

Transactions and Proceedings
of the
National Association of
State Universities
in the
United States of America

Edited for the Association by
DEANE W. MALOTT
Secretary-Treasurer

Volume XLIII, 1945

Regular Annual Meeting Held at Edgewater Beach Hotel
Chicago, Illinois, Friday and Saturday,
April 27 and 28, 1945

378.06
N277t
v43

UNIVERSITY
OF FLORIDA
LIBRARY



Transactions and Proceedings
of the
National Association of
State Universities
in the
United States of America

Edited for the Association by
DEANE W. MALOTT
Secretary-Treasurer

Volume XLIII, 1945

Regular Annual Meeting Held at Edgewater Beach Hotel
Chicago, Illinois, Friday and Saturday,
April 27 and 28, 1945

N277t
v.43

THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE UNIVERSITIES
IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The National Association of State Universities, in response to a call issued by Chancellor Fulton of the University of Mississippi, was formed at Denver, Colorado, the eleventh of July, 1895. Meetings have been held as follows:

| | | | | | |
|----------------------|-----------|------------------|------------------|---------|-------------|
| 1896 | - - - - - | Buffalo | 1921, Nov. 7-8 | - - - | New Orleans |
| 1897 | - - - - - | Milwaukee | 1922, Nov. 13-14 | - - - | Washington |
| 1898 | - - - - - | Washington | 1923, Nov. 12-13 | - - - | Chicago |
| 1899 | - - - - - | Los Angeles | 1924, Nov. 10-11 | - - - | Chicago |
| 1900 | - - - - - | Charleston | 1925, Nov. 16-17 | - - - | Chicago |
| 1901, Nov. 12-13 | - - - | Washington | 1926, Nov. 15-16 | - - - | Washington |
| 1903, Jan. 3-5 | - - - | Washington | 1927, Nov. 14-15 | - - - | Chicago |
| 1904, June 27 | - - - - | St. Louis | 1928, Nov. 19-20 | - - - | Washington |
| 1904, Oct. 31-Nov. 1 | - - - | Des Moines | 1929, Nov. 11-12 | - - - | Chicago |
| 1905, Nov. 13-14 | - - - | Washington | 1930, Nov. 19-20 | - - - | Washington |
| 1906, Nov. 12-13 | - - - | Baton Rouge | 1931, Nov. 18-19 | - - - | Chicago |
| 1907, Nov. 18-19 | - - - | Washington | 1932, Nov. 17-18 | - - - | Washington |
| 1908, Nov. 15-16 | - - - | Washington | 1933, Nov. 16-17 | - - - | Chicago |
| 1909, Oct. 8-9 | - - - | Cambridge-Boston | 1934, Nov. 21-23 | - - - | Washington |
| 1910, Nov. 14-15 | - - - | Washington | 1935, Nov. 20-22 | - - - | Washington |
| 1911, Oct. 19-20 | - - - | Minneapolis | 1936, Nov. 19-20 | - - - - | Austin |
| 1912, Nov. 18-19 | - - - | Washington | 1937, Nov. 17-19 | - - - | Washington |
| 1913, Nov. 10-11 | - - - | Washington | 1938, Nov. 9-11 | - - - | Chicago |
| 1914, Nov. 9-10 | - - - | Washington | 1939, Nov. 13-14 | - - - | Washington |
| 1915, Aug. 30-31 | - - - - | Berkeley | 1940, Nov. 8-9 | - - - | Chicago |
| 1916, Nov. 12-13 | - - - | Washington | 1941, Nov. 7-8 | - - - | Chicago |
| 1917, May 4-5 | - - - - | Washington | 1942, Oct. 23-24 | - - - | Chicago |
| 1918, Nov. 11-12 | - - - - | Chicago | 1943, Oct. 22-23 | - - - | Chicago |
| 1919, Nov. 10-11 | - - - - | Chicago | 1944, Apr. 28-29 | - - - | Chicago |
| 1920, Nov. 12-13 | - - - - | Washington | 1945, Apr. 27-28 | - - - | Chicago |

Copies of proceedings of the current and previous meetings may be had at 50 cents a copy upon application to the Secretary.

DEANE W. MALOTT, Secretary-Treasurer
University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas.

Contents

| | |
|--|-----|
| Organization of the Association, 1945-1946 | 4 |
| Program | 7 |
| Roll Call | 9 |
| President's Address: President John C. West | 10 |
| Report of Secretary-Treasurer | 17 |
| Legislation of Interest to State Universities: Dr. Fred J. Kelly | 19 |
| Report of Committee on Military Affairs and Special Committee on Perpetuation of the R. O. T. C. | 25 |
| Plans for Revision of the U. S. Office of Education: Dr. Fred J. Kelly | 31 |
| Curricular Reorganization in College of Liberal Arts at University of Iowa: President Virgil M. Hancher; Dean Harry K. Newburn | 34 |
| A Professional Dean Looks at Liberal Arts: Professor W. B. Donham | 48 |
| Greetings from the Canadian Universities: President James S. Thomson | 56 |
| Behind the Scenes with a Senator: The Honorable J. W. Fulbright | 58 |
| Committee on Group Life of Students | |
| The Union Building as an Educational Factor: President A. C. Willard | 59 |
| The Returned Veteran and the Civilian Student: President A. A. Hauck | 64 |
| The Veteran Vocational Rehabilitation and Education Program: Mr. C. E. Hostetler | 65 |
| Federal Assistance to Higher Education: Dr. Francis J. Brown | 77 |
| Report of Nominating Committee and Election of Officers | 86 |
| Reports of Committees | |
| Committee on Auditing | 87 |
| Committee on Accrediting | 87 |
| Special Committee on Vocational Education | 99 |
| Committee on Radio Broadcasting | 103 |
| Special Committee on Distribution of War Surplus Commodities | 118 |
| Committee on Resolutions | 120 |
| Committee on Relations with Foreign Students | 122 |
| Committee on Necrology | 129 |
| Appendix | 131 |

ORGANIZATION OF THE ASSOCIATION

1945-1946

OFFICERS

President—A. C. WILLARD

President of the University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois.

Vice-President—VIRGIL M. HANCHER

President of the University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa.

Vice-President Ex-Officio—JOHN WARD STUDEBAKER

The United States Commissioner of Education, Washington, D.C.

Secretary-Treasurer—DEANE W. MALOTT

Chancellor of the University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE—The President, Vice-President, Secretary-Treasurer, and the following:

HERMAN L. DONOVAN

President of the University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky.

ARTHUR A. HAUCK

President of the University of Maine, Orono, Maine.

FREDERICK M. MIDDLEBUSH

President of the University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri.

J. L. NEWCOMB

President of the University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia.

JOHN C. WEST

President of the University of North Dakota, Grand Forks, North Dakota.

STANDING COMMITTEES

Permanent Delegate to the Council on Education of the American Medical Association

FREDERICK M. MIDDLEBUSH

University of Alabama, University, Alabama.

Committee on Military Affairs

PRESIDENT RALPH D. HETZEL

Pennsylvania State College, State College, Pennsylvania.

PRESIDENT HOWARD L. BEVIS

Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio

PRESIDENT GEORGE LYNN CROSS

University of Oklahoma, Norman, Oklahoma.

PRESIDENT ALEXANDER G. RUTHVEN

University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

PRESIDENT HERMAN B. WELLS

Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana.

Committee on Radio Broadcasting

PRESIDENT HOWARD L. BEVIS

Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.

PRESIDENT JOHN J. TIGERT

University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida.

PRESIDENT ILA D. WEEKS

University of South Dakota, Vermillion, South Dakota.

Committee on Group Life of Students

PRESIDENT ARTHUR A. HAUCK

University of Maine, Orono, Maine.

PRESIDENT JOHN C. BAKER

Ohio University, Athens, Ohio.

PRESIDENT R. R. PATY

University of Alabama, University, Alabama.

Committee on Accrediting Agencies

PRESIDENT JOHN J. TIGERT

University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida.

CHANCELLOR C. S. BOUCHER

University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska.

PRESIDENT HERMAN L. DONOVAN

University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky.

Committee on Relations with Foreign Students and Universities

PRESIDENT ALEXANDER G. RUTHVEN

University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

PRESIDENT W. B. HATCHER

Louisiana State University, University, Louisiana.

PRESIDENT ARTHUR A. HAUCK

University of Maine, Orono, Maine.

Representatives on American Council on Education

PRESIDENT A. C. WILLARD (*ex officio*)

University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois.

CHANCELLOR DEANE W. MALOTT (*ex officio*)

University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas.

PRESIDENT FRANK P. GRAHAM

University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina.

Committee on Cooperation with Religious Agencies

PRESIDENT C. E. LAWALL

West Virginia University, Morgantown, West Virginia.

PRESIDENT ALEXANDER G. RUTHVEN

University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Special Committee on Vocational Education

PRESIDENT ALBERT N. JORGENSEN
University of Connecticut, Storrs, Connecticut.

PRESIDENT HARMON W. CALDWELL
University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia.

PRESIDENT JOHN J. TIGERT
University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida.

Special Committee on Distribution of War Surplus Commodities

PRESIDENT HOWARD L. BEVIS
Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.

PRESIDENT J. L. MORRILL
University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota (after July 1, 1945).

PRESIDENT HERMAN B. WELLS
Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana.

Program

10:00 A.M., FRIDAY, APRIL 27, 1945
Michigan Room

Roll Call and Introduction of New Members and Guests.

President's AddressPRESIDENT JOHN C. WEST
University of North Dakota

Report of Secretary-TreasurerCHANCELLOR DEANE W. MALOTT
University of Kansas

"Legislation of Interest to
State Universities"DR. FRED J. KELLY
U.S. Office of Education

ReportsPRESIDENT A. C. WILLARD
University of Illinois

Committee on Military Affairs.

Special Committee on Perpetuation of the R.O.T.C.

2:00 P.M., FRIDAY, APRIL 27, 1945
Michigan Room

"Plans for Revision of the U.S.
Office of Education"DR. FRED J. KELLY
U.S. Office of Education

Special Committee to Study Postwar
Educational ProblemsPRESIDENT VIRGIL M. HANCHER
University of Iowa, Chairman

"A Professional Dean Looks
at Liberal Arts"PROFESSOR W. B. DONHAM
Former Dean, Harvard Business School

Discussion.

7:00 P.M., FRIDAY, APRIL 27, 1945
West Room, INFORMAL BANQUET

ToastmasterPRESIDENT JOHN C. WEST

Greetings from the
Canadian AssociationPRESIDENT JAMES S. THOMSON
University of Saskatchewan

"Behind the Scenes
with a Senator"THE HONORABLE J. W. FULBRIGHT
U.S. Senator from Arkansas

9:00 A.M., SATURDAY, APRIL 28, 1945
Michigan Room

- Committee on Group
Life of StudentsPRESIDENT ARTHUR A. HAUCK
University of Maine, Chairman
- “The Veteran Training Program”MR. C. E. HOSTETLER
Chief, Vocational Rehabilitation and
Education Division, Veterans Ad-
ministration, Hines, Illinois.
- “Federal Assistance to
Higher Education”DR. FRANCIS J. BROWN
Director, Study of Higher Education
for House Committee on Education

12:30 P.M., SATURDAY, APRIL 28, 1945
West Room, LUNCHEON SESSION

- Report of Committee on
Accrediting AgenciesPRESIDENT HERMAN L. DONOVAN
University of Kentucky
- Report of Committee on
Vocational EducationPRESIDENT JOHN C. WEST
University of North Dakota
- Report of Committee on
Radio Broadcasting.....
- Report of Special Commit-
tee on Distribution of War
Surplus Commodities.....
- }PRESIDENT HOWARD L. BEVIS
Ohio State University, Chairman
- Report of Committee on
Relations with Foreign
Students and UniversitiesPRESIDENT ALEXANDER G. RUTHVEN
University of Michigan, Chairman

- Report of Auditing Committee.
Report of Necrology Committee.
Report of Resolutions Committee.
Report of Nominations Committee.
Election.

Adjournment, 2:30 p.m.

Proceedings, 1945

FRIDAY MORNING SESSION

— APRIL 27, 1945

The Fiftieth Annual Meeting of the National Association of State Universities convened at ten o'clock at the Edgewater Beach Hotel, Chicago, Illinois, President John C. West, University of North Dakota, presiding.

. . . The following institutional representatives and special members were present:

UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA
UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS
UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO
UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
INDIANA UNIVERSITY
STATE UNIVERSITY OF IOWA
UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS
UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

UNIVERSITY OF MAINE
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
UNIVERSITY OF MISSISSIPPI
MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA
UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA
UNIVERSITY OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
RUTGERS UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA
UNIVERSITY OF NORTH DAKOTA
OHIO UNIVERSITY
OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA
PENNSYLVANIA STATE COLLEGE
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH DAKOTA
UNIVERSITY OF UTAH
UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA
WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

UNIVERSITY OF WYOMING
U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Special Member:

HERMAN G. JAMES, Ohio University, 1935-1943.

Guest:

A. F. ARNASON, Commissioner of Education, North Dakota.

LEE BIDGOOD, *Dean, School of Commerce*
ALFRED ATKINSON, *President*
A. M. HARDING, *President*
R. C. GUSTAVSON, *Acting President*
HARMAN W. CALDWELL, *President*
A. C. WILLARD, *President*
H. T. BRISCOE, *Vice-President*
VIRGIL M. HANCHER, *President*
DEANE W. MALOTT, *Chancellor*
HERMAN L. DONOVAN, *President*
W. B. HATCHER, *President*
FRED C. FREY, *Dean of the University*
ARTHUR A. HAUCK, *President*
J. F. PYLE, *Dean, College of Commerce*
ALEXANDER G. RUTHVEN, *President*
A. B. BUTTS, *Chancellor*
ERNEST O. MELBY, *President*
C. S. BOUCHER, *Chancellor*
JOHN MOSELEY, *President*
HAROLD W. STOKE, *President*
A. S. JOHNSON, *Comptroller*
FRANK P. GRAHAM, *President*
JOHN C. WEST, *President*
JOHN C. BAKER, *President*
HOWARD L. BEVIS, *President*
GEORGE LYNN CROSS, *President*
A. O. MORSE, *Assistant to President*
I. D. WEEKS, *President*
LEROY E. COWLES, *President*
J. L. NEWCOMB, *President*
C. E. LAWALL, *President*
I. L. BALDWIN, *Dean, Graduate School*
H. SCUDDER MEKELL, *Prof. of Anthropology*
J. L. MORRILL, *President*
FRED J. KELLY

. . . President West appointed the following special committees:

Auditing Committee: President Melby, President Harding.

Resolutions Committee: President Ruthven, President Morrill, President Baker, President Donovan.

Necrology Committee: President Atkinson, President Newcomb.

Nominating Committee: President Newcomb, Chancellor Butts, President Weeks, Chancellor Boucher.

. . . President West read the President's Address. . .

PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS

THE STATE UNIVERSITY AND ITS NEIGHBORS

It has been said that the virility and the life span of an institution is measured by its ability and willingness to change its character, its function, and even its objective, in order to meet new or changing problems and ideas. In pointing out some applications of this principle as it has manifested itself in the past, and as it may project itself into the future of the membership of the N. A. S. U., the example of President Wells who departed from the traditional type of philosophical address and presented a survey and an evaluation of the addresses and work of the Association for the past quarter of a century is clearly in mind. Neither has the suggestion of President Newcomb to the effect that the omission of the usual presidential address "may be a source of satisfaction and even of thanksgiving to the membership of this important organization" been overlooked.

Those who have sought to define and limit the function of this Association have found it to be variable, elusive in nature, but generally stemming from problems of administration rather than from problems of instruction. In its youth it was mentioned as a debating society. Only seven years ago it was characterized as a "pleasant club offering a congenial place from which to point with pride and to view with alarm."

Behind this ribbing on the part of other groups, both educational and political, has been a feeling of deep respect and even of fear. The Congress of the United States, through the voice of its members, has repeatedly said that the power is potential but real. They have recognized that, if the voice of the universities united in purpose and volume reaches Washington, action will promptly follow. The sleeping giant may awake and give public education a voice, which it has never had, other than a timid whisper or a conflicting set of cross purposes. Or it may sleep on until an impatient nation will look else-

where for positive, unified leadership. From the literature of the French Revolution comes this: "What is the Third Estate?" "Everything." "What has it been hitherto?" "Nothing." "What does it ask?" "To be something."

While our estimate of the past weakness must be frank, credit for vast accomplishments may not justly be withheld. As units, if not as an association, the state universities have profoundly affected the political, material, and cultural welfare of our country. The organization itself may justly claim an honorable part in the decision which made the accrediting associations the servants of the universities, rather than their masters. They have been freed from the influence of self-appointed groups heavily dominated by representatives of nontax-supported institutions. The voice of N. A. S. U. has, through its officers and committees, been repeatedly sought and heeded by the Office of Education, the Army, the Navy, the Veterans Administration, and the American Council on Education. Ten years ago the annual dinner presented an array of "boiled shirts" and dinner jackets. Prestige has been lost socially, but it is fair to say that the N. A. S. U. has increased in stature, both at home and in foreign nations, as the spokesman of higher education in the United States. Not to Europe, nor to the Big Three, as Yale, Harvard and Princeton were once known, nor to the big endowed universities in the mid- or far west do people look for inspiration, but, with great hope and some pride, they seek the crystallized and unified leadership of their own State Universities.

Some help in looking to the future of the universities, and hence the N. A. S. U., may be forthcoming through a backward look over the road that has been traveled, together with a glance at our fellow travelers. We are informed that the bones of the saber-toothed tiger and the bones of the coyote are found together in the pitch pits of California, and that the lowly cockroach has been able to survive the perils of the electric kitchen. Academies have found it difficult to compete with tax-supported high schools, and medical schools have found a separate existence to be precarious, with the result that most of them have become connected with a university in one way or another. Law schools and schools of nursing are following a similar but more deliberate trend. The alternative seems to be extinction.

The state university, new in the field, adopted some of the strong points, also some of the weak points, of the older nontax-supported institutions. The staffs of the early state universities of necessity came from the alumni of private or endowed schools of America and Europe, and to a certain extent still do, and vice versa. The implications of this interchange are too extensive to examine in detail. Certain it is that the present pattern of all types of higher educational institutions have been conditioned by emulation as well as by compe-

tion. It may be too early to observe a trend, but a few facts do stand out.

In general each state has a state university, but some notable exceptions or modifications break the rule. Special conditions exist in some of the states, like New York, which for certain purposes has affiliated with Cornell to the extent that it shares in the nature of a state university. New Jersey supports a Board of Regents and maintains a contract with Rutgers under an old Colonial charter. Like Cornell, Rutgers shares in the nature of a state school, and is a state university in so far as it has been legally designated as a state university and a land-grant college. The history of the University of Pennsylvania indicates a close connection with the state from time to time, but Pennsylvania State College must be considered the true state university in everything but name.

There are other minor departures from the general pattern dating back to the time when the state university system began to share the field with the nontax-supported institutions. In the emergence of the publicly-supported high school and the state university is the most fascinating chapter of the history of education. The early struggle of the lowly high school with the powerful academies, some of which are still in existence, is only less intriguing than that between the state-supported universities and the large, powerful endowed institutions reaching back into Colonial times. The people of the country do not in general realize that this chapter has not been closed. A glimpse of the new campus of the University of Maryland discloses physical evidence of militant desire to fulfill its destiny even though it lies in the shadow of older institutions, entrenched, and rich both in property and tradition.

