For example, new types of personnel are needed to plan and administer new multipurpose programs at State and local levels, such as regional economic or resource development projects, model cities and neighborhood centers programs.

The combination of skills needed successfully to plan and carry out such programs requires great sophistication concerning our governmental, economic, and social institutions and system.

But, unfortunately, there are all too few places where such education can be obtained at the present time and all too little effort is being made to recruit and educate students for entry into these challenging new careers.

Legislative responses: To help meet this need, President Johnson, in his March 17, 1967, special message to the Congress on "The Quality of American Government," recommended two legislative proposals—companion bills—the Education for the Public Service Act and the Intergovernmental Manpower Act.

Together, these bills would provide a vital and much-needed impetus to increasing the number and quality of trained personnel in local, State, and Federal service.

Together, the two bills would support education prior to entry into public service and training following entry on duty in State and local government service.

Fellowships could be provided for up to 3 years of graduate-level training, as well as for short courses offered either by universities or Government-operated training programs.

While we are not commenting on the proposed Intergovernmental Manpower Act today, we also strongly endorse that bill as recommended by the Civil Service Commission.

With respect to HEW's part of the assignment—the Education for the Public Service Act—President Johnson has said:

> This legislation has a single clear goal: to increase the number of qualified students who choose careers in government.

Title XII would do this by substantially improving and extending the educational resources of our universities to develop, expand, and improve education for the public service, primarily at the graduate level.

Grants under the act would support training and retraining of faculty for public service teaching and research, development and testing of new approaches to curriculum content and teaching methods, organization of special short-term or regular session advanced study institutes for those preparing to practice their basic professional, administrative, or technical skills in the public service, and development and teaching of public affairs as part of other programs leading to graduate degrees. And, through fellowships, it would provide interested students with the financial means whereby they could afford to pursue this interest.

We believe that the proposed Education for the Public Service Act would fill a need not now met by the different and highly specialized educational assistance programs.

The bill would focus on the demands for planners, managers, and providers of governmental services and those involved in legislative processes who are required to have both an extensive knowledge of

systems and procedures unique to public service and an understanding of the way Government works.

It would also provide an "overlay" of graduate study in public affairs and public administration for those persons whose professional training is in law, engineering, medicine, education, architecture, or in one or another of the academic disciplines needed for planning and administering an extensive range of professional, scientific, and technical governmental programs.

First, the bill could be used to establish strong regional centers for general public service study or for one or another of its functional specialties.

These centers could, for example, offer programs in such fields as public works management (already such a program is underway at the University of Pittsburgh); the training of science administrators (five such programs have been started with funds from NASA but more are needed); management of environmental pollution control activities; education of city and county managers; organization and administration of antipoverty programs; and special multidisciplinary programs in the fields of economic, social, and physical urban development.

Such centers could well involve consortiums of two or more universities located in adjacent areas, capitalizing on the specialized resources of each.

Second, studies could be undertaken to determine the optimum mix of 2-year, 4-year, graduate and professionally educated staff. Manpower shortages can be partially alleviated through more effective use of scarce and highly educated personnel. Reassignment of those portions of their work not demanding their highest skills to subprofessionals and technicians probably offers one of the most efficient and most individually satisfying ways for upgrading Government service.

Third, grants could be used to support research and investigation into the kinds of educational programs most useful to State and local governments and the best methods for providing them.

In the field of public administration, for example, there is wide belief among local, State and Federal administrators that many of the courses offered in the universities are not as relevant to the problems of contemporary government as they should be.

Fourth, experiments and demonstrations in curriculum combinations and specialized educational programs among many widely different academic disciplines are needed for the development of modern government managers, most of whom are drawn from technical, professional, or scientific disciplines.

Such experiments and demonstrations could well include study more relevant to the real problems of government through use of practitioners as guest lecturers, adjunct professors, or field work directors. These might include judges, social workers, city managers, tax, health, and welfare officials, transportation authorities, State and local budget directors, legislators, councilmen and civic leaders.

There would also be advantage in developing field experience as a requirement for a graduate degree in many programs where it is not now included.

Fifth, studies could be undertaken, and demonstration projects tried, to develop and test better integrated graduate and undergradu-

ate programs. Education for public service at graduate levels should be geared to either undergraduate or graduate courses in one or another of the major professions or technical specialties.

For example, economists seeking public careers might be given concentrated graduate education on public economic policy, resource allocation among government programs, application of econometrics to urban problems, and so forth.

Sixth, there is real need for research, experimentation and innovation in methods for preparing teachers in graduate programs in public affairs and public administration.

How can professors best keep abreast of rapidly changing governmental and managerial systems and procedures?

Are there advantages to frequent interchange of teachers, researchers and practitioners in the fields of public service?

How can such programs best be organized, utilizing both the practical work experience available in government service and the scholarship and detachment available on the campus?

I could go on with this list, but the items mentioned give ample illustration of both the need for and possible avenues toward better education for the public service.

I do not want to imply by this listing that the bill would give any stimulus to fragmentation in teaching and research related to public affairs. Quite the opposite—the present compartmentalized efforts within our universities need to be brought together in new organizations or coordinated programs just as all governments are coordinating their attacks on the stubborn problems of poverty, disease, ignorance, disability, and unemployment among all levels and among a variety of agencies.

The authorizations for graduate fellowships in part B of the bill, like the improvement grants and contracts authorized in part A, are also needed to satisfy unmet needs among the existing programs of Federal support for graduate or professional education.

Primary emphasis under this bill should be given to potential public service employees trained in the social sciences, law, and other fields which now receive little or no Federal aid but from which many of the most urgently needed program and staff personnel must be drawn.

Among such disciplines are economics, sociology, political science, history, the behavioral sciences, law, and architecture. But there is also a need for graduate public service education as an "overlay" for other fields.

Such Federal assistance would provide another year on top of the basic professional, scientific, or technical preparation. These programs would help produce people prepared for more efficient and effective practice of their profession in government employment.

The emphasis which various disciplines should receive in terms of opportunity for graduate public service education will vary both by numbers needed by governments and the duration of the fellowship.

In some instances, relatively short courses of a month or two or even up to one academic year may be adequate. In others, 3 years of graduate instruction will be needed. For example, expert opinion believes that civil engineers seeking public service careers should have at least a full year's study in public finance, public administration,

the interrelationships of physical, economic, and social planning, and similar courses.

Lawyers seeking public service careers may need relatively short courses. Political scientists, students of public administration, economists and sociologists seeking new solutions to such old and difficult problems as excessive fragmentaton of local government, more equitable tax bases for competing jurisdictions, more effective local policy-making and better planning, organization and execution of local government services, and so forth, could well profit from a full 3 years' graduate education—the maximum authorized in the bill.

The education for the Public Service Act together with the Intergovernmental Manpower Act, if enacted, could contribute greatly to the quality of administration in State and local governments.

The emphasis on development of modern personnel practices and training to meet the needs of rapidly expanding and changing government services is of particular merit to those of us in Federal agencies administering grant programs.

We are, of course, fully dependent on the quality of State and local personnel for the achievement of the great national purposes embodied in the Federal grant programs, which you in the Congress have helped to erect.

Thank you, Madam Chairman. I would be happy, together with my colleagues, to discuss any questions the committee may have.

Mrs. GREEN. Thank you very much, Mr. Simpson.

As I understand it, your recommendation and the administration recommendation is that this act along with the Intergovernmental Manpower Act go into effect in fiscal year 1969.

Mr. SIMPSON. That is correct.

Mrs. GREEN. I don't find myself in disagreement with anything you have said and I think the goal is noble and the need is very, very great.

But I have real trouble in resolving the conflict between the current draft policy which is going to take all of the college graduates, and all of the first- and second-year graduate students, and the recommendation for a new graduate program to try to lure more people into areas where there is an obvious shortage of highly trained people.

How do we reconcile this? On the one hand the Government says, "We don't want you in college, you can't stay there, sorry, brother, you are going to be drafted."

And on the other hand we say we desperately need more highly trained people so we will give grants to institutions, we will give fellowships to individuals, we will pay stipends to try to lure more people into these areas which are neglected.

How do you resolve that very obvious conflict?

Mr. SIMPSON. I think I would have to agree with you, Madam Chairman, it is an obvious conflict.

I would hope we could find some method, in consideration of these two national policies, to resolve that conflict. If, indeed, we pursue the policy of priority draft of all college graduates and graduate students——

Mrs. GREEN. And the priority draft is the current policy.

Mr. SIMPSON. It is the current policy. It will have a sharp impact on this program and on all of our graduate education programs of the Federal Government without any question.

On the other hand, I would hope that we could start with this bill. I think the bill is 10 years late in coming. We urgently need it. We could start at least with the development of the programs which badly need to be developed in our graduate schools and in the interrelationship of curriculum at the graduate level and the undergraduate level. From all that I read and from all that I experience in employing people coming out of the relatively few schools of public administration and public affairs that we have at the present time, there is much need for more and more improvement in the kind of training and the extent of training for public affairs that is given in our universities today.

I do not know that I can add anything. Do you have anything you can add to that?

Mr. HUITT. I would say simply that even in wartime we have to go ahead planning, we have to go ahead starting things. There will be some graduate students. If this is worth doing I don't think we ought to put it off 2 or 3 years simply because there is a war on.

I recognize the conflict that you mentioned and Mr. Simpson does.

Mrs. GREEN. If this is worth doing and I think it is too, I am in complete agreement with the purpose of the bill and everything that you have said, but if it is worth doing, isn't it worth considering a change in the draft policy which defeats the purposes for which this legislation is designed?

Mr. HUITT. All I can say, Madam Chairman, is that you have brought your case to the wrong court. I cannot do anything about that.

Mrs. GREEN. I want you to know I will bring it to any court that is available, even the court of appeals.

Mr. REID. Madam Chairman, on the same point.

Mrs. GREEN. Yes, Mr. Reid.

Mr. REID. I will merely add I am in 100-percent agreement with our chairman on this. I would merely ask you what is HEW prepared to do vigorously, privately or publicly, to deal with what many consider to be a catastrophic judgment with regard to our graduate students?

This is not a time, it seems to me, for silence by HEW. Presumably you do not wholly concur with the announcement this past weekend and I would be very much interested to know what you are prepared to do about it.

Mr. HUITT. I think, Mr. Reid, we ought to wait on the departmental policy made by the people who are charged with that. I do not think I should shoot from the hip this morning.

Mr. REID. I can only add that Dr. Pusey and a number of others have called attention to it.

I would call to your attention a letter in the New York Times this morning. I do not think any serious educator feels that the present policy will not have relatively catastrophic impact not alone on graduate programs but equally on graduate students teaching in undergraduate programs.

What is your sense of concern and urgency about it, speaking personally, if not officially?

Mr. HUITT. I have a very great sense of concern about it. After all, I have spent 20 years as a graduate professor. This problem hits me about as close to home as it does anyone.

I think, at the same time, it is not possible for me, in this job, to speak as an individual. I think I must let the proper people in HEW do the things which they will want to do. I don't think, in a word, it is proper for me this morning to make a statement for HEW.

Mr. REID. Do you think HEW will be making a statement?

Mr. HUITT. I cannot say, Mr. Reid.

Mr. REID. I can only urge you to press strongly for something that I am sure is consistent with what you would like to see.

Mr. HUITT. That I will do.

Mr. REID. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

Mrs. GREEN. I have one question on the bill.

On page 111, part B, section 1211, is the procedure for selecting the fellowships to be the same as in the NDEA, the allocations made to the college and university and the college and university chooses the individual who is to receive it?

Mr. SIMPSON. That is correct.

Mrs. GREEN. Congressman Quie, do you have questions?

Mr. QUIE. Yes, I do.

First, where do you get the information on the $87 billion per annum now from State and local investment? [1] I had the occasion yesterday of working some of these figures and for 1965 and 1966 the State and local expenditures were $95 billion, according to the U.S. Bureau of the Census in the Department of Commerce, and this was a chart book on "Governmental Finances and Employment for 1967."

I am always interested when the Federal Government comes up with different figures.

Mr. SIMPSON. I believe, sir, these figures were taken from the report of the Committee for Economic Development in its report on "Modernizing State Government."

Mr. QUIE. CED?

Mr. SIMPSON. Yes.

Mr. QUIE. What year is that?

Mr. SIMPSON. 1967. The report was published in 1967.

Mr. QUIE. That would be for the same year or do they have all the figures?

Mr. SIMPSON. May I check that and put it in the record for you?

Mr. QUIE. It could be that they used the year of 1964–65 which would make the difference.

Mr. SIMPSON. That could be, yes.

Mr. QUIE. How much money do you expect to spend in this program if you get it from the Congress for succeeding fiscal years? I see you have $10 million for the first one for your seed money.

Mr. SIMPSON. We have not, of course, got any clearance on this from the Bureau of the Budget, but in our own projections we would see, after $10 million for the first year, a substantial jump, particularly in the fellowship money, in the second year to a total, under part A and part B, of almost $26 million. Then it would go on up for the third year. The part A, improvement grants, would level off at $10 million from the second year on.

The funds would go up again on the doubling of fellowships to

[1] "Manpower in State and Local Governments 1965 and 1975." U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1966. Refers to fiscal year 1965.

the third year to about a total of $41 million in the program and then level off there.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Would you yield at that point?

Mr. QUIE. Yes, I will yield.

Mr. ERLENBORN. In one of the earlier hearings I asked for a memo from the counsel for HEW as to the application of the law, the number of which I have forgotten at the moment, which requires that when new programs are suggested and bills are introduced they be accompanied with an estimate of the cost over the next succeeding number of years.

This was not done as to this title or other titles of this bill.

I wonder if our subcommittee has received a memo from the counsel for HEW.

Mrs. GREEN. No.

Mr. ERLENBORN. My point is that I think the law requires that such estimates be given along with the bill, and this was not done.

Mr. SIMPSON. I can enter into the record sir, the statement that I was just reading from here but I should emphasize that this has not been cleared by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Are you familiar with the law I have reference to?

Mr. SIMPSON. Yes, I am.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Why was it not complied with when this bill was filed?

Mr. SIMPSON. That I cannot answer, sir.

Mr. ERLENBORN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. QUIE. You mentioned that the bill is to establish strong regional centers for general public service study.

How many centers are you going to have?

We all of a sudden became aware of the establishment of centers after it is an accomplished fact. I would like to know what your plans are.

Are they going to coincide with the regional education laboratories or the R. & D. centers? Or will you have a new grouping of regions?

Mr. SIMPSON. I think what we had in mind here is the relatively small amount of money that would be available under the part A grants and contracts for improvement. We have a difficult thing of weighing a relatively few number of centers, yet we want to get a geographical distribution.

The bill requires a geographical distribution in making the money available for developing centers for this kind of education. At the same time, we want to be sure that they are strong centers, that there is a high quality of program developed within them.

We have no preconceived notions as to just what kind of regional pattern would emerge. We would hope that in the administration of the bill, if enacted, we would be able to locate, on a dispersed basis around the country, at least 15 or 20 regional centers that could serve the needs.

When we look at some of the information we receive about the needs of State and local government for trained personnel, particularly for generalists in the field of public administration, we have noted that in a number of areas of the country, and I think the southwest is a case

in point, there are very few schools offering a graduate program in public service or public administration training.

It will not be possible, with the relatively small amount of money available, to be able to put such a center in every State, but perhaps where the States have common problems physical resource development is one such common problem we could develop a center that would capitalize on the special expertise in the faculty of several universities in an adjacent area. Thus we could establish quite a number of good, strong regional educational centers that could offer both general preparation for public administration or training in a specialized field.

Mr. QUIE. As I understand you, the centers would operate more akin to the R. & D. centers which have been assigned special subjects or areas in which to conduct their research work rather than the regional educational labs which are really generalists to take in anything.

Mr. SIMPSON. I would hope some would be generalists and some would be both. In the University of Kansas, there is a good training program for the education and development of city and county managers, and it draws from all over the Midwest.

I would consider that a strong regional center for that kind of generalist training would be useful in several areas of the country.

On the other hand, you might find that it would be wise to develop in one of the Rocky Mountain State universities a special curriculum for resource development, the administration of conservation programs something of this nature, where in schools other than the school of public administration they would have an expertise that could be brought together in a special program for the development of administrators of those kinds of government programs.

Mr. QUIE. What is it about public service in general that needs a special program now and the expansion of the centers?

I know people in private industry are short of planners and the kind of individuals we are speaking of here. They are in education although I imagine education would also be considered as a public service, and therefore, probably would qualify under this.

Mr. SIMPSON. No. The bill specifically provides that this program should be used for the support of education where there are not now other programs. Education as a field has a number of support programs at the present time.

Mr. QUIE. Then the University of Kansas could not get any support because it already has one on—

Mr. SIMPSON. No, where there is training for the public service, they could. I was thinking of the field of education programs, *per se*. They are not excluded but the bill suggests that the Secretary should give particular emphasis to those areas in which there is not now available any Federal support for higher education.

Your analogy with business is a very good one, really, because we have a great many more and better organized schools of business administration in this country than we have schools of public administration.

The two fields are in many ways comparable but with the special problems of public administration, the lack of numbers of schools, the difficulty of recruiting people into public administration, and the

difficulty of finding financial support for graduate education in the field of public administration, a lot of the better students who might well go into the field of public service instead go to schools of business administration or to other graduate schools where support is available because it is not available in this particular field.

Mr. QUIE. What do you mean where support is available?

Mr. SIMPSON. Available from Federal assistance.

Mr. QUIE. Why is it not available from Federal assistance at the present time? I know there is a specialized one for public service but is there not a general enough authority already so that we will say the same assistance could be given a program of training in public services?

Mr. SIMPSON. There are many different Federal programs for assistance for training and for graduate education but they are mission-oriented. Very often that mission is quite narrowly defined.

There are few, if any, that give the kind of general support where a graduate student can select the field that he wishes to pursue in his graduate education.

This bill fills a gap in that it does provide for general support for public service education. There are two kinds of programs authorized. One is the development of generalist—people like city managers, county managers, the management intern types we have in the Federal Government, or the development of the "assistants to" concept where you are training generalists in urban administration or county government administration.

Then on the other hand, we need what I refer to in the statement as an "overlay" of training in public administration and public affairs for people profesionally or technically trained in another field who are going into government service but who would be far more effective practitioners of their profession if they knew more about government and how government works.

Mr. HUITT. May I comment, Mr. Quie?

Mr. QUIE. Yes.

Mr. HUITT. I think there is another kind of student that is not mentioned here who will not be a city manager or any other kind of professional who has chosen a field. He is the sort of generalist who may become a staff member to a Congressman, a mayor or a governor. He may work on a staff like mine or may actually run for office himself. He knows he wants to get into public affairs but he is not sure he wants to be a public administrator.

These students come to professors all the time. They say "What can I do?" At the present time, they go into law, which means they spend 3 years taking training, some part of which is relevant, much of which is not. Or they can become graduate students and become a Ph. D.

The problem with a Ph. D. is that it is a research oriented degree. It is frequently process-oriented or behavioral oriented.

To a lot of people who take Ph. D.'s in political science, for instance, public policy is just an output. They don't care what the public policy is at all. To this person who wants to get some training, some kind of master's degree, let us say, or some kind of program setup which will acquaint him with the system, its problems and with the problems of policy, can be very useful.

Now you say, why do you need some kind of special thing to get people to do this?

Well, professors are not the most likely to change of any group in the country. There has to be some kind of incentive. So far as the kids are concerned, there has to be some visibility to this program. You have to be able to say here is a public affairs course that gets you into a certain kind of life. There has to be some recruitment for it.

After all, the graduate department recruits all over the country just like a professional football team. If you don't have somebody trying to get students for this kind of thing, then they will go into political science or economics.

Again, the student needs first job assistance. I know in the Department of Political Science we will take care of students for their jobs—get them teaching jobs. The attitude of most graduate professors is, that if a kid goes into public service he has been lost—you have wasted your time on him.

I don't know of anybody who is trying to get kids started in a job of this kind. So I would say this is the ideal use of a categorical grant. You recognize the need. You encourage somebody to do something about it. You get him started.

In due time I should think a program like this could be phased out and it could be handled in the ordinary operations of the university. What you try to do now is to get some people to do something which they have not been doing, which is to set up an interdisciplinary kind of approach with the idea they will turn people out for public life which I think is a noble act.

Mr. QUIE. Do you think we ought to get the idea established well enough in 5 years so that we could phase it out?

Mr. HUITT. I would hate to set a time ahead of time.

Mr. QUIE. If you don't, it will last forever. It will probably last forever, anyway.

Mr. HUITT. No. I think the record of our department shows that we try to move away from categorical approaches—categorical grants—to general programs such as we have done in health and such as I hope we will do in higher education in time, where we will give help to institutions without its being categorical.

It seems to me that the purpose of the categorical grant is short-run—to encourage people to do some things that they are not now doing.

Mr. QUIE. I know you are trying to phase out of the Higher Education Act—the academic facility acts—evidently by your recommendation.

Are there other areas of special training that are not being recognized as public service or is this the one now that needs the most help?

Mr. SIMPSON. I think it is the most urgent one, sir. That is the constant plea you hear from administrators in the Federal Government as well as those in State and local, an urgent need for trained, highly educated personnel. For example, a circular came across my desk the other day from the New York State Health Department. They were looking desperately for an assistant commissioner in the administrative office to do planning for them under the new Comprehensive Health Planning Act.

This kind of talent requires a very broad knowledge of public health administration, plus the kind of skills in cost-benefit analysis one gets

in the basic study of economics. They were circularizing the whole country, apparently, trying to find that kind of talent.

Mr. QUIE. Do any States have programs of this nature, either fellowship or assisting the training centers?

Mr. SIMPSON. I think there are one or two State legislatures that do provide funds to their own State universities for the development of curricula in the field of public service but they are much too small for the need.

Mr. QUIE. Could you find out what they are doing, the amount of program expenditures and all?

Mr. SIMPSON. I will be glad to do that.

(The information requested follows:)

The most current, comprehensive information on State support for public service education dates from 1961. Most State universities and a number of private universities (e.g., Harvard, Princeton, Syracuse, Pittsburgh, Southern California) do offer some degree of financial assistance to able but needy graduate students who are seeking to prepare themselves for careers in the public service. However, the U.S. Office of Education is unaware of any earmarked State support for institutional or curriculum development in the field.

Aside from these programs operated by and through the universities, the State of New York conducts what is probably the only program operated directly by a State government. This is the Herbert H. Lehman Graduate Fellowship program conducted by the Regents Examination and Scholarship Center, State Education Department, Albany, New York, which awards some 90 fellowships annually. A description of this program will be found in *Fellowships in the Arts and Sciences*, Tenth Edition, 1967–68, American Council on Education, p. 35.

A copy of the 1961 Office of Education survey, *Graduate Study in Public Administration* is attached.

Mr. QUIE. Just in round numbers, it seems to me, that of the total money expended in domestic programs the Federal Government comes up with about two-fifths and the local and State governments about three-fifths. So they must have the financial wherewithal to do this. They can't be as close to being broke as we are.

How about private foundations? Are there many private foundations that do work in this way?

Mr. SIMPSON. There are a few but not really very much that are doing work in the field of public affairs training, public administration training.

Mr. QUIE. I was thinking of the Bush Foundation inMinnesota as one which has funded that sort of thing. Do you have information on who the private foundations are?

Mr. HUITT. The Eagleton Foundation did a lot of that through Rutgers University. The Ford Foundation for a number of years financed the National Center for Education and Politics.

I think we should make a listing of the foundations.

Mr. QUIE. You could make a listing and include some explanation of what they are doing. When you laid out this program I hope you benefited from the experience of private programs and State programs rather than just walking on the Mall and coming up with another idea.

(The information requested follows:)

The Foundation Directory (third edition, 1967) published by the Russell Sage Foundation, lists only three foundations active in the field of public administration, six in the field of citizenship, and ten in the field of government. The number of foundations listed as active in the following closely related fields are: Civic

improvement—3; community planning—7; law—5; and political science—4. The amount of foundation assistance available specifically in support of graduate education for the public service, however, is extremely limited, since few, if any, of the foundations are engaged in the direct operation of graduate fellowship programs of this nature.

Some of the best-known related programs that have been conducted with foundation help in the past include the Southern Regional Training Program in Public Administration, the Congressional Fellowship Program of the American Political Science Association, and the Eagleton Foundation program at Rutgers University.

Among the principal foundations that have been concerned generally with strengthening and improving the public service through education would be included in the following:

The Carnegie Corporation of New York.
The Danforth Foundation.
The Samuel S. Fels Fund.
The Ford Foundation.
The Government Affairs Foundation.
The Hayes Foundation.
The McKinsey Foundation for Management Research, Inc.
The Rockefeller Foundation.
The Rockefeller Brothers Fund.
The Russell Sage Foundation.
The Twentieth Century Fund, Inc.

Mr. HUITT. I think there is plenty of precedence for this. I mentioned the program in practical politics the Eagleton Foundation has. The American Political Science Association offers congressional fellowships which have had a profound effect not only on staff work on the Hill, but also on the teaching about the Congress of the United States in the colleges and universities of the land. So there has been a good deal done on this by private people.

Mr. QUIE. Probably on some Congressmen, too.

What do you plan on for the stipends you are going to pay these fellows? I see that is wide open on this bill.

Mr. SIMPSON. The plan is to pay the same as we are paying on most of the higher education support programs. For the first year it would be $2,000 stipend plus a small dependents' allowance. This would move up, I think, in $200 or $400 increments in the second and third years.

Mr. QUIE. Could you put this in the record?

Mr. SIMPSON. Yes; we will put this in the record.

Mr. QUIE. And the stipend for the dependents. How about the institution itself?

Mr. SIMPSON. There is support for the institution for each individual that would be enrolled under this program. The amount that I think Commissioner Howe mentioned the other day that the Office of Education would put in for this is $3,500 per student, per year.

(The information requested follows:)

	1st year	2d year	3d year
Basic stipend	$2,000	$2,200	$2,400
Dependent's allowance	600	600	600
Institutional support	3,500	3,500	3,500
Estimated academic year total	6,100	6,450	6,800
Summer stipend	400	400	400
Dependent's allowance	120	120	120
Estimated summer cost	520	550	580
Estimated total cost per year per student	6,620	7,000	7,380

Note: Estimates based on past experience with NDEA title IV fellowships. Average number of dependents is estimated to be 1 for the 1st year, 1¼ for the 2d year, and 1½ for the 3d year.

Mr. QUIE. Those are all the questions I have, Madam Chairman.

Mrs. GREEN. Congressman Gibbons?

Mr. GIBBONS. I think you have an interesting idea. I want to explore it a little more.

How many finished products each year would you turn out?

Mr. SIMPSON. On the fellowship program we would hope, if we could start with the full $10 million authorization, we would turn out somewhere between 800 and a thousand per year and then gradually increase that up to 3,000 or 4,000 per year.

Mr. GIBBONS. What do you think the national need is in this year? The 3,000 or 4,000 would be all under your 5-year projection. What period of the national need is that?

Mr. SIMPSON. I think it would make a substantial contribution to the national need but by no means meet the national need.

Mr. GIBBONS. Do you mean less than 50 percent or more than 50 percent?

Mr. SIMPSON. I think it would be less than 50 percent in terms of the need.

Mr. GIBBONS. Those people who would receive the fellowships would come from two categories. One would be from college students who just went on and continued their education. Then they would also be from, let us say, people who had gotten out in the field and gotten a little rusty and needed some upgrading.

How would you divide this?

Mr. SIMPSON. That second category as you described it is in the other bill, the Intergovernmental Manpower Act. In it there is a provision of grants to State governments to award fellowships for training after people had been employed.

Mr. GIBBONS. So these are all——

Mr. SIMPSON. These are all preentry-type fellowships.

Mr. GIBBONS. You don't go back and take any rusty ones that come up?

Mr. SIMPSON. No; that is in the other bill.

Mr. GIBBONS. Couldn't some of this work be done under a cooperative education program? Would it not be a good idea to let some of these college students get out and get a little practical experience along with their training?

Mr. SIMPSON. I think that is an excellent idea. It would be authorized in the contracts authorized in part A. Particularly the idea of internships appeals to me.

I would like very much for our graduate schools in public administration and public affairs to develop cooperative work relationships with governments in the area where they place these people in internships.

Mr. GIBBONS. Internships got a kind of nasty connotation around Congress a couple of years ago. They seemed to be a little too relaxed and really not businesslike enough.

I am talking about a cooperative education program where a student goes out and gets an actual hard job to do it, and does it.

Mr. SIMPSON. That is what I mean by internships.

Mr. GIBBONS. The internships we had around here were sort of drifting, people wandering around.

Mr. SIMPSON. Let me talk of my personal experience. I majored in political science and public administration both in my college and graduate work.

In the little college I went to the college ran the bureau of municipal research and the municipal personnel system. Under the guidance of the head of the department, and some of the faculty in the department, we were assigned to city jobs. I worked in the city assessor's office and I worked awfully hard on assessment problems in city government.

It was a very practical and a real work experience in which one learned a great deal about tax problems, the administration of taxes at the local levels of government. This is the kind of thing I think we need much more of. There is altogether too little of it done.

Mr. GIBBONS. I agree with you.

You talk about the regional centers. About how many regional centers do you think you would establish under this program?

Mr. SIMPSON. It is very difficult to know until we see the applications that come in from the universities. I would suspect that in the first year of the program we would have to start rather slowly and we might have only 15 or 20 such regional centers.

We might in addition to that, where there are particularly appealing, from the point of merit, innovative programs being started, support others that would not necessarily be regional centers. Where there are good programs and there are some experiments with curriculum being made, maybe with other professional schools or other graduate departments in the university, support what I call this overlay kind of training to prepare technical specialists for public service.

Mr. GIBBONS. I have been looking for a type of skill that would be applicable to both the business and public service. Would it not be better if people were trained together?

Mr. SIMPSON. Some universities are experimenting with this as you know. They are combined into schools of administration, as they are sometimes called, where they are giving curricula in business administration and in public administration.

There is a good deal of interchange in the content of the instruction given in such graduate schools.

On the other hand, there are very specialized courses that relate to governmental service as distinguished from business. Marketing is a major problem, for example, in the graduate curriculum in business administration. This is not a problem in governmental administration.

Mr. GIBBONS. Don't you think a governmental person ought to have some—particularly a college level person, that goes right straight from college to governmental service, ought to have some exposure to these problems that the profit end of our society has?

Mr. SIMPSON. Very much so. I could not agree more. The teaching of management in our graduate schools of business administration has many elements which are directly applicable to the principles of management in government administration.

Mr. GIBBONS. But the whole problem of the economy-making profit is something that every governmental administrator ought to have some appreciation of and formal training in that area if he is going

to make qualitative decisions about how much of this should be done in the public sector, and how much should be done in the private sector.

Mr. SIMPSON. He definitely needs to have that understanding, I agree.

Mr. GIBBONS. Would it not be a good idea to encourage these adjuncts of schools of business administration rather than separate programs?

Mr. SIMPSON. I would like to see further experimentation on the idea of combined schools of administration with certain curricula outlined for those who want to pursue a career in business administration, but within the same school other curricula for those who want to pursue a major in public administration.

Mr. GIBBONS. Do you think you could do this under this act?

Mr. SIMPSON. I think we could.

Mr. GIBBONS. That being your view, you would attempt to try to do that rather than to try to set up separate schools where the students might be isolated?

Mr. SIMPSON. I think we need to do both. I think we need to do some experimentation with both approaches.

Mr. GIBBONS. I often find people in business have very little understanding of government and vice versa. There is a tendency to overspecialize in colleges.

Mr. SIMPSON. That is correct. You probably know of the Brookings Institution seminars, short seminars, they give to business leaders and government leaders jointly reviewing their administrative problems.

Mr. GIBBONS. That is all I have.

Mrs. GREEN. Congressman Reid.

Mr. REID. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

I would like to ask just one general question both of Assistant Secretary Huitt and Assistant Secretary Simpson touching on an earlier point here.

I increasingly feel like I am living like Alice in Wonderland these days. I have no question on the validity of your program or the articulate character of your presentation or, indeed, the need.

But I do have very strong, serious questions on another point. First, we seem to be starting a program for which there may be no students. Second, if we have students there is a very real question whether we will have any funds, which leads me to the third question. I, for one, have felt very strongly that the administration was making a serious mistake in cutting education as drastically as it is now cutting it and in its lack of attention to urban crises and so forth. My question, therefore, is this: Is it wise to start a new program when we have cut, according to the administration request, higher education facilities by five-sixths, title I of elementary and secondary by 54 percent, and other programs?

And the scale of priorities, is there any reasonable prospect that we will either have students or funds and is this a priority that should be started now unless it can be fully supported particularly when we are cutting back on a wide range of other programs?

I know this is a difficult question but I think increasingly we are witnessing a situation where the administration is starting programs and then drastically cutting them back in almost every area.

This does not lead one to have total reassurance about a new program.

Mr. SIMPSON. I think my only answer to your question, Mr. Reid, is that even a little bit of money, relatively, to get started with this program would do a lot of good in terms of beginning the buildup of graduate education in a field that is terribly in need of it.

You talk about urban problems. I could not agree more. I think the greatest problem we will have in the Federal grant programs, let alone the problems that the cities themselves have, and I am referring here to the neighborhood center programs and model cities programs, is finding the planners and the administrators. These are the people who can bring together in a proper balance, in accordance with the priority needs within the city (and these have to be city people), an efficient and effective program for overcoming the further decay and decline of the inner city. It is so urgent that even if we start such training in only a dozen or 20 places we have made a tremendous net gain in this country.

I am sure that while the war is on, the program will have to start slowly. But maybe that will make for the best buildup in our universities in preparation for the kind of graduate education needed for the problems of cities and State governments.

Mrs. GREEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REID. Certainly.

Mrs. GREEN. I would like to add a footnote on this Alice in Wonderland situation.

In the war on poverty and in the model cities program it seems to me that governmental policy is to turn the program over to "the poor" and this means if you wear a white shirt or have gone to college you don't qualify to administer the program.

So why should we train administrators if this is the case?

Mr. SIMPSON. It had been true, I think. But in the amendments that were made, if I am corrct now in recalling this, in the Economic Opportunity Act this past year, we put back the regular leadership structure at the local level of government in both planning and administering the antipoverty programs.

Mrs. GREEN. The OEO guidelines do not indicate this.

Mr. SIMPSON. There is a need to have the beneficiaries of the program involved in the planning and in the administration, but that, in turn, makes all the more important that we do have expert administrators working side by side with them to make the program work effectively.

Mrs. GREEN. But the struggle of those people who want to get control of the program is only for the paying jobs.

Mr. SIMPSON. This is true.

Mrs. GREEN. So they disqualify the highly trained administrator.

Mr. SIMPSON. I really hope that there will emerge out of this a balance of trained administrators in the career service working side by side with the leaders and the poor so that together they can have programs that are effective and that are truly responsive to the needs of the poor.

Mr. HUITT. May I say one thing in regard to Mr. Reid's question? Two points, sir: I believe, in the first place, we do need to go ahead even if there is a war going on. We need affirmation in a time like this. This is kind of like the question of whether you should have a child when a war is going on. I had my first child when I was in the Navy and it was good to me to think that there would be a republic after the war. There are things to be done and you go ahead.

This is a small enough amount of money so that it has the virtue that you cannot cut it drastically. It is not big enough to cut drastically.

Secondly, I think, to support Mr. Simpson's point, a little bit of encouragement and help in this field will go a long way because this kind of thing is beginning to catch on anyway.

In Wisconsin, for instance, under the prodding of the Republican Governor, the department of political science has started a program of this kind—a separate department.

There are other schools that are moving in that direction. So this is a case, I think, where a little bit of seed money will bring a big harvest.

Mr. REID. I certainly thank you, Mr. Simpson and Secretary Huitt, for your answers which I think are fair and to the point. Clearly we do need many more public administrators. There is a shocking shortage of urbanists and they are badly needed.

Let me turn the question back once more, Secretary Huitt. I think what disturbs me is not what you say but the whole drift of the present administration.

We seem to not worry about public works. We have, not the largest bill, but one of the largest ones in our history. We are going ahead with supersonic aircraft even though we are not permitting Americans to travel very much. No real cut in farm subsidies; $4 billion for highways. You could mention others, or one might differ over where you could cut. But what disturbs me is that there seems to be a lack of awareness downtown of the high importance of education.

The one thing we must not cut back is education. Could you comment as to what can be done, in your judgment, to change the priorities to focus on the imperative needs here? What can you do and what can the Congress do?

I think there are many of us who will support education but it makes it awfully difficult if we fight for a program and the next year you come up here and you slash it to ribbons, not by your direction, I am well aware. But is there not some way we can more clearly point out the priorities of education and that this is not the time to cut it by 50, 60, 80 percent, or whatever the figure is? What can you say that will reassure this committee on this point? Because I would have to say that I think the administration's assessment of priorities is very faulty as regards education.

Mr. HUITT. I think all I can say is that I am in the job and this is administration that I like most because my priorities are very much the same as yours.

Within the administration we push our priorities. The President has the task ultimately of deciding what priorities there shall be for the executive branch in the message and in the budget that it sends up.

Now I cannot suggest what you can do, but in this partnership, Congress certainly is not without resources. When we bring recommenda-

tions here, they are as recommendations and Congress does with them as it can.

Mr. REID. Do you see any concern at the top level of our government that we are seriously cutting education?

Mr. HUITT. Yes, sir; I think that there is. I think the President cares very much about this. I think he has a record as a supporter of education and health which is surpassed by no President in my time. I think the President is very deeply concerned about these matters.

Mr. REID. Why do you by five-sixths the higher education and elementary and secondary education by 54 percent?

I agree that the President has fought hard for these programs but he has not fought as hard to support them.

Mr. HUITT. I am not privy to all the things that the President takes into account. I am a participant in this, too. I am partial as you are. I have a set of values which goes this way. He has the job ultimately of deciding the priorities.

Mr. REID. I do not want to pursue the question any further. I appreciate the sensitivities of it.

Do you think it is wise public policy, war or no war, to start these education programs which I think have merit, and then a year or 2 years later cut them on the order of 50 to 80 percent?

Mr. HUITT. I have no comment on that, Mr. Reid.

Mr. REID. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

Mrs. GREEN. Congressman Burton.

Mr. BURTON. I could save a lot of time by merely incorporating the remarks of my learned colleague from New York, Mr. Reid. I share all of his concerns.

I have read some of this material with interest. I shall probably support the program, but I suspect little is going to be done in the anticipated future in this area whether or not we authorize the legislation.

Mr. SIMPSON. I think, sir, that I can only comment on that the same as I have earlier to Mr. Reid. In this field a little goes a long way toward starting us down the right road in the development of programs in our universities for training for public service which is a great need.

I hope that if we can get the bill enacted and get the authorization on the books, we can then proceed to squeeze out as much of the resources as possible within the priorities.

Mr. BURTON. Is this the first time that the legislation has been requested?

Mr. SIMPSON. Yes.

Mr. BURTON. After 7½ years of Democratic administrations and a couple of hundred years of the Republic, at what point in time did it become obvious that there was a need that was not being met? Why was not the general authority requested in one or another of the plethora of education legislation that previous Congresses have passed.

Mr. SIMPSON. I am not sure that I can answer that except to say that I think the problems of highly educated and highly skilled administrators of public programs have been highlighted and exacerbated perhaps in the last couple of years with the extensive growth in programs that are designed to provide more educational opportunity, better health conditions, better transportation, antipoverty programs and the like, which have been enacted particularly in the 88th and 89th Congresses.

This has put a strain on governmental services, plus the strain that has dveloped upon our cities and upon State government for an increasing number of services in more recent years.

When you think about problems like water pollution and air pollution control, the breakdown of transportation in our metropolitan areas, and so forth, all of the local governments, State governments and the Federal Governments have reacted to them. This is largely accountable for the very large growth of government in recent years.

Mr. BURTON. Madam Chairman, I do not need more time. I think this is going to be essentially a wheelspinning operation for the foreseeable future.

As I say, I probably will vote for it because I am for mother, country, God and flag, and education, but I am not going to go to bed tonight thinking I have struck much of a blow for democracy.

Mrs. GREEN. I wonder at this point in the record, Dr. Huitt, if I could ask you to provide the committee with a list of all of the fellowships that are available from other departments and agencies that would be closely related to this new proposal.

(The information requested follows:)

The most closely related fellowships supported by the Federal Government are those offered under the authority of PL 88-560, the National Housing Act. Title VIII, Part II authorizes fellowships for which $500,000 were appropriated for FY 1968. 97 fellowships have been awarded for this academic year in the following fields:

City and regional planning	63
Urban public administration	13
Urban affairs (political science)	9
Housing and urban renewal	4
Urban sociology	4
Urban Law	2
Real estate and urban development	2
Total	97

Other fellowship programs for public service are much more categorical, aiming at specific professions. Thus, the Office of Education can award fellowships to train school administrators; the Public Health Service, hospital administrators, community health specialists, air pollution experts, and public health officers.

Congressman Erlenborn.

Mr. ERLENBORN. I wonder if the program contemplated here would have any relevance to the preparation of people to go into Foreign Service under our State Department? Would this be encompassed within public administration?

Mr. SIMPSON. This would be included within the bill. I think there are available other programs, Federal assistance programs, for area studies, for language studies, and for other fields that are directly related to preparation for the Foreign Service.

As the bill directs, we must take these programs into account in administration of this bill. I would think that that kind of support would have a lesser priority than would support for the normal functions of city and State government.

Mr. ERLENBORN. The authorization requested here is $10 million for fiscal 1969. That is for both part A and part B?

Mr. SIMPSON. That is correct.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Can you tell us what breakdown there will be in the allocation of those funds between part A and part B for fiscal 1969?

Mr. SIMPSON. Yes, I think I can.

For part A, the grants and contracts for strengthening schools would be $4,600,000. Under part B, fellowships, it would be $5,400,000.

Mr. ERLENBORN. I haven't lived through the legislative birth of Elementary and Secondary Education Act and its funding and putting it into operation. It leads me to ask this question: What sort of timetable do you foresee for the passage of this authorization, the passage of the appropriation, the drafting of your guidelines and then the beginning of the awards of contracts, grants, and fellowships?

Mr. VALIEN. Of course, it would depend to some extent when the legislation is passed. I do want to make one point, though, that I think is relevant, and I think it has been alluded to but probably has not been emphasized. That is that speaking on behalf of the higher education institutions, for example, I think it is important for them in order to be able to plan to know some of the dimensions and details of proposed Federal program support so that it seems to me that it is very difficult, even after legislation has been passed, but certainly almost impossible before it has been passed, for education institutions to begin to plan as to how they would respond to programs of Federal support.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Let me ask this question: If this legislation is passed and the appropration is passed, let us say hopefully by the 1st of August, which might be a legislative miracle if it could be done that quickly, do you think, really, that you then will be prepared to grant $5,400,000 worth of fellowships for the school year beginning the 1st of September?

Dr. VALIEN. I doubt that. As you know, many of our programs are funded on a forward financing basis. Under our NDEA scholarship we make the award around the middle of November or the 1st of September for the next school year.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Are you telling me that the $10 million that would be authorized in this act could be appropriated this year and then actually spent the following year in fiscal 1970?

Mr. SIMPSON. There is a provision in the bill that the authorization would be available for 2 years.

Mr. ERLENBORN. That is in this particular bill?

Mr. SIMPSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Does that apply also to the appropriation?

Mr. SIMPSON. No.

Mr. ERLENBORN. In other words, do you have to spend the $10 million before June 30, 1969? And are you going to, as we saw in elementary and secondary education history, hurry up and spend the $10 million before the year runs out?

Mr. SIMPSON. The provision on appropriations in the bill reads that "funds appropriated for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1969, shall be available for obligation during that year and the succeeding fiscal year."

Mr. ERLENBORN. I see. So that the $10 million would not have to be spent in fiscal 1969?

Mr. SIMPSON. That is correct.

Mr. ERLENBORN. It could be carried over to 1970?

Mr. SIMPSON. That is correct.

Mr. ERLENBORN. I would hope that you would contemplate not awarding fellowships probably until the fall of 1969 since it must take some time for the schools to gear up for accepting students in this course of study.

I would hate to see the sort of waste we had in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act where funds became available in the middle of the school year and were spent hastily just because they were available and authority was going to run out by the end of the school year.

Is this what you really contemplate—that the fellowships would not be awarded for the school year beginning in the fall of this year but would be awarded for the following year?

Mr. SIMPSON. I think that would be highly likely, given that timetable.

Mr. ERLENBORN. I have no further questions.

Mrs. GREEN. This would be true of all of the fellowship programs in the Higher Education Act of 1968?

It is my understanding that you would like to announce the granting of the fellowships in April.

Mr. SIMPSON. Yes.

Mrs. GREEN. So that if this time schedule were to be followed you would really need very prompt action on the bill on the Senate side as well as the House?

Mr. SIMPSON. That is correct.

Mrs. GREEN. Congressman Brademas.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you, Madam Chairman. I have just a quick comment or two, Mr. Simpson.

I, for one, am very glad to see this kind of legislation coming before us because I think one of the chief headaches that we are facing in our country today is getting first-class people to operate at the State, local, and regional levels of government.

As a matter of fact, perhaps in response to Mr. Burton's observation, I put in a bill called the Public Service Education Act some months before the President's bill and, Madam Chairman, without objection, I would like to insert my bill with some comments on it at this point in the record following my questions.

Let me ask you this question, Mr. Simpson: What are the main problems that you see in getting first-class people to work in local and State government?

Is it a question of poor salaries? Is it a question of inadequate educational opportunities, which is what this bill, as I understand it, is addressed to? Or are there other factors?

To what extent, in other words, does this bill make a difference?

Mr. SIMPSON. I think poor salaries is a factor in it. I do not want to say that it is not. Much has to be done with salaries and fringe benefits in local government, particularly.

On the other hand, it is true that the lack of educational opportunity and competition from opportunity for fellowships for graduate education available in other fields has meant the schools of public administration at the present time are getting few students in number and of a lesser quality than are going into the other fields that are better financed.

More than that, there are few students who really know the opportunities that are available in government service. I am one who thinks you have to appeal beyond salaries for people to go into the public service. There has to be another appeal made to students.

I think students are highly susceptible to such appeals. I don't think we make nearly enough of them at the present time. This relates to the prestige that government service carries, generally.

This has been commented on in the reports, for example, of the Committee for Economic Development on Modernizing State and Local Governments which goes into this at some length.

We need to do a variety of things which will open opportunity as this bill provides, that will raise salaries, that will raise the prestige of government service.

I have spent my lifetime in government service. I can certainly say that the jobs are fascinating, the challenge of public service is tremendous, whether it is public service in administrative work or public service in the political arena. But I recall back in the days when I was in graduate school, most of the people in the particular school of public administration I attended were much more interested in going into research and teaching than they were in government service.

I do not know the reasons for that. I think somehow we emphasize the thing to do is to get a Ph. D. and go and write books on government.

Mr. GIBBONS. Ph. D.'s and people like that do not have to read in the newspapers about the mistakes that they make all the time. There are all kinds of things that keep people out of public service.

Mr. HUITT. May I make a comment, Mr. Brademas? I think education is needed on both sides in a thing like this. A lot of college students don't know what the public service is like and a lot of State and local units of government don't know what first-grade help could do for them.

Where the private foundations, about which we were talking awhile ago, have put people into these jobs, the usual result is that the people in government discover that they can't get along without them. The people who do this kind of work like it.

I will cite an example. The Ford Foundation sent some research people into the Wisconsin Legislature. They gave each party leadership one as an example in each house. When the Ford money was gone the State appropriated money for those people.

It is a process of grading-up the expectations and the needs of the State and local people and at the same time making kids acquainted with what is to be found in this kind of work.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I have talked with some mayors who were newly elected in some cities in my State last year. In one city in particular, the problems are so enormous I will not recite its name. This man is swimming in a sea and may drown unless he gets some first-class, very intelligent, very qualified and capable and honest people to help him.

He is going to have to repair to some private foundation or other to try to bail him out, otherwise, he is going to capsize.

I will make one other comment and then I will stop, Madam Chairman.

It seems to me we completely delude ourselves if we think the Federal system is going to survive at all, which I think everybody wants

it to do, if we don't in some way attract first-class young men and women to work in government at every level, local and State as well as National.

I think this bill responds to only part of the problem, but by providing better educational opportunities it may be very helpful.

(The bill and comments referred to by Congessman Brademas follow:)

[From the Congressional Record, Apr. 6, 1967]

EDUCATION AND THE PUBLIC SERVICE: THREE PROPOSALS TO STRENGTHEN STATE, LOCAL, AND FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join the distinguished chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee, Congressman CARL PERKINS, of Kentucky, in introducing two imaginative legislative proposals designed to strengthen government at the State, local, and Federal levels: H.R. 8175, the Education for the Public Service Act, and H.R. 8234, the Intergovernmental Manpower Act.

These bills are similar in purpose, if not in all details, to H.R. 5989, my own Public Service Education Act which I introduced on February 22, 1967.

These three proposals will establish a series of programs to strengthen government at all levels by providing government employees significantly expanded opportunities for study, training, and intergovernmenal exchanges which will significantly enhance their abilities as public servants.

H.R. 5989. THE PUBLIC SERVICE EDUCATION ACT

Mr. Speaker, the genesis of the Public Service Education Act lies in a concern I am sure that all of us in this body share; it is that the genius of the American constitutional system lies in our reliance on effective government at all levels, local, State and regional, as well as Federal.

The federal system, with its many powers, sometimes overlapping, sometimes distinct, has been called a great laboratory for social experiment. Federalism has encouraged a diversity of solutions to the many problems with which the American people have wrestled throughout our history.

RESPONSIBILITIES OF STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT

But the American brand of federalism implies that State and local, as well as regional governments are all viable partners in the political system. The social laboratory cannot be directed from Washington alone if it is truly to be a force for diversity. So we must set ourselves to the task of revitalizing government at all levels. The Public Service Education Act, by enabling all levels of government to attract and train able men and women for public service, will provide a vital tool in renewing the capacity of State, regional, and local government to participate creatively in the federal system.

PROBLEMS OF GOVERNMENT

The problems we face today in our States, our cities and metropolitan areas are growing with extraordinary swiftness. Their complexity is staggering. Consider even a brief list of the difficulties we must overcome in the years ahead:

We must rebuild the inner cores of our cities, indeed entire cities.

We must reclaim the streams and rivers from their increasing pollution.

We must insure that the very air we breathe is safe for human life.

We must reestablish confidence in the integrity and ability of our legal system to maintain a just order and to prevent the loss of property and life.

For many of our young people, we must work to make the schools of our country centers of intellectual and community activity, not cells where they wait until ready for employment, military service, or the ranks of the aimless unemployed.

We must establish in practice what we have so long preached—that every American is entitled to an equal opportunity to the opportunities afforded by a true and open society.

We must provide a level of medical and other social services consistent with the great riches which our economy continues to produce in astonishing abundance.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on to list still more tasks which face us as a Nation. But the point is clear: we have much to do and government at all levels—local, State, regional, and Federal—will play an important role in helping us accomplish what we must.

Yet no government has deeper knowledge, greater foresight, or richer imagination than the men and women who do its necessary work. It is because we need more than ever before the most able and well-educated public servants we can get that I have introduced H.R. 5989, my Public Service Education Act of 1967.

PROVISIONS OF PUBLIC SERVICE EDUCATION ACT

The Public Service Education Act of 1967 is a three-pronged measure aimed at attracting talented persons to government at all levels, but chiefly at the State and local level. This measure can help produce more and better men and women for government not only in Washington, D.C., but in Maine and California and Indiana, in towns and cities and counties across the Nation.

The Public Service Education Act of 1967 seeks to improve the quality of government through three main lines of approach: support for graduate study at colleges and universities by those who plan to pursue careers in public service; fellowships for university study and inservice training for those now in government at the local, State, regional, and Federal levels; grants to institutions of higher education to strengthen their capacity to meet the demand for more and better education for the public service. Let me outline the major aspects of the bill.

First. Fellowships for persons who plan to pursue careers in the public service: This bill will help to attract more talented young people into careers in local, State, regional, and Federal Government by providing fellowships for up to 2 years of graduate study for persons intending to follow public service careers. The bill authorizes $46 million for a total of up to 3.750 fellowships over the next 5 years. The fellowships are for graduate study in public administration and public affairs at colleges and universities in the United States.

As part of the fellowship programs, colleges and universities will be encouraged and enabled to arrange internships in State, local, and regional government, much as we in Congress and the executive branch now arrange during the summers for outstanding college students.

Towns and cities all over the country like South Bend, Mishawaka, Michigan City, Plymouth, and La Porte in my own district; county governments, or States like Indiana could employ able students of public administration during their summer vacations. Both the student and the local or State government would benefit greatly from these internships, as the experience with student internships here in Washington has shown.

Second. Opportunities for further education for those already in public service: The Public Service Education Act will enable men and women now working for State and local governments, as well as for the Federal Government, to improve their professional qualifications by graduate study and through short-term, inservice training.

State and local government: For example, city administrators, State water pollution experts, police officers, and a wide variety of other public officials could attend the best colleges and universities in the country to catch up on the newest techniques in their fields. Or they might attend inservice institutes designed to bring new knowledge and information from the classroom into city hall and the statehouse.

Under this part of the measure, States will receive Federal grants to enable State and local government personnel to do graduate work or participate in inservice courses. The bill authorizes $85 million over 5 years for such programs.

Federal Government: A similar measure, although contained in a separate title of the bill, will provide some 3,200 graduate fellowships for Federal employees similar to the fellowships proposed for local, State, and regional personnel. Present authority for graduate study by Federal employees is no framed to encourage its fullest use by Government agencies nor is it focused squarely on public administration. The Public Service Education Act is intended to correct these deficiencies.

The proposed act also establishes a system of sabbatical leaves for career Federal employees in the supergrade category, somewhat like the practice of periodic sabbaticals common for American college and university teachers. Under the sabbatical system in the bill, these high-level employees would be eligi-

ble to apply for 1 year of study, reading or research out of every 7 years of high Federal service. Many of the eligible might choose to pursue formal academic programs, but they should have an opportunity for the kind of individual study which has proved so valuable in academic life.

Third. Grants to colleges and universities: The act provides grants over the next 5 years to colleges and universities to develop the strongest possible programs in public administration and public affairs. We need the best people obtainable in the public service and we cannot expect institutions of higher education alone to shoulder the financial burden of producing them.

The bill establishes a 5-year $70 million program of grants to participating colleges and universities to assist them in meeting the demands for more and better public servants. It is intended that at the end of a 5-year grant, the university should expect and would be prepared to sustain the program without further Federal support under this act.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford to staff Government programs involving the expenditure of millions, sometimes billions of dollars, with less than the ablest and most highly trained men and women. That is why what we sow in the Public Service Education Act can reap such a rich harvest in the improvement of government in the United States.

VALUE OF PUBLIC SERVICE

As an American of Greek ancestry, I am acutely aware that my forebears knew well and appreciated fully the value of public service. In ancient Greece, to which we look for inspiration even today, the ideal of public service was a lofty one. Indeed, a man was judged by the character and quality of his public life and his contribution to the shared experiences of the city. I look to the day when public service at all levels will be as honored in this country as it was in the Greece of Pericles and to the time when we can acknowledge with even greater pride than we do today, the intelligence, ability, knowledge, and contributions of those who choose to serve in government, from the township to the highest levels of our Federal Government.

The Public Service Education Act, I think, can help us reach that goal.

My own Public Service Education Act, H.R. 5989, and both President Johnson's proposals differ somewhat in scope and detail. But a common thread of concern for improving the quality of government at all levels runs through the three bills.

Let me summarize briefly the major facets of the Education for the Public Service Act, H.R. 8175, and the Intergovernmental Manpower Act, H.R. 8234—both proposed by President Johnson today.

PRINCIPAL PROVISIONS OF H.R. 8175—EDUCATION FOR THE PUBLIC SERVICE ACT—PROPOSED BY PRESIDENT JOHNSON

Mr. Speaker, this bill would establish in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare a program of institutional grants and graduate fellowships designed to attract young men and women to public service in any branch of State, local, or Federal government, and to improve education for such service. The bill would authorize $10,000,000 to be appropriated for the first fiscal year, and such sums as might be necessary for the next 4 fiscal years.

Title I of the bill would authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make grants to or contracts with institutions of higher education—and other designated public or private agencies in special circumstances—to assist them in preparing graduate or professional students to enter the public service, or for research into, or development or demonstration of improved methods of educating students—including students at the undergraduate level—for the public service.

Grants or contracts would be equitably distributed throughout the United States among institutions that will be able to use the funds effectively, except that preference could be given to programs designed to meet an urgent national need.

Title II of the bill would authorize the Secretary to award fellowships, not to exceed three academic years in duration, for graduate or professional study for persons who plan to pursue a career in public service. Fellowships would be equitably distributed throughout the United States among institutions of higher education that have, or are developing, programs of high quality in-

tended to educate persons for the public service or which contribute to the meeting of a significant and continuing need in the public service, except that preference could be given to programs designed to meet an urgent national need. The fellowships would carry a stipend consistent with prevailing practices under comparable federally supported programs, and a payment to the institution of $2,500 per academic year.

The Secretary would be authorized to establish an advisory committee to advise him on matters of general policy arising in the administration of the act.

Mr. Speaker, this proposal is similar to titles I and IV of my own Public Service Education Act, H.R. 5989.

PRINCIPAL PROVISIONS OF H.R. 8234—INTERGOVERNMENTAL MANPOWER ACT—PROPOSED BY PRESIDENT JOHNSON

Mr. Speaker, this bill would provide Federal financial and other assistance to State and local governments to train and improve administrative personnel.

Under this proposal, Federal agencies would be authorized to admit State and local employees to training programs for Federal employees, as well as to initiate special training programs for State and local employees who administer Federal grant programs.

The Civil Service Commission would be authorized to make grants covering up to 75 percent of the cost to assist State and local governments to establish and carry out comprehensive in-service training programs and to strengthen personnel administration.

H.R. 8234 would also facilitate intergovernmental cooperation by providing authority for temporary exchange assignments of Federal employees to State and local governments, and of State and local employees to the Federal Government.

