

Carnegie Commission Reluctantly Requests Federal Aid To Higher Education

by Joseph Kelly

The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, in a report issued last year, took a strong stand against "lump-sum, across-the-board grants to colleges and universities." Such aid, it stated, would in the long run be detrimental to higher education.

Instead, the commission reaffirmed a proposal it first advanced in December, 1968: to base direct federal support of institutions on the number of federally supported needy students that each of them enrolls.

In so doing, the Carnegie Commission has again addressed itself to one of the most controversial dilemmas facing higher education. Confronted with a sharp drop-off in local and state support and a declining contribution from the private sector, the nation's colleges are compelled to turn to the federal government for funds.

Yet the air has long been filled with dire warnings that if higher education turned to the government for large scale support it would lose its institutional independence and find itself under controls that in the end would "produce uniformity, mediocrity, and compliance."

The Carnegie Commission, which has long been at the forefront of those cautioning against unstructured programs of federal aid, rationalized its program of institutional grants by emphasizing the following points: 1) Certain levels and types of educational programs are essentially national in character and therefore justify some federal support. 2) Certain federal programs are a burden on the institutions — therefore compelling federal support of a different nature. 3) The need for federal support to encourage and reward additional contributions from other sources. 4) Federal funds are needed to encourage educational innovation designed to improve instructional programs. (Institutional grants are grants made in general support of the institution's educational programs, to be utilized as the institution sees fit.)

Various formulas can be utilized in devising a program of federal aid. The components which could be utilized in the formulation of such formulas and which would control the actual distribution of money range from enrollment, degrees awarded, specified groups of students (returning

G.I.'s, low income), to growth factors or actual increased in cost.

The component favored by the commission involves the enrollment of the needy or middle-income student. The institution would be provided with "cost of educational supplements" of \$500 for each needy student they enrolled who received an educational opportunity grant from the federal government. The institution shall also receive \$200 for each middle-income student receiving a subsidized federal loan. The commission also proposes institutional grants of \$5,000 for each enrolled doctoral fellow, thus bringing the Commission's total package to \$950 million a year.

While putting forth this formula for federal aid, the Commission reaffirmed its dedication to state and private involvement in higher education. Because of our pluralistic system combining federal and local funds we have avoided many of the disadvantages which characterize national systems in other countries.

In the report the Commission stressed the need for a method of distributing funds which would spur diversity in academic programs. The Commission pointed out that by distributing grants on the basis of eligible students a wide range of institutions would be affected, such as private trade and technical and business schools which have long been excluded. Higher education's new clientele — low income students, part-time students, older students, women, and students with different educational goals must be considered in any new programs of federal aid.

In view of the current financial crisis in higher education any formula of aid should be a supplement to, not a substitute for funding from other sources. Federal aid, the Commission noted, should encourage effective allocation of resources.

The Commission cautioned against federally funded programs based on the general rationale of "financial distress," but lacking either clear measures of distress or effective provisions which would compel present sources to maintain their support.

"The evidence reveals that the financial crisis is not a single crisis with a single cause. It is also doubtful that any single solution would bring

more than a brief respite. Nor can the crisis be entirely solved at the federal level.

A major theme of the Commission's report places an emphasis on continued state support. Some states might hold back in order to put greater pressure on the federal government to take over more responsibility. The Commission feels however that a program of cost of educational supplements as it has suggested would not be subject to such problems.

The commission maintained that it was not endorsing any bill on institutional aid now before Congress. However its position in this latest report would seem to align it with a Senate approved plan and against a broader proposal passed by the House of Representatives.

The House bill would authorize an estimate \$1 billion a year in payments to institutions. Two-thirds of the funds would be distributed according to enrollments, and the rest according to a percentage of federal student-aid funds awarded at particular institutions.

The Senate-passed bill, which in principle is very close to the Commission's proposal, would authorize some \$700 million annually for cost-of-education grants to institutions based on the number of students receiving educational opportunity grants.

The Commission concluded its report with the following: "Unless the federal government is willing to increase its support levels sufficiently to add new programs while retaining and expanding existing programs, new forms of direct aid to institutions may be gained at the expense of present programs of aid to institutions and students.

"Through implementation of this package of federal aid (the Commission's proposal), the federal government would be giving federal support for federal priorities and, at the same time, would be providing the level of additional funding required for the continued vitality and strength of American higher education."