Nor has the principle of endowed institutions gone into an eclipse. There are present today those who have seen new giants in the educational field spring into being, either by the process of absorption of a smaller institution or by direct birth. Among these are Duke University, the University of Chicago, the University of Southern California, and Stanford University.

And thus, by devious means and indirections, we present an age-old problem facing the National Association of State Universities. Which system can best adapt itself to the service of the country, or is the field large enough for both types of higher education to flourish and to grow? In presenting this problem, it may be recalled that there is excellent precedent which dates back to Colonial times for direct state appropriations to endowed colleges and universities. The power of the universities in the state legislature and in the Congress of the United States for the past seventy-five years has brought appropriations to the state institutions to a maximum, and to private institutions to

a minimum. The great impetus to state education given by the Morrill Act and the fear that the church might dominate public education partially explains the procedure and the result.

The desire of the nontax-supported institutions to come under the protecting umbrella of the state without jeopardizing their original purposes, be they religious or otherwise, is still in a good state of health. In fact the vigor exhibited in the patriotic desire to cooperate with the Army and the Navy by organizing training courses, as well as the successful plan to cooperate with the Government in the training of returned veterans on a basis highly advantageous to the private school, is matched only by the persistent efforts to share in United States government appropriations and subventions.

In preparation now is a bill to authorize a huge appropriation, of which 75 per cent will go to public institutions and 25 per cent will go to private institutions. What will be the attitude of the National Association of State Universities on this whole problem, which may so profoundly affect every university affiliated with this organization?

As a second consideration, it may be in order to mention another problem brought about by the Morrill Act that established land-grant colleges. Some seventeen or eighteen state universities do not come under this act and are thereby in direct competition for legislative support with the separate land-grant colleges in the same states. Since this is more or less of a family affair, the problem of nation-wide education is not involved, except when we consider the possibility that the separate land-grant college and the separate state university may nullify each other, with the result that there may be two weak institutions rather than one strong one occupying the same field. Except in cases in which separate state universities are located in large cities, such as Seattle, or the separate land-grant colleges are located in relatively inaccessible spots, the past half century seems to have given the land-grant college, because of its government connection and support, an advantage that makes the future of the separate state universities somewhat obscure. Duplication of effort and institutional ambition tend to invite political notice and undignified quarrels. In some states great injury has followed and public confidence has been withheld. This Association may well take a sympathetic interest in the welfare of the separate universities, since they are the weak links in the powerful system of the state universities.

As a third item of concern, the dispersion or decentralization of university units may be examined. The State of Ohio now has five state universities, three of which are members of this Association. California has one university, but has all of the manifestations of having two. Idaho has one state university and a branch, and Indiana has two state universities. This dispersion idea, if followed through, will tend

to make state universities out of the separate land-grant colleges, and out of other state institutions that may sporadically show political or local strength.

The state normal schools and state teachers colleges are also suffering from troubled dreams. The Teachers College at Greeley, Colorado, for instance, offers the doctor's degree in at least one field, thus sharing with the state university the attributes of a graduate school. Numerous other normal schools have proclaimed that they are now junior colleges, and offer not only the first two years of the traditional Science, Literature and Arts college, but also offer preprofessional work on the college level. State teachers colleges have also gone into the junior colleges and preprofessional line, and there is evidence of further ambitious efforts. The State Board in Montana, in a statement of policy, proposed to transfer teacher education from the Billings Normal School to the State University, and to organize an Eastern Montana State College at Billings. This is the first step toward the organization of a second state university. In North Dakota, the State Board has just proclaimed that two teachers colleges, namely Minot and Dickinson, shall henceforth divide the work with the Agricultural College in offering two years' work in agriculture and allied fields. The State Legislature has already purchased land for experiment stations for the colleges. Ambitious planners foresee the second and third steps into the field now occupied by the state university. This trend is observable in several other states. Thus a new problem, that of dispersion of state education, is placed before the universities holding membership in this Association.

A fourth area of concern lies in the plans in some states to organize new institutions of "less than college grade." This phrase, "less than college grade," has occupied the attention of a joint committee of this Association and the Association of Universities and Land-Grant Colleges. It has been freely predicted that these new institutions may enter the university field and may become either state or national universities. This expectation may be far-reaching and may be the result of "looking for ghosts." Be that as it may, the organization and maintenance of any new state institution of higher learning, by its very nature, shares the work heretofore done by a state university.

As a fifth item, the municipal junior college and university movement must enter into the future plans of the state universities. Junior colleges, formerly the exception, have now become the rule, and have profoundly affected the attendance, and therefore the staff strength, of the state universities. It is too early to appraise the direction of their growth, but it seems probable that their influence will be considerable, if not dominant, in the first two years of the traditional college, and also in the preprofessional field. For the present, this

will throw more emphasis on the senior college and the graduate school of the state universities. In cases where junior colleges are located in large centers of population in states where the university is located in some place less accessible, the growth of the junior colleges may not in every instance cease at the junior college level.

Municipal universities, except in a few places such as the University of Wichita in Kansas, Omaha University in Nebraska, and Wayne University in Michigan, have not shown an extraordinary rate of expansion. Older municipal universities seem to have stabilized. Just what relationship with the state universities will finally emerge is obscure.

When one observes a phenomenon, the cause of which is not evident, he seeks to pronounce a cause which will satisfy him and serve his purpose until the real cause comes to light. From this homemade cause he then seeks to draw conclusions. These may not be trustworthy, but they must form a hypothesis to be used as a basis of further development. It is in line with this observation, rather than an effort to pontificate, that notice of some possible causes may be taken.

All social institutions have a tendency, upon birth, to anchor, to intrench, and then to expand. So it is with the colleges and universities of all types. It may be observed that separate boards are more prone to enhance the importance of the state universities than are state-wide boards who, through public pressure, find it convenient to "treat all institutions alike." Legislators are observed to follow somewhat the same pattern. Political sense prompts institutions, both public and private, to include members of the legislature or of the Congress on their boards, or in their lists of men receiving honorary degrees. Financial responsibility suggests that advantage be taken of state and government subventions, military contracts, and federal compensation for the education of veterans. Local pressure, local pride, and convenience seem to prompt centers of population to demand that educational opportunities, accessible or adjacent to one community, shall be duplicated in every community. Highly specialized education, such as that offered by medical schools and technical research, such as agricultural investigation and engineering research, drift to institutions with large endowments, or to those adequately supported by the wealthier states.

The five special problems confronting state universities may or may not have their origin in these facts. Neither can it be said with any degree of confidence that every state university must react with equal vigor to the several situations that have been presented. Universities, which are also designated as land-grant colleges, need not worry over agricultural colleges. However, they are not thereby justified in being

unsympathetic with the separate state universities. Likewise it is true that states wherein 95 per cent of the enrollment in institutions of higher education is located in state colleges or universities will not react in exactly the same manner as those states wherein the ratio is reversed. Certain it is that all state universities, as representatives of the university system, should be concerned with the welfare and standing of all other state universities. As the prestige of the large and strong units spills over to the smaller state universities, a misfortune happening to one of the weaker institutions is reflected in the halls of the legislature with detrimental effect to other units of the nation. Certain also is the fact that state universities now enjoy opportunities and face problems unknown and undreamed of during the last half of the preceding century and the first quarter of this century.

Of interest to this Association are many current problems for discussion and perhaps for action. Among these are compulsory military training, reeducation of veterans, current and future enrollment, and other topics that may well be discussed at this or at some future annual meeting. Without designating a hierarchy or rank as to importance, this paper has largely confined itself to nation-wide movements which will, beyond all doubt, enter into any discussion which attempts to recognize, condition or modify the life stream of the state universities. Recapitulating, the following topics have been presented, not with any attempt of solution in mind, but with the sincere desire to place them on the calendar of any planning groups, either formal or informal. Notice is served on the new members of this group, the great majority of whose service is less than a dozen years, that a responsibility and an awareness on their part rests on their shoulders and may not be shifted or ignored.

1. The desire of private institutions of higher learning to become partially or wholly tax supported institutions.
2. The duplication of the efforts of separate state universities and separate land-grant colleges working in the same state.
3. The decentralization or dispersion of state university units and the assignment of part of the work traditionally done by the universities to teachers colleges or other state units.
4. The organization of new state institutions of "less than college grade" that may later become institutions of college level.
5. The impact on the enrollment and the state and federal support of the state universities coming from the multiplicity of junior colleges and municipal universities on a nation-wide scale.

Future research workers will examine the pitch pits of education and find therein the bones of the extinct educational systems mixed with

the discarded and replaced bones of virile living organizations that have survived vicissitudes and have adapted their functions to the ever changing demands of the social structure, and which have thus extended their life span through many generations.

The N.A.S.U. will, through an interchange of ideas and the unification of purpose, be a directing force and a voice in determining the nature and form of the things to come in state education.

PRESIDENT WEST: At this time I recognize the Secretary-Treasurer, who will make his report. Chancellor Malott.

. . . Chancellor Malott read his prepared report. . .

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-TREASURER

During the past year, the Executive Committee of your Association held three meetings, on July 2, September 23, and December 8, 1944, all at the University Club in Chicago. Minutes of those meetings were circulated to the membership.

The routine and detailed business of the Association has been carried forward, the Annual Proceedings published and distributed, cooperation extended to the various standing committees, and the correspondence of the Association cared for.

The chief focal point of the activities of the officers and Executive Committee has had to do with the Veterans Administration in its relation to the state universities, particularly in regard to compensation.

Mr. R. B. Stewart, Business Manager of Purdue University, and Chairman of the Advisory Committee of the Veterans Administration, attended two of the meetings to defend and urge upon us the compensation plans of the Veterans Administration. Your Association has held firm and continuous pressure for a fair and reasonable cost basis. This pressure resulted in sending two letters to General Hines, copies of which were sent to you.

The situation has become increasingly more complicated; there are now several alternative methods of payment in effect, all unsatisfactory to varying degrees, and all contributing to confusion. These alternatives appear to have been offered, partly at least, to meet our continued disapproval, but none accomplishes the desired result, and the situation has disintegrated during the year.

President West and I represented the Association at a meeting on the subject of compensation for veterans' training called in Washington by the American Council on Education on April 4th. The Veterans Administration representative at that meeting appeared to avoid every major question and had no authority to speak. The group present went on record as backing a Congressional proposal to divorce the amount of any future military bonus from educational payments made by the

Veterans Administration, and reaffirmed the belief of educators in fair and reasonable cost as the proper basis for cooperation. We have attempted to have General Hines here at this meeting in Chicago; we tried a year ago. He has not been able to come because of Congressional hearings, although we hope to have an address prepared by him delivered by a member of his organization tomorrow.

The new Executive Committee will be glad, I know, to have further instructions from the floor or from your Resolutions Committee to guide your next year's officers, because veterans' problems and relations with the Veterans Administration will assume greater importance in the immediate years ahead.

Turning now to the finances of the Association:

Exhibit A

BANK RECONCILIATION STATEMENT AS OF APRIL 16, 1945

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Cash Balance in the First National Bank, Lawrence, Kansas, April 16, 1945 | \$ 2,623.30 |
| Deduct outstanding checks: | |
| No. 131 | \$ 4.10 |
| No. 134 | 4.70 |
| No. 135 | 3.91 |
| No. 136 | 10.14 |
| | 22.85 |
| Correct Cash Balance, April 16, 1945 | \$ 2,600.45 |

Exhibit B

STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS AND DEPOSITS, APRIL 24, 1944, TO APRIL 16, 1945

| | |
|---|-------------|
| Receipts entered in the Cash Receipts Journal | \$ 2,425.51 |
| Deposits in the First National Bank, Lawrence, Kansas | 2,425.51 |

Exhibit C

STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS, APRIL 24, 1944, TO APRIL 16, 1945

| | |
|------------------------------------|-------------|
| Balance, April 24, 1944 | \$ 2,824.21 |
| Receipts—Dues (48 at \$50) | \$ 2,400.00 |
| Transactions and Proceedings | 25.51 |
| | 2,425.51 |
| | \$ 5,249.72 |

Disbursements

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Clerical | \$ 262.00 |
| Special: Committee Expense | |
| Accrediting | \$ 41.18 |
| Legislation | 382.47 |
| Committee on R.O.T.C. | 35.95 |
| Radio Broadcasting | 140.70 |
| | 600.30 |
| Convention and Meeting Expense | 235.06 |
| Postage, Express and Freight | 10.14 |
| Stationery, Supplies and Mimeographing | 89.27 |
| Telephone and Telegraph | 225.12 |
| Transactions and Proceedings | 489.68 |
| Travel | 637.20 |

| | | |
|---|--------|-------------|
| Miscellaneous | | |
| Membership in American Council on Education | 100.00 | |
| Bank Charges | .50 | 2,649.27 |
| Balance, April 16, 1945 | | \$ 2,600.45 |

Exhibit D

STATEMENT OF UNPAID MEMBERS AS OF APRIL 16, 1945

| | |
|--------------------------------|-----------|
| University of Arizona | \$ 50.00 |
| University of Kansas | 50.00 |
| Montana State University | 50.00 |
| West Virginia University | 50.00 |
| Total | \$ 200.00 |

Exhibit E

BALANCE SHEET AS OF APRIL 16, 1945

| | |
|-------------------------------|-------------|
| Current Assets | |
| Cash | \$ 2,600.45 |
| Unpaid Members Accounts | 200.00 |
| Total Current Assets | \$ 2,800.45 |
| Liabilities and Surplus | |
| Accounts Payable | \$ 00.00 |
| Surplus | 2,800.45 |
| Total Surplus | \$ 2,800.45 |

With the approval of President West, I have had the accounts audited by an accountant, and the accounts are now ready for your Auditing Committee.

DEANE W. MALOTT, Secretary-Treasurer.

. . . It was voted to adopt the report. . .

PRESIDENT WEST: It now becomes my pleasure to pass on to the next order of business. I shall call on Dr. Fred Kelly, of the United States Office of Education, to present the topic, "Legislation of Interest to State Universities." Dr. Fred Kelly.

DR. FRED J. KELLY (U.S. Office of Education): I am glad to be here to greet you friends again. I understand from the program that a number of the topics dealing with federal legislation are to be handled by other men, and I can therefore pass over them. For example, I think that Dr. Francis Brown is to speak tomorrow morning on the federal assistance to education, and can, better than I, tell about the developments in the legislation affecting the training of veterans. The American Council, through Dr. Brown, follows very closely that legislation. He and I agreed that that would be a division of labor, which you will probably appreciate.

I think, too, that the legislation having to do with vocational education will be handled by Dr. Tigert as part of the report of the Committee on Vocational Education, so that I shall not take up the very

important piece of legislation that is before Congress now dealing with the expansion of the program of vocational education, leaving those two matters for other parts of the program.

I am not going to read a paper. It will be better if I speak quite informally about these matters. I represent a federal agency myself, but what I say can be said as a former president of a university and one of your members, rather than as a government representative. I happen to be greatly interested in the developments of federal legislation, and naturally I must be mindful of these bills as they are before the Congress. I am glad to talk about them, and talk quite freely.

I will just mention certain bills that I think may turn out to be important but, because the chances of their passage is anybody's guess, I don't think it is well to devote very much time to them until there is more evidence that they will receive a good deal of attention. They will illustrate certain problems that arise in federal legislation affecting education.

The first one is H.R. 198, which is a bill to establish a federal board for character education, and appropriating money, three million dollars a year annually, to help pay teachers' salaries for teaching courses related to character training, moral standards, ethics, temperance and good citizenship, and providing five million dollars additional for training of teachers for that end.

Now, I can understand why smiles show across the faces of many of you when I read that title. But I think it is well for us to have in mind that when people get the notion that they want to change education in this country, the way for them to do it is to set up a commission or board to go at it, and to go out to the public schools, or sometimes to a different agency than the public schools, and influence the education in this country directly from Washington.

Another bill is H.R. 548, which establishes a separate division of aviation education in the United States Office of Education. It is to provide for all the types of things which are necessary to produce air-mindedness on the part of the young generation of this country.

The next one is H.R. 2044, which is to establish a United States Commission for the Promotion of Physical Fitness, with a 25 million dollar annual appropriation to be matched in part, after 1946, by the states. Now that is another independent educational effort to produce a particular kind of result, namely physical fitness.

It is worth pausing just a moment to say, with respect to these bills, that I suspect they probably will not pass; but the point is that they represent a criticism felt in Congress of our present education. The method which Congressmen think of to correct the fault is, as I said a moment ago, to set up somebody in Washington whose business it is to bring that correction to pass. That is a point of view, I think, that

is well worth our taking account of, because that is the way it is done. I could point out some dozen or so other measures where that same thing is in the mind of Congressmen introducing the bills.

A bill that has very great significance if it receives much attention—and I think it is well for educational people to have it in mind—is H.R. 2827. This is a bill to provide for the release from military service and the deferment from military service of persons to aid in education and scientific and technological pursuits. That means to modify the method of discharging veterans so that people in teaching and scientific investigation can be discharged in a priority relation to others. Now of course there are those in education who believe so strongly in that kind of thing that this bill may have some support in Washington. I think that the Army has a very excellent answer to it when they say, "Do you believe education can ask for a special position in the discharge category for people who want to come back for teaching or scientific research?" Even though many might say that over the long run you can justify it, it would be pretty difficult.

It seems altogether likely that some one of the several bills now before Congress will pass, adding Merchant Marine veterans to the persons available for aid under the G.I. Bill of Rights. It may not be administered by the Veterans Administration, but will give the same sort of treatment to the people who are discharged from the Merchant Marine. That will mean education, loans, and other advantages which the G.I. Bill gives to veterans. One of the most likely bills is H.R. 2180.

I want to give you some of the principal provisions of S. 6. It is a bill to establish in the Civil Aeronautics Administration a youth training division which shall be under the supervision of a director of youth training, hereinafter referred to as the director. Notice that here is an educational office created in the Civil Aeronautics Administration, with a director of youth training, with whatever amount of money is required to carry out the purposes of this bill. The object of the bill is to develop skill in glider training, in glider use, glider piloting, glider construction, and the like; the notion being that exercise of young people with gliders is one of the effective means of producing the kinds of skills in later use of airplanes, as well as gliders, that can be participated in by younger people. I think it is worth reading the duties of the director:

"To sponsor and assist in the organization of glider clubs, in high schools, colleges, universities, and other places; by providing literature, outlines of club operations, including sample charter and by-laws, and the assignment of representatives of the youth training division to such clubs, and upon request to assist in the financing and operation of such clubs.

"B. To furnish such plans, specifications and directions for the construction of various types of gliders and sail planes.

"C. To instruct persons between the ages of 12 and 18 in the construction and operation of gliders and sail planes; to establish glider academies, glider ports, and workshops in connection therewith, for the purpose of training young persons in the construction, repair and operation of gliders; to conduct research and make studies and experiments with respect to gliders and their possible uses," and so on.

The point that I think must be clear is that here is contemplated the creation in a governmental office a division having to do with a very important aspect of education, to work directly with the schools and colleges in promoting a certain type of education. No matter how worthy that type of education is, the establishment of units in the federal government for the control of various aspects of education in the schools and colleges must give deep concern to people in education throughout the country, especially I think in higher education. The first appropriation is for five million dollars for the year, and after that whatever sums may be necessary to carry out the program.

With those comments on pending bills which have not yet reached the hearings stage, I want now to pass on to those which are having hearings at the present time in Congress.

Passing over S. 619 which President Tigert will talk about, I want to speak of two bills in the field of general education, both of which have serious connotations for higher education. The first is the NEA bill, so called, which is S. 181. Its provisions, I think, are familiar to you: (1) That 200 million dollars a year will be appropriated at the outset to help bring up standards of teachers, assure against closed schoolrooms, help to meet low salaries, and things of that sort. That 200 million dollars will not be perpetual, but will pass out within a year after the emergency period has been declared over. (2) That 100 million dollars a year will be distributed on the basis of need in the states, that being presumably a continuing appropriation indefinitely. It is to take the place of what was advocated before the war as a 300 million dollar annual appropriation by the National Education Association.