The Civil Service Commission would also be authorized to make grants to State and local governments to provide fellowships for graduate study for employees selected by State and local governments for further training.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I would like to insert in the RECORD four documents which will help to clarify further the purposes and content of the similarities and differences between these interrelated proposals for improving the quality of American government: first, excerpts from the text of President Johnson's message on "The Quality of American Government," which he transmitted to Congress on March 20, 1967; second, H.R. 8715, the President's proposed Education for the Public Service Act; third, H.R. 8234, the President's proposed Intergovernmental Manpower Act; fourth, H.R. 5989, my own Public Service Education Act.

(The documents follow:)

"THE QUALITY OF AMERICAN GOVERNMENT"—EXCERPTS FROM THE MESSAGE OF PRESIDENT JOHNSON TO CONGRESS ON MARCH 20, 1967

THE PUBLIC SERVICE

Government is personal.

It is as compassionate and vibrant—or as ineffectual and spiritless—as the men and women who shape the laws, who make the decisions, who translate programs into action.

Andrew Jackson once said that the duties of all public offices were "plain and simple." We have journeyed far since then.

Today's public servant—at all levels of government—is a servant of change. He works to make the American city a better place to live. He strives to increase the beauty of our land and end the poisoning of our rivers and the air we breathe. In these and countless other ways he seeks to enlarge the meaning of life and to raise the hopes and extend the horizons for all of us.

The work to be performed in the years ahead will summon trained and skilled manpower in quantities—and quality—we have never needed before.

Within the federal government, we are making careers more attractive. Since I became President, I have proposed and you in the Congress have approved pay increases in each of the past 3 years for federal workers, raising salary levels by an average of 12%. The new Executive Assignment System begun last year will re-shape the upper civil service so that talent is readily recognized and excellence is fully rewarded.

Later in this session of Congress, I shall submit additional proposals to enable the government to attract and retain the public servants it needs.

But nowhere is the magnitude of government manpower greater—and the accompanying challenge more critical—than at the State and local levels. Consider the following:

—Between 1955 and 1965 employment in State and local governments increased from 4.7 million to 7.7 million, or four times the rate of growth of employment in the economy as a whole.

—By 1975, State and local government employment will grow to more than 11 million.

—Each year, from now through 1975, State and local governments will have to recruit at least one quarter of a million new administrative, technical, and professional employees, not including teachers, to maintain and develop their programs.

—One out of every three of the Nation's municipal executives, and one out of every two municipal health directors will be eligible for retirement within the next 10 years.

—There will be 2 vacancies for each new graduate of a university program in city and regional planning.

These statistics show that States and local governments are flourishing as they never have before. But they also contain a clear signal that in the chain of Federal-State-local relationships, the weakest link in the emerging shortage of professional manpower.

We can strengthen that link, or later pay the price of weakness with inefficient government unable to cope with the problems of an expanding population.

I believe we should take positive action now.

I recommend two legislative proposals to improve the quality of government in the years ahead—the Public Service Education Act of 1967 and the Intergovernmental Manpower Act of 1967.

My fiscal 1968 budget includes $35 million for these proposals:

—$10 million for the Public Service Education Act, and

—$25 million for the Intergovernmental Manpower Act.

These measures are demanding. They will require the support of Congress, the Executive Branch, State and local governments, and colleges and universities and private organizations.

1. The Public Service Education Act of 1967 [*now Educational for the Public Service Act*]

This legislation has a single clear goal; to increase the number of qualified students who choose careers in government.

The measure would authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to provide fellowships for young men and women who want to embark on the adventure of government service.

It would provide support to universities seeking to enrich and strengthen their public service education programs.

This financial assistance can be used to support a broad range of activity including:

—Research into new methods of education for government service;

—Experimental programs, such as study combined with part-time public service;

—Plans to improve and expand programs for students preparing for government careers;

—Training faculties, establishing centers for study at the graduate or professional level, conducting institutes for advanced study in public affairs and administration.

2. The Intergovernmental Manpower Act of 1967

This legislation is designed specifically to deal with the varied manpower needs of State and local governments.

It would authorize the Civil Service Commission to:

—Provide fellowships to State and local government employees.

—Make grants of up to 75% to help State and local governments develop and carry out comprehensive training plans and strengthen their personnel administration systems.

It would allow federal agencies to admit State and local employees to federal training programs, and to provide additional assistance for those employees who administer federal grant-in-aid programs.

Across America, many men and women of skill and vision work in State houses and city halls.

Their knowledge and experience can help us. And we are prepared to bring the special experience of federal employees to the local level.

The Intergovernmental Manpower Act would allow federal workers to take assignments in State and local governments for periods up to 2 years, with full protection of job rights and benefits. In addition, the federal agencies would be able to accept State and local employees for assignments of equivalent periods.

The proposal, I believe, fills a vital need. The mutual interchange of ideas and perspectives will benefit all echelons of government.

TEXT OF EDUCATION FOR THE PUBLIC SERVICE ACT, H.R. 8715

A BILL To establish in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare a program of grants and fellowships to improve the education of students attending institutions of higher education in preparation for entrance into the service of State, local, or Federal governments, and to attract such students to the public service, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Education for the Public Service Act".

TITLE I—GRANTS AND CONTRACTS TO STRENGTHEN AND IMPROVE EDUCATION FOR THE PUBLIC SERVICE

SEC. 101. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereafter in this Act referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to make grants to or contracts with institutions of higher education, or combinations of such institutions, to assist them in planning, developing, strengthening, improving, or carrying out programs or projects (a) for the preparation of graduate or professional students to enter the public service or (b) for research into, or development or demonstration of, improved methods of education for the public service. Such grants or contracts may include payment of all or part of the cost of programs or projects such as—

(1) planning for the development or expansion of graduate or professional programs to prepare students to enter the public service;

(2) training and retraining of faculty members;

(3) strengthening the public service aspects of courses or curricula leading to a graduate or professional degree;

(4) establishment, expansion, or operation of centers for study at the graduate or professional level (but not including payment for construction or acquisition of buildings);

(5) conduct of short-term or regular session institutes for advanced study by persons engaged in, or preparing to engage in the preparation of students to enter the public service;

(6) carrying out innovative and experimental programs of cooperative education involving alternate periods of full-time or part-time academic study at the institution and periods of full-time or part-time public service; and

(7) research into, and development of, methods of training students or faculty, including the preparation of teaching materials and the planning of curriculum.

The Secretary may also also make grants to other public or private nonprofit agencies and organizations, including professional and scholarly associations, or contracts with public or private agencies or organizations, to carry out the purpose of this section when such grants or contracts will make an especially significant contribution to attaining the objectives of this section.

APPLICATION FOR GRANT OR CONTRACT; ALLOCATION OF GRANTS OR CONTRACTS

SEC. 102. (a) A grant or contract authorized by section 101 may be made only upon application to the Secretary at such time or times and containing such in-

formation as he may prescribe, except that no such application shall be approved unless it—

(1) sets forth programs, activities, research, or development for which a grant is authorized under section 101, and describes the relation thereof to any program set forth by the applicant in an application, if any, submitted pursuant to section 203;

(2) provides for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the applicant under this section; and

(3) provides for making such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Secretary may require to carry out his functions under this section, and for keeping such records and for affording such access thereto as the Secretary may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

(b) The Secretary shall allocate grants or contracts under section 101 in such manner as will most nearly provide an equitable distribution of the grants or contracts throughout the United States among institutions of higher education which show promise of being able to use funds effectively for the purposes of section 101, except that to the extent he deems proper in the national interest the Secretary may give preference to programs designed to meet an urgent national need.

(c) (1) Payments under this section may be used, in accordance with regulations of the Secretary, and subject to the terms and conditions set forth in an application approved under subsection (a), to pay part of the compensation of students employed in public service, other than public service as an employee in any branch of the Government of the United States, as part of a program for which a grant has been approved pursuant to this section.

(2) Departments and agencies of the United States are encouraged, to the extent consistent with efficient administration, to enter into arrangements with institutions of higher education for the full-time, part-time, or temporary employment, whether in the competitive or excepted service, of students enrolled in programs set forth in applications approved under subsection (a).

TITLE II—PUBLIC SERVICE FELLOWSHIPS

SEC. 201. The Secretary is authorized to award fellowships in accordance with the provisions of this title for graduate or professional study for persons who plan to pursue a career in public service. Such fellowships shall be awarded for such periods as the Secretary may determine but not to exceed three academic years.

ALLOCATION OF FELLOWSHIPS

SEC. 202. The Secretary shall allocate fellowships under this title among institutions of higher education with programs approved under the provisions of section 203 for the use of individuals accepted into such programs, in such manner and according to such plan as will most nearly—

(1) provide an equitable distribution of such fellowships throughout the United States, except that to the extent he deems proper in the national interest the Secretary may give preference to programs designed to meet an urgent national need, and

(2) attract recent college graduates to pursue a career in public service.

APPROVAL OF PROGRAMS

SEC. 203. The Secretary shall approve a graduate or professional program of an institution of higher education only upon application by the institution and only upon his finding—

(1) that such program has as a principal or significant objective the education of persons for the public service, or the education of persons in a profession or vocation for whose practitioners there is a significant and continuing need in the public service as determined by the Secretary after such consultation with other agencies as may be appropriate;

(2) that such program is in effect and of high quality, or is readily put into effect and may reasonably be expected to be of high quality;

(3) that the application describes the relation of such program to any program, activity, research, or development set forth by the applicant in an application, if any, submitted pursuant to section 102; and

(4) that the application contains satisfactory assurance that (A) the institution will recommend to the Secretary, for the award of fellowships under this title, for study in such program, only persons of superior promise who have demonstrated to the satisfaction of the institution a serious intent to enter the public service upon completing the program, and (B) the institution will make reasonable continuing efforts to encourage recipients of fellowships under this title, enrolled in such program, to enter the public service upon completing the program.

STIPENDS

SEC. 204. (a) The Secretary shall pay to persons awarded fellowships under this title such stipends (including such allowances for subsistence and other expenses for such persons and their dependents) as he may determine to be consistent with prevailing practices under comparable federally supported programs.

(b) In addition to the amounts paid to persons pursuant to subsection (a), the Secretary shall pay to the institution of higher education at which such person is pursuing his courses of study an amount equivalent to $2,500 per academic year, less any amount charged such person for tuition and nonrefundable fees and deposits.

FELLOWSHIP CONDITIONS

SEC. 205. A person awarded a fellowship under the provisions of this title shall continue to receive the payments provided in section 204 only during such periods as the Secretary finds that he is maintaining satisfactory proficiency and devoting full time to study or research in the field in which such fellowship was awarded in an institution of higher education, and is not engaging in gainful employment other than employment approved by the Secretary by or pursuant to regulation.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 301. As used in this Act—

(a) The term "State" means a State, Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, the Canal Zone, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

(b) The term "institution of higher education" means an educational institution in any State exclusive of an institution of any agency of the United States, which (1) admits as regular students only persons having a certificate of graduation from a school providing secondary education, or the recognized equivalent of such certificate, (2) is legally authorized within such State to provide a program of education beyond secondary education, (3) provides an educational program for which it awards a bachelor's degree or provides not less than a two-year program which is acceptable for full credit toward such a degree, (4) is a public or other nonprofit institution, and (5) is accredited by a national recognized accrediting agency or association approved by the Secretary for this purpose. For purposes of title I, such term includes any school which provides not less than a one-year program of training to prepare students for gainful employment in a recognized occupation and which meets the provision of clauses (1), (2), (4), and (5). For purposes of this subsection, the Secretary shall publish a list of nationally recognized accrediting agencies or associations which he determines to be reliable authority as to the quality of training offered.

(c) The term "public service" means service as an officer of employee in any branch of State, local, or Federal Government.

(d) The term "academic year" means an academic year or its equivalent as determined by the Secretary.

(e) The term "nonprofit" as applied to an institution, agency, or organization, means an institution, agency, or organization owned and operated by one or more nonprofit corporations or associations no part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully inure, to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

COORDINATION OF FEDERAL ASSISTANCE

SEC. 302. In administering this Act, the Secretary shall give primary emphasis to the assistance of programs and activities not otherwise assisted by the Depart-

ment of Health, Educaton and Welfare, or by other agencies of the Federal Government, so as to promote most effectively the Act's objectives.

METHOD OF PAYMENT

SEC. 303. Payments under this Act may be made in installments, and in advance or by way of reimbursement, with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or under payments.

LIMITATION

SEC. 304. No grant, contract, or fellowship shall be awarded under this Act to, or for study at a school or department of divinity. For the purposes of this section, the term "school or department of divinity" means an institution or department or branch of an institution whose program is specifically for the education of students to prepare them to become ministers of religion or to enter upon some other religious vocation or to prepare them to teach theological subjects.

UTILIZATION OF OTHER AGENCIES

SEC. 305. In administering the provisions of this Act, the Secretary is authorized to utilize the services and facilities of any agency of the Federal Government and of any other public or nonprofit agency or institution, on a reimbursable basis or otherwise in accordance with agreements between the Secretary and the head thereof.

FEDERAL CONTROL OF EDUCATION PROHIBITED

SEC. 306. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution, or the selection of library resources by an educational institution, or over the content of any material developed or published under any program assisted pursuant to this Act.

AUTHORITY TO ESTABLISH ADVISORY COMMITTEE

SEC. 307. (a) The Secretary may without regard to the civil service and classification laws, appoint a committee to advise him on matters of general policy arising in the administration of this Act. Members of the Committee, who are not in the regular full-time employ of the United States shall, while attending meetings or conferences of the Committee or otherwise engaged in the business of the Committee, be entitled to receive compensation at a rate fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per diem (or, if higher, the rate specified at the time of such service for grade GS–19 in 5 U.S.C., § 5332), including travel time, and while so serving on the business of the Committee away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized the 5 U.S.C., § 5703, for persons employed intermittently in the Government service.

REPORT

SEC. 308. The Secretary shall include in his annual report to the Congress, a report of activities of his Department under this Act, including recommendations for needed revisions in the provisions thereof.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 309. There are authorized to be appropriated $10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years, to carry out the purposes of this Act. Funds appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, shall be available for obligation pursuant to the provisions of this Act during that year and the succeeding fiscal year.

TEXT OF INTERGOVERNMENTAL MANPOWER ACT—H.R. 8234

A BILL To improve intergovernmental cooperation and grant-in-aid program admnistration; to assist State and local government in strengthening their staffs by improving personnel administration and extending merit principles

and by providing support for training of public employees; to permit temporary assignments of personnel between Federal and State and local governments; and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Intergovernmental Manpower Act of 1967."

GENERAL DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby finds and declares a national interest in—

(1) improving the quality of public administration at all levels of government, particularly in connection with programs that are financed in whole or in part from Federal appropriations;

(2) strengthening the capacity of State and local governments to deal with complex problems confronting all levels of government;

(3) aiding State and local governments in training their professional, administrative, and technical employees and officials;

(4) aiding State and local governments in developing systems of personnel management that are responsible to the goals and needs of their programs, effective in attracting and retaining capable employees, and based on merit principles; and

(5) facilitating temporary assignments of personnel between levels of government.

SEC. 3. The authorities provided by this Act shall be administered in such manner as to recognize fully the rights, powers, and responsibilities of State and local governments.

TITLE I—TRAINING AND DEVELOPING STATE AND LOCAL EMPLOYEES

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SEC. 101. The purpose of this title is to strengthen the training and development of State and local government employees and officials, particularly in professional, administrative, and technical fields.

ADMISSION TO FEDERAL EMPLOYEE TRAINING PROGRAMS

SEC. 102. (a) In accordance with such conditions as may be prescribed by the head of the Federal agency concerned, a Federal agency may admit State and local government employees and officials to agency training programs established for Federal professional, administrative, or technical personnel.

(b) Federal agencies are authorized to receive payments from, or on behalf of, State and local governments for the costs of training provided under this section, and to enter into agreements with them for this purpose. The head of the Federal agency concerned may waive all or part of such payments. Payments received by the Federal agency concerned for training under this section shall be credited to the appropriation or fund used for paying the training costs.

(c) The Commission may use appropriations authorized by this Act to pay the additional developmental or overhead costs that are incurred by reason of admittance of State and local government employees to Federal training courses and to reimburse other Federal agencies for such costs.

TRAINING OF PERSONNEL ENGAGED IN GRANT-IN-AID PROGRAMS

SEC. 103. (a) Any Federal agency administering a program of grants or financial assistence to State or local governments may—

(1) establish, provide, and conduct training programs for State and local employees and officials who have responsibilities related to the federally aided program, and, to the same extent provided in section 102(b) of this Act, receive or waive payments for such training and credit any such payments to the appropriation or fund used for paying the training costs; and

(2) authorize State and local governments, from the grants or financial assistance when so provided in appropriation or other acts, to establish, conduct, provide, and support training and education programs for their employees and officials who have responsibilities related to the federally aided program, including internship, work-study, fellowship, and similar programs

if approved by the Federal agency concerned, provided that full-time, graduate-level education supported under this subsection shall be consistent with provisions made for Government Service Fellowships under section 106 of this Act.

(b) The State or local government concerned shall—

(1) in accordance with eligibility criteria prescribed by the Federal agency concerned, select the individual employees and officials to receive education and training in programs established under this section; and

(2) during the period of the education or training, continue the full salary of the employee or official concerned and normal employment benefits such as credit for seniority, leave accrual, retirement, and insurance.

GRANTS TO STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS FOR TRAINING

SEC. 104. (a) If training is not adequately provided for under grant-in-aid or other statutes, the Commission is authorized to make grants to State and general local governments for up to 75 per centum of the cost of developing and carrying out training and education programs for their professional, administrative, and technical employees and officials. Such grants may not cover costs of full-time graduate-level study, provided for in section 106 of this Act, or the costs of the construction or acquisition of training facilities. The State and local government share of the cost of developing and carrying out training and education plans and programs may include, but shall not consist solely of, the reasonable value of facilities and of supervisory and other personal services made available by such governments.

(b) A grant authorized by subsection (a) of this section may be made to a State on application to the Commission at such time or times and containing such information as the Commission may prescribe. To be approved, the application must meet requirements established by this subsection unless any requirement is specifically waived by the Commission. Such grant to a State, or to a general local government under subsection (c) of this section, may cover the costs of developing the program set forth in the application. The program set forth in the application must—

(1) provide for designation, by the Governor or chief executive authority, of the State office that will have primary authority and responsibility for the development and administration of the program at the State level;

(2) provide, to the extent feasible, for coordination with relevant training available under or supported by other Federal Government programs or grants;

(3) provide for training needs of the State government and of local governments in that State;

(4) provide, to the extent feasible, for intergovernmental cooperation in employee training matters, especially within metropolitan or regional areas; and

(5) provide assurance that the making of a Federal Government grant will not result in a reduction in relevant State or local government expenditures or the substitution of Federal funds for State or local funds previously made available for these purposes.

(c) If, within one year from the effective date of the grant provisions of this Act, a State has not submitted and had approved an application for a program grant providing adequately for training of employees of local governments within the State, the Commission may consider and approve applications for grants authorized in subsection (a) of this section from those general local governments, or a combination of such governments, that serve a population of 100,000 or more. To be approved, a general local government application for a program grant must meet requirements similar to those established in subsection (b) of this section for State applications unless any requirement is specifically waived by the Commission. The Commission may—

(1) waive, at the request of a general local government, the one-year waiting period provided under subsection (c) of this section unless the State concerned declares, within ninety days from the effective date of the grant provisions of this Act, an intent to file an application for a program grant that will provide training for employees of the general local government; and

(2) make grants to a general local government, or a combination of such governments, serving a population of less than one hundred thousand if it finds that such grants will help meet essential needs in programs of national

interest and will assist general local governments experiencing problems that result from their location in an area of rapid urbanization, in a metropolitan area, in a transportation corridor, or in a similarly critical area.

GRANTS TO NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS

SEC. 105. (a) The Commission is authorized to make grants to nonprofit organizations to pay up to 75 per centum of the costs of providing training to professional, administrative, or technical employees and officials of State or local governments if the Commission—

(1) finds sufficient State and local government interest in the proposed program to warrant Federal financial support; and

(2) approves the program as meeting such requirements as may be prescribed by the Commission in its regulations pursuant to this Act.

(b) The nonprofit organization must be—

(1) a national, regional, statewide, or metropolitan organization representing member State or local governments;

(2) an association of State or local public officials; or

(3) an organization primarily engaged in offering professional advisory, research, development, or other services to governments or making professional studies designed for the improvement of public administration.

GOVERNMENT SERVICE FELLOWSHIPS

SEC. 106. (a) The Commission is authorized to make grants to State and general local governments to support programs approved by the Commission for providing government service fellowships for State and local government personnel. The grants may cover—

(1) the necessary costs of the fellowship recipient's books, travel and transportation, and such related expenses as may be authorized by the Commission;

(2) reimbursement to the State or local government for not to exceed one-fourth of the salary of each fellow during the period of the fellowship; and

(3) payment to the educational institutions involved not in excess of $3,000 per academic year for each fellow less any amount charged the fellow for tuition and nonrefundable fees and deposits.

(b) Fellowships awarded under this section may not exceed two years of full-time graduate-level study for professional, administrative, and technical employees. The regulations of the Commission shall include eligibility criteria for the selection of fellowship recipients by State and local governments.

(c) The State or local government concerned shall—

(1) select the individual recipients of the fellowships; and

(2) during the period of the fellowship, continue the full salary of the recipient and normal employment benefits such as credit for seniority, leave accrual, retirement, and insurance.

COORDINATION OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS

SEC. 107. The Commission, after consultation with other agencies concerned, shall—

(1) prescribe regulations covering the training for State and local employees and officials provided for in this title, including requirements for coordination of and reasonable uniformity in such training programs;

(2) coordinate the training support given to State and local governments under authority of this Act with training support given such governments under other Federal programs; and

(3) make such arrangements, including the collection and maintenance of data on training grants and programs, as needed to avoid duplication of programs providing for training and to insure consistent administration of related Federal training activities.

TITLE II—STRENGTHENING STATE AND LOCAL PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SEC. 201. The purpose of this title is to assist State and local governments to strengthen their staffs by improving their personnel administration.

IMPROVING BASIC PERSONNEL SYSTEMS

SEC. 202. (a) To the extent he determines to be practicable, the President is authorized in programs that are financed in whole or in part from Federal funds and as a condition for the grant of such funds, to require State and local governments to provide for their employees systems of merit personnel administration. For this purpose, the President may establish appropriate standards consistent with such merit principles as—

(1) recruiting, selecting, and advancing employees on the basis of their relative ability, knowledge, and skills, including open consideration of qualified applicants for initial appointment;

(2) providing equitable and adequate compensation;

(3) training employees, as needed, to assure high-quality performance;

(4) retaining employees on the basis of the adequacy of their performance, correcting inadequate performance, and separating employees whose inadequate performance cannot be corrected;

(5) assuring fair treatment of applicants and employees in all aspects of personnel administration without regard to political affiliation, race, color, national origin, sex, or religious creed; and

(6) assuring that employees are protected against coercion for partisan political purposes are prohibited from using their official authority for the purpose of interfering with or affecting the result of an election or a nomination for office.

(b) Nothing in this section or in section 203 or 204 of this Act, however, shall be construed to authorize any agency or official of the Federal Government to—

(1) exercise any authority, direction, or control over the selection, assignment, advancement, retention, compensation, or other personnel action with respect to any individual State or local employee whose employment is in compliance with the established standards; or

(2) require the application of such standards to educational institutions or school systems.

STATE GOVERNMENT AND STATEWIDE PROGRAMS AND GRANTS

SEC. 203. (a) The Commission is authorized to make grants to States for up to 75 per centum of the cost of developing and carrying out programs or projects to strengthen State and local government personnel administration and to furnish needed personnel administration services to local governments in that State.

(b) A grant authorized by subsection (a) or this section may be made to a State on application to the Commission at such time or times and containing such information as the Commission may prescribe. To be approved, the application must meet requirements established by this subsection unless any requirement is specifically waived by the Commission. Such grants to a State may cover the costs of developing the program or project set forth in the application which most—

(1) provide for designation, by the governor or chief executive authority, of the State office that will have primary authority and responsibility for the development and administration of the approved program or project at the State level;

(2) provide for personnel administration based on merit principles for State government employees of the office designated under paragraph (1) of this subsection unless, in the case of projects of limited scope, it is determined to be impracticable by the Commission, and for those State government employees who are affected by the program or project and who are engaged in the administration of federally aided programs, if not otherwise covered by merit standard requirements in Federal statutes and regulations or by Presidential action under section 202(a) of this Act;

(3) provide for certain personnel administration improvement needs of both the State government and the local governments in that State, including State personnel administration services for local governments;

(4) provide assurance that the making of a Federal Government grant will not result in a reduction in relevant State or local government expenditures or the substitution of Federal funds for State or local funds previously made available for these purposes; and

(5) set forth clear and practicable actions for the improvement of such aspects of personnel administration as—

(A) expansion of the coverage of State and local employees under existing merit standards, the establishment of merit standards where they do not now exist, and the further improvement of existing systems based on merit principles;

(B) establishment of statewide personnel systems to meet the needs of urban, suburban, or rural governmental jurisdictions that are not able to provide sound career services, opportunities for advancement, adequate retirement and leave systems, and other career inducements to well-qualified professional, administrative, and technical personnel;

(C) making of State grants to local governments;

(D) assessment of State and local government needs for professional, administrative, and technical manpower, and for the initiation of timely and appropriate action to meet such needs;

(E) improving one or more major areas of personnel administration, such as recruitment and selection, training and development, and pay administration;

(F) research and demonstration projects to develop and apply better personnel administration techniques, including both projects conducted by State and local government staffs and projects conducted by colleges or universities or other appropriate nonprofit organizations under grants or contracts;

(G) improving the recruitment, selection, assignment and development of handicapped persons, women, and members of disadvantaged groups whose capacities are not being utilized fully;

(H) achieving the most effective use of scarce professional, administrative, and technical manpower; and

(I) intergovernmental cooperation in personnel administration, with respect to such matters as recruiting, examining, pay studies, training, education, personnel interchange, manpower utilization, and fringe benefits.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS AND GRANTS

SEC. 204. (a) The Commission is authorized to make grants to general local governments, or combinations of such governments, that serve a population of 100,000 or more, for up to 75 per centum of the cost of developing and carrying out programs and projects to strengthen the personnel administration of such governments. Such grants may be made only if, within one year from the effective date of the grant provisions of this Act, a State has not submitted and had approved under section 203 of this Act an application for a grant providing adequately for assistance in strengthening the personnel administration of local governments within the State.

(b) A grant authorized by subsection (a) of this section may be made to a general local government on application to the Commission at such time or times and containing such information as the Commission may prescribe. To be approved, the application must meet requirements similar to those established in section 203(b) of this Act for a State application for a grant unless any requirement is specifically waived by the Commission. Such grants to a general local government may cover the costs of developing the program or project set forth in the application. The Commission may—

(1) waive, at the request of a general local government, the one-year waiting period, unless the State concerned declares, within ninety days from the effective date of the grant provisions of this Act, an intent to file an application for a grant that will include the local government; and

(2) make grants to general local governments, or combinations of such governments. that serve a population of less than one hundred thousand if it finds that such grants will help meet essential needs in programs or projects of national interest and will assist general local governments experiencing problems that result from their location in an area of rapid urbanization, in a metropolitan area, in a transportation corridor, or in a similarly critical area.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL COOPERATION IN RECRUITING AND EXAMINING

SEC. 205. (a) The Commission may join, on a shared-costs basis, with State and local governments in cooperative recruiting and examining activities under such procedures and regulations as may jointly be agreed on.

(b) The Commission also may, on the written request of a State or local government and under such procedures as may be jointly agreed on, certify to such jurisdictions from appropriate Federal registers the names of eligible persons. The State or local government making the request shall pay the Commission for the costs of performing the service as determined by the Commission, and such payments shall be credited to the appropriation or fund from which the expenses were or are to be paid.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

SEC. 206. The Commission may furnish technical advice and assistance, on request, to State and general local governments seeking to improve their systems of personnel administration. The Commission may accept payments, in whole or in part, for the costs of furnishing such assistance from the State or local governments to which furnished. All such payments shall be credited to the appropriation or fund from which the expenses were or are to be paid.

INTERSTATE COMPACTS

SEC. 207. The consent of the Congress is hereby given to any two or more States to enter into compacts or other agreements, not in conflict with any law of the United States, for cooperative efforts and mutual assistance (including the establishment of appropriate agencies) in connection with the development and administration of personnel and training programs for employees and officials of State and local governments.

TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS

SEC. 208. (a) There are hereby transferred to the Commission all functions, powers, and duties of—

(1) the Secretary of Agriculture under section 10(e)(2) of the Food Stamp Act of 1964 (7 U.S.C. 2019(e)(2));

(2) the Secretary of Labor under—

(A) section 3 of the Act of June 6, 1933 (29 U.S.C. 49b); and

(B) section 303(a)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 503(a)-(1);

(3) the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare under—

(A) sections 134(a)(6) and 204(a)(6) of the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Health Centers Construction Act of 1963 (42 U.S.C. 2674(a)(6) and 2684(a)(6));

(B) section 303(a)(5) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3023(a)(5));

(C) sections 314(a)(2)(F) and (d)(2)(F) and 604(a)(8) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 246(a)(2)(F) and (d)(2)(F) and 291d(a)(8)); and

(D) sections 2(a)(5), 402(a)(5), 503(a)(3), 513(a)(3), 1002(a)-(5), 1402(a)(5), 1602(a)(5), and 1902(a)(4) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 302(a)(5), 602(a)(5), 703(a)(3), 713(a)(3), 1202(a)-(5), 1352(a)(5), 1382(a)(5), and 1396a(a)(4)); and

(4) any other department, agency, office, or officer (other than the President) under any other provision of law or regulation applicable to a program of grants-in-aid that specifically requires the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis with respect to the program; insofar as the functions, powers, and duties relate to the prescription of personnel standards on a merit basis.

(b) The Commission shall—

(1) provide consultation and technical advice and assistance to State and local governments to aid them in complying with standards prescribed (A) by the Commission under subsection (a) of this section or (B) by the President under section 202(a) of this Act; and

(2) make investigations and advise Federal agencies administering programs of grants or financial assistance as to compliance with the standards and recommend the taking of such action as the Commission considers will most effectively carry out the purpose of this title.

(c) So much of the personnel, property, records, and unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, and other funds of any Federal agency employed,

used, held, available, or to be made available in connection with the functions, powers, and duties vested in the Commission by this section as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall determine shall be transferred to the Commission at such time or times as the Director shall direct.

(d) Personnel standards prescribed by the Commission under subsection (a) of this section and section 203(b)(2) of this Act shall be consistent, to the extent practicable, with standards prescribed by the President under section 202(a) of this Act.

(e) Personnel standards prescribed by Federal agencies under laws and regulations referred to in subsection (a) of this section shall continue in effect until modified or superseded by standards prescribed (A) by the Commission under subsection (a) of this section or (B) by the President under section 202(a) of this Act.

(f) This section shall become effective sixty days after the date of enactment of this Act.

TITLE III—MOBILITY OF FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL EMPLOYEES

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SEC. 301. The objective of this title is to provide for the temporary assignment of personnel between the Federal Government and State and local governments.

AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE

SEC. 302. (a) Chapter 33 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting the following new subchapter at the end thereof:

"SUBCHAPTER VI—ASSIGNMENTS TO AND FROM STATES

"§ 3371. Definitions.

"For the purpose of this subchapter—

"(1) 'State' means—

"(A) a State of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and a territory or possession of the United States; and

"(B) an instrumentality or authority of a State or States as defined in clause (A) of this paragraph (1) and a Federal-State authority or instrumentality; and

"(2) 'local government' means—

"(A) any political subdivision, instrumentality, or authority of a State or States as defined in clause (A) of paragraph (1); and

"(B) any general or special purpose agency of such a political subdivision, instrumentality, or authority.

"§ 3372. General provisions.

"On request from or with the concurrence of a State or local government, and with the consent of the employee concerned, the head of an executive agency may arrange for the assignment of—

"(1) an employee of his agency to a State or local government; and

"(2) an employee of a State or local government to his agency; for work of mutual concern to his agency and the State or local government that he determines will be mutually beneficial to both. The period of an assignment under this subchapter may not exceed two years. However, the head of an executive agency may extend the period of assignment for not more than two additional years. The President may prescribe regulations for the administration of this subchapter.

"§ 3373. Assignment of employees to State or local governments.

"(a) An employee of an executive agency assigned to a State or local government under this subchapter is deemed, during the assignment, to be either—

"(1) on detail to a regular work assignment in his agency; or

"(2) on leave without pay from his position in the agency.

An employee assigned either on detail or on leave without pay remains an employee of his agency. The Federal Tort Claims Act and any other Federal tort liability statute apply to an employee so assigned. The supervision of the duties

of an employee on detail may be governed by agreement between the executive agency and the State or local government concerned.

"(b) The assignment of an employee of an executive agency either on detail or on leave without pay to a State or local government under this subchapter may be made with or without reimbursement by the State or local government for the travel and transportation expenses to or from the place of assignment and for the pay or supplemental pay or a part thereof, of the employee during assignment. Any reimbursements shall be credited to the appropriation of the executive agency used for paying the travel and transportation expenses or pay.

"(c) For an employee so assigned and on leave without pay—

"(1) if the rate of pay for his employment by the State or local government is less than the rate of pay he would have received had he continued in his regular assignment in the agency, he is entitled to receive supplemental pay from the agency in an amount equal to the difference between the State or local government rate and the agency rate;

"(2) he is entitled to annual and sick leave to the same extent as if he had continued in his regular assignment in the agency; and

"(3) he is entitled, notwithstanding other statutes—

"(A) to continuation of his insurance under chapter 87 of this title, and coverage under chapter 89 of this title or other applicable authority, so long as he pays currently into the employee's life insurance fund and the employee's health benefits fund or other applicable health benefits system (through his employing agency) the amount of the employee contributions; and

"(B) to credit the period of his assignment under this subchapter toward periodic step increases, retention, and leave accrual purposes, and, on payment into the civil service retirement and disability fund or other applicable retirement system of the percentage of his State or local government pay, and of his supplemental pay, if any, that would have been deducted from a like agency pay for the period of the assignment and payment by the executive agency into the fund or system of the amount that would have been payable by the agency during the period of the assignment with respect to a like agency pay, to treat (notwithstanding section 8348(g) of this title) his service during that period as service of the type performed in the agency immediately before his assignment.

However, an employee or his beneficiary may not receive benefits referred to in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of this paragraph (3), based on service during an assignment under this subchapter for which the employee or, if he dies without making such an election, his beneficiary elects to receive benefits, under any State or local government retirement or insurance law or program, which the Civil Service Commission determines to be similar. The executive agency shall deposit currently in the employee's life insurance fund, the employee's health benefits fund or other applicable health benefits system, respectively, the amount of the Government's contributions on account of service with respect to which employee contributions are collected as provided in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of this paragraph (3).

"(d) (1) An employee so assigned and on leave without pay who dies or suffers disability as a result of personal injury sustained while in the performance of his duty during an assignment under this subchapter shall be treated, for the purposes of subchapter I of chapter 81 of this title, as though he were an employee as defined by section 8101 of this title who had sustained the injury in the performance of duty. When an employee (or his dependents in case of death) entitled by reason of injury or death to benefits under subchapter I of chapter 81 of this title is also entitled to benefits from a State or local government for the same injury or death, he (or his dependents in case of death) shall elect which benefits he will receive. The election shall be made within one year after the injury or death, or such further time as the Secretary of Labor may allow for reasonable cause shown. When made, the election is irrevocable unless otherwise provided by law.

"(2) An employee who elects to receive benefits from a State or local government may not receive an annuity under subchapter II of chapter 83 of this title and benefits from the State or local government for injury or disability to himself covering the same period of time. This provision does not—

"(A) bar the right of a claimant to the greater benefit conferred by either the State or local government or subchapter III of chapter 83 of this title for any part of the same period of time;

"(B) deny to an employee an annuity accruing to him under subchapter III of chapter 83 of this title on account of service performed by him; or

"(C) deny any concurrent benefit to him from the State or local government on account of the death of another individual.

"§ 3374. Assignments of employees from State or local governments.

"(a) An employee of a State or local government who is assigned to an executive agency under an arrangement under this subchapter may—

"(1) be appointed in the executive agency without regard to the provisions of this title governing appointment in the competitive service for the agreed period of the assignment; or

"(2) be deemed on detail to the executive agency.

"(b) An employee given an appointment is entitled to pay in accordance with chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of this title or other applicable law, and is deemed an employee of the executive agency for all purposes except—

"(1) subchapter III of chapter 83 of this title or other applicable retirement system;

"(2) chapter 87 of this title; and

"(3) chapter 89 of this title or other applicable health benefits system unless his appointment results in the loss of coverage in a group health benefits plan the premium of which has been paid in whole or in part by a State or local government contribution.

"(c) During the period of assignment, a State or local government employee on detail to an executive agency—

"(1) is not entitled to pay from the agency;

"(2) is deemed an employee of the agency for the purpose of chapter 73 of this title, sections 203, 205, 207, 208, 209, 602, 603, 606, 607, 643, 654, 1905, and 1913 of title 18, section 638a of title 31, and the Federal Tort Claims Act and any other Federal tort liability statute; and

"(3) is subject to such regulations as the President may prescribe. The supervision of the duties of such an employee may be governed by agreement between the Executive agency and the State or local government concerned.

"(d) A State or local government employee who is given an appointment in an executive agency for the period of the assignment or who is on detail to an executive agency and who suffers disability or dies as a result of personal injury sustained while in the performance of his duty during the assignment shall be treated, for the purpose of subchapter I of chapter 81 of this title, as though he were an employee as defined by section 8101 of this title who had sustained the injury in the performance of duty. When an employee (or his dependents in case of death) entitled by reason of injury or death to benefits under subchapter I of chapter 81 of this title is also entitled to benefits from a State or local government for the same injury or death, he (or his dependents in case of death) shall elect which benefits he will receive. The election shall be made within one year after the injury or death, or such further time as the Secretary of Labor may allow for reasonable cause shown. When made, the election is irrevocable unless otherwise provided by law.

"(e) If a State or local government fails to continue the employer's contribution to state or local government retirement, life insurance, and health benefit plans for a state or local government employee who is given an appointment in an executive agency, the employer's contributions covering the state or local government employee's period of assignment, or any part thereof, may be made from the appropriations of the executive agency concerned.

"§ 3375. Travel expenses.

"(a) Appropriations of an executive agency are available to pay, or reimburse, a Federal or State or local employee in accordance with—

"(1) subchapter I of chapter 57 of this title, for the expenses of—

"(A) travel and per diem instead of subsistence to and from the assignment location;

"(B) per diem instead of subsistence at the assignment location during the period of the assignment; and

"(C) travel and per diem instead of subsistence while traveling on official business away from his designated post of duty during the

assignment when the head of the executive agency considers the travel in the interest of the United States;

"(2) section 5724 of this title, for the expenses of transportation of his immediate family and of his household goods and personal effects to and from the assignment location;

"(3) section 5724(a)(1) of this title, for the expenses of per diem allowance for the immediate family of the employee to and from the assignment location;

"(4) section 5724(a)(3) of this title, for subsistence expenses of the employee and his immediate family while occupying temporary quarters at the assignment location and upon return to his former post of duty; and

"(5) section 5726(c) of this title, for the expenses of nontemporary storage of household goods and personal effects in connection with assignment at an isolated location.

"(b) Expenses specified in subsection (a) of this section, other than those in paragraph (1)(C), may not be allowed in connection with the assignment of a Federal or State or local employee under this subchapter, unless and until the employee agrees in writing to complete the entire period of his assignment or one year, whichever is shorter, unless separated or reassigned for reasons beyond his control that are acceptable to the executive agency concerned. If the employee violates the agreement, the money spent by the United States for these expenses is recoverable from the employee as a debt due the United States. The head of the executive agency concerned may waive in whole or in part a right of recovery under this subsection with respect to a State or local government employee on assignment with the agency.

"(c) Appropriations of an executive agency are available to pay expenses under section 5742 of this title with respect to a Federal or State or local employee assigned under this subchapter."

(b) The analysis of chapter 33 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting the following at the end thereof:

"SUBCHAPTER VI—ASSIGNMENTS TO AND FROM STATES

"Sec.
"3371. Definitions.
"3372. General provisions.
"3373. Assignments of employees to State or local governments.
"3374. Assignments of employees from State or local governments.
"3375. Travel expenses."

REPEAL OF SPECIAL AUTHORITIES

SEC. 303. The Act of August 2, 1956, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1881–1888), except that the Secretary of Agriculture may continue to make arrangements for the temporary assignment of employees with land-grant colleges or a college or university operated by any State or local government subject to the provisions of this title, and section 507 of the Act of April 11, 1965, Public Law 89–10, 79 Stat. 51 (20 U.S.C. 867), and section 314(f) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 246 (f)) (less applicability to commissioned officers of the Public Health Service) are hereby repealed.

SEC. 304. This title shall become effective sixty days after the date of enactment of this Act.

TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SEC. 401. The purpose of this title is to provide for the general administration of titles I, II, and IV of this Act (hereinafter referred to as "this Act"), and to provide for the establishment of certain advisory groups.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 402. For the purpose of this Act—

(1) "Commission" means the United States Civil Service Commission;

(2) "Federal agency" means an executive department, military department, independent establishment, or agency in the executive branch of the Government of the United States, including Government owned or controlled corporations;

(3) "State" means a State of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and a territory or possession of

the United States, and includes interstate and Federal-interstate agencies but does not include the governments of the political subdivisions of a State; and

(4) "local government" means a city, town, county, or other subdivision or district of a State, including agencies, instrumentalities, and authorities of any of the foregoing and any combination of such units or combination of such units and a State. A "general local government" means a city, town, county, or comparable general-purpose political subdivision of a State.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 403. (a) Unless otherwise specifically provided, the Commission shall administer this Act.

(b) The Commission shall furnish such advice and assistance to State and local governments as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

(c) In the performance of, and with repect to, the functions, powers, and duties vested in it by this Act, the Commission may—

(1) issue such standards and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act;

(2) consent to the modification of any contract entered into pursuant to this Act, such consent being subject to any specific limitations of this Act;

(3) Include in any contract made pursuant to this Act such covenants, conditions, or provisions as it deems necessary to assure that the purposes of this Act will be achieved; and

(4) utilize the services and facilities of any Federal agency, any State or local government, any other public or nonprofit agency or institution, on a reimbursable basis or otherwise, in accordance with agreements between the Commission and the head thereof.

(d) In the perfomance of, and with respect to the functions, powers, and duties vested in it by this Act, the Commission—

(1) may collect information from time to time with respect to State and local government training programs and personnel administration improvement programs and projects under this Act, and make such information available to interested groups, organizations, or agencies, public or private;

(2) may conduct such research and make such evaluation as needed for the efficient administration of this Act; and

(3) shall include in its annual report, a report of the administration of this Act.

(e) The provisions of this Act are not a limitation on existing authorities under other statutes but are in addition to any such authorities, unless otherwise specifically provided in this Act.

REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

SEC. 404. A State or local government office designated to administer a program or project under this Act shall make reports and evaluations in such form, at such times, and containing such information concerning the status and application of Federal funds and the operation of the approved program or project as the Commission may require, and shall keep and make available such records as may be required by the Commission for the verification of such reports and evaluations.

REVIEW AND AUDIT

SEC. 405. The Commission, the head of the Federal agency concerned, and the Comptroller General of the United States, or any of their duly authorized representatives, shall have access, for the purpose of audit and examination, to any books, documents, papers, and records of a grant recipient that are pertinent to the grant received.

TERMINATION OF GRANTS

SEC. 406. Whenever the Commission, after giving reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State or general local government concerned, finds—

(1) that a program or project has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of this Act; or

(2) that in the operation of the program or project there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision;

the Commission shall notify the State or general local government of its findings and no further payments may be made to such government by the Commission until it is satisfied that such noncompliance has been or will promptly be, corrected. However, the Commission may authorize the continuance of payments to those projects approved under this Act which are not involved in the noncompliance.

ADVISORY GROUPS

SEC. 407. (a) The following advisory groups are authorized to be established under this Act:

(1) The President may appoint, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service—

(A) an advisory council to study and make recommendations concerning standards of merit personnel administration for personnel systems of State and local governments; and

(B) an advisory committee on intergovernmental manpower policy composed of representatives of the Federal Government, State and local governments, institutions of higher education and other educational and training organizations, professional organizations, employee organizations, and the general public, to advise on matters of general policy relating to this Act.

(2) The Commission may appoint, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, such advisory committee or committees as it may determine to be necessary to facilitate the administration of this Act.

(b) Members of the advisory council or of the advisory committees who are not regular full-time employees of the United States, while serving on the business of the council or committees, including travel time, are entitled to receive compensation at rates not exceeding the per diem rate for GS–18; and while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, members may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, for individuals in the Government service employed intermittently.

APPROPRIATION AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 408. There are authorized to be appropriated, without fiscal year limitation, such sums as may be necessary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for each of the four succeeding fiscal years, to carry out the programs authorized by this Act.

REVOLVING FUND

SEC. 409. (a) There is established a revolving fund, to be available without fiscal year limitation, for financing training and such other functions as are authorized or required to be performed by the Commission on a reimbursable basis by this Act and such other services as the Commission, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, determines may be performed more advantageously through such a fund.

(b) The capital of the fund shall consist of any appropriations made for the purpose of providing capital (which appropriations are hereby authorized), and such unexpended balances of appropriations or funds relating to the activities transferred to the fund and the fair and reasonable value of such stocks of supplies, equipment, and other assets and inventories on order as the Commission may transfer to the fund, less the related liabilities, unpaid obligations, and accrued annual leave of employees who are transferred to the activities financed by the fund at its inception.

(c) The fund shall be credited with—

(1) reimbursements or advance payments from available funds of the Commission, other Federal agencies, State or local governments, or other sources for supplies and services at rates which will approximate the expense of operations, including the accrual of annual leave, the depreciation of equipment, and the net losses on property transferred or donated; and

(2) receipts from sales or exchanges of property and payments for losses or damage to property accounted for under the fund.

(d) Any unobligated and unexpended balance in the fund that the Commission determines to be in excess of amounts needed for its operations shall be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

LIMITATIONS ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR COST SHARING

SEC. 410. Federal funds made available to State or local governments under other programs may not be used by the State or local government for cost-sharing purposes under grant provisions of this Act. State or local government funds used for cost sharing on other federally assisted programs may not be used for cost sharing under grant provisions of this Act.

METHOD OF PAYMENT

SEC. 411. Payments under this Act may be made in installments, and in advance or by way of reimbursement, as the Commission may determine, with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments.

EFFECTIVE DATE OF GRANT PROVISIONS

SEC. 412. Grant provisions of this Act shall become effective one hundred and eighty days following the date of enactment of this Act.

TEXT OF PUBLIC SERVICE EDUCATION ACT—H.R. 5989

A BILL To establish fellowships to enable persons in or planning a career in public service at the local, State, or Federal level to pursue graduate programs of education in public affairs, public administration and other related fields; to provide support for the development and strengthening of graduate level programs of public administration and public affairs at institutions of higher education; to provide support to State and local governments for the improvement of public service through short-term training programs for State and local government personnel; and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as "Public Service Education Act".

TITLE I—PUBLIC SERVICE FELLOWSHIPS

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

SEC. 101. The purpose of this title is to improve the quality of government by providing fellowships for graduate study to persons who plan to pursue a career in public service in government at the local, State, regional or Federal level. For the purpose of this title, the term "career in public service" means a career as an officer or employee of a local or State government, a regional governmental organization established under a compact approved by the Congress of the United States, or the United States, in an executive, administrative or similar position which requires special competence in the fields of public affairs and public administration, including those which require qualifications in technical or professional fields.

FELLOWSHIPS AUTHORIZED

SEC. 102. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to award not to exceed 750 fellowships during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and each of the four succeeding fiscal years, for up to two years of graduate study leading to a post-baccalaureate degree for persons who are pursuing or plan to pursue a career in public service. Such fellowships shall be awarded as provided in sections 103 and 104 of this title and for such periods as the Commissioner may determine, but not to exceed 24 months.

(b) In addition to the number of fellowships authorized to be awarded by subsection (a) of this section, the Commissioner is authorized to award fellowships equal to the number previously awarded during any fiscal year under this title but vacated prior to the time to the end of the period for which they were awarded; except that each fellowship awarded under this subsection shall be for such period of study, not in excess of the remainder of the period for which the fellowship which it replaces was awarded, as the Commissioner may determine.

ALLOCATION OF FELLOWSHIP

SEC. 103. The Commissioner shall, in consultation with the Advisory Council on Public Service Education, allocate fellowships under this title to institutions of higher education with programs approved under the provisions of section 104(a) for the use of individuals accepted for study a program in accordance with such standards and priorities as he shall prescribe by regulation.

APPROVAL OF PROGRAMS

SEC. 104. The Commissioner shall approve a graduate program of an institution of higher education for purposes of this title only upon application by the institution and only upon his finding—

(1) that such program will substantially further the objective of improving the quality of education of persons who are pursuing or intend to pursue a career in public service.

(2) that such program is of high quality and either is in effect or readily obtainable and

(3) that only persons who demonstrate a serious intent to pursue or to continue a career in public service will be accepted for study in the program.

In approving the application of institutions the Commissioner shall give preference to those which are carrying on or have arranged for internship programs for the benefit of persons pursuing fellowships under this part.

(b) The Commissioner is authorized to obtain the services of experts and consultants in accordance with section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, to advise him with respect to the making of grants and contracts and the approving of programs under this title. Experts and consultants employed pursuant to this subsection may be compensated or so employed at rates not in excess of $100 per diem, including travel time, and may be allowed while away from their homes or regular places of business, travel expenses (including per diem in lieu of subsistence) as authorized by section 5703, of title 5, United States Code, for persons in Government service employed intermittently.

STIPENDS

SEC. 105. (a) Each person awarded a fellowship under this title shall receive a stipend of $2,500 for the first academic year of study, and $3,000 for the second such year, plus an additional amount of $600 for each such year on account of each of his dependents. Where a person awarded a fellowship under this title for study at an institution of higher education pursues his studies as a regularly enrolled student at such institution during periods outside of the regular sessions of the graduate program of the institution, the Commissioner may make appropriate adjustments in his stipends and allowances for dependents.

(b) In addition to amounts paid to persons pursuant to subsection (a) there shall be paid to the institution of higher education at which each such person is pursuing his course of study $2,500 per academic year, less any amount charged such person for tuition and nonrefundable fees and deposits.

(c) In addition to the amounts paid pursuant to subsections (a) and (b) of this section, the Commissioner may pay to institutions of higher education which carry on or arrange internship programs at the State, local or regional level of government for the benefit of persons pursuing fellowships under this part an amount up to $100 per week, for a period not to exceed ten weeks during each year of fellowship study, for each fellowship holder who participates in such an internship program. Such amouts shall be used to defray any salary paid to fellowship holders participating in an intership program by the participating State, local or regional governmental agency.

LIMITATION

SEC. 106. (a) No fellowships shall be awarded under this title for study at a school or department of divinity. For purposes of this section the term "school or department of divinity" means an institution or department or branch of an institution whose program is specifically for the education of students to prepare them to become ministers of religion or to enter upon some other religious vocation or to prepare them to teach theological subjects.

FELLOWSHIP CONDITIONS

SEC. 107. A person awarded a fellowship under the provisions of this title shall continue to receive the payments provided in section 105(a) only during such periods as the Commissioner finds that he is maintaining satisfactory proficiency and devoting full time to study of research in the field in which such fellowship was awarded in an institution of higher education, and is not engaging in gainful employment other than such part-time employment in teaching, reserach, or similar activities related to his training, or as a participant in an internship or cooperative education program, as has been approved by the Commissioner.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 108. There are hereby authorized the appropriations to carry out this title, $4,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968; $8,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969; $11,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and each of the two succeeding fiscal year; and such sums for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, as may be necessary to enable persons who have been awarded fellowships prior to July 1, 1972, to complete their study under such fellowships.

TITLE II—EDUCATIONAL IMPROVEMENT FOR FEDERAL OFFICERS

PART A—FELLOWSHIPS FOR FEDERAL OFFICERS

SEC. 201. Chapter 41 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "S. 4119. Award of fellowship to employees.

"(a) During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and each of the four succeeding fiscal years, the Civil Service Commission shall carry on a program under which it awards fellowships to employees for one year of graduate study at non-government facilities which are institutions of higher education.

"(b) To be eligible for a fellowship under this section an employee must (1) be in grade 11 to 15, inclusive, of the General Schedule under section 5332, or be employed in a position of comparable responsibility, as determined by the Commission, and (2) be selected by the agency in or under which employed.

(c) Of the fellowships awarded under this section, not less than 60 per centum shall be for study in postbaccalaureate programs concentrating in the social sciences and which will enhance the effectiveness of Federal executives, administrators, managers, and others on the general supporting staffs of agencies. The remainder of such fellowships shall be awarded for postbaccalaureate programs concentrating in the sciences, engineering, or other professions to allow Federal professional employees to expand and update their professional knowledge.

"(d) The number of fellowships awarded under this section shall not exceed the following percentages of those eligible in the fiscal year ending:

	Per centum
1. June 30, 1968	0.25
2. June 30, 1969	.5
3. June 30, 1970	.75
4. June 30, 1971	1.0
5. June 30, 1972	1.0

The number eligible shall be determined by the Commission in accordance with the requirements of part (b)(1) of this section.

"(e) The Civil Service Commission shall pay each non-Government facility at which a fellow is pursuing his course of study under this section the sum of $2,500 for each such fellows, less any amount charged such person for tuition and nonrefundable fees and deposits.

"(f) The head of an agency shall, as authorized by section 4109(a)(1), pay all of the pay (except overtime, holiday, or night differential pay) of an employee of the agency pursuing a fellowship awarded under this section. The head of an agency shall not make any payments under section 4109(a)(2) which would constitute a duplication of a payment under subsection (e) of this section. Each agency which makes expenditures under section 4109(a)(2) on account of employees awarded fellowships under this section shall be reimbursed in full for such expenditures by the Civil Service Commission."

SEC. 202. (a) The analysis at the beginning of chapter 41 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the bottom thereof the following:

"4119. Fellowship training."

(b) Section 4106(a)(1) of such title is amended by inserting before the period the following: ", but the number of man-years of training for an agency shall not include fellowship training under section 4119".

(c) Section 4112(a) of such title is amended by inserting after "this chapter" the following: "(other than section 4119)".

PART B—SABBATICAL LEAVES

SEC. 211. Chapter 63 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 6325. Sabbatical leaves.

"(a) During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and each of the four succeeding fiscal years, the Civil Service Commission shall carry on a program under which it authorizes one year sabbatical leaves at full pay for employees as defined in section 2105.

"(b) To be eligible for a sabbatical leave under this section such an employee must (1) be in grade 16 to 18, inclusive, of the General Schedule under section 5332, or be employed in a position of comparable responsibility, as determined by the Commission, (2) have been such an employee for not less than six years, and (3) have been employed for not less than three years in a grade not lower than grade 16 of such Schedule, or in a position of comparable responsibility, as determined by the Commission.

"(c) An employee shall be selected for a sabbatical leave on the basis of applications submitted by him showing a plan which he intends to pursue for a one-year program of graduate level study, travel, reading research, or a combination thereof. Such an application shall include an estimate of the expenses involved in carrying out the plan. Upon the examination of such applications, each agency shall select those of its employees to be given a sabbatical leave on the basis of the extent it is anticipated enhancement of the employee's effectiveness and of the overall benefit to the Government. During the period of his fellowship, no employee shall engage in any substantially gainful employment or activity other than as a Federal employee. The number of employees in or under an agency who may be given a sabbatical leave in any year shall be determined by the Civil Service Commission.

"(d) The Civil Service Commission shall pay the cost incurred by an employee in carrying out his approved plan, except that such payments shall not exceed $10,000, exclusive of the pay of such employee and, where the plan provides for full-time study by the employee at any institution of higher education, such institution shall be paid $2,500, less any amount charged the employee for tuition and nonrefundable fees and deposits. Where less than full-time study is provided for the Commission shall reduce the payment to the institution by an appropriate amount."

TITLE III—IMPROVEMENT OF EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATIONS OF STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS

PART A—PUBLIC SERVICE FELLOWSHIPS FOR STATE AND LOCAL OFFICIALS

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 30. For the purpose of enabling the United States Civil Service Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission") to make grants to States under this title, there is authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, the sum of $3,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, the sum of $6,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, the sum of $11,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, the sum of $15,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, the sum of $20,000,000.

ALLOTMENTS TO STATES

SEC. 302. (a) From the sums appropriated under section 201 or any fiscal year, the Commission shall reserve such amounts, but not in excess of 2 per centum thereof, as it may determine and shall allot such amount among the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands according to their respective needs for assistance under this part. From the remainder of such sums, the Commission

shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount of such remainder as the product of—

(A) the population of the State, and

(B) the State's salary index (as determined under paragraph (2), bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all the States.

(2) The "salary index" for a State shall be 100 per centum less the product of (A) 50 per centum and (B) the quotient obtained by dividing the average salary paid in the United States to State and local employees eligible for a fellowship under this part by the average salary paid to such employees of the State. The determination of the salary index for a State shall be made by the Commission on the basis of the most recent satisfatcory data available to it. For the purpose of this section, (1) the term "United States" means the 50 states and the District of Columbia, and (2) the term "State" does not include the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

(b) The amount of any State's allotment under subsection (a) for any fiscal year which the Commission determines will not be required for fiscal year shall be available for reallotment from time to time, on such dates, during such year as the Commission may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under subsection (a) for that year, but with such proportionate amount for any of such other States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum the Commission estimates such State needs and will be able to use for such year; and the total of such reductions shall be similarly reallocated among the States whose proportionate amounts were not so reduced. Any amount realloted to a State under this subsection during a year from funds appropriated pursuant to section 301 shall be deemed part of its allotment under subsection (a) for such year.

