist that notification for 1 academic year be given at least during the first half of the preceding academic year.

In regard to the first point, here again, the research grant provides a poor model for institutional development. Staff and curriculum development programs necessitate a longer time commitment for support if they are to be meaningful and have a significant impact.

Secondly, given the tight market in academic personnel, unless an institution can contact potential new staff members early in the year preceding their new contracts, chances are that such potential new staff will already be committed to their previous appointments.

All of this leads me to the more general point I would like to make in regard to Federal programs to develop undergraduate educational institutions: In a word, I believe it is now time for the Congress and the Office of Education to clarify for themselves precisely what they aim to do in this area and, correlatively, to establish some general guidelines for the applicant institutions in line with such general policies.

To date and understandably, leadership on the part of the Office of Education has not been too strong nor have the directions been too clear. I do not speak here, of course, of Federal control. Rather, it is a matter of thrust in regard to basic problem areas.

For my own part, it is axiomatic that qualitative differences among institutions of higher education are much more obvious, functional, and significant than is the case with elementary and secondary education. We are, after all, speaking of higher education. And it is a fact of life that, other things being equal, unless the student can meet the demands of such education, ability to pay and age have no bearing on his matriculation and graduation.

This, of course, is especially true of graduate education. Therefore, the Congress and the Office of Education must be clear about their aims in this area. Is the aim to develop new institutions? Is the aim to simply keep existing institutions going? Is the aim to level up and consolidate the current programs of such institutions? Or is the aim literally to expand and increase the quality of the existing institutions?

These are fundamentally different goals, however much they are interrelated.

There are over 2,000 4-year colleges and universities in this country. It is difficult to name more than a few hundred, and, as Professor Riesman has noted, there is a great distance between the head and the tail of the academic procession.

In other words, with limited funds, it will make a great difference where we put our money. I am not here to give you an answer to these