Now as to the provisions in the bill which I think should be of keen interest to us all, in addition to the essential fact that it is a federal appropriation to assist the states in the maintenance of better educational systems: It starts with the idea of determining distribution of these funds on the basis of need. The formula which has been worked out (a very clear one, even if a bit complicated) is based upon two factors: (1) The ratio of the number of children in each state to the number of children in all states; and (2) the ratio of income in each state to the income in all of the states. When the first ratio is 65 per cent or more of the second ratio, the state is to receive aid. That is to

say—let me illustrate—if a state has one per cent of the children and two per cent of the income, then the first ratio is only 50 per cent of the second, and that state is not thought to be in need. Therefore it will get none of these funds. If on the other hand, a state has one per cent of the children and one per cent of the income, then its percentage of ratio 1 of ratio 2 is 100 or more than 65, and its excess will be the difference between 65 and 100, or 35 units. The sum total of these excess units will be used to make up the distribution for the several states.

I am afraid it may sound complicated the way I am saying it. It really isn't very complicated, and it is a perfectly mathematical kind of thing, the population figures coming from the census, the income coming from the Department of Commerce, and the figures being made out so that the money is distributed mathematically.

It is to be used to help meet the maintenance and cost of the schools up through the junior colleges. One of the things which I think is important is that the bill says, "including public secondary schools, which may include through the 14th grade." That is, the federal government is defining secondary schools as including the 13th and 14th grades. We need to have in mind the bearing that that will have upon the development of the universities in their relationships to secondary schools. That bill is having its hearings now. It is similar to the bill that was held up in the last Congress by the committee on education in the House of Representatives. I think the bill has somewhat more generous and widespread support than its predecessors have had.

Another bill has gone through its hearings in the Senate. It is S. 717. It is a bill sponsored by the American Teachers Union of the American Federation of Labor. It calls for an appropriation of 550 million dollars a year—and this does not terminate with the end of the war as does the 200 million in the other bill of which I spoke, S. 181. The bill sets up a National Board of Apportionment, which has jurisdiction, actually, over the administration of the bill. It is set up as a division of the Federal Security Agency, and the United States Commission of Education is the Executive Secretary of the Board. The bill is to be administered, as approved in regulations by the National Board of Apportionment, through the U.S. Office of Education by the U.S. Commissioner of Education.

That is a significant change, because there has been a feeling of opposition to placing in an appointive officer in the government as much responsibility as goes along with the distribution of a fund such as this. Therefore, in order to get around that, the sponsors of this bill set up a board of five members, to be appointed by the President, and that board has jurisdiction over the apportionment of the funds. Consid-

erable discretion is lodged in the board in apportioning the funds among the states to meet certain needs.

The bill provides 300 million for general state aid to raise sub-standard educational conditions. The other two items of the bill are: (1) 100 million dollars a year for so-called special services. Those special services are "to promote the health, welfare and safety of school children by providing for current expenditures for educational facilities and services, such as transportation for educational purposes, library facilities, textbooks and other reading material, visual aids and other instruction materials, school health programs and facilities, and other necessary educational projects." And (2) 150 million is for a student aid program. This fund may be used for scholarships, loans, or work grants, according to the state plan. The fund may be available for high-school students as well as college students.

All three of these funds may be used in private as well as in public schools and colleges. In order to avoid any complication in those states where, either by statute or by constitutional provision, the state is unable to give public money to privately-controlled institutions, the bill sets up a very clever device. It arranges for the appointment, in each of such states, of a trustee appointed by the National Board of Apportionment from persons nominated by the Governor. That trustee distributes the money to private institutions, whether it be from the 300 million dollar allotment, or the 100 million dollar allotment, or the 150 million dollar student loan allotment.

That is again a new principle of federal aid to education in that it tries to incorporate all educational agencies and institutions, and is not, as has been true in the past, whether it be the land-grant college fund or the vocational education fund, limited to publicly-controlled institutions. Here we have a plan under which it is expected that all institutions, public and private, shall be treated alike. The only limitation is that in the institutions that are privately controlled the money cannot go for the salaries of teachers. That is an exceedingly important issue in American education. The states have been very slow to provide public funds for non-publicly-controlled institutions. The federal government is now giving serious consideration to a bill which will put public money into institutions under public or private control, without discrimination.

In the hearings which this bill had before the Senate committee there was a very influential representation of educators speaking in its favor. There seems to be a friendly attitude toward this bill in the Congress. What will happen about it I do not, of course, pretend to say.

I hope that there will be time for you to consider some of the implications of these measures.

Thank you very much.

PRESIDENT WEST: Thank you, Dr. Kelly.

We have several committee reports at this time. Two committees have been working jointly on two different aspects of a problem, and they seem to be so closely related that it was not wise to separate them. I am calling for the report of the Committee on Military Affairs and the Special Committee on Perpetuation of the R.O.T.C. President Willard.

PRESIDENT A. C. WILLARD (University of Illinois): Mr. President, Members and Guests of the Association: As one of the members of the two committees that have been referred to, I want to bring to your attention the fact that President Hetzel found it impossible to be with us this morning, and he has asked me to present his report. The two committees have met on various occasions, and President Hetzel has reduced the results of these deliberations to a relatively small compass. I think the best way in which I can present this material to the Association, Mr. President, would be to read Mr. Hetzel's report.

. . . President Willard read the following report. . .

During the year your committees have represented the Association at the following significant conferences:

1. On August 10 and 11, 1944, a conference with the Special Planning Division of the War Department was held in Washington, D. C. The meeting was under the chairmanship of General W. F. Tompkins, Chief of the Division. General Tompkins presented the program of the War Department for postwar military organization and procedure in the form of some eighteen general principles. These were confidential and are therefore not available as a part of the record.

In response to an invitation from the chairman to comment on the program, members of your committee vigorously urged the importance of full participation on the part of the educational institutions of higher learning, and particularly the public institutions, in the postwar plan. The contributions of these institutions during the past years were called to the attention of the committee, and it was pointed out that, in view of the developments of modern warfare, it is increasingly imperative that the educational, scientific and technological resources of these institutions should be used in the fullest possible measure, not only in the training of officers, but in the prosecution of scientific research, the application of technology to the prosecution of war, the training of specialists in the fields of medicine, supply, military government, and the training and mobilization of war industries. The committee urged that the R.O.T.C. program be expanded, strengthened, and advanced. General Tompkins and members of his staff expressed themselves as being convinced that the edu-

educational institutions could perform a vital service in these various fields, and assured the members of the committees that the War Department plans would make proper provision for the participation of the educational institutions.

2. Representatives of your committees met with the Committee on Military Affairs of the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities in Chicago on October 24, 1944. The two committees reviewed the developments to date and joined in a memorandum which was presented to the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities at their annual convention.

3. On December 29, 1944, the chairman of your committees was invited as one of twelve college administrators to meet with the Secretaries of War and Navy, Chiefs of Staff of the Army and the Navy, representatives of the Department of State, and members of the general staff of all services, for the discussion of general policies and plans for postwar military training. The discussions at this conference were concerned with the broader problems of postwar organization, and particularly with a proposal for universal military training. Your representative again urged the importance of the participation of the colleges and universities in this program. The military representatives gave assurance that full consideration was being given to these institutions in the formulation of postwar plans.

4. March 14, 1945, representatives of your committees met in Washington at the call of Brigadier General Edward W. Smith for the consideration of a plan for postwar reorganization of the R.O.T.C. In addition to your committees, there were present representatives of the Committee on Military Affairs of the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities and of the military colleges.

General Smith presented an extensive memorandum outlining proposed organization and procedures for a postwar R.O.T.C. system designed to provide a greatly increased number of reserve officers. The document was designated as "restricted" and therefore can not be made a part of the report of your committees.

The plan presented was predicated upon the assumption that there would be a system of universal military training. The program called for a basic course designed to produce reserve second lieutenants, the curriculum to be essentially that of the prewar advanced R.O.T.C. course. This part of the program would be given during the first two academic years and would involve approximately 320 hours of on-campus instruction. It would also require six weeks of training during the vacation period between the freshman and sophomore years.

The advanced course would be designed to produce reserve officers who would be qualified as first lieutenants. The scope and quality

of the military instruction would be similar to that of the officer training programs of the military services. The advanced course would be supplemented by a thirteen-weeks period of training at the various branch service schools either between or immediately following the advanced course years.

Admission to the basic course would be voluntary and would be conditioned upon the completion of the proposed universal military training program.

Enrollment in the advanced course would also be voluntary, and would be limited to a quota designed to meet the requirements of the military services, and to those who successfully meet the special tests which would be applied.

The committees were given to understand that consideration is also being given to the possibility of establishing in certain institutions a major in military science leading to an appropriate degree. It is also possible that some advanced instruction suitable to the graduate level might be offered in selected institutions.

The program in all of its elements would be given more adequate financial support. This would apply to instruction at the institutions as well as to service in the training camps. Such financial aid would be sufficient to serve as a definite inducement to students to elect the R.O.T.C. program.

The study reviewed by the committees on this occasion was exhaustive, exact, and conceived with a balanced understanding, not only of the interests of the military services, but of the institutions of higher learning as well. The committees believe that it is most heartening evidence that when the final program is formulated, it will be of high merit.

While the committees did not have opportunity to review the Naval R.O.T.C. program to the same extent as the Army plan, it is their understanding that these two plans are similar in their major provisions.

All planning, however, is made uncertain by the fact that national policy relative to universal military training is as yet undetermined. Both the War Department and the Navy Department are on record as strongly favoring twelve months of basic universal military training, and all plans having to do with the training of officers are predicated upon the assumption that such a plan will be approved by Congress. Until this issue is finally settled, all planning is largely speculative. However, one major concern which disturbed the institutions of higher learning a year ago seems now to be largely dissipated, namely, the attitude of the War and Navy Departments relative to the continuation of the R.O.T.C. programs. Members of the committees who have conferred frequently with Army and Navy officers during the year are

convinced that there is no longer any serious doubt as to the intention of the military services relative to this matter. There seems to be, on the other hand, every reason to believe that the contributions of the colleges in the training of officers are fully understood and highly appreciated by those who are planning the postwar military programs.

R. D. HETZEL, *Chairman*

PRESIDENT WILLARD: The membership of the committees is as follows:

The Committee on Military Affairs: Presidents, Hetzel, Willard, Bevis, Ruthven, and Wells.

Special Committee on Perpetuation of the R. O. T. C.: Presidents, Hetzel, Ruthven, and Willard.

. . . Brigadier General E. W. Smith, Executive for Reserve and R.O.T.C. Affairs, War Department, and Colonel Charles M. Boyer, Executive Officer, spoke off the record concerning the future of the R.O.T.C. . .

PRESIDENT WILLARD: President West has suggested, and I thoroughly agree, that this would be a very appropriate time to hear from Dr. Kelly.

DR. KELLY: Mr. Chairman, I am glad to make the following comments because I should like to bring to your attention the details of the bills now before Congress. You probably know that the American Legion has taken a great deal of initiative in supporting the military training bills in this session of Congress. They asked the Congress committees to call together a group of people to formulate the new measures for military training. Those conferences were held and the two identical bills, the May bill in the House and the Gurney bill in the Senate, were drawn up.

I shall read the first part of the May bill.

"Be it enacted by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled: That (a) the Congress hereby declares that the reservoir of trained manpower built up at such enormous expense during the present war should not be permitted to become empty again as after World War I, but should be perpetuated for the peace and security of future generations.

"(b) That Congress further declares that this end can be assured only through a system of military training for all able-bodied male citizens in their early manhood. While the details of future military organization cannot be determined with precision until after terms of a permanent peace can be envisaged, there can be no thoroughly ef-

fective national defense system that does not rest upon the democratic principle that all citizens of a free state should be trained to defend their country.

“(c) The Congress further declares that the training system should be inaugurated as soon as practicable after the cessation of hostilities in order to utilize material resources and training experience which will otherwise be dissipated.

“Section 2. Under such regulations as the President shall prescribe, every male citizen of the United States and every male alien residing therein, shall, upon attaining the age of 18 years, or within four years thereafter, be subject to military or naval training, and shall be inducted into the Army or Navy of the United States, for this purpose alone, for a period of one year, . . .”

May I pause there. I think one thing that interests this group is that this provision precludes what some of us have felt might possibly be brought about, that it could be spread along through a four-year course in college or something like that, and not made a continuous one year, which it would have to be outside of college attendance. This settles that question.

Those are the provisions that seem to me to be the basis for whatever thinking we care to do in respect to the issue that this group has raised from time to time, as to whether it is feasible to have the year of military training, and still not postpone for those boys going to college their date of entrance upon their lifework by one full year; whether to associate that in some way with the R.O.T.C., in such a way that those boys who are going to devote their time in college in R.O.T.C. training may be allowed to come without that year of military training. It is those questions, I think, which are important for a discussion here. The educational program stretches out longer and longer, and for us to stretch it out for those who are going to go on to a college education, for one year more is, I think, an issue of great social significance.

I am not going to argue about it one way or another. I am sure that in the conferences in which General Smith sits, these issues are up constantly. There is no lack of sympathy in the Army circles for the issue that is brought out. I feel that it is exceedingly important for people in education to face the significance of military training, not only from the standpoint of its desirability—that I am not qualified to debate at all—but whether or not it is feasible to fit it into the courses that boys take who go on to spend at least four years in college, without the delay of one year.

You know that the American Legion is doing a very fine job from the standpoint of those advocating military training. They have issued a large number of pamphlets, many of which I am sure have come into

your hands, giving the arguments for this type of military training program. The initiative to a large extent has been taken by the American Legion in fostering this legislation.

Thank you.

PRESIDENT WILLARD: I assume the members of the Association remember that at the last annual meeting of this Association we agreed to sponsor the American Legion program.

Dr. Kelly has posed a question here that is very important and very vital. If the members wish discussion at this time it is appropriate, I believe, to have some.

PRESIDENT A. A. HAUCK: I should like to ask one question. Is it true that the American Legion plan which the Association endorsed last year is considerably different from the present legislation?

DR. KELLY: I am sorry that I was not conscious of the fact that this group last year did endorse the American Legion plan. I do not know what the Legion plan last year was as distinct from this. I was not aware of the fact that the Legion had last year written into a bill the specific provisions which are in this bill.

PRESIDENT WILLARD: We should have a copy of the resolution, Dr. Kelly, that was adopted by the Association last year. As I recall the resolution, the Association adopted the American Legion plan in principle. I am quite sure that the American Legion plan as of that date was not as definitely complete nor was it the same as it has been read by you in this bill. But in principle the Association was going along with the American Legion as of that time. The Association has, in my judgment, made no commitment on any detail of this bill at all.

PRESIDENT WEST: I think that is important to remember.

We will resume deliberations at two o'clock this afternoon.

. . . The meeting recessed at twelve-fifteen o'clock. . .

FRIDAY AFTERNOON SESSION

APRIL 27, 1945

The meeting reconvened at two-five o'clock, President West presiding.

PRESIDENT WEST: Commissioner Studebaker was supposed to be here, but he has every reason for not being here. We wish that he might have found it possible to be here, but since he hasn't, we are pleased indeed to have Dr. Kelly speak to us on the plans for reorganization of the Office of Education, to which Dr. Kelly is attached.

DR. KELLY: I am doubly embarrassed to bring the apologies of the Commissioner to you this time, because I think I suggested to your officers that the reorganization in the Office was important enough to justify having this topic on the program. The Commissioner fully expected to be here. Only yesterday afternoon he called me to say that he had to abandon the trip, because the transcripts of the hearing that had just concluded the day before yesterday in the committee of the House were coming to his desk with a time limit. They had to go back for printing, and he had to be there because it was mostly his own statement that was being drafted for printing. So he asked me to bring you his sincere regrets at not being able to come. I am glad to do that. But the double embarrassment is that, after having had a chance to talk to you about federal legislation this morning, I should be on the program again to talk to you about the reorganization in the Office.

I shall be very brief about it. I am assuming, in the first place, that most of you, probably all of you, know the essential idea back of it. And while I would expect the Commissioner to amplify it somewhat more than I shall, I think it is best that I do no more than make a very brief statement.

When President Roosevelt said in his budget message to Congress, in January, that he was seeking the reorganization of the Office of Education, that word went all over the country. We had many inquiries as to the meaning if its appearing in the President's message to Congress. To those letters that came to us we merely said that the President was assuming responsibility for approving the proposal which the Commissioner, the Federal Security Agency, and the Bureau of the Budget had joined in making. It was to give effect to what the Commissioner was himself recommending.

Now why should the Commissioner, with the approval of the Federal Security Agency and the Bureau of the Budget, come forward, at a time when the Congress is concerned with reducing appropriations for regular agencies—and rightly so—to ask for approval of a proposal

which in three, four, or five years contemplates quadrupling the Office of Education staff and suggests an organization under which that quadrupled staff would be able to work effectively? It is that question that I suspect many of you have asked. How could there be justification for that much of an increase in the Office of Education staff now? I want to try to give the reasoning back of the reorganization proposal.

Possibly the very hasty report I made this forenoon on legislation that is now before Congress may give some hint as to why, if we are to stem the tide of piecemeal legislation to give federal support to this or that or the other aspect of education, there must be a sufficiently influential Office of Education to do two things: First, to bring about legitimate changes in the school system in the interest of what the Federal Government thinks is the absolutely essential requirement of education.

Let me illustrate that. If, for example, better physical fitness is the thing that the nation is interested in, as I suspect we all believe it is, if there is a good strong Office of Education it may be possible to get the schools and colleges to modify their practices on a voluntary basis so as to give the country a better physical fitness program. That is the first thing, to try, without the buying power of federal money to get improvements in education which are in the national interests.

The second thing a strong Office of Education could do is to try to avoid the throwing out of balance programs of education in the states, in the city school systems or county school systems, or in the institutions of higher education, that come about through the federal money going into some particular phase of education even though in certain states that is not the most important thing to do. The Smith-Hughes Law has been in operation since 1917. According to that law a certain amount of money is available to each of the states, on a matching basis. Let us say a certain state is entitled to \$50,000 for agricultural education, to give to the teachers of agriculture in the high schools of that state. They have to match it, fifty-fifty. Some of the states have not accepted all the federal money for agricultural education because they were not willing to match it. Now, supposing that this new program of vocational education under S. 619 is inaugurated. It gives about three times as much additional money as the states now get for agricultural education. The state isn't going to have to match that at all for two years, and after that it is to match only 25 per cent of the funds, instead of dollar for dollar. It is pretty obvious that such special earmarked funds will bring about an unbalanced educational program in the states. This is only one illustration, but there are many others which are apparent in the present bills before Congress.

If we want to avoid the constantly increasing federal control that comes from making appropriations for special programs in the schools

and colleges, and want to encourage the institutions of higher education and the school systems of the states and communities to develop well-rounded, systematic programs to take care of their educational needs, then some way must be evolved in order to do it.

I do not want to take time to recite much history, but back in the depression we had the very expensive CCC camp program, which had a small educational feature. Then we had the NYA program, which started out essentially to be a student aid program. It developed a number of work projects. Then when the defense training program came on, those work projects became defense training projects. We had the beginnings of a parallel school system, supported and controlled and financed by the Federal Government, paralleling the public school systems throughout the country.