STATE PLANS

SEC. 303. (a) Any State which desires to receive grants, under this part shall submit to the Commission a State plan, in such detail as the Commission deems necessary, which—

(1) designates a single State agency to act as the sole State agency for administration of the State plan;

(2) sets forth a fellowship program under which—

(A) the State agency will award fellowships for one year of graduate level study at institutions of higher education,

(B) fellowships will be awarded only to employees of the State, or of a political subdivision of the State, whose duties are generally comparable to those of Federal employees in grades 11 to 15, inclusive, of the general schedule, under section 5332 of title 5, United States Code,

(C) not less than 60 per centum of the fellowships will be awarded for study in graduate programs concentrated in the social sciences and designed to enhance the effectiveness of State and local executives, administrators, managers, and general supporting staffs, and that the remainder of such fellowships will be awarded for graduate programs concentrating in sciences, engineering, or other professions and designed to enable scientists, engineers, and other professional employees to expand and update their professional knowledge,

(D) the persons awarded fellowships may elect to pursue their fellowship programs at any instiution of higher education in a State which will accept them,

(E) persons granted fellowships will be paid their full salaries during the period of their study, and will be reimbursed for necessary transportation expenses and the expenses of the movement of their households, incident to the pursuit of their fellowships,

(F) the institution of higher education at which each fellow attends will be paid a supporting grant of $2,500 per annum for each fellow in attendance, less any amount charged such fellow for tuition and nonrefundable fees and deposits,

(G) the selection of fellows will be based on the needs of the State, as set forth in the State plan, or on the basis of the relative qualifications of the applicants as determined by standards and methods set forth in the State plan,

(H) provision is made for obtaining the participation of local government officials in the program,

(I) provision is made for providing reasonable opportunity for both State and local public service personnel to be awarded fellowships,

(3) sets forth such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to insure proper disbursement of, and accounting for, Federal funds paid to the State under this part; and

(4) provides for making such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Commission may reasonably require to carry out its function under this part, and for keeping such records and for affording such access thereto as the Commission may find necessary to assure correctness and verification of such reports.

(b) The Commission shall approve any State plan and any modification thereof which complies with the provisions of subsection (a).

PAYMENTS TO STATES

SEC. 304. From the amounts allotted to each State under section 302 the Commission shall pay to that State an amount equal to the amount expended by the State in making the payments required by section 302(a)(2) and (F). Such payments may be made in installments, and in advance or by way of reimbursement, with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments.

PART B—GRANTS TO STATES FOR SHORT-TERM EDUCATION AND TRAINING

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATION

SEC. 311. For the purpose of making grants to assist in the establishment and carrying out of more comprehensive programs of short-term, in-service training for State and local government officials, there is authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, the sum of $10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and each of the two succeeding fiscal years, the sum of $10,000,000.

ALLOTMENTS TO STATES

SEC. 312. (a) From the sums appropriated for carrying out this part for any fiscal year, the Commission shall reserve such amount, but not in excess of 2 per centum thereof, as it may determine and shall allot such amount among the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands according to their respective needs for assistance under this part. From the remainder of such sums, the Commission shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to such remainder as the population of that State bears to the population of all the States. The population of a State and of all the State shall be determined by the Commission on the basis of the most recent satisfactory data available to it. For purposes of this subsection the term "State" shall not include the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

(b) The amount of any State's allotment under subsection (a) for any fiscal year which the Commission determines will not be required for such fiscal year shall be available for reallotment from time to time, on such dates during such year as the Commission may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotment to such State under subsection (a) for that year, but with such proportionate amount for any of such other States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum the Commission estimates each States needs and will be able to use for such year; and the total of such reductions shall be similarly reallotted among the States whose proportionate amounts were not so reduced. Any amount reallotted to a State under this subsection during a year from funds appropriated pursuant to section 311 shall not be deemed part of its allotment under subsection (a) for such year.

STATE PLANS

SEC. 313. (a) Any State which desires to receive grants under this part shall submit to the Commission a State plan, in such detail as the Commission deems necessary, which—

(1) designates a single State agency (which may be the State agency designated for purposes of part A) to act as the sole State agency for administration of the State plan;

(2) provides for establishing and carrying out programs of short-term education or training (including specialized extension courses, management and executive development seminars, and full-time intensive programs of study) such programs to be carried out through contracts or other arrangements with public or nonprofit educational institutions;

(3) provides for obtaining the participation of local governmental officials in carrying out the program;

(4) provides reasonable opportunity for both State and local public service personnel to receive education and training;

(5) sets forth such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of, and accounting for, Federal funds paid to the State (including any such funds paid by the State to any other public agency) under this part; and

(6) provides for making such reports, in such form, and containing such information, as the Commission may reasonably require to carry out its functions under this part, and for keeping such records and for affording such access thereto as the Commission may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

(b) The Commission shall approve any State plan and any modification thereof which complies with the provisions of subsection (a).

PAYMENTS TO STATES

SEC. 314. From the amounts allotted to each State under section 312, the Commission shall pay to that State an amount equal to one-half of the amount expended by the State in carrying out its State plan. Such payments may be made in installments, and in advance or by way of reimbursement, when necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments.

PART C—ADMINISTRATION OF STATE PLAN; JUDICIAL REVIEW

ADMINISTRATION OF STATE PLAN

SEC. 321. (a) The Commission shall not finally disapprove any State plan submitted under this title, or any modification thereof without first affording the State agency administering the plan reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

(b) Whenever the Commission, after reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing to such State agency, finds that—

(1) that the State plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of section 303(a) or 313(a), as the case may be, or

(2) that in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provisions, the Commission shall notify such State agency that the State will not be regarded as eligible to participate in the program affected until the Commission is satisfied that there is no longer any such failure to comply.

JUDICIAL REVIEW

SEC. 322. (a) If any State is dissatisfied with the Commission's final action with respect to the approval of its State plan submitted under section 303(a) or 313(a), as the case may be, or with its final action under section 321(b), such State may, within sixty days after notice of such action, file with the United States Court of Appeals for the Circuit in which such State is located a petition for review of that action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Commission. The Commission thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceedings on which it based its action as provided in section 3112 of title 28, United States Code.

(b) The findings of fact by the Commission, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive; but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commission to take further evidence, and the Commission may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify its previous action, and shall certify to the court the record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence.

(c) The court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Commission or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to

review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code.

TITLE IV—ASSISTANCE TO INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION FOR IMPROVEMENT OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS AND ADMINISTRATION PROGRAMS

AUTHORIZATION FOR GRANTS

SEC. 401. The Commissioner is authorized to make grants to institutions of higher education to assist them to carry out comprehensive programs, not to exceed five years in duration, to expand or improve the graduate education in public affairs and public administration provided at the institution, including programs designed to renew the professional knowledge of Federal, regional, State, and local governmental officials. Such programs may include the expansion or improvement of graduate instruction in those social sciences which form the basis for effective education programs in public affairs and public administration. Grants under this title may be for projects and activities which are an integral part of such a comprehensive program such as—

(1) planning for the development or expansion of graduate education in public affairs of public administration,

(2) increasing and training faculty,

(3) teaching, research, curriclulum development, and other related activities,

(4) acquisition of additional library resources,

(5) research on problems of government,

(6) developing and carrying out short-term intensive courses to renew the professional knowledge of public service employees.

GRANTS

SEC. 402. The Commissioner may make a grant under this title to an institution of higher education to assist it to carry out a program which he determines meets the requirements of section 401. No grants under this title shall exceed 75 per centum of the cost of the expenses incurred by the institution in carrying out the program with respect to which the grant was made or continue for more than five years with respect to any one program. Payments under this title may be made in installments, and in advance or by way of reimbursement, with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments.

PRIORITIES

SEC. 403. The Commissioner shall, in consultation with the Advisory Council on Public Service Education, establish a system of priorities to be used by him in making grants under this title where the funds available are insufficient to permit him to approve all eligible applications.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 404. For purposes of carrying out this title, there is authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, the sum of $5,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, the sum of $10,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, the sum of $15,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, the sum of $20,000,000, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, the sum of $20,000,000, and for the four succeeding fiscal years such sums as may be necessary to enable institutions of higher education to complete programs begun before July 1, 1972.

TITLE V—ADVISORY COUNCIL AND GENERAL PROVISIONS

ADVISORY COUNCIL ON PUBLIC SERVICE EDUCATION

SEC. 501. (a) There is hereby established an Advisory Council on Public Service Education which shall consist of the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, who shall be Chairman, of the Advisory Council, the Commissioner of Education, and ten additional members appointed by the President. Of the ten additional members, one shall be an officer or employee of the Federal Government,

three shall be officers or employees of State or local governments, and three shall be officers or employees of institutions of higher education and three shall be representative of the general public.

(b) The Advisory Council shall advise the Commissioner and the Commission on policies, procedures, criteria, and regulations implementing this Act, and such members of the Advisory Council who are not regular full-time employees of the United States shall, while serving on business of the Council, be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the President, but not exceeding $100 per day, including travel time; and while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5 of the United States Code for persons in Government service employed intermittently.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 502. As used in this Act—

(1) The term "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of Education.

(2) The term "Commission" means the United States Civil Service Commission.

(3) The term "institution of higher education" has the meaning given it by section 103(b) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958.

(4) The term "State" includes the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

FEDERAL CONTROL PROHIBITED

SEC. 503. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over any officer or employee of any State or local government, over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any education institution or school system, or over the selection of library resources.

Mr. ERLENBORN. I notice in section 908 advanced funding is authorized for NDEA and Higher Education Facilities Act.

Would it not be wise to also provide for advanced funding in this act? I don't believe it is provided for. Although you can carry over your appropriation for this year you are not authorized to appropriate a year in advance.

Mr. SIMPSON. I think this would be good.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Is there any reason why it was not included?

Mr. SIMPSON. No, I think not. I think the work on the drafting of it went back a good long time ago.

Mr. HUITT. It is just a happenstance. This bill was brought up last year and introduced on this side and was adopted this year as a title. I think it was an oversight when it was left out.

Mr. ERLENBORN. You would say the advanced funding is just as valid here and just as desirable?

Mr. HUITT. Yes.

Mrs. GREEN. On page 109, Dr. Simpson, you suggest in asking for educational centers that there might be as many as 15 or 20. Is there any reason that these centers have to be outside of institutions of higher education?

Mr. SIMPSON. No; I would contemplate them within the institutions of higher education.

Mrs. GREEN. The language does not provide this, does it?

Mr. HUITT. In my reading of the bill I don't see the Federal Government setting up centers any place.

Mrs. GREEN. I was thinking of title IV of the Elementary and Secondary Act.

Mr. SIMPSON. It reads—

The Secretary is authorized to make grants to institutions of higher education or combination—and so forth.

Then—

Such grants or contracts may be such as—

And then the fourth one is—

Centers of study at the graduate or professional level.

So I think it does contemplate them within institutions of higher education.

Mrs. GREEN. At page 109, it says—

The Secretary may make grants to other public or private organizations or contract with public or private agencies or organizations.

Mr. SIMPSON. It does say that. I think the idea was to allow room for grants for some unique contributions that might be made by scholarly associations.

Mrs. GREEN. What is the purpose, to establish centers in existing colleges and universities or to give authority to do both?

Mr. SIMPSON. To give authority to do both, actually.

Mrs. GREEN. Your first answer was that they definitely should be within the college.

Mr. SIMPSON. I would contemplate centers as described in my statement to be within universities.

Mrs. GREEN. You would not object to language that would limit the centers to existing colleges or universities?

Mr. SIMPSON. I don't think so.

Mr. HUITT. Let me say a number of things that can be done in the act. I would see a center as being established at a university. I cannot conceive of it being established anywhere else.

Mrs. GREEN. I wish you had been implementing title IV of the Elementary and Secondary Act.

Mr. HUITT. If, for instance, the Secretary wanted to contract with a learned association like the American Political Science Association to make a study of what kinds of programs are in operation in the country as a matter of information, he might do that but it would seem inconceivable to me that the Federal Government would attempt to establish a center to do this type of thing.

Mrs. GREEN. Under the Education Professional Development Act we had quite a lot of discussion of what was meant by "short term."

I believe we put some limiting language in that act. In subparagraph 5, what do you mean by short term? Would this allow you to set up 2-day institutes?

Mr. SIMPSON. I think it would. These are primarily aimed at short-term sessions for those who teach or those who are engaged in the preparation of people.

Mrs. GREEN. Would you object to language similar to the Education Professions Development Act?

Mr. SIMPSON. I would like to defer to my colleagues.

Dr. VALIEN. We would not.

Mrs. GREEN. What do you mean by innovative and experimental? In your statement you said that many universities are experimenting at the present time.

Mr. SIMPSON. I would simply like to encourage a good deal more of it in combination curriculums between professional schools, for example, and schools of public affairs in the development of professional or technically trained people for public service employment.

I can give you some examples. In schools of public health where there are grants-in-aid available under the authority of the Public Health Service Act, I think much more could be done in the way of building into the curriculum of those schools, courses which would draw on professors and the expertise available in the schools of public administration. Health officers in the country are administering very large-scale public services and they need the kinds of training that are available in our schools of public administration.

One or two schools have done this. I would like to see lots more of that kind of experimentation with combinations of curriculum.

Mrs. GREEN. D you need the authority to give contracts and grants, and so forth, to profitmaking agencies or organizations and if so, what do you envision here?

Mr. SIMPSON. I would expect that this would be used very rarely. There might be occasions where we would want to contract with a profitmaking organization for the development of teaching materials; for example, where we wanted to try some wholly new approaches.

Mrs. GREEN. You do contract with universities for this, too?

Mr. SIMPSON. Yes; we can contract with universities.

Mrs. GREEN. I am getting gun shy of all the negotiated contracts plus a fixed fee by the Office of Education and Office of Economic Opportunity.

What would be your reaction if we put a provision in the bill that the generosity accorded to the profitmaking institutions in each and every case shall also be extended to any college or university and that any college or university that is doing a bit of work that is similar to the profitmaking shall have the same kind of financial arrangement?

Mr. SIMPSON. I think this would be quite satisfactory. I would hope in this kind of use, and I think it would be rarely used, we would use fixed-price contracts with any private concern. We might thus contract for teaching materials, for example, rather than use a cost-plus-fixed-fee type of contract.

But I think your suggestion would give me no particular trouble at all.

Mrs. GREEN. They ought to operate under the same ground rules.

Mr. SIMPSON. Yes.

Mrs. GREEN. On page 111, who is going to determine the national need? Will that be up to the Secretary?

Mr. SIMPSON. Yes; it would. There is authorized here, as you may have noticed, an advisory committee to assist the Secretary in the administration of this program. We would have to give a good deal of thought to that advisory committee. Whether we could use the advisory committee authorized, the general advisory committee on graduate education, or a separate one here, I think is a matter we would have to think through.

If we did go to a separate one, I think we need representation on the advisory committee of both the consumer, officials of State and local government, leaders of State and local government, who know best what their needs are, and the producers, the educators in our institutions of higher education.

Mrs. GREEN. How many new advisory committees do we have in the whole act?

Mr. SIMPSON. I don't know. One of the advisory committees is a consolidation of some existing ones.

Mrs. GREEN. I know, but every time we consolidate we do that and then we add two or three others.

On page 113, would law students be entitled to 3-year fellowships?

Mr. SIMPSON. Yes. I think that there is a possibility that lawyers who are going into a highly specialized field of public law might go on for as much as 3 years of further education for the practice of their specialty.

Mrs. GREEN. Let me turn now to the funding because it would apply, I think, to all of the fellowship programs.

You like to announce your fellowship awards in March or April, is that correct?

Mr. SIMPSON. That is correct.

Mrs. GREEN. You are going to do that this year?

Mr. SIMPSON. Yes, ma'am.

Mrs. GREEN. Suppose you have awarded a fellowship to Mr. X and in October he finds he is drafted, what do you do? Do you freeze the funds and hold the fellowship for him until he returns?

Mr. SIMPSON. No. Now I am out of my field, really.

Dr. VALIEN. Let me try to answer that, Madam Chairman.

We announce the allocation of fellowships usually in November or early December. The institution, of course, begins to recruit students and they make their awards generally around the middle of April, the 15th of April, this being the award date. Then, of course, the students are selected for entering the next fall, which is the next September.

Up to that time, of course, what we have done, the students who have had fellowships under our present program and have been drafted after being awarded them, they have been permitted to do what we call interrupt their tenure, scholarships are held for them until they come back.

Mrs. GREEN. The money is frozen then?

Dr. VALIEN. Yes. Now we are studying this situation at the present time in our Bureau of Higher Education in order to see if we can meet, of course, the increased urgency which we will now face in view of the new graduate draft policy which has just been announced.

Mrs. GREEN. May I just say finally, Dr. Huitt, while I ordinarily would be quite excited about such a program, my enthusiasm for this legislation is considerably dampened by the current draft policy. It seems to me nothing less than sheer hypocrisy to talk about a new program, to try to give fellowships to 800 or a thousand people when we are at the same time saying to 226,000, "You can't continue your graduate education, you are going to be drafted."

I think it is the greatest inequity that I have ever seen in the draft system extending back to the Korean conflict and World War II. I do not know about my colleagues, but it would be with great hesi-

tancy that I would take any bill to the floor and urge that it be passed for 800 to a thousand fellowships when at the same time we are cutting off the education of over 200,000.

I would hope that you people would exercise the resources that are available to you to get a change in draft policy. I would like in an executive session for this subcommittee to consider the advisability of spending our time and efforts and energy on bringing about a change in draft policy rather than spending our time, energy, and efforts on a bill that is going to give fellowships to a thousand while we are denying an education to 200,000.

Mr. BURTON. Amen.

Mr. QUIE. May I ask one question for some information?

Mrs. GREEN. Yes.

Mr. QUIE. Congressman Brademas brought up the question of these people being underpaid. Do you have some information on what kind of salaries under the present schedules would be available in public service outside the poverty program?

Mr. SIMPSON. Yes. I don't have anything with me.

Mr. QUIE. In the action agencies, I think they are starting out as directors, the little ones, at $10,000 apiece, which is not exactly underpaid. I understand that in public service this is the problem.

Mr. SIMPSON. I think we can furnish for the record some of the entrance level salaries.

Mr. QUIE. Not only entrance level, because we want to hold them there, too.

Mr. SIMPSON. Yes. We can give you the ranges.

(The information follows:)

STATE SALARY RANGES
of
Selected Classes of Positions in
Employment Security-Public Welfare-Public Health
Mental Health-Civil Defense
Vocational Rehabilitation

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
Office of State Merit Systems

(251)

92-371 O - 68 - pt. 1 - 17

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	iii
Change in Mean Salaries, 1965 - 1967	v
EMPLOYMENT SECURITY CLASSES	
State Director, Employment Service	1
Chief of Benefits	2
Hearings Referee	3
Local Office Manager	4
Unemployment Claims Deputy	5
Employment Interviewer	6
Director of Employment Security Research and Statistics	7
Labor Force Analyst	8
Employment Counselor	9
Unemployment Insurance Field Auditor	10
PUBLIC WELFARE CLASSES	
Director of Welfare Research and Statistics	11
Public Welfare Field Representative	12
Public Assistance Casework Supervisor	13
Public Assistance Caseworker	14
Medical Social Work Consultant	15
State Director of Child Welfare	16
Consultant on Foster Care and Licensing	17
Child Welfare Supervisor	18
Child Welfare Worker	19
PUBLIC HEALTH CLASSES	
Director of Public Health Statistics	20
Director of Public Health Engineering	21
Public Health Engineer	22
Sanitarian	23
Health Officer	24
State Director, Public Health Nursing	25
Public Health Nurse Consultant	26
Public Health Nurse	27
Director of Public Health Education	28
Nutrition Consultant	29
Laboratory Technician	30

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Contd.)

Page

MENTAL HEALTH CLASSES

Psychiatrist 31
Psychologist 32
Psychiatric Social Worker 33

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION CLASSES

Vocational Rehabilitation Director 34
Vocational Rehabilitation Counselor 35

CIVIL DEFENSE CLASSES

State Director, Civil Defense 36
Deputy State Director, Civil Defense 37
Administrative Officer 38
Operations Officer 39
Area Coordinator 40
Training and Education Officer 41
Public Information Officer 42
Chemical, Biological and Radiological Defense Officer 43
Communications Officer 44

INTRODUCTION

This salary survey has been made for the information and use of State and Federal officials concerned with the grant-in-aid programs. The compilation shows salary ranges in pay plans for selected classes of positions in State and local grant-aided employment security, public welfare, public health, mental health, civil defense and vocational rehabilitation programs. The survey includes all States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

The data for the survey were compiled by the regional representatives, Office of State Merit Systems, in each of the regional offices of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The representatives obtained their information from the classification and compensation plans regularly submitted to this Department, and to the Department of Labor, and Department of Defense as merit system plan materials.

The definitions for the selected classes reflect typical functions and responsibilities as outlined in the appropriate class specifications of the various States. However, any brief definition of this kind cannot reflect all the possible variations in assignment of duties. If the principal duties of a class of position are determined to be substantially the same as those outlined in the corresponding definition, the salary range has been recorded, irrespective of the State's title for the class. If the duties of a position in a particular State are determined not to be substantially within the scope of the definition, salary data for the class in this State have been excluded.

A number of the definitions indicate the customary amount of required background experience by use of the following qualifying statements: "some" experience, "considerable" experience, and "extensive" experience. These are, in general, interpreted as follows: Some experience - less than 2 years; considerable experience - 2 to 5 years; extensive experience - over 5 years.

The statements in the definitions indicating the usual educational requirements are based primarily upon those stated in the class specifications, but may reflect such educational requirements maintained as a general practice through the total selection process.

Definitions using the term, "This is the entry (beginning) level professional position in the series," should be interpreted as meaning the level of position in which new workers are recruited to fill beginning professional positions and not the trainee level of position. For the purpose of the survey, a trainee position is one in which the employee (a) is appointed to go on educational leave or (b) has the basic education but does not have the experience required for appointment to the journeyman level, is not expected to perform the level or scope of duties outlined in the "Definition," usually works under close supervision, spends a portion of his time in a formal continuing training program (in contrast to regular orientation and in-service), and is trained for early promotion to the entry level professional class as defined in the "Definition."

Where a position is not the trainee level as defined above, but is a beginning level position where tenure is limited and promotion is automatic at the next higher level, footnote (f) is used.

The decisions as to what are corresponding classes were made by the regional merit system representatives after studying the State class specifications and applying their additional knowledge to State classification plans and organization. Program representatives participated in the development of the definitions and the determination of comparable classes. The comments of State personnel on previous issuances of the survey have also proved valuable.

It should be kept in mind that because of the differences among the States in size and structure of organizations, as well as in programs and in assignment of duties, the data are not precisely comparable from State to State. In addition to differences in duties of related positions among the State and local agencies, there also are differences with respect to job titles, minimum qualifications, and the policies and practices in the administration of pay plans. Only the more significant of these differences have been identified in the footnotes to the tables. The standard footnotes are outlined below.

In view of the considerable differences noted above, caution should be exercised in using these salary data, particularly in assuming exact comparisons between positions.

Standard footnotes (a) through (f) used uniformly throughout the survey report, together with explanatory statements, are as follows:

(a) Longevity payments are added to this base pay range.
This footnote indicates that longevity payments may be granted above the recorded maximum salary rate. Cost of living adjustments or other regular supplemental payments are included in the salary range reported.

(b) Appointments are frequently made above the minimum of this salary range.
If under established policies appointments are always made above the minimum, the induction rate is shown as the minimum of the range.

(c) Minimum qualifications in this State significantly higher.

(d) Minimum qualifications in this State significantly lower.
In footnotes (c) and (d), the references to significantly higher and lower qualifications apply where the combination of education and experience is higher or lower than that stated in the definition.

(e) This range includes the lowest minimum and highest maximum limits used by jurisdictions for this class.
This relates to cases where the class of position is used by several jurisdictions and the salary ranges differ. Where many jurisdictions appoint at rates higher than the recorded minimum, the footnote (b) is also used.

(f) After a short period (6 months-1 year) of satisfactory service in this class, the employee is automatically promoted to the next level class which is at a higher pay scale.
This footnote refers to entrance classes of positions from which the incumbent is automatically promoted to a higher level at the end of 6 months or a year.

Remaining footnotes apply to special items applicable to particular States.

For reference purposes, we are listing below the mean minimum and mean maximum salaries for the current period and the past two years.

CLASS	7/1/65 MEAN Min.-Max.	7/1/66 MEAN Min.-Max.	7/1/67 MEAN Min.-Max.
State Director, Employment Service	$10456-13123	$11021-13876	$12054-15324
Chief of Benefits	8969-11275	9440-11876	10257-13004
Hearings Referee	7750- 9737	8204-10339	8795-11174
Local Office Manager	6231- 7871	6604- 8345	7175- 9124
Unemployment Claims Deputy	5237- 6604	5521- 6968	6000- 7629
Employment Interviewer	4768- 6009	5100- 6394	5553- 7064
Director Employment Security Research and Statistics	9210-11546	9758-12257	10686-13557
Labor Force Analyst	5805- 7344	6078- 7702	6592- 8351
Employment Counselor	5569- 7017	5918- 7448	6492- 8173
Unemployment Insurance Field Auditor	5663- 7190	5987- 7570	6550- 8299
Director Welfare Research and Statistics	8974-11178	9648-12093	10620-13380
Public Welfare Field Representative	7501- 9349	8000-10008	8846-11124
Public Assistance Case Work Supervisor	5810- 7762	6180- 8325	6736- 9122
Public Assistance Case Worker	4544- 6049	4890- 6488	5306- 7133
Medical Social Work Consultant	7378- 9278	7958-10026	8635-10964
State Director Child Welfare	9730-11986	10296-12752	11395-14102
Consultant on Foster Care and Licensing	7414- 9290	7946- 9939	8610-10889
Child Welfare Supervisor	6267- 8284	6658- 8864	7231- 9629
Child Welfare Worker	4913- 6493	5288- 7029	5724- 7630
Director Public Health Statistics	9050-11455	9433-12068	10378-13332
Director Public Health Engineering	12366-15452	13114-16499	14054-17945

CLASS	7/1/65 MEAN Min.-Max.	7/1/66 MEAN Min.-Max.	7/1/67 MEAN Min.-Max.
Public Health Engineer	$ 6551- 8145	$ 7013- 8749	$ 7640- 9706
Sanitarian	5142- 6592	5408- 6990	5901- 7721
Health Officer	11145-14325	12276-15532	13596-17078
State Director, Public Health Nursing	8940-11309	9662-12147	10694-13743
Public Health Nurse Consultant	6934- 8784	7333- 9313	8210-10551
Public Health Nurse	4778- 6194	5093- 6640	5798- 7469
Director Public Health Education	8712-11026	9295-11713	10085-12907
Nutrition Consultant	6277- 7973	6726- 8573	7499- 9692
Laboratory Technician	5052- 6393	5358- 6692	5904- 7572
Psychiatrist	14199-17375	15498-18549	16816-20765
Psychologist	7115- 8990	7467- 9455	8268-10541
Psychiatric Social Worker	6293- 7980	6674- 8474	7238- 9196
Vocational Rehabilitation Director	11557-13722	12372-14820	13673-16497
Vocational Rehabilitation Counselor	6051- 7712	6465- 8229	6840- 8764
State Director, Civil Defense	11580-13522	11644-12453	12335-13055
Deputy State Director, Civil Defense	8621-10721	9359-11543	9979-12474
Administrative Officer	6893- 8819	7450- 9490	7891-10036
Operations Officer	7399- 9338	7789- 9840	8452-10818
Area Coordinator	6610- 8463	7069- 9034	7544- 9638
Training and Education Officer	6423- 8159	6898- 8756	7469- 9505
Public Information Officer	6638- 8463	7041- 8972	7451- 9489
Chemical, Biological and Radiological Defense Officer	7184- 9092	7538- 9567	7759- 9804
Communications Officer	6726- 8210	7063- 8911	7468- 9582

STATE DIRECTOR, EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

This is highly responsible administrative and supervisory work involving the direction of the state-wide employment service program and the operation of the local Employment Security offices. This class usually requires extensive experience in employment security work and college graduation, or its equivalent.

New York	22800-26310 (a)	*South Carolina	11555-15010
*Wisconsin	16440-21360	*North Dakota	11544-14592 (a)
*Michigan	16412-20254 (a)	*Florida	11520-14400 (a)
*Illinois	15996-22404	*Minnesota	11400-16224 (a)
Arizona	14868-18072 (a)	*Alabama	11304-14616
Pennsylvania	14657-19664	*Missouri	11148-14928
*New Jersey	14590-18970	*Rhode Island	11024-13260 (a)
*Alaska	14520-17424	*Virginia	10992-14328
*Maryland	13973-18354	Idaho	10812-13128
*North Carolina	13800-17556 (a)	Montana	10620-13260 (a)
*Oklahoma	13380-17460 (a)	*Arkansas	10500-12900 (a)
Massachusetts	13278-16845	West Virginia	10440-13380
*Colorado	12900-16464 (a)	Iowa	10200-11400 (a)
*Oregon	12840-15420	*Virgin Islands	9840-12402 (a)
*Vermont	12636-17680	*New Hampshire	9780-12040 (a)
Georgia	12612-16908	*Wyoming	9720-11820 (a)
*Washington	12612-16104	Louisiana	9600-12000 (a)
*Kentucky	12576-16056 (a)	New Mexico	9420-12840 (a)
Hawaii	12552-16032 (a)	*South Dakota	9300-10800 (a)
*Mississippi	12348-15876	*Delaware	9180-11340 (a)
*Connecticut	12280-15340 (a)	Puerto Rico	9000-11400 (a)
*Nevada	12176-14805	Nebraska	8820-11400 (a)
*Utah	12132-17040 (a)	Maine	8580-10452 (a)
*Tennessee	11760-14820	Kansas	8160-10416 (a)

Mean Minimum Salary - 12054
Mean Maximum Salary - 15324

(a) Longevity payments are added to this base pay range.

No comparable class within scope of definition in California, District of Columbia, Indiana, Ohio, Texas.

*Salary range revised since last semi-annual survey.

CHIEF OF BENEFITS

This is responsible administrative and supervisory work involving the direction of the processing of claims and benefit payments. An employee in this class has direct authority over the central office benefit operations, but may have only indirect and very limited authority in regard to local office benefit functions. This class usually requires extensive experience and training in one of the fields of management. College training may be substituted for some of the required experience.

New York	16655-19590 (a)
Pennsylvania	13301-17839
District of Columbia	12873-16905
*Illinois	12852-18012
*Michigan	12779-16495 (a)
*Alaska	12720-15264
*Indiana	12300-15120
*New Jersey	12003-15603
*Ohio	11960-17576
*Wisconsin	11856-15456
*Maryland	11548-15168
*Oregon	11400-13800
*Connecticut	11140-13780 (a)
Arizona	11088-13488 (a)
*Nevada	11040-13422
*Rhode Island	11024-13260 (a)
*Washington	10896-13908
*Mississippi	10812-13908
*Florida	10800-12600 (a)
Massachusetts	10782-13653
*Colorado	10608-13536 (a)
Texas	10512-12830
*North Carolina	10320-13128 (a)
Idaho	10296-12504
*Oklahoma	10260-13380 (a)
*South Carolina	10111-13172
*North Dakota	10032-12672 (a)
*Utah	10020-14040 (a)
Iowa	9900-11100 (a)
*Minnesota	9744-13872 (a)
*Missouri	9636-12900
*Virginia	9600-12528
Kentucky	9384-11976 (a)
Hawaii	9372-11952 (a)
Louisiana	9360-11160 (a)
*Arkansas	9300-11220 (a)
*South Dakota	9300-10800 (a)
*Alabama	9264-11304
*Tennessee	9060-10800
*Vermont	8996-12402
West Virginia	8940-11580
Montana	8880-11100 (a)
Georgia	8544-11436
*Delaware	8460-10380 (a)
Nebraska	7980-10320 (a)
*Wyoming	7980- 9180 (a)
*New Hampshire	7895- 9835 (a)
Kansas	7764- 9924 (a)
Maine	7592- 9230 (a)
New Mexico	7560-10320 (a)
Puerto Rico	6600- 7800 (a)

Mean Minimum Salary - 10257
Mean Maximum Salary - 13004

(a) Longevity payments are added to this base pay range.

No comparable class within scope of definition in California, Virgin Islands.

*Salary range revised since last semi-annual survey.

HEARINGS REFEREE

This is responsible work preparing, conducting, and deciding quasi-judicial hearings, involving questions of statutory compliance, claims, assessments, and regulation violations, in issues between State departments and outside parties. Decisions are subject to review of an administrative appellate body or of courts. This class usually requires knowledge of rules of quasi-judicial procedures and evidence, of the jurisdictional rules of procedure of administrative hearing agencies, and of Federal and State employment security statutes. This class usually requires college graduation and responsible experience in labor or industrial relations, public welfare administration, law, or enforcement of Federal or State labor laws, or any equivalent combination of experience and training. Some States require graduation from law school or admission to the bar.

*California	15276-18576	Idaho	8472-10296
*Michigan	12779-16495 (a)	Iowa	8400- 9600 (a)
New York	12140-14505 (a)	*Utah	8280-11580 (a)
*Alaska	11916-14304	*Wyoming	8280- 9480 (a)
*Wisconsin	11856-15456	Montana	8160-10140 (a)
District of Columbia	10927-14338	*Washington	8136-10380
*Ohio	10400-14768	*Virginia	8040-10512
*Indiana	10320-12840	Nebraska	7980-10320 (a)
Arizona	10056-12216 (a)	*Alabama	7944- 9924
*North Dakota	10032-12672 (a)	*Florida	7920-10080 (a)
*Illinois	9960-13920	*New Hampshire	7895- 9835 (a)
Pennsylvania	9923-13301	*Maryland	7887-10360
*New Jersey	9875-12839	*Vermont	7878-10790
Hawaii	9372-11952 (a)	*Delaware	7800- 9540 (a)
*Oregon	9300-11400	Kansas	7392- 9456 (a)
Massachusetts	9110-11497	*Oklahoma	7380- 9720 (a)
*Nevada	9083-11040	West Virginia	7200- 9420
*Rhode Island	9074-10972 (a)	Kentucky	6996- 8940 (a)
Mississippi	8952-11580	New Mexico	6900- 9420 (a, d)
*South Carolina	8846-11555	Louisiana	6900- 8400 (a, d)
*Colorado	8724-11136 (a)	*Arkansas	6900- 8280 (a)
*South Dakota	8700-10200 (a)	*Missouri	6864- 9180
*Minnesota	8664-12336 (a)	Texas	6624- 8076
*Tennessee	8640-10320	Maine	6240- 7592 (a)
Georgia	8544-11436	Puerto Rico	5100- 6060 (a)
*North Carolina	8520-10848 (a)		

Mean Minimum Salary - 8795
Mean Maximum Salary - 11174

(a) Longevity payments are added to this base pay range.
(d) Minimum qualifications in this State significantly lower.

No comparable class within scope of definition in Connecticut, Virgin Islands.

*Salary range revised since last semi-annual survey.

LOCAL OFFICE MANAGER

This is administrative and supervisory work involving the management of one of the smallest local employment security offices excluding sub-offices and itinerant stations. In addition, an employee in this class usually spends considerable time performing the duties of the regular Employment Security Interviewer or Deputy. This class usually requires graduation from high school plus considerable experience in employment service or closely related work.

*Alaska	9108-10932
*California	8952-10860
New York	8825-10670 (a)
*South Dakota	8700-10200 (a)
*Nevada	8652-10512
Massachusetts	8499-10777
*Wisconsin	8484-11004
*Utah	8280-11580 (a, c)
*Connecticut	8160-10080 (a)
*North Carolina	8124-10320 (a)
Hawaii	8100-10332 (a)
*Maryland	7887-10360
*Delaware	7800- 9540 (a)
*Washington	7752- 9888
*New Jersey	7737-10059 (c)
*Minnesota	7692-10956 (a)
*Indiana	7560- 9420
*Colorado	7536- 9624 (a, c)
*Illinois	7524-10548
Arizona	7512- 9120 (a, g)
*Oregon	7500- 9300
*Vermont	7410-10088
Pennsylvania	7407- 9923
Idaho	7320- 8904
*Mississippi	7212- 9252
Georgia	7032- 9420
*Kentucky	6996- 8940 (a)
*Michigan	6911- 8728 (a)
*Florida	6900- 8700 (a)
*New Hampshire	6900- 8680 (a)
*Arkansas	6900- 8280 (a)
*North Dakota	6888- 8712 (a)
Montana	6780- 8520 (a)
*Wyoming	6780- 7980 (a, c)
*South Carolina	6767- 8846
*Virginia	6720- 8784
*Oklahoma	6600- 8700 (a)
Iowa	6600- 7800 (a)
*Ohio	6552- 9776
*Rhode Island	6370- 7722 (a)
*Tennessee	6360- 7800
Louisiana	6300- 7800 (a)
Maine	6240- 7592 (a, c)
Texas	6204- 7560
West Virginia	6120- 8040
*Alabama	6084- 7944 (c)
New Mexico	6000- 8280 (a)
Virgin Islands	5940- 6984 (a)
*Missouri	5928- 7932
Nebraska	5880- 7560 (a)
Kansas	5496- 7044 (a)
Puerto Rico	5100- 6060 (a)

Mean Minimum Salary - 7175
Mean Maximum Salary - 9124

(a) Longevity payments are added to this base pay range.
(c) Minimum qualifications in this State significantly higher.
(g) Two positions, one applicable to employment service and one to unemployment insurance.

No comparable class within scope of definition in District of Columbia.

*Salary range revised since last semi-annual survey.

UNEMPLOYMENT CLAIMS DEPUTY

This is technical work involving the non-monetary determinations on unemployment insurance claims including the adjudication of questionable or contested claims. An employee in this class may supervise claims clerks in the processing of the more routine claims. A working knowledge of unemployment compensation laws and related labor laws and regulations as well as of labor relations and employment problems is required. This class usually requires graduation from high school and considerable training and experience. College training may be substituted for some of the required experience.

*Alaska	7272- 8724	Hawaii	6048- 7716 (a)
*Mississippi	7212- 9252	*Michigan	6013- 7496 (a)
*Wisconsin	7200- 9420	*New Hampshire	5980- 7558 (a)
*Maryland	7170- 9417 (a)	*Virginia	5880- 7680
District of Columbia	7068- 9183	Pennsylvania	5803- 7772
*California	7008- 8520	*New Jersey	5774- 7508
*New York	6967- 8135 (a, j)	*Florida	5760- 7200 (a)
*Colorado	6840- 8724 (a, c)	*Utah	5652- 7896 (a)
*Illinois	6840- 8640	New Mexico	5520- 7560 (a)
*South Carolina	6767- 8846	West Virginia	5520- 7200
*North Dakota	6576- 8316 (a)	*Wyoming	5520- 6720 (a)
*Vermont	6552- 8840	Iowa	5520- 6600 (a)
*Nevada	6466- 7850	Maine	5408- 6552 (a)
*Connecticut	6400- 7840 (a)	*South Dakota	5400- 6900 (a)
Georgia	6372- 8544	*Delaware	5400- 6600 (a)
*Rhode Island	6370- 7722 (a)	Louisiana	5280- 6480 (a)
*Tennessee	6360- 7800	*Arkansas	5280- 6300 (a)
Massachusetts	6349- 8034	Texas	5088- 6204
*Alabama	6348- 8268	*Ohio	4992- 7384
Idaho	6324- 7692	*Oklahoma	4980- 6600 (a)
*Indiana	6300- 7920	Kentucky	4980- 6360 (a)
*Oregon	6300- 7860	*Missouri	4884- 6540
Montana	6180- 7800 (a)	Nebraska	4800- 6180 (a, b)
Arizona	6180- 7512 (a)	Kansas	4740- 6060 (a)
*Washington	6120- 7440	*Puerto Rico	4140- 5040 (a)
*Minnesota	6072- 8664 (a)		

Mean Minimum Salary - 6000
Mean Maximum Salary - 7629

(a) Longevity payments are added to this base pay range.
(b) Appointments are frequently made above the minimum of this salary range.
(c) Minimum qualifications in this State significantly higher.
(j) Requires one year experience as trainee.

No comparable class within scope of definition in North Carolina, Virgin Islands.

*Salary range revised since last semi-annual survey.

EMPLOYMENT INTERVIEWER

This is the professional entry position in the Interviewer series and involves interviewing applicants for employment or interviewing employers seeking workers through the State employment service offices. The duties may include taking unemployment insurance claims. The work primarily involves determining the work qualifications of applicants and in most instances placing them in suitable employment. A working knowledge of employment service practices, State and Federal employment laws, the Unemployment Compensation Act, Dictionary of Occupational Titles, and occupations in industry and business is needed for satisfactory performance, but may be obtained after appointment. This class usually requires graduation from high school and considerable training and experience, some of which shall have been in related fields, or graduation from a college.

*Alaska	7764- 9324	Massachusetts	5590- 7072
*New York	6967- 8135 (a, j)	*Florida	5520- 7560 (a)
*California	6672- 7368 (f)	*Indiana	5520- 6900
*Wisconsin	6648- 8688	*Ohio	5491- 8112
*Illinois	6600- 8340	*Virginia	5400- 7032
*Colorado	6204- 7920 (a)	*South Dakota	5400- 6900 (a)
*Minnesota	6072- 8664 (a)	*Delaware	5400- 6600 (a)
*Michigan	6013- 7496 (a)	*Tennessee	5340- 6720
*Oregon	6000- 7200	Louisiana	5280- 6480 (a)
*North Dakota	5988- 7572 (a)	Arkansas	5280- 6300 (a)
*Connecticut	5960- 7160 (a)	Hawaii	5220- 6660 (a, f)
*Maryland	5900- 8562	*South Carolina	5182- 7082
*Nevada	5866- 7125	Wyoming	5100- 6300 (a)
*North Carolina	5832- 7380 (a)	*New Hampshire	5069- 6286 (a, f)
*Washington	5832- 7080	*Alabama	5028- 6612
Pennsylvania	5803- 7772	Virgin Islands	5028- 6180 (a)
*Vermont	5798- 7774	*Oklahoma	4980- 6600 (a)
Georgia	5784- 7752	Kentucky	4980- 6360 (a, d)
*New Jersey	5774- 7508	Maine	4914- 5954 (a)
Iowa	5760- 6900 (a)	*Missouri	4884- 6864 (b, e)
*Rhode Island	5746- 6968	New Mexico	4800- 6600 (a)
Idaho	5736- 6972	Nebraska	4800- 6180 (a, b)
*Utah	5652- 7896 (a)	Texas	4764- 5808
*Mississippi	5640- 7248	Kansas	4740- 6060 (a)
Montana	5640- 7080 (a)	West Virginia	4200- 5520 (d)
*Arizona	5592- 6180 (a)	Puerto Rico	3600- 4500 (a)

Mean Minimum Salary - 5553
Mean Maximum Salary - 7064

(a) Longevity payments are added to this base pay range.
(b) Appointments are frequently made above the minimum of this salary range.
(d) Minimum qualifications in this State significantly lower.
(e) This range includes the lowest minimum and highest maximum limits used by jurisdictions for this class.
(f) After a short period (6 months - 1 year) of satisfactory service in this class, the employee is automatically promoted to the next level class which is at a higher pay scale.
(j) Requires one year experience as trainee.

No comparable class within scope of definition in District of Columbia.

*Salary range revised since last semi-annual survey.

DIRECTOR OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY RESEARCH AND STATISTICS

This is specialized technical and supervisory work which involves the direction of statistical reporting and analysis and research activities in a state-wide employment security program. An employee in this class usually receives general administrative direction from the agency head. Responsibilities include supervising a staff of professional, technical and clerical personnel engaged in the collection, analysis, interpretation and presentation of program data. This work also involves participation in agency program planning and policy development, functional supervision of local office reports, including development of reporting procedures and validation of local office reports, the preparation of administrative analyses of agency activities and the carrying out of basic research studies in the fields of labor market analysis and employment security operations. This class usually requires college graduation, including courses in statistics and economics, considerable professional experience in progressively responsible research and statistical work, usually in the employment security field, including some responsible supervisory duties.

New York	16655-19590 (a)
*Michigan	16412-20254 (a)
*California	16044-19512
*Ohio	14352-21112
Pennsylvania	13301-17839 (c)
*Illinois	13236-18540
*Wisconsin	12900-16800
*Alaska	12720-15264
*Maryland	12703-16685
*Indiana	12300-15120
*New Jersey	12003-15603
*Connecticut	11640-14280 (a, k)
*Washington	11436-14604
Kentucky	11412-14556 (a, h)
*Minnesota	11400-16224 (a)
*Oregon	11400-13800
*North Carolina	11376-14472 (a)
*Utah	11028-15468 (a)
*Rhode Island	11024-13260 (a, r)
*Mississippi	10812-13908
*Oklahoma	10800-14100 (a)
*Tennessee	10800-13740
Massachusetts	10782-13653
*Colorado	10608-13536 (a)
Arizona	10560-12840 (a, g)
*Nevada	10512-12783
Georgia	10380-13908
Idaho	10296-12504
*South Carolina	10111-13172
*Florida	10080-12600 (a)
*North Dakota	10032-12672 (a)
Iowa	9900-11100 (a)
Hawaii	9840-12552 (a)
*Virginia	9600-12528
*Alabama	9588-11784
*Arkansas	9300-11220 (a, d)
Texas	9216-11232 (d)
*Missouri	9180-12288
*Vermont	8996-12402
*West Virginia	8940-11580
Montana	8880-11100 (a)
*South Dakota	8700-10200 (a)
*New Hampshire	8650-10702 (a)
Louisiana	8640-10440 (a, d)
Maine	8580-10452 (a)
*Delaware	8460-10380 (a)
*Wyoming	8280- 9480 (a)
Nebraska	7980-10320 (a)
Puerto Rico	7800- 9000 (a)
Kansas	7764- 9924 (a)
New Mexico	7560-10320 (a)

Mean Minimum Salary - 10686
Mean Maximum Salary - 13557

(a) Longevity payments are added to this base pay range.
(c) Minimum qualifications in this State significantly higher.
(d) Minimum qualifications in this State significantly lower.
(g) Two positions, one applicable to employment service and one to unemployment insurance.
(h) Serves employment security and public assistance programs.
(k) Performs public information duties in addition to research and statistics responsibility.
(r) Also has responsibility for development and adaptation of agency operating methods and procedures.

No comparable class within scope of definition in District of Columbia, Virgin Islands.

*Salary range revised since last semi-annual survey.

- 8 -

LABOR FORCE ANALYST

This is technical work at the professional entry level in labor force analysis. An employee in this class usually receives supervision and assignments from the chief of reports and analysis, a higher level labor force analyst, local office manager, or area supervisor. Responsibilities include the collection, interpretation and presentation of economic and statistical data concerning labor force conditions in an assigned labor force area, and the preparation of reports on local office activities. The duties may entail supervision and training of local office personnel engaged in the collection, compilation and preparation of statistical data. This class usually requires college graduation including courses in statistics, economics, or business administration and some experience in the compilation and interpretation of statistical information, or equivalent combination of education and experience.

*Alaska	9108-10932
*California	8952-10860
New York	8365-10125 (a)
Montana	8160-10140 (a)
*Illinois	8040-10440
*Wisconsin	7812-10152
*Utah	7524-10524 (a)
Arizona	7512- 9120
*New Jersey	7352- 8688
*North Dakota	7224- 9132 (a)
*Mississippi	7212- 9252
*Indiana	7200- 9000
*Maryland	7170- 9417
*Connecticut	7100- 9020 (a)
Pennsylvania	7055- 9011
Idaho	6972- 8472
*Michigan	6911- 8728 (a)
Massachusetts	6895- 8674
*Missouri	6864- 9180
*Colorado	6840- 8724 (a)
*Minnesota	6828- 9744 (a)
*South Carolina	6767- 8846
*Tennessee	6720- 8220 (d)
*North Carolina	6708- 8520 (a)
*Washington	6696- 8136
*Oklahoma	6600- 8700 (a)
*Florida	6600- 8280 (a)
*Virginia	6432- 8400
*Wyoming	6360- 7560 (a)
*South Dakota	6300- 7800 (a)
*Nevada	6160- 7478
West Virginia	6120- 8040
*Arkansas	6120- 7320 (a, d)
*Alabama	6084- 7944
Kansas	6060- 7764 (a)
Louisiana	6000- 7500 (a, d)
*Oregon	6000- 7500
*Delaware	6000- 7200 (a)
Texas	5808- 7080
Georgia	5784- 7752
Hawaii	5760- 7344 (a)
Iowa	5760- 6900 (a)
*Rhode Island	5746- 6968 (a)
*Ohio	5740- 8112
*New Hampshire	5669- 7240 (a)
Nebraska	5580- 7200 (a)
Kentucky	5484- 6996 (a)
*Vermont	5460- 7306
New Mexico	5280- 7200 (a, d)
Maine	5148- 6240 (a)
*Puerto Rico	4140- 5040 (a)

Mean Minimum Salary - 6592
Mean Maximum Salary - 8351

(a) Longevity payments are added to this base pay range.
(d) Minimum qualifications in this State significantly lower.

No comparable class within scope of definition in District of Columbia, Virgin Islands.

*Salary range revised since last semi-annual survey.

- 9 -

EMPLOYMENT COUNSELOR

This is specialized employment service work at the professional entry level of counseling. An employee in this class spends a major portion of his time in assisting applicants in making a suitable occupational choice or in adjusting to employment they have already chosen. The incumbent maintains cooperative relationship with schools and with health, rehabilitation and other agencies providing services that may be required to better fit job seekers for employment. In addition, the incumbent follows up on the adjustment of counseled applicants. This class usually requires college graduation, including courses in psychology, vocational education or counseling, personnel administration or sociology, or equivalent combination of education and experience and some experience in a closely related field.

*Alaska	9108-10932	*Connecticut	6400- 7840 (a)
*California	8112- 9852	Georgia	6372- 8544
*Nevada	7850- 9533	Idaho	6324- 7692
*Indiana	7560- 9420	*South Dakota	6300- 7800 (a)
New York	7475- 9070 (a, j)	*Missouri	6228- 8328 (b)
*New Jersey	7352- 8688	*Utah	6216- 8700 (a)
*Wisconsin	7200- 9420	*Mississippi	6192- 7932
Iowa	7200- 8400 (a)	*Virginia	6144- 8040
*Maryland	7170- 9417	*Rhode Island	6032- 7332 (a)
*Michigan	7162- 7371 (f)	*Florida	6000- 7560 (a)
*Wyoming	7080- 8280 (a)	*Delaware	6000- 7200 (a)
Pennsylvania	7055- 9011	*Ohio	5990- 8840
*Vermont	6968- 9464	Virgin Islands	5940- 6984 (a)
*Illinois	6960- 8964	Massachusetts	5936- 7527
*Oregon	6900- 8580	*South Carolina	5927- 7738
*North Dakota	6888- 8712 (a)	*Oklahoma	5880- 7800 (a)
*Colorado	6840- 8724 (a)	*Alabama	5820- 7596
*Minnesota	6828- 9744 (a)	Texas	5808- 7080 (d)
Arizona	6816- 8280 (a)	Louisiana	5760- 6960 (a)
*Tennessee	6720- 8220	*New Hampshire	5669- 7240 (a)
*North Carolina	6708- 8520 (a)	Maine	5668- 6890 (a)
*Washington	6696- 8136	Nebraska	5580- 7200 (a, b)
Hawaii	6660- 8508 (a)	New Mexico	5520- 7560 (a)
West Virginia	6480- 8460	Kentucky	5484- 6996 (a)
Montana	6480- 8160 (a)	Kansas	5232- 6684 (a)
*Arkansas	6480- 7680 (a)	Puerto Rico	4440- 5400 (a)

Mean Minimum Salary - 6492
Mean Maximum Salary - 8173

(a) Longevity payments are added to this base pay range.
(b) Appointments are frequently made above the minimum of this salary range.
(d) Minimum qualifications in this State significantly lower.
(f) After a short period (6 months - 1 year) of satisfactory service in this class, the employee is automatically promoted to the next level class which is at a higher pay scale.
(j) Requires one year experience as trainee.

No comparable class within scope of definition in District of Columbia.

*Salary range revised since last semi-annual survey.

- 10 -

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE FIELD AUDITOR

This is responsible field work in the determination of employer liability by means of investigating and auditing payrolls and other records of private employers who may be subject to the State unemployment insurance law. Work includes the interpretation of laws and regulations, advising employers regarding procedures to be followed in complying with the law, and the collecting of delinquent contributions from employers. This class usually requires college graduation including courses in accounting, or an equivalent combination of education and experience.

*Alaska	9684-11604	*Vermont	6552- 8840
*Indiana	7920- 9840	*Maryland	6500- 9417
*Wisconsin	7812-10152	*Arkansas	6480- 7680 (a)
Georgia	7752-10380	*Pennsylvania	6390- 8163
District of Columbia	7696-10045	*Tennessee	6360- 7800
Idaho	7692- 9348	Hawaii	6348- 8100 (a)
*Ohio	7488-11232	*Florida	6300- 7920 (a)
*Illinois	7380- 9408 (c)	Montana	6180- 7800 (a)
*North Carolina	7380- 9384 (a)	*Nevada	6160- 7478 (f)
*Mississippi	7212- 9252	*Virginia	6144- 8784
*Connecticut	7100- 9020 (a)	*Kentucky	6048- 6996 (a)
*Wyoming	7080- 8280 (a)	*Oregon	6000- 7500
*California	7008- 8520	Iowa	6000- 7200 (a)
*New York	6967- 8135 (a)	*Missouri	5928- 7932
*Michigan	6911- 8728 (a)	*Oklahoma	5880- 7800 (a)
Louisiana	6900- 8400 (a)	West Virginia	5820- 7620
Massachusetts	6895- 8674	Texas	5808- 7080
*North Dakota	6888- 8712 (a)	Kansas	5772- 7392 (a)
*Colorado	6840- 8724 (a)	New Mexico	5760- 7920 (a)
*Minnesota	6828- 9744 (a)	*New Hampshire	5669- 7240 (a, c)
*Arizona	6816- 7512 (f)	*Utah	5652- 7896 (a)
*South Carolina	6767- 8846	Nebraska	5580- 7200 (a)
*Washington	6696- 8136	*Delaware	5400- 6600 (a)
*New Jersey	6684- 7018 (f)	*Rhode Island	5174- 6292 (a, d)
*Alabama	6612- 8604 (d)	Maine	5148- 6240 (a)
*South Dakota	6600- 8100 (a)	*Puerto Rico	3960- 4860 (a)

Mean Minimum Salary - 6550
Mean Maximum Salary - 8299

(a) Longevity payments are added to this base pay range.
(c) Minimum qualifications in this State significantly higher.
(d) Minimum qualifications in this State significantly lower.
(f) After a short period (6 months - 1 year) of satisfactory service in this class, the employee is automatically promoted to the next level class which is at a higher pay scale.

No comparable class within scope of definition in Virgin Islands.

*Salary range revised since last semi-annual survey.

- 11 -

DIRECTOR OF WELFARE RESEARCH AND STATISTICS

This is specialized technical and supervisory work which involves the direction of statistical reporting and analysis and research activities in a State Welfare Department. The incumbent usually receives general administrative direction from the Commissioner and consults with program directors. This class usually requires a Master's degree, preferably in the social sciences or social work, including or supplemented by twelve semester hours of statistics and social research methods, and considerable professional experience including the planning and conduct of social research activities in an organized unit, preferably in a social welfare agency.

New York	16655-19590 (a)
*Michigan	16412-20254 (a)
Pennsylvania	16170-21672 (p)
*Illinois	15936-22320
*California	14556-17700
*Maryland	13973-18354
*Georgia	13908-18636
*New Jersey	13233-17205
*Wisconsin	12900-16800
District of Columbia	12873-16905
*Alaska	12720-15264
*Connecticut	11640-14280 (a)
*Ohio	11440-15496
*Washington	11436-14604
Kentucky	11412-14556 (a, h)
Minnesota	11400-16224 (a)
*Oregon	11400-13800
Hawaii	11388-14532 (a)
*South Carolina	11315-12535
*Utah	11028-15468 (a)
*Iowa	10800-12000 (a)
*North Dakota	10512-13284 (a)
*Nevada	10511-12782
Mississippi	10500-11940
*Indiana	10320-12840
Massachusetts	10169-12945
*Missouri	10116-13548
*Colorado	10104-12900 (a)
*Florida	10080-12600 (a)
*Rhode Island	10010-12090 (a)
*Oklahoma	9720-12660
*Wyoming	9720-11820 (a)
*North Carolina	9384-11940 (a)
Idaho	9348-11340 (a)
*Nebraska	9300-12000 (a)
*Alabama	9264-11304
Delaware	9168-11652 (a)
*Arizona	9120-11088
*Tennessee	9060-11760
*Virginia	8784-11472
South Dakota	8700-10200 (a)
*Montana	8640-10560 (a)
Texas	8628- 9840
*Arkansas	8600- 9200
Maine	8580-10452 (a, i)
Louisiana	8280-10080 (a)
West Virginia	8040-10440
*New Hampshire	7895- 9834 (a)
*Vermont	7878-10790
Puerto Rico	7800- 9000 (a)
Kansas	7764- 9924 (a)
*New Mexico	7560-10320
*Virgin Islands	6720- 8352 (a)

Mean Minimum Salary - 10620
Mean Maximum Salary - 13380

(a) Longevity payments are added to this base pay range.
(h) Serves employment security and public assistance programs.
(i) Includes direction of research and statistics for State health and welfare programs.
(p) Includes program planning, evaluation and coordination.

*Salary range revised since last semi-annual survey.

- 12 -

PUBLIC WELFARE FIELD REPRESENTATIVE

This is responsible supervisory work at the State level involving the interpretation of State requirements, standards, and criteria and giving general supervision to the administration of public welfare programs in local units or a designated area of the State. This class usually requires training in a graduate school of social work and considerable professional social work experience in a welfare agency including some supervisory, consultative or administrative work. The incumbent may be responsible for Public Assistance or Child Welfare Services programs or both.