FOR THE FREE UNIVERSITY

An informal fellowship of those interested or curious about hearing the *Word of God* and what it says to people today.

Tuesdays at 7:30 p.m. in the Hulett Lounge (St. Lawrence)

Tenure: The Why's and The Wherefor's

by Dr. J. Calvin Keene
Professor of Religion

The following statement, made at the request of the Editor of the *Hill News*, is a condensation of a longer article by the same title which appeared in the *Faculty Bulletin*.

The granting of tenure to college professors has been accompanied by certain misunderstandings on the part of both faculty members and university administrators. In recent months a variety of articles and comments have appeared, attempting to clarify the nature of the tenure commitment in what it both does and does not do. Frequently faculty members have considered the achievement of tenure status to be a guarantee of continuing employment, and administrative officers, accepting the same belief, have feared it might fill the faculty ranks with "dead wood" and lower professional accountability and efficiency.

One of the best informed treatments of this matter appears in the October 1, 1971 issue of the *American Association of University Professors Bulletin*. William Van Alstyne, its author, is a professor in the Duke University Law School. His concern is to show that both of the beliefs mentioned above are false. He declares that the university need not fear a lowering of professional productivity since even under tenure an instructor's contract can be terminated if he fails to meet the university's standards of performance, productivity, and conduct. Tenure protects the individual to the extent that such termination of contract may be executed only after "due process," and not arbitrarily. From the standpoint of the faculty member, the value of tenure lies precisely in its guarantee of guarding against "summary termination of service."

Professor Van Alstyne goes on to

note, however, that in the present campus situation, it is doubtful that anyone can be summarily dismissed even where no tenure plan exists. Since this is true, the primary advantage of being under tenure, he states, is that under tenure the institution must initiate action by showing cause for terminating contracts while in the absence of tenure the individual himself must initiate action demanding evidence to support the dismissal.

In actual practice, tenure policy tends normally to benefit the university more than the faculty member for it makes mandatory a close examination of the instructor, after a stated period of service on the faculty, and a definite decision concerning his continuing service. This period is normally one that is long enough to give the instructor ample opportunity to provide evidence of his professional qualities and abilities, yet not so long as to make it appear that the institution is committed to retaining him. At St. Lawrence, a professional committee examines very carefully the record of an instructor in his sixth year of service, under four headings, namely, his teaching ability (usually assisted by student evaluations); his possession of the appropriate professional degree, normally the doctorate; indication of his creative ability and interest in his field; and his campus commitments and cooperation. Tenured members of the individual's department and the chairman of that department make their recommendations to the committee. This precise and careful examination of an instructor is a demand which stimulates new faculty members to complete work toward their degree; to develop as teachers, and to accept responsibility toward their college community and their profession.

Internship In Nairobi

In January, 15 St. Lawrence University students traveled 8,000 miles to take a close look at both family and public life in Kenya, East Africa, as participants in a January inter-term off-campus seminar.

The St. Lawrence field seminar, entitled "Field Survey of Political and Economic Development in A New Nation," will be distinctive among foreign studies programs for undergraduates primarily because of its provision of individualized internships for each of the participating students.

After arrival in Nairobi, Kenya, each student lived three days with African families in Kubuku, a village 16 miles from Nairobi, to speed the cultural immersion process and make the students more sensitive to the new environment.

Following the homestay students are serving a two-week internship with a government agency, newspaper editorial office of the *Daily Nation*, a law firm, voluntary agency, or public corporation. The third segment of the program will involve a tour of rural economic development projects. In addition, the students will be guests of the Kenya Parliament's deputy speaker, the Honorable Dr. Muniya Waiyaki, at the Parliament; observe

constituency level political activities; and hear a series of lectures on manpower development, university operations, and the functioning of foreign ministry in a new state.

The seminar schedule also includes a five-day field safari, with visits to the Nakuru Game Reserve, the Nyanjira tea factory, Tambac homecrafts area and Masai-Mara Game Reserve.

Director of the field seminar is Dr. Peter L. French, assistant professor of government at St. Lawrence, who worked as a civil servant in Nairobi in 1964-65, was a director for the Botswana I training program for the Peace Corps, director of the Eastern African Development Resources Center at Syracuse University, 1967-69, and last summer conducted political science research in Kenya. He joined the St. Lawrence faculty in 1970.