Probably nobody had any sinister idea of that kind. I think the people merely thought that that was a good thing to do. But I don't think that they understood the long-time meaning of that kind of federal participation in education. If we expect the idea that is dominant in our American Constitution to prevail, namely that the responsibility for education is a state and local function, and not a federal function, we must be on guard about special education programs controlled by the Federal Government.

It is really to preserve that concept of education that the Commissioner and his superior officers in the Federal Security Agency, backed up by the President through the Budget Bureau, have made their proposal. In spite of the fact that this is a critical time as far as federal money is concerned, we can't afford to delay longer this attempt to preserve in the states and local communities the control of education. By having a strong Office of Education in the Federal Government we can probably accomplish a good many of these improvements through the normal processes of influence, through disseminating information, through studies of superior practices in education, and through the exercise of other forms of leadership.

That in general is the fundamental idea. All the details of reorganization are to aid in accomplishing it. If you take higher education as an illustration, it looks like an enormous increase to employ somebody in each of the main departments, such as English. Let's take history, as a good illustration. When you think of the kind of criticism that has gone about this country concerning history teaching, if we can have some influence with historical societies, with associations of history teachers, and others interested in improving history teaching, it might pay big dividends. We know our help would be welcome to personnel officers, business officers, and the like. If we could have somebody in Washington concerned with each of the principal professional groups maintained in the various institutions of higher education, I think we

might be helpful. We certainly wouldn't be domineering. We would ask for no authority. We don't want authority. In fact, we want to prevent the development of authority in the federal office. But I think we could be of service. Even on the enlarged basis the Office budget represents a small contribution to a two and a half million dollar a year enterprise in education.

PRESIDENT WEST: Thank you, Dr. Kelly.

We come now to the next section of the program. At this time I shall turn the meeting over to President Virgil Hancher, who worked with a special committee to study postwar educational problems. President Hancher.

PRESIDENT VIRGIL M. HANCHER (University of Iowa): President West and Gentlemen: When the Executive Committee decided, wisely or unwisely, that this committee should for the second year in succession have a part on the program for your annual meeting, I sent out letters to the various institutions asking them to report any developments in their own curricular thinking in the course of the year. I also asked the Executive Committee if they had suggestions to offer as to the nature of this program.

Without attempting to pin responsibility on any member of the Association, the suggestion was made that I might speak on the curricular reorganization which has been taking place in the College of Liberal Arts at the University of Iowa. The printed program, I think, was circulated to all of the institutions, at least all of the institutions in the United States represented in this room, going either to the president of the institution or the dean of the College of Liberal Arts.

I would have refrained from speaking on that subject myself, or did decline to do that, but as an alternative decided that I could ask the man who really knew about the program to speak to you. Although it seems to be plugging the University of Iowa, I do so with a clear conscience, for this reason: The program is interesting in itself; the proposal that it be discussed was suggested by others, it was not my idea; and it gives me an opportunity to present to this Association, although most of you know him, Dean Newburn, who becomes President of the University of Oregon on July 1. I am very happy to present to you Dean Newburn, with the request that he give you an outline of the work we have been doing at the University of Iowa in the last three or four years, and particularly the work of the last year in implementing the program which was adopted by the faculty of the College of Liberal Arts.

DEAN HARRY K. NEWBURN (State University of Iowa): Mr. President, President Hancher, Gentlemen: I am somewhat awed to come

before this group, particularly with my employer at my elbow to care for me properly if I don't say the right things in the proper way. I assure you that any nervousness displayed is due almost entirely to these two factors.

I shall try to summarize as briefly as possible the curricular program which was approved by the faculty of the College of Liberal Arts at the State University of Iowa in April of last year, and which went into effect for beginning freshmen last fall. The new program becomes effective for all students including transfers, June 1, 1946.

So that there be no misunderstanding, may I point out in the beginning that this program was developed, in the first place, to operate in a university which accepts broadly its responsibilities to the state which it serves. In fact, we admit any graduate of any approved Iowa high school, and consequently have represented among our freshmen students the complete range of talent, ability and aptitude which exists among the high school graduates of the state.

In the second place, the program was designed to operate in a college which is quite comprehensive in organization. The College of Liberal Arts includes such units as a School of Fine Arts, a School of Journalism, a Division of Physical Education, a School of Religion, and a Department of Education, as well as all other divisions usually found in such colleges. In addition to the B.A. and the B.S. degrees, the College offers work leading to the Bachelor of Fine Arts degree. We were hoping to find a program in which the base requirements could be made common to all degrees available in all departments and schools of the College.

In the third place, it should be emphasized that the program was designed for a particular campus, taking into consideration the traditions, the facilities and the needs of that one university. I believe President Hancher agrees with me when I say that while the program seems to be working out well at our institution, we are not presenting our plan as one which should necessarily be adopted by other institutions.

You might be interested in the fact that it took over two years of work to prepare this program for presentation to the faculty. You may know or guess that it was not developed without some interesting personal sidelights. I shall not take time, however, to present such items to this group which, I presume, specializes in such experiences.

Very early in the development of the program it became clear that we had two major jobs on our hands. The first was that of developing a practical working definition of the function of the College of Liberal Arts on our campus and the second was that of providing the best possible program to achieve the accepted objectives. After a considerable period we did develop a set of functions which we desired to serve,

some of which are less general than those usually stated for liberal education.* Before these objectives could be developed, however, it was necessary to make some decisions relative to the nature of liberal education.

We agreed that liberal education is directed at people as human beings, rather than as workers, homemakers or citizens—is interested in the total development of the individual. Liberal education is something very personal, and consequently must be sought by the student. It won't come to him unsolicited. It can be obtained only through active effort on his part.

Since liberal education is qualitative in nature, we agreed that it is difficult to demonstrate when an individual is liberally educated. A person can be more or less liberally educated, since such education does not begin with entrance to college nor end with graduation. Such education may take place at any point where liberal experiences are available, but should result more readily and effectively from study in a college dedicated to the teaching of the liberal arts.

Finally, we agreed that there is no single pathway to a liberal education which must be followed rigidly by all persons. On the con-

* The following statement of purposes was adopted by the Faculty of the College to guide the development of the program:

AIMS AND PURPOSE. The primary function of the College of Liberal Arts is to provide a liberal education, that is, to encourage the student in the fullest possible development of his capacities as a person and a member of society. The fundamental goal is the well-rounded development of the individual—intellectual, spiritual, physical, emotional and aesthetic.

In performing this primary function, the College seeks:

1. To assist the individual in the continued acquisition of certain abilities, such as
 - a. The ability to speak, write, and read,
 - b. The ability to solve problems involving counting and calculating,
 - c. The ability to secure and maintain physical fitness.
2. To guide the student toward a mastery of the leading ideas, the significant facts, the habits of thought and methods of work in several fields such as the sciences, the social studies, language and literature, the fine arts, history, and philosophy, so that he may
 - a. Better understand the world and the society in which he lives.
 - b. Appreciate more fully the basic values upon which civilization and culture rest and through which they may be improved.
 - c. Perceive and accept his responsibilities as an active participant in social groups—the family, the occupation, the community, the democratic state, and the world.
3. To aid the student in the development of a resourceful and independent mind, the ability to use as well as to accumulate knowledge, and the awareness of his mental strengths and weaknesses.
4. To provide the student with experiences which will be conducive to the development of strength of character and a sense of personal responsibility—including such personal qualities as self-reliance, perseverance, integrity, cooperation and reverence.

trary, such an education may be achieved by different persons through different means or as a result of very different course content.

We can now turn our attention to the various elements of the curricular program as they were developed in an effort to achieve the accepted goals. In some cases, to the degree that time will permit, the requirements will be discussed in detail.

Since we believe that each graduate should be able to read, write and speak the English language with a degree of competency which will permit him to meet adequately his general responsibilities, he is required to demonstrate that he does possess such ability before he receives a degree from the College. At entrance, each student is given a series of examinations designed to determine his ability in reading, writing, and speaking. Those who are not sufficiently competent in any or all three areas are required to enroll in a course titled, *Communication Skills*. The individual remains in this course, taking four semester hours each semester, until he demonstrates that he possesses adequate competency in the skills concerned. The course is organized specifically to provide experiences adapted to individual needs in the skills mentioned. At the present time, the staff believes that any who cannot develop adequate competency by the end of three semesters of such registration will not profit by further enrollment.

The examinations which are used to determine proficiency are diagnostic in type and thus are used not only to determine competency but also to indicate the nature of the work which needs to be done by each student if he is to achieve the desired performance in reading, writing and speaking. He is required to present speeches and to prepare themes as well as to perform on pencil and paper tests. The speeches and themes are judged by a jury which has developed certain standard definitions of performance. Since the course is designed to care for individual needs, it is quite flexible in nature and provides for a maximum of adaptation to the individual.

It is organized in small sections (approximately 20 students) which meet four times weekly. In some cases the student is assigned to a speech group, in others to a writing section, and again to classes emphasizing only reading. Where the individual shows weaknesses in all aspects of communication, he is assigned to a class where instruction in reading, speaking, and writing is integrated. Sections are provided for all ability levels ranging from very elementary work to that which is quite advanced. Those who are particularly weak in writing are sent to the writing laboratory where they receive small group and individual instruction. Those especially weak in speech or reading are sent to the speech and reading clinics. Since some freshman students read at the level of the average ninth grade high school student, the need for such special attention is evident. Where the communication skills are

integrated in one course, the student may write a paper and deliver a speech on the same topic, thus securing experience in two (three where reading provides the source material) important phases of communication in one exercise.

Every effort is made in the course to stimulate and motivate interest. Certain activities have been designed to convince the student that not everything he has to say or write will inevitably find its way to the instructor's wastebasket and to no other audience. A little magazine, named *MS* is printed several times during the year and distributed to the class membership. The contributions are selected from all levels of ability included in the course by a board of student and faculty judges. Approximately once each month the class takes over the editorial page of the *Daily Iowan*, local student newspaper.

On the speech side, a radio program has been provided where each week selected students, again at all ability levels, appear over the University Station WSUI to discuss some timely topic developed in class. Also a series of public discussions and debates has been held for the purpose of providing the group with a functional audience. Such efforts seem to have paid fine dividends in terms of motivating interest in writing and speaking.

Out of 835 beginning freshmen entering in September, 1944, a total of 52, or 6 per cent, met the communication skills requirement at entrance. These students were excused from the course and were permitted to continue advanced writing, speaking, or to enroll in a core course in literature. At the end of the first semester 122 students or 15 per cent and at the close of the second semester 522 students or 63 per cent completed the requirement and were excused. This left, when drops are considered, approximately 100 students of the original 835 for the third semester of such instruction. Some of these students will not be able to complete the requirement at the end of the third semester of registration and presumably will not graduate.

The basic skills portion of the program will be enlarged to include work in mathematics and physical education with the fall of 1945. We believe that each graduate should demonstrate that he possesses satisfactory physical fitness; consequently those who are unable to do so will be enrolled in a course designed to bring them to a proper stage of development and will remain in the course until the requirement is met. Likewise, those who do not possess adequate competency in mathematics, as determined by examinations administered at entrance, will be enrolled in a mathematics course designed to bring them to a satisfactory level of competency in such skills. Each of these courses will be offered on a two semester hour basis.

By vote of the faculty, the student may submit a maximum of twelve semester hours of credit in basic skills toward graduation even

though many students will require many more than twelve hours to meet the requirements in communications skills, mathematics, and physical fitness. The names of students meeting the basic skills requirements at entrance are forwarded to the parents and to the officials of the high schools from which such persons graduated. It is expected that over a period of years this will encourage the high schools to do a better job of preparing their college bound students in these important tools to further learning. So much then for the basic skills requirement.

Since the faculty believes that each graduate should read or speak a language in addition to his own with a reasonable degree of proficiency, each student is required before graduation to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the language departments that he does possess such ability. Temporarily, the achievement level is arbitrarily defined as that point which can be reached by the typical college freshman after one year of study in a semi-intensive course meeting five hours weekly and directed at either the reading or the speaking adaptation. To aid the student in meeting this requirement, the foreign language courses have been reorganized to provide experiences which will develop the desired proficiency. Students elect sections in speaking or reading, depending upon their preference, and remain in the sections until they pass off the requirement. On the spoken side, drill sections with native-speaking informants are in operation. This year we have used young Latin-Americans, some graduates and some undergraduates, to assist in this part of the work. Such students are carried at graduate assistant stipends, thus reducing considerably the cost of the program. While no definite results are available at the present moment, the language people are rather well satisfied with developments.

It should be emphasized in passing that each of the foregoing requirements, basic skills and foreign language, result from changes in the thinking of our faculty. Heretofore such requirements were stated in terms of semester hours to be completed; now they are set up in terms of demonstrated competency. Earlier, for example, the student was required to amass twelve semester hours or the equivalent at the high school level in order to satisfy the language requirement. Now he must demonstrate that he can speak or read the language at a desired level of proficiency. He may do this when he enters, regardless of his formal language study, but he cannot under any circumstances satisfy the requirements by presenting a given number of hours or years of study. Now the requirement can only be met by adequate performance. This change in point of view on the part of the faculty is one of the most important outcomes of our planning, it seems to me.

Since the faculty believes that each student should possess some of the leading ideas, the methods of work, and the important disciplines

characteristic of several important fields of learning, each student is required to complete before graduation a minimum of 32 semester hours of work in what we have called "Core Courses." This requirement is met through the satisfactory completion of four eight-hour courses, one in each of four divisions. The divisions are literature, social sciences, natural sciences, and what we have called history and other cultural studies. In each of the four areas, with the exception of literature, the student has some election. In the natural sciences there will be three core courses available next fall namely, *Biology of Man*, a course in geology and astronomy, and a course in physics and chemistry. In the social sciences, the student must elect either *Introduction to Social Science*, or *Government*. In the group titled history and other cultural studies, the great majority of students elect *Western Civilization in Modern Times*. The other courses available in this group are in the history and appreciation of fine arts, religion and philosophy.

These "general education" courses are not surveys and neither are they lecture courses. In each case, provision is made for laboratory groups, quiz sections, discussion groups, and other such activities where the sections can be kept small. It is not necessary for the student to complete all four of his core courses in the first two years, although all freshmen must take at least one, and it is assumed that ordinarily all students will have completed a minimum of three core courses by the end of their sophomore year. At the present time, there is no provision for passing off such requirements by examination as is true in foreign language and basic skills.

The fourth requirement is that of the "Area of Concentration." This portion of the program gives the student an opportunity to develop a well planned and integrated series of courses built around his area of special interest. We think of the area of concentration as that portion of the individual curriculum which provides both breadth and depth of experience, thus giving the student deeper insights and at the same time greater breadth of interest and understanding. In the latter sense it provides a significant part of his general education. If the student has decided upon his special interest, he may begin his area of concentration as a freshman and select one course to start this portion of his program. This arrangement makes it possible to build upon the student's interest as a means of motivating his entire undergraduate program. Too many times in the past the student came to the campus filled to overflowing with a desire to study art, or history, or journalism only to be told that he must postpone his work until he has completed two years of general studies. In our plan, he may begin immediately, not necessarily with a subject in

his field of interest, but certainly with a course which provides the first contact with that field in terms of natural sequence.

It is expected that the area of concentration will be especially designed for each student. In this way there will be some functional unity to the program completed, not just a series of courses without any necessary relationship. The area of concentration will include courses selected from the department of major interest, from departments tangent to and supporting the major department, and from other areas selected primarily to enrich the individual program. New areas of concentration cutting across departmental lines are being developed.

Within each of the areas of concentration, flexibility is being secured by requiring all majors to take only a small number of courses and varying the remainder in terms of the goals of the student concerned. There is no minimum number of hours in any area and the maximum number which may be submitted from any one department is fifty, although it is assumed that the typical major will include much less than this from any single department.

Another provision in the new program is that of elective credit submitted from colleges other than Liberal Arts. If the student completes all other requirements, he may submit as much as 30 semester hours of elective credit secured in any college on the campus. This makes it possible in some cases to combine three years of liberal arts study with a first year of work in a professional school and thus reduce the total number of years required to secure both degrees. This provision will operate to the advantage of the better students, particularly those who are able to meet the basic skills and the language requirements at entrance. On the other hand, those who must devote considerable time to satisfying the liberal arts requirements will find it impossible to reserve any important portion of their four years for such elective study. In fact, some of the poorer students may find it necessary to devote more than four years to the completion of the required work in liberal arts.

The final element to be discussed is the advisory program. This is something new with us, although we realize that many institutions have been operating successful advisory services for some time. It was clear from the beginning, however, that the new program, depending as it did upon intelligent personal judgment rather than rules and regulations for its success, would become effective only in those cases where the student was guided properly by an alert and understanding adviser. The degree to which the adviser and the student could work out for the latter a well integrated set of educational experiences would determine, in the long run, the success or failure of the plan.

Thus each student is assigned to an adviser at the time of his first

registration. This adviser is responsible for working out with his advisee the full four-year program, and must take responsibility for all official decisions relating to the development of the individual educational pattern. Together they must decide such matters as to the wisdom of postponing the study of foreign language beyond the freshman year, the order in which the core courses are to be taken, the supplementary courses essential to a well-rounded educational program, the total load to be carried, and the development of the area of concentration. Where the student has determined upon his area of interest, the adviser is selected from that area; where he is undecided special advisers are available. The adviser remains with the student through his entire period of enrollment in the College except where special circumstances dictate a change. Since the number of advisees per adviser is kept small, most faculty members must act in this capacity.

A central advisory office has been established to provide the advisers with information relating to their advisees and to supervise the entire advisory program. This office also serves as a liaison office between the adviser and the technical personnel services. Wherever possible, it operates to reduce the routine load placed upon the adviser so that the latter may concentrate upon his major task—that of counselling his advisees.

In review then it should be pointed out that the new program includes the following requirements: (1) the demonstration of competency in the basic skills including reading, writing, speaking, computational skills, and physical fitness; (2) the demonstration of ability to read or speak adequately a foreign language; (3) the completion of an eight semester hour core course in each of four areas (total 32 semester hours); (4) the completion of a carefully planned and well integrated area of concentration approved by the adviser; (5) the opportunity to elect, if all the above requirements are met, a maximum of 30 semester hours selected from any college on the campus. The student must also amass a total of 126 hours and have the recommendation of his major adviser to graduate. It should also be pointed out that all male students must complete two years of work in military science and tactics before graduation.

Certain general outcomes of our curriculum study program are quite evident at this time. In the first place, a great number of the faculty have become actively and intelligently interested in educational problems during the three-year period covered by the study. While at times our debates became pretty heated, they served to develop an awareness on the part of the great majority of the staff of the basic problems we were considering. This honest and sincere interest in

what is happening to the student is undoubtedly the most important outcome of our study to date, so far as the speaker is concerned.

The second important development is the declaration of interest in the matter of demonstrated competency as contrasted with credit hours completed. Over a period of time, we expect to see this idea emphasized to even greater extent, but already we are interested more in what the individual knows, how he thinks, what attitudes of mind he holds, what values and value judgments he possesses—in short, how he behaves—much more than we are interested in the number of credits he has accumulated and the time he has spent in school.

In the third place, the program breaks pretty sharply with the recent trend toward sharply defined junior and senior divisions, with the former devoted largely to general education and the latter to specialization. Our program is planned as a four-year unit with general education and concentration interwoven at all levels. The major may be begun in the freshman year; the core courses completed as late as the junior or senior years. The area of concentration is expected to provide breadth as well as depth of learning. It will be interesting to watch the development of this idea in comparison with the program involving a rather definite break at the end of two years.

It should be emphasized that the work is not completed; in fact, most of the detailed planning is yet ahead. Developments will occur continuously as experience dictates the need for modifications. We assume that it will be necessary to continue our study indefinitely, to evaluate what we have, and to adapt and adjust constantly. At the present moment, a dozen or more specific activities are under study and will be introduced as time goes on. The basic plan is well established—the specific program will change constantly within the general framework of our design.

It is not a radical plan in that it insists upon a rigidly defined program with the majority of the courses required. Neither is it extreme in the sense that it gives the student complete freedom to elect only such courses as appeal to his immediate interests or needs. Rather, it demands of the student his continuous growth as a person, and gives him the opportunity to choose rather broadly the avenues he will follow in achieving the discipline of a truly liberal education. It insists that the results of his efforts and ours be measured in terms of his own personal growth as demonstrated from day to day in what he does, how he thinks, and what he believes, as well as in what he knows and understands.

No curricular program or plan of instruction can be successful unless it brings the student into meaningful association with great teachers. The curricular pattern can be so designed, however, as to encourage such relationships and consequently may make them more profitable

to the learner. The program just described is much more dependent upon the conscientious and intelligent efforts of competent teachers than ordinarily is the case. Only to the degree that we are able to maintain a staff of outstanding teachers enthusiastically interested in guiding youth in their search for liberal learning will we succeed in the task which we have established for ourselves. For our program, like all others, will rise or fall in direct proportion to the quality of the men who operate it.

I appreciate your interest in this story. May I say in conclusion that we should be pleased to provide you with any material which is available relating to the program, and also that we should appreciate your comments. Thank you.

PRESIDENT HANCHER: One observation made by Dean Newburn calls for a little emphasis, I think, from me, or at least I should like to emphasize it. For a period of years, prior to this study and implementation of the liberal arts program, there had been no substantial review of what was being done by the College of Liberal Arts. It was timely, therefore, that a review should be undertaken. One of the very definite benefits which has come out of the review has been a general awareness on the part of the faculty of the College of Liberal Arts that that faculty has a responsibility toward the total educational outcome; that their duties are not confined to the teaching of history, or sociology, or chemistry, but to the production of a well educated person. And whether or not we are on the right road, at least we know that we have a faculty that is interested in some basic problems.

I may say parenthetically at this time, too, what I think you may begin to suspect if you did not already know it, namely, that the University of Oregon is very fortunate in the selection of its new President, and that Dean Newburn's departure from our campus will break an association which has been most enjoyable from my point of view, and which I trust has been from his. Fortunately, he is going to be in a position where we shall have some contact with each other; perhaps some of our problems will resemble each other more closely than they do now. We see him leave our campus with the very best wishes and with the assurance that the University of Oregon is most fortunate.

When the question of the review of postwar programs was under consideration, there was a possibility of taking into account developments in professional programs. It seemed to me, however, there were two reasons why we might concentrate, very briefly, in this portion of the program, on the liberal arts program.

In the first place, that is the one college which is common to us all. Some of the universities have pharmacy, and some do not. Some have medicine, and some do not. All have colleges of liberal arts, and

I believe all, or nearly all, have graduate schools; but as soon as you pass those two areas, you begin to get divergence.

Furthermore, it is my personal view (for which the committee has no responsibility; I take complete responsibility for this on my shoulders) that the most vulnerable portion of our university life has been the liberal arts college. When I had an opportunity to talk to the North Central Association a little more than a year ago, I did it with some trepidation, because it is a little daring for a professional man to speak to that body of educators. But I made an observation at that time which I am still willing to stand by, namely, that if you were to select an impartial jury of persons familiar with the universities of the country, and were to ask that jury whether the professional schools or the liberal arts colleges were doing the better job, I believe that eight out of ten, perhaps nine out of ten, would say that the professional schools are doing the better job on the average. If they are, it seems to me that it is because they have certain objectives, certain principles which they follow in the education of their students, quite apart from the greater selectivity.

The four principles which they follow, for the most part, can be summarized in these words: Each professional school attempts to provide its students with a common body of knowledge which is essential to an understanding of the profession. They have some basis of agreement on things which they regard as fundamental. That does not mean that all men in professional colleges take the same courses, necessarily cover the same subject matter, but usually there is some basic portion of the program which is recognized as essential to professional activity. The second is that they attempt to create in the student a familiarity with the source materials and the ability to add to his skill and knowledge, so that when he leaves his professional school and goes into his professional activities he will be able to and will have every incentive to develop himself along the lines started in the professional schools. The third thing that is attempted is the creation of the ability to think and act effectively in the presence of new and unprecedented situations. That is the whole purpose of clinical study in medicine. It is to give the young man the capacity to study a case, analyze it, and prescribe for it, so that when he meets a new situation he will not be baffled, or at least he will know what the means and methods of tackling it really are. Then the last thing which the professional schools attempt to do, perhaps quite unsuccessfully, but at least attempt to do, is to create in their students an ethical attitude with respect to the uses to which this professional knowledge and skill may be put.

It seems to me that these general objectives are not improper objectives for a college of liberal arts. I suppose if any one of these

were to be made the subject of controversy, the first one would be, that is the acquisition of a common body of knowledge essential to an understanding of the liberal arts, of liberal thought, and of liberal living. We certainly have no common agreement on that, but we are attempting to get it.

I think one of the most hopeful signs on the horizon is not the actual achievement at the University of Iowa, or at the other universities which are represented here, but the fact that most of us are struggling with the idea that there are some things that all people who are liberally educated ought to know. We have that belief and we are trying to find out what the basic things are and get agreement upon them, recognizing that much of the four years will be spent on other matters than those composing a common body of knowledge.

I want to acknowledge at this time my appreciation to those who took the time and trouble to reply to my inquiries by mail. I know that more inquiries must have seemed pretty exasperating in these times, and I personally do not welcome too many of them. It seems to me that each mail brings its full quota. But many of you did take the time and trouble to reply, some in great detail. From the replies which I received, I would say there are about fifteen institutions in this organization which are very actively engaged in a program of reevaluation of the liberal arts. There are very few institutions in which there is nothing being done at all. Most institutions are taking advantage of this time to reevaluate their work in the liberal arts.

Without attempting to draw comparisons or to weigh merits or anything of the sort, I can suggest four universities where interesting things are going on which are somewhat representative of the work as a whole. Your judgment might differ from mine on these, and I don't mean that there are not equally interesting things going on elsewhere, but these seem to be representative of certain approaches to the problem. Those four are Maine, Florida, Minnesota, and Ohio.

Without attempting to give in detail what is going on at these or any other institutions, I think I shall, for the sake of brevity and for the expedition of the program, content myself with certain generalizations which come out of an analysis of all of these various replies. If it is possible to generalize safely about them, the significant trends may be stated about as follows:

First, that competence in certain school subjects, such as English, speech, and mathematics, is being generally stressed in these curricular revisions. Competence examinations are increasingly becoming the criteria of achievement. Training in reading, writing and speaking are frequently combined in communications courses, or at least there are indications that institutions are moving in that direction. Sub-freshman courses in those subjects are offered in some institutions.

It would not be safe to say, however, that they are offered by the majority.

The second generalization would be that foreign language departments include intensive courses in the spoken language, and show a tendency to meet the degree requirements by achievement examinations, either as a substitute for or in addition to course work.

The third generalization would be that there appears to be a trend toward the consolidation of the subject matter within the first two years into broad fields of intellectual activity, such courses being variously designated as integrated, divisional, generalized, core courses, and so forth. There seems to be a difference of opinion among the institutions as to whether these courses are preferable to courses of the old-fashioned type or to the sequence of courses which are required in certain institutions.

Within the program in general education in the various institutions, the following observation might be made: Areas of concentration, or inter-departmental majors, are cutting across departmental lines. Many of these are focused upon fairly broad fields, such as American studies, American civilization, humanities, foreign area and language studies, that is, the study of the culture of an area—its language, history, and all its political, economic, and social institutions. Certain institutions have non-major curricula for those who desire to pursue their course without any particular specialization, and others have what might be called group majors, where two or more departments may combine for the production of a new major.

The fifth observation is that, in the semi-professional area, institutions are generally awarding the B. A. degree for specialization in a single department.

Sixth, with respect to curricula of less than four years, other than those organized on the junior-senior college basis, combinations of the regular department, directed toward the individual objective, appear to be the general practice.

And, seventh, that refresher courses are not being planned or developed on a scale which might be anticipated. Most of the institutions apparently have a wait-and-see attitude, being unable to forecast accurately enough to enable them to lay down in advance a satisfactory schedule of refresher courses.

That, Mr. President, concludes the report which I wish to make at this time. If you are interested in special work being done at any of the institutions, I do recommend the four institutions that I mentioned as being typical or representative of different types of approaches to the general problem of curricula reorganization.

PRESIDENT WEST: Thank you, President Hancher, and thank you, Dean Newburn.

For reasons that will be clear very shortly, we will delay discussion on these two papers until after the next address. Our Secretary-Treasurer mildly objected when I asked that he make the next introduction, but I have insisted that for sentimental reasons he do so, because I knew it would be a matter of great joy to the next speaker to be introduced by a former student, Chancellor Malott.

CHANCELLOR MALOTT: Dean Donham did not intend, I think, to be a university administrator, or a pedagogue. He was a graduate of the Harvard Law School, and then for fifteen years was vice-president of the Old Colony Trust Company in Boston. Called to the Harvard Business School by President Lowell, at the end of the first war, he was really the builder of that institution; he adapted the case method of instruction to business education; and developed a significant graduate school of business from what was a small school of applied economics. He is incidentally a promoter and money-raiser, as well as an educator.

He voluntarily retired from the leadership of the Harvard Business School about two years ago to engage in writing and teaching. He is now Professor of Administration there. He has written a book which some of you may have read, "Education for Responsible Living", published by the Harvard Press the first of this year. He has talked to a number of the faculties in institutions throughout the country, including the University of Kansas, where he succeeded in treading upon the toes of all present with equal pressure, thereby endearing himself to us all. He speaks from the perspective of a professional dean, looking at the job we are doing in the liberal arts.

It is a privilege to introduce to you former Dean Wallace B. Donham, speaking on the subject, "A Professional Dean Looks at the Liberal Arts." Dean Donham.

DEAN W. B. DONHAM: This is the first time I have had the pleasure of speaking simultaneously to so many of my old bosses, and I am a little worried about it.

I think I have a little different slant on problems of the liberal arts college, and a little different background, than most people interested in the subject. I have been systematically working with what I call a "consumer's study" of the products of the American college, for a quarter of a century. I had an opportunity, both through direct contact and through an interested faculty, to make some generalizations about the successes and failures of American college education, particularly with reference to students who are not preparing to be college teachers, not preparing to be high school teachers, not preparing to be pure scientists; but planning in one way or another to go into the world of affairs,—that is, to join the great body of citizens of this

democracy as active participants in its life, whether in private affairs or in public service.

It is characteristic of such men that, whether they wish it is not, they must deal with uncertainties and confusion, with the unknown and the unknowable, with human emotions and sentiments more powerful, for better or for worse, than the intellect. If their education is to be useful, they require from it a foundation of skills and judgment apt for handling such problems.

During the period of my deanship, over 12,000 graduates of American colleges passed under my observation; graduates of over 500 American colleges, different types of colleges, state universities, state colleges, private universities, private colleges, all types of educational institutions, that did undergraduate work, whether it was in engineering or in the liberal arts.

This study interested me continuously, first because I was planning,—staking out an appropriate design of post-graduate professional education in business administration, one great area of human activities, for this heterogeneous group of students; second, as the basis for an appraisal of the fitness of college men for the environment faced by men of affairs. The men who came to us at the end of the four-year liberal arts college course, or engineering school course, were naturally a very small percentage of the total graduated from those types of institutions. Most graduates who entered careers of this nature did so directly from college.

I think that everybody in this room was shocked at the appraisal made by the military of the higher educational structure of this country. I suspect that every person here—I know it surprised me—was shocked that the military, quite unlike their attitude in the first World War, assumed that nothing happens to the student in the liberal arts college that is worth spending time on except the study of science and mathematics or the beginnings of engineering training. Essentially that is what their decisions meant. The result was that the liberal arts colleges were turned into rather inefficient imitators of the engineering schools by the rules governing what should be studied. I was disturbed because I had the feeling that the Army and the Navy needs men of leadership and that the least effective job of training for leadership is training in elementary mathematics and science. This was a conclusion based on experience.

Roughly, twenty per cent of our students were from engineering schools. Many of those men actually were in blinders; very well trained within a narrow range of things and almost completely oblivious to the existence of forces outside of that narrow range in spite of the fact that in vast ranges of human experience that involve engineering these other forces are far more significant than the engineer-

ing elements. When the engineering schools of the country are pleased to state to youth the great percentage of factory executives who have come from engineering schools, to me they prove too much because thereby, along with the credit for great technological success, they take the responsibility for a large part of the most shocking failures of American industry.

When we at the Business School get an engineering graduate, our first job, as we have found in practice, is to break down his training, to prove to him that his training lacked the rounded preparation for life that he thought it gave; to introduce him to a range of experience where judgments must be made about uncertainties. The liberal arts groups who came to us not specialists in science are relatively free from that criticism; but by and large they had no focus of any sort. They had no common body of material or training. The engineering students did, to a large extent, have a common body of material, common habits of thought, common training capacity. This is not typically true of the graduates of liberal arts colleges.

If, as many people believe, there is a rush after this war to the immediately practical, in professional training or in the sciences, it will, in my opinion, not be the result of war, but the result of the fact that for years before the war the colleges of liberal arts have not done the training job in general education that is required,—a training functionally related to life, a training job which is far and away the most important educational job which can be done in America.

The specialized training in our universities—and the universities are mainly responsible for the inadequacies of the liberal arts colleges—has sub-divided human experience into minute segments. Yet life as it is lived in human experience is integrated into a unity by every individual who is not a case for the psychiatrist or the insane hospital. We have assumed that there are many different subjects for education, with no effort to show that those different subjects have any unity. General education has disappeared everywhere.

As the sources of weakness and even of the disappearance of liberal arts general education, we can put at the top of the list two things in which my own university has a large share of responsibility: graduate schools of arts and sciences, and the elective system. These two have been basically responsible for the destruction of the capacity of one liberal arts college after another to do any great job. The graduate school of arts and sciences, because of the fetish of the Ph. D. and the resulting narrow specialization has become one of the major calamities in higher education. I doubt if any of you who are connected with such institutions can relate their work effectively to the general training of youth to live in a democracy, which is our job. Nothing could be less related to the functional needs of the youth in the Amer-

ican democracy than the whole Ph. D. process in our great universities. My own university is one of the offenders. Yet the teachers of youth are trained by this process.

The elective system carried specialization and confusion back into the college and not only destroyed the unity in the intellectual content of educated men but prevented the development of the trained capacities needed in our democracy. The defects of the elective system are widely realized.

Concentration, as a way out, is anathema to me. Forced concentration in undergraduate training for a man who is going on for professional or other graduate training? I think this ridiculous. Why compel two successive periods of concentration for a man whose scheme of life involves the need for a broader kind of a background than most of our universities now make possible? Why force or allow men who need breadth to put somewhere from a third to a half of their work in one field? One man presented a college record from a big American college and asked admission to the Harvard Business School in pursuance of a longstanding plan to go into business. This college course was eighty-five per cent concentrated in Romance languages and literature!

I picked up the other day the catalogue of a great university and studied prerequisites. Either the titles to the courses didn't mean what they said, or there was no logical basis for many prerequisite rules. For instance, if you want to go into most social science fields, you have to take History I. You start with the fall of the Romans and read a few chapters of Gibbons. You get no real conception of why he was so obviously opposed to Christianity. You spend a week in the study of feudalism, say the week of the Yale game. Suppose, on the other hand, you are a chemistry major. You are pretty well loaded up, particularly if you are a good man so that you are going to be a candidate for honors. Under those conditions chemistry and allied courses take about two-thirds of your college work. If you can find time to get one course of history in, you're lucky. I would not use History I as the one course of history I was going to take. I have taken it. I have three sons who have taken it. It is impossible to cover such a subject within the confines of one course, and yet you are not supposed to study the history of your own country without it. For too many, the effort to make an impossible task interesting results in a distaste for history. The impact of one required course in history, one prerequisite, is often to destroy interest in history. I don't see the logic of it.

The accrediting agency, too, is the invention of the devil. I think it assures as far as it may that education will tend toward mediocrity. It lifts the bottom but lowers the top. The way to advance education,

in my opinion, is to raise the level at the top and let the devil take the hindmost temporarily while you are doing it. If you can raise the level of the top, you have accomplished something. But the accrediting agencies used to come into my office and say we must do certain things. Our attitude always was that we were training for business according to our ideas as to the ways to train for business and we would not offer subjects that did not fit our plans. Any other attitude would have destroyed the whole scheme of our education and compelled us to turn out narrowly trained men, particularly for those fields of business which had already suffered most from narrowness.

The president of a fine small college said to me, "I felt that I had to have work in sociology, and I looked around and couldn't find a sociologist that I would appoint. I called a fine historian to teach sociology, and I was called down by an accrediting agency, with a statement that the next time I did that sort of thing I would probably be stricken off the list." I don't like that. But not all colleges can afford to be independent of such demands. There is only one way to stop them. That is by the action and attitude of you gentlemen. You can stop them in their tracks but you and the great private universities must do the job, if the small colleges are to be let out from such chains. They can't do it alone.

Mr. Whitehead has a statement that interests me:

"For successful education there must always be a certain freshness in the knowledge dealt with. It must either be new in itself or it must be invested with some novelty of application to the world of new times. Knowledge does not keep any better than fish. You may be dealing with knowledge of the old species, with some old truth; but somehow or other it must come to the students, as it were, just drawn out of the sea and with the freshness of its immediate importance."

Do we pay enough attention to the freshness of the immediate importance of the things we teach and the way we teach them?

One thing that we need in liberal education is a system of integrated training. We are preparing our students to live surrounded by the unknown and the unknowable and the unpredictable. I doubt if any one of the men in this room is doing today anything like what he planned to do when he was a young man. In my own career I have almost always had perfectly healthy objectives with no thought of change. Yet several times I have changed my mind and my life within forty-eight hours to meet new conditions and for good reasons.

What kind of preparation do men need for life in that kind of world? They need preparation for immediate livelihood. Take my own college: from the time it was founded in 1936 to the present

time, there has never, I suspect, been a time when less than half the students at Harvard College were there with definite vocational objectives, seeking vocational training, and getting it. There is too much false pride about the pretense that liberal and general education have no vocational objectives. But on the other hand, the other day when I studied another catalogue of a great university—and everyone in this room would agree that it is a great university—and saw the melange of careers it prepares for, I was reminded of a river and harbor bill in the palmy days of logrolling. Great harbors and muddy creeks. Unfortunately, there is a strong probability that the men who give these courses seek students. And some of those vocations, Gentlemen, won't stand the test of social need.

I think every university ought to remember that many colleges describe courses in high-sounding words—all of us do it a little—that make a student feel that if he takes those courses he will get preparation for something worthwhile. Instead of putting in one good, solid vocational course, they often put in the same number of courses that a great university offers. In such colleges and in some universities, some poor devil has to teach I don't know how many hours a week because the catalogue relies on form and not on substance. The fact is that a great many courses offered in the universities are defensible only because they keep other classes down in size.

One boy came to us to get training in advertising after he had graduated from an undergraduate school. Looking at his program, it turned out that he had taken seven courses in advertising in that undergraduate school and he was coming to us. We never did allow the student to take more than one course in advertising, because in a rounded business training we don't think it is entitled to more than one course. We think we can pick out the things that are most worth training and let the job later take care of questions like the techniques of advertising layouts. We think we can hold up standards in writing and give men some conception of the assets and liabilities of advertising and develop useful habits based on a study of advertising problems. But in this case the student came to us with a background of seven courses in advertising. One of my assistants said to the young man, "Well, you really should either enter a liberal arts college as a freshman and take four years there, or you should apply now for a professorship on our faculty in the subject of advertising." He disappeared.

Nevertheless, I believe education should be useful. I want to make a plea for a new emphasis in the difference so often stressed between training for making a living and training for life. The student is going into an unknown world. You can't give him rules because you can't give rules that are going to determine the future. The future is un-

known and unknowable. You can't give rules. What can you give? Well, you can give him background. You can give him a trained imagination. You can make him struggle with problems and work them out until he has developed skills and habits and judgments. In complete disagreement with a statement made earlier this afternoon, I don't think you ought to transmit a particle of information voluntarily except as a part of an intellectual process. There are so many unknowns in the world that you can never do more than scratch the surface of information, but you can give habits and skills and you can train imagination.

I am not interested in knowledge that men get out of an educational system, except as an incident. I don't mean that I wouldn't carefully select the knowledge that I tried to get men to acquire. Of course I would. That is why I mention background. The kind of curriculum that I believe in is the curriculum that is integrated into one whole unit, not into three or four segments. I think you ought to have courses in general science that give men an understanding of science and in addition give them a conception of the power of science for good and evil. Men come to us with very little background. Well taught, such courses can give a start toward integrated experience. Let us think of training men for their future by emphasizing the present and training them to think about it. Let us teach history not in accordance with the timetable of Ploetz' *Epitome*, interrupted by the vagaries of an elective system. Put upon the professor the responsibility not only of writing a magnificent book like John Finley's "Thucydides," but of taking the next steps forward and studying the importance of Greek democracy for the understanding of our present problems. Make boys understand the analogy between ancient Rome and modern New York, and the differences between ancient Rome and modern London, and let them get a little better perspective on two great civilizations in the process of doing it. Give them some grasp on the one hand of the new problems of adaptation which come with the modern rapidity of change and, on the other hand, of the solid foundation which comes with slow social conditioning.

Human relations: Very little thought is given to human relations in the American colleges, very little indeed. As a matter of fact, for the last twenty years it has been one of my major obsessions in the Harvard Business School. We have done a great deal of research. I put human relations right alongside of natural science, social science, and the humanities. I think they are equally important.

Human relations are almost completely neglected except in extra-curricular activities, and extra-curricular activities aren't as effective as they used to be. Why not find out from the football coach how he succeeds in turning that group of fifty boys into football teams, each

man able to do his part in team work. There is nothing more important for our graduates to know. How can they share in and, according to their capacities, get the human collaboration of groups of men? There is nothing closer to the foundation of a democracy.

I am not going to attempt to go into all the things I think about the curriculum in general education, the core curriculum. I personally think it should be at least seventy-five percent of the program for the first two years. For the wise men who decide to take four years in college and not to start professional training at the end of two years, it should be a very heavy percentage of the remaining two years.

Our education has lost unity and integration and our nation has lost the capacity to cooperate. I believe these facts present the great job facing education. This is the task which we have as educators; to train men so that they can think and act cooperatively and responsibly. The leadership of this democracy, the public opinion of this democracy, instead of being built up on an education that stresses a great variety of specialties but gives no emphasis to general thinking, should, so far as the educated graduates of the liberal arts colleges are concerned, be based on a core of habits and skills, capacity of cooperation, trained imagination, which can pull this country together again. We should not again let our educational system get into the condition that it was in between the two wars. Then it contributed to the inability of our public opinion to see anything as a problem of unified cooperation. Then it contributed to the growth of hates and conflicts as the inevitable result of failure to see a common basis of living in this democracy of ours.

PRESIDENT WEST: Thank you, sir. I think, from the attention that has been given your address, we have acted positively and negatively not on the entire address, but sentence by sentence all the way through.

. . . Following a brief discussion period, the meeting recessed at four twenty-five o'clock. . .

FRIDAY EVENING SESSION

APRIL 27, 1945

The meeting reconvened at eight-fifteen o'clock, President West presiding.

. . . President West introduced President James S. Thomson, of the University of Saskatchewan, who brought greetings from the National Conference of Canadian Universities. . .

PRESIDENT THOMPSON: I am happy to bring greetings from the National Conference of Canadian Universities. Our organization is not quite identical with yours—all the Canadian universities are included in its membership. They have a great variety of constitutions, and we also speak two languages—English and French.

This occasion provides me with an opportunity to express the gratitude of Canadian universities to the academic institutions of the United States of America. You have been most generous to us, particularly in providing fellowships for our graduate students. Indeed, our academic life would be greatly impoverished without your help. On the other hand, we flatter ourselves that we have sent you some rather good material. Our only lamentation is that many of them find your country so attractive that they fail to come back.

We have been in the habit of bringing you our greetings now for a long time. If ever these messages had a sense of formality, that cannot be true today. Our two countries are united in a great cause and must face a common future. It is very apparent that we confront a new time in world-history, and whatever may be the outcome of these tremendous events through which we pass, new responsibilities rest on the peoples of North America. Universities cannot escape from their share in these new engagements.

Our Canadian universities have been profoundly affected by the war. We were a most unwarlike people and were almost completely unprepared for what has already been a five and a half years' conflict. But we cast all that we had into the national cause, and it may be said that, without the universities, our contribution to the war would have been much less effective. The Canadian Officers' Training Corps was almost the only source of supply for young officers, and unless these leaders had been available, the Canadian Army would never have been able to proceed overseas in 1939.

Fortunately, government authorities early recognized the importance of the university contribution. University authorities were called into conference at every stage. When the dimensions of the war-effort in the supply of technical and scientific workers began to be realized, the

universities were found to be the only new source to provide staff alike for the armed services and industry. The plan adopted was to recognize that the universities were best equipped to do their own job, and we were left to do it, in full consultation, of course, with our governmental authorities. A University Advisory Board was set up to advise National Selective Service on all questions of manpower affecting academic institutions. All of this side of the national effort has worked not only smoothly, but, I think we may say, effectively.

The result has been a new appreciation of universities on the part of government. Indeed, it may be said, in all humility, that the universities have made a contribution to the prosecution of the war, without which the Canadian share would have been very much less than it has been.

With the assurance of victory now becoming appreciably nearer, we are beginning to get ready for our next engagement. The Government of Canada has recognized its great obligation to the men and women who have been on service. They have given up much for us, especially precious years of youth's opportunity. Consequently, a plan has been prepared offering university education to all demobilized men and women who are qualified to avail themselves of this means of preparing for satisfactory return to civilian life. The plan provides university education, including fees and maintenance, for a period equal to the time spent on service in the forces.

It is very clear that the universities must now encounter new duties on an unprecedented scale. We expect at least to double our normal enrollment. An endeavor has been made to study the problems involved. These are:

1. *The securing of the necessary teaching staff.* This is complicated by the fact that now for six academic years we have trained practically no new academic teachers.
2. *The securing of necessary buildings.*
3. *The securing of necessary funds.* As every university knows, tuition fees do not represent anything like the total cost of university education. We have computed that tuition fees pay only about one-third of the cost.

Nevertheless, we believe that while we shall encounter serious problems, we are also presented with splendid opportunities to fulfil the functions we exist to perform. These young men and women who have been on service are our country's finest asset, and it is at once a responsibility and a privilege to help them not only to become re-established in life, but to make the contribution we can expect them to give in a new hour of human destiny.

. . . The Honorable J. W. Fulbright, United States Senator from Arkansas, talked to the Association intimately and most interestingly on the topic, "Behind the Scenes with a Senator." . . .

. . . President West expressed to Senator Fulbright the appreciation of the Association and adjourned the meeting until nine o'clock the following morning. . .

SATURDAY MORNING SESSION

APRIL 28, 1945

The meeting convened an nine-ten o'clock, President West presiding.

PRESIDENT WEST: The meeting will come to order, please. We open the meeting this morning with a report. I am asking President Arthur Hauck to take charge of the meeting.

PRESIDENT HAUCK: The Committee on the Group Life of Students has no formal report to make, but the members felt that a discussion of student affairs should not be overlooked this year, even though our time and energy these days are so largely devoted to problems related to the war.

I am happy that President Willard has consented to lead the discussion on the topic, "The Union Building as an Educational Factor in University Life."

PRESIDENT WILLARD: President Hauck, President West, Members of the Association: I know there are many in the room who have had more experience with union buildings and the value of their additional influence on the education of our students than I. But possibly because the University of Illinois has been the last institution in this country to acquire a union building, I believe President Hauck thought that the newcomer to the field would have a lot of things to say that he wouldn't say if he had a little bit more experience. That was your purpose, I understand. There is no contradiction, so that is the purpose. Therefore, I am compelled to exhibit the enthusiasm of the newcomer or freshman to any situation.

The obvious, I suppose, in this discussion would be, first of all, the importance of a union building. Three or four years ago we had nothing of the kind on the campus of the University of Illinois. We, therefore, felt a tremendous lack in the coordination of our extra-curricular activities of a more or less social nature. In fact, the University lacked a social center. It lacked what might be called a home away from home, which is the title applied to the union building.

And so, after considerable planning, and with the assistance of various educators, we constructed a building at the University of Illinois which is the center of social life on the part of the students, more or less on the part of the faculty, and to as large a degree as possible on the part of our alumni.

The building was designed with an educational motive, with an educational influence, at least, in its conception. I am going to say just a word or two as to the philosophy behind the building and its construction. The University of Illinois draws students from the East and

Middle West. We thought possibly we should attempt to present in this building certain conceptions of colonial life, certain backgrounds that were traditional with the Eastern seaboard. Therefore, the motive of the building, the architectural motive, is that of the colonial period of this country.

It is designed, as many of you know from having visited it, in accordance with the Williamsburg tradition. The only modern aspect to the building is in the Commons, where food service is provided. Otherwise, the building is a purely colonial structure. The hope was that the students would be pleased by that and would be given, in a very objective manner, a conception of the way in which early American architecture developed. I think the building has had unusual success from that standpoint. It caused a good deal of comment. It is quite different, I think, from most of the union buildings, not as large as many, but it has been very definitely an influence in bringing to the attention of our students, the faculty, and the alumni what is believed to be the best traditional American architecture.

That is just the structure. Into that structure, of course, we needed to introduce the life of the students, and the faculty as well, and we were concerned about just how this idea was going over. Illinois never had anything of this kind. We were very diversified, and the student activities on the campus had no physical headquarters. Of course, we had the usual Senate Committee on Student Affairs; we attempted to bring about some coordination, but everything ran its way and there was no central point at which we could coordinate these activities. So, frankly, we weren't any too sure of our idea.

We asked the students if they would be willing to be assessed \$5.00 a semester, and it was important, therefore, that they should realize that here was something new and different. We knew it would succeed only in so far as all the students on the campus were interested in it.

We have some 60-odd fraternities and 30 sororities, and they represent one large group of students interested in the activity and philosophy peculiar to our Greek letter societies, you might say. Then we have students living in the private homes, known as the independents, and they were pretty far apart in their social contacts and in their thinking. The question was how to bring these various groups together, to say nothing of the diversification between men and women.

The building started out with a manager, who was very carefully selected and was very sympathetic with the educational objectives we had in mind. We appointed a social director. Then we realized that the students, of course, would not be interested in this project unless they felt they had an active part in it. Consequently, a student organization was set up, and that is what I would like to speak about next, having touched briefly on the building itself.

The organization set up was called the Illini Union Board, composed of students and faculty members. This Board runs the building. It is theirs. The manager is there to carry out their ideas. The social director is there to carry out their ideas. Everybody in the building is there to carry out the program devised by and supported by and maintained by the students. They are given a great deal of responsibility for it. They can do nearly everything except pull the structure apart, and they have shown not the slightest indication nor desire to do that. They are very proud of the building, and they are most meticulous in their care of it. I have never seen anything like it.

This Union Board is composed of sixteen individuals, six faculty and ten students, consulting with the students. Out of that came an executive board of six seniors, who are also on the Union Board. It is looked upon as a very worthwhile recognition of ability. You don't get on this Board unless you have been connected with the union building for a period of at least three years, in an active capacity.

Directly under the Board of sixteen are the major chairmen, sixty students. We have co-chairmen also, a man and a woman, on each committee. Then under these juniors come the sub-chairmen, and here we use 300 sophomores. Then, finally, in order to spread the interest, students are selected from both fraternities and sororities and from the independents at the freshman level. We have some 600 freshman who are allocated to these various student activities in this building. So the grand total rolls up to a sizable figure, even in a school having some 10,000 or 12,000 students. We have 10 per cent of our students connected more or less actively with the building, and mostly actively, because as soon as any activity shows signs of decadence, it is out. We drop it. We don't believe in carrying activities by name that are not in service to the student body.

So much for the building and organization. We then decided, or the students decided, because it really is their own program and their responsibility, that the various social activities that exist over the campus should be headed up and centered, in so far as possible, in this building. It is not, as I have said, a very large building. It is a very fine building, and it is a very expensive building; it cost a great deal of money. By no means is it one of the largest union buildings in the country.

So, we were most anxious to see that all grades, ranks, and conditions of students were given as prominent a place as was justified in the development of the social program. We have our music hours, a very popular activity in the union building, through every conceivable type of student activity, down to the bowling alley. We have a very informal, very popular browsing room in the library, but we established one in the union building also. The latest books are always available. There

are some 1500 volumes kept in this room. The thing we discovered almost immediately was—this is an educational feature of the building, of course—that we hadn't made the room large enough.

I spoke of music hours, which we started almost immediately with the opening of the building. We devoted a whole lounge to it, called the Music Lounge. The students took over very actively and aggressively, and not only did they take it over in the afternoon, but in the evening, and, to my surprise, they will play nothing but symphonic and classical music. Everything else is out. They are more severe than our school of music faculty. We have a committee in charge of the music hour, and the committee members really work at the program. They go to the students, consult with the directors and members of the faculty, get criticism and advice, and their programs are not only just the reproduction of fine music, but also include a statement by some student as to the background of the composer—very brief, of course, but the students handle this activity very intelligently.

There are the obvious dances, social hours, meetings in lounges, familiarizing students with the organization of the program. Then they meet the people who are invited—it may be an out-of-town group, it may be a group of faculty, it may be a mixed group. Students are the hosts and hostesses. It is their business to see that the social function goes off well. Students are required to meet people they have never seen before, older people and younger people, and make those people feel at home, find out what their interests are; that sort of thing develops personalities.

The plan also involves certain financial responsibilities. The budget is made up for all these activities at the beginning of the year. Each chairman knows what he has to spend. Some of the chairmen return quite a bit from these incomes. They, therefore, get actual experience, sometimes very severe experience, in staying within the budget in order to develop a program for the whole year. They must not spend all their funds in the first few months.

I don't know, Mr. President, whether there is very much more I can say on this subject. I have given you some idea of what we have felt was being accomplished at Illinois in connection with our union building. I think this is a tremendously important experimental activity in the field of human relations, and it does have many contacts with our educational program, such as the music and browsing lounges and other activities in the building. I think that at the University of Illinois it was a major event to acquire such a facility as this union building. I think that if you attempted to take this building away from the students, the faculty, and the alumni of Illinois today, it would cause the most terrific outburst of protest you could possibly imagine and a demand that the building be retained. Yet before we built it I doubt

if there were 10 per cent of the people on the campus who had the least interest in it, or any idea of what it was going to do for us, or why we wanted the building. But now that the building is in operation, and has shown its possibilities, I think it is one of the most important educational features of our entire program. I am including everything we do; I am making no exceptions.

I think, Mr. President, I can sum it all up by saying that a union building can be, and I think in most cases is, a very important factor in the educational life of any university.

PRESIDENT ATKINSON: President Willard, you speak of the advantages this has given to the University life. What has come into the life of the University of Illinois as a result of the building that was not there before?

PRESIDENT WILLARD: I think one of the principal advantages made possible by this building was the fact that it reduced and reconciled competition between activities on the campus. Groups were entirely unaware of each other's objectives. The building resulted in a spirit of cooperative enterprise that we had never had before. We had had a faculty committee that tried to integrate activities, but members of the committee were sometimes badly crossed up. Now these activities are integrated and handled by the faculty-student board.

PRESIDENT ATKINSON: The faculty-student board handles all of the activities on the campus?

PRESIDENT WILLARD: Everything. Oh, they don't handle the football team, but all of the social activities on the campus. Frankly, I think it is one of the most valuable additions to University life. We didn't have a "front door" to the University. When parents arrived on the campus—this is another aspect from the administrative point of view—with their son and daughter, there was no place for them to go. They could go into some dean's office if they knew where it was, but they didn't know which dean's office they wanted to go into. All they knew was that they wanted to see the University of Illinois, they wanted a place to check their baggage, they wanted a place to eat some lunch, they wanted to find out where they were to go. We had no service of that kind available. The administration building has an office with the usual sign, "Information", with perhaps half a dozen chairs available, but it certainly does not furnish the complete service that would please the parents who are interested in getting their children properly located.

Therefore, it served a very useful purpose for the administration to have a place where the parents could go on arrival on the campus, where they could be "put up" at night, and be fed. Any intelligent

person can see that here is a facility that is very much worthwhile. It has a tremendous effect, I think, in setting the standards of the University of Illinois in a visual way, the minute you walk in through the door.

PRESIDENT HAUCK: Are there any other questions or comments? Thank you very much, President Willard.

The other topic that the Committee chose as one of possible interest is "The Returned Veteran and the Civilian Student." Having been unsuccessful in getting anyone else to take the assignment, I have taken it myself.

It is not possible to foresee the character and dimensions of the problems involved in the readjustment of veterans to college environment. After demobilization there will be two dissimilar groups on our campuses, one much older than the other. While both groups are comparatively small at the present, particularly where men predominate in the normal enrollment, we should try to visualize the future and make reasonable, if tentative, provision for it.

The following questions suggest problems that may be anticipated. First, what is going to be the attitude of the veteran, who is widely traveled and worldly wise, toward the younger civilian student? Second, will there be unusual difficulties resulting from the return of self-discipline to the men who have been living and working under military control? Third, what about the establishment or re-establishment of habits of study, particularly in connection with the liberal arts subjects, since many of the men have had their attention intensively directed to the specific and immediate objectives of army training? Will it be harder for the veterans to accept as necessary the prerequisites and other requirements which would normally be accepted as a matter of course? Fourth, what about the college activities of prewar undergraduate life? Will they seem rather juvenile to the more adult men returning from military service?

A fundamental question then seems to be this: How can we minimize the group conflicts that are likely to arise because of the varying levels of sophistication and the different backgrounds of experience? I think we can go on the assumption that adjustments can be normal and natural. We should not make too much of imaginary troubles before they arise. An attempt should be made to "spot", as early as possible, in both civilian and veteran groups, those individuals who seem likely to prove helpful in their leadership. I believe that the veterans can be made to feel that they have an unusual opportunity to help younger students, particularly those just out of secondary school. It will help matters greatly if we can focus the attention of all groups upon the college community, its normal activities and worthy traditions. The organization of a student-faculty committee which will include

veterans can be extremely helpful in working out plans for dealing with situations that might arise.

On our campus the veterans have not yet organized as a separate group. They may wish to do so later and we shall be glad to cooperate with them. We shall, however, try, in so far as possible, to focus attention on the activities of the University as a whole, hoping that participation in athletics and membership in student organizations and in the fraternities will fill the need for social and group life.

Our experience with the veterans has, thus far, been most encouraging, both from the standpoint of social adjustment and scholastic achievement. The academic record of veterans now enrolled is higher than the average for the University as a whole. The number of cases of social maladjustment has been gratifyingly low. We have had veteran leadership which has been helpful and wholesome.

We have a few minutes available for discussion. Have I given too optimistic a picture? What have been your experiences?

. . . In a brief discussion period, President Gustavson of the University of Colorado, emphasized that the veterans organization on the University campus had been very helpful in bringing veterans' problems to the attention of the administration and in regard to housing. It was agreed that adequate housing for married veterans was one of the major problems facing most colleges and universities in regard to returning veterans. . .

PRESIDENT WEST: Moving to the next order of business, General Hines was to appear on this program. For reasons best known to him, but understood by all of us, he has been prevented from coming, so we have asked for and he has furnished Mr. Hostetler, who will give the message of General Hines at this time.

. . . Mr. C. E. Hostetler, Chief, Vocational Rehabilitation and Education Division, Veterans Administration, Hines, Illinois, read the following address by General Hines:

THE VETERAN VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION AND EDUCATION PROGRAM

The heartening news from Europe brings the realization that the time when the veterans will be returning may be nearer than we think and that definite preparation for their readjustment must be made. "They have fought the good fight, they have kept the faith." We must now keep faith with them.

The colleges and universities have an exceedingly important role to play in veteran readjustment. They had an important role to play in the war and they will have a still more important role to play after the war. Never has a war required so much learning as this one.

It was necessary to train millions of workers to make new weapons and millions of soldiers to use them. When the nation's call came, the universities with one accord placed all their resources at the service of the government. Over a million persons were trained in our colleges and universities for the war industries and the armed forces. All this required planning, although that planning was necessarily hasty.

As the colleges mobilized their resources for the war effort, they must mobilize their resources for the needs of peace. Planning is essential if we are to prevent chaos. While victory was yet far off, Congress passed legislation to assist the veterans to readjust and make the transition back to civilian life. Not only has the government planned well in advance for the postwar period of readjustment, but the men in the armed forces themselves have been planning—in terms of jobs, social readjustment, and education.

The colleges and universities of the country must plan now to implement the purposes of this legislation and the hopes of the men now fighting on the war fronts. It is for this purpose that we meet together.

It is important in planning to know what the men in the armed forces have in mind in regard to job readjustment and education. It is important also to estimate the tendencies revealed in the rehabilitation and education programs so far. It is my purpose in meeting with you to give you, as far as possible, the facts you will need to make your plans for the rehabilitation and readjustment of these men who have so well earned the gratitude of every one of us. Let me first then give you a summary of the present desires of the men in the armed forces as shown in a recent study made by the Information and Education Division of the Army Service Forces, and then give you the results of a recent study made by the Veterans Administration on the characteristics of the vocational rehabilitation and education program to date.

Soldier plans of course cannot be definite. The characteristic of the war and of the peace to follow is that they are fluid. Everything is changing but change itself. Men far away from home, who are still unacquainted, many of them, with even the basic provisions of the G. I. Bill of Rights, who can make no predictions as to economic conditions or when the war will end, cannot know for sure just what they will do when they return. Surveys conducted among the men, however, reveal that they do have plans and that some of them have fairly definite plans. Many, for instance, are already settled in their minds as to whether they will endeavor to go to school, work for an employer, or start business or farming for themselves.

About 10 per cent of the men in the armed forces entered the services directly from school. These are the men whose educational plans have been interrupted and a large proportion of whom will be returning

to full-time school. Two-thirds of them are now definitely planning to enter school or college.

On the basis of a survey of a sample of 25,000 soldiers here and abroad, 8 per cent of the men in the Army definitely plan to return to full-time school, and about 90 per cent of these are qualified on the basis of their previous education to enter college if they so desire. It may be presumed that at least 75 per cent of the men qualified for college will enter college rather than some other type of institution. Assuming that the same percentages would hold in estimating the number from the Navy and other services, by taking 75 per cent of the 8 per cent of the 11,000,000 men in the armed forces, we have 660,000 men who at the present time definitely intend to enter college full time, regardless of other conditions, such as the number of jobs available after the war.

I am not making predictions—I want to be very clear on that point—I am simply giving you the stated intentions of the men in the armed forces at the present time under present conditions. Plans stated now, well in advance of demobilization, are not in themselves predictors of what the men actually will do when they return to civilian life. The problem is how far present plans are predictive of future action. No one knows exactly when the war will end. The longer it lasts the less likelihood there will be of the men resuming their education. Soldier plans strongly indicate tendencies which are important to planning but it must be remembered that there are a number of factors which may operate to change, in one or another direction, the plans of the men as presently stated. These factors are the length of time before demobilization; the over-all economic situation at the time of demobilization; the effect of an increased knowledge of the educational provisions of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act; the encouragement the men are given to take advantage of the aid provided by the Act and their willingness to seek and act upon advisement with respect to the realism of their plans. It is obvious that most of these factors fall within our determination. We can encourage education; we can make university courses suitable and attractive to adults; we can increase a knowledge of the liberal provisions of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act and the still more liberal provisions of the Rehabilitation Act; we can make counselling and guidance widely available.

The Veterans Administration has guidance centers in each of its 53 Regional offices and, in addition, it has set up centers in 80 colleges and universities, with more in prospect. By distributing guidance services among the educational institutions where the men are likely to go for inquiry, the Veterans Administration has increased the likelihood of their taking advantage of these services. The more the value of education is demonstrated and the more the veterans follow the

realistic guidance when it is given, the greater will be the number of men going into full-time education. If, on the other hand, the economic situation after the war is such that job rewards are unusually high, the men may postpone their educational plans. It will be advantageous both to the men and to the country for large numbers of them to make their readjustment in school. Many men in the armed forces have been technically trained, have been on their own, have been in positions of considerable authority, have exercised resourcefulness and have achieved considerable prestige. The transition from the military status with its movement, adventure and responsibility, to the relative humdrum of civilian office and factory work will not be easy. The school is by far the best medium for adjustment, especially if that adjustment is upward as most of the men desire.

You realize, of course, that the educational level of the armed forces of this war is far above that of the last war. This explains the fact that such a large proportion of the men planning to complete their education are going to enter college. In the last war 5 per cent of the armed forces had some college training; in this war 15 per cent have had college training. In the last war 4 per cent were high school graduates; in this war 25 per cent are high school graduates. In the last war 11 per cent had some high school education; in this war 28 per cent have some high school education. In the last war 80 per cent were on the elementary school level; in this war 32 per cent are on the elementary school level. Thus the number who were qualified to undertake college and university work after this war will be 40 per cent. It is out of this 40 per cent, constituting high school graduates and former college students, that 90 per cent of our present enrollment under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act is coming.

Not only is the educational level of the men in the armed forces an inducement to a full utilization of the educational provisions of the legislation but the widespread and manifest desire for increased job prestige is also operative. The number expected to go into business for themselves is unusually large. Two-fifths of those who were employed want better jobs. Men who had jobs on lower levels aspire to change them for jobs on higher levels. Such plans for upgrading call for education and training.

The group which is most interested in undertaking education after the war consists of men who were attending full-time school at the time they were inducted. Forty-six per cent of those attending school at the time of induction say that it is their intention to return to school, and 61 per cent of those who had begun college at the time of induction plan to come back. But of those who were attending full-time school below fourth year high school only 24 per cent plan to

return to school. Thus those who were attending college at the time of induction are the most likely to continue their education.

In other words, the men who have definite plans for further education on a full-time basis after the war are those who were students just prior to entering the service. Age also seems to be a determining factor in most cases. Ninety per cent of those who are planning to return to school are under 25 years of age, and 75 per cent are under 22. The fact that youth is the time for schooling holds for veteran education. The men who have definite plans for returning to school have the characteristics found in the school population generally; that is, they are under 25, unmarried, and high school graduates. All but 3 per cent of them have at least two of these characteristics and four-fifths of them have all of these characteristics.

Let me now turn to the results of a recent study by the Veterans Administration which is highly indicative in terms of planning because, among other things, it shows actual educational choices. This study covers the numbers applying for rehabilitation and education, the numbers now in the rehabilitation and education program, the age distribution, the type and level of training, the course elections and the pattern of institutional utilization. The information at hand shows certain trends, but it is necessary here also to point out that these trends must be viewed with caution. The characteristics of the training as shown to date are not necessarily indicative of the nature of the program over its entire future course. The program very definitely reflects the war situation. A large number of veterans under both the vocational rehabilitation program and the readjustment program are, for the time being, putting off their training. While they have made inquiry and have signified their intention to pursue education, they are at present working to further the war effort and to establish themselves. In other words, not only the proportion now in actual training as compared with the number who have indicated interest by application, but the character of the training itself will, in all probability, be modified after victory is won.

The intention of large numbers of veterans to undertake education or training is indicated by the fact that over 10,000 applications showing intention to avail themselves of the program have been coming to the Veterans Administration each month for the past year. As of February 28, 1945, there were 56,000 applications on file for educational benefits under Public 16, the Rehabilitation Act, and 52,000 applications on file for benefits under Public 346, the Readjustment Act. As of March 30, 1945, there were in training under the Rehabilitation Act 13,477 disabled veterans, and under the provisions of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, 21,000 veterans—about 34,000 in all, and almost a third of the applications on file.

The study indicates that 80 per cent of the trainees under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act were between 18 and 24 years of age at the time of enlistment, the model age being 20. The men taking training under the Rehabilitation Act are a little older and more widely distributed as to age than the men in training under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act.

As a whole, the disabled are seeking training in greater proportion to their numbers than are the non-disabled, as would be expected; and, since wounds and disability are no respecters of status or educational ambition, the characteristics of the Rehabilitation program are more normal for the population than the present characteristics of the training under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act. Taking the figures as a whole, we have 13,000 veterans taking rehabilitation training as against a total of about 900,000 casualties; and 21,000 veterans taking readjustment education out of about 2,000,000 discharged servicemen. Those at present undergoing education under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act are probably a highly selected group. They are the better educated and the more ambitious. They represent the group which definitely intends to go into the professions, the men who realize that if they do not start now they will be too old to accomplish what they desire, the men who are foregoing the advantages of present high wages to pursue their long-term plans. The men with less training and education who do not intend to go into professional or technical work are more likely to postpone their education or training to an indefinite time after the war. If these presumptions are correct, the character of the choices under the provisions of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act will change somewhat as time goes on.

Those present here will be interested in the characteristics of the training programs under both Acts. Training under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, Public 346, is almost entirely in educational institutions, in contrast to job training, and three-quarters of these institutions are universities and colleges. Twenty-five per cent of the men under this program are in trade and industrial and clerical and sales courses, and 75 per cent are pursuing general education or professional or technical training in universities and colleges and in professional schools.

In contrast, training under Public 16, the Rehabilitation Act, is for the most part institutional, with about one-third of the training being carried on on the job. A little over half of the men under this program are in universities, professional and technical schools. A little less than half are pursuing trade, clerical and sales courses, and half of these are pursuing training-on-the-job.

Members of this audience should find the course elections of the veterans taking training under the provisions of the Servicemen's Re-

adjustment Act of particular interest from the point of view of planning for future needs. The first twenty course elections, in order, out of 5,000 cases of veterans taking training are as follows: Liberal Arts College, 16+%; Commerce and Business, 12+%; Dentistry, 10+%; Engineering, 8+%; Education, 4.7+%; Medicine, 3.6+%; Accounting and Sales, 3.6+%; Agriculture, 3.5+%; Law, 3.1+%; General High School, 2.9+%; Veterinary Medicine, 2.4+%; Fine Arts, 1.9+%; Radio Technician, 1.9+%; Music, 1.4+%; Journalism, 1.2+%; Refrigeration, 1.3+%; Mortuary Science, 1%; Theology, Auto Mechanics, Graduate School; Optometry, less and 1%. The choices tend toward the academic with a strong vocational slant. Engineering and other professional subjects such as dentistry and law stand out.

The course elections of the veterans taking training, 5,000 in all, under Public 16 are by contrast as follows: Miscellaneous Mechanical Trades, 14+%; Engineering Subjects, 10.5+%; Education, 6.5+%; Law, 3.7+%; Commerce and Business, 3.5+%; Watch Repair, 2.5+%; Shoe Repair, 2.5%; Electrical Work, 2%; Journalism, 1.9+%; Aero Mechanics, 1.1+%; Barbering, 1.1+%; Pharmacy, 1+%; Music, Theology, Optometry, Carpentry, Medicine, Tailoring, Social Work, Veterinary Medicine, less and 1%. In contrast to the course elected under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, veterans undergoing rehabilitation are selecting under guidance a large number of practical, vocational courses, most of them skilled trades, in which employment is fairly steady and in which there is not a large amount of physical activity. Barbering, pharmacy, tailoring, watch making, shoe repair are typical, but a very large number are going into education and engineering, law and business.

In this war some of the veterans will be women. The courses taken by women, of whom there are 102 out of the first 5,000 veterans in training under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, are in order as follows: Liberal Arts, 25%; Business, 24%; Commerce, 9%; Education, 9%; Cosmetology, 6%; Fine Arts, 4%; Radio Technicians, 3%; Nursing, 3%; Engineering, 2%; Medicine, 2%; Journalism, 4%; Graduate School, 2%. There are approximately one-quarter million women in the armed forces as of January, 1945.

The educational pattern for Negro veterans in training under the provisions of Public 346 is similar in most respects to the general pattern of choices. The course elections of 251 Negro veterans out of the first 5,000 World War II trainees are in order as follows: Liberal Arts College, 19+%; Dentistry, 8+%; Education, 8%; Radio Technician, 4%; Auto Mechanics, 4%; Mortuary Science, 3+%; Commerce and Business, 5%; Agriculture, 4%; Engineering, 3%; Barbering, 2%; Law, 1+%; Music, 1+%; Theology, 1+%; Business,

1%; Refrigeration, 1%; Shoe Repair, Graduate School, Fine Arts, less than 1%. As in the case of the white veterans, the majority are taking university, technical and professional courses, with trade and business courses running a close second.

The selection of courses under Public 346 is generally in line with the educational pattern of professional training in institutions of higher learning as of 1940. The chief differences between the veteran program elections and the national pattern of choices is that the veterans, in proportion, are taking fewer engineering and education courses and a very largely increased number of commercial and business courses, medicine, law, and dentistry courses, especially the latter. The veteran program in the training of dentists accounts for one-sixth of the training in that field in the country under normal times, and under present times it accounts for possibly one-third of it. This is indicative of the place veteran education will take in the manning of the professions. Training in the professions, as we all know, has been hard hit during the war.

This group of university officials should also be interested in the utilization of the various types of institutions under this program. The types of institutions used correspond substantially to the types of education previously listed. The over-all emphasis in institutional utilization is at present on universities and colleges and on trade and business schools. About two-thirds of the enrollments are in universities and colleges and approximately one-third in trade, business and other educational institutions. Over half of the institutions of higher learning had, as of January, 1945, some veteran trainees. The proportion is probably a good deal larger now. The distribution of the training load among the institutions is fairly even considering the nature of the course elections.

Perhaps the outstanding fact so far in the training program is the prominent position of the universities and colleges. As was stated, over 75 per cent of the veteran trainees taking training under the provisions of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act are in the universities and colleges. The colleges for the veterans are thus the instruments of adult education. If present indications hold true for the future, the veteran educational program will be largely a college and university program.

I should like to say a word about the importance of the counselling centers being set up in your institutions. It is probable that the veteran rehabilitation and education program will set a mark in the establishment of guidance facilities in educational institutions. After these centers are set up, however, it is important that they be widely used by returning veterans. The industrial world is at present exceedingly complex. There are tens of thousands of occupations and these are

complicated by economic factors relatively unknown to those seeking education. Full occupational information is essential for the proper guidance of the returning veteran. The incongruity between vocational plans and employment possibilities is in many cases marked. For instance, one survey reveals that there are in the Air Corps 140,000 men who are planning to secure jobs in commercial aviation after the war. This is three times the number of jobs that will be available on the basis of the most optimistic view of the situation. It is exceedingly important that all returning veterans should be given a realistic picture of the possibilities and be directed toward the fields in which they can capitalize their abilities, training and experience.

I should like to emphasize also the fact that under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act the Veterans Administration is explicitly prohibited by law from abridging individual choice or in any manner interfering with educational institutions or processes. It is the responsibility of the appropriate state educational agencies to see that the institutions placed on the approved list under the provisions of the Act are thoroughly suited and equipped to give education and training to veterans. The responsibility which rests with the appropriate agency of the state to determine whether a training institution is qualified and equipped to furnish education or training to veterans is, in my opinion, one of the most important responsibilities contained in the law. It is my hope that the colleges and universities may play a very important part in insisting that high standards be maintained in approving institutions as "qualified and equipped" to furnish educational training to the returning veteran. The veteran must be protected against exploitation by unqualified schools and against the mistakes which will inevitably occur if proper guidance is not furnished. He must also be furnished education which is really adult.

PRESIDENT WEST: Thank you, Mr. Hostetler. Mr. Hostetler has been called to the telephone to receive a message of some importance, but will be back presently so that we may question him. At this time, however, we may proceed on our own to examine the field that has been pointed out repeatedly, namely that of the cost of education of veterans. At this moment I will recognize President Atkinson of Arizona to state the case so that we may discuss it. Would you care to do that, sir?

PRESIDENT ATKINSON: Mr. Chairman, and Gentlemen: The only reason, I take it, that he asked me to say something about this was that I wrote him some little time ago and expressed the hope that the question of who would pay for the education of veterans under the G. I. Bill would be up for discussion. There is nothing new that I can bring on it, and I was hoping that we might have the opportunity of asking Mr. Hostetler some questions.

You have all received, I presume, the administrative decision, No. 638, under date of March 19. A number of questions are asked, and in the decisions regarding some of these questions you find the statement, "If a non-resident of the state, the non-resident rates are non-applicable. If a non-resident of the state, the non-resident rates will apply to those who entered prior to July 1, 1944." In many states 90 or 95 per cent of these G. I.'s who return will be residents.

It is pointed out in this decision that payment of non-resident fees for resident students is in conflict with the law. That merely puts the case back to the place where the states will have to pay the cost of educating these men who have piled up and could have been cared for had they come to the institutions in the regular numbers. I am afraid that some of us are going to be confronted with the decision as to whether or not we will take veterans and turn back the people who come regularly, or look to some other rather substantial appropriations for meeting the cost of this veteran education. The decision, of course, entirely sets aside the earlier provisions and arrangements under which I suppose most of us billed the government at the end of the first semester.

I have nothing to add in this connection, and it may be that there is nothing we can do about it. It certainly upsets plans that most of us had set up to provide for the expense of taking care of this group. I was hoping that there might be some discussion and a decision as to whether or not we should try to bring about a modification of this administrative decision under the date I referred to.

PRESIDENT WEST: President Atkinson has presented to you a topic that has been discussed in practically every organization from the Council on Education clear down the line. I think that the Council on Education has made some sort of a survey which indicates a unanimous, or nearly unanimous, opinion that any present plan or suggestion is unsatisfactory to the state university, and largely inoperable. That seems to be the situation that confronts us right now.

I recognize President Moseley.

PRESIDENT JOHN MOSELEY (University of Nevada): Mr. President, I should like to read the provisions of Senate Bill 781. This bill was introduced by Senator McCarran of Nevada. It is a bill to amend veterans regulation No. 1 with respect to payment to educational or training institutions. I will omit the preamble. "And provided further, that if any publicly supported institution or private institution exempt from tax under Section 101 (6) of the Internal Revenue Code has no established tuition fee, or if the established tuition fee of any such institution is less than the actual cost to such institution of furnishing the education or training, the Administrator is authorized to provide

for the payment to such institution, with respect to any such person, of the actual cost of furnishing such education or training, but not to exceed \$500 for an ordinary school year."

The sum and substance of that is to figure the cost, I think, like the universities did in the Army training program.

. . . In further discussion it was pointed out (1) that "actual" cost of furnishing education could not be ascertained and that the words "fair and reasonable" might be substituted for "actual"; that the phrase "the Administrator is authorized to provide payment" simply made payment permissive and that the substitution of "directed" for "authorized" would make the provision mandatory; and (3) that the bill should contain a specific provision prohibiting the deduction of educational benefits from any future bonus. It was further pointed out that the War Dads organization has so aroused public opinion in some states, particularly in Iowa, against institutions receiving more money for educating veterans than for educating civilians that only federal legislation can clarify the situation. President Donovan's comments on the experience of the University of Kentucky are printed in full. . .

PRESIDENT DONOVAN: From the very inception of this idea of educating the veterans, it was regarded by the administration in Washington, if I have read correctly the reports that came to me, that this was a part of the cost of the war and that the Federal Government would assume that cost. The Congress of the United States passed the G. I. Bill of Rights which gave the veteran opportunity to return to school. I have talked with the man who introduced that bill into Congress, as well as to a good many other Representatives and Senators—and we have a distinguished Senator here today who can testify as to whether this is true or not. In the conferences between the House and Senate—I didn't attend them, but I have heard Dr. Brown talk about them—it was understood that the cost would be paid by the Veterans Administration as a cost of rehabilitating the veteran for civilian life, just the same as when a man comes back and has to be sent to a mental hospital, the Federal Government assumes the burden instead of throwing it onto the state and letting the state rehabilitate him mentally.

The Veterans Administration in Washington apparently took the position, almost as soon as the law was enacted, that they were not going to do that, and from that time on, as you know, we have had something of a struggle.

More recently, I sat in some of the committee meetings in Washington, and I heard a very prominent official of the Veterans Administration ask what the officials of the several states would say about permitting the institutions to charge returned veterans more than civilians.

I took the position that these men were not coming back to us to be educated as citizens of the state, but they were being sent back by the Federal Government to be re-educated, and the Federal Government was going to pay the bill.

Just recently, we had a letter addressed to our attorney general asking this question: "If the institution may lawfully charge a tuition fee, may it charge a resident veteran the higher tuition, or non-resident fee, which is not charged a non-veteran resident?"

The attorney general of Kentucky studied both state and federal laws, and came back with this decision: "While the state-supported institution could not charge the veteran himself a fee in excess of that charged the civilian students of like residence, there would seem to be no reason why you could not enter into a mutually approved arrangement with the Veterans Administration for payment by that Administration to the institution, of compensation in excess of the fee assessed civilian students."

In other words, the institution might enter into an agreement for the payment of its incidental fees, which is what we call our fee in Kentucky, and "in addition a tuition rate agreed upon by the parties concerned. Whatever the payment, it would not be charged the veteran himself, but rather the Veterans Administration."

So we are not charging the veteran more. The bill did not require us to charge the veteran anything. The bill approved by Congress said that the Veterans Administration would pay more. That is the position I should like to take on this. Now I have come to the conclusion that the Veterans Administration is not going to pay more unless we amend the law, and I hope that this bill which President Moseley presented will be approved by this group. Also, I should like to see added to it an amendment which would say that this amount will not be deducted from any bonus or any other compensation that might be given to the veterans at a later date. I don't think it is fair to charge any more than a veteran would be charged for a hospitalization fee, and that amendment ought to be put into law. I would suggest that Senator McCarran add that amendment, too.

PRESIDENT ATKINSON: Mr. President, by way of crystalizing the discussion, I take it that the Committee on Resolutions will bring in some resolution about the attitude of this group toward these proposed amendments. There should be some record.

PRESIDENT WEST: I am of the opinion that that is true, President Atkinson; however, I am also of the opinion that the Resolutions Committee will be guided somewhat by any action that we may take. I just want to throw in a little example of my own. Our solicitor has ruled, and so has the court as far as that is concerned, that we can't

charge tuition either to a resident or non-resident, except in two specific instances. However, he has also ruled that we may engage with any other municipality, corporation, or what not, for any specific service, as we did with the United States Government for the Signal Corps, for the Army, for the Navy, and dentistry schools, which is deemed not to be in violation of the non-tuition law.

Now Dr. Brown, of the American Council on Education, will speak to us.

DR. BROWN: MR. Chairman, Members: I hesitate to interrupt the previous discussion, because I realize how vital this problem is to the interests of all of the universities, and through you to the interests of the veterans. I shall come back to it at the end of what I shall say, since I feel very definitely that some action on the part of this group can be of real aid in meeting the situation that has become, even to put it mildly, chaotic.

I am glad also of the opportunity of meeting with you who are forming the policies of administration to a much greater degree than they can be formulated in Washington. Unless decisions in Washington are interpreted in terms of services, as you men carry them out on your campuses, those decisions are fruitless.

As Dr. Kelly pointed out yesterday, there has never been a time when so many issues revolved around the national capital, affecting all education, but higher education more than any other. There has never been a time when the decisions made are so far-reaching in their consequences, and have such serious implications for the entire future of higher education.

Dr. Kelly reviewed this legislation for you yesterday; it is my purpose not to review the report, "Effect of Certain War Activities Upon Colleges and Universities," made for the Committee on Education of the House of Representatives, nor yet to indicate the complex relationship between the Federal Government and higher education; but rather to point out, through the report, some of the fundamental issues that are raised by it and especially by the developments that have taken place since the report was introduced.

You are familiar with the House resolution that created the Advisory Committee to conduct this study, you are familiar with the membership of the Committee, and, I hope, you are familiar with the recommendations that were made by the Committee.

The first and the third recommendations dealt with the deferment of students and faculty, the former to continue their education, and the latter to provide instructors for such education. It is extremely interesting to go back just for a moment and see what has happened in this whole matter of deferment.

The quota for induction into the armed forces reached the peak of

256,000 a month, in the spring of 1944, when the ASTP was canceled and the Navy V-12 program was reduced in size. It dropped rather rapidly to as low as 80,000 in December of 1944, and then, with the reversal in Europe, the quotas were stepped up almost immediately to 130,000 above the numbers who enlisted during their 17th year. It is indicated now by Selective Service and by the armed forces that this quota will not be reduced substantially at least until July 1 and possibly even later, regardless of the progress of the war in Europe.

Since only 80,000 of the 120,000 men who become 18 each month are physically and mentally qualified for military service, this quota required that the pressure on the men of the faculty up through age thirty be very acute during these past few months, as all of you know. There was a further complicating factor in that the colleges and universities, together with publishing houses and a number of other such types of service, had no governmental agency that would certify the essentiality of an individual. After conversations with representatives of Selective Service and other government agencies, the Council urged institutions to submit the Special Form (42A Revised) directly to the local Board with an explanatory statement.

However, I think it is safe to say now, from conversations held only recently, that that pressure on the men up from thirty to thirty-three will be substantially reduced. The men are classified I-A, but there is now a definite intent to leave on inactive duty those that are certified by the institution as essential in the necessary field. Let me put it this way, they will be classified I-A, but not called for induction, except by boards where the necessity of meeting quotas is such that they have taken policies contrary to a very definitely accepted national point of view.

This policy has, however, in no way influenced the continuance of the induction of all physically qualified males as they reach eighteen, nor is there any prospect that quotas will be reduced to provide such relief prior to the end of the victory, when it finally comes, in the Pacific as well as on the far-flung battlefields of the world.

That being true, the situation in the technical field has become increasingly acute. I need not go into details, because you are familiar with conditions. The situation in the medical schools is illustrative. For a rather considerable time the medical association took the position that deferment was not necessary and that they did not face a situation that was serious. In a report that was sent to me just as I left Washington, they have totally reversed that position. They now know that they are faced with a very acute situation and that something must definitely be done. Beginning in 1946, approximately 10 to 15 per cent of their freshman enrollment will be women, 5 to 15 per cent will be 4-F's, with about the same percentage coming from veterans. With

the cancellation of the Army program and the dropping of the Navy contracts to 5 per cent, freshman enrollment will not be in excess of a third to a half of normal enrollment in the first year class.

The dental schools are in the same situation at the present time. The report by the Council on Dental Education, which was received two or three days before I left, indicated that there were only 310 dental eligible students who had applied and been accepted for the year 1945 for the freshman classes that approximate 2500 enrollment, a little more than 10 per cent on the average of normal admissions.

Engineering enrollments are from 10 to 25 per cent of normal, with definite reports coming from industry and from government that they are planning expansion ranging from 35 to 50 per cent in their research staffs alone. The other fields—chemistry, physics, and possibly some others—are facing an equally serious situation.

There are two approaches: by legislation or by administrative action. There is authority in existing law to provide for deferment. At this date, however, there is no indication of a change in policy by Selective Service. In fact, there will probably be an effort to lower physical requirements and thereby induct an even higher per cent of 18 year olds.

Discussions have been held with the Mead Committee of the Senate. Members of that Committee are vitally concerned with this problem and have asked us to submit a rather detailed report of the whole history of deferment and the facts on the present serious situation. They are contemplating holding hearings before the Committee very shortly on this problem.

There is a possible change resulting from the change in administration. One of the statements made recently, just as we were leaving a conference on this issue, was that perhaps the change on the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue may make a change in the view of the manpower problem in these fields. Perhaps a very hopeful indication of that is the recent rebuff of the Army and Navy command by the Congress insisting on putting in a provision that no eighteen-year-old shall see active duty short of six months of training, passed in spite of opposition of both Army and Navy. That is, it may be that we are moving now into a situation whereby the total manpower problem in these essential fields may be viewed in a different light.

The other possible approach, of course, is through legislation. What it shall be, I think, is something that we cannot at this time predict. But certainly, again, it is one of the areas in which an organization such as this can have a tremendous weight, if it can be agreed as to the policies that should be followed, at least if it can be agreed that the situation in the technical and professional fields has reached such a point that some definite, positive and constructive action must take place, and quickly.

The Council is now preparing, in cooperation with the National Research Council, a special Bulletin (Since issued, *Higher Education and National Defense*, No. 84, May 28, 1945) summarizing data on the shortage in technical and scientific fields.

The second and fourth recommendations dealt with the discharge of men from service, students and faculty. Those recommendations have been refused by both the Army and Navy in official communications. Both of the armed forces believe it would be unwise to discharge men either for return as students or for teaching in colleges and universities. They base their arguments on two factors: One is that the type of individual who would indicate his desire to return to college as a basis for being discharged from the armed forces would, by and large, not be the type of individual that the institutions would themselves desire to have returned to them. The second and more important reason is that the plans which they have for an intensive educational program—not a plan for the future, but actually now being put into operation in many of the more inactive overseas theaters of operation—will require the services of all who can teach. We hope shortly to release a very detailed description of this plan.

Let me just describe in about three or four sentences the major design of this educational program prescribed for the time the theater becomes inactive and the time the men are returned to the United States for demobilization. The base is the so-called unit school, provided for each battalion, involving approximately 1000 men. This school will include in it everything from the boy who is learning to read and write to the lad who wants to take college work through approximately the junior college level. A considerable number of technical institutions will be established in centers where shop and trade equipment can be made available.

On top of these two types of schools there will be the establishment of a rather considerable number of institutions to be known as university study centers, that will take men through the complete college curriculum. Plans are now under way to set these up as autonomous educational institutions, with presidents, deans, and all the rest, and with a curriculum that involves almost the whole cross-section of higher education.

In that connection, there is a rather interesting bit of opposition developing on the part of some of the professional groups, that their particular subjects ought not to be included in these Army study centers. I think it is rather important that institutions face that problem, and take a definite position. Certainly the professional groups should definitely favor the inclusion of study in their fields provided that the armed forces, under the direction of the Information and Education Division, can establish an educational program that will be a fair repre-

sensation of the standards and quality of instruction that one would anticipate in a civilian school. Many of these men will be overseas not weeks, but months, and possibly years, before they can be returned to the United States, and certainly the opportunities that the armed forces have are now being realized. It does need the complete support of higher education throughout the United States. As far as possible all of the instructors and administrative officers should be men in uniform.

The Navy plans are not so far developed because the Navy does not contemplate that its entire educational program will need to be put into effect nearly so quickly as the Army.

Some of us have urged that there also be two or three graduate study centers in establishments where research and construction materials may be readily available. Arrangements are being made for selected men to be sent to established European universities.

In addition to all of this, there will be the vast quantity of self-teaching texts. The textbook order of the armed services is unparalleled in the history of the world. Eleven million textbooks have been ordered, printed, and already distributed, and 14 million textbooks are on order by the armed forces for this interim educational program. Certainly the magnitude of the Army and Navy plans can hardly be conceived, even by those of us who have been somewhat accustomed to dealing in round numbers.

The next recommendation dealt with surplus war properties. I suppose there is no area in which there is such confusion as there is in this one area at the present time. The Surplus War Properties Board has just recently designated the Federal Security Agency and the Office of Education as the agencies to work with them on the basis of priorities for both health and education, but at the present time it now appears as though small businesses would have priority, not in defiance of the law, but in exercising options within the law. I do not, myself, have very much hope in the matter of actually competing with small business and other interests in behalf of education. The Council and the Office of Education and other agencies have been actively at work with this problem for many months.

The seventh recommendation is one that is controversial perhaps more than any other, and that is the emergency aid to colleges. You recall this recommendation proposed to set up a separate commission. It provides funds only for the war emergency, and the basis of compensation is exclusively that of partial compensation for the decrease in student income. The bill, to embody recommendation seven, has been drafted and has been approved by the Advisory Committee. I hoped I could report to you that it had already been introduced into the Congress. It is to be introduced by Representative Barden, and I

hope within the next few days. (Introduced May 3, 1945, H. R. 3116).

The eighth deals with aid in the construction of necessary buildings, provided such aid is a part of a total public works program. I think I can say to you that conditioning such assistance as a part of a public works program is a matter of compromise within the Committee itself. Some felt that it ought to be definitely an educational program, others that it should be only a part of a larger public works program. Certainly it is tied very closely with the surplus war properties, and the two cannot be thought of except in the same terms.

The ninth recommendation dealt with research. Here too, there is difficulty of coordination. The vast number of organizations in Washington seeking to develop research programs through institutions of higher learning makes it extremely difficult to emerge with anything like a unified program. The Army and Navy have plans for a program of scientific research on a vast scale. Other agencies, both in and out of government, have almost comparable plans, such as the Civil Aeronautics Authority, the Department of Agriculture, and the Department of Labor. I could go on, indicating the agencies that are working in this area of development of research for the immediate postwar years. Again, it is an area in which coordination of effort is certainly mandatory if a constructive program is eventually to emerge that will utilize the full facilities of colleges and universities in proportion to their ability to contribute constructively to the future welfare of the nation.

The tenth recommendation proposes the setting up of a joint committee to plan for the effective utilization of colleges and universities in a declared national emergency. With that recommendation, my own thoughts go back to some of my first contacts in Washington, down in the old Munitions Building, in a little office in back of one of the wings. There General Hershey, then Major Hershey, together with two other officers, both of whom are now generals, had been since 1928—for twelve years—working and reworking a plan for national selective service. When it was finally proposed as legislation, the armed services at least had a plan that had been the result of years of painstaking and careful study.

And then I remember that meeting in Baltimore that many of you attended, at which a thousand university presidents met. War had been declared less than two weeks before. No one could point to previously developed plans. There had been serious dissension as to whether war had any implication for higher education. There was no sense of previously considered judgments. While the institutions offered their full services to the government, there was no plan by which they could say, "This has been the outgrowth of a study, these are our collective plans, this is what should be done."

So the Advisory Committee felt that, even though the war, we

hope, is a thing of the past and not of the future, there should be a joint commission continuously studying such possible emergencies in order that some plan might be ready when and if a national emergency, war or otherwise, made such national planning necessary.

The last recommendation urged the naming of an advisory committee by the Committee on Education of the House and the Committee on Education and Labor of the Senate, to advise in terms of legislation. Certainly there is no better illustration of the need of such a committee than the two bills that are now before the Congress dealing with federal assistance to elementary and secondary education, including the junior college level. One bill is supported by the American Federation of Teachers, the other supported primarily by the National Education Association. The bills differ in at least two very fundamental respects. In this instance education is tossing into the laps of the committees of the Congress the absolute necessity of themselves making basic decisions and formulating fundamental educational policies. Certainly these are a problem which education should face. Educators should not compel the committees of Congress to step in and make such decisions for us!

The Report to the Committee on Education did not create new issues. It rather focused attention upon several basic issues. Let me indicate only two of them. One is whether higher education is a responsibility of the Federal Government, and, if so, to what extent, as compared to the responsibility of the state government, and of the local institution and its supporters. The second issue is whether public monies should be distributed on the same basis to privately and publicly administered institutions.

The report focused attention upon those issues exclusively as a war measure. It did not seek to point the direction for the meeting of those issues on the postwar basis. But they are issues that must be decided constructively by education.

The Committee did one other thing, and that is, it has demonstrated that a unanimity of judgment can be arrived at by a group who sit around the table, differing markedly in their own philosophies and points of view, when they approach educational problems in the spirit of genuine and sincere cooperation and compromise.

There was one area which was not discussed at all in the report, except incidentally, and which Dr. Kelly and I agreed that I should summarize briefly for you this morning: the amendments to the G. I. Bill that you have just been discussing. There are nine such amendments that were introduced as of day before yesterday. Let me just cite them briefly, and emphasize the ones with which you are most concerned.

One was to increase the major payments to veterans. Another is

to include the children of veterans killed in war, under the benefits of the G. I. Bill. The third, to extend the benefits of the G. I. Bill to the Merchant Marine and to other subsidiary services not members of the armed forces, such as the WACS and the Merchant Marine.

In regard to these three amendments, the National Committee on Relationship of Higher Education to the Federal Government took no action, on the assumption that they were matters that went beyond the educational concern of the Committee.

Another amendment is one which has been read to you this morning, to pay the cost of instruction. The National Committee met just the day before the meeting of the Advisory Committee to the Veterans Administration, and prior to the release of this letter to which I referred this morning. Since the policy of the Veterans Administration has been to move by regulation rather than by legislation, the Committee opposed this particular amendment. I am sure that now, in the light of this letter which came the day after the meeting of our Committee, it is very probable that the Committee will reverse its decision in regard to definite action through legislation.

Another amendment is in regard to striking out the age qualifications. At the present time a boy who had passed his 25th birthday at the time of induction must prove that his education was interrupted. This was opposed by the Committee on Relationship on the ground that this age 25 qualification, as liberally interpreted now by the Veterans Administration, is desirable, especially when it is combined with the amendment to increase maintenance payments. It was the feeling of the Committee that if a man of any age, regardless of how long he had been out of school, could enroll without proving that his education had been interrupted, the colleges and universities might well be forced to accept, by pressure of outside groups, many individuals who are there not for education, but for the security that would be provided.

Another amendment is the shortening of the school year, at the discretion of the educational institution. You remember at the present time the bill states that the maximum of \$500 is to be paid for instruction on a full-time basis for an "ordinary school year". The Veterans Administration has defined "ordinary school year" as thirty weeks. Pressure has been brought to bear by special colleges of optometry and others stating that they can do a full year's educational job in twenty weeks. Their tuition is \$500, and consequently the Veterans Administration should pay the full fee.

The Committee strongly opposed this amendment on the ground that once an ordinary school year is defined as less than thirty weeks, there is no place to stop. This