New York	14225-16875 (a)
*California	13860-16860
*Alaska	11916-14304
*Illinois	11280-14604
*Connecticut	11140-13780 (a)
*Nevada	11040-13421
*Maryland	10498-13789
*Indiana	10320-12840
*Vermont	10296-14300
*Oregon	10140-12360
*Minnesota	9744-13872 (a)
*Colorado	9624-12276 (a)
Pennsylvania	9454-12675
*Washington	9420-12012
*Wisconsin	9156-11916
*Arizona	9120-11088
*Utah	9108-12732 (a, c)
Idaho	8904-10812 (a)
*New Jersey	8898-10059
*Rhode Island	8632-10426 (a)
*South Carolina	8590- 9410
Maine	8580-10452 (a)
Georgia	8544-11436
*North Carolina	8520-10848 (a)
*Missouri	8328-12288 (e)
*Ohio	8320-12272
*Florida	8280-10560 (a)
*New Hampshire	8280-10280 (a)
*Wyoming	8280- 9480
*Michigan	8227-10607 (a)
Texas	8076- 8916
West Virginia	8040-10440
*North Dakota	7932-10032 (a)
Louisiana	7920- 9720 (a)
*Iowa	7800- 9900 (a, e)
*Tennessee	7800- 9480
*Kentucky	7716- 9852 (a)
Virginia	7680-10032
*Alabama	7596- 9588
Montana	7500- 9120 (a)
*South Dakota	7200- 8700 (a)
*Arkansas	7200- 7800 (d)
Mississippi	7080- 8280
Kansas	7044- 9000 (a)
*Oklahoma	6960- 9180
Massachusetts	6895- 8674 (d)
Nebraska	6840- 8820 (a)
Puerto Rico	6600- 7800 (a)

Mean Minimum Salary - 8846
Mean Maximum Salary - 11124

(a) Longevity payments are added to this base pay range.
(c) Minimum qualifications in this State significantly higher.
(d) Minimum qualifications in this State significantly lower.
(e) This range includes the lowest minimum and highest maximum limits used by jurisidictions for this class.

No comparable class within scope of definition in Delaware, District of Columbia, Hawaii, New Mexico, Virgin Islands.

*Salary range revised since last semi-annual survey.

PUBLIC ASSISTANCE CASEWORK SUPERVISOR

This is professional social work at the local level involving the immediate supervision and development of a group of caseworkers through review of case records and individual and group supervisory conferences. This class usually requires training in a graduate school of social work and some social casework experience.

*Alaska	10404-12480
*Maryland	9544-12536
*Vermont	8424-11544
District of Columbia	8421-11013
*North Dakota	8316-10512 (a)
*Connecticut	8160-10080 (a)
Hawaii	8100-10332 (a)
*Illinois	7980-10032
*Oregon	7860- 9720
*Nevada	7849- 9532
*Michigan	7830- 9667 (a)
Pennsylvania	7772- 9923
*Utah	7524-10524 (a)
*Rhode Island	7410- 9022 (a)
Idaho	7320- 8904 (a)
Maine	7228- 8788 (a)
*Arizona	7152- 8688
*Wisconsin	7080-10320 (e)
Virgin Islands	7080- 8160
Kansas	7044- 9000 (a)
*Washington	7032-10380
*Minnesota	7020-10020 (a, e)
*North Carolina	6960-10224 (b, e)
*South Dakota	6900- 8400 (a)
Massachusetts	6720- 8520 (d)
*Tennessee	6720- 8220
*Colorado	6600- 9852 (a, e)
*New Hampshire	6600- 8300 (a)
*Ohio	6552-11232
*Kentucky	6360- 8112 (a)
*New Jersey	6300- 9700 (b, e)
*New Mexico	6300- 8640
Montana	6300- 7680 (a)
Wyoming	6240- 7680 (a)
*Alabama	6084- 7944
*California	6060-11280 (e)
*Iowa	6000- 8700 (a, e)
Delaware	6000- 7872 (a)
*Florida	6000- 7560 (a)
*Missouri	5928- 8740 (e)
*South Carolina	5900- 6930
West Virginia	5820- 7620 (d)
*Arkansas	5800- 6000 (d)
Georgia	5784- 7752 (b)
Louisiana	5760- 6960 (a)
Virginia	5700-11976 (a, b, e)
Mississippi	5580- 6540
*Nebraska	5040- 8820 (a, e)
Puerto Rico	4800- 5760 (a)
*Oklahoma	4680- 6240
*New York	4640-10627 (b, e)
Indiana	3600- 9300 (e)

Mean Minimum Salary - 6736
Mean Maximum Salary - 9122

(a) Longevity payments are added to this base pay range.
(b) Appointments are frequently made above the minimum of this salary range.
(d) Minimum qualifications in this State significantly lower.
(e) This range includes the lowest minimum and highest maximum limits used by jurisdictions for this class.

No comparable class within scope of definition in Texas.

*Salary range revised since last semi-annual survey.

- 14 -

PUBLIC ASSISTANCE CASEWORKER

This is professional public assistance casework at the beginning level but does not include the trainee. An employee in this class, after a brief orientation period, is expected to carry a full case load, establishing eligibility and extent of need, and explaining laws, regulations and eligibility requirements to clients and other interested persons. This class usually requires graduation from college, but in some States, experience in related fields may be substituted.

*Alaska	7764- 9324	*New Jersey	5237- 8500 (b, e)
*Michigan	7162- 7371 (a, f)	*Kentucky	5232- 6360 (a)
*Illinois	6600- 8340	Hawaii	5220- 6660 (a, f)
*Maryland	6518- 8562	Maine	5148- 6240 (a)
*Connecticut	6400- 7840 (a)	Delaware	5100- 6720 (a)
Pennsylvania	6390- 8163	*South Dakota	5100- 6600 (a)
Idaho	6324- 7692 (a)	*New Hampshire	5069- 6286 (a, f)
*Vermont	6162- 8320	*New Mexico	5040- 6900
*Oregon	6000- 7200	Montana	5040- 6660 (a, e)
*North Dakota	5988- 7572 (a, b)	Wyoming	5040- 6480 (a)
*Massachusetts	5940- 8162 (e)	*North Carolina	4980- 8028 (b, e)
*Nevada	5866- 7125	Kansas	4980- 6360 (a)
*Washington	5832- 7080 (f)	*South Carolina	4945- 5430
*Rhode Island	5746- 6968 (a)	Texas	4920- 5616
*Utah	5652- 7896 (a)	Virginia	4800- 8940 (a, b, e)
*Minnesota	5640- 8040 (a, e)	Louisiana	4800- 6000 (a)
*Arizona	5592- 6816	*Alabama	4764- 6348 (b)
*Florida	5520- 7200 (a)	*California	4740- 8580 (e, f)
West Virginia	5520- 7200	*Colorado	4596- 7212 (a, e)
*Iowa	5520- 6600 (a, e)	*New York	4500- 8474 (b, e)
*Wisconsin	5400- 8100 (e)	*Missouri	4428- 5928 (b, e)
Virgin Islands	5400- 7400	Mississippi	4400- 5400
*Tennessee	5340- 6720	*Oklahoma	4200- 5580
District of Columbia	5331- 6915	Puerto Rico	3600- 4500 (a)
*Arkansas	5300- 5500	*Nebraska	3540- 6180 (a, b, e)
Georgia	5244- 7032	Indiana	2400- 8100 (e)
*Ohio	5241- 8840 (e)		

Mean Minimum Salary - 5306
Mean Maximum Salary - 7133

(a) Longevity payments are added to this base pay range.
(b) Appointments are frequently made above the minimum of this salary range.
(e) This range includes the lowest minimum and highest maximum limits used by jurisdictions for this class.
(f) After a short period (6 months - 1 year) of satisfactory service in this class, the employee is automatically promoted to the next level class which is at a higher pay scale.

*Salary range revised since last semi-annual survey.

- 15 -

MEDICAL SOCIAL WORK CONSULTANT

This is responsible professional social work in a State Welfare Department involving participation in the medical care aspects of public assistance programs and/or in the administration of APTD. An employee in this class usually works under general administrative direction. The incumbent assists in the development of policies, procedures, and methods for medical-social aspects of the public assistance programs, and carries responsibility for assuring that these established standards are maintained. The work includes responsibility, as a member of the medical team, for the social work role in reaching decisions with respect to eligibility. The incumbent participates in planned training of social work staff through interpretation of their responsibilities in the medical-social aspects of the public assistance programs. This class nearly always requires training in a graduate school of social work and some supervisory experience in social work with either training or experience in a medical setting.

Pennsylvania	11501-15387 (c)	*Ohio	8320-12272
*California	11124-13536	*North Dakota	8316-10512 (a)
District of Columbia	10927-14338	*Wyoming	8280- 9480 (a)
*Florida	10560-13200 (a, c)	*Oregon	8220-10140
Georgia	10380-13908	Virginia	8040-10032
New York	10330-12430 (a)	Maine	7982- 9698 (a)
*Indiana	10320-12840	*Missouri	7932-10620
*New Jersey	9811-11092	*Tennessee	7800- 9480
Delaware	9168-11652 (a, c)	*Iowa	7800- 9000
*Wisconsin	9156-11916	Mississippi	7680- 8880
Massachusetts	9110-11497	*Alabama	7596- 9588
*Utah	9108-12732 (a, c)	*Arizona	7512- 9120
*Vermont	8996-12402	*Rhode Island	7410- 9022 (a)
*Washington	8976-11436	Kansas	7044- 9000 (a)
*Michigan	8895-11171 (a)	*Minnesota	7020-10020 (a, e)
*Illinois	8724-12228	New Mexico	6900- 9420
*Colorado	8724-11136 (a)	Nebraska	6840- 8820 (a)
*South Carolina	8590- 9410	*Oklahoma	5880- 7800 (d)
*Connecticut	8520-10440 (a)		

Mean Minimum Salary - 8635
Mean Maximum Salary - 10964

(a) Longevity payments are added to this base pay range.
(c) Minimum qualifications in this State significantly higher.
(d) Minimum qualifications in this State significantly lower.
(e) This range includes the lowest minimum and highest maximum limits used by jurisdictions for this class.

No comparable class within scope of definition in Alaska, Arkansas, Hawaii, Idaho, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, North Carolina, Puerto Rico, South Dakota, Texas, Virgin Islands, West Virginia.

*Salary range revised since last semi-annual survey.

STATE DIRECTOR OF CHILD WELFARE

This is highly responsible professional work under the general direction of the Commissioner involving the planning, organization, and administration of the child welfare program in a State Welfare Department. This class usually requires training in a graduate school of social work and extensive experience in social work, including considerable experience in a supervisory, consultant, or administrative capacity in a public or private welfare agency, some of which involved social services to children.

*New York	24581	(a)	*Arkansas	10400-11600	
*Wisconsin	20856		Idaho	10296-12504	(a)
Pennsylvania	18725-23915		*Utah	10020-14040	(a)
District of Columbia	17550-23013		*Iowa	9900-11100	(a)
Georgia	15336-20556		Texas	9840-10872	
*California	15276-18576		*New Hampshire	9780-12040	(a)
*New Jersey	13895-18065		*Wyoming	9720-11820	(a)
Illinois	13380-18480		Maine	9698-11830	(a)
*Minnesota	13344-18972	(a)	*North Dakota	9576-12096	(a)
*Alaska	12720-15264		Louisiana	9360-11160	(a)
*Vermont	12636-17680		*Nebraska	9300-12000	(a)
*Kentucky	12576-16056	(a)	*Alabama	9264-11304	
*Indiana	12300-15120		*Missouri	9180-12288	
*Rhode Island	12090-13910	(a)	Virginia	9168-12000	
Massachusetts	11973-15249		Delaware	9168-11652	(a)
*Oregon	11880-14340		*Ohio	9152-12896	
*Maryland	11548-15168		*Montana	9120-11160	(a)
*Washington	11436-14604		South Dakota	9000-10500	(a)
*South Carolina	11315-12535		Kansas	8568-10920	(a)
*North Carolina	10848-13800	(a)	West Virginia	8460-10980	
*Oklahoma	10800-14100		*New Mexico	8280-11280	
*Tennessee	10800-13740		*Virgin Islands	8280- 9560	
Colorado	10608-13536	(a)	Puerto Rico	7800- 9000	(a)
*Florida	10560-13200	(a)	*Arizona	7512- 9120	
Mississippi	10500-11940				

Mean Minimum Salary - 11395
Mean Maximum Salary - 14102

(a) Longevity payments are added to this base pay range.
(b) Appointments are frequently made above the minimum of this salary range.

No comparable class within scope of definition in Connecticut, Hawaii, Michigan, Nevada.

*Salary range revised since last semi-annual survey

CONSULTANT ON FOSTER CARE AND LICENSING

This is responsible professional work, usually under the administrative direction of the State Child Welfare Director. An employee in this class gives consultation to voluntary agencies and institutions, State agency child welfare staff, and other concemed individuals and agencies on the development and use of foster care services and facilities; program development and changes to meet the needs of children who need care away from their own homes either in foster family or group care; and interpretation to State Welfare Agency, voluntary agencies and institutions, State and local community planning groups, and other concerned individuals and organizations of standards and good practice. This class usually requires training in a graduate school of social work and considerable social work experience, including some supervision of casework with children.

*Minnesota	11400-16224 (a)
*Alaska	11112-13344
*Michigan	10711-13530 (a)
*Maryland	10498-13789
Illinois	10380-14160
*Indiana	10320-12840
*Rhode Island	10010-12090 (a)
Pennsylvania	9454-12675
Georgia	9420-12612
*Washington	9420-12012
*Wisconsin	9156-11916
Utah	9108-12732 (a)
*Oregon	8940-10980
Idaho	8904-10812 (a)
*Nebraska	8820-11400 (a)
*Colorado	8724-11136 (a)
*Iowa	8700- 9900 (a)
*New Hampshire	8650-10702 (a)
*South Carolina	8590- 9410
Virginia	8400-10992
*Arkansas	8400- 9000
*Missouri	8328-11148
*North Dakota	8316-10512 (a)
Delaware	8268-10614 (a)
*North Carolina	8124-10320 (a)
West Virginia	8040-10440
Maine	7982- 9698 (a)
*Alabama	7944- 9924
Massachusetts	7938-10028
Louisiana	7920- 9720 (a)
*Tennessee	7800- 9480
South Dakota	7800- 9300 (a)
Kansas	7764- 9924 (a)
Kentucky	7716- 9852 (a)
Mississippi	7680- 8880
*Wyoming	7680- 8880 (a)
*Ohio	7488-11232
*Florida	7200- 9120 (a)
*New Mexico	6900- 9420
Puerto Rico	6600- 7800 (a)
Montana	6420- 7920 (a)

Mean Minimum Salary - 8610
Mean Maximum Salary - 10889

(a) Longevity payments are added to this base pay range.

No comparable class within scope of definition in Arizona, California, Connecticut, District of Columbia, Hawaii, Nevada, New Jersey, New York, Oklahoma, Texas, Vermont, Virgin Islands.

*Salary range revised since last semi-annual survey.

- 18 -

CHILD WELFARE SUPERVISOR

This is professional social work involving the immediate supervision and development of a small group of child welfare workers through individual conferences and group discussions. This class may include supervision of workers in a local agency or in a district office of a State agency, but does not include directors of local administrative units whose duties are primarily administrative. This class usually requires training in a graduate school of social work and some case-work experience, which includes work with families or children.

*Maryland	9544-12536
District of Columbia	9221-12056
*Vermont	8996-12402
Idaho	8904-10812 (a)
*New Jersey	8898-10059
*New Hampshire	8650-10702 (a, c)
Pennsylvania	8580-10954
Georgia	8544-11436
Illinois	8460-11700
*North Dakota	8316-10512 (a)
*Utah	8280-11580 (a)
Michigan	8227-10607 (a)
*Connecticut	8160-10080 (a)
*Washington	8136-10380
Hawaii	8100-10332 (a)
*Alabama	7944- 9924
*Oregon	7860- 9720
*Nevada	7849- 9532
*South Dakota	7800- 9300 (a)
*Rhode Island	7410- 9022 (a)
*California	7356-12576 (e)
Maine	7228- 8788 (a)
West Virginia	7200- 9420
*Arizona	7152- 8688 (b)
*Wisconsin	7080-10320 (e)
Delaware	7080- 9168 (a)
*Virgin Islands	7080- 8160
Kansas	7044- 9000 (a)
*Minnesota	7020-10020 (a, e)
*Kentucky	6996- 8940 (a)
*North Carolina	6960-10224 (b, e)
*Florida	6900- 8700 (a)
*Arkansas	6900- 7500
Massachusetts	6895- 8674
*Missouri	6864-10116 (e)
*Tennessee	6720- 8220
Texas	6624- 7320
*Colorado	6600- 9852 (a, e)
*New Mexico	6300- 8640
Louisiana	6300- 7800 (a, d)
Montana	6300- 7680 (a)
*Iowa	6000- 7800 (a, e)
*South Carolina	5900- 6930
Virginia	5700-11976 (a, b, e)
Mississippi	5580- 6540
Puerto Rico	5400- 6360 (a)
*Nebraska	5040- 8820 (a, e)
*New York	4640-10627 (b, e)
Indiana	3600- 9300 (e)

Mean Minimum Salary - 7231
Mean Maximum Salary - 9629

(a) Longevity payments are added to this base pay range.
(b) Appointments are frequently made above the minimum of this salary range.
(c) Minimum qualifications in this State significantly higher.
(d) Minimum qualifications in this State significantly lower.
(e) This range includes the lowest minimum and highest maximum limits used by jurisdictions for this class.

No comparable class within scope of definition in Alaska, Ohio, Oklahoma, Wyoming.

*Salary range revised since last semi-annual survey.

- 19 -

CHILD WELFARE WORKER

This is professional social casework at the entry level but does not include the trainee. An employee in this class, after a brief orientation period, is expected to carry under rather close supervision a full case load helping children and their parents in situations where children have difficulties in family relationships, present behavior problems, have mental or physical handicaps, are neglected and abused, or need substitute care. This class usually requires training in a graduate school of social work, or college plus some casework experience. For workers without professional training, duties and responsibilities may be restricted and under closer supervision.

*Alaska	9108-10932
*Michigan	7559- 7830 (f)
*Illinois	7380- 9660
Pennsylvania	7055- 9011
Idaho	6720- 8076 (a)
*California	6672-11280 (c, e)
*Florida	6600- 8280 (a)
*North Dakota	6576- 8316 (a)
*Maryland	6518- 8562 (d)
*Nevada	6466- 7849
District of Columbia	6451- 8368
*Washington	6432- 7812
*Connecticut	6400- 7840 (a)
*Oregon	6300- 7860
*Utah	6216- 8700 (a)
*Vermont	6162- 8320
Hawaii	6048- 7716 (a)
*Tennessee	6000- 7440
*Ohio	5990- 8840 (e)
Massachusetts	5936- 7527
*Arizona	5880- 7152 (b)
Georgia	5784- 7752 (b)
*New Jersey	5774- 7508 (d)
*Rhode Island	5746- 6968 (a, d)
*Minnesota	5640- 8040 (a, e)
*Missouri	5640- 7560 (b)
*Alabama	5556- 7272
*Iowa	5520- 8100 (a, e)
West Virginia	5520- 7200 (d)
Montana	5520- 6720 (a)
Kansas	5496- 7044 (a)
*North Carolina	5484- 8028 (b, e)
*Wisconsin	5400- 8100 (e)
*Virgin Islands	5400- 7400
*Arkansas	5400- 6000
*New Mexico	5280- 7200
*Colorado	5256- 7884 (a, e)
*Kentucky	5232- 6360 (a, d)
*South Carolina	5180- 5665
Maine	5148- 6240 (a, d)
Delaware	5100- 6720 (a, d)
*South Dakota	5100- 6600 (a)
Mississippi	5100- 6060
*New Hampshire	5069- 6286 (a, d, f)
*Oklahoma	4980- 6600
Texas	4920- 5616 (d)
*Virginia	4800- 8940 (a, b, d, e)
*New York	4500- 8474 (b, d, e)
*Nebraska	3900- 6840 (a, e)
Puerto Rico	3600- 4500 (a, d)
Indiana	2400- 8100 (e)

Mean Minimum Salary - 5724
Mean Maximum Salary - 7630

(a) Longevity payments are added to this base pay range.
(b) Appointments are frequently made above the minimum of this salary range.
(c) Minimum qualifications in this State significantly higher.
(d) Minimum qualifications in this State significantly lower.
(e) This range includes the lowest minimum and highest maximum limits used by jurisdictions in this class.
(f) After a short period (6 months - 1 year) of satisfactory service in this class, the employee is automatically promoted to the next level class which is at a higher pay scale.

No comparable class within scope of definition in Louisiana, Wyoming.

DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC HEALTH STATISTICS

This is responsible technical and supervisory statistical and research work. An employee in this class organizes and directs the public health research and statistical program of the department. The work includes the direction of subordinates; assembling, tabulating, and analyzing statistical data; and the preparation of periodic and special reports with charts and explanatory data. The employee may supervise the vital statistics unit, but this position should not be considered the same as the vital statistics registrar or chief of vital statistics if these latter two positions do not include research. This class usually requires graduation from college with specialization in statistics and extensive experience in progressively responsible research and statistical work, usually in the field of public health.

New York	17560-20595 (a)
*Illinois	15936-22320 (c)
District of Columbia	15106-19813
*Maryland	13973-18354
*California	13860-16860
Texas	13400-15000
*Wisconsin	12900-16800
Georgia	12612-16908 (c)
*Kentucky	12576-16056 (a)
*Indiana	12300-15120
*Arizona	11640-18048
*New Jersey	11431-14863
*Minnesota	11400-16224 (a)
*Alaska	11112-13344
*Virginia	10992-14328
Pennsylvania	10954-14657
*Washington	10896-13908
*North Carolina	10848-13800 (a)
*Oregon	10140-12360
*Colorado	10104-12900 (a)
Mississippi	10000-11600
*Alabama	9924-12288
Hawaii	9840-12552 (a)
*Michigan	9834-12779 (a)
*Oklahoma	9720-12660 (a)
*Florida	9600-12000 (a)
Montana	9600-11400
*Connecticut	9580-11860 (a)
*South Carolina	9467-14411
New Mexico	9420-12840 (a)
*Missouri	9180-12288
*Utah	9108-12732 (a)
*Tennessee	9060-11760
*Vermont	8996-12402
West Virginia	8940-11580
*Ohio	8736-12272
*Nevada	8652-10511
*Rhode Island	8632-10426 (a)
Maine	8580-10452 (a, i)
*North Dakota	8316-10512 (a)
*New Hampshire	8280-10280 (a)
Louisiana	8280-10080 (a)
Puerto Rico	7800- 9000 (a)
Kansas	7764- 9924 (a)
*South Dakota	7500- 9000 (a)
*Virgin Islands	6720- 8352 (a)
Nebraska	6480- 8400 (a)

Mean Minimum Salary - 10378
Mean Maximum Salary - 13332

(a) Longevity payments are added to this base pay range.
(c) Minimum qualifications in this State significantly higher.
(i) Includes direction of research and statistics for State health and welfare programs.

No comparable class within scope of definition in Arkansas, Delaware, Idaho, Iowa, Massachusetts, Wyoming.

*Salary range revised since last semi-annual survey.

- 21 -

DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC HEALTH ENGINEERING

This is responsible administrative and technical work in planning and directing the state-wide public health engineering program. An employee in this class has responsibility for coordinating the sanitary engineering program as a part of a general state-wide public health program, and for providing technical engineering advice toward the solution and control of environmental sanitation problems. Supervision is exercised over a staff of engineers, technicians, and related personnel. This class usually requires a BS degree in engineering including undergraduate or graduate training in sanitary engineering, plus at least one year of graduate study leading to a Master of Science degree, or a Master's degree in public health and extensive public health engineering experience.

New York	22800-26310 (a)
District of Columbia	20075-25435
*Illinois	18780-25764
*Michigan	17873-22008 (a)
*California	17700-21516
*Oregon	16500-19680
*Wisconsin	16440-21360
*Alaska	16332-19596
*New Jersey	16086-20910
Ohio	15600-21112
*Nevada	15549-18922
Pennsylvania	15387-20629
Georgia	15336-20556
Kentucky	15288-19512 (a)
Massachusetts	15148-19219
*Indiana	15120-18480
*North Carolina	14472-18420 (a)
*Florida	14400-18120 (a)
*Connecticut	14220-17580 (a)
*Oklahoma	14100-18420 (a)
*Nebraska	14000-17400 (a)
*North Dakota	13920-17592 (a)
*Washington	13900-17748
Texas	13800-15000
*Colorado	13536-17280 (a)
*Vermont	13520-19058
*Minnesota	13344-18972 (a)
*Tennessee	13200-16440
Hawaii	13176-16836 (a)
*South Carolina	13142-23100
*Virginia	13128-15675
*Arizona	12840-19860
*Idaho	12504-15204
Montana	12480-14460
*Iowa	12420-14640 (a)
*Alabama	12288-15876
*Utah	12132-17040 (a)
*Wyoming	12060-14460 (a)
Delaware	12024-16068
South Dakota	12000-15000 (a)
Maine	11830-14378 (a, c)
West Virginia	11580-14580
*Virgin Islands	11500-14164
Mississippi	11000-13400
*Arkansas	10800-13800
New Mexico	9420-12840 (a)
Puerto Rico	7800- 9000 (a)

Mean Minimum Salary - 14054
Mean Maximum Salary - 17945

(a) Longevity payments are added to this base pay range.
(c) Minimum qualifications in this State significantly higher.

No comparable class within scope of definition in Kansas, Louisiana, Maryland, Missouri, New Hampshire, Rhode Island.

*Salary range revised since last semi-annual survey.

- 22 -

PUBLIC HEALTH ENGINEER

This is the professional entry position in environmental sanitation work requiring engineering training. Under supervision of an experienced engineer or a health officer, an employee in this class assists in the enforcement of public health laws, regulations, and standards by reviewing designs and installations of facilities and equipment and by means of investigational and educational activities involving the application of sanitary science and engineering skills for the control of communicable diseases and the promotion of health and safety. The incumbent supervises or trains sanitation aides and inspectors engaged in routine inspection and sampling work. This class usually requires no experience but requires a Bachelor's degree in engineering with a major in sanitary, civil, mechanical, or chemical engineering.

Alaska	10404-12480	*Missouri	7560-10116 (b)
Delaware	9000-12024	*Nebraska	7560- 9780 (a, b)
*Arizona	8688-13476	Florida	7560- 9120 (a)
*Rhode Island	8632-10426 (a)	Montana	7500- 9240
*Illinois	8520-10452	*Nevada	7477- 9082
*California	8520- 9396	Massachusetts	7392- 9373
*South Dakota	8400- 9900 (a, b)	*Oklahoma	7380- 9720 (a)
*Michigan	8373-10064 (a)	New York	7370- 8590 (a, f)
Ohio	8320-11232	Hawaii	7344- 9372 (a, c)
*Indiana	8280-10320	*South Carolina	7213-11470
*New Hampshire	8280-10280 (a, c)	*West Virginia	7200- 9420
*Tennessee	8220- 9900	*Iowa	7200- 8400 (a)
*Arkansas	8100- 9000	Kansas	7044- 9000 (a)
*Virginia	8040-10992	*New Jersey	7018- 9124
*Maryland	7887-10360 (a)	Kentucky	6996- 8940 (a)
*Oregon	7860- 9720	*Alabama	6948- 8928 (b)
*Wisconsin	7812-10152	Texas	6852- 8352
Pennsylvania	7772- 9454	*Minnesota	6828- 9744 (a)
Georgia	7752-10380	New Mexico	6600- 9000 (a)
*Washington	7752- 9888 (c)	Mississippi	6600- 8000
*North Carolina	7752- 9852 (a)	Maine	6552- 7982 (a, c)
*Idaho	7692- 9348	*Utah	6216- 8700 (a)
*North Dakota	7572- 9576 (a)	Puerto Rico	5400- 6360 (a)

Mean Minimum Salary - 7640
Mean Maximum Salary - 9706

(a) Longevity payments are added to this base pay range.
(b) Appointments are frequently made above the minimum of this salary range.
(c) Minimum qualifications in this State significantly higher.
(f) After a short period (6 months - 1 year) of satisfactory service in this class, the employee is automatically promoted to the next level class which is at a higher pay scale.

No comparable class within scope of definition in Colorado, Connecticut, District of Columbia, Louisiana, Vermont, Virgin Islands, Wyoming.

*Salary range revised since last semi-annual survey.

- 23 -

SANITARIAN

This is the professional entry position in environmental sanitation work which involves the application of sanitary science in the control of communicable diseases, the promotion of health and safety, and the solution of environmental health problems. Under the supervision of an experienced sanitarian or health officer, an employee in this class assists in the enforcement of public health laws and regulations by means of investigational and educational activities. The incumbent may supervise and train sanitation aides and inspectors engaged in routine inspection and sampling work. This class usually requires no experience but requires college graduation with undergraduate or graduate courses in physical and biological sciences.

*California	7728- 9376	*Vermont	5798- 7774
*Alaska	7764- 9324	Georgia	5784- 7752
*Indiana	7560- 9420 (c)	*New Mexico	5760- 7920 (a, c)
Illinois	7500-10500	Montana	5760- 7200
New York	7065- 8590 (a, j)	*Iowa	5760- 6900 (a)
*South Dakota	6900- 8400 (a, b)	*Utah	5652- 7896 (a)
*Minnesota	6828- 9744 (a)	*Tennessee	5640- 7800
*Wisconsin	6648- 8688	*Oklahoma	5580- 7380 (a)
*Oregon	6600- 8210	*Nebraska	5580- 7200 (a, b)
*Maryland	6518- 8562	*Florida	5520- 7920 (a)
*Washington	6432- 7812	*West Virginia	5520- 7200 (e)
Pennsylvania	6390- 8163	*North Carolina	5484- 8028 (b, e)
*Colorado	6204- 7920 (a)	*Kentucky	5484- 7716
*Nevada	6159- 7477	*New Hampshire	5469- 6921 (a)
*New Jersey	6063- 7881	*South Carolina	5409- 9076 (b)
Hawaii	6048- 7716 (a)	Texas	5256- 6408
*Rhode Island	6032- 7332 (a)	*North Dakota	5196- 6576 (a, d)
*Idaho	6024- 7320	*Arkansas	4740- 5400
*Connecticut	5960- 7160 (a)	Puerto Rico	4440- 5400 (a)
*Missouri	5928- 7932 (b)	Mississippi	4000- 5000
*Virginia	5880- 7680	Arizona	3984- 8688 (e, f)
Delaware	5844- 7428 (c)	Louisiana	3840- 5040 (a, f)
*Alabama	5820- 7596		

Mean Minimum Salary - 5901
Mean Maximum Salary - 7721

(a) Longevity payments are added to this base pay range.
(b) Appointments are frequently made above the minimum of this salary range.
(c) Minimum qualifications in this State significantly higher.
(d) Minimum qualifications in this State significantly lower.
(e) This range includes the lowest minimum and highest maximum limits used by jurisdictions for this class.
(f) After a short period (6 months - 1 year) of satisfactory service in this class, the employee is automatically promoted to the next level class which is at a higher pay scale.
(j) Requires one year experience as trainee.

No comparable class within scope of definition in District of Columbia, Kansas, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Ohio, Virgin Islands, Wyoming.

*Salary range revised since last semi-annual survey.

- 24 -

HEALTH OFFICER

This is the professional entry position in medical work in the public health field. An employee in this class may work with the director of a division in the central office and is responsible for making field investigations of the factors related to the causes of various communicable diseases. The incumbent evaluates facilities available and recommends techniques to be used to prevent or treat such diseases, and may be in charge of a small local health unit or assist a health officer of higher rank in the administration of a larger local unit. This class requires graduation from an accredited medical school, plus one year's internship, and ability to secure a license to practice medicine in the State. One year of graduate study in public health may also be required.

*Maryland	21000	Montana	12840-14880
*Michigan	19794-24430 (a)	New York	12790-15255 (a)
*Missouri	19000-22000	*New Jersey	12603-16383
*California	17268-20000	*North Carolina	12384-18240 (b, e)
*Utah	17196-21948 (a)	*South Carolina	12056-21000
Pennsylvania	16170-18725	Delaware	12024-16068
*Vermont	15470-21970	*Illinois	12000-16452
*Connecticut	15080-18860 (a)	*Oklahoma	12000-15720 (a)
*Idaho	14472-17724	Louisiana	12000-14400 (a)
*Oregon	14340-17100	Hawaii	11952-15264 (a)
Virginia	14328-16400	New Mexico	11760-15600 (a)
*Tennessee	14280-16440	Kansas	11460-14592 (a)
*Washington	13944-16524	*Minnesota	11400-16224 (a)
*North Dakota	13920-17592 (a)	Mississippi	11400-13800
Georgia	13908-18636	Massachusetts	11344-14427
*Kentucky	13860-19512	*Alabama	11304-14616 (b)
West Virginia	13380-16380	Maine	11258-13702 (a, c)
Texas	13200-14100 (q)	Florida	11040-13800 (a)
Arizona	12840-17196 (e)	Puerto Rico	9600-12000 (a)

Mean Minimum Salary - 13596
Mean Maximum Salary - 17078

(a) Longevity payments are added to this base pay range.
(b) Appointments are frequently made above the minimum of this salary range.
(c) Minimum qualifications in this State significantly higher.
(e) This range includes the lowest minimum and highest maximum limits used by jurisdictions for this class.
(q) One thousand dollars additional may be added to annual salary for board certification.

No comparable class within scope of definition in Alaska, Arkansas, Colorado, District of Columbia, Indiana, Iowa, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, Ohio, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Virgin Islands, Wisconsin, Wyomin

*Salary range revised since last semi-annual survey.

- 25 -

STATE DIRECTOR, PUBLIC HEALTH NURSING

This is responsible professional public health nursing work of an administrative nature. An employee in this class participates in agency program planning and policy development, has responsibility for organizing, planning and directing public health nursing services of the State department of health, and coordinating the nursing services with other services of the department of health, and with local, State and Federal agencies. In some instances the work may include supervision of the local nursing programs. This class usually requires a BS degree including public health nursing, graduate training in public health nursing, registration to practice nursing in the State, and extensive public health nursing experience, including some administrative and supervisory responsibilities.

District of Columbia	17550-23013
*Maryland	13973-18354
*California	13860-16860
*Wyoming	13680-16380 (a)
*Alaska	13656-16380
New York	13500-16050 (a)
*Arizona	13476-20820
Pennsylvania	13301-17839
*South Carolina	12056-21000
Massachusetts	11973-15249
*Ohio	11960-17576
*Wisconsin	11856-15456
*Indiana	11760-14520
*Michigan	11630-14741 (a)
*Delaware	11460-14312
Georgia	11436-15336 (d)
*Washington	11436-14604
*New Jersey	11431-14863
*Hawaii	11388-14532 (a)
*Illinois	11280-14928
*Nevada	11040-13421
*Utah	11028-15468 (a)
*Vermont	11024-15314
*North Carolina	10848-13800 (a)
*Missouri	10620-14220
*Florida	10560-13200 (a)
West Virginia	10440-13380
*Connecticut	10440-12720 (a)
*Tennessee	10320-13200
*Oregon	10140-12360
*Colorado	10104-12900 (a)
*Rhode Island	10010-12090 (a)
Mississippi	10000-11600
*Montana	9960-11760
*Minnesota	9744-13872 (a)
*Oklahoma	9720-12660 (a)
*Virginia	9600-12528
*Alabama	9588-11784
New Mexico	9420-12840 (a)
*New Hampshire	9400-11580 (a)
Kentucky	9384-11976 (a)
*Iowa	9300-10500 (a)
*Maine	9230-11258 (a)
*North Dakota	9132-11544 (a)
South Dakota	8700-10200 (a)
Kansas	8568-10920 (a)
*Arkansas	8400- 9600
Texas	8352-10176
Nebraska	7560- 9780 (a)
Puerto Rico	7200- 8400 (a)
Louisiana	6900- 8400 (a)
*Virgin Islands	6720- 8352 (a)

Mean Minimum Salary - 10694
Mean Maximum Salary - 13743

(a) Longevity payments are added to this base pay range.
(d) Minimum qualifications in this State significantly lower.

No comparable class within scope of definition in Idaho.

*Salary range revised since last semi-annual survey.

PUBLIC HEALTH NURSE CONSULTANT

This is professional work at the consultant level in the field of public health nursing. An employee in this position analyzes and plans the nursing needs and develops the nursing services in a generalized public health service program or in special fields such as maternal and child health, mental hygiene, crippled children, or tuberculosis. This class usually requires State registration, one or two years graduate study in public health nursing, and some experience in public health nursing.

*California	10860-13200
*Arizona	10560-16380
*Maryland	10498-13789
*Alaska	10404-12480
*Wisconsin	9960-12960
*Michigan	9667-12298 (a)
Massachusetts	9607-12181
Ohio	9568-12896
Pennsylvania	9454-12675
District of Columbia	9221-12056
*Tennessee	9060-10800
*Delaware	9000-12024 (c)
*Washington	8976-11436
*West Virginia	8940-11580
New York	8825-10670 (a)
*Illinois	8760-11568
*Indiana	8640-10800
*Georgia	8544-11436
*New Jersey	8530-11092
*North Carolina	8520-10848 (a)
*Montana	8520-10320
*Hawaii	8508-10848 (a)
*Maine	8372-10192 (a)
*Missouri	8328-11148
*Utah	8280-11580 (a)
*Florida	8280-10560 (a)
*Oregon	8220-10140
*Virginia	8040-10032
*Alabama	7944- 9924 (d)
*Connecticut	7920- 9840 (a)
*Rhode Island	7826- 9464 (a)
South Dakota	7800- 9300 (a)
Kansas	7764- 9924 (a)
*Minnesota	7692-11956 (a)
*South Carolina	7664-12258
*Colorado	7536- 9624 (a)
*Oklahoma	7380- 9720 (a)
Texas	7320- 8916
*North Dakota	7224- 9132 (a)
Iowa	7200- 8400 (a)
Mississippi	7000- 8400 (c)
Kentucky	6996- 8940 (a)
*Idaho	6972- 8472
New Mexico	6900- 9420 (a)
*New Hampshire	6900- 8680 (a)
*Virgin Islands	6336- 7872 (a)
*Arkansas	6120- 7080
Louisiana	6000- 7500 (a, d)
Puerto Rico	6000- 7200 (a)
Nebraska	5880- 7560 (a)

Mean Minimum Salary - 8210
Mean Maximum Salary - 10551

(a) Longevity payments are added to this base pay range.
(c) Minimum qualifications in this State significantly higher.
(d) Minimum qualifications in this State significantly lower.

No comparable class within scope of definition in Nevada, Vermont, Wyoming.

*Salary range revised since last semi-annual survey.

- 27 -

PUBLIC HEALTH NURSE

This is the professional entry position in public health nursing. An employee in this class is expected to perform the scope of duties and responsibilities normally assigned a trained public health nurse. The employee works under only general supervision as regards the accurate performance of the technical duties of the position. This class usually requires graduation from an accredited school of nursing, State registration, and a program of study in public health nursing or appropriate public health nursing experience.

*Alaska	8328- 9996	*Montana	5760- 7200
*California	8112- 9852	*South Dakota	5700- 7200 (a)
*Illinois	7740-10140 (c)	*Virginia	5640- 6720
*Nevada	7477- 9082	*Oklahoma	5580- 7380 (a)
*District of Columbia	7303- 9220	*North Carolina	5484- 8028 (b, e)
*Maryland	7170- 9417	*Kentucky	5484- 7716
*Washington	6900- 8220	*Virgin Islands	5480- 6216 (a)
*Oregon	6600- 7500	*Idaho	5472- 6636
*Connecticut	6400- 7840 (a)	*South Carolina	5409- 8278
Pennsylvania	6390- 8163	*Maine	5408- 6552 (a)
*Tennessee	6360- 7800	Georgia	5244- 7032
*Missouri	6228- 8328 (b)	Kansas	5232- 6684 (a)
*Utah	6216- 8700 (a)	*North Dakota	5196- 6576 (a)
*Vermont	6162- 8320	Iowa	5040- 6000 (a)
*Delaware	6132- 7788	*Arkansas	4920- 5400
*Minnesota	6072- 8664 (a)	Nebraska	4800- 6180 (a, b)
*New Jersey	6063- 7881	Louisiana	4800- 6000 (a, d)
*Hawaii	6048- 7716 (a)	New Mexico	4800- 6000 (a, d)
*Rhode Island	6032- 6968 (a)	Arizona	4608- 7884 (e)
*Florida	6000- 7560 (a)	Texas	4608- 5616
*Indiana	6000- 7560	*Alabama	4524- 6084 (b)
*New Hampshire	5980- 7558 (a)	*New York	4355- 8600 (b, e)
Colorado	5904- 7536 (a)	Mississippi	3900- 4800
*West Virginia	5820- 7620	Puerto Rico	3420- 4320 (a, d)

Mean Minimum Salary - 5798
Mean Maximum Salary - 7469

(a) Longevity payments are added to this base pay range.
(b) Appointments are frequently made above the minimum of this salary range.
(c) Minimum qualifications in this State significantly higher.
(d) Minimum qualifications in this State significantly lower.
(e) This range includes the lowest minimum and highest maximum limits used by jurisdictions for this class.

No comparable class within scope of definition in Massachusetts, Michigan, Ohio, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

*Salary range revised since last semi-annual survey.

- 28 -

DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC HEALTH EDUCATION

This is professional work of an administrative nature in public health education. An employee in this class directs a state-wide program of health education; supervises staff personnel such as district health educators, writers, artists, and librarians; consults with program chiefs within the agency on educational methods of achieving program goals; coordinates the health education program with other agencies' programs; consults with health educators and other personnel in local health agencies; mobilizes community resources for public health action; prepares and makes effective use of health education materials; plans and conducts in-service and community-wide training programs; directs conferences; recruits and places health educators, prepares budgets, etc. In some instances the work may include conducting research. This class usually requires a Master's degree in public health education and considerable experience in public health education or a closely related field.

New York	17560-20595 (a)
District of Columbia	15106-19813
*Illinois	15000-19992 (c)
*California	13860-16860
Mississippi	13400-15800 (c)
Georgia	12612-16908
Pennsylvania	12075-16170
Massachusetts	11973-15249
*Ohio	11960-17576
*Indiana	11760-14520
Texas	11400-12000 (d)
*Utah	11028-15468 (a)
*Tennessee	10800-12720
*Alabama	10608-13200
*Arizona	10560-16380
*Maryland	10498-13789
*Washington	10380-13248
*Oregon	10140-12360
*Wisconsin	9960-12960
*Minnesota	9744-13872 (a)
*Oklahoma	9720-12660 (a)
*Missouri	9636-12900
*Virginia	9600-12528
*Connecticut	9580-11860 (a)
*Rhode Island	9542-11544 (a)
*South Carolina	9467-14411
New Mexico	9420-12840 (a)
Kentucky	9384-11976 (a)
Hawaii	9372-11952 (a)
*Iowa	9300-10500 (a)
Montana	9240-11040
*Colorado	9168-11700 (a)
*Florida	9120-11520 (a)
Delaware	9000-12024
*Vermont	8996-12402
West Virginia	8940-11580
*North Carolina	8940-11376 (a)
*Idaho	8904-10812 (d)
Kansas	8568-10920 (a)
*North Dakota	8316-10512 (a)
Nebraska	7560- 9780 (a)
*South Dakota	7200- 8700 (a)
Arkansas	7200- 8400
Louisiana	6900- 8400 (a)
Puerto Rico	6900- 8100 (a)
Maine	6890- 8372 (a)
*Virgin Islands	6720- 8352 (a)

Mean Minimum Salary - 10085
Mean Maximum Salary - 12907

(a) Longevity payments are added to this base pay range.
(c) Minimum qualifications in this State significantly higher.
(d) Minimum qualifications in this State significantly lower.

No comparable class within scope of definition in Alaska, Michigan, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Wyoming.

*Salary range revised since last semi-annual survey.

- 29 -

NUTRITION CONSULTANT

This is professional work at the consultant level in an agency having a nutrition director. An employee in this class is responsible for developing and carrying out public health nutrition services in an assigned geographical area. The incumbent works under administrative direction and with technical assistance. He consults with medical and para-medical personnel on current scientific findings in foods and nutrition and their application to agency programs; he may design, conduct or participate in dietary and nutrition studies or other studies with a nutrition component; he develops educational materials; and he cooperates with other agencies in the formulation and coordination of nutrition programs. This class usually requires graduation from college with a major in foods and nutrition, one year of graduate training in nutrition as applied to public health, and some experience in a health, welfare or related agency.

Arizona	10560-16380
*Michigan	9667-12298 (a)
*California	9396-11400
*Hawaii	9372-11952 (a)
District of Columbia	9221-12056
*Wisconsin	9156-11916
*Indiana	9000-11280
Delaware	8580-10920
*New Jersey	8530-11092
New York	8365-10125 (a)
*Oregon	8220-10140
Rhode Island	8216- 9932 (a)
Pennsylvania	8163-10954
*Washington	8136-10380
*Maryland	7887-10360
*North Carolina	7752- 9852 (a)
Colorado	7536- 9624 (a)
*North Dakota	7224- 9132 (a)
*South Carolina	7213-11470
*Florida	7200- 9120 (a)
*Ohio	7176- 9776
*Connecticut	7100- 9020 (a)
*Tennessee	7080- 8640
Virginia	7032- 9168
*Missouri	6864- 9180
*West Virginia	6840- 8940
*Minnesota	6828- 9744 (a)
Alabama	6612- 8604
Georgia	6372- 8544
Kentucky	6360- 8112 (a)
Massachusetts	6349- 8034
Maine	6240- 7592 (a)
Nebraska	6180- 7980 (a, c)
Louisiana	6000- 7500 (a)
*Iowa	6000- 7200 (a)
*Arkansas	5940- 6900
Puerto Rico	5400- 6360
*Mississippi	5200- 6600

Mean Minimum Salary - 7499
Mean Maximum Salary - 9692

(a) Longevity payments are added to this base pay range.
(c) Minimum qualifications in this State significantly higher.

No comparable class within scope of definition in Alaska, Idaho, Illinois, Kansas, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virgin Islands, Wyoming.

*Salary range revised since last semi-annual survey.

- 30 -

LABORATORY TECHNICIAN

This is the professional entry position in laboratory technical services. An employee in this class performs the more routine types of bacteriological, serological, chemical, microscopic or other analyses of water, sewage, industrial wastes, milk, dairy products, foods, and drugs. The incumbent may assist in special technical research projects. The work is performed under relatively close supervision and in accordance with well defined standards and procedures. This class usually requires no experience, but requires graduation from an accredited college with a Bachelor's degree in an appropriate science, such as bacteriology or chemistry.

*California	7368- 8520
South Dakota	7200- 8700 (a)
*Tennessee	7080- 8640
*Illinois	7020- 9216
*Iowa	6900- 8100 (a)
Pennsylvania	6716- 9011
New York	6675- 8135 (a)
*Wisconsin	6648- 8688
*Indiana	6600- 8280
*Oregon	6600- 8220
*North Dakota	6576- 8316 (a)
*Michigan	6556- 8039 (a)
*Maryland	6518- 8562
*Arizona	6492-10056
*Georgia	6372- 8544
*Colorado	6204- 7920 (a)
*Vermont	6162- 8320 (f)
*Washington	6120- 7440
*New Jersey	6063- 7881
Kansas	6060- 7764 (a)
*Hawaii	6048- 7716 (a)
*Minnesota	6022- 8664 (a)
*Florida	6000- 7560 (a)
*Connecticut	5960- 7160 (a)
*Missouri	5928- 7932
*South Carolina	5860- 9076
*West Virginia	5820- 7620
*Alabama	5820- 7596
New Mexico	5760- 7920 (a)
*Kentucky	5760- 7344 (a)
Montana	5760- 7200
*Rhode Island	5746- 6968 (a)
*Idaho	5736- 6972
*Utah	5652- 7896 (a)
*Virginia	5640- 7344
*Virgin Islands	5616- 6612 (a)
*Ohio	5491- 8112
Maine	5408- 6552 (a)
District of Columbia	5331- 6915
*Nevada	5330- 6466
*New Hampshire	5269- 6604 (a)
Texas	5256- 6408
Massachusetts	4896- 6185
*North Carolina	4812- 6108 (a)
Nebraska	4800- 6180 (a, b)
Louisiana	4800- 6000 (a, d)
Delaware	4584- 5568
Puerto Rico	4440- 5400
Mississippi	3800- 4600

Mean Minimum Salary - 5904
Mean Maximum Salary - 7572

(a) Longevity payments are added to this base pay range.
(b) Appointments are frequently made above the minimum of this salary range.
(d) Minimum qualifications in this State significantly lower.
(f) After a short period (6 months - 1 year) of satisfactory service in this class, the employee is automatically promoted to the next level class which is at a higher pay scale.

No comparable class within scope of definition in Alaska, Arkansas, Oklahoma, Wyoming.

*Salary range revised since last semi-annual survey.

- 31 -

PSYCHIATRIST

This is responsible professional and administrative work involving the direction of a local or regional mental health clinic. Duties include diagnosis and treatment of patients and may involve supervision and training of clinic personnel. This class requires an M.D. and a year's internship, usually supplemented by three or four years of specialized training and/or experience in the field of psychiatry.

*North Dakota	23304-29448 (a)	*Connecticut	16460-20420 (a)
*Indiana	21120-26880	*Illinois	16440-22548
*Missouri	21000-24000	Virginia	16400-21100
*Maryland	21000	*Arkansas	15900-17700
*South Carolina	19643-20813	New York	15790-18635 (a, b)
Utah	18936-24168 (a)	Massachusetts	15777-20051
*Tennessee	18840-21360	*Florida	15720-19920 (a)
Delaware	18780-23460 (c)	Kentucky	15288-19512 (a)
*North Carolina	18240-26916 (b, e)	*Rhode Island	15106-17368 (a)
*Ohio	17888-23920	West Virginia	14580-17580
Pennsylvania	17839-20629	*Maine	14378-17498 (a)
Oregon	17700-22620	*Oklahoma	13380-17460 (a)
*Michigan	17497-21402 (a)	*Minnesota	13344-18972 (a)
District of Columbia	17198-21905	Puerto Rico	13200-15600 (a)
Georgia	16908-22668	*New Hampshire	12300-15220 (a)
*Louisiana	16800-19800 (a)	Virgin Islands	11500-14164
*Montana	16680-20520 (a)		

Mean Minimum Salary - 16816
Mean Maximum Salary - 20765

(a) Longevity payments are added to this base pay range.
(b) Appointments are frequently made above the minimum of this salary range.
(c) Minimum qualifications in this State significantly higher.
(e) This range includes the lowest minimum and highest maximum limits used by jurisdictions for this class.

No comparable class within scope of definition in Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Mississippi, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, South Dakota, Texas, Vermont, Washington, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

*Salary range revised since last semi-annual survey.

- 32 -

PSYCHOLOGIST

This is responsible professional psychological work in a clinic, hospital, or similar medical setting. An employee in this class selects, administers, and interprets psychological tests; assists in diagnosis and plan of therapy as a member of a clinical team with a psychiatrist and psychiatric social worker; helps design and carry out research projects; under supervision, gives individual and group psychotherapy, and participates in local and State mental health programs. This is essentially non-supervisory work, but may, in some cases, include the supervision of students and trainees. This class usually requires a Master's degree with the major emphasis on clinical psychology and some experience.

*Indiana	11760-14520 (c)	*Iowa	8100- 9300 (a)
*Alaska	10404-12480	*South Carolina	8086- 9464
*Illinois	10056-14088	West Virginia	8040-10440
*Virgin Islands	10000-12320	*Montana	7920- 9744 (a)
Wisconsin	9960-12960 (c)	*Arizona	7884-12228
*Alabama	9924-12288 (b, c)	Texas	7812- 9528
*Arkansas	9600-10800 (c)	*Oklahoma	7800-10260 (a)
District of Columbia	9221-12056	Pennsylvania	7772-10432
*Florida	9120-11520 (a, c)	*Georgia	7752-10380
Oregon	8940-11880 (c)	*Minnesota	7692-11956 (a)
*Connecticut	8940-10860 (a)	*Idaho	7692- 9348 (c)
Hawaii	8928-11388 (a)	Virginia	7680-10032
*Michigan	8895-11171 (a)	*New Hampshire	7580- 9452 (a)
*New Jersey	8841- 9577	New Mexico	7560-10320 (a, c)
*North Dakota	8712-11016 (a)	*Rhode Island	7410- 9022 (a)
*Maryland	8676-11396	Maine	7228- 8788 (a)
Louisiana	8640-10440 (a, b, c)	*North Carolina	6960-10224 (b, e)
Delaware	8460-10080	Massachusetts	6895- 8674
*Vermont	8424-11544	*Utah	6840- 9564 (a)
New York	8365-10125 (a, b)	Mississippi	6800- 7800
*Missouri	8328-11148	Kansas	6684- 8568 (a)
*Colorado	8316-10608 (a, c)	*Ohio	5990- 8840
*Tennessee	8220- 9900	Puerto Rico	5400- 6360 (a)

Mean Minimum Salary - 8268
Mean Maximum Salary - 10541

(a) Longevity payments are added to this base pay range.
(b) Appointments are frequently made above the minimum of this salary range.
(c) Minimum qualifications in this State significantly higher.
(e) This range includes the lowest minimum and highest maximum limits used by jurisdictions for this class.

No comparable class within scope of definition in California, Kentucky, Nebraska, Nevada, South Dakota, Washington, Wyoming.

*Salary range revised since last semi-annual survey.

- 33 -

PSYCHIATRIC SOCIAL WORKER

This is responsible psychiatric social work performed in a clinic, hospital, or similar medical setting. An employee in this class compiles case histories for diagnostic study; assists in diagnosis and plan of therapy as a member of a clinical team with a psychiatrist and psychologist; assists in the supervision of trainees, and aids in the development and conduct of community mental health educational programs. This is essentially non-supervisory work, but the duties may, in some cases, include directing social work services in a small clinic or hospital. This class usually requires training in a graduate school of social work with a major in psychiatric social work, or a major in social case work plus some experience in psychiatric social work

*Alaska	10404-12480	*Idaho	6972- 8472
*California	9168-11124	New York	6967- 8135 (a, b)
*Maryland	8676-11396	*Alabama	6948- 8928 (b)
Georgia	8544-11436	*South Carolina	6916- 7943
*District of Columbia	8421-11013	*Utah	6840- 9564 (a)
*Indiana	8280-10320	Delaware	6840- 8460
*Oregon	8220-10140	*Tennessee	6720- 8220
*Missouri	7932-10620	Kansas	6684- 8568 (a)
*Illinois	7920-10380	*New Hampshire	6600- 8300 (a, b)
*Colorado	7920-10104 (a)	Florida	6600- 8280 (a)
*Vermont	7878-10790	Arkansas	6600- 7800
*Wisconsin	7812-10152	Puerto Rico	6600- 7800 (a)
Pennsylvania	7772- 9923 (d)	*Ohio	6552- 9776
*Minnesota	7692-10956 (a)	Maine	6552- 7982 (a, b)
*Michigan	7538- 9292 (a)	Massachusetts	6349- 8034
*Connecticut	7480- 9400 (a)	*North Carolina	6324- 9288 (b, e)
Virginia	7344- 9600	*Virgin Islands	6276- 7416 (a)
*New Jersey	7320- 8374	Mississippi	6200- 7400
*Montana	7284- 8964 (a)	Nebraska	6180- 7980 (a)
West Virginia	7200- 9420	*Rhode Island	6032- 7332 (a)
Arizona	7152- 9576	Louisiana	6000- 7500 (a)
Kentucky	6996- 8940 (a)	Texas	6000- 7320
Hawaii	6996- 8928 (a)		

Mean Minimum Salary - 7238
Mean Maximum Salary - 9196

(a) Longevity payments are added to this base pay range.
(b) Appointments are frequently made above the minimum of this salary range.
(d) Minimum qualifications in this State significantly lower.
(e) This range includes the lowest minimum and highest maximum limits used by jurisdictions for this class.

No comparable class within scope of definition in Iowa, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Washington, Wyoming.

*Salary range revised since last semi-annual survey.

- 34 -

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION DIRECTOR

This is highly responsible administrative and supervisory work involving the direction of the state-wide program of vocational rehabilitation for the physically and mentally handicapped. This class usually requires an extensive background of experience in vocational rehabilitation work or designated related fields, including supervisory experience, and college graduation or equivalent additional experience.

New York	22788
California	22500
*Wisconsin	18600
*Virginia	18000
*South Carolina	17955-20475
District of Columbia	17550-23013
*Connecticut	17240-21380 (a)
*Illinois	17220-23244
Ohio	17056
*Louisiana	17000
Pennsylvania	16978-21672
*West Virginia	16780
*Michigan	16412-20254 (a)
*Alaska	16332-19596
*Florida	16320-23400
*Minnesota	15600-22188 (a)
*Maryland	15370-20188
Georgia	15336-20556
*Colorado	14928-19056 (a)
*Oregon	14880-17700
*New Jersey	14590-18970
*Missouri	14400-17500
*Oklahoma	14100-18420 (a, c)
Indiana	13920-17040
Kentucky	13860-19512 (a)
*North Carolina	13800-17556 (a)
*Idaho	13500
Massachusetts	13000
*Arkansas	12800-14000
*Vermont	12636-17680
*Washington	12612-16104
*New Mexico	12348
*Nevada	12176-14805
*Utah	12132-17040 (a)
Nebraska	12000-15000
Iowa	12000-14940 (a)
*Arizona	12000-13500
*Tennessee	11760-14820
Mississippi	11500-13000
*Hawaii	11388-14532 (a)
*Alabama	10608-13200
*New Hampshire	10560-13000 (a)
*South Dakota	10200-12336 (a)
Wyoming	10000-12000
*Virgin Islands	9840-12402 (a)
Delaware	9720-13340
*North Dakota	9700-11700 (a)
*Rhode Island	9074-10972 (a)
Montana	8940-12300
Texas	8916-10872 (c)
Maine	8788-10712 (a)
*Kansas	8568-12000
Puerto Rico	8400-10800 (a)

Mean Minimum Salary - 13673
Mean Maximum Salary - 16497

(a) Longevity payments are added to this base pay range.
(c) Minimum qualifications in this State significantly higher.

*Salary range revised since last semi-annual survey.

- 35 -

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION COUNSELOR

This is counseling work at professional entry level in the general rehabilitation agency. An employee in this class takes responsibility, under supervision, for initiating and carrying out rehabilitation processes for persons who are physically and mentally handicapped. The duties include the determination of eligibility, evaluation of individual needs and potentialities, and counseling of the disabled person in the attainment of a satisfactory vocational adjustment. This class usually requires college graduation and some experience in the field of vocational guidance, psychology, social work, personnel work or industrial relations, or an equivalent combination of training and experience.

*Alaska	9108-10932	Texas	6852- 8352
*California	8952-10860	*Utah	6840- 9564 (a)
New York	8365-10125 (a)	*Colorado	6840- 8724 (a)
*Nevada	7850- 9533	*Minnesota	6828- 9744 (a)
*Wisconsin	7812-10152	*Tennessee	6720- 8220
Mississippi	7750- 8750	*North Carolina	6708- 8520 (a)
*Missouri	7700-10500 (e)	*New Jersey	6684- 8688
*Wyoming	7680- 8880 (a)	*North Dakota	6600- 8600 (a)
*South Dakota	7500- 9408 (a)	Nebraska	6600- 8500
Idaho	7500	*Arkansas	6600- 7500
*Connecticut	7480- 9400 (a)	*Ohio	6552- 9776
*Washington	7380- 9420	*Arizona	6500- 9500
*Michigan	7224- 8895 (a)	*Louisiana	6500- 7700
*Indiana	7200- 9000	District of Columbia	6451- 8368
*Maryland	7170- 9417	*Florida	6060- 8160
Pennsylvania	7055- 9011	Kansas	6060- 7764 (a)
*South Carolina	7035- 9555	*Hawaii	6048- 7716 (a)
Georgia	7032- 9420	*Rhode Island	6032- 7332 (a)
*Virginia	7032- 9168	Montana	6000- 8940
Iowa	7000-10520 (a)	Delaware	6000- 8100
*Vermont	6968- 9464	*New Hampshire	5980- 7558 (a)
*Oklahoma	6960- 9180 (a)	*Virgin Islands	5940- 6984 (a)
*Alabama	6948- 8928	Maine	5668- 6890 (a)
*New Mexico	6900- 9420 (a)	West Virginia	5520- 7200
*Illinois	6900- 9384	Kentucky	5484- 6996 (a)
*Oregon	6900- 8580	Puerto Rico	4140- 5040 (a)
Massachusetts	6895- 8674		

Mean Minimum Salary - 6840
Mean Maximum Salary - 8764

(a) Longevity payments are added to this base pay range.
(e) This range includes the lowest minimum and highest maximum limits used by jurisdictions for this class.

*Salary range revised since last semi-annual survey.

- 36 -

STATE DIRECTOR, CIVIL DEFENSE

This is highly responsible administrative work, involving planning, organizing and carrying out a state-wide program designed to protect civilians in time of natural disaster or enemy attack. The incumbent acts as the Governor's representative on all civil defense matters and coordinates civil defense activities in all State Departments. When this position is included in the classified service, it usually requires college graduation and extensive administrative and planning experience in a large-scale public, military or industrial organization.

New York	29160	
California	21500	
District of Columbia	17550-23013	
*Alaska	16524-19836	
*Vermont	16500-18150	(n)
Pennsylvania	16170-20629	
Georgia	16103	(n)
Kentucky	16000	(n)
*Colorado	15642	(n)
*Massachusetts	15300	
*Illinois	15000	
*Rhode Island	15000	
*Washington	15000	
Wisconsin	15000	
Louisiana	14400	
*South Carolina	14207	
*Minnesota	14000	
Virginia	14000	
*Florida	13620	
*Oregon	12360	
New Hampshire	12000-13500	(a, n)
Alabama	12000	
Idaho	12000	
Maryland	11340	
*Connecticut	11140-13780	(a)
*Nevada	11000	
New Mexico	11000	
North Carolina	11000	
Maine	10920	
*Iowa	10500	
*Tennessee	10320-13200	
Puerto Rico	10200	
Nebraska	10000	(n)
*Virgin Islands	10000	
West Virginia	10000	
*Oklahoma	9720-12660	
Wyoming	9600	(n)
Texas	9216-11232	
*North Dakota	9200	
*Utah	9108	
Delaware	9000	
Missouri	8500	
Arizona	8400	
Indiana	8100-11800	
Mississippi	8000	
Arkansas	6000-10000	
Kansas	6000	(n)
South Dakota	4800	(a)

Mean Minimum Salary - 12335
Mean Maximum Salary - 13055

(a) Longevity payments are added to this base pay range.
(n) Serves as Adjutant General or State department head with part-time responsibility for the civil defense program.

No comparable class within scope of definition in Hawaii, Michigan, Montana, New Jersey, Ohio.

* Salary range revised since last semi-annual survey.

- 37 -

DEPUTY STATE DIRECTOR, CIVIL DEFENSE

This is highly responsible administrative work, involving the planning, organizing and directing of the state-wide defense program. The incumbent may be responsible for supervision of one or more specified phases of the civil defense program. Duties include acting for the State Director in his absence. The class usually requires college graduation and considerable administrative and planning experience in a large-scale public, military or industrial organization, or an equivalent combination of education and experience.

New York	20585-23900 (a)
District of Columbia	15106-19813
*New Jersey	13895-18065
Georgia	12900 (o)
*Alaska	12876-15444
*Ohio	11960-17576 (o)
Hawaii	11952-15264 (a, o)
*Wisconsin	11856-15456
*Michigan	11735-15054 (a, o)
*Minnesota	11400-16224 (a)
Montana	10927-14338 (o)
*Maryland	10498-13789
*Washington	10380-13248
Nebraska	10248-13560 (o)
Massachusetts	10169-12945
*Colorado	10104-12900 (a, o)
Louisiana	10080-12480
*Alabama	9924-11000
*Vermont	9500-10450
*Oregon	9300-11400
*Virginia	9168-11472
New Mexico	9000-12300
Puerto Rico	9000-11400 (a)
*Florida	8700-11040 (a)
*Tennessee	8640-10320
*Rhode Island	8632-10426 (a)
Virgin Islands	8600
Kentucky	8520-10872 (a)
Idaho	8472-10296
South Dakota	8400- 9900 (a, o)
*South Carolina	8316-11701
*Utah	8280-11580 (a)
Texas	8076- 9840
*West Virginia	8040-10440
Wyoming	7980- 9180 (a, o)
Iowa	7500- 8700 (a)
*Kansas	7392- 9456 (a, o)
Maine	7228- 8788 (a)
*New Hampshire	7220- 9052 (a, o)
Mississippi	6600- 7800

Mean Minimum Salary - 9979
Mean Maximum Salary - 12474

(a) Longevity payments are added to this base pay range.
(o) Has major responsibility for civil defense program in States where State Director has only part-time civil defense duties.

No comparable class within scope of definition in Arizona, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Missouri, Nevada, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania.

* Salary range revised since last semi-annual survey.

- 38 -

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER

This is responsible administrative work, involving the management of the State Civil Defense office, and coordination of the State program and the Federal contributions and surplus property programs. An employee in this class also provides supporting administrative services, such as personnel, budget, fiscal and supply. This class usually requires college graduation and considerable experience in general administration or office management, or an equivalent combination of education and experience.

New York	14990-17740 (a)
*California	14556-17700
Pennsylvania	9923-13301
*Illinois	9600-13440
*Maryland	9544-12536
Georgia	9420-12612
*Washington	9420-12012
Massachusetts	9110-11497
*New Jersey	8957-11645
*Nevada	8652-10450
*Alabama	8604-10608
Hawaii	8508-10848 (a)
*Delaware	8200- 9840 (a)
*Connecticut	8160-10080 (a)
*North Carolina	8124-10320 (a)
*Virginia	8040-10512
*Missouri	7560-10116
Oklahoma	7380- 9720
*West Virginia	7200- 9420
*South Carolina	7161-10076
Texas	7080- 8628
*District of Columbia	7068- 9183
*Rhode Island	7046- 8528 (a)
Kentucky	6996- 8940 (a)
Nebraska	6840- 8760 (a)
*North Dakota	6576- 8316 (a)
Wyoming	6360- 7560 (a)
Maine	6240- 7592 (a)
*Utah	6216- 8700 (a)
Kansas	5772- 7392 (a)
*Tennessee	5640- 7080
Arkansas	5400- 6600
Mississippi	5400- 6600
Puerto Rico	5400- 6360 (a)
South Dakota	5040- 6540

Mean Minimum Salary - 7891
Mean Maximum Salary - 10036

(a) Longevity payments are added to this base pay range.

No comparable class within scope of definition in Alaska, Arizona, Colorado, Florida, Idaho, Indiana, Iowa, Louisiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, New Hampshire, New Mexico, Ohio, Oregon, Vermont, Virgin Islands, Wisconsin.

* Salary range revised since last semi-annual survey.

- 39 -

OPERATIONS OFFICER

This is responsible work in the State office, involving the development of operational plans, the organization of civil defense resources, and the coordination of all elements of the operational plans. Duties may also include the organization of, and direction of training for civil defense manpower. This class usually requires college graduation and extensive experience in civil defense, emergency services, or disaster relief, including considerable administrative experience. In some States, experience in related fields or as a military officer may be substituted for college graduation.

New York	14990-17740 (a)	*Virginia	8040-10032
*California	13860-16860	*Temessee	7800- 9480
*Alaska	13812-16584	Idaho	7692- 9348
Illinois	12144-17016	*Missouri	7560-10116
Pennsylvania	12075-16170 (c)	*Utah	7524-10524 (a)
District of Columbia	10927-14338	*Vermont	7410-10088 (d)
*Wisconsin	10872-14172	*Alabama	7272- 9264
Massachusetts	10169-12945	*North Dakota	7224- 9132 (a)
*Maryland	9544-12536 (a)	Nebraska	7200- 9300 (a)
Georgia	9420-12612	*Iowa	7200- 8400 (a)
*Washington	9420-12012	*South Carolina	7161-10076
Hawaii	9372-11952 (a)	Texas	7080- 8628
*Nevada	9083-10450	Kentucky	6996- 8940 (a)
Puerto Rico	9000-11400 (a)	New Mexico	6900- 9420
*Minnesota	8664-12336 (a)	*New Hampshire	6600- 8300 (a)
*New Jersey	8530-11092	*Florida	6600- 8280 (a)
Montana	8421-11013	South Dakota	6600- 8100
*Ohio	8320-11752	Maine	6552- 7982 (a)
*Rhode Island	8216- 9932 (a)	Arizona	6492- 8700
*Delaware	8200- 9840 (a, d)	*Oklahoma	6360- 9180
*Connecticut	8160-10080 (a)	Wyoming	6360- 7560 (a)
*North Carolina	8124-10320 (a)	Arkansas	5400- 6600
*West Virginia	8040-10440	Mississippi	5400- 6600

Mean Minimum Salary - 8452
Mean Maximum Salary - 10818

(a) Longevity payments are added to this base pay range.
(c) Minimum qualifications in this State significantly higher.
(d) Minimum qualifications in this State significantly lower.

No comparable class within scope of definition in Colorado, Indiana, Kansas, Louisiana, Michigan, Oregon, Virgin Islands.

* Salary range revised since last semi-annual survey.

- 40 -

AREA COORDINATOR

This is responsible work, involving development and coordination of all phases of the plan for civil defense within an assigned area of the State. An employee in this class coordinates the development of plans for local agencies and serves as liaison between the local agencies and the State agency. The incumbent exercises independent judgment on the application of State standards to local situations. This class usually requires college graduation and considerable administrative or supervisory experience, or an equivalent combination of education and experience.

*California	13860-16860-	*Virginia	7032- 8784
New York	10330-12430 (a, d)	*West Virginia	6840- 8940
*Illinois	9600-13440	*Tennessee	6720- 8220
Pennsylvania	9454-12675	*Florida	6600- 8280 (a)
*Wisconsin	9156-11916	Mississippi	6600- 7200
Massachusetts	9110-11497	*North Dakota	6576- 8316 (a)
*Minnesota	8664-12336 (a)	*Ohio	6552- 9360
*Indiana	8280-10320	Nebraska	6480- 7400 (a)
*Michigan	8227-10607 (a)	Kentucky	6360- 8112 (a)
*Connecticut	8160-10080 (a)	*Alabama	6348- 8268 (d)
*New Jersey	8124-10560	Louisiana	6300- 7800
*North Carolina	8124-10320 (a)	*South Carolina	6006- 8450
*Maryland	7887-10360	*New Hampshire	5980- 7558 (a)
Washington	7752- 9688	Maine	5954- 7228 (a)
Montana	7696-10045	Puerto Rico	5400- 6360 (a)
Georgia	7032- 9420	Arkansas	4200- 5400 (d)

Mean Minimum Salary - 7544
Mean Maximum Salary - 9638

(a) Longevity payments are added to this base pay range.
(d) Minimum qualifications in this State significantly lower.

No comparable class within scope of definition in Alaska, Arizona, Colorado, Delaware, District of Columbia, Hawaii, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Nevada, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virgin Islands, Wyoming.

* Salary range revised since last semi-annual survey.

- 41 -

TRAINING AND EDUCATION OFFICER

This is responsible professional work, involving the planning and administration of a state-wide civil defense training and education program. An employee in this class is responsible for coordination of local training programs with the State and national programs. This class usually requires college graduation, preferably including courses in education, psychology or public administration, and considerable experience in the administration of training programs including some supervisory experience, or an equivalent combination of education and experience.

*Alaska	11256-13512	*North Dakota	7224- 9132 (a)
*California	10860-13200	*West Virginia	7200- 9420
*Washington	9420-12012	Iowa	7200- 8400 (a)
*District of Columbia	9221-12056	*Delaware	7000- 8400 (a)
Massachusetts	9110-11497	Kentucky	6996- 8940 (a)
*Maryland	8676-11396	New Mexico	6900- 9420
*Minnesota	8664-12336 (a)	Louisiana	6900- 8400 (1)
*New Jersey	8530-11092	*New Hampshire	6600- 8300 (a, 1)
*Ohio	8320-11752	*Florida	6600- 8280 (a)
*Alabama	8268-10272	South Dakota	6600- 8100
Pennsylvania	8163-10954	Nebraska	6480- 7400
*Illinois	7992-11208	*South Carolina	6468- 9101
*Colorado	7920-10104 (a)	Wyoming	6360- 7560 (a)
Idaho	7692- 9348	Texas	6204- 7560
*Missouri	7560-10116 (1)	Puerto Rico	6000- 7200 (a)
*Utah	7524-10524 (a)	Maine	5954- 7228 (a)
*Rhode Island	7410- 8528 (a, 1)	Arkansas	5400- 6600
Oklahoma	7380- 9720	Mississippi	5400- 6600
*Virginia	7344- 9168 (1)	*Tennessee	5040- 6360

Mean Minimum Salary - 7469
Mean Maximum Salary - 9505

(a) Longevity payments are added to this base pay range.
(1) Also performs public information duties.

No comparable class within scope of definition in Arizona, Connecticut, Georgia, Hawaii, Indiana, Kansas, Michigan, Montana, Nevada, New York, North Carolina, Oregon, Vermont, Virgin Islands, Wisconsin.

* Salary range revised since last semi-annual survey.

PUBLIC INFORMATION OFFICER

This is responsible professional work, involving the development and administration of a continuing program of public information in the field of non-military defense. Duties include the preparation and dissemination of information to the local civil defense agencies and the public. This class usually requires college graduation, preferably with courses in communications, such as public relations or journalism, and considerable administrative and planning experience in the field of public information, or an equivalent combination of education and experience.

New York	13500-16050 (a)	*North Carolina	7044- 8940 (a)
*California	10356-12576	Delaware	7000- 8400
Massachusetts	9110-11497	Oklahoma	6960- 9180
*Maryland	8676-11396	*Minnesota	6828- 8328 (a)
*New Jersey	8530-11092	*Florida	6600- 8280 (a)
Montana	8421-11013	Nebraska	6480- 8400 (a)
Louisiana	8280-10080	*South Carolina	6468- 9101
*Oregon	8220-10140	Hawaii	6048- 7716 (a)
*Connecticut	8160-10080 (a)	Puerto Rico	6000- 7200 (a)
*Illinois	7992-11206	*Tennessee	5640- 7080
*Ohio	7904-11752	Mississippi	5400- 6600
*Wisconsin	7812-10152	Kansas	4740- 6060 (a)
Kentucky	7716- 9852 (a)	Arkansas	4200- 5400
Texas	7080- 8628		

Mean Minimum Salary - 7451
Mean Maximum Salary - 9489

(a) Longevity payments are added to this base pay range.

No comparable class within scope of definition in Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Colorado, District of Columbia, Georgia, Idaho, Indiana, Iowa, Maine, Michigan, Missouri, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Virgin Islands, Washington, West Virginia, Wyoming.

* Salary range revised since last semi-annual survey.

- 43 -

CHEMICAL, BIOLOGICAL AND RADIOLOGICAL DEFENSE OFFICER

This is responsible technical work, involving the planning and implementation of a program designed to utilize all available techniques and knowledge for minimizing the effects of chemical, nuclear and biological warfare with particular reference to inhabitants, natural resources and industries. An employee in this class is responsible for coordinating the State and local programs with national policy and practice. This class usually requires college graduation with a major in physical or biological science, and considerable experience in the application of scientific principles and techniques, including responsible supervisory or planning experience, or an equivalent combination of education and experience.

New York	14990-17740 (a, m)	*Virginia	7680-10032 (m)
Massachusetts	10169-12945	West Virginia	7620- 9900
*Maryland	8676-11396	*North Dakota	7224- 9132 (a)
*New Jersey	8530-11092 (d, m)	South Dakota	7200- 8700 (a)
*Wisconsin	8484-11004 (m)	Iowa	7200- 8400 (a)
Montana	8421-11013	*Missouri	6864- 9180
*Alabama	8268-10272	*Florida	6600- 8280 (a, d, m)
Pennsylvania	8163-10954	*South Carolina	6468- 9101 (m)
*Connecticut	8160-10080 (a)	Wyoming	6360- 7560 (a)
Colorado	7920-10104 (a)	Maine	6240- 7592 (a)
*Rhode Island	7826- 9464 (a)	Kansas	5772- 7392 (a, m)
Georgia	7752-10380	*Puerto Rico	5700- 6660 (a, m)
*Washington	7752- 9888 (m)	Mississippi	5700- 6600
North Carolina	7752- 9852 (a, m)		

Mean Minimum Salary - 7759
Mean Maximum Salary - 9804

(a) Longevity payments are added to this base pay range.
(d) Minimum qualifications in this State significantly lower.
(m) This position involves radiological defense duties only.

No comparable class within scope of definition in Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Delaware, District of Columbia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virgin Islands.

* Salary range revised since last semi-annual survey.

- 44 -

COMMUNICATIONS OFFICER

This is responsible technical work involving planning and effectuating a program designed to insure communication capability in an emergency. This work includes supervision of the establishment and operation of warning and communications systems and networks, and the coordination of local and State systems with established national systems. This class usually requires college graduation or equivalent post-high school technical training in electronics or physics, and considerable experience in electronic communications, with special emphasis on planning systems of communications and integrating or coordinating different kinds of facilities. Some supervisory or administrative experience may also be required.

*California	13200-16044	*North Dakota	7224- 9132 (a)
*Nevada	10040-13422	West Virginia	7200- 9420
Illinois	9420-12960	Iowa	7200- 8400 (a)
Massachusetts	9110-11497	Georgia	7032- 9420
Hawaii	8928-11388 (a)	Maine	6890- 8372 (a)
*Maryland	8676-11396 (a)	*Missouri	6864- 9180
*Ohio	8320-11232	Texas	6624- 8076
Pennsylvania	8163-10954	*Florida	6600- 8280 (a, d)
*Colorado	7920-10104 (a)	Nebraska	6480- 8400 (a)
*Oregon	7860- 9720	*South Carolina	6468- 9101
*Washington	7752- 9888	*Alabama	6348- 8268
*District of Columbia	7696-10045	Oklahoma	6240- 8220
*Utah	7524-10524 (a)	Louisiana	5760- 6960 (d)
*Rhode Island	7410- 9022 (a)	Mississippi	5400- 6600
*North Carolina	7380- 9384 (a)	Puerto Rico	5400- 6360 (a)
*Virginia	7344- 9168	Arkansas	4500- 5700

Mean Minimum Salary - 7468
Mean Maximum Salary - 9582

(a) Longevity payments are added to this base pay range.
(d) Minimum qualifications in this State significantly lower.

No comparable class within scope of definition in Alaska, Arizona, Connecticut, Delaware, Idaho, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, South Dakota, Tennessee, Vermont, Virgin Islands, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

* Salary range revised since last semi-annual survey.

Mrs. GREEN. May I extend my thanks to you, Dr. Simpson, Dr. Huitt, Dr. Valien, Dr. Stewart. I regret that we pose problems for you over which you have no control, but at the time we seem to have no control either.

Thank you very much.

Mr. SIMPSON. Thank you.

Mrs. GREEN. The next witness is Dr. Otis Conoway, dean of the Graduate School of Affairs of the University of New York. Dr. Conoway, would you come to the table. I am sorry that we are so late. Dr. Conoway is not only dean of the graduate school but also current chairman of the Council on Graduate Education for Public Administration.

Dean Conoway, we are delighted you could stay for this. I understand you have a tight schedule. If you want to summarize your statement and make some comments and then have the full statement made a part of the record at this point, I am sure that that will meet with the approval of the members of the subcommittee, but you follow your own desires.

STATEMENT OF O. B. CONOWAY, DEAN OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS, STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK, ALBANY, AND CURRENT CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNCIL ON GRADUATE EDUCATION AND PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

Dr. CONOWAY. Thank you, Madam Chairman. I would like to summarize the statement. I think I can do so very quickly and then you may wish to ask for my opinion on some of the questions you have been discussing.

(The document referred to follows:)

PREPARED STATEMENT OF DR. O. B. CONOWAY, DEAN OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS, STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK, ALBANY, AND CURRENT CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNCIL ON GRADUATE EDUCATION AND PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION.

Madam Chairman and distinguished members of the subcommittee, you have honored me by your invitation to comment on the important legislation you are considering this morning. I appear as Chairman of the Council on Graduate Education for Public Administration, an affiliate of the American Society for Public Administration. The Council is an organization of 70 universities that offer graduate programs in public administration. I should add that I presently am serving as Special Assistant for Urban Affairs to the Chancellor of State University of New York and that I have been Dean of the Graduate School of Public Affairs of that institution since its establishment in 1962 although I now am on leave from the position.

I will confine my comments to Title XII of HR 15067. While the Council on Graduate Education for Public Administration has formally recorded its strong support of this legislation the following comments are personal ones. I believe the program proposed by Title XII would most significantly improve the public services of the United States. I would like to present a short statement of my reasons for this opinion after which I will be glad to respond to any questions you may wish to ask.

Title XII recognizes that public administration in this country has become a professional occupation of unusually demanding requirements and that our governments cannot discharge their responsibilities without adequate numbers of men and women professionally trained in this field. Title XII also recognizes that this country's present programs of professional education for public administration graduate each year only a small fraction of the number of men and women needed by its governments and that their capacity will not

be expanded significantly without Federal support of the kind given in recent years to other educational programs deemed of exceptional importance to the national interest.

I have indicated that almost all of my professional career has been devoted to the organization and direction of programs of graduate education for public administration in the United States and in several foreign countries. Today I am deeply disturbed by the inadequate development of such programs in the United States. At least 100 of our universities offer programs of education for public administration most of which have been established in the last 30 years. However, in my considered opinion, there are now no more than ten really substantial institutions for education for public administration in this country. These few schools have made a contribution to the effectiveness of American government that is out of all proportion to their size and resources. I do not wish to disparage the efforts made by the other institutions but most of them simply have lacked the faculties and other resources to offer first-rate professional training.

Whatever the quality of the country's respective programs of education for public administration, their total annual student output simply is not at all adequate to either the present or future needs of our governments. In 1967, 53 of the 70 member institutions of the Council on Graduate Education for Public Administration reported that they had granted 670 master's degrees and 70 doctoral degrees. I suspect that at least one-fourth of these degrees were granted to individuals already employed by a public agency and that at least 10 percent of the degree recipients sought academic positions. If I am approximately correct, then in 1967 the new entrants into American public services with professional training in public administration probably did not exceed 500.

This number of men and women, whatever their ability, and it has been high, cannot meet annual needs of our state, local and national governments. The distinguished Dean of the School of Public Administration of the University of Southern California, Dr. Henry Reining, has estimated that governments in the State of California alone could have employed at least a thousand young men and women with professional training in public administration in 1966. I can add that the State of New York never has filled its annual quota of positions for persons with the degree of Master of Public Administration. The United States Civil Services Commission and the National agencies also compete vigorously each year for the members of the small number of public administration graduates. The projections of the manpower needs of our governments in the period 1968–1975 are well know. They reveal that the unmet needs of our governments for professionally trained administrative personnel will be vastly greater than I have indicated with the passing of each of these years unless our universities are assisted in a dramatic expansion of their programs of education for the public service. I will not labor this point further except to note that the great present effort to strength our state and local governments depends importantly on increasing the number of persons professionally trained for public administration.

The reasons for the inadequacy of most of our schools of public administration long have been well known in both universities and governments. All graduate education is increasingly expensive and our universities, with very few exceptions, simply have not had the money to support significant programs of graduate education for public service. Nor has the national government contributed significantly to date to their resources for this purpose. Consequently, faculty members have not specialized in public administration and there is a national shortage of competent teachers in the field. Graduate students have not entered the field in adequate numbers because of lack of fellowships comparable to those available in other fields. Third, most of the universities that have attempted to established programs in public administration in recent years have not had the resources for the kind of program planning and interdisciplinary curriculum development that is essential in this increasingly complicated and rapidly changing field of education. Not only have our governments suffered as a result of these conditions but many young people interested in public service have not had an opportunity for the necessary education.

Title XII of HR 15067 is well-designed to meet the needs of our universities if their programs of education for public service are to be significantly improved. They need substantial additional funds for—

(1) Program planning;

(2) Training of present and prospective faculty members;
(3) Fellowships of sufficient size to attract a reasonable share of the country's promising college graduates; and
(4) Adequate institutional support.

There is only one aspect of Title XII about which I am particularly concerned. I hope that whatever resourcese are provided by this title for improvement of programs of education for public service will not be unduly diffused among the universities of the country. If they are generally diffused then I fear the purpose of Title XII will be defeated. A significant graduate school of public administartion must by its nature be a rather sizable academic enterprise. In my experience, if the institution os to maintain an adequate faculty and fully utilize the necessary supporting resources, including a special library, it must have a student body of at least 100 full-time students. Such an institution, I think, requires today an operating budget of at least $1,500,000. I strongly urge that whatever funds are provided by this bill be used to create approximately twenty schools of public administration of the size I have indicated. Twenty such schools would in a few years at least quadruple the present annual number of graduates with professional training in public administration. I am not at all sure that this increased number of graduates would meet all our increasing needs for persons with their training, but their influence on the public services of the United States would be fundementally important and would indicate possible courses of action for the future.

In conclusion, I would emphasize as strongly as possible my belief that this proposed legislation is of exceptional importance to the governments of the United States. It would, I am confident, significantly improve the quality of education for public administration in the country and greatly increase the supply of persons trained professionally in the field.

Dr. CONOWAY. First, I would like to note that I do appear here primarily as Chairman of the Council on Graduate Education for Public Administration. That means that I am one of the people who would utilize any funds that were made available by this legislation.

I represent at this point the people in the country who would be the major users of the money that might be provided.

First, I think the premises of this bill are sound. I think it recognizes that public administration has become a profession in the country, that our governments do need adequate numbers of people trained in public administration.

The second main premise of title XII as I understand it, is that it recognizes that the country's present programs of professional education for public administration graduate each year only a small fraction of the number of men and women needed. And their capacity simply will not be expanded without substantial Federal support.

I have some figures later about the total output of the schools of Public Administration. I will come back to this point in a few minutes. I have emphasized, too, that I am deeply disturbed by the inadequate development of programs of public administration in this country.

While at least a hundred of our universities do offer such programs, in my opinion there are now no more than 10 really substantial institutions for the study of public administration in the United States.

These schools have made a contribution to the effectiveness of American Goverment that is out of all proportion to their resources.

Their graduates are all over this country. They are in very high positions and they have had, I think, truly a seminal influence.

I do not disparage at all the work and the devoted work of other universities but they simply have not had the resources to do the job. Whatever the quality of the country's programs of education for public administration, the total annual student output simply is not adequate

either to meet the needs of our governments now or the projected needs of the next several years.

As I have noted in my statement, the best figures that we have in the Council of Graduate Education indicate that last year there were 740 degrees given in this field.

I also have noted that I doubt that this means that more than 500 people entered the services of the country with this kind of education. They can't meet the needs of our States, of our local governments or the National Government.

I have cited the estimate of the dean of the School of Public Administration at Southern California, Dr. Henry Reining, that in 1966, California alone, or goverments in that State, could have employed a thousand people with the degree of master of public administration or its equivalent.

I certainly can add that the State of New York never has filled its annual quota of positions for training of this kind. In the school of which I have been dean since 1962, we have had an average of eight jobs offered to each one of our graduates. As I am a consultant to the U.S. Civil Service Commission in its college relations and recruitment activities, I know how inadequate Federal recruitment of these people has been.

There is no question about the reasons for the inadequacy of our schools of public administration. With the exception of a few States and a few schools that by one means or another have received very large endowments, we simply have not had the money to do the job.

Consequently, faculty members have not been attracted to public administration. There is a very large national shortage of teachers in this field.

As chairman of the council and my position, I must receive three or four inquiries a week from people who are trying to fill vacancies as professors of public administration or public affairs.

As the Secretaries of HEW have indicated, graduate schools of this kind have not been able to attract appropriate student bodies for lack of adequate fellowships.

The State of New York is remarkably fortunate in this sense, because of the Lehman Fellowship program and simply because the State university has allocated rather large amounts of money for scholarships.

Third, most of the universities that have tried to enter the field have not had adequate sources for the kind of detailed and complicated program planning that is essential.

I think title XII would meet all of these needs. Primarily those for the training of faculty members and for fellowship.

I would give priority in the use of those funds for those purposes.

Finally, if this legislation is passed, I hope the resources won't be diffused among all the schools of the country and I am referring now to the provisions of the bill that provide for equitable distribution.

You asked the question of Secretaries Huitt and Simpson as to how many institutions they feel should be established for this purpose with the likely available funds. I would use the figure of 20, at least to begin with, because a school of public administration by its very nature has to be a rather sizable institution and I think a minimum operating budget for a school that can justify the use of a faculty and the special resources is at least a million and a half if not about $2 million, and the

capacity of a school with resources of that size is usually about a hundred graduates a year.

Mr. QUIE. You said a million and a half or $2 million per institution.

Dr. CONOWAY. Yes, sir.

Mr. QUIE. How are you going to get 20 institutions out of the money asked for in this?

Dr. CONOWAY. I never understood that this bill would pay the entire cost of a school such as a graduate school of public affairs in the State university of New York or the Littauer School at Harvard, and so on.

Mr. QUIE. What percentage of the 20 schools would the Federal money finance?

Dr. CONOWAY. That is a difficult question to answer. I think if you were to use the kind of standard that I have suggested that $400,000 or $500,000 to each of these schools would vastly increase its capacity. The figure is really derived from the experience of Harvard, Princeton, New York University, the University of Southern California, and our own experience in an optimum size of a graduate school of public administration which seems to be about a hundred.

Mr. QUIE. How many do you have now?

Dr. CONOWAY. How many schools?

Mr. QUIE. You say the optimum is about a hundred. How many do you have now?

Dr. CONOWAY. How many students do we have in the school in New York?

Mr. QUIE. Yes.

Dr. CONOWAY. We have an annual entering group of about 135. The usual student attrition reduces the annual graduating classes to probably 80 or 90.

Mr. QUIE. If you are operating at optimum size, why should we give you any money?

Dr. CONOWAY. Well, I think my comment now ought to be off the record because I am talking not as dean of the school of New York but as counsel to the Graduate School of Public Administration.

I thing the present resources of the various institutions would have to be taken into consideration in making grants or in reviewing applications for contracts. There are three or four schools of this kind in the country that are very well off, indeed, but the objective of this bill is not to assist those. It is the assist the weak ones and to create other strong centers.

Offhand, I think there are perhaps four or five such schools that might not receive a subsidy.

Madam Chairman, that completes my summary of my prepared statement. I will be very glad to respond to any questions you may wish to address to me.

Mrs. GREEN. Thank you very much, Dr. Conoway.

Because of the time, I am going to ask the other witness, Dr. Brewster Denny, if he would come to the table and present his statement to the subcommitee.

This subcommittee is delighted to have one of the most able members of Congress, Congressman Meeds, here this morning with us on the committee. We have learned to respect Congressman Meeds and his views and the hard work he does.

I am awful glad you are here this morning, Lloyd. I am wondering if you would like to introduce the third member that appears before the subcommittee today.

Mr. MEEDS. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

It gives me great pleasure to introduce to the committee Dr. Denny, dean of the Graduate School of Public Affairs of the University of Washington, and chairman-elect of the Council of Education on Public Administration.

Dr. Denny holds a master of doctors degree from the Fletcher's School of Law and Diplomacy.

He has wide experience in public service serving on a number of national and international commissions and boards, and was appointed the first director of the university's graduate school of public affairs an interdisciplinary professional graduate school established to provide research in this area.

Madam Chairman, it should also be of interest to the committee that Dr. Denny has been considering this type of legislation since at least February of 1967 when I sent to him from the Congressional Record a similar bill which Mr. Brademas had introduced.

He is eminently qualified to testify upon this subject by his studies.

Mr. BRADEMAS. If the gentleman would yield, I would like to note also that Dr. Denny had the good judgment to marry a young lady from my district.

Mr. DENNY. I was going to say that if you did not scoop me on that, Congressman Brademas.

Mrs. GREEN. Dr. Denny, will you proceed.

STATEMENT OF BREWSTER DENNY, DIRECTOR, GRADUATE SCHOOL OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS, UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON, SEATTLE, AND CHAIRMAN-ELECT OF THE COUNCIL ON GRADUATE EDUCATION FOR PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

Mr. DENNY. Thank you very much. I appreciate the opportunity to talk on this vital piece of legislation and for the very gracious welcome you have given to me today.

Let me very briefly summarize my statement because I, too, would like to answer some of the questions that have been raised and some others which may not yet have been raised.

I do feel, first, this is a bill of historic importance, because it would really in fact be a first direct program identified for the purpose of the education for the public service.

Secondly, I think it has been adquately pointed out today that this legislation comes at a critical time and crisis in our cities and desperate shortages of trained public servants.

I would particularly like to identify the fact that this legislation comes at a time when a very vital and important generation of young people is passing from adolescence to adulthood and when they are choosing their professional careers from the vast array of opportunities in this largely, if not entirely, affluent society.

I think it is of critical importance that every possible step be taken to assure that the very ablest and most highly motivated of these young people be attracted to the public service as a career.

I think the proposed legislation is the single step that the Congress might best take to assure that. More and more these days young people particularly the most gifted and highly motivated ones, are making career choices at that stage in their undergraduate education when they choose the kind of professional or graduate special education which is increasingly required to compete in modern technological society.

The attractiveness of graduate or professional programs as seen through the eyes of these young people becomes the critical point in the recruitment of the profession which these programs serve.

And the significant feature of the recruitment process these days is the availability of financial assistance as well as an attractive and exciting program.

May I say parenthetically, because of the emphasis placed today on the impact of the newly announced draft rules, that I think that if these regulations hold and in fact substantially reduce the number of young people going into graduate and professional schools, as appears apparent, it seems to me it is all the more important that we be able, that the public service be able to recruit competitively for the best of these young people from what group or pool of students that are available for graduate education.

I would like to stress that particular aspect as it relates to the matter that was raised several times this morning.

I would also like to urge that the consumer of this vital human capital that we hope to produce and do produce in these programs these days of course is best qualified to testify on the urgent nature of the need.

I hope that mayors and Governors and public officials who depend vitally on these people testify. We do from our vantage point feel the desperateness of the need because the mayors and Governors call us and ask for people to fill these vital positions.

We are not able nearly to meet the measure of need that is proposed to us in our own areas, in fact, it is a difference of rather great dimension. It is hard to put numbers on it. Dr. Conoway mentioned eight offers per student, but I am sure it is much higher than that if you look at the real need, because we do not promote them adequately to get those numbers and I think it is a very, very significant factor.

I might point out that a number of our students in the second year of their professional program work part time, largely because of the absence of financial aid, and the demand for these second-year students, particulary in these new governmental programs in the cities, is insatiable

We can't supply enough of our student body to participate in these programs, let alone graduates.

One other main point that I have made in my testimony is my feeling that we must look carefully at the ways in which this program and the programs are resource consumers. That is the vital resource of teaching which is required to train these people.

I feel very strongly that professors who will teach about the public service, who will train people to be better public servants must in addition to meeting the rigid academic requirements of the several key disciplines that are involved in these areas and very often it is more than one discipline in which they must be real experts, that in addition

to that they must in most cases have practical firing line government experience.

It is not possible to do this in every kind of teaching assignment, nor is it necessary, but in important measure it is essential to this particular kind of education that the people have governmental experience, in the sense of the real world, if I might make that statement, of governmental activity.

I think I will conclude my brief summary at this point. I shall be delighted to join Dean Conoway in answering any questions concerning this vital legislation which I strongly urge you to support.

Thank you.

(The document referred to follows:)

PREPARED STATEMENT OF BREWSTER C. DENNY, DIRECTOR, GRADUATE SCHOOL OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS, UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON, AND CHAIRMAN-ELECT, COUNCIL ON GRADUATE EDUCATION FOR PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

It is a privilege to support Title XII of H.R. 15067. I appear as a concerned citizen who believes that the future of the Republic depends in large measure on the quality and professional skill of those who serve it. We may talk of programs, budgets, offices, departments, branches and divisions, personnel and staff counts, management systems, planning programming and budget systems. But people—their skill, their training, their integrity, their loyalty, and their energy—are the heart and life of our democratic government. People, not agencies or bureaus, *not even computers*, make decisions, dreams, plan, make judgments, pass laws, administer, lead and follow. Thomas Jefferson knew this and viewed the education of citizens and public servants as the key to realizing his extravagant dreams for this great republic. His life-long devotion to education, in turn, was based on his devotion to the great democracy he helped to found. At no time in our history have a President and a Congress done more to realize Jefferson's dream in education than in these years of the mid-sixties. This great committee of the House deserves the lasting gratitude of generations to come for its contributions to this vital water-shed period in the history of American education.

In this context, the Education for the Public Service Title of H.R. 15067, is truly landmark legislation. Support for higher education by the federal government either through direct educational programs such as those administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, or through programs of other departments of government such as NSF, AEC, HUD, Interior, NASA, etc., have supported and support a wide range of educational and research fields—very nearly the full range of the modern university. Many of these programs aid in some indirect way or other the preparation of people for public service. For the most part, however, all programs to date place the education of public servants as *public servants* in the category of a side-effect, a need *also* to be served. Thus doctors, physicists, nurses, librarians, biologists, and engineers are educated to perform their vital professional roles in our society, and many of them perform those roles while employed by government. But the bill before you today would be the first direct program for the education of public servants. This bill, then, is of vital and historic importance.

This legislation comes at a time of crisis in our cities, of desperate shortages of trained public servants to meet new challenges and to replace those now leaving active service at the end of long and fruitful careers. Most important of all, this legislation comes at a time when the largest generation of young people in our history is passing from adolescence to adulthood and when they are choosing a profession from the vast array of opportunities in this largely affluent society. It is of critical importance that every possible step be taken to assure that the very ablest and most highly motivated of these young people be attracted to the public service as a career. The proposed legislation, in my judgement, is the single step the Congress might best take to assure this. Let me explain this assertion in some detail.

More and more these days, young people, particularly the most gifted and highly motivated ones, are making career choices at that stage in their undergraduate education when they choose the kind of professional or graduate special education which is increasingly required to compete in modern technological

society. The attractiveness of graduate or professional programs as seen through the eyes of these young people becomes the critical point of the recruitment of the professions which these programs serve. A significant feature of the recruitment process is the availability of financial assistance as well as an attractive and exciting program.

The fellowships provided in Part B of Title XII (Sec. 1211–1212–1213–1214–1215) would provide the critical ingredient to this recruitment process and represents, in my judgment, the single most important feature of Title XII.

This legislation also meets head-on a critical need of today's college generation: the search for commitment and involvement. No simple or single-cause analysis will explain hippies and the more violent activists on our campuses, or the vast millions of students whose frustrations and anxieties this small minority sometimes seems to express. But at the heart of any explanation is the search for commitment and involvement. This bill, like the Peace Corps, will help to serve this deep need and provide the opportunity for a constructive commitment.

Before turning to other portions of Title XII, let me note first the great demand for the kind of persons that the fellowship program will recruit and educate. I hope that governors, mayors, county commissioners, and federal executives will testify to their need. For it is these people, facing the great challenges of contemporary public life, who can best bear witness to the urgency. It is they and their principal subordinate officers who are now seeking to staff the challenging new programs designed to meet critical needs in our society.

The consumer, then, is best qualified to testify to need. For my part, let me simply note that persons now receiving the kind of training that is contemplated in this legislation are in great demand at all levels of government. The experience of our program at the University of Washington may be relevant and typical: Our program has been in operation since 1948. Since we became a School in 1962, our enrollment has increased from 17 to 93. Our graduates now serve as follows: approximately 15% are teaching, doing research or administration in higher education; 25% are in local government; 15% in state government; 35% in federal government and less than 10% in private or quasi-public employment usually with a significant public policy aspect. Except for those students who came from public employment as full or part-time students (about 35%), all others were significantly recruited for the public service as a career by the educational opportunity of this program. Our graduates receive as many as 30 offers each upon graduation. The demand for the part-time services of second-year students who need to or wish to work while completing their studies is insatiable.

To meet the expansion of existing programs and the establishment of new ones which must take place whether or not this fellowship program is approved, but particularly if it is, the nation's universities will have to compete for the very small number of persons qualified to teach these students and to organize and run their programs. Such professors must be a rare breed. For not only must they meet the rigid academic requirements of the several key scholarly disciplines, but they must have practical firing-line government experience as well. Such people are in rare supply and the existing programs at existing levels in the country are competing aggressively for the few that there are.

This legislation and the proposed Intergovernmental Manpower Act will, in my judgment, increase by several-fold the demand for new faculty and administrators for the existing major programs in public affairs in the United States. The legislation will further cause new programs to start from scratch.

It is therefore critical that the *resource producing* aspects of this legislation be designed to match the drains which its new programs will place upon limited resources. The analogy to the Congress' reaction to Sputnik in 1957 is relevant: Congress invested heavily in the training of the professors and research scholars who were the vital human capital for the training of practicing engineers and scientists whom the nation needed then and now for our rapid technological growth and our national security.

I therefore urge you to approve and strengthen those portions of this act, particularly Sec 1203 sub-paragraph 2, which could result in imaginative programs for the training of professors and administrators to staff these programs. Such programs should include support for solid disciplinary and interdisciplinary training in the contributing research and academic fields and new ways to make periods of active public service a part of the teacher's training.

I strongly urge that these two urgent needs—the public service fellowship program and the training programs for the teachers who will educate and motivate

these people towards careers in public service be accorded the highest priority of the several programs contemplated in Title XII. I further urge that the Intergovernmental Manpower Act be viewed as a *resource-consumer* in educational terms and that the resource *producing* aspects of Title XII be implemented first. I regard the in-service and mid-career training programs for present public servants as provided in the Intergovernmental Manpower Act to be vitally important, but not as important as these two key programs. These programs—pre-entry training and teacher training—deserve the highest priority because they are the longest range and because they provide the resources upon which the other programs depend. My emphasis on pre-entry training at the graduate professional level is based upon the conviction that graduate professional education is now the critical gateway into the public service. It is there that the most vital recruitment of tomorrow's leaders is taking place.

With the passage of this legislation, the federal government will enter a significant new field. Other legislation which touches on education for the public service has already passed the Congress (Title I of the Higher Education Act, Title VIII of the Housing Act of 1964, for example) and this Congress has before it the Intergovernmental Manpower Act. All this legislation will vitally affect programs for education for the public service and I hope that adequate means for coordination for these programs will be developed. Perhaps, for example, the advisory panel envisioned in Title XII might be extended to provide coordinating and policy guidance to programs under the other legislation. Such coordination, however provided, must be effected someplace so that scarce resources may be wisely used and that high quality educational standards may be maintained.

Thank you for the opportunity of making these few comments. I would welcome the chance to answer questions about these points and others I have not mentioned, such as the importance of internships, the research components of programs, and the administration of the Title.

Mrs. GREEN. Thank you, Dr. Denny.

Congressman Brademas, do you want to lead off with some questions?

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

I have some quick ones. Why is it so difficult to get State and local governments to support public service education since they are the ones who would benefit most from it?

Mr. CONOWAY. I haven't found it terribly difficult or I did not find it terribly difficult in New York to obtain appropriations for the purpose but I must say that the school in Albany is in a very fortunate situation.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I will interrupt to ask you in view of your representing a national organization, how many States have programs designed to produce public service education to meet the needs of State government?

Mr. CONOWAY. There are several programs but they are very small and they are very weak, sir. Of the 10 major institutions of this kind in the country, only three of them are publicly supported.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Isn't there, therefore, a strong justification for State legislatures doing more to help meet their own State need for personnel?

Mr. CONOWAY. Yes, there is. There is a corresponding problem that the civil service systems of most of the States are so inadequate that they don't attract the graduates. One of the problems of directing our students into State and local positions is that they don't have appropriate merit systems and consequently too high a proportion of the students who earn a MPA degree enter the Federal service, not that the Federal service does not need these people, but the States and locals need them, too.

These two things have to go hand in hand and, of course, that is contemplated in the Intergovernmental Personnel Act. And many States simply have not appropriated funds for this purpose.

Mr. BRADEMAS. That is what concerns me. The States and local authorities who would stand most to benefit from the kinds of programs contemplated here apparently have not done much.

Mr. DENNY. In the case of the State of Washington, the State legislature has been generous in its support of the University of Washington's program, but I would emphasize that the fellowship area and the competitive nature of the kind of fellowship program, competitive for students I am talking now, competitive nature of the kind of fellowship program that is proposed in this legislation is not something that the State of Washington would be likely to mount as successfully as the program proposed here.

So I would put the greatest emphasis from the point of view as I see it, on the fellowship program and on the training of professors.

Mr. BRADEMAS. You said, Dr. Conoway, that New York State's annual quota for public administration has never been met.

What kind of jobs would these MPA's do?

Mr. CONOWAY. They would go in the full range of staff positions, personnel administration, financial administration, organization, and methods analysis.

Some, I think, the most fortunate ones become assistants to commissioners, secretaries.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I have one other question.

Dr. Denny, I was struck by two points you made in your testimony—one, that professional programs of the kind contemplated in this legislation would help enormously in recruiting young people, and the other, that if we passed this bill it would, itself, mean a drain on public service manpower.

Isn't it really more sweepingly true that all of these Federal programs we have been passing in the last several years from elementary and secondary education to medicare to poverty and all the rest of them, impose a tremendous drain on manpower?

I know in my own State in Indiana we do not take part in the water program. The reason is that we cannot find any technically qualified people to do so.

Mr. DENNY. I think that is exactly correct. The water programs I have had some experience with, and I think this is exactly the situation, we are not producing the kind of qualified leadership and professional people for these positions in anything like the numbers that these vital new programs demand.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I would make just one final plea, Madam Chairman. That is that the very consideration of this bill, whatever happens to it this year, would trigger among State political leaders across the country some desire to do something in their own States.

I know in the State of New Jersey, Governor Hughes has launched a program of internships for people who are going to be water pollution control experts.

It seems to me conceivable that if a person got a fellowship from his own State in public funds he might pledge to work in that State for a year or so. But here is a great role for the State to show initiative because they are the ones that in a large measure would benefit.

Mrs. GREEN. Congrssman Quie.

Mr. QUIE. On page 4 you say, "This bill, like the Peace Corps, will help to serve this deep need and provide an opportunity for a constructive commitment."

Are you going to find people who are already committed or will it bring in people who are looking for that commitment?

Mr. DENNY. I think when young people come to talk to professors about career opportunities they are in part in the process of the search for commitment and in part committed, for they are in a stage of development and gowth.

We see a great deal of this in the kind of counseling that we do of young people who say, "I want to make a career of public service. How do you do it?"

Not, "I want to be a city manager." He might say that but they usually are not that specific. They come in with a broad commitment. These schools, I think, help to meet this commitment, help to channel it, and help to strengthen it.

Mr. QUIE. With the financial assistance they could find the commitment a little easier?

Mr. DENNY. I think there is no question about that. Looking at the array of opportunities that young people do see, obviously, those programs that offer good financial assistance as this fellowship program would do, are going to be additionally attracted to them. There is no question about that.

Mr. QUIE. That makes me wonder about the commitment in the first place. It sounds again like money talks. It is the green power again.

Mr. DENNY. I think it is valuable to put the resources of the Nation behind this notion of commitment and as a matter of fact, I think the language of the bill with respect to the point of commitment is very important. It makes it clear that the schools are responsible by some method or other to be sure that commitment is a part of their standard in these programs, make as a very major part of our admission procedures to our schools the commitment to the public service as a career.

And our record on people going into the public service following such programs as this is generally very good.

Mr. QUIE. Do you think this will reduce the number of hippies and violent activities on the campus now that they have found new hope other than the Peace Corps?

Mr. DENNY. I think that would be a very difficult question to answer.

Mr. QUIE. I see the need for public officials. It seems far reaching when you bring the hippies in.

You are within seven of the optimum size. It would be pretty unlikely that you would get any money.

Mr. DENNY. I don't know what your hundred is, Dean Conoway. We don't graduate a hundred a year. Ninety-three is our student body, not the number of graduates.

Mr. QUIE. You want to make it graduates instead of student body?

Mr. DENNY. The hundred figure that Dean Conoway used I understood to mean graduates. Isn't that correct?

Mr. CONOWAY. Yes.

Mr. QUIE. How many do you graduate per year?

Mr. DENNY. I think it would be about 26 this coming June.

Mr. QUIE. Is this a 3-year program?

Mr. DENNY. Ours is a 2-year program.

Mr. QUIE. That sounds like a pretty big dropout.

Mr. DENNY. We have a number of part-time students. We have students in a mid-career status who do not actually receive degrees and who do not appear in the number of graduates.

For example, the National Institute of Public Affairs' midcareer program, they receive certificates. I suppose I should include them in the number of graduates.

Mr. QUIE. That is all.

Mrs. GREEN. Congressman Meeds, would you like to direct some questions to either one of these?

Mr. MEEDS. I think not, Madam Chairman, in view of the time. Thank you.

Mrs. GREEN. Congressman Esch?

Mr. ESCH. No.

Mrs. GREEN. Congressman Erlenborn?

Mr. ERLENBORN. I have no questions.

Mrs. GREEN. My thanks to both of you gentlemen. We appreciate your staying here even after the 12 o'clock noon deadline. Both statements will be made a part of the record.

(Whereupon, at 12:15 p.m. the special subcommittee recessed, to reconvene at 10 a.m., Wednesday, February 21, 1968.)

92-371—68—pt. 1——21

HIGHER EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1968

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 1968

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION,
OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,
Washington, D. C.

The subcommittee met at 10:05 a.m., pursuant to call, in room 2261, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. John Brademas presiding.

Present: Representatives Brademas, Gibbons, Erlenborn, and Esch.

Staff members present: William F. Gaul, associate general counsel, W. Phillips Rockefeller, minority research specialist.

Mr. BRADEMAS. The subcommittee will come to order.

The Chair regrets to report that the distinguished chairman of our subcommittee, Mrs. Green, is not well today, and we hope that she will be back on the job very quickly.

We are pleased to call as our first witness Dr. Stephen K. Bailey, the distinguished dean of the Maxwell Graduate School of Citizenship and Public Affairs at Syracuse University.

Dean Bailey, we are very pleased to have you here this morning. I know from personal observation of your very important contributions to the shaping of other legislation in the field of education, and I think you are particularly well qualified, moving as you do, between the worlds of both political science and education, to comment to us today and give your views on the public service title of the higher education bill.

Will you please go ahead, sir.

STATEMENT OF DR. STEPHEN K. BAILEY, DEAN, MAXWELL GRADUATE SCHOOL OF CITIZENSHIP AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS, SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY, AND NATIONAL PRESIDENT, AMERICAN SOCIETY OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

Dr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, members of the committee: The fact, Mr. Chairman, that the two great passions in my life—education and the public service—coincide with the demonstrated concern of your own distinguished career, and with the career of the distinguished chairman of this subcommittee and also with the key words of title XII of the bill before you, makes me especially grateful for your invitation to appear before this special subcommittee at this time.

Some years ago, when I was administrative assistant to Senator William Benton of Connecticut, I was brought face to face with the operating dilemmas of the legislative process. The volume of business even then was staggering. Then, as now, unmet domestic needs of

the Nation had to be considered in the context of the financial and manpower demands of an Asian war of ubiquitous international tension.

Then, as now, a bewildering variety of special groups—each with its own sincere view of the consonance of its wishes with the interest of the broader public—contended for legislative advantage and support. Then, as now, executive agencies and various levels of our Federal system vied with one another for budgetary or jurisdictional advantage.

Then, as now, the normally healthy division in our Government between President and Congress was in danger of producing a national paralysis of will—threatening effective and consistent responses to observed national and international pathologies.

And yet, in retrospect, the world of 1951 seems almost bucolic compared to the world of 1968. It is as though all of the generic problems of the recent past had suddenly taken an exponential leap without a comparable jump in human wisdom and skill. The bonds of community at home and abroad seem suddenly to have become unglued. We are in danger of becoming a nation of strangers and a world of sullen and apocalyptically dangerous tribal antipathies. Frustrated by the complexities and inertias of what we observe and experience, we either withdraw into protective self-indulgence or we lash out blindly at those whose prudence restrains our collective compulsions to trigger suicidal aggressions.

It is in this context that you are considering the education for the Public Service Act. It is not that public officials are the only resources available for our national salvation. Self-government cannot be totally delegated. If community commitments of private, professional, and voluntary energies should wither away, politicians and bureaucrats would have no function but to preside over the melancholy wake of freedom. But if government cannot exist without the support of an underlying society, the reverse is equally true.

Government is the proximate guarantor of order and the major instrument of achieving those more positive values encapsulated in the beautiful rhetoric of our constitutional preamble. And the very power and scope of government today, and the complexity of its agenda, make patent the need in the public services for the ablest and best educated of our citizens. To paraphrase Dwight L. Moody's comment about religion, government is too important to be left to duffers.

There are roughly 90,000 units of government in the United States. These units employ directly over a sixth of our total labor force. Even so, thousands of important government jobs remain unfilled. In 1964, for example, the Municipal Manpower Commission found that one of every four professsional jobs in New York City was vacant because of the shortage of qualified and interested applicants. And the Bureau of Labor Statistics has estimated the need for additional State and local administrative, professional, and technical personnel at nearly 3 million by 1975. By then it is estimated that the Federal Government will need nearly an additional million civilian employees.

At this very moment I can testify to the government manpower shortage from my own experience as dean of the Maxwell School. Each

year our average graduating class of about 50 young American master's degree candidates in public administration is beseiged by job recruiters from scores of Federal, State, and local agencies. Last week, for example, the commissioner of administration of the State of Wisconsin and the head of the New York City Housing and Development Authority both visited our campus.

Health, Education, and Welfare; the Department of Defense; the Bureau of the Budget; Interior; TVA; and Housing and Urban Development are among the Federal agencies that have sent representatives to Syracuse in the past few weeks.

Last year one of our students alone received 25 offers of public employment. And our situation is not unique. All major university centers of public administration and public affairs report that they could place several times the number of candidates they graduate. Yet in the face of this overwhelming demand for professionally educated management personnel, the national annual production of master's degrees in public administration was under 700, according to a quick survey by the American Society for Public Administration conducted in 1967.

This shortage of trained administrative generalists and staff officers would be serious in itself, for there is an ever-increasing need for men and women of broad background in public management at every level of government. But the problem is compounded by the fact that most higher positions in the government services are manned by people who have come out of highly specialized technical and professional backgrounds: engineering, law, education, forestry, agricultural science, social work, economics, business administration, medicine, and so on.

Not only are not enough of the new crop of specialists opting for government service; many who do so opt are inadequately educated in the arts and sciences of governmental affairs. There is nothing in the normal professional training of an engineer or a doctor that would prepare him for the communications, organizational, human relations, and conflict-resolution problems that comprise the basic stuff of the public service.

We need more and infinitely better trained people entering government service than is presently the case.

The reasons for this vast disparity between supply and demand are numerous: the low prestige of public service in the Nation at large and within the academic community; the shortage of financial assistance for students in professional management programs; and the paucity of qualified instructors. For each of these causes, the education for the public service bill provides a strategic remedy.

First, in its symbolic value alone, the bill would for the first time place public service education on a level with other kinds of professional education. Like engineering, law, teaching, and medicine, preparation in public administration and public policy is professional training. The recognition extended by this act would make a significant contribution to publicizing that fact.

Second, in its provision of fellowships, the bill would vastly increase the number of students who could enroll in public affairs programs. And what is equally important, it would permit public service

programs to compete for the very best students, students who are now attracted into other fields of graduate study where financial assistance is more plentiful.

Third, in its provisions for training and retraining of faculty, the bill could contribute importantly to the expansion of the pool of qualified instructors for public service education. Fellowships of 3-year duration will permit the best students to achieve the doctorate degree, thus preparing them to serve both the public service and education for the public service in tandem or at different times in their careers.

As noted earlier, however, most professional personnel in government do not receive their training in public management. The health sciences, engineering, social work, law, the natural sciences are all areas of great government demand. The Education for the Public Service Act contains important support for developing and implementing, in a variety of flexible organizational patterns, a public service component in the curricula of professional schools. Now and relevant courses will serve the twin purposes of attracting more professional school graduates into government and fitting them to operate more effectively in the unique environment of the public sector.

But more fellowships and more courses are only half the answer to the problems of education for public affairs. The other half has to do with the quality of the courses we teach and their relevance to the challenges confronting public executives at all levels of government.

The role of computer technology, the problems of the innercity, social accounting systems, planning for the future, the internationalization of public policy, the changing patterns of creative federalism, new management techniques, the control of environmental pollution, the interrelationship among social, economic, and political developments—these are random but staggering examples of subject areas where educators and curricula need extensive updating.

Clearly one of the most important impacts of the Education for the Public Service Act will be its provisions for grants to universities to permit them to take a good hard look at their own offerings and to come upwith better programs of public affairs education—and better ways of teaching. For we have barely begun to tap the exciting possibilities for the utilization of techniques and technology for communicating more effectively and efficiently with our students.

TV, programed learning, audiovisual techniques are all underutilized; team teaching, syndicate and T-group techniques, self-instruction all offer valuable improvements over traditional methods when properly employed. Innovative internships and exchange programs can be richly rewarding. But up until now we have had neither the time nor the resources to do the experimentation to determine what are the most productive teaching methods for different kinds of subject matter with different types of students.

In this area I see the provisions of section 1204 as a challenge to the universities and to private associations like the American Society for Public Administration, the International City Managers Association, and the Public Personnel Association to develop new knowledge and new ways of disseminating it, and to utilize existing capabilities in the stronger institutions to foster new capabilities through regional cooperative arrangements with institutions that are currently weak. None of these are easy tasks, but they must be faced and mastered if we

are to upgrade the Nation's ability to develop and implement public policies to master our public problems.

For that is really the purpose of title XII, to improve the capacity of the American people to govern themselves. The vast new responsibilities entrusted to the public service of State, local, and national governments can be met only by a vastly improved public service backstopped by universities with heightened capabilities for public purposes.

Public service fellowships; newly devised internship and exchange programs; updated faculty, curriculums, and teaching materials; and new kinds of institutional arrangements are all made possible by the Education for the Public Service Act. All will contribute to attracting and educating more and better qualified college and professional school students for careers in government. Together with the equally important provisions of the Intergovernmental Personnel Act, title XII of the Higher Education Amendments of 1968 constitutes a strategic program for raising the quality of government in the United States. And the two bills are interrelated, for inservice and mid-career training of existing Federal, State, and local officials must depend in no small measure upon university-based research, teaching materials, and talent.

Mr. Chairman, the President and the Congress have taken giant steps in recent years to develop appropriate legislative responses to some of this Nation's most serious and intractable problems. This has been true in education, in health, in housing, in urban renewal, in civil rights, in transportation, in consumer protection, in social security, and so on.

Billions of dollars have been appropriated. New and exciting intergovernmental partnerships have been established. These responses have been heartening. But without trained men and women to carry out these complex functions with imagination and skill, the laws themselves can be thwarted by administrative incompetence and can themselves create a bureaucratic quicksand perilous to freedom itself.

Unless Congress helps our educational institutions to attract and to prepare outstanding young people for modern public service careers, the great hopes and purposes of our Government cannot possibly be achieved. We cannot, in Lord Balfour's great phrase, continue to be "so fundamentally at one that we can safely afford to bicker." We cannot harness our collective and diverse energies for the accomplishment of common and humane goals.

In the long run, the legislation before you may spell the difference between success and failure for what is surely "the last best hope on earth."

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I shall be happy to discuss to the best of my abilities, any questions the committee may have.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you very much, Dean Bailey.

That is, in my judgment, one of the most eloquent analyses of the significance of this proposal that I have heard. I would like just to make an observation and get your comment on it. Considering the fact that ours is such a huge country with a very large population and a big government made necessary by a variety of historical developments, I would have thought that one of the concerns that all of us ought to have, a concern to which you make reference in your opening

remarks, is whether or not we can really maintain a viable democracy. Will the man in the street come to the point where he feels that government is so big and far away that it is insensitive and unresponsive to his concerns?

Therefore, isn't it possible to suggest that by the year 2000, since that is the date the futurists seem to be using, we may well see that the only hope for maintaining a really effective, functioning democracy in our country, in the sense of a responsive democracy, is by decentralizing many of the functions that are now carried on from Washington, let's say? But isn't it possible to suggest that we are really not going to be able to call on the States, the regional organizations, the metropolitan areas and neighborhood communities to serve effectively and sensitively and responsively to the citizens' needs unless we get first-class, well-educated, well-trained men and women to help carry out these functions?

That is just a rhetorical reaction on my part. In other words, what I am suggesting is that the kind of effort this legislation today represents may well be the key to whether or not we are able to maintain a democratic society in this country.

Do you have any comment on that?

Dr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I couldn't agree more. I have to assume that the international problems of the United States are not going to go away. The Federal Government of the United States has the prime, almost exclusive, responsibility for the foreign affairs of this Nation. This means that top levels both in the legislative and executive branches must devote, over the years, a vast amount of attention to the problem and on the overriding problem in my estimation, of world peace.

This means, in turn, that the successful conduct of our domestic programs if they are going to be viably conducted will have to devolve increasingly upon State and local authorities; it seems to me with whatever help in Federal funding and guidelines, but the day-to-day administration must increasingly take place at the level of State and local and regional governments.

Without an adequate manpower resource to carry out these very difficult and complex functions, it is very hard to see how the society can keep together and can develop the kinds of responses to the problems that face us that are urgently needed.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I should have thought in view of that analysis that those who are genuine in their opposition to what they call centralized government here in Washington and are anxious that these programs be really controlled at the local and State and regional levels ought to be strong supporters of this kind of legislation. In this respect, why is it, in your own experience, Dean Bailey, that we have seen no greater effort on the part of local and State government, to cite the two most obvious examples, to support programs of the kind advocated in this bill?

Dr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I have to speak at the moment as a former mayor of a city, Middletown, Conn., in the early fifties. I know that the day-to-day preoccupation of local governments and of State governments and their own shortage of manpower has made it very difficult for them to see how they could spring loose some of their own people for short course training at midcareer in-service level.

I think there has been a sanguine assumption that the educational system by itself would kind of automatically turn out the number and kinds of people needed to meet the manpower needs at the local and state level. I think furthermore that until fairly recently at the State level the perhaps over-weighting of rural interests in many of our State legislatures has taken the minds of the legislators away from some of the enormous frontier problems that are emerging in our cities. I think this is being changed now as a result of reapportionment.

Even so, I think there was a kind of assumption on the part of many rurally oriented State legislatures, perhaps even a Jacksonian assumption, that most of the problems were fairly simple and routine and that people of modest education could take care of them. There is nothing in what we are presently facing that suggests we can any longer live with this kind of illusion.

Mr. BRADEMAS. In that connection, to just take one area to which you referred in your paper, to what extent do schools of public administration or comparable institutions in our colleges and universities now offer seminars or courses in what might be called computers for the public servant?

Dr. BAILEY. Well, this has developed very rapidly in the last 6 or 7 years. I haven't taken an actual count, but I think if you looked at the 70 or 80 graduate schools in public administration, public affairs, that certainly half of them would have introduced within the last 5 years work in what is generally called quantitative aids to decision-making but which includes computer technology and work on PPBS and other analytical tools for making cost benefits analyses, for attempting to impose some kind of rationality upon public expenditures.

Mr. BRADEMAS. We are just getting around to educating ourselves in Congress, in the legislative branch, in this whole area.

I have just one other question. You said there were some 70 or so graduate schools of public administration in the country.

Dr. BAILEY. This is hard to tag because there are a number of departments of political science, say, at the graduate level that have courses in public administration, but if you are talking about graduate schools which are devoting their attention specifically to the preprofessional training of those going into public service, there are somewhere between 70 and 80. The membership here that I am using, the figures I am using to define membership, comes really from the membership of what is called the Council on Graduate Education in Public Administration and the number now is somewhere between 70 and 80.

Mr. BRADEMAS. To what extent do the graduates of those programs find themselves moving into local, State and regional government as distinguished from the Federal Government?

Dr. BAILEY. It varies enormously from place to place. The University of Southern California, which is one of the most distinguished of the graduate programs in this area, devotes almost all of its attention to State and local personnel. It has had some international programs but has done nothing almost at the Federal Government. Fels Institute at the University of Pennsylvania, a definition of its work is in its title. At the Maxwell School we have about 80 students at the M.A. or Ph. D. level heading toward urban careers, urban, regional,

State careers. We have a number going into the Federal service and the international service as well.

The Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs at Princeton has a number going into the State and local, but even there they have increased their interest in this area in the last few years. It depends on what institution you are talking about.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Let me put my question this way.

Do you contemplate there being across the United States a network of centers in public administration that would help feed the needs, help respond to the needs especially of State and local governments in their particular regions? Or do we now find that there is great strength in some parts of the country, as on the western and eastern seaboards, where the needs of course are very great, but that there is nonetheless inadequate strength in some other parts of the United States in educating for the public service?

Dr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I would hope that the number of programs attracting students interested in State, local and regional careers would expand, and that the existing programs would increase the numbers who are coming in who are heading toward these kinds of careers. But I must say that I would be, I think, opposed to the general development of graduate programs concerned only with State or local government.

It seems to me that what marks the present era in governmental activity is an extraordinary intergovernmental activity where someone who is working at the State level or at the local level, must be extraordinarily familiar with Federal programs; conversely where people who are planning to go into Federal Government posts, take HUD posts for example, are very sensitive to the needs of State and local government and hopefully have some kind of direct experience with those levels.

We live, as General McLane once said, in a marble cake of federalism not in a layer cake of federalism, and it seems to me that there is a real need for graduate programs that attempt to relate the Federal to the State and regional and local, rather than pretending that State and local government can any longer be viewed as separate and autonomous units of Government.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you.

Mr. GIBBONS. This is a very interesting discussion. I have a little emergency in my district. A lady in my office down there came down with the mumps, and I have to shuffle some personnel.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Intergovernmental personnel operations.

Mr. GIBBONS. Yes; very definitely.

I am struck by the words that you have here on page 2, "The bonds of community at home and abroad seem suddenly to have become unglued."

That is certainly true in my area down in Florida right now where we have all kinds of people teaching school with all kinds of views of what is going on down there. You say we are turning out about 700 graduates a year in this area of specialization; is that right?

Dr. BAILEY. Mr. Congressman, I want to make clear that when I refer to the 700, I am referring only to those who have gone through graduate programs in public administration or public affairs so-called. These by and large tend to be generalized type programs where stress

is put upon such matters as government organization, communications, budgeting, personnel, organization and methods, and some policy concerns of a general character.

In addition to this, if one were asking the question how many graduate students are going into the public service, this would represent only a tiny fraction because lawyers, doctors, engineers, educators, and so on are obviously going into the public service in very substantial numbers out of graduate school. So I have tried to suggest in my testimony that there is a dual need here.

One is the need to increase the number of those who are trained to go into general governmental positions, city managers, jobs in the Bureau of the Budget, jobs as staff officers in the Congress, and so on. At the same time it is necessary to increase the amount of knowledge about government and government practice that a student in the more precise professional fields like medicine or engineering or health or education would have because a lot of these are going into the public service, but many of them are, I think, ill-equipped in terms of their knowledge of the way the Government works to make full use of their professional knowledge in the public context.

Mr. GIBBONS. What undergraduate schools will most of your people come from, schools of business administration or arts and sciences?

Dr. BAILEY. By and large from arts and sciences.

Mr. GIBBONS. That leads up to my next question as to whether or not we shouldn't in some way encourage the understanding of this problem in the schools of business administration so that people who are going there might have some exposure to the problems of governmental management.

Dr. BAILEY. Yes, sir. I couldn't agree more. There have been some experiments along these lines. As you know, the graduate school at Cornell in this area is called the Graduate School of Business and Public Administration. There are a number of schools now suggesting or planning for the development of schools of administration in which both business types and public service types would be trained.

The Harvard Business School, which is certainly one of the leaders in the country, every year turns out a substantial number of people who end up in the public service. So that, I can only echo your position that the more that is done in infusing into business schools material about government, government in business, science in government, and so on, is all to the good.

Mr. GIBBONS. Is there anything in this proposed legislation that would help that situation? As I understand, this legislation is primarily aimed at the graduate level. We were talking for a moment here about the undergraduate level. Is there anything in this legislation which would help schools of administration at the undergraduate level that would work both in business and public administration?

Dr. BAILEY. I am not sure that there is, sir, except indirectly as you train graduate levels who teach at the undergraduate level who go back and teach. I happen to have a philosophy of education which suggests that the undergraduate life of the student ought to be devoted largely to broad and general liberal arts education and only at the upper divisional level and graduate level should the student begin to concentrate in such a field as business administration and public administration.

This doesn't mean that there shouldn't be courses offered but it seems to me that the world we live in is so unbelievably complex, draws upon so many insights into the humanities, into the sciences, into the social sciences, that any professional competence at the graduate level ought to be based upon a very rich undergraduate experience.

Mr. GIBBONS. Thinking about career planning from a young person's point of view and tying it in with your statement on page 4 about the use of internships and practical experience in some of these things, don't you think that at the undergraduate level we should give these people some experience in this type of, say, public administration in order to make sure that it is what they are really interested in before we stick them into a graduate course?

Dr. BAILEY. Mr. Congressman, I do believe this is valuable, and I am delighted with the developments over the last decade or so just in this area.

Mr. GIBBONS. Are you talking about cooperative education?

Dr. BAILEY. I am talking particularly about some of the very rich internships that have been opened by the Federal Government for summer employment of students, say between the junior and senior year, in Government service.

I know when I was working on the Hill, we used to have some girls from Wellesley College come down and work during the summertime in Senators' offices. There are a number of opportunities opening up in city government, in regional government and State government for summer employment in the public services.

Mr. GIBBONS. Do you think it would be worthwhile for us to encourage this at the undergraduate level before someone makes a career decision to go into public administration?

Dr. BAILEY. Yes, sir. I do.

Mr. GIBBONS (presiding). Mr. Erlenborn.

Mr. ERLENBORN. I am sorry I wasn't here when you made your statement, Dr. Bailey. I hope that my questions don't repeat other questions that may have already been asked. I think if Mrs. Green, our chairman, were here, she would probably ask this question in a better way than I can; but, given the present draft policy of taking all of those who are receiving their baccalaureate degrees this year and those who are in the first and second year of graduate schools, draft eligible males who can physically qualify, do you think that this year or next there will be sufficient students available for the graduate schools to make a program such as this worthwhile?

Dr. BAILEY. Mr. Erlenborn, I am, I am sure, quite as upset as I understand your chairman to be about the impact of the present draft law upon graduate programs. It is going to be a very rough time for us. But it seems to me that two things must be said.

One is that, even if this program were passed and funded this year, you can still take a year or two for most of the graduate programs that are referred to in this bill to tool up adequately for the kind of activity which the bill suggests.

The second thing is that there are a number of men who, because of 4–F status or because of the activity of local draft boards, will not find themselves drafted and will be coming to graduate school. With the smaller number of these, it becomes, it seems to be, even more important to be able to bid for the quality types that will be coming in.

In addition to this, of course there are a number of very highly educated and competent and highly motivated women who are going into the public service, and we ought not to forget the contribution that they are making now and that they can make.

So that, for all these reasons the urgency for doing something in this area, it seems to me, is heightened by the existing situation.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Can we expect the need to be fulfilled with the program financed principally or almost entirely at the Federal level, or should this be designed to encourage the investment by States and local governments in graduate studies?

Dr. BAILEY. Well, I would of course like to see an additional interest on the part of State and local governments in financing preentry training of this kind. It becomes difficult when you realize that most of the important programs in graduate education for the public service are not limited in constituency to a particular area.

In the Maxwell School we draw from, I think, 40 to 45 of the States of the Union and probably a dozen foreign countries. Leaving out the foreigners here who are not included in this bill, it is a little hard to know how we would go to State and local authorities for money to support preentry activity as against midcareer activity, preentry activity in the Maxwell School. I think this has to be looked at really as a national program tapping national resources and therefore it seems to me the major burden of the responsibility must come from the Federal Government.

Mr. ERLENBORN. One last question, and really I pose this not as a question I expect you to answer but maybe to give you an insight into some of the problems we face. That is, at what point can we say that the deficits facing this Federal Government, running in the magnitude of $20 to $25 or $30 billion a year, can we afford to do even these worthwhile things? We have to look at this, of course, in the context of the overall budget of the Federal Government, the demands upon the resources that we do have, and set priorities within the availability of those resources. Even some of the most desirable programs may not be feasible at a time when the resources are not available.

Dr. BAILEY. Mr. Congressman, before you came in, I mentioned in my testimony an earlier experience of mine as an administrative assistant to a U.S. Senator. I am fully aware of the very difficult problems which you people face. The business of setting priorities in the face of the kinds of restrictions that are imposed by our international commitments at the moment must be a kind of traumatic thing to go through.

I don't want to sound here as though I were self-serving because my major concern in life has been with education for the public service. I honestly can't believe there is any higher priority, and I mean this in terms of both international relations and domestic problems, than bringing into the public service the highest quality people we can possibly bring in. This seems to me the sine qua non of effective government abroad and at home. This becomes really dimensional, and, if we don't have adequately trained people to run these programs, and they are becoming more complex all the time, it doesn't make any sense particularly to allocate billions of dollars to the carrying out of a series of programs for which there is not ade-

quately trained manpower. It seems to me that if you are looking at priority questions, the major question which ought to confront the Congress at the moment is how can we do better than we are doing presently in the conduct of public affairs and international affairs.

If this is the central question, then it seems to me that this title XII deserves a very high priority.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Thank you very much.

Mr. GIBBONS. Thank you, Dean Bailey. We appreciate this very much. As we said in the beginning, it is a very fine statement, and you have added a lot to our understanding. Now, only because I cut off the questioning here on this because I have that crisis that I mentioned a little while ago, I would like to call on Mr. Harold Pfautz, who is a professor of sociology, at Brown University, to come forward.

Dr. BAILEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

STATEMENT OF DR. HAROLD W. PFAUTZ, PROFESSOR OF SOCIOLOGY, BROWN UNIVERSITY

Dr. PFAUTZ. Mr. Chairman and Congressmen, I might begin by saying I appreciate very much the opportunity to appear before you. I am convinced in my own mind that the work of this subcommittee and the parent committee is the pivot around which the future of higher education in America will undoubtedly turn.

I am professor of sociology in Brown University and for 2 years, 1964 and 1965, served as coordinator of the Tougaloo College-Brown University cooperative program. My remarks are apropos to H.R. 15067, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965, especially titles III, parts A and B, title IV, part C, and title IX.

As you will recall, the major impetus for title III, "Strengthening Developing Institutions" by means of cooperative programs was the growing recognition of the plight of young Negro Americans relative to opportunities for quality higher education.

On the one hand, a tradition of de facto segregation and occasional discrimination on the part of our colleges and universities, coupled with the abiding economic and educational disabilities of Negro youth minimized the matriculation of Negro high school graduates at predominantly white schools.

On the other hand, such studies as Dr. McGrath's survey of the predominantly Negro colleges made clear their financial predicament and all the correlative defects which stem from inadequate funding; a situation, incidentally, which they share with an even greater number of the smaller, predominantly white institutions of higher learning.

Together, these factors were largely responsible for the isolation not only of the predominantly Negro colleges from the academic mainstream but of their students from American society.

Of course, as long as the future of such young people was the traditional ghetto—for example, Negro business and teaching in segregated schools and colleges—these defects were of minimum import. But, in the past decade, our Nation has rededicated itself to making real the promise of equal opportunity and has come to recognize the folly of literally writing off the human potential of one-tenth of our population.

At this point the educational experience of Negro Americans takes on significance. Indeed, despite the ambiguities involved in supporting such institutions due to their own de facto segregated character, the fact that they have served, serve today, and will continue to serve in the near future the largest number and proportion of Negro undergraduates has made it imperative that they be brought into the mainstream of higher education.

Moreover, given the rapid pace of development that our best colleges and universities have experienced since World War II, it also became clear that the gap between such institutions and significant numbers of our smaller, independent colleges was increasing as a result of the rising costs and competition for staff.

It was in this context that title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965 was enacted. It aimed precisely at providing Federal financial support for cooperative working relationships between so-called developing institutions with the desire and the potential to make a substantial contribution to our educational resources and the talents and know-how of our best colleges and universities, as well as the educational resources of business and industry.

Significantly, this title involved a much needed innovation in Federal aid to higher education; that is, direct financial aid, not for buildings, facilities, or research, but for basic educational operations: curriculum development, faculty and administrative development, student services, and planning operations.

In addition, the national teaching fellowship program sought further to be helpful in staffing the developing colleges.

We are now beginning our third year of experience. And, while I have not been privy to the inner workings of the operation, I have had the honor of serving as an adviser to the Office of Education as a member of the panels which have reviewed the proposals, in addition to my tenure as coordinator of the Tougaloo-Brown program.

In the first place, I would say that the Office of Education and especially the division of college support have done a really magnificent job in administering the title to date. Despite the press of time and the problems of setting up lines of communication between Washington and the myriad of institutions throughout the country, the moneys have been allocated with a minimum of the bureaucratic difficulties usually encountered in such an extensive and complicated program. Moreover, I am personally convinced that these moneys have performed exceedingly useful functions which are precisely along the lines of the intent of the Congress.

Through the medium of cooperating working relationships literally hundreds of colleges outside the mainstream of higher education have been brought into contact with our more developed institutions.

Correlatively, these contacts and the funds received for such programs have, to a greater or lesser extent, at the very minimum served a significant catalytic function: They have acted to shake up, so to speak, the operations of the smaller and less developed schools.

I do not need to tell you that educational institutions, despite their formal dedication to truth, learning, and change, are, in the final analysis, also human institutions with understandable vested interests in their own status quo and informed by administrative and faculty fears of the consequences of rocking the boat.

Last but not least, I would note that the program has also served to bring forth a myriad of new ideas and new techniques focused on the educational problems presented by ill-prepared but motivated students and on the economic and administrative problems indigenous to the small, underdeveloped college.

To be sure, all of these are still in the testing stage, but it is exceedingly doubtful, in the absence of title III funds and concepts, that the energies of the staffs of either the developing or so-called coordinating institutions would have been marshaled so quickly, so efficiently, or in the same degree.

Looking specifically at the experience to date, I would estimate that despite the minimum funds appropriated, from one-quarter to one-fifth of all of the Nation's 4-year colleges, in addition to the numerous junior colleges, have been touched by the act. More than 60 percent of the predominantly Negro colleges have received funds.

Indeed, true to the original thrust of the legislation, more than half of the funds available to 4-year colleges have gone to the predominantly Negro schools.

Finally, of the approximately 60 grants of more than $100,000 in fiscal 1967, 51 have been made to such institutions.

This is all to the good. But what lessons have we learned, and how best might we now proceed?

Given the rapidly rising costs of higher education, I start with the assumption that not only the development and maintenance of quality education but the very viability of many of our smaller 4-year colleges and universities are ultimately dependent on direct State and Federal financial support.

Title III is the first step in this direction, and I therefore applaud it. I do not wish to waste your time on the philosophical issues connected with Federal aid to higher education—the specter of Federal control—because I believe that men, not programs, are the final determinants in the concrete instance.

The only relevant concern is commitment to the basic function of our institutions of higher education as centers of independent thought. I would like, however, to remark on a number of aspects of the philosophy and administration of title III which should be considered in the development of any amendments to the act.

I believe that title III should not be broadened out as a single title to bear the major burden of direct Federal aid to higher education. Rather, it should be more realistically and actively oriented to its original concept: cooperative programs which do, in fact, draw on the resources of our best schools or involve clear-cut economies and upgradings of existing educational programs among consortia of developing institutions.

I do not believe there is much profit in the blind leading the blind as far as new programs are concerned.

Correlatively, it seems to me that the Office of Education should immediately undertake an analysis of the self-defined needs and problems of the smaller developing institutions as these have been revealed by the proposals for funding under title III.

In fact, an increasing number of these proposals have involved no real cooperative plans or any element of drawing on the resources

of the coordinating institutions but rather a simple statement of institutional needs.

On the basis of such an analysis, I think that a new title should be proposed which would precisely be oriented to providing grants to undergraduate institutions for curriculum, faculty and administrative development, student services, et cetera, without the baggage of the cooperative concept.

This, in my view, is a first priority and, insofar as it is based on our empirical experience, has the greatest promise of effective impact.

Such legislation should also involve the establishment of a Council of Advisers for Undergraduate Education similar to that proposed for graduate education in part B of the amended title. Parenthetically, only then does it make sense to undertake the much more costly and complex support of graduate education, a point on which I will elaborate in a moment.

The proposals for amending title IV by adding part C—"Special Services for Disadvantaged Students"—as well as the addition of title IX—"Networks for Knowledge"—seem to me to risk considerable and unnecessary confusion in administering the act and therefore in achieving its aim. In fact, such programs as are envisioned as the provision of counseling, tutorial, career guidance and placement, and other student services, as well as the sharing of facilities, the exchange of faculty, et cetera, are already being funded under title III.

And it is certainly not clear as to whether these new programs would involve additional advisory councils and separate applications on the part of the colleges seeking such funds.

I depart from my text for a moment and say that it has been an inordinate burden on many of the small colleges, the kinds of detailed applications they have had to make. They certainly have difficulties in finding personnel and energies available to do this kind of thing. And anything that complicates the application process is a kind of undue burden.

If we can, in a sense, make more efficient and, I think, pointed the kind of data the Office of Education needs, I think it would be considerably simplified and a good deal of energy could be saved for use in other directions.

This leads me to my next general point: I am afraid that there has been a confusing and possibly wasteful tendency to view institutional grants under title III on the model of the traditional research grant. I speak here not of the questionable policy of allowing overhead charges in grant proposals which are concerned with direct financial aid as I have defined it—curriculum, faculty and staff development, et cetera.

Rather, I would point out that if we are concerned to provide funds to develop and maintain our institutions of higher education, we must design our support in institutional terms.

Such development is all of a piece, so to speak. You cannot develop one aspect—faculty, curriculum, student services, et cetera—without involving all the others.

Already, as I have noted, title III support the gamut of institutional needs. The single research project, on the other hand, typically has the minimum impact on other institutional functions but is rather grafted on, not only in regard to its personnel but also often with respect to

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

difficult and complex questions, but I am here to urge you to consider them so that we might know what we are doing and, correlatively, maximize our chances of success.

Parenthetically, not every institution, despite its desire has, in fact, the potential for making a substantial contribution to our higher educational resources. This is true especially in the light of my previous observation that there is, if anything, a greater and increasing gap between our best and least developed colleges.

Moreover, beyond the reality of our commitment to share, to make an honest effort at serving the total universe of colleges, institutional grants for higher education must be of significant size as to make an impact and closely reviewed, in the case of the smaller institutions, so as to be not so large as to constitute a burden of absorption and administration, especially in regard to the implications of such grants for future commitments.

Thus, in my own experience in regard to the Tougaloo College-Brown University cooperative program, one measure of whatever success we might have achieved has been, through Federal and private foundation grants, the doubling of Tougaloo's operating budget in less than 3 years. In a manner of speaking, this is what the inauguration of a development program means. It changes an institution from one that has been kept going to one that is going places.

This not only costs money, but there are obvious risks insofar as we have not been able to secure the kinds of funds that will guarantee continued operation at the new and higher level. Now, Tougaloo is truly in trouble; now, we have a real challenge on our hands.

There are other, minor observations I would make in regard to the administration of title III. For example, in cooperative programs I see no reason why a faculty member who serves as a consultant should receive a consultant's fee of $100 per day. To be sure, his expenses should be paid, but there is little meaning in the concept of cooperation as defined in the title—drawing on the resources of the coordinating institutions—if its personnel are paid twice for their time.

I also feel very strongly that there is one tradition in the research-grant model which should be adapted to the institutional-grant program; site visits. Where an institution receives a grant of $100,000 or more, I believe that site visits should be made, if only in the interests of the taxpayers.

Finally, I would remark briefly on the addition of part B, "Improvement of Graduate Programs," to title III. Frankly, I was shocked by the inclusion of this function in this title, especially at this time.

This is not to say that I disapprove of direct Federal aid to graduate schools in the same manner that I have been speaking of such aid to undergraduate colleges. But it is self-evident, I think, that such a program would be vastly more complex, perhaps even more costly, and certainly involves more contentious issues.

Here, especially, the concept of higher education cannot be diluted. In part, the difference is explicitly recognized in the title by proposing the formation of an Advisory Council on Graduate Education. In any case, however, it is not the concept but the timing and the almost unserious nature of the proposal for such a program that disturbs me.

In fact, our graduate schools are already receiving considerable support, especially in connection with their research operations and

training programs, from a variety of Government agencies. And some Government agencies, like the National Science Foundation, already provide institutional block grants.

Therefore, it seems to me that unless the current pattern of Federal support of graduate schools and graduate education is analyzed, the inauguration of a new general program only invites chaos and costly duplication. Moreover, in terms of priority and given the current level of Government support for graduate education, it is our smaller colleges, which provide the students for our graduate schools, that are most in need at this point in time.

Finally, in the light of the costs of any proposal which would have any significant impact on any single graduate school, the level of appropriation mentioned for both parts of title III only suggests to me the need to give considerably more thought to the matter before any final decision is made. To place this program in title III is only the final questionable decision in my view.

I would conclude by emphasizing the point that graduate education is, in fact, "another country." To link the form and administration of its support with the concept of developing institutions is dangerous and misleading. Here, especially, we must have the courage to face up to the invidious choices that must be made in the allocation of limited funds if we are to maintain the integrity and insure the functions of graduate education in our Nation.

Mr. BRADEMAS (presiding). Thank you very much, Professor Pfautz, for your obviously very carefully prepared analysis of title III programs and your recommendations.

Mr. Gibbons, have you any questions?

Mr. GIBBONS. I want to thank Dr. Pfautz. We seldom ever get someone who is as blunt and critical as you have been in some of these things, and we appreciate that.

Let me go back to your experience at Tougaloo. Perhaps I am the person on this committee who was most skeptical of title III, because at that time, with every institution under the definition we put in the act, from Harvard and Stanford and all of them on down—and I don't say they are the tops but just assuming for the sake of argument that they are—it looked like every institution could qualify as a developing institution.

You are very correct in saying that this was a direct aid for building of the facilities of the institution and, also, for its educational operation.

I was worried that we had not put enough guidelines and boundaries on the activities of title III. So I guess I am the person who probably objected most and had the most to do with cutting down the amount of money we put in the title.

Could you explain to me precisely what you did when you went down to Tougaloo, what went on there, how many people actually went with you?

Dr. PFAUTZ. Well, I think I should say first, Congressman Gibbons, that Brown was asked by Tougaloo if they couldn't find some way in which they might be helpful, given Tougaloo's problems, which were precisely the problems of any small underdeveloped college.

They knew that costs were rising, that they had no alumni constituency on which they could depend to raise funds, that they had problems relative to their ability to attract faculty.

Mr. GIBBONS. That would be a modest statement of Tougaloo's problems, wouldn't it? They were a lot deeper and harder than that, weren't they?

This is a Negro institution in a very hostile area of the United States, as I recall. It has all of those handicaps in addition. Is that right?

Dr. PFAUTZ. Yes, but on the other hand, I would say that for Tougaloo and some of the other colleges at least at the time this kind of dimension of the crisis offered some positive notes that people were interested in it.

One of our concerns has been to develop a kind of a national constituency for support. But I will say, and I have learned something—I hope I have learned something—that when we got into it, I learned that the decisionmaking process is a river that runs.

I am not so sure that you can point out the time, but we went down there merely to help. And we went down there insofar as we were asked in such a manner that we actually became or I actually became involved in every dimension of Tougaloo's operations. That is, I was present to be helpful where and when I could.

Therefore, we have been involved in their building programs. We have been involved in the development of student facilities, in the development of administration and the like.

As to who went down there with me, we have four of my colleagues each year down there, that is, two men serving in a single department for a semester each, because we felt that a semester would give a person some time to learn a little himself and to play some kind of a role as far as the college was concerned.

I think one of the difficulties of many of the schools, particularly of this type, is that they tend to become zoos with interested people perfectly willing to spend a few days down there but in no position to commit any significant amount of their time. Indeed, I think this is a real problem with respect to all of the programs.

The programs are usually very cogent in their construction. The problem is, can you get the personnel to do the job?

We have been down there now for, as I say, 3 years. It is a very long and complicated story, but we will be there as long as the board of trustees at Tougaloo and the corporation at Brown are agreed that the program is mutually beneficial.

It has meant considerable to the individuals who have gone down there from Brown. The Hippocratic oath is not that the doctor will cure but will do no harm. We hope that it has also been useful to Tougaloo.

Mr. GIBBONS. You say there were four of you that went down there?

Dr. PFAUTZ. Well, I have four of my colleagues in addition to myself.

Mr. GIBBONS. Five all told?

Dr. PFAUTZ. That is right.

Mr. GIBBONS. How much actual time did you spend?

Dr. PFAUTZ. My colleagues spent a semester there, in which they taught Tougaloo's curriculum, attended faculty meetings, and served on committees. They were visiting colleagues. I was there myself all the time except for a time when I went back to Providence.

It was an actual time obligation.

Mr. GIBBONS. During that time what changes came about at Tougaloo?

Dr. PFAUTZ. As I say, I think it is quite clear that we have got them on what one might call the development step. That is, Tougaloo is a college, you know, that is 100 years old. And by and large, because of the isolation, as I have said in my little piece here, it had literally been "kept going." It was largely supported at one time by the United Church American Missionary Association, established right after the Civil War.

In those days an organization like this could afford to support what existed for higher education. Today this is frankly economically impossible. This was really the issue that many of these colleges face.

To stand still is to fall behind. I think this was the original and quite cogent motivation of the board of trustees at Tougaloo, recognizing what this problem was, that the only way they could continue to survive literally and conceivably provide that kind of service that many of the young people, most of whom come from Mississippi, would not have available to them, the only way they could do this was to make the decision to go ahead.

Mr. GIBBONS. I don't want to dwell on this too long. Let us talk about what actually happened at Tougaloo. What was the enrollment, the size of the student body?

Dr. PFAUTZ. When we first went there, the enrollment was close to 500. This year it is 640. The college has built additional dormitories. The faculty has increased from about 33 to 45 or so.

We have inagurated, of course, all kinds of new ancillary programs. We do have a career planning and placement operation there now.

We have been working with the library, and they have a much better collection now, not only in terms of absolute numbers but in terms of the quality of the materials, because many of these smaller colleges understandably often have many volumes in their libraries which simply have been contributed by well meaning people over the past. As a matter of fact, they are not very useful items.

So we spent a lot of time almost pruning, in a sense, and this is another area in which I think we might have been helpful.

Then, of course, as to my colleagues, for example, I had two colleagues in chemistry. After a semester there they have not only some feeling but some understanding of what the problems are and are able to leave with the administration there some kind of more cogent notion of the directions which are possible in which a chemistry department in an undergraduate college might go when the funds are available.

Mr. GIBBONS. Don't you think a semester is really too short a time to have much impact?

Dr. PFAUTZ. Yes; like everything else, a semester is too short, but it is better than a weekend. It isn't as good as a year.

I might say that, of course, everyone who goes down there from Brown University goes there as a volunteer and that the university makes it possible. But when you raise the question under what conditions, despite a person's desire to go, can he go there has to be the convergence of a number of items—family, wife, time of career, the research process.

To shake loose a regular member of a faculty, I think you can appreciate particularly in a small institution such as Brown the kind of nuisance impact that losing a man from a department has. It is not the easiest thing in the world to set this up. That is one of the reasons why we have kept it at a level at which I hope we can continue to operate.

Mr. GIBBONS. How do you suggest the Congress set some reasonable boundaries on these developing institutions?

Dr. PFAUTZ. This, I think, is the most difficult thing in the world to do. As I say, we have over 2,000 4-year colleges. As you say, from one point of view they are all developing.

But I think, and I certainly agree with you, that it is probable that we cannot support them all. And I suspect that a number of small grants are just utterly meaningless.

As a private personal individual, I have felt from the very beginning that a program like this understandably has to serve as many as possible. But perhaps within the university one might get agreement to support a small number of these colleges in a significant fashion. Then at the end of 10 years you might have 10 new first-rate quality colleges, which would be a magnificent achievement. But it would take a considerable amount of courage and a considerable amount of cooperation to make this kind of decision.

Yet, certainly, I think it is quite true that if you spread your funds very far you begin to get grants of $10,000 and $15,000, which may have no impact, which do in fact have no impact whatsoever. And the same problem, I think, you will have to face when we get into the graduate education.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Just in that connection, Professor Pfautz, I was reminded as I heard you in colloquy with Mr. Gibbons of the extremely provocative and thoughtful speech delivered in January at the annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges by Alan Pifer, the president of the Carnege Corp., in which he remarked that by the year 1975, in his judgment, higher education in this country would be depending on the Federal Government for about 50 percent of their support.

He made the proposition, therefore, that we should begin to think about some kind of a mechanism which would enable us to establish a national policy for higher education. He was, of course, not suggesting any kind of Federal control but, on the contrary, was trying to urge leaders of higher education to consider that if they are not going to be able to get enough money to meet the problems of higher education from State and local sources, from student charges, and from philanthropy and would therefore have to call more and more upon the Federal tax dollar, they would all the more need to develop some way of making sure that their views were heard by people such as those on our committee and by people in the executive branch of Government. The point he was making was, for example, that when decisions are made about whether it is wise to give more support to developing institutions or not, those decisions are made against a backdrop of considering all the needs of higher education and all the pressures on it.

Have you any comment on Mr. Pifer's suggestion?

Dr. PFAUTZ. I think that is of first priority. Especially, as I say, will the problem become difficult, I think, in the area of graduate education, because you do have commitment to a certain kind of education which is quite different and, as I say, we must have courage.

I do not mean this as a criticism of the Office of Education, but in the case of graduate education most of the funds from the Government have come from what I would call operating agencies, the National Institutes of Health, National Institute of Mental Health, NASA, and operations like this.

Now the Office of Education is not itself a kind of educational agency in the same sense that NIMH is, constantly doing research. And I would certainly think that in some way or another the universities have to begin more directly—and I am not too knowledgeable about this, but just have some vague impressions—the universities might lean on occasion for a significant amount of time some of their personnel so that the communications and traffic will be meaningful and productive.

I think that this would cost the university something in terms of these people, but I think if the Office of Education gets into institutional development on the graduate level, this is the kind of thing that we would have to do in order to at least have a stab at what you are saying of making some of these decisions.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Unless there is objection, I would like to insert at this point in the record the text of Mr. Pifer's address to which I made reference.

(The document follows:)

[Congressional Record, *Extensions of Remarks, May 1, 1968*]

TOWARD A COHERENT SET OF NATIONAL POLICIES FOR HIGHER EDUCATION—SPEECH BY ALAN PIFER TO THE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES, JANUARY 16, 1968

I have sometimes wondered why foundation officers are asked to give speeches such as this one today and in the course of musing about this have posed two hypotheses to myself. Either, it is possible that proximity to great sums of money may be thought to be indicative of a special wisdom or capacity for philosophical reflection, rather the way the possession of a flowing beard once used to be. Or, these appearances may be considered to have fund-raising possibilities—a kind of identification parade of potential givers arranged for their constituents by conscientious presidents of educational associations.

But neither of these theories really stands up to scientific inquiry. After fifteen years in the foundation business I am still looking for any signs of a special prescience there, and the identification parade of big money men, any schoolboy knows, has to be made up these days not of foundation executives but of Washington bureaucrats.

Anyway, here I am, possibly under false colors, and I am going to speak to you for a few minutes this morning not, as I am supposed to, about new roles for old institutions within the framework of inter-institutional cooperation, but about the federal role in higher education, or, if you will, new dollars for old institutions. This, as you know, is a venerable topic on which everything anyone could possibly say has already been said many times. So all I can do is hope to bring to it the insights of one who is fortunate enough to be neither a dispenser nor a seeker of Washington's largesse.

BEGINNING OF A NEW ERA IN FEDERAL FINANCING OF HIGHER EDUCATION?

In recent months important policy statements on the subject of federal aid have been made by virtually every higher educational association in the country. Several prominent university leaders have made public speeches on the subject. A number of bills dealing either directly or indirectly with the financing

of higher education have been introduced in the Congress. A presidential task force on education, including higher education, not long ago submitted its secret report to the White House.

Despite non-defense federal budget cuts caused by the mounting expenses of Vietnam, there seems to be a certain expectancy in the air in regard to federal aid to higher education, a feeling that the Administration is about to take some dramatic new initiatives in this area. Perhaps, think some of the cynically-minded, this will prove to be nothing more than campaign rhetoric. But hopes are, nonetheless, high. There appears to be a kind of consensus developing that the financial needs of our colleges and universities are now so desperate nothing will save them except major amounts of additional dollars from Uncle Sam.

A common element in nearly all of the policy statements by educational associations I have just referred to is that the time has now come for the federal government to make general, non-categorical support grants to all institutions while at the same time continuing its research support, aid to students, construction grants and loans, and other forms of categorical assistance.

Thus, these proposals seem to be saying two things in regard to federal aid: one, there must be something in it for everyone, that is for every type of institution, large or small, public or private, undergraduate, graduate or professional; and, two, we have reached a new stage in the evolution of American higher education where it cannot continue to prosper without general, across-the-board support from the federal government, that is, support simply to meet normal operating expenses once considered exclusively someone else's responsibility.

If these two deductions are correct, and if Washington should accept them as guiding principles for its course of action in the future, then we have indeed reached the end of an era in the financing of higher education and are about to pass into a new one. It behooves us, therefore, to pause for a moment and look at the situation as it now stands before examining what the new era will be like.

A truly objective observer of American higher education and the federal role in it—this would have to be a stowaway on the first spaceship returning from a distant planet—could not but be impressed with the almost total irrationality, disorderliness and complexity of what he saw.

Looking at the "structure" of higher education he would discover some 2,200 institutions, of widely varying types and wildly varying standards. He would find that some of these institutions are publicly controlled, some privately, with some of the latter church-related and some not. He would also find 50 separate state systems of higher education, all different and, with thhe exception of some regional coordination, not related to each other in such a way as to add up collectively to anything like a national system of higher education. He would become aware of a superfluity of educational and professional associations, each speaking for the special interests of some group of institutions, faculty or administrators, but amounting collectively on most issues to a discordant babel.

Finally, he would search in vain for any coordinated, coherent, comprehensive set of policies subscribed to universally by this miscellaneous array of institutions, a set of policies which would guarantee that the full range of higher educational needs of the nation are being met now, or will be in the future.

This may surprise our visitor from outer-space considerably, because it would be a reasonable assumption on his part that a nation with the greatest power and largest responsibilities of any on earth would possess a well-organized national system of higher education, comparable, let us say, to its national system of defense. He would perhaps, especially, expect this in an age when higher education has become of absolutely central importance to all that matters most to the people of that nation, including their health, their economic well-being, their very capacity for survival itself—to say nothing of their Saturday afternoon entertainment through televised intercollegiate football games.

NO CLEARLY DEFINED FEDERAL ROLE

But our observer would be even more surprised when he looked at the role of the national government in regard to higher education. Here he would discover: that there is no clearly expressed and clearly understood federal role; that the nation's constitution, while not prohibiting federal activity in higher education, had nonetheless largely passed this responsibility to the states: that very few federally controlled institutions are actually in existence; that the federal role in higher education (with the exception of that mandated in the Land-Grant Acts) has over the years been only a by-product of other federal purposes, such as the

support of research or discharge of responsibilities to war veterans or to the disadvantaged: that only recently has the federal government begun to support higher education for its own sake and in so doing only on a hesitant, fragmented basis that could best be described as backing into a federal policy.

He would also discover that at the present time every federal department except the Post Office and Treasury and at least 16 independent agencies have direct relationships with institutions of higher education and that the Office of Education alone is responsible for administering over 60 separate programs in this area under the authorization of 15 different legislative enactments.

Finally, he would find out that there is no single place in the federal government where all of this activity is directed or coordinated, or its collective impact on the colleges and universities even assessed—no locus of concern about the health and welfare of higher education per se.

Our visitor, while recording his astonishment at all of this, would, however, have to recognize the good side of the lack of a national system and clear federal policy within it. He would, along with the shortcomings, have to note the relative freedom and autonomy our colleges and universities have enjoyed, the high degree of academic freedom in most of them, the relative breadth of democratic access to them and the great intellectual distinction achieved by some of them. He would have to note the immense vitality that has existed in this non-system —the freedom to duplicate what others could do better, to waste money, to perform useless, even meretricious functions, yes, but also the freedom to develop and experiment so that higher education could remain as dynamic as the nation itself.

Our objective observer from another planet, having now served his purpose, can be allowed to be apprehended by the U.S. Immigration Service and sent to Cape Kennedy to await repatriation while we move on to consider what the new era may be like, and some of the problems it may bring. First, let us look at a few figures on the growth of the higher educational enterprise.

BY 1975—$34 BILLION AND 9 MILLION STUDENTS

Twelve years ago, in the academic year 1955–'56, there were enrolled on a degree-credit basis in our junior colleges, four year colleges and universities some 2.6 million students. That figure last year was 6 million students. By 1975 it is conservatively projected to be over 9 million, an increase of three-and-a-half fold in just two decades.

In 1955–'56 the total capital and recurrent expenditure by all higher educational institutions was $4.1 billion, of which 12 per cent, including research and development support, was supplied by the federal government. Last year the figure was $16.8 billion, of which 23 per cent, including research support and loans, was from federal sources.

The figure for 1975 can, of course, be no more than rough guesswork because of the wide variation possible in the assumptions on which it might be developed. An estimate provided by the Office of Education, based on a projection of cost increases for the past decade applied against anticipated enrollment increase and expressed in current dollars unadjusted for inflation puts the amount at about $34 billion. My own guess, however, is that because of soaring personnel costs it may quite possibly be rather higher, perhaps as high as $40 billion. Such a figure, if we do reach it, would then represent a tenfold increase in funds spent by higher educational institutions in two decades, or a rise in such expenditure as a proportion of GNP from about one per cent to something over there per cent—during a 20 year period in which student numbers will have increased three-and-a-half fold.

FEDERAL SHARE IN 1975 MAY BE 50 PERCENT

To estimate what proportion of expenditure will be covered by funds from federal sources by 1975 is difficult indeed. Yet one can predict with little risk that it will be far larger than the present 23 per cent. The Office of Education, again extrapolating from past experience predicts a rise to about 30 per cent. I, however, believe that the federal share will be even greater. Indeed if the Vietnam war ends by 1970, the federal share by 1975 may go as high as 50 per cent. This would suggest that, of an estimated total annual expenditure then by higher educational institutions of $40 billion, as much as $20 billion may come from federal sources, including, of course, research and development support, as well as other kinds

of aid. My prediction is based simply on the obvious inelasticity of other sources in relation to the expansion task ahead.

Tuition and fees, in 1963, the latest year for which figures are available provided about 20 per cent of all income in all our institutions, public and private, taken together. Income from this source will rise somewhat but not nearly as fast as costs, and therefore this source will, in my opinion, represent a declining portion of total income. Endowment income and gifts, which taken together, again for all institutions, public and private, accounted for about 8.5 per cent of income in 1963 will also rise but not as fast as costs and so will also represent a declining portion of the total.

The dramatic success of the special endowment drives of a few of our major private universities seems to belie this assertion. They are to be warmly congratulated for their accomplishment. But I would remind you that only a few of the more fortunate institutions have demonstrated such success.

Income from ancillary enterprises, which was 17 per cent of the total in 1963, will, with more students, obviously rise but again may well represent a declining proportion of total income. This is because the unit costs in these enterprises, which are in any event financially self-contained, should rise somewhat less rapidly than the costs of instruction and research.

STATE AND LOCAL FUNDS WILL NOT MATCH GROWING NEEDS

Finally, income from state and local governments, which at present covers about 26 per cent of the total costs of higher education will rise in absolute amount, but will meet a declining proportion of the much larger costs ahead. The cities and states, especially the latter, have borne the principal burden of the great expansion of student numbers of the past decade. Their resources are derived in major part from tax systems that have virtually reached the limit of productivity. Other calls on state and local income, such as welfare and lower levels of education, are becoming ever more demanding. For these reasons it is unlikely the cities and states will be able to maintain their present proportional effort.

We are forced therefore to a very simple conclusion. If this nation's needs for higher education are to be met in the years to come, the federal government will have to accept the principal part of the consequent financial burden. And, judging from the statements of those representing higher education, this is what they think and want, as contrasted with an earlier period when there were considerable doubts on this score. As evidence I have only to cite the total reversal of policy on this question by the Association of American Universities from the position it took in the early fifties.

Some of you may have been at the American Council on Education meeting in San Francisco in 1964 at which my predecessor, John Gardner, spoke. In commenting on higher education's attitude toward federal aid he told the story of the little boy who wrote to his family from summer camp that the food was terrible, and anyway the portions were so small. I would suggest to you now that the little boy writing today would be concerned only about the size of the portions and the shape of the dishes in which they are served.

At present about 30 percent of federal aid takes the form of research and development support. A good question can be raised of how much this contributes to the undergraduate educational purposes of our colleges and universities. It is my belief, however, that in the future a steadily rising proportion of the federal contribution will represent direct support for institutional operating and instructional costs and support for students. Research support, while continuing to mount in dollar volume, will probably represent a declining proportion of the federal contribution because higher education's capacity to absorb vastly increased research funds will be restricted pending a general strengthening of the enterprise.

Well, if the federal government is to be the largest supporter of higher education, what will be the consequences? Will this be a good or a bad thing? Will the leverage in the federal contribution serve to make the enterprise more orderly and more efficient? Should it be used that way? Will the needs of the nation which are external to but dependent on higher education be better met? Will there be a decline of freedom and autonomy in our colleges and universities? What will happen to academic standards? What will happen to the distinction between public and private institutions?

These are questions which lie just over the horizon for both the federal government and higher education. It seems extraordinary to me that they are re-

ceiving so little careful attention, that there is so little real discussion—I was about to use that tattered word dialogue—between the two parties at such a crucial moment. Yes, it *is* extraordinary that in an age when a plethora of communication has become one of the curses of society, when a government *says* it wants to hear the views of higher education but still does its planning in an aura of secrecy, and when all the sectors of higher education are busy framing essentially self-serving statements for delivery in Washington, we still lack a high-level, dispassionate, non-political debate on the future of higher education. The inauguration of such a debate is surely the first priority for both Washington and for the colleges and universities.

SOME EFFECTS OF GREATLY INCREASED FEDERAL AID

The question of what effect substantially increased amounts of federal aid will have on the higher educational enterprise will, of course, depend very largely on how this aid is given. Under some circumstances the effect could actually be minimal.

It is, for example, tempting in view of the present financial crisis, especially of our private institutions, to come out in favor of some formula for general, across-the-board federal support for all institutions on a non-selective basis. But a considerable possibility in this form of support is that it may be largely self-defeating simply by causing a further inflation of costs. The federal government could sink several billion dollars a year in this manner with little to show for it by way of a general strengthening of higher education. Everything that is wrong about the enterprise as it is now would simply be perpetuated, only on a more costly scale.

In any event, it is clear that the possible effects of such an approach are sufficiently little understood to require a great deal more study of it before any decision is made in Washington to adopt it.

A prior question, however, to this one is whether a shortage of money is the sole problem in higher education. If a noninflationary way could be found to provide general support, would this be all that is required? Or is there also a fundamental structural problem? Has the nation reached a point in its development when it must have a more orderly, more coherent and more efficient national provision for higher education? And if this is so, should the leverage in federal support be deliberately used to bring this about?

There is, I believe, considerable recognition now not only by experts but by the public at large that higher education in this country, despite its successes, has in recent years failed to meet many of the nation's most pressing needs. It has, for example, not been able to provide all of the kinds of research and public service required of it. It has not been able to produce all of the specialized professional and technical manpower required of it. It has not been able adequately to serve the needs of the economically disadvantaged. It has not been able to provide enough classrooms, laboratories, or dormitory beds. So, the nation, through the federal government, has in effect moved into the field with massive federal funds to achieve specific national purposes. And in the urgency of the hour many of the old ideological arguments against federal aid have been forgotten.

It is my view now, looking into the future, that the pressures on the United States for at least the balance of this century are going to be so great, and our colleges and universities so absolutely central to the society's well-being, in ways that dwarf anything we have yet seen, that we can no longer afford the luxury of an unplanned, wasteful, chaotic approach to higher education. I believe, therefore that, like it or not, we must now use every means at our disposal deliberately to develop a coherent, articulated set of national policies to guide its future growth along lines that can be counted on to meet the nation's needs fully, effectively, and in good time. To do less than this is to court disaster. Implicit in this statement, of course, are two important assumptions: first, that the values to be found in educational planning are similar to those in other fields, that is, that good planning leads to efficiency and coherence; and, second, that it is appropriate, at least in part, to look to higher education for the systematic meeting of pressing social needs.

A COHERENT SET OF NATIONAL POLICIES

What, then, will such a set of national policies be like? The sad truth is that no one knows because the design of even a preliminary model for discussion purposes has not been a task the society has ever set itself. Naturally not. This would

have seemed a futile, profitless exercise when it was the prevailing assumption that we could get by with an essentially *laissez-faire* approach to the provision of higher education and could live comfortably with the notion that the federal role was purely to offer supplementary financial assistance.

I would suggest, however, that the creation of some models for national consideration and debate is now a matter of the greatest urgency. The Carnegie Commission on the Future of Higher Education, under the chairmanship of Clark Kerr, is one attempt to build such a model.

Public discussion of proposals for possible sets of national policies should, if at all possible, take place before irrevocable decisions are made by the Administration and Congress about large new programs of federal aid, because new programs instituted without the benefit of a considered and articulated national plan for higher education may create patterns of funding and development that will be extremely difficult to change later.

Can a set of national policies be brought into being without federal leadership? The answer, I am afraid, is probably no—at least, not entirely. Voluntary cooperation of individual institutions is important and can have some effect. Voluntary cooperation of the states through the new Educational Commission of the States is also important and can achieve quite a bit. But it seems extremely unlikely to me that we will ever put into operation a fully adequate set of national policies without the active participation of the federal government in the devising and implementing of them. As the federal government's stake in higher education, in behalf of all the people, becomes ever greater, as its share of the support of higher education become ever larger, so its responsibility for what happens in it will steadily increase. The government will simply not be able to maintain the fiction that its role is purely that of supplementary financier. Its large appropriations will have to be based on policies, and these policies will inevitably have an influence on the nature of higher education.

What has already happened proves that. In a sense, the new federal leadership role was foreshadowed in the Morrill Act. But it was to be nearly a century before it was to be fully revealed, in the passage of the National Defense Education Act. And since then there have been numerous pieces of legislation that have added to the role immeasurably. So we are dealing now not with a hypothetical situation but with a process already begun. And since this is the case, and since our need for a coherent set of national policies seems clear, the time has come to bring into the open the question of how federal participation can best be used to help shape up the right set of policies.

I have said that no one knows what a coherent set of national policies would look like. It is easier to state some of the things it would not include. It would not, for example, imply centralized control of who should be admitted to a particular institution or who should teach at it. Nor would it imply control over the content of a given course of study or how it should be presented. These prerogatives can remain the responsibility of individual institutions and of state authorities, as they are now.

EXAMPLES OF NATIONAL POLICIES

A coherent set of national policies would, however, in the broadest terms, be concerned with the overall functions, structure and financing of higher education, the quantity of it available, its quality and the degree of access to it. Some of the kinds of policies which might be included have already been discussed here and there. Let me give some random examples.

One policy would be to establish a minimum standard of free education through the fourteenth grade, that is, through the lower division, or junior college, for all young men and women who successfully complete the earlier grades. Such a policy would rectify the present indefensible situation in which a resident of one state has this entitlement but the resident of another one does not.

A second policy would be the equalization of opportunity for access to higher education beyond the junior college stage, including upper division work and graduate academic and professional training, for any qualified—and I emphasize the word qualified—American citizen no matter what his age, sex, family or economic circumstances or place of residence. This would amount to a national policy of advancing our most talented citizens upward through the highest level of preparation for service to society of which they are capable, without limitation.

A third policy has to do with the amount of high-level graduate and professional training and advanced research capacity available to the nation. It en-

visages the creation of a list of designated "national universities" which would receive preferential treatment in the support of their research laboratories and libraries and other facilities for advanced study and research. Such a list would be limited in length and highly selective, and would be made up of universities already in existence.

A fourth policy has to do with the role of higher education in helping to solve the complex problems of our great urban areas. It contemplates as a national, not simply a state or local imperative, the establishment of vastly strengthened higher educational facilities in our great cities.

A fifth policy is concerned with the nation's international responsibilities. It assumes that ultimately of greater importance to the nation's security than armaments will be its capacity to assist economic and social development in the poorer and technologically less-advanced nations of the world, and it further assumes that American colleges and universities have a centrally important role to play in this process. It therefore regards as a matter of top national policy the development of such a capacity in our higher educational institutions, again on a selective and discriminating basis.

A final group of policies relates to improving the academic quality of our colleges and universities, in every field, but especially in key subjects such as mathematics, the sciences and English language.

If it is accepted that the federal role in the development of a coherent set of national policies for higher education must now be a substantial, perhaps even a determining one, the nature of the federal planning process and higher education's participating in this process becomes of crucial importance.

The federal planning capability has not been strong in the past. It has improved considerably in recent months but still has a good way to go. Similarly, Washington's capacity to bring higher education into its planning has been limited. Little improvement is discernable here, but this is in part higher education's own fault.

NEED FOR A CENTER FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

What seems to be needed now is the creation of a new kind of focal point, or center, for higher education close to the summit of the federal government where it can influence all federal action that impinges on higher educational institutions. Such a center would be charged with the responsibility for long-range planning for cooperation with the states in devising a set of national policies, for communication with higher education, and for safeguarding the interests of our colleges and universities when they are affected by any form of federal action.

One would expect such a center to be presided over by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, although possibly not be located within his department. Most importantly it should be set up in such a way that it has a real authority within the federal establishment in regard to all aspects of federal support of higher education. Lastly, it goes without saying, such a center should depend heavily in all its activities on men and women co-opted from the colleges and universities so that it is as much of higher education itself as it is of government.

The creaton of this center, no matter what its authority or how well staffed it is, will not automatically solve the problem of what kind of a system of higher education we ultimately wish to have for the nation and what particular combination of coordinated national policies will get us where we want to go. But the center can, and should, serve as a forum where a variety of proposals, can be debated and policies hammered out.

IN THE PAST DECADE: GREAT CHANGE IN HIGHER EDUCATION

I am fully aware that discussing the need for a coherent set of national policies and the explicit use of federal leadership first to help devise these policies and then to help implement them through the leverage of federal funding, will strike many of you in this room, and many people generally, as a piece of un-American, unconstitutional and dangerous nonsense! But we must be realistic. The status of higher education in American life, its size and its financial demands have altered radically in the past decade, and the coming years will bring even greater change. If a laissez-faire approach could still work, we would all prefer it, but the needs of the nation have outgrown it. What we have to face up to now is a totally new situation, and we must bring to it a fresh eye, that we may be aware of its opportunities and alert to is dangers.

Among the former will be the possibility of raising the general level of academic standards, of bringing adequate support to our greatest national centers of learning so that they may hold their positions of international leadership, of providing access to higher education for many thousands of talented young people who would otherwise not have it, of enabling our colleges and universities to serve the continuing education needs of our citizens of all ages, of meeting our full national manpower needs, for example in the health field, and, finally, of enabling our institutions to play a full part in meeting the nation's international responsibilities.

Among the dangers in the new era the greatest, of course, will be the possibility of a decline in institutional autonomy and institutional initiative. To some degree this may happen. On the other hand, it would be painting a rosy picture indeed to suggest that either autonomy or initiative have prospered universally under our past system. For many institutions better funding within the context of a set of national policies may actually offer new hopes for independence and experimentation.

A paradox of the new age, as we seek a way to reconcile order and independence, or if you will, direction and freedom, within a set of agreed national policies, will be that in their relationships with the federal government our colleges and universities will have to be subject to both a less restrictive and a more restrictive concept of public accountability for the large sums of public money they will be spending. On the one hand, if they are not to slip gradually into the status of virtually government controlled institutions, appendages, as it were, of Washington bureaucracies, they will have to be freed of many of the federal accounting and report-in procedures which they now endure procedures which are on the whole more restrictive than anything suffered at the hands of state governments and which are demeaning, many university people feel, because they amount in effect to punching a time clock.

On the other hand, the colleges and universities, as their *quid pro quo* for greatly increased federal support and the greater degree of trust placed in them, will have a strong obligation to improve their efficiency and increase their productivity. The very use of the words seems antithetical to the nature of the academic enterprise and is bound to raise the hackles of academic man. But there *will* be possibilities for keeping costs down without sacrificing quality, and the acceptance of massive federal support will entail a recognition of this responsibility.

A special problem as we develop a national policy framework, and as the federal financial role becomes ever larger, will be how to prevent a rapid drying up of state and local contributions and private gifts. Will other sources want to put money into institutions which increasingly are becoming the responsibility of a dominant central funding source? Initially, I believe, it should be possible to devise forms of federal support which require a maintenance of previous effort by other sources. Over the longer range, however—and here is a really heretical thought—I would guess that the financing of higher education will, like the support of agriculture, more and more come to be regarded as almost exclusively a federal responsibility, freeing state and local funds for other pressing purposes and freeing private funds, either for special uses in higher education, such as experimentation or the provision of unusual amenities, or for other fields, such as the arts and recreation. This, however, may lie a long way in the future, perhaps around the year 2000, of which we have been hearing so much lately.

PUBLIC VERSUS PRIVATE ISSUE NOT CENTRAL

You must be wondering why I have said almost nothing about how the development of a set of national policies may affect the respective interests of public and private institutions. I do not, in fact, regard the public/private issue as being in itself of central importance. The central issue is the one I have touched on: how can we build a coherent set of national policies for higher education while at the same time preserving as much as possible of the freedom of all institutions, public and private. The question of public versus private is, I would submit, a side issue, and those who allow themselves to be diverted by it are going to miss the main issue and their chance to have a say in its resolution.

It is conceivable that private higher education as we have known it in the past will gradually disappear and we will end up with a system in which some institutions historically have their roots in the government sector and some in the private sector, but all are, in a general sense of the word, public institutions,

responsive to the public need and articulated with each other in a national policy framework.

To many of you here in this room that prospect will be considered disastrous because you believe that the preservation of academic freedom, the maintenance of high academic standards and the capacity for experimentation in *all* of our colleges and universities, both public and private, is safeguarded by the very existence of private institutions. This may to some degree all have been true in the past; no doubt it was. But it would be a difficult claim to make today and, I believe, will be a ridiculous one to make tomorrow. What we should be worrying about then is how all our institutions, whatever the nature of their control, can preserve academic freedom, high academic standards and an experimental turn of mind in the face of their inevitable heavy financial dependence on the federal government.

And now, ladies and gentlemen, as I close, you will perhaps agree that my topic wasn't, after all, so remote from the theme of this AAC annual meeting: inter-institutional cooperation. I doubt, however, that many of you would have had in mind inter-institutional cooperation within the framework of a deliberately developed, coherent set of national policies for American higher education. If this proves to be a jarring note in your deliberations here, I apologize. But it is the way I see the future.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I made a speech at Spellman College in Atlanta last year, a Negro women's college. One thing that struck me there was the apprehensiveness on the part of the leaders of that institution at the zealous recruiting by larger, more established, more powerful colleges and universities elsewhere in the United States of the most talented and brightest Negro women in that area of the South.

One can readily think of major institutions in the North who were out looking for bright young Negro high school graduates in the South to give them scholarships to go up North and, of course, this was a very tantalizing opportunity. But the effect of it was to deplete the potential of the student body at Negro institutions in the South that were less strong.

Do you have a comment on this problem?

Dr. PFAUTZ. One, it is empirical question, and I don't know whether in fact a significant number have been drained off, so to speak.

I suspect, secondly, that it is very human and understandable that there would be this feeling. I doubt very much whether it has really had that kind of an impact.

These people are not only selected for their abilities and potential but, for the young Negro American from Mississippi with talent and energy, it also takes a good deal of, in a sense, courage to make a decision to go to a northern college, as it would, I think, even for a white person in Mississippi, in the sense of going away from home.

So it is all true that there is this feeling and mood, but I doubt very much, although I don't have the data.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you.

Mr. Esch.

Mr. ESCH. I have questions, but I yield to my senior colleague.

Mr. ERLENBORN. I thank my colleagues for not taking advantage of the seating position.

Dr. Pfautz, I noticed on page 5 of your statement that you have made note of the fact that the institutions making proposals or applications under title III have increasingly asked merely for institutional help rather than having cooperative plans. You apparently draw the conclusion that this would or should lead Congress to fulfill these requests and make institutional help available without cooperative plans.

Do you think that the developing institutions have the ability to use properly and wisely, these institutional grants if they don't have some leadership from outside?

Dr. PFAUTZ. First, I see certainly some meaning in the original concept of title III for cooperative operations, but I think it is also clear that for a significant number—and I have no idea what proportion of our smaller colleges is predominantly Negro and white in terms of what Congressman Brademas was mentioning—their future viability is just tied up with the necessity for certain basic funds.

It isn't that you would expect out of many of these small schools—what shall I say—large advances in programs or anything like this.

I think we are coming to the point where it is just maintenance and to maintain their quality.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Would this fit into your concept of just keeping them going rather than getting them going places? Would you want the institutional grants to be given initially or just as a followup after a cooperative program?

Dr. PFAUTZ. I think that what we need is a graduate and an undergraduate program which would be oriented, on the one hand, to institutional development. And when I say "development" here, I mean a kind of a sensible and responsible development so that one doesn't get in over one's head.

I suspect, for example, that we have many interesting educational curriculum programs which focus on the problems of young people of energy and talent who have suffered because they have gone to poor schools on the primary and secondary levels.

I also personally suspect that many of these programs are oriented to some notion of a clinical education in which you have a very small student-teacher ratio.

Now, I think that if you finally get down to it, you can teach a person a lot. The real problem here is to, I believe, address ourselves to the problem of taking that middle majority of young people who certainly do not in educational terms score 600 and 700 but 300 and 450 and ask what can we do for them in a realistic basis, both educationally and economically.

I suspect that many of these programs actually involve a kind of a clinical approach, very costly, and the question is, when the cooperative grants end, will the college be able to maintain this kind of education at this level?

Mr. ERLENBORN. Do I understand you to say that the institutional grants would be more valid as a continuation after the cooperative effort rather than initially?

Dr. PFAUTZ. That is right.

Mr. ERLENBORN. In your experience at Tougaloo, would it have been valid for them to have been given an institutional grant without a cooperative program to get them started in the right direction?

Dr. PFAUTZ. In the beginning I think no, but there are many small independent colleges who have the administrative cadres and know-how to handle it.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Maybe you could explain to me what sort of grants are now being given. Are they categorical grants?

For instance, would the plan that is approved call for a certain amount of money to be spent in the science part of the college or

another certain number of dollars be devoted to developing the library? Are funds made available just for improving administrative abilities in the school?

Dr. PFAUTZ. Yes. It has been my observation personally that they are in these basic areas I mentioned, curriculum, facility development, administrative development, student services, and long-range planning.

Not every institution requests funds in all areas, although I suspect there is a kind of tendency to. As to what part of the curriculum will be at stake, this depends upon the individual college.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Are funds available, for instance, just to augment the faculty salaries, or would this be prohibited under title III?

Dr. PFAUTZ. I don't know. Let me think.

Of course, I have only been privy to a small and unrepresentative sample of the items, but it has been more along the lines of additional personnel rather than any orientation to raising faculty or administrative salaries of those present.

Now, I suspect that additional personnel often come in at a higher rate, which has some kind of a feedback on other salaries.

But, no, my answer to that would be that by and large it has been money for additional personnel connected with the new programs.

Mr. ERLENBORN. I was interested in your comment about the $100 a day fee. How was that applied, for instance, at Tougaloo, as to you personally or as to the professors who spent a semester there?

Dr. PFAUTZ. It had nothing to do with that, but the point is that when my colleagues who occasionally act as consultants, not those who are there for a semester, go down, they do not receive a consultant's fee. Their expenses are paid. Brown University pays them.

My impression is that in many programs where consultants go from many universities, they go and their expenses are paid. And they are paid $100 a day.

I am rigid enough to feel a little uneasy about this.

Mr. ERLENBORN. You mean those who go for a weekend or a week, not those assigned there for a semester? They certainly would not get the $100 a day fee?

Dr. PFAUTZ. No, sir. That is a different proposition. It is a minor matter.

Mr. ERLENBORN. I have no other questions.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Esch.

Mr. ESCH. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to bore in on title III(B), if we might, on the improvement of the graduate programs.

You suggested that you were somewhat shocked by the inclusion of this function at this particular time. You alluded to the fact that the concept of higher education cannot be diluted.

Are you suggesting that there is only so much expertise and so much comprehension and ability on the graduate level and that we can't dilute that by broadening out the base?

Dr. PFAUTZ. What I am trying to suggest is that I think that there is a Federal difference here.

A graduate educational program grows in terms of the people who are involved in the learning themselves, doing research, which is quite different—and it is not an invidious difference. They are just simply

different functions than what is going on in the individual college, where most of the professor's time is taken up in teaching and being with students, as opposed to in the graduate school in dividing his time between being with the students, doing research and also involving the students in research.

Mr. ESCH. What you are saying is that because we have put money into graduate schools, in effect we have through our research grants supported the extension of graduate schools directly?

Dr. PFAUTZ. Yes, sir.

Mr. ESCH. Would you look at this as a more feasible way to continue in the future.

Dr. PFAUTZ. No. I am certainly for this. Don't misunderstand me. I think we have come to this for many of our graduate schools, and it will be useful to the national, too, to increase their quality.

I think I was surprised, maybe, because I am just not knowledgeable here. But until we have some take on, you know, what is the pattern of funding from this traditional source relative to research? I think it would be a little bit confusing if you suddenly go into institutional development. I think we should have institutional development, but that is quite a different ballgame.

Mr. ESCH. Let me comment that your concern and confusion is reflected by some of us on the committee. We are concerned about starting any broad-base program of development grants on the graduate level and in relationship to what we have extant now. I wonder if you want to comment on one other aspect of that.

The bill says that the geographical or regional emphasis will be placed on the selection of grant recipients as a specific criterion and insofar as practicable and consistent with other purposes of the grant application.

Do you think it is necessary for us to have specific graduate programs spread geographically throughout the country?

Dr. PFAUTZ. I suspect that it is hard to justify this as a primary criterion relative to the movement that we know exists in a country like ours today.

Of course, many institutions even on the undergraduate level, technically the private colleges, seek a kind of heterogeneous student body, which is good for the student.

Certainly the whole notion of graduate education is oriented to a much larger concept than is implied by local or regional considerations, and certainly the faculties of these colleges, I suspect, are increasingly peripatetic in terms of their movement from one to the other.

Mr. ESCH. I appreciate that answer.

Let me emphasize that we have no lack of interest in improvement of graduate programs. Our concern is to develop a program which will encourage the continuation of strong support for the existing programs rather than the diluting of those programs out into institutions that do not have now the expertise in a given area.

One other question in regard to title III(B). That was the Commissioner making grants for the degree of doctor of philosophy or equivalent, and so on, in terms of the graduate programs as such.

Do you look upon any other vehicle or would you suggest any other vehicle we might use other than title III(B) to further the funding

we are beginning to serve? Do you see any other way that we can strengthen graduate schools other than direct grants?

Dr. PFAUTZ. No. I believe in this.

I would agree with Mr. Peiffer that this is what we are going to have to have. I am just concerned that, let's say, in your deliberations that increasingly you have access to kinds of differences, conflicts, and problems and issues that are involved, that to make an impact on the graduate school you have to have a grant of considerable size because graduate education is fairly costly education and it would be quite different from title III, as Mr. Brademas observed, where you spread this out.

I would hate to see large sums of money, you know, that are not large enough to do the job. I would hope and I know it would be in your minds when you deliberate, and I am certainly 100 percent for the idea of a program to support graduate education, to support undergraduate education. And I am certainly committed to the cooperative program, but they are three quite different affairs. I think this is my major concern to communicate.

Mr. ESCH. Thank you very much.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you very much, Professor Pfautz, for your very helpful testimony.

Dr. PFAUTZ. Thank you, sir.

Mr. BRADEMAS. The next witness is Dr. Russell F. W. Smith, representing the National University Extension Association.

We are pleased to have you, Dean Smith. Won't you proceed?

STATEMENTS OF RUSSELL F. W. SMITH, DEAN, SCHOOL OF CONTINUING EDUCATION AND EXTENSION SERVICE, NEW YORK UNIVERSITY; DR. WILLARD THOMPSON, DEAN, GENERAL EXTENSION DIVISION, UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA; AND JAMES M. BANOVETZ, DIRECTOR, CENTER OF RESEARCH IN URBAN GOVERNMENT, LOYOLA UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO, AND CHAIRMAN, STATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR TITLE I, STATE OF ILLINOIS; REPRESENTING THE NATIONAL UNIVERSITY EXTENSION ASSOCIATION

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am Russell F. W. Smith, dean of the School of Continuing Education and Extension Services, New York University. On my right is Willard Thompson, dean of the General Extension Division, University of Minnesota, and on my left is James M. Banovetz, director of the Center of Research in Urban Government, Loyola University of Chicago, and chairman of the State Advisory Committee for title I in the State of Illinois.

We appear before you on behalf of the 129 U.S. member institutions of the National University Extension Association, including most of the leading institutions of higher education, both public and private, that have extension and continuing education programs in 49 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico.

On behalf of my colleagues and our member institutions, I wish to thank the committee and its chairman and its assistant chairman for the privilege of testifying on H.R. 15067, the Higher Education Amendments of 1968, especially title I of the amendments.

Title I is of special concern to universities and colleges with higher continuing education programs because of their already existing involvement in community service programs, both urban and rural. More than four-fifths of our member institutions have participated in planning State programs and carrying out local projects, or are now participating in them.

These institutions also share a concern with institutions of higher education which have not previously been involved in community service programs. Since 1966 the members of our association have been attempting to get private financing to provide technical assistance to small and newly emerging private and public community institutions of higher education for organizing extension and continuing education arms within their institutions.

Some, such as Syracuse University, have operated title I programs for training community service staff people for schools with small or nonexistent continuing education programs. We believe that, if title I and other community service programs are to succeed, the know-how of experienced institutions will have to be extended to those community institutions which have an interest in relating to the needs of their own communities.

On behalf of these institutions we urge in particular three actions with respect to title I: (1) Improve the present late annual funding so that programs will not be foreshortened or forestalled, (2) restore the 75–25 matching formula for funds, and (3) extend the authorization for 5 years through fiscal year 1973.

The record of this subcommittee in seeking to solve the critical late funding problem in Federal educational programs deserves and receives commendation from educational administrators in all the States. Those of us who direct programs of higher continuing education welcome this opportunity to add our voices to the chorus of acclaim. Authorization for forward funding was provided in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act amendments last year. Now we urge the committee to provide the same authorization in funding title I and other relevant sections of the Higher Education Act. Institutions of higher education need to know well in advance of the beginning of the academic year what their staffing and program requirements are when they seek additional staff and faculty and when they must release staff or faculty to other assignments. The Congress has often expressed concern for good management practices in our educational institutions—and properly so—but under the present system we are precluded from this possibility.

If funding of title I remains at 50–50 instead of 75–25 for the current fiscal year, the effectiveness of the program will be greatly reduced. We do not have an exact figure for the number of institutions whose projects for fiscal 1968 have been approved—314 were approved and carried on in fiscal 1967, 78 of them currently still in operation. Of the institutions whose projects have been approved for fiscal 1968, 87 will not be able to accept the grants at 50–50 funding, according to a recent nationwide survey by the Office of Education.

Eighty percent of the 87 are private schools and 20 percent are small or moderate-sized public schools.

My institution, New York University, is one of the private schools. Other institutions in this situation in New York State are Alfred, Columbia, Herbert H. Lehman, and Fordham Universities; Barnard, Brooklyn, City, Mount St. Mary, and Sarah Lawrence Colleges; Pratt Institute; and the New School for Social Research. Lists for other States would be available, I am sure, from the Office of Education.

The overall significance is clear. Private universities and smaller public universities and colleges cannot afford 50–50 matching, cannot "find" the matching funds. This is true in spite of the fact that many of these institutions are located in parts of the States not served by the larger public institutions.

In my own State of New York, where I am a member of the State advisory council on continuing higher education, I see clearly the harm that 50–50 matching will do. There is an unusually large number of private colleges and universities in our State with long-established continuing education and community service programs, including such large universities as the Universities of Rochester, Syracuse, Columbia, and my own institution.

Few of these can afford additional new projects for which 50–50 matching funds must be found, especially because they already have large budgets and consequently large deficits, so that when they undertake a new project over and above the regularly budgeted program, they must expect to find new funds for the new project. My own school, for example, has the largest noncredit continuing education program of any private university in the country, with an express budget more than eight times as large as the title I funds available for the whole State of New York. That does not make it easy to take on additional projects with 50–50 funding.

In addition, New York has many small public institutions, such as the separate campuses of the State University of New York, that do not yet have extension programs or public service programs of staffs or budgets. They have a very real problem in accepting 50–50 funded projects. Although we only have estimates on how many approved projects will be undertaken in the State at 50–50 funding, we do know there have been half as many proposals this year as there were last year.

The result of changing funding from 75–25 to 50–50 is not to make funds go farther, but to defeat the original purpose of the title I if I have understood that purpose. Under the title, it was intended that new projects be undertaken, that new institutions be involved, and that new moneys be used in order to find solutions to pressing community problems. The result of asking the institutions to find a larger percentage of the enabling moneys is to discourage some institutions from developing the new programs which the Congress intended, and others from entering the program at all.

If funds are available early enough and in not more stringent matching terms than 75–25, we most certainly urge the extension of title I through fiscal year 1973. In every State, title I has made possible new programs, new projects, new approaches to community problems

that would have otherwise come much more slowly, if at all, without Federal assistance.

This has certainly been true in New York where successful programs have included midcareer development training for State and municipal employees—incidentally with the cooperation of Dean Bailey—a model training program for lay community planning boards, a program for training community service staff people for schools with small or nonexistent extension divisions, and where the possibility of seeking title I grants encouraged many schools to initiate programs for which they did not receive grants.

To avoid embarassing anyone else, I will cite only an example from my school, where we launched a career information and planning service for women partly because it was a good idea and partly because we had anticipated obtaining a title I grant for it and had put much staff time into its development.

To be sure, the program has a more limited scope and rate of development than if it had been funded under title I, but it has started, and others will start if title I is adequately funded over a period of years. Otherwise community service programs will grow only at the slow pace that characterized them prior to the creation of the title I program.

The program is taking on a new urgency with the enactment and funding of model cities legislation and title VIII of the Housing Act. Efforts are already being made to coordinate what the universities are doing and can do under these three acts. The pitiful inadequacy of the model cities legislation in particular makes it especially important to increase, not decrease, the work that can be accomplished with funds from title I of the Higher Education Act.

Many of us in the universities are anxious to see an expansion of the community service programs that have been given so much stimulus by the relatively small amount of funding under title I. When additional funds become available for domestic problems, we shall certainly urge upon you specialized legislation for educational and training needs of many kinds.

For the present, we urge you most strongly to do as much as you can to make as much available under title I as possible under favorable conditions. These funds are the most versatile, the most flexible support any government has ever provided for education that gets out into the community and directs itself practically to a variety of important social needs.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you very much, Dean Smith, for your very useful statement.

All three of you gentlemen represent States with strong leadership in the field of education, which have major urban areas, cities, metropolitan areas in each and where the sensitivity and support for the kind of program represented by title I could be expected to be considerable.

I would ask all of you or any of you to comment on this pair of questions. Where has the matching money in your States come from for title I, and to what extent has that matching money come from the State governments and from the local governments that might be expected to benefit from title I type programs?

Mr. SMITH. I do understand that in some States there has been the provision of matching funds by State action. No survey of the States that I know of exists, and I do not know in how many places that has happened. In none of the three States that we represent have matching funds been supplied by the State legislatures or by State action.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I have just remarked on the fact that one might expect more forward looking and imaginative leadership from your States than out of some others. In view of the fact that States could expect to benefit from the kinds of programs supported here, why this abdication of State responsibility?

Mr. SMITH. Well, of course, I should be glad to try to answer that, but I would have to say that I have to be guessing about peoples' intentions. I think that the problem in our State legislatures is not unlike what seems to me to be a problem sometimes in Congress, that where you have already done a good deal in particular areas, it seems all the harder to find extra funds for similar purposes.

So that, it has been proposed in each of our States that State funds should be made available. Such a proposal has not yet been successful. I hope that we might be able to report in another year or two that it would be and, of course, if State funds did become available upon a fairly wide basis to supply matching funds, then the question of 75–25, 50–50 would be a much less relevant question than it is today.

Mr. BRADEMAS. That is exactly, of course, why I raised this question. I take it that it is not unconstitutional in any of the States represented by you three gentlemen for your State legislature to vote some money for these purposes?

Mr. SMITH. Actually that is a question in New York State where you can divide both the members of the legislature and the public as to whether it is constitutional.

Mr. BRADEMAS. For your church-supported institutions?

Mr. SMITH. Yes, and private. There is some hesitation about that because if you say private then that presumably includes church supported. But certainly I think a majority opinion in the legislature now is in favor of such support as shown by the reception of the Bundy report which is concerned with higher education but not higher continuing education.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Do either of you other gentlemen have a comment?

Dr. THOMPSON. I think part of it is on the uncertainty of title I and its funding, so that, if there were to be a more significant statement as to the future of the act that the possibility of persuading the State legislatures to appropriate funds for matching purposes would be increased greatly, but there has been a great deal of uncertainty with respect to the total act.

Our legislature adjourned in June of last year and will not convene again until January of next year. This was in this period. Now, the possibility of this kind of action in the next legislature is greatly increased, I think, and would be substantially increased if there were something more definite with respect to the act.

Mr. SMITH. This is part of the early funding.

Dr. THOMPSON. That is right.

Mr. BANOVETZ. This was specifically part of the case in Illinois. When our legislature last met in early 1967 or just prior to the meeting of the legislature the word we had received at that time indicated

that there was a possibility that title I would not be funded for fiscal year 1967 in which case a legislative appropriation by the State legislature would find no funds with which to match.

This was, I am sure, a part of the reason why our efforts to secure State matching funds at that time was not successful.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Almost thou persuadeth me, but not really. I am very dubious, in all candor, about that kind of an explanation. I think what we are really saying here is that the State politicians don't want to vote the money but want the Federal politicians to vote the money.

Mr. SMITH. I think that clearly does enter into it. I think that State legislators as well perhaps as Federal ones are not quite sure just what can be accomplished in terms of what are the purposes of title I and are in part waiting to have this proved to them. I think that is one reason for hoping that the situation may change in State legislatures.

Mr. BRADEMAS. That ought to be your job, though, ought it not?

Mr. SMITH. Indeed. I am not saying that that is your job. I am just explaining that I do think that we have more chance of persuading our own legislatures each year than we had the year before that this sort of thing should be done.

Dr. THOMPSON. And the legislature, at least in Minnesota, has not been totally reluctant to appropriate funds this way. Historically over a long period of time they have done this in terms of cooperative extension. They have in the past legislature appropriated matching funds for use in support of the Technical Services Act, and they have provided funds to establish an office to make possible some of the things under title VIII of the Housing Act.

So it is not without precedent. I think it is in large part the uncertainty that has been attendant upon title I efforts.

Mr. BANOVETZ. I think an added part of this picture, Mr. Chairman, at least in my own State of Illinois has been the nature of the priorities which the State has currently established for the development of higher education.

As Congressman Erlenborn well knows, the State is now engaged in a massive attempt to develop what we call community colleges or the 2-year junior college institution and a major part of the functions perceived for the junior college are community service and continuing education activities. The funds are going into this channel at the moment and the title I advisory committee in the State is making a great deal of effort to help junior colleges with title I funds develop these specific kinds of programs.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Let me just make one observation before I yield to Mr. Erlenborn.

I am not trying to be combative. I am on your side, as you can judge. I have certainly nothing to boast about because I think my State of Indiana is one of the few in the country—and I see Mr. Robert Pitchell with you who is from my State—I think we are one of the few States that do not participate in title I or the Technical Services Act, so that we have a distance to go.

The only point I was trying to get across is that in both these fields, it seems to me that there has not been nearly enough effective leadership on the part of the university community, but perhaps still more the political leaders in those States. There is a great deal of cry about

States rights, but when the States rights rhetoric seems to entail a State legislator's standing up and being counted and voting for a revenue or appropriations measure to lend credibility to his rhetoric, then suddenly there is a great flight from States rights.

I apologize for the sermon.

Mr. Erlenborn.

Mr. SMITH. It's a useful sermon. We will promise to quote you to our State governments.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I am a States righter, provided this means States display their share of responsibility for these programs.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Let me say that I appreciate the gentleman's comments. I like to hear him talking that way. I want to thank all three of you for being here. I am particularly glad to see you, Mr. Banovetz, from my Alma Mater, Loyola.

The question of the effect of 50–50 funding rather than 75–25 leaves me a little confused. Aren't you presently in fiscal year 1968 under 50–50 funding?

This is not anticipated but you are presently operating under this.

Mr. SMITH. Yes and no, I am afraid. It is a confusing situation. In various States the State agencies concerned with title I have found their own patterns of behavior.

For example, in New York State as late as November information was being sent by the State agency to the colleges and universities of the State saying, "It is probably a good time to be making proposals for fiscal 1968 pretty soon. We wish you would be thinking about this, but it is not yet clear whether they will be 50–50 or 75–25 and consequently we are not even quite sure what the deadline for getting in applications will be."

So that applications have come in. Some applications have stipulated 75–25. Some said 75–25 or 50–50 whatever is available. Some of these proposals have been tentatively approved. But none of the money for fiscal 1968 has been officially committed in our State yet. In other States the situation is different.

In the three States that we represent there have been fewer proposals because of the 50–50 which is one thing we need and Dean Thompson was pointing out last night that in his State proposals were originally solicited at 75–25 and then people were notified that they would have to be at 50–50 and they would have to reconstruct their proposals and, when the proposals came back in, most of them had been scaled down so that the institution would still be funding the same maximum amount of funds and would do less for what it is going to get than it would have otherwise done.

One of the things that worries us about 50–50 is the experience that we are seeing of the institutions that say that they can't do it, the ones that have reported this to the Office of Education, and the fact that even in our own States we see fewer proposals being made and the proposals being made on a smaller scale.

Mr. ERLENBORN. I am still confused. Since it would seem to me that applications for fiscal year 1968 should be made prior to the beginning of the fiscal year or at least prior to the beginning of the academic year, it would seem to me that your applications for fiscal 1968 would be for programs funded in 1968 and we only have a few short months left in fiscal 1968.

Mr. SMITH. I am sorry I didn't make a point about that, that the requirement with these funds is that they be committed by the end of fiscal 1968 through programs that are funded with fiscal 1968 money can begin, for example, as late as fall of 1968 and before the academic year 1968–69.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Then you do, in effect, have a 1-year advance funding?

Mr. SMITH. Yes, in effect we do. There are problems about it, however. One of the great ones is the kind of confusion there is in the States agencies in terms of what applies to a particular fiscal year when the questions do get settled rather late so that we have had confusing situations in our various States this year. Unless the information is in and is fairly definite, the amount of money and preferably the conditions under which the money will be available, what matching requirements there will be, it is difficult for a State agency to go through the proper procedures in developing an appropriate State plan which must be completed before the beginning of the fiscal year.

It is only a pious guess when what the funds are to be is not known. To say that x percent of the money will be spent on such and such when you don't know x percent of what, is making an unrealistic State plan. If you make an unrealistic State plan and request proposals, people are not quite sure what to do about making their proposals, and when the proposals come in, most of our State agencies especially in the States that have been particularly active in this program are concerned in many cases with further conversations with the college or the university that makes the proposal.

The college has not realized that certain expenses are not allowable, there is the possibility that they have not considered things that have been done in other places in presenting what there is and you go back to them. By the time you do this kind of negotiation, the time disappears. While we could theoretically fund all of the programs from fiscal 1968 as late as the last week in June of 1968, the kind of procedure that has to be gone through before you collect proposals is difficult to do in less than 3 months and the time that needs to be taken in making proposals for the different universities is usually a month or two, and then it is desirable to have as much as 6 months' operation between when these proposals begin to come in and when they can be cleared. So that, a full year's lead is all that we think we can reasonably ask for and is difficult enough to operate within.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Would it be true that most or all of the funds appropriated for fiscal 1968 are obligated in 1968 and spent in fiscal 1969?

Mr. SMITH. No; this varies considerably from State to State. Many proposals in various States for fiscal 1968 are already in operation. None of the proposals for 1968 in New York are yet in operation. There are many programs in operation but they are ones funded in 1967.

Minnesota has a somewhat different situation.

Dr. THOMPSON. We have a mixture. Some programs will not be started until later, but others we began as quickly as we were assured of the funding. In fact, the urgency to get certain programs started is so great that the university established a budget on faith and made

funds available that could be used until such time as the dollars began to flow from the Federal funds.

Included here in addition to the need to get certain programs underway because of the urgency of them, we felt was the need to try to develop a viable program of title I in sufficient time to be able to report back to the Congress as to the effectiveness of the program.

One of the things that we hear most frequently from Washington is that Congress would like to have some evidence as to the effectiveness of title I but if we keep pushing back the starting dates for these various programs, the period in which you are going to get an accurate evaluation of what can be achieved is also pushed back into the somewhat distant future.

Mr. ERLENBORN. What was the first year of funding for this program, title I?

Mr. SMITH. 1966.

Mr. ERLENBORN. 1966. So you had 75–25 funding for fiscal 1966 and fiscal 1967.

Mr. SMITH. Right.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Those programs that are now operating with fiscal 1968 funds are presently 50–50?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

Mr. ERLENBORN. If they are operating under funds appropriated for fiscal 1967, committed that year but now being spent, then they are 75–25 so that you have a mix.

Dr. THOMPSON. Right

Mr. SMITH. That is right.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Let me ask, does your organization, which is the National University Extension Association, represent only 4-year universities or does it also have the community colleges?

Mr. SMITH. It does not exclude community colleges. It is open to membership in them, but so far it has a very limited membership of them. We do have community college members.

Mr. ERLENBORN. I notice you have 49 States here. Which State is not represented?

Mr. SMITH. I have a list here but I am not really sure. Is either of you? May we ask Mr. Pitchell, who is in the back of the room?

It is Vermont, not Indiana we are glad to assure you.

Mr. ERLENBORN. I note on page 3 your comment:

> Few of these—
>
> Referring to institutions—
>
> can afford additional new projects for which 50–50 matching funds must be found, especially because they already have large budgets and consequently deficits * * *.

You are familiar, of course, with the Federal budget and the Federal deficit. Do you think that we here are in a better position to finance these programs?

Mr. SMITH. That I would be asked where we have deficits or how we operate with them I had anticipated, but to try to judge our relative ease in handling these deficits, no; I haven't really speculated about that. But it certainly is true that the private colleges and universities are indeed being rather hard pushed about budgets.

I refer you to the recent Bundy report which has specific reference to New York State, but it applies on a nationwide basis. It is not literally true, according to Mr. Bundy, that most of the private colleges and universities are actually in the process of breaking up and disappearing. They are in considerable risk of becoming underdeveloped institutions, however, in terms of not being able to do the kind of quality job that they should do if they don't find more assistance in terms of budgets.

Now, when it comes to the matter of community service programs of the kind that we are talking about here, many of the private colleges and universities have assumed over the years that they could afford to do nothing about this at all in terms of their ordinary budgets.

There are some of us that have been, we think, fortunate enough to have central administrations who have approved of this kind of notion and have tried to do something about it. It is really rather an anomaly that a private university like my own should have as large a program of this kind as it does. It is the sort of thing that one expects to find more often in the large State universities where a good deal of the money has been voted by a State legislature.

With the private college our only equivalent is, of course, what it is that we can get from philanthropy, from unspecialized grants from foundations. For us to operate an extension program does mean for us to be operating something whose operation cost is more than its income is, and when we are asked to find extra financing for extra projects, this pushes rather hard.

Now, it is true that the larger places can make some decision priorities about the deficit, where it is going to lie. In that sense the problem is comparable to what you have with Congress in deciding how big your deficit shall be and what things shall contribute to it. So that we do make decisions of this kind and so do go ahead with some programs.

What seems desirable is for the title I legislation to encourage people to do more of this. The more attractive the legislation is in terms of offering a considerable percentage of the costs of the program, the more likely it is that more places will make more good proposals and it will be possible to pick among very good proposals instead of having to take proposals from whoever is either rich enough or foolish enough to make one, which can be the case.

Mr. ERLENBORN. In the several different programs of Federal aid for higher education, I think we have established some priorities sometimes unmeaningly by the kind of matching provisions that we have. For instance, the work-study program was 90–10 and has now gone to 85–15. It must be much more attractive to put your money into a program like that when establishing your own priorities because not only do you get a higher Federal subsidy but you are also getting the benefit of the students' work under this program. All of these programs seem to start on the concept that the Federal contribution is seed money to get the program going. We make it attractive with the amount of seed money, and it seems quite clear that the Office of Education says this is seed money. We are going to have a high level of funding at the beginning and a stepdown built

right into the act, and as the program gets going the Federal contribution will become less.

So often the acceptance of these funds by the university seems to be like getting started on dope. When you reach a certain level, it is very difficult to reduce that level without there being a very difficult traumatic experience. We find that we have gone to 85–15 in the work-study program. Even though the law originally called for 75–25, this year we modified it and made it 85–15, and this still has been a traumatic experience for the universities who would like to go to 90–10 or even 100-percent Federal financing.

The program when you advanced it called for 50–50, but like dope, when you get started on that level, it is difficult to cut back.

Mr. SMITH. Your analogy is certainly an interesting one, Mr. Erlenborn. I wouldn't doubt that the universities occasionally get hooked on it. There have been, however, some rather different circumstances. When this was originally proposed with the stepdown, it was also proposed on a much broader, much larger expenditure of funds than now and it was reasonable to suppose that it was going to be possible to demonstrate much more clearly and much more quickly the effectiveness of community service programs.

So that perhaps if we had had for title I the kind of financing that was originally authorized, we would have been able to make a much happier reply to the chairman's question whether the State legislatures are supplying the matching funds. We might have been able to carry the case better. We thought so at least, and we still would hope that it would be possible to do this and this is why we support the amendment that proposes to continue 75–25 for 1968–69 and then to drop to 50–50 for the succeeding years.

This is based upon a hope that it is going to be possible to make a good case for the successful continuing operation on a cutdown basis at that time.

I must add as a private individual from a private institution that I have hope of this, but not certainty of it. If support of these operations in both public and private universities is not to be found in the States, then the number of institutions that can participate effectively under 50–50 would be relatively smaller. There still might be in terms of a continued period of operation sufficient enough that it would be entirely reasonable to go ahead with the operation and simply to leave the private colleges and universities out of it. I wouldn't be perfectly happy about being left out of it because we are devoted to this particular notion, but sometimes funds reach only so far.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Then you really can't give me any assurance that if the 75–25 is extended for another couple of years we won't find either you or some of your colleagues coming here saying that the withdrawal symptoms then are too great to experience?

Mr. SMITH. No; I can't give you an assurance of it, but we have as a rather loosely tied together association of universities discussed this and we think what is proposed in this amendment makes sense, and that really only means that we hope that it will not be necessary to come back.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I might observe that Mr. Erlenborn may be pressing a policy of LSD, "less seed dollars," here, but I don't think I will say that.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you very much, Dean Smith and Dean Thompson, and Mr. Banovetz. We are very grateful to you for your very thoughtful testimony.

We are adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 12:20 p.m. the subcommittee recessed, subject to call.)

HIGHER EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1968

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1968

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION
OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met at 10:15 a.m., pursuant to recess, in room 2261, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Edith Green (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Representatives Green, Brademas, Burton, Quie, and Esch.

Staff members present: William F. Gaul, associate general counsel.

Mrs. GREEN. The subcommittee will come to order for the further consideration of H.R. 15067, the Higher Education Amendments of 1968.

This morning we are very pleased to have a panel from the higher education community, Dr. Morton, the executive secretary of the Missouri Commission on Higher Education; a friend of this committee, Father Collins from Georgetown University, and Mr. Jones, the executive secretary of the Commission of Higher Education for the State of West Virginia.

May I express on behalf of all of the members of the subcommittee our appreciation for taking time out of your schedules and coming to this hearing this morning to give us the benefit of your views and recommendations.

Have you gentlemen agreed upon a method of procedure? Dr. Morton, you are going to lead off?

Mr. MORTON. Yes, Mrs. Green, if it is all right with you.

Mrs. GREEN. All right.

STATEMENT OF DR. BEN MORTON, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, MISSOURI COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION, ON BEHALF OF ASSOCIATION OF EXECUTIVE DIRECTORS OF HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES

Mr. MORTON. Mrs. Green, I am here to represent the Association of Executive Directors of Higher Education Facilities Commissions. So I am attempting, although it is very difficult, to speak for these 50 groups around the country. I know your time is limited.

I have prepared a written statement which I think you have. If you will prefer, I will just hit the highlights rather than go down and read it all.

92-371—68—pt. 1——24

Mrs. GREEN. Your full statement will be made a part of the record at this point.

Mr. MORTON. Thank you.

(The document referred to follows:)

STATEMENT OF DR. BEN MORTON, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, MISSOURI COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

My comments today will focus on the proposed amendments, including a few additional suggestions for your consideration, on Title VI, Part A, of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (the Federal grant program for instructional equipment and materials), and Title I of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 (the Federal grant program for the construction of undergraduate academic facilities). Also, we would like to offer some general comments concerning the two programs, growing out of our experience in administering them at the state level. Finally, if you will allow it, we wish to comment on levels of funding.

GENERAL COMMENTS

The majority of our members indicate that the Facilities Act, particularly Title I, has stimulated construction of badly needed facilities. At least in some cases, the program has been the impetus needed to produce the rest of the necessary financing from both private and public sources.

The easiest demand to defer, under financial pressures for ever higher faculty salaries and allied rising operational costs, is that for capital facilities. One can "make do" for a time with overcrowded conditions and the use of surplus barracks and rented houses. However, such a situation over any period of time, can have serious consequences for the educational program. The Facilities Act has been a healthy counterbalance. The need still very much exists.

The instructional equipment and materials program (Higher Education Act of 1965, Title VI, Part A) has served a similar purpose. For several reasons, faculty salaries have been rising at a rate of five to seven percent per year. Competition for professors has been keen because of rapidly expanding demand caused by rising enrollments and the establishment and expansion of many colleges and universities. The supply and demand imbalance has also created demands for higher teaching loads. Personnel costs at institutions of higher education, particularly for able faculty members, are thus somewhat dictated by the cited market conditions. The natural course to follow is to cut purchases of teaching equipment, library materials, and the like. Again, as in the case of the Facilities Act, Title VI is acting as a healthy counterbalance.

Now, I would like to turn to a review of the specific suggestions our group, as a collection of administrative officers at the state level, would like to offer.

Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, title I

The main suggestion we would like to make has not been proposed in amendments offered for the Facilities Act. It relates to that portion of Section 106 of P.L. 88-204, dealing with institutional eligibility. As presently enacted, it says:

"An institution of higher education shall be eligible for a grant for construction of an academic facility under this title only if such construction will, either alone or together with other construction to be undertaken within a reasonable time, (1) result in an urgently needed substantial expansion of the institution's student enrollment capacity or capacity to carry out extension and continuing education programs on the new campus of such institution, or (2) in the case of a new institution of higher education, result in creating urgently needed enrollment capacity or capacity to carry out extension and continuing education programs on the campus of such institution".

Please note we are talking about the basic institutional eligibility and not the way priorities are established.

We believe that considerations other than raw enrollment growth criteria should play some part in determining the eligibility, or expressed another way, the basic need for the facility.

There are many instances where a college or university desperately needs to renovate or replace existing space in order to adequately serve even its present student body. It must often be done in order to establish a reasonable facility base for enrollment expansion. The most usual example is "Old Main" built to last forever some 30 to 50 years ago. Because of room size mix, and general physical condition, the structure has definitely limited utilization potential. Yet, the square feet are there if renovation can make them truly usable (often it can). If renovation isn't feasible, then the space should be replaced with new construction, and not assumed to be part of the existing facilities pool.

We would recommend the present language in Section 106 be replaced with something like the following:

"An institution of higher education shall be eligible for a grant for construction of an academic facility under this title only if the State Commission determines that, in the particular case and in the institutional context, the facilities included in the project constitute essential needs of the institution and will be fully and efficiently utilized for academic purposes, or in support of the operation of facilities which will be needed for such purposes."

Priority emphasis, as it should be, is still on enrollment expansion capacity generated, since under Office of Education regulation at least 25 percent of the priority rating rests with this factor, with another ten percent on the number of square feet of space to be added by the new construction, and still another ten percent relating to utilization of existing facilities.

Higher Education Act of 1965, Part A, Title VI

There have been a number of amendments proposed to Part A, Title VI, of the Higher Education Act of 1965. Our group would like to offer some recommendations concerning these items.

First, we feel the elimination of subject matter categories is desirable. In fact, the current listing of eligible subjects is virtually all inclusive of academic disciplines. The basic approach in Part A of Title VI should be to justify the need for equipment in terms of programmatic improvement. The increased flexibility provided by the elimination of categorical limitations should aid in zeroing in on basic programmatic goals. Furthermore, it is often not practical to directly relate equipment needs to one specific department or course.

The proposed broadening of the language to include instructional equipment and materials at all levels, rather than just so-called undergraduate items, is a practical move. In fact, the line of demarcation between instructional aids at the various levels is a rather vast gray zone. Because of the system of priority criteria, the advantage will still go to the institutions with primarily undergraduate programs. This is proper since other sources of funding for sophisticated graduate-research type of equipment, at least by the Federal government, are more plentiful than for basic undergraduate assistance.

The Association supports the proposed amendment which would prohibit the purchase of "athletic or recreational equipment" under Title VI. The Association, however, construes this language to mean that equipment for physical education courses would still be eligible. We believe that most, if not all State Commissions, have attempted to administer the existing language in this manner. The distinction between equipment for "physical education" and for "athletic and recreational" purposes can be further clarified in the U.S. Office of Education by Federal regulations.

A majority of our association members would like to propose for your consideration three other amendments for Title VI. I will state them very briefly.

We recommend that in Section 603, subparagraph two, the word "objective" be stricken from the law. Many state commissions would like the opportunity to use such methods as evaluation panels to set priorities. Those that would wish to do so, could still keep their plans on an objective basis.

We suggest consortium of colleges and universities be eligible to receive Title VI grants. We feel that in some instances, equipment could thus be more extensively utilized to the benefits of more students.

The Association recommends that the present legislation, placing closed-circuit television equipment in a second category from other instructional equip-

ment and materials, be amended to include closed-circuit television as only one of the many sophisticated educational media available today. This particular instructional approach has had two years of special emphasis under Title VI. The Association believes that it is appropriate at this time for closed-circuit television projects to compete along with projects utilizing other educational media. Increasingly, the various types of educational hardware are used in integrated teaching approaches. And we should approach funding in terms of programmatic needs.

As a final reference to Title VI, we must point out that current funding levels do not nearly meet the needs. Many state plans reflect the fund limitations in that the Federal share is set at well below the fifty percent allowable. Institutions are aware of the limited funds available so they frequently do not apply for needed equipment and materials because the chances of receiving a grant are relatively slim, or the probable reduced Federal share makes it impossible for them to finance the balance.

Title III of the Higher Education Facilities Act

Although our commissions do not directly have any responsibilities for facilities loans, nevertheless, we do interest ourselves in total facilities development. In this context, we would point out that raising the interest rate will ultimately reduce income available for other purposes in higher education or increased costs to students.

IDEAS FOR THE FUTURE

The Association recognizes that the proposed legislation, and our suggestions alike, simply represent efforts for improvement in existing legislation. For longer term purposes, we recommend consideration of some more far reaching changes as soon as possible.

In particular, we are concerned with having a more direct and coordinated relationship among all the Federal programs for capital improvements and equipment. Academic facility needs are directly related to residence facilities. Library items are an important consideration in the total equipment and materials situation. In fact, one can argue that very direct relationships exist among all the physical requirements of a campus.

As a practical step toward a more integrated aid program, we suggest consideration be given to transferring the loan program for self-amortizing facilities such as dormitories and student unions, to the U.S. Office of Education. This proposal is currently appropriate since the Office of Education is establishing its own construction service in field offices.

We believe there is merit in broadening the Higher Education Facilities Act to make it the basic program for Federal participation in the constructon of higher education facilities. Title VI could perform a similar role with respect to Federal participation in the purchase of instructional equipment and materials.

In general, it would appear the concept of state agencies for higher education, working in close partnership with the U.S. Office of Education, can achieve two objectives. First, desirable national educational goals can be pursued. Second, local variations can be adequately accounted for. We have found the ongoing partnership with the Facilities branch most conducive to creative administration of the programs. The individuals involved at the Washington level have provided strong and positive leadership. At the same time, they have given the State Commissions the needed flexibility to properly account for particular local differences. The arrangement has worked well to the end of advancing American higher education.

LEVEL OF FACILITIES FUNDING

As you might suspect, we feel compelled to comment on the abrupt change in level of funding and the subsequent impact. For if American higher education is to prepare at all adequately for the responsibilities of the near future, the facts seem to us to point toward even higher levels of construction activity and planning.

It is true that construction now in the pipeline will possibly increase slightly the overall square footage available on a per student basis. That is, it will be true if national enrollment projections are accurate. In the past they have almost invariably been conservative. However, such an analysis is, in our judgment, an over-simplification for several reasons.

First, a great deal of the available space is not really usable on an efficient basis. Much is old and designed for programs of yesteryear. Much is located on campuses where, either by institutional decision or because of the nature of things, enrollment growth will not occur.

Second, there is a change taking place in higher educational programming which relates directly to space needs. The fastest growing enrollments are in graduate and technical education, where much more space is needed on a per student basis than for undergraduate arts and sciences or teacher education.

Third, the more favorable per student space amounts will very shortly be reversed if we slow down now. The impact will be felt in three to five years, a time when enrollment increases will go up again.

Perhaps the most compelling point lies in the perceived needs by states and institutions. Attached to this testimony is hastily compiled data for Title I of the Higher Education Facilities Act as per fiscal year 1968. Please note that applications far exceed the amount available in most states and we know that many more applications would have been filed if the institutions could have seen a reasonable hope for funding. Although no one would suggest that every project is critical, there must have been some evidence of real need or the two thirds of the cost required as matching for the expected Federal funds would not have been provided.

What will happen to the projects which were planned on the basis of one third federal funding? The answer, of course, will vary with every situation.

The first alternative is to go ahead with the project by either reducing its scope one third or securing funding elsewhere. Hopefully, reduced projects won't happen too often since, presumably, the buildings were designed in relation to a particular program or activity. If funds are secured elsewhere, this will have the effect of taking resources away from hard pressed operations budgets or other needed construction. Or the costs will be charged back to students, thus negating somewhat the push to provide more educational opportunities.

The second alternative is to hold up construction until such time as Federal funds do become available. The problem here of course, relates to rising costs and the disruption of planning timetables.

For better or worse, the cuts tend to affect most the private colleges and universities. The basic law, Federal regulations and state plans all put high priority on enrollment growth as such. When funds are sharply limited, the resultant priority ratings almost always favor the large, rapidly growing institutions. These tend to be the public ones. Involved here are some implications for the dual system of higher education.

Our association is fully aware that data and apparent facts are often contradictory. We know that sometimes existing space isn't as well utilized as well as it might be, commensurate with a reasonable physical climate for the educational process. However, we are generally convinced from first hand experience in our various states that much real need still exists. We are reasonably sure that the reduced funding will cause serious problems for the future.

FISCAL 1968 STATUS OF HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES ACT, TITLE I

As reported by State commissions, Feb. 21, 1968

State	Sec. 103			Sec. 104		
	Funds requested	State allotment	Deficiency	Funds requested	State allotment	Deficiency
Alabama	$2,159,187	$1,627,668	$531,519	$8,463,962	$3,198,834	$5,265,128
Alaska	0	[1] 0	0	867,614	[1] 229,391	638,223
Arizona	1,540,078	640,961	899,117	3,204,999	1,877,254	1,327,745
Arkansas	158,905	[1] 158,905	0	2,688,413	[1] 2,509,517	178,896
California	13,873,174	5,265,020	8,608,154	38,443,019	21,845,718	16,597,301
Colorado	914,755	748,599	166,156	3,979,436	2,483,671	1,495,765
Connecticut	1,100,863	701,230	399,633	6,106,206	2,676,180	3,430,026
Delaware	134,679	128,815	5,864	944,739	467,984	476,755
District of Columbia	0	[1] 0	0	9,249,685	[1] 1,319,313	7,930,372
Florida	3,525,309	1,871,424	1,653,885	7,140,553	5,196,834	1,943,719
Georgia	1,541,632	[1] 1,541,632	0	6,320,025	[1] 3,884,226	2,435,799
Idaho	375,000	321,697	53,303	1,224,817	816,985	407,832
Illinois	10,692,565	2,674,158	8,018,407	15,699,905	10,163,100	5,536,805
Indiana	3,300,000	[2] 1,992,912	1,307,088	4,800,000	[2] 4,800,000	0
Iowa	3,515,382	1,141,069	2,368,313	4,901,950	3,273,427	1,628,523
Kansas	1,023,626	828,828	194,798	4,579,915	2,646,008	1,933,907
Kentucky	3,248,369	1,454,405	1,793,964	8,139,309	3,003,519	5,135,790
Louisiana	3,011,987	1,478,016	1,533,971	11,953,409	3,519,830	8,433,579
Maine	0	[1] 0	0	2,853,711	[1] 1,339,391	1,514,320
Maryland	4,264,494	1,080,666	3,183,828	5,007,492	3,253,871	1,753,621
Massachusetts	4,517,916	1,732,775	2,785,141	15,108,680	6,360,586	8,748,094
Michigan	19,418,198	[2] 6,583,755	12,834,443	5,405,841	[2] 5,405,841	0
Minnesota	1,701,796	1,491,648	210,148	5,005,159	4,251,238	753,921
Mississippi	1,509,140	1,002,140	507,000	4,550,072	2,240,072	2,310,000
Missouri	8,427,734	1,582,831	6,844,903	9,718,334	4,539,156	5,179,178
Montana	518,618	292,342	226,276	1,840,000	786,225	1,053,775
Nebraska	251,390	[1] 251,390	0	4,666,306	[1] 1,957,306	2,709,000
Nevada	0	[1] 0	0	505,000	[1] 418,094	87,906
New Hampshire	258,087	[1] 258,087	0	1,522,777	[1] 775,586	747,191
New Jersey	20,197,383	1,784,573	18,412,810	16,204,208	5,055,032	11,149,176
New Mexico	66,602	[1] 66,602	0	2,746,539	[1] 1,511,512	1,235,027
New York	11,283,722	4,036,894	7,246,828	26,837,427	16,867,427	9,970,000
North Carolina	3,771,064	2,159,919	1,611,145	14,557,907	4,748,834	9,809,073
North Dakota	409,748	[2] 409,748	0	528,925	691,706	[3] (162,781)
Ohio	4,821,080	3,463,504	1,357,576	22,885,648	10,074,030	12,811,618
Oklahoma	593,701	[1] 593,701	0	7,215,772	3,254,776	3,960,996
Oregon	9,219,764	777,176	8,442,588	5,573,189	2,442,360	3,130,829
Pennsylvania	10,052,000	4,311,271	14,740,729	19,510,000	11,036,512	8,473,488
Rhode Island	296,236	296,236	0	2,840,784	950,233	1,890,551
South Carolina	1,955,277	[2] 1,619,296	335,981	1,773,358	[2] 1,773,358	0
South Dakota	0	[1] 0	0	2,151,406	[1] 1,185,946	965,460
Tennessee	1,619,988	1,563,455	56,533	7,195,999	3,669,668	3,526,331
Texas	10,021,084	3,572,262	6,448,822	35,212,975	10,481,437	24,731,538
Utah	30,840	[1] 30,840	0	5,100,000	[1] 2,139,614	2,960,386
Vermont	179,007	179,007	0	1,919,210	506,765	1,412,445
Virginia	2,242,143	1,553,572	688,571	6,945,884	3,702,340	3,243,544
Washington	3,746,800	1,115,036	2,631,764	5,555,229	3,921,752	1,633,477
West Virginia	618,228	[1] 618,228	0	8,277,113	[1] 2,177,058	6,100,055
Wisconsin	4,475,148	1,633,948	2,841,200	8,050,501	4,778,123	3,272,378
Wyoming	360,571	134,560	226,011	2,566,882	376,968	2,189,914
Total	185,943,270	66,776,801	119,166,469	398,541,284	196,584,608	201,956,676

[1] Remaining sec. 103 funds in allotment transferred to sec. 104.
[2] Remaining sec. 104 funds in allotment transferred to sec. 103.
[3] Balance.

Note: Information for Hawaii was not available.

Mr. MORTON. There are really three parts I would like to comment on, Madam Chairman. First, we would like to point out to you that we feel very strongly that the approach that is taken through the Higher Education Facilities Act and the title VI program is working out very well and is very popular in our various States for the most part.

We comment in here on why we think it has also been a very good aid to the realization of national policy, perhaps, too, to increase the higher education opportunities in this country.

Second, we would like to make some specific comments on the amendments that have been proposed by the administration and some of our own we would like to throw out for your consideration.

The first I would like to touch on is not in the recommendations for this time. It is the one that relates to the Higher Education Facilities Act, title I. We call your attention to section 106 of that act as it was originally passed which has to do with institution eligibility. This is on page 2 of my testimony as written, at the bottom of the page.

There is a very heavy stress, as you know, almost complete stress, in this eligibility requirement on raw enrollment growth as such, as a requirement to become eligible to even be considered for one of these groups.

I would like to point out that we are talking here about basic institution eligibility, not the way priorities are to be established.

We don't want to change that. There are cases I think where a college or university we believe does desperately need to renovate or replace existing space or they will not able to serve the student body they have already. And I think it must often be done in order to even establish a base for any enrollment increases for the future.

The most usual case, of course, is the "Old Main" that every campus has in the United States which was built at the turn of the century or before. It was built to last 100 or 200 years but yet by today's standards its utilization is not very great.

The size of the rooms are such that they do not match up to modern-day techniques. Frequently you can renovate a building like this and make it something worth using, something worthwhile.

The way it is now these kinds of buildings, frequently, because of the nature of section 106, cannot even become eligible for consideration.

So we do suggest that some rewording of this section be made if this is possible, which in effect will allow commissions, our proposal here is, or some other means if there is a better way, to make some judgments or some hopefully objective analysis if that is possible, of this particular kind of case.

That is the base to go from before you can make your enrollment expansions.

Mr. QUIE. May I ask a question here? It is my recollection that in previous consideration of the Higher Education Facilities Act we did that. Is there nothing in the act? Maybe it was in the report—but I do recall this coming up before.

Mr. MORTON. To my knowledge, Mr. Quie, there is no change that I know of.

Mr. QUIE. I guess we discussed it but did not actually include it.

Mr. MORTON. Right.

What we are trying to say in essence on this particular point is that nobody would suggest that we change the basic thrust which is to put the higher priorities where the enrollments are going to be but there are many cases where you can prepare an institution to take more students by doing things like this and this is all we are talking about.

I suspect this is enough on that point unless there are further questions.

I would like to turn now to the title VI amendments of which there are more proposed by the administration and also by us.

They are largely technical amendments, although I would like to say something later on about the general philosophical approach to this for your consideration.

First of all, we do feel that the elimination of subject matter categories is desirable as proposed in the bill that you are considering.

In fact, we would suggest that the current listing of eligible subjects is in fact exclusive of all academic disciplines anyway.

There are just a few left out. I think what we are getting at here is to begin to focus more on programatic improvement rather than just talking specifically of nuts and bolts and things.

You can get a little broader. It does give increased flexibility.

Second, of course, it is more practical to relate equipment needs to broader spectrum than to one specific department or course.

I know members of this committee are familiar with how these things happen and frequently some materials and equipment should be used across the spectrums and this makes it easier to do it.

The second point where it is proposed the language be broadened to include instructional equipment at all levels rather than undergraduate items, we suggest it is a practical move.

It was not discussed within our group. We did feel from our own experience that the line of demarcation for instructional aids as such at the various levels is pretty gray. It is very difficult to really do this.

I suspect there has been a good bit of subterfuge used in the past in order to somehow or other to be sure it is undergraduate when really it is going to be used across the line in the institution.

We would say, of course, that because of the system of priority criteria which, of course, as you know, gives advantage to the poor institution in terms of expenditure per student credit hour, still the top priorities will go to the undergraduate programs because the institution with a purely undergraduate program is going to rank higher on that kind of priority.

So I think this is taken care of to some extent.

The third amendment, the one that permits the purchase of athletic or recreational equipment, we think is good. We do construe this to mean, the way we understand it, that we are talking here about just that and not physical education.

I think it is important that we do recognize, continue to recognize that physical education is a legitimate part of the curriculum.

It will be somewhat of a problem to do this but I am sure the Office of Education by regulation can help us keep this sort of thing honest.

Those are the three or four major things that we saw in the bill to comment on. I would like to switch to three or four of our own suggestions, if I may, Madam Chairman.

The first one, and this, of course, came up for a lot of discussion and I am not sure that everybody was in complete agreement, but I think the vast majority were, and that is that we recommend specifically in section 603, subparagraph 2 of title VI, that the word "objective" be stricken.

Now there we are talking about the kinds of priorities that are to be used to establish the priority standards for the grants.

The reason for this is that many States have expressed themselves as wanting to use such methods as evaluation panels to set priorities rather than just cost per credit hour and these kinds of things. Of course, those who wish to do so, if you took that word out, could still use the objective priority kinds of things.

The second recommendation we would make is that we suggest that consortiums of colleges and universities be eligible to receive title VI grants. There are many of these, as you know, around the country, and we feel that in some instances if it is carefully done equipment can be more extensively utilized to the benefit of more students if this is possible.

I stress it should be carefully done but it is possible that we can get more mileage for the money under some conditions.

Mr. QUIE. About what sort of equipment are you talking?

Mr. MORTON. For example, some of the audiovisual kinds of equipment could be used by two or three colleges close together. The example I know best is Kansas City, of course, being from Missouri, or St. Louis, and there are five, six, or even seven colleges almost within shouting distance from each other, and they do have consortiums in existence.

This would make it possible for the consortium to bring the stuff to bear on all the campuses. Again I stress it should be carefully done.

Mr. QUIE. Don't you have problems in higher education like in elementary and secondary education where they want audiovisual equipment for each class?

Mr. MORTON. Yes; we do.

Mr. QUIE. Maybe there could be some cooperation between departments and the colleges.

Mr. MORTON. The consortium thing might tend to mitigate this kind of problem you are talking about. You are right; that force is very much at work on many campuses.

The final major recommendation we would like to make on title VI of a specific nature is that we would recommend that the closed-circuit television equipment, which is now in the second category, be amended to include closed-circuit television as one of the many sophisticated educational media available today.

We feel that this particular instructional approach has had 2 years of special emphasis under title VI and we believe that it is appropriate at this time for closed-circuit television projects to compete with all other projects, utilizing all the educational media.

As you know, increasingly, the various types of hardware are used in an integrated fashion. You have audiovisual, laboratories, closed-circuit television. You have all sorts of things.

We feel it would be better, rather than artificial splitting between television and other kinds of equipment, if institutions could put together a more integrated package in making a proposal.

Then finally, I am sure you are tired of hearing this, it is a fact that the current funding levels are doing some strange things, I think the word would be. What is happening is in fact in many of our States, because of the low amounts of money, project applications are to a large degree being tailored to the amount of money that is available.

This may not be the way you intended it or the way it should have been but this is what is happening. Of course, probably there is nothing you can do about it now but I thought that point ought to be made that, in fact, this is what is going on.

What it would take—well, who knows, probably three or four times as much money to meet all the legitimate projects that we are now getting in in the various States. But I don't want to stress that.

I just want to make the point so that you will realize what is going on.

That is all I have to say about title VI specifically, Madam Chairman.

I would like to jump to one comment about title III of the Higher Education Facilities Act and say that although our commissions do not directly have any responsibilities for facilities loans, we are interested, of course, in total facilities development and in this context we would just point out that raising the interest rate will ultimately reduce income available for other purposes in higher education or it is going to increase costs to the students.

This is probably what is going to happen.

I would like to comment very briefly on some thoughts for the future if you are not running out of time completely.

We would suggest to you, members of the committee, that what we are really talking about here in the legislation which has been proposed to date and in the suggestions that we have thrown out to you, that what we are really doing here is cleaning up some of the obvious problems that do exist in these pieces of legislation.

For longer term purposes we would recommend for your consideration some more far-reaching changes as soon as possible. In particular, we are concerned with having a more direct and coordinated relationship among all the Federal programs for capital improvements and equipment.

Academic facility needs are directly related to residence facilities.

Library items are an important consideration in the total equipment and materials situation.

There is an argument, I think, to somehow or other bring closer together the kinds of planning and funding, for all these things categorize, be they buildings or items of instructional equipment.

We would suggest, with some trepidation I might add, that as a practical step toward a more integrated aid program, we do honestly believe it would be better for higher education if the loan program for self-amortizing facilities such as dorms and student unions could be transferred to the U.S. Office of Education.

We think this proposal is appropriate now because the Office of Education in fact now does have constructional services in the field in their local offices.

We do believe there is merit in broadening the Higher Education Facilities Act to make it the basic program for Federal participation in the construction of higher education facilities and title VI could serve a similar role for Federal participation in the purchase of instructional equipment and materials as time goes on.

Finally, in terms of philosophy, we would comment that the concept of State agencies for higher education working in close partnership with the U.S. Office of Education can, and I think are to some degree, achieve two objectives.

First, desired national educational goals can be pursued. I think we are all interested in that at the State or national level.

Second, local variations can be adequately accounted for. I would like to offer a little testimonial to the effect that all of us, I think, without exception, have found the partnership we have had with the Fa-

cilities Branch of OE to be very conducive to creative administration of the programs.

We think the individuals involved have been very strong and positive in providing leadership to us and have been sensitive to the kinds of suggestions we have had to make. So we feel that perhaps you have hit on something here that can be explored for more utilization in the future.

Madam Chairman, the final thing, I don't know whether this is appropriate for the committee, I have in the testimony, it has to do with some information on title I of the Higher Education Facilities Act, about what is happening in terms of dollars this year compared to the appropriations and the demands that are being shown vis-a-vis applications.

What it boils down to is that as of this time for fiscal 1968 all the applications that have been turned in that are eligible to the 50 States, actually I have 48 State commissions, is about $320 million more than the allotments that have been made under this program.

This, of course, has created quite a few problems in a sense, that frankly we did not anticipate this kind of gap, at least not quite this much.

There are some cases where we are being able to take care of the problem because these buildings are planned, we need to build them or we would not have planned them because we do have to put up two-thirds.

In Missouri we are going through the agonizing process of appropriating $4.6 million to pick up 10 projects that we thought we were going to have the one-third Federal money for from last year.

So this is creating quite a problem in the sense that not necessarily because the amount of money is too little or too much, although that is a problem, but because in the planning that we have been doing in the various States we have been anticipating—we have not gone so far as to anticipate at the authorized level, don't misunderstand me—but we have done our planning based on the ongoing trend line of appropriations that have been made by Congress.

So every one of us practically in all the States is facing a very difficult situation this year with many projects that were either appropriated by the State legislature or were planned for by the private institutions or public junior colleges, districts, are either going to have to wait, and this is not good because hopefully they are planned in phase so that they make sense when they are constructed, or we are going to have to find the money somewhere else.

In many cases, particularly in the private schools, if they do find the money somewhere else this means money that some of these hard-pressed institutions will not have for operating expenses.

You have heard plenty about the problems they are having in getting their budgets filled in, you might say.

There are several points in the written testimony, Madam Chairman, about this where I suggest in a little more organized detail what the net effect of this is going to be. There is a table in the back of the testimony State by State, I got a report from all the commissions, showing you what kind of money they asked for in terms of demand versus the allotment amount.

It is in the back of this written testimony. It is done State by State with the grand total at the bottom. The only ones that are not in there are Hawaii, the Virgin Islands, and the various territories.

There we had no way to get hold of them. There was no way to get the data in time for this meeting. So I believe I will close here although there is a good deal more said in the written material and see if there are any questions or comments that you care to make.

Mrs. GREEN. I thank you very much, Dr. Morton.

What do you envision as the role of State higher education tomorrow? How far would you go?

Mr. MORTON. Eventually, you mean, in all states?

Mrs. GREEN. Yes.

Mr. MORTON. Well, one of our problems here is, obviously, there are lots of differences in terms of development in each State. What is happening, of course, as you well know, is that there are some 23 or 24 States now that have what is called a coordinating commission or board, or whatever it is called, which has a general coordinating overview of at least public higher education and in many cases, public and private.

For the most part, these are the same people who have been designated as the facilities commissions. We are a case in point of that.

I think the trend, and I think it is a proper trend, although not all my colleagues will agree with me, is toward a planning, coordinating, not a governing, overall board, which is going to attempt at least to see to it that some of these disruptions don't take place within our higher education systems, at least they can point with alarm when something begins to happen and have the right kind of information for the policymakers of the State or the National Government, if that is appropriate, at any given time in order to come up with on-the-scene kinds of information, recommendations, and the like.

I think this is the way of the future, Madam Chairman, I really do. Whether it is good or bad, of course, is a matter of opinion.

I happen, obviously, since I work for one, to think that it is a perfectly appropriate approach.

Mrs. GREEN. In your judgment, which States have moved the furthest in this?

Mr. MORTON. I would suspect that a State like Illinois is one of the outstanding examples of a State which has gone almost to the point where in many respects the board of higher education is a governing board.

That is, they have been delegated the power, the authority, by the State legislature, to make final decisions on new institutions, new programs, and these kinds of matters.

Mrs. GREEN. This is for public and private institutions?

Mr. MORTON. No; you cannot do that for private, of course. This is public.

Mrs. GREEN. This is a problem in higher education when you have so many more non-tax-supported institutions.

Mr. MORTON. I can say from my own personal experience, that this is a very difficult thing to deal with. Now the law that set up the Missouri commission says take account of the private institutions, in effect, and we are doing our best to do that, but I can assure you it is not easy to somehow or other wed them in so that it all makes sense.

Now we are in constant dialog with the private institutions. We have made specific studies of their status and this kind of thing. I believe most of them will feel that we are glad we are there but I do not want to suggest that there is any resolution of this problem. The problem, of course, is that they would have to some degree give up at least a fraction of autonomy in order to fit in with all these things that we may be proposing. This is our problem.

Mr. QUIE. Will the chairwoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN. Yes.

Mr. QUIE. Are the private colleges represented on the board in all the State facilities commissions?

Mr. MORTON. Right.

Mr. QUIE. Is this not also true in Illinois?

Mr. MORTON. Yes. I think their board of higher education, I am pretty sure, has representation from private schools. It is in Missouri, too, and many other States.

My point is that you get so wrapped up in making appropriations recommendations, you know, on the public institutions, and dealing with your State legislature and helping them solve their problems because that is one of the reasons you are created, that frequently you are not able to do an adequate job of really accounting for the private institutions in a good way.

I think we should, and I think eventually we can, but we have not found the magic formula to know quite how to do this without in fact having them be private any more.

This is your problem. It must be a problem no matter what government is dealing with these institutions.

Mr. QUIE. Are you going to go off this subject?

Mrs. GREEN. No, go ahead.

Mr. QUIE. As a gentleman who is connected with a private college, I would like to hear Father Collins' attitude.

Reverend COLLINS. I am Father Collins from Georgetown. The District of Columbia has the opposite. We have 15 institutions, 13 of which are private. Our composition is made up of representatives able to act by vote of all member institutions.

To answer the specific question, What relationship could be established between private education and State education, it is my own thought which I press in the Jesuit education institutions and in Catholic education institutions in the United States and in our allies, the Methodists and also in private schools, that the future of higher education, I believe, is summarized in the approach that has been granted through the efforts of this committee on comprehensive planning.

It is forcing the State institutions and private institutions to plan together. When you plan your facilities, the programs for those facilities, necessarily have to be planned. The interrelationship between the State and the private schools, I don't personally believe, is an insoluble difficulty. I think it is a natural growth that the private institutions will assume that and maintain the historical element that they have given to the United States and although Mr. Morton is somewhat apprehensive of this loss or fear of loss of self-jurisdiction, in fact, nearly every private institution of higher education now is

so interrelated with Federal programs and State programs that they have a joint effort.

So, to answer the question, I think there is no problem that can't be handled by his joint approach. I am of the same opinion that the joint approach is the best approach and in fact, I think it is the only approach.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Would the chairwoman yield at this point?

Mrs. GREEN. Yes.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I was out in Cedar Rapids last Saturday talking to a group of presidents of small private colleges. This was the whole subject of discussion. I noted that some of the conference participants seemed to be militantly hostile to the great public universities.

I am very glad to hear what you have just said, Father, because it seems to me that if in every State of the country the small private colleges get embroiled in bitter battles with the large public institutions, it will be to the benefit of neither.

In this respect, I was struck with the recommendation of the McGeorge Bundy panel in New York State a few days ago in which he proposed that State funds be used to help small private colleges, including church-related colleges. I know this poses, obviously, some church-State problems in that particular State.

I do not know what the answer is but the kinds of comments that both of you gentlemen have made in which you have suggested that there ought to be an effort at planning and cooperation and coordination to make the best use of scarce resources is, I think, most encouraging and much better than coming in and simply, in frustration, throwing brick bats at each other.

Mrs. GREEN. Dr. Morton.

Mr. MORTON. This, of course, is a midwestern phenomenon, I think, there is some difference between the Midwest and East and maybe the west coast, although I am not as familiar with the west coast as I probably should be.

One of the problems, take Missouri, for example, and Iowa is the same thing, I know enough about it, we have in Missouri by count, take part III of the Office of Education Directory, 47 private institutions of higher education.

There is a real problem here when you have 47 as to how you are going to handle it. We are talking in Missouri, not very seriously at the present time, about some kind of program like tuition equalization, which kind of hopefully equalizes the opportunity of the private schools to get the students that they maybe can best educate, but you run into all kinds of sticky problems where you have this phenomenon where you have 47 schools.

One time I counted well over half of them have fewer than 500 students. The large private universities, St. Louis University, Washington University, there is obviously a possible viable relationship. This is one of the quasi-political problems you have in a given State when you start doing things like this in addition to the constitutional thing which we have been arguing about vehemently in our legislature in the last 2 months on the guaranteed student loan program, of all things.

We finally passed the bill but it was by a very close margin purely on the constitutional ground.

Mrs. GREEN. When you recommend, Dr. Morton, a State agency with perhaps some governing authority, it raises questions that were pertinent of problems discussed in 1963.

I think in terms of the Federal legislation this committee would continue to be concerned that the private colleges be eligible for the same kinds of programs that the public tax-supported institutions are.

Mr. MORTON. I think you should. I think one of the things that does happen is that to the degree you are forcing, through the Facilities Act, the States in the Midwest to do this, as Father Collins said, I suspect we would have had a much more difficult time as a coordinating commission getting into the business of coordinating private and public if we had not had the Facilities Act to work through. Not only the planning money but also just the fact you made it clear that this was money to be provided for institutions of higher education, not public.

Mrs. GREEN. I would not want to see hostility between the private and public institutions, but I am concerned about the financial difficulties of the small private colleges.

I think their financial difficulties are very real and should not be ignored.

Mr. MORTON. Right.

Mrs. GREEN. Do any of you gentlemen have any figures on the space that is available in private colleges? Isn't this where there are places for students to be enrolled?

Mr. MORTON. I have data for one State. I don't know whether it has been collected by OE on this basis or not.

Mrs. GREEN. What does that show?

Mr. MORTON. The one State?

Mrs. GREEN. Yes.

Mr. MORTON. The number of square feet per student that is now available—you know, the number enrolled now versus the number of square feet—is roughly two and a half times as great on our private campuses as a whole as on our public campuses.

In other words, there is space that could be used, they could be better utilized right now.

Mrs. GREEN. Would any of you three gentlemen be able to help this committee in doing a study of this in terms of the cost of higher education?

I am thinking particularly of a matter which has been under discussion for several years, the tax credit proposal.

The administration has always been opposed to this because their estimates are that it cost up to a billion dollars. I do not know of any consideration which has been given to this matter in terms of the space that is available at private colleges today.

We should compare the relative costs of a tax credit which would result in full utilization of private institutions and of the additional costs to the Federal Government for construction of facilities at colleges and universities which are already overcrowded. I suspect the additional construction costs might also run up to $1 billion. We have always viewed independently the relationships of these programs to others.

We have always talked in terms of just the outright cost.

Mr. MORTON. I think what we could do if you wanted us to, within all these facilities commissions, of course, there now are inventories either completed or nearly completed, and we could probably put together some data that might be helpful to you in terms of what might be called excess space that is now available in private schools.

I suspect we could do that. I am not sure it would be perfect but we might do something that is useful if you want us to.

Mr. GREEN. On page 8, in making a plea for more funds for facilities, and I must say I am completely sympathetic, you say the fastest growing enrollments are in graduate and technical education.

When you prepared the statement did you take into consideration the impact of the current draft policy on graduate students?

Mr. MORTON. This is historical, really, and projects as we have made them over the last couple of years. I am not even guessing, none of us is, about what that is going to do. We do not know.

Mrs. GREEN. Most of our reports, the ones that have been called to my attention, show a reduction in enrollment of anywhere from 40 to 50 percent in graduate education.

I wonder whether this committee should consider this matter this year. I think the subcommittee is bent on getting a change in that draft policy but if we cannot do this, should this subcommittee consider transferring funds from title II of the act to title I?

Mr. MORTON. One of the difficulties we are having, as I am sure you are having, is that most of us have tried to assess this by one means or another. Of course, what we really seem to come back to is the fact you have umpteen thousand local boards and you are not sure how it will come out in the end even with these general policies being applied because there is still room for differences.

We are getting estimates from our graduate schools in Missouri and I don't know where they are getting these figures, anywhere from 75 percent down to 25 percent.

Mrs. GREEN. In projecting your figures on your construction needs in Missouri and, Father Collins and Mr. Jones, is consideration being given to the impact of the GI bill?

Mr. MORTON. Our enrollment projects have taken this into account. We went to the Veterans' Administration in Missouri and tried to assess it for the year that we are now in and we missed by about 50 percent, or they did, there were that many fewer than what they though would be enrolling.

So we have had to reassess it in terms of this coming year.

Mrs. GREEN. Thank you.

Mr. Quie?

Mr. QUIE. You mentioned that the U.S. Office of Education has now established its own construction service in field offices. Is that in actual operation in all of the regional offices now or is it in the process of being implemented.

Mr. MORTON. I believe it is in the process everywhere. I believe Kansas City was one of the last to go into operation and I know it is. It was scheduled toward the last. It has been in operation for several months.

Mr. QUIE. That means the loan money under the Facilities Act and the construction can even go to the regional office of the Office of Education for all the supervision that is needed and for approval?

Mr. MORTON. That is correct.

Mr. QUIE. How about the dormitories?

Mr. MORTON. It is still HUD, separate. As the chairman pointed out, it is a different piece of legislation.

Mr. QUIE. This is especially appealing to Minnesota because Minnesota's Education Office is in Kansas City but the HUD office is in Chicago.

Mr. MORTON. I know Dick Hoff has complained about that.

Mr. QUIE. Also, it seems to me that if there is any proof that the Higher Education Facilities Act has been an excellent program it is your statement that the States, like Missouri, are planning now to pick up that Federal share.

My reaction is that on a program the people will accept, but if the Federal Government won't do it then nobody will. I wonder about the value of the program.

Mr. MORTON. What we are doing when we pick up this $4.6 million, we are taking some money that we would have spent for something else out of the State budget simply because we thought this was a higher priority, or the Governor did. What it means is, as I say, there is a balancing process going on.

We had committed ourselves in the planning process to starting these 10 buildings within a certain time and having them on the line at a certain time. We are so committed in terms of planning on the various campuses we really had very little choice. We had to do it.

I caught a little bit of flak for that. They said I was a bad prognosticator.

Mr. QUIE. I wish we had proven that you were a good prognosticator if that was their attitude. When you talk about the square footage per student necessary and the square footage per student which would mean overcrowding, do you use the same basis for private and public institutions or are there two different figures?

Mr. MORTON. What the Office of Education has done, and I can't argue with this, they have taken a very gross figure and just averaged everything out without any relationship to public, private, graduate school, or junior college. Obviously, there are vast differences between the requirements of a college in terms of its size, in terms of its program, and all other kinds of factors.

A smaller college, just to have the basic facilities you have to have, will have more square feet per student even with roughly the same utilization as a larger institution. This is one point.

So really when you come right down to it, if you want to talk about individual institutions, you have to have the square footage for that institution that relates to its program and its size.

I wish we had 150 square feet per student in Missouri, but we don't.

Mr. QUIE. That is all, Madam Chairman.

Mrs. GREEN. Congressman Brademas?

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you very much. I have a couple of questions.

I am distressed that apparently State legislatures and Governors in many of the States of our country are asking for less money for facilities these days rather than for more. I can see that you are very unhappy and I share the attitude of Mrs. Green that most of us on this subcommittee are unhappy about the administration's proposed cutbacks in facilities.

I was just looking at the Chronicle of Higher Education here. One of the leading stories is entitled, "State Campuses To Feel Effects of Economies." And it cites the celebrated cutbacks of Governor Reagan, and he is not alone. Since I seem to be on a States rights emphasis, let me ask why aren't these State legislators showing a little political courage here and calling for the enactment of progressive income taxes so that their State can get some money for facilities?

Mr. MORTON. I suppose maybe you are in a little deeper than I can probably wade out when you ask a question like that. All I can say is that if you look at the recent history of the State appropriations for higher education it has been nothing short of phenomenal, the increases.

Mr. BRADEMAS. The same thing is true at the Federal level. What is your next point?

Mr. MORTON. Relatively speaking, I think we have increased the operating appropriations something like 275 percent in 4 years.

Mr. BRADEMAS. It must have been pretty low.

Mr. MORTON. It was pretty low. Others have done similar sorts of things, of course. We are not the only one.

Basically, the problem that they are coming up against, of course, is the fact, as you pointed out, that income and expenditures are crossing. Missouri is facing this next year.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Do you have a progressive income tax?

Mr. MORTON. Yes, although it is low. It is progressive——

Mr. BRADEMAS. But not very progressive?

Mr. MORTON. Right. This, I suspect, will be a consideration at the next session. We had a tax increase in 1964–65, I guess it was.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I am not here so much making the point that there should be a tax increase, but rather speaking of the nature of the tax. That, I think, is in large measure the key as to whether or not you are really going to be able to do a serious job of meeting the needs at the State level.

Mr. MORTON. Right. One of the things we are doing which sort of answers your question about one State, there is a constitutional amendment which will be voted on which will directly tie our State income tax as many States have done, to the Federal income tax which makes it as progressive as the Federal income tax is.

Mr. BRADEMAS. In my judgment, that is good. It will really help make States rights a reality rather than a piece of rhetoric. Let me ask you a couple of quick questions. Your testimony, I believe, was very thoughtful. You ask, in effect, however, do you not, for an expansion of the purposes for which the facilities moneys may be spent at a time—I refer to title I, for instance—at a time when we are cutting back on the amount of money that is being proposed for existing services?

Mr. MORTON. I don't think I am exactly asking for an expansion. I think I am asking for a more sophisticated approach to how we spend whatever we have. My point was that the way it is now it is purely crude, for the most part, it is crude in enrollment growth, no matter whether it is undergraduate, lower division, upper division. It could be in many cases you could really get more mileage out of your money by getting an institution ready to take enrollment; that is what I am trying to say.

I don't think the way we suggest this be done that it will in fact do violence to the concept of taking care of more students.

Mr. BRADEMAS. My final question is this: In terms of how we can maximize the use of scarce funds, to what extent can we hope for any respite either from interinstitutional use of facilities or from the year-round use of college and university facilities, or have you some other suggestion whereby we might get more for our national investment?

Mr. MORTON. The first thing, of course, that I will say, and I will get to your main point, is that our biggest problem now is the dislocation of facilities in relation to students, getting at the point of why don't we get more out of what we have.

The fact is that many of our larger public and private institutions have what would be in my judgment, we do debate this, I am sure, even overutilization at the present time of facilities in terms of good educational programs. At least, as far as the regular academic year is concerned.

So, I think this is the first thing that we have to try to rectify if we are going to do what we should do which is to make maximum use of what we already have on the line.

The second thing, of course, is that as hard as we have tried for all these years in higher education to get year-round utilization at the higher level, there has been a growth of summer term enrollments, but the American public does not seem to want to go to school in the summer.

We have promoted this in many States to the best of our ability. We have gone so far in Missouri to say, when a certain group of students that wants to go to our public institutions, "You start in the summer or you have to wait until the second semester" in order to try to get this thing done.

Still our summer schools are relatively small. So, I don't frankly have a lot of hope that we are going to have truly, at least not in the near future, year-round utilization of facilities. Of course, when you look at figures and you find, let us say, that XYZ college has a weekly classroom utilization of 30 hours a week and you might say immediately, well, that ought to be 35 or 40, maybe it should, and maybe it should not.

You have to look at those rooms and find out. My impression is that in the larger institutions and the ones that are experiencing enrollment growth, the utilization is outstanding. It is these others where our problems are.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you very much.

Mrs. GREEN. Congressman Esch?

Mr. ESCH. Thank you very much, Madam Chairman. I have one or two general questions.

Do you have information pointing to large increases in enrollment in the early 1970's? We are really talking about whether the funding we have now will bring about facilities for that increase.

Do you have projected figures on the enrollment in the early 1970's?

Mr. MORTON. No, sir, not on a nationwide basis. I am referring to the Office of Education's projections with which as we measure our own State projections they seem to make sense.

Mr. ESCH. The big influx again will come in the early 1970's?

Mr. MORTON. Yes.

Mr. ESCH. The facilities we are building now provide for that?

Mr. MORTON. Yes, sir.

Mr. ESCH. And any cutback that is made now will thus hamper that great influx?

Mr. MORTON. I think so, because there are some variations from State to State.

Our big thrust, again, will be really about 1973, in Missouri. That is just the way it works out. Of course, by that time, you know, if we cut back now in our construction program that will really hit us in 1973.

Mr. ESCH. I would like to cover another general area. Has the Commission any suggestions as to how we might develop a better vehicle to discriminate between the undergraduate and graduate levels when we are taking into account grants and the development of facilities?

You suggested that the per capita basis may not be adequate.

Mr. MORTON. Not in and of itself.

Mr. ESCH. Does your group collectively or individually have suggestions of how we might develop, either on the State level or Federal level, a vehicle which will take into account the added cost at the graduate or professional level?

Mr. MORTON. Yes, in various States they have done a pretty fair job—we haven't—of making these kinds of differentiations in an adequate manner.

We are going to try to next year. We have a special study planned which will come up with norms, hopefully. I know in the case of California, there is a manual now that the coordinating council has out which spells out the kinds of relationships that you need for a graduate program at the Ph. D. level, let us say, in chemistry as compared to the undergraduate program in the arts and sciences.

I think there needs to be a lot more work like this done. Right now, to my knowledge, there is no centralized study which has covered the waterfront of the United States. There have been bits and pieces that are helpful. The best one I have seen is the one from California which I think was very well done. I hope we can do as well.

Mr. ESCH. I think it would be essential that we move into this area as we provide more broad-base support.

Mr. MORTON. I would agree.

Mr. ESCH. If we could move on to what Congressman Brademas mentioned momentarily, do you look for a continuing partnership on a long-range basis with State and Federal aid in facilities?

Mr. MORTON. I hope so.

Mr. ESCH. Would you care to project ahead 10 years to the point when most of the facilities money would be coming from the Federal level, assuming a resolution of the conflict in Southeast Asia?

Mr. MORTON. Most of the Federal money?

Mr. ESCH. Most of the money for facilities. Do you look to a point of time when most of the facilities money will come from the Federal level?

Mr. MORTON. I have never been that bold to expect that. Of course, we have all projected the hope that some day the proportion, you know, the one-third now might be somewhat larger so it would make it easier.

Mr. ESCH. A half?

Mr. MORTON. Speaking personally, I would not want to go beyond the half because it is no longer really a partnership if you do.

Mr. ESCH. Thank you.

Mrs. GREEN. Do you feel that way on all matching funds?

Mr. MORTON. Well, matching funds that are, again speaking personally, for higher education as such. When you are talking about specific contracts for research and this kind of thing, I am not sure I feel that way there. Because there in theory you are buying services from these particular groups of people.

Mrs. GREEN. But on programs where you are not buying services where there is a goal that is of equal interest to the local area, State and Federal?

Mr. MORTON. I will stick my neck out but I personally feel philosophically that way.

Mrs. GREEN. Congressman Burton.

Mr. BURTON. You then would hold to this average despite the great difference in the ability of various States to meet their educational needs? What abou the very-low-income States?

Mr. MORTON. With small populations?

Mr. BURTON. Not necessarily small, but those faced with the dilemma that they do not have the local resources to construct adequate higher education facilities and their more talented youngsters go to the States that have these facilities and they lose this talent for all time.

Mr. QUIE. If the gentleman will yield, we had a little problem in the Elementary and Secondary Act where the richest States got the most and the poorest States got the least.

I don't think the Congress has ever been able to put forth those equalization programs.

Mr. BURTON. I only want to test his suggestion in the light of this problem.

Mr. MORTON. That is a very good question. I recognize, of course, that there are many States that are making a tremendous effort now, the Dakotas, for example, in our region, based on their per capita income, and all these other kinds of measures, they are doing a tremendously lot more than, say, Missouri is, in terms of effort. But they have bumped against a kind of ceiling.

Your point is well taken. The other thing that I would have to say and this might engender some more discussion, that I am not completely buying the theory that just because one of our students goes to school in California or Illinois that this is necessarily bad.

I mean, this is the national panorama, particularly in graduate education. What I am trying to say is that I am not sure that watertight State boundaries on matters like this is completely defensible.

That is why I think maybe the Federal Government has a role in all of this. I do not know the answer; you have raised a good point, whether or not we can logically expect North Dakota——

Mr. BURTON. Or Mississippi.

Mr. MORTON. Or Mississippi; they are putting a pretty good effort, too, from what I read—to come up with the same kind of effort as Illinois. I was talking of your general principle. Your point is well taken.

What would happen is that maybe the 25 or 30 larger more wealthy States this would work. Maybe with some of the others we would have problems.

Mr. BURTON. Then you would tend to qualify your observation?

Mr. MORTON. Yes. I am sympathetic with their problems. For example, some of the smaller States around us are trying to work out arrangements with some of the larger States, for example, on medical education, and I think we have a responsibility to work with them on this, but I am not sure how far we can go.

They really can't afford a medical school on their own.

Mr. BURTON. Is there any mechanism for coordinating the kind of education available in the various regions of the country?

Mr. MORTON. Yes, there are quite a few mechanisms. Probably the most successful one, and I don't know too much about it in detail, is the southern regional board—Jerry knows about this, he is in that group—where they have made all kinds of arrangements about you do this high level professional program and you do this one and students go back and forth.

So West Virginia does not have to maintain a school of veterinary medicine, they can send them someplace.

Mrs. GREEN. An example close to home is the Western State Compact on Higher Education which has pioneered a great many of these efforts.

Mr. MORTON. Right. Also, there is a New England group that is beginning to work. We have one that is called the "Big Eight" group in the Middle West. The University of Missouri has arrangements with Nebraska and Kansas and Arkansas on certain of these kinds of back-and-forth deals.

Mr. BURTON. Would you say that this regional approach to higher education is already effective or just really beginning to realize its potential?

Mr. MORTON. I would say it is beginning to realize its potential. There is a great deal more that can be done. I think there are cases, of course, West Virginia has been in business a lot longer, they have gotten more done but still they have a long way to go in the potential that can be carried out.

Mr. BURTON. Do those regional structures receive any funding from the Federal Government?

Mr. MORTON. I don't think so.

Mrs. GREEN. They do on special projects.

Mr. BURTON. I have no further questions.

Mrs. GREEN. Thank you.

Father Collins.

STATEMENT OF REV. T. BYRON COLLINS, S.J., VICE PRESIDENT FOR PLANNING AND PHYSICAL PLANT, GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY, AND CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMISSIONER'S ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HIGHER EDUCATION, CACHE

Reverend COLLINS. Madam Chairman, I have my prepared testimony in front of you. In terms of time, I will limit it to a few brief statements if the report can be put in the record.

Mrs. GREEN. Yes, it will be made a part of the record at this point.

Reverend COLLINS. Thank you.

(The document referred to follows:)

STATEMENT OF REV. T. BYRON COLLINS, VICE PRESIDENT FOR PLANNING AND PHYSICAL PLANT, GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY; CHAIRMAN, COMMISSIONER'S ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HIGHER EDUCATION

I am Reverend T. Byron Collins, S.J., Chairman of the Commissioners' Advisory Council on Higher Education for the District of Columbia (State Commission on Higher Education), and Vice President for Planning and Physical Plant of Georgetown University. With me is John Jay Petrone, Executive Secretary of our State Commission.

I am here to present the needs of the District of Columbia for Title I—HEFA funds and for Title III—HEFA funds at the 3% rate.

The District of Columbia State Commission has substantially completed its first phase of our Comprehensive Planning Program. To supply our needs is the present District of Columbia allotment for Title I—HEFA. This FY–1968 allotment is far short of our demand.

	Millions
Estimate D.C. State Allotment—July, 1967	$2.0
D.C. State Allotment after Federal Cutback, January, 1968	1.3
Estimated D.C. State Allotment for FY–1969	1.0

These cutbacks seriously jeopardize the coordinated programs of the District of Columbia institutions of higher education; specifically The George Washington University. The George Washington University Title I HEFA request of $2.6 million will not receive its full federal share for three to four years hence. The delay in the library construction, which is to serve the faculty, student body of George Washington, and the other area universities that are members of the Consortium of Universities is of immediate concern to all involved. This library facility could use the entire FY–1968 and FY–1969 State Allotment to fund the project.

This material only exemplifies the problems of one of 14 institutions eligible for federal funds in the District of Columbia. It is expected that during FY–1969 there will be requests of $3.9 million for Title I funds in the District of Columbia. Of this $3.9 million, $2.0 million will be for a badly needed undergraduate library at The American University.

The severe cutbacks in Title I—HEFA funds will definitely hinder the development plans of the institutions of higher education in the District of Columbia.

If it is decided that there will be no increase in Title I funds, a fair solution might be provided by increasing the Title III HEFA funds, thus making it possible for institutions to borrow additional funds which they were unable to acquire under Title I—HEFA.

Shortages of Title III funds are posing increasing difficulties in connection with title I grants, since about 95% of the loan applications are related to projects under either Title I or Title II, and in many instances the requested loan is an *essential* part of the financing plan for a project submitted under Title I.

The following table estimates an unfunded loan Title III HEFA demand of $182,702,000 for FY–1968.

Fiscal year 1968 (estimate):	*Millions*
Loan demand	
Application deferred from FY 1967 (205)	$156,227
Applications received from 7/1/67 to 10/5/67	24,172
Estimated loan demand from 10/1/67 to 6/30/68	[1] 152,203
Total actual and estimated demand	332,702
Anticipated lending level	150,000
Unfunded loan demand estimated	182,702

[1] Estimated loan demand based on 200 loan applications filed at $761,515 average request.

Considering the Title I cutback and the limited amount of Title III loan funds, it can be seen that College and University construction plans will be severly hindered. Critical demands of the institutions for classroom buildings, libraries, and administration buildings must be delayed or completely taken off the drawing boards of the immediate future.

How does Title III funding affect the plans of the colleges and universities in the District of Columbia?

The Title III funds are an essential part of the District of Columbia construction program. As an example, Georgetown University has been enabled to

proceed on a definite schedule with its new Library and Law Center because of these loans. Also, George Washington has a request for $2.5 million under this title for its new library.

I believe there is a great necessity to increase these funds up to a level of $300 million for FY-1969. Of this, $150 million is recommended for the backlog of fiscal 1968 and $150 million is recommended for the fiscal year 1969, making a total of $300 million at 3%.

This would be needed even more if the grant program were to be cut to the proposed allotments, especially for the needs of the private colleges and universities and smaller state institutions of higher learning.

Reverend COLLINS. In planning our program for the District of Columbia, as I have said, there are 15 institutions, including our two very welcome and new institutions, the ones for the District of Columbia, the Technical Institute and the Federal City College. In programing, ourselves, we had as of July 1967, an estimated $2 million available for our demands.

The cutback in January of 1968 by the Office of Education reduced our allotment to $1.3 million. This is in title I funds. The allotment for next year would be $1 million.

In our program of emphasis we have selected Washington University as the one that is most eligible and most in need. It has a program for a library that it needs direly.

The impact of the cutback is to jeopardize certainly the starting of this and perhaps its existence.

American University with a library request behind that of George Washington is likewise in jeopardy. Both of those are part of our coordinated program of the District of Columbia in providing facilities for the interrelationships, the consortium that exists in the District of Columbia.

The joint effort by the five universities for exchange of students and professors on the graduate and undergraduate level, I think would suffer, all of us would suffer, from this cutback.

So it is our plea, if possible from the point of view of this one area of the United States, that such efforts as are available to this committee should be made to request it to be put back to the planned program

Another point that I wish to make is the question in title III funds. Title III funds are proposed at $150 million for fiscal year 1969. The summary on the second page of my testimony shows really there is a $300 million demand existent. There is $150 million backlog and $150 million of need that exists.

Needless to say, our Commission, and myself personally, think that the 3-percent rate should be maintained, not the change in the formula as proposed in the bill.

What effect does the cutback on title III have in the District of Columbia?

Once again, George Washington, as an instance of our 15 institutions, has a request for $2.5 million of eligible funds under this title.

In the present program if it goes in for reservation of funds from the Office of Education, it must be in line, and the likelihood of getting anything toward it at this point is very minimal.

So it is my statement to request, showing an instance in the District of just one, the impact it will have on the cutback in title I funds, that title III funds on the national level be increased since this then would accrue to the benefit of our institutions here in the District of Columbia.

Thank you.

Mrs. GREEN. Thank you very much, Father Collins. Would you expand more on the view you expressed a moment ago that if we are going to cut, it should be in the research effort?

Reverend COLLINS. Yes. Unfortunately, I do not have the appropriation analysis but I do remember one figure of $75 million, as it comes to my mind, of a research element, a new element of research proposed.

I remember the dollars and not the program. We discussed, ourselves, saying what elements, because of our own particular needs, could we recommend.

I do not remember the precise one but there are some new programs. I hate to propose this but there are some elements of research for teachers, as I vaguely remember it. I had better limit myself to that.

Mrs. GREEN. This strikes a responsive cord. I feel if a cut has to be made it could be made in this area.

Do you think your colleagues share your view, Father Collins?

Reverend COLLINS. This was unanimous in the District of Columbia. This reason is this: The reason I am here is to instance the testimony of Mr. Morton. The program that goes in for these facilities takes a long time to build. We have worked hard, as all the other members of our region have, even in coordinating our programs with Maryland and Virginia in their planning.

We have set our method of funding; especially this is dramatically true of the private schools. You have to really scrounge for a dollar. You get set, get your plans, get your application in, you are set to go. Then a million dollars is pulled out and we just say we can't do it.

This is the real reason, I think, that given the needs as evidenced by Mr. Morton and I also am cognizant of some of the institutions in West Virginia and in our own region, that this program takes a long time and this, I think, has a serious impact on higher education.

What is the sense—well, I don't want to put it quite that broadly but before you are able to teach you have to have a place.

Mrs. GREEN. Congressman Quie.

Mr. QUIE. When you asked if his colleagues agreed with you, I thought you meant his colleagues at the table. I would like to hear from them, too, on the question of cutting back on research and putting more in facilities.

Mr. MORTON. I can't answer that quite as directly as Father Collins because—I am being selfish now, I am thinking of our own particular State situation—we have three major State universities that are developing, hopefully, more and more graduate programs. Some of this research money is the lifeblood of graduate program development.

So I would not want to be quite as direct as Father Collins has been.

However, in terms of meeting immediate student problems, getting ready for the numbers, there is no question in my mind but what this has a higher priority than that.

Mr. JONES. Madam Chairman, one of the new programs that seems to be very challenging and very wonderful is the "Networks of Knowledge" program. I think with the reduced funds one of the things we need to keep in mind is the fact that a college must apply for these

funds and there is a cost on the part of the college in making application and processing this, the administrative procedure within the college.

By continually spreading the money further it may complicate the college problem even more. Certainly these programs appear to be very good. This particular one is very appealing to me. I think it has real potential.

Mr. QUIE. Why do you need Federal help for the "Networks of Knowledge" program by which I thought the Commissioner really meant it was the "Lonesome Professors" program?

Mr. JONES. I was lending support to the idea of not diluting further the money to these programs. It is an appealing potential when greater funds are made available.

Mrs. GREEN. Will you yield to me?

Mr. QUIE. Yes, I will yield.

Mrs. GREEN. You have commented on one thing which bothers me—the cost to a university for putting an application in for funds.

I know at least one instance where the amount of the award which the institution finally received did not equal the cost to the institution of making the application.

I also am told that in one program there were only 70 awards made out of over 900 applications. I cannot help but think of the cost the 900 institutions incurred in making these applications.

Do any of you gentlemen or have your various groups considered this and would you have recommendations to make to this subcommittee on how we might simplify the legislative program so it would be less burdensome?

Mr. JONES. I think one of the problems is that when a program is started with a very minimum allocation in the initial phase, the amount of press coverage is significant even though the amount of money available is perhaps very insignificant.

So the interest is built up, perhaps in some instances we should postpone the idea of starting a very small program with a very insignificant amount of money until there is a greater amount of money to pump into the program.

Mrs. GREEN. Dr. Morton.

Mr. MORTON. I would say I think in direct response to your question, and I am now speaking of titles I and VI, those are the ones we are directly involved in, that generally the laws that you passed are not conducive to overcomplication. It is the interpretation that keeps getting made.

Mrs. GREEN. I thank you, Dr. Morton.

Mr. MORTON. I am not saying that it is necessarily more so and somebody's fault in OE or anything else, but there is this constant problem of what is congressional intent.

This seems to get interpreted in so many different ways. I really don't understand the mysteries, frankly, of what congressional intent means, but it seems to be that is the way we keep going. There seems to be more involved kind of things necessary all the time.

Mrs. GREEN. I think that the congressional intent is very clear and then I read some of the guidelines that are put out by especially one of my favorite agencies.

Mr. MORTON. I am speaking as they are interpreted to us.

A case in point: We were just instructed that from now on we were supposed to turn in documentary evidence on the matching money.

What this means is that we have to fill out some more papers and if they do not believe me this much, I wonder why we are there. It is this kind of problem.

Mr. QUIE. I would like to ask a question of Father Collins, if I may. It does not relate to your testimony here but I know that public institutions of higher learning would like to see us not only provide assistance for construction of facilities but also institutional grants, if we could move in the direction of institutional grants.

I get the feeling that the private or church-related institutions of higher learning would prefer the tuition grant.

Now it may be because they think there is some public policy or constitutional difficulty with the institutional grant and, therefore, they are moving in that direction.

What would be your druthers if there were not public policy or constitutional difficult?

Reverend COLLINS. In terms of institutional grant?

Mr. QUIE. In terms of institutional grant or getting it through a tuition grant.

Reverend COLLINS. Once again, our Commission has specifically considered this. You mean by institutional grant, a grant of dollars per full-time student, is that right?

Mr. QUIE. Yes.

Reverend COLLINS. Our Commission unanimously said this is desirable and in some cases necessary, especially for private education. One of the reasons that I accepted the chairmanship was to be able to voice my own concern for private education in the United States, and especially for those 29 Jesuit institutions that have some 400,000 students; that having been a budget officer for the university for 15 years and seen our own particular budgeting from $7 million to $40 million in 10 years, it is necessary for us to have outside help. This is true, I think, of all private education. I view with great delight the program such as Mr. Jones has in West Virginia for institutional or equivalent grants of State help to the private schools giving an enrollment.

Mr. QUIE. He is shaking his head. You had better confer with him.

Reverend COLLINS. What was the particular point?

Mr. JONES. State scholarship. West Virginia, in the last session of the legislature, like many other States, passed the State scholarship program that would allow grants to go to individual students that might attend any institution, public or private.

The big point here is, that it is a method of helping students attend college, and this is the import.

Mr. QUIE. Is there any help to the institution that goes along with the scholarship of the student such as we have in the fellowship program?

Mr. JONES. No.

Mr. QUIE. That would not really get to the point. You either do it one way or another, giving an institutional grant to the institution or you have some additional money follow that Federal or State scholar that goes to the institution to reduce the cost of education.

Mr. MORTON. There is one plan that is being used in some States

which, in effect, is helping the private institutions. What is generally referred to as the tuition equalization program. Are you familiar with this?

Mr. QUIE. Right.

Mr. MORTON. Of course, that does, in effect, make it possible for the youngster to go to a private school with something like a more reasonable competitive cost compared to the public.

Reverend COLLINS. My basis of that, Mr. Quie, is this: I am convinced, myself, that there must be joint effort, State and private. Each has a proper function, and they must work together or the private schools will be unable to exist because of financial difficulties.

Mrs. GREEN. Congressman Esch.

Mr. ESCH. In view of the time, Madam Chairman, I have no questions except to indicate my support for the thesis that we are going to have a crisis in facilities if we follow the current recommendations in this proposal.

Thank you very much.

Mrs. GREEN. Then may we hear from the third member of the panel, Mr. Jones, who is the executive secretary of the commission of higher education in the State of West Virginia.

Mr. Jones, if you wish to summarize, your whole statement will be made a part of the record.

STATEMENT OF JERRY LEE JONES, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, WEST VIRGINIA COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. JONES. Wonderful.

(The document referred to follows:)

STATEMENT OF JERRY LEE JONES, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, WEST VIRGINIA COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

Madam Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I wish to inform you of the severe affect of the reduction in funds for Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1963. We received twenty-five applications under Sections 103 and 104 for Fiscal 1968, totaling $8,895,341 in eligible federal requests for which we were allocated only $2,795,286 for eight projects.

The reduction in funds is a very serious problem in West Virginia because the capital improvement plans for our public institutions exceed $40 million and were based upon expectations of federal funding at fiscal 1967 levels or above. Private institutions have projects already under construction in five colleges and have applied for supplemental grants for those projects as well as assuming fiscal 1967 federal funding level for future projects.

The Chairman of the Education Committee in the House of Delegates made a statement in the Journal of the House of Delegates concerning the problem from which the following statements are taken:

". . . Urging Congress to reinstate the original estimate of funds considered for the Higher Education Facility Program.

"Whereas, it has come to the attention of this body that Congress has reduced, by one-third, the funds for the fiscal year 1968 to be made available under Title I of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963; and

Whereas, this action has resulted in a reduction from $4,232,926 to $2,795,286 of the portion of such moneys representing West Virginia's share; and

"Whereas, the proposed budget for the fiscal year 1969 provides for a fifty percent reduction in the funds proposed for the year 1968, resulting in an even greater loss to our State; and

"Whereas, the projects financed through federal participation in this program are vitally needed, and any reduction in the amount of funds available from the figure originally proposed will result in a drastic curtailment in the much needed projects that are eligible for assistance under the act."

The State Commission in reviewing applications for Title I must consider total funding, therefore, loans under Title III of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 represents an important part of the total project.

It is in this relationship that I review with concern Section 1102 of H.R. 15067. The change was originally proposed last year and was designed to:

1. Ease the demand on federal funds.
2. Encourage non-federal participation.
3. Provide the Commissioner with some degree of flexibility in determining the rate of interest.

During the last year, we have seen a rise in the rate of interest and drastic reductions in funds available under the Higher Education Facilities Act.

The result has been a very dangerous curtailment in college construction of facilities to be placed in use for the period beginning the decade of the 70's when enrollment in higher education will be significantly more than current levels by Office of Education projections.

The predictability and accuracy in forecasting the interest market in the years ahead is a major problem. The one observation that might be made concerning this is the fact that the record of the last few months shows the potential for major flunctuations and indicates that the interest rate is subject to sharp and drastic changes within a relatively short period of time.

The purpose of Title III was to record the interest of the government in assisting in the construction of vitally needed academic facilities. The result of tying the rate of interest paid by the college directly to the market rate would appear to result in the following difficulties for our colleges and universities:

1. A serious financial handicap for many colleges and universities.
2. The current interest rate fluctuations and future expectations of even greater fluctuations will result in confusion and delay in construction.
3. The fluctuations in the rate of interest and increased difficulty in estimating cost would be inconsistent with college planning and could be very injurious to our small public institutions and to our private institutions in America.

The foresight of this subcommittee and other responsible members of the Congress in passing the Higher Education Facilities Act stands as an example of our interest and involvement in assisting in the construction of the academic facilities for our institutions of higher educations.

The effect of Section 1102 will be to complicate the financing of facilities for the institutions without any corresponding benefits to the colleges and universities of America.

The real question for this subcommittee seems to be:

Should a program that is generally understood and appreciated because of its simplicity and efficient administration by the Office of Education be modified by the change proposed in Section 1102?

I encourage you to eliminate Section 1102 from H.R. 15067 and restore the reductions made in funding for facilities programs.

Mr. JONES. Madam Chairman, we have certainly felt the reduced appropriations for title I in a very significant way in West Virginia. A number of our institutions had started projects and submitted supplemental applications.

In four of our private institutions this happened and the expectation of Federal funding to maintain the current level was, of course, disappointing to the institutions and almost disastrous.

In one of the private institutions it has mean a very serious problem because of the expectation of the level of funding as the assurance had been originally stated, and we have an August closing, and based on the objective figures we gave tentative assurance that money would be available.

When the reductions came there were some major problems. However, in reference to the total funding of a facilities project, the State commission must review title III applications in the sense that this is a part of the total funding aspect.

It is in this reference that I would like to make some comments. The original proposal in H.R. 15067 indicated a change in section 1102 involving the rate of interest.

These changes were made or recommendations were made about a year ago and were designed to ease the demand on Federal funds to encourage non-Federal participation, and to provide the commissioner with some degree of flexibility in determining the rate of interest.

Since that period of time, we have seen a drastic reduction in total facility funds.

In addition, we have seen a significant increase in the rate of interest. The serious problem that could develop with regard to this would appear to be that we may have, first of all, a significant financial handicap to the small colleges and universities in America by the increased rate of interest.

The current interest pattern is one of erratic behavior. Major fluctuations are taking place. This will in many instances result in a greater degree of problems in estimating costs on the part of our colleges and universities in trying to plan for title III loans.

As a result, this will be incompatible with the long-range planning that the college in attempting to do.

In summary, I would encourage the subcommittee to consider very seriously section 1102 because it could be very harmful to many small private and small public institutions in America and the resulting benefit, should it pass, seems to be very minimal.

Thank you, Madam Chairman.

Mrs. GREEN. In the private institutions, what would be the smallest grant that any institution could receive under title I?

Mr. JONES. The smallest amount of grant? I don't believe any of our plans would provide for a minimum allocation.

Mrs. GREEN. No, but when you divide it up, do any of them get, say, $35,000?

Mr. JONES. Yes, this is possible, especially on supplementals. In many instances you do have very small supplementals in remodeling.

Mrs. GREEN. One recommendation was made to me by one of the college presidents that the committee should set a minimum of $50,000 under title I.

When you consider the cost of making the application and all the work which has gone into it that there should not be less than that amount.

Do you agree?

Mr. JONES. In some instances it might present problems. You occasionaly have unique instances, especially on supplementals where you have an institution that is strained to the point that the project may or may not be able to go. The $30,000 or $40,000 in a supplemental grant might make the difference whether the project could go.

On an initial application, I think there might be a difference but on the supplemental I think we need to have the opportunity of granting small supplementals.

Mrs. GREEN. Dr. Morton, do you have any view on that?

Mr. MORTON. I wanted to ask, would this still keep the one-third?

Mrs. GREEN. One-third matching?

Mr. MORTON. What I am trying to say is that you said $50,000, that would make the minimum size project $150,000. There are many I think

that are meritorious that are somewhat smaller than that. At least some, I don't know how many.

Althought the point is well taken that you do spend some money making the thing out.

Mrs. GREEN. They had a $2 million application, as I recall, and got around $35,000.

Mr. JONES. Madam Chairman, in reference to that point, it is possible that that was the last institution on the priority list of the State. Many States plans allow for this kind of situation.

A number of years ago, our State commission was in the position of giving an institution about $20,000 on a million-dollar request. Now the problem involved is the institution will probably come back the following year and the State may incorporate in its plan a bonus in effect or at least not penalize the institution for accepting that very small partial grant. This does happen.

In those instances, if the institution is aware, they will plan to come back the following year; I think it is important to kep this in the program.

Mrs. GREEN. Do you gentlemen think that the reservation for junior colleges should be continued?

Mr. MORTON. The percentage?

Mrs. GREEN. Yes.

Mr. MORTON. Speaking from my point of view, yes; it is better for us in Missouri.

In West Virginia, I suspect it is not.

Mr. JONES. We transfer money every year. So long as you are able to transfer, it works out all right. It means there is a certain delay but as long as you can transfer from 103 to 104.

Mrs. GREEN. May I express my thanks to Father Collins, Dr. Morton, Mr. Jones. You have been very helpful in your suggestions.

Mr. JONES. Thank you for the opportunity.

Mrs. GREEN. We have now one person representing the American Library Association and then a person representing the Association of Research Libraries.

Dr. Low, will you come up? I will turn to my colleague from Michigan to make the introduction.

Mr. ESCH. Thank you very much.

I would like to welcome and introduce to the committee Dr. Low. I must recognize my inherent bias. We think the University of Michigan is one of the truly great research institutions in the country and the heart of the contributing factors to that leadership is the great research complex within the university library system.

I regret to say that Dr. Fred Wagman, scheduled to testify, became ill this morning. We have in his place the very competent Professor Low, who will present the testimony.

Dr. Low, we know, has contributed not only within the university in Oklahoma but also at the University of Michigan this year. He is the vice president of the American Library Association.

He is speaking, I am sure, today, for that association.

Dr. Low.

STATEMENT OF DR. EDMON LOW ON BEHALF OF THE AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION

Mr. Low. Thank you, Congressman Esch. I appreciate those kind words of introduction and the kind words about our institution.

I happen to be a graduate of the University of Michigan and am coming back home to teach there. So it is a pleasure, indeed.

I am appearing, as you said, in place of Dr. Wagman, who became ill earlier this morning, and I will be presenting his testimony at this time. Dr. Wagman wrote this and it is being presented as really his testimony.

Mr. QUIE (presiding). Would you want to submit that for the record and then briefly summarize it? You know we are close to quarter to 12.

Mr. Low. I will be glad to do that, sir, as well as I can with my very brief minutes of introduction and being drafted in here, but I have gone over the testimony quickly and I believe I can summarize it.

Mr. QUIE. Without objection, we will make it part of the record.

Mr. Low. That will be fine if we may do that.

I share Dr. Wagman's opinions on all of these questions. He does emphasize in here the desirability of support for graduate programs as represented by acquisition of library materials to assist in those programs.

There is a minor suggestion here that the recommendation about library schools be changed from the area of research (sec. 224(a)) to the area of training for librarianship (sec. 223(a)).

He supports very strongly the need for the new networks of knowledge title but points out that any network like this will be some time in accomplishment and we must continue with our present methods for the exchange of information for a very considerable time.

We are all interested in this technological development. Opinions vary as to the time it will take to make these networks really effective. I share with Mr. Wagman the opinion that there will be considerable time before these changes will be highly significant even though the potential is surely there.

These are, I believe, the central points that he has made in his testimony. If we may introduce that for the record, I shall try to answer any questions you might have and rest on that.

Thank you, Madam Chairman.

Mrs. GREEN. Dr. Wagman's statement will be made a part of the record, without objection, at this point.

(The document referred to follows:)

STATEMENT BY DR. FREDERICK H. WAGMAN, DIRECTOR, UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARY

My name is Frederick H. Wagman. I am the Director of the University Library and a Professor of Library Science at The University of Michigan. I am also a Past President of the American Library Association and of the Michigan Library Association, a member of the ALA Council, which is the governing body of the American Library Association, a Regent of the National Library of Medicine and a member of the Board of Directors of the Council on Library Resources, Inc., a nonprofit foundation which stimulates and supports research and development aimed at the improvement of librarianship.

I am here today as a representative of the American Library Association to present our views on certain parts of H.R. 15067, the Higher Education Amend-