Dr. French explained that the African seminar will be a valuable educational venture because "one of the fundamental realities of the future is that Americans are now and will continue to go abroad for business and other reasons in increasing numbers. They will transact commerce and develop contacts with many peoples of the non-Western world."

Community Craft Center Opens In Dean-Eaton

Continued from page 1

cannot be continued into the second semester. In addition, the lack of an adequate space was noted as the rooms currently occupied are normally the recreation room areas for the Dean-Eaton residents.

The work of faculty and staff wives was named as a major factor in the planning and operation of the center and the demonstration program. Miss Angelo stated that the idea for a center of this type was developed this summer and that the actual planning has been underway since October.

"We really hope that this can be a total community project. We're particularly interested in involving senior citizens. I don't ever want to underestimate the role that the students are playing, however. It is the students who are regenerating the whole idea of crafts making. It is our hope that maybe some of the older people can help the students."

Miss Angelo emphasized the community wide scope of this experiment and noted the great participation by faculty wives, staff wives, people from the physical plant, secretaries, and students alike.

Miss Angelo also mentioned the possibilities for expanding the facilities to make possible the teaching and practicing of crafts other than those presently within the scope of the project. Specifically, she named woodworking, leather craft, jewelry making, and others. It is her hope that the center can, in the future, have in stock the necessary large tools required for some of the crafts.

Another facet of the program which

Miss Angelo hopes to develop for the future is some form of cooperation with the Fine Arts Department. One possibility which Miss Angelo mentioned was that the majors of that department might be able to use the center and the program as a type of laboratory for their work. This, she felt, might be accomplished by using the resources of the Fine Arts majors as staff and instructors at the center.

Another idea which Miss Angelo expanded upon was the possibility of setting up some form of shop in which the students and other interested people could purchase the necessary materials for the various crafts at wholesale costs.

One of the hopes which Miss Angelo expressed for the future is that any center which becomes a reality in the future will also become a social center of sorts in which people would be free to come and go as they choose without being a part of the activity of the center if they so choose.

Recognizing the importance of location to any such scheme, Miss Angelo stated her belief that the present site would be the most conducive to this type of activity by virtue of the fact that it is quite centrally located and has a great proximity to a large number of people.

Miss Angelo announced that she has prepared a "... document for our consideration in future planning in terms of a very intricate craft center that would be built over a five year period." She stated that this would permit the center to become large

enough to serve the majority of the interests of the community and at the same time flexible enough to offer a greater concentration as it was needed from time to time.

"We would like to compliment what is happening elsewhere on the campus. Not to duplicate what the Fine Arts department is doing but to supplement it."

Miss Angelo stated her hope that the proposal for the craft center for the future would be an expanded form of what currently exists only for this month and that it could be kept as freely structured as it is now.

Laurentian Singers On Tour

The Laurentian Singers are presently on concert tour in Europe. Participation in the trip gives academic credit for the January interterm to each singer. Following is the itinerary for the tour

January

- 10 Leave Montreal for London.
- 12 London Concert at the Royal College of Music.
- 15 Paris. Concert at Chartres Cathedral in Chartres.
- 17 Montreal. Concert at the Palace in Villars.
- 23 Innsbruck. Concert at the Kurhaus, Igls.
- 25 Dinkelsbuehl. Concert in the Town Hall.
- 28 Amsterdam. Concert at the Buitensociteit in Zwolle. (Students will spend two days with Dutch families in Zwolle.)
- 31 Return trip from Paris.

BARGAINING . . . from page 1

ulty. Both Mr. Randall and Dean Baker spoke of the very blissful relationship between the two groups.

Dr. William Elberty, Acting Head of the Geology Department feels that to a certain extent an adversary relationship does exist. Dr. Elberty stated that there is a feeling on the part of many faculty that the administration does not trust them.

However, Dr. Elberty is himself against collective bargaining. He feels that it has a tendency "to bring things more rapidly to mediocrity."

"It stifles any kind of merit system; pay raises are across the board — everyone gets the same percentage increase; it puts things into a manage-

ment-labor category; and could, due to resultant administration pressure, result in a "clock-punching environment."

Dr. Daniel Mahoney of Economics department stated that while this was his first year at St. Lawrence he hadn't seen anything which would indicate that an adversary relationship exists.

"I've heard a lot of talk about it but I've never heard any specific issues."

Dr. Mahoney said that he was not aware that any one had come up with a reason for collective bargaining and that he himself did not see anything for which he would be willing to pay union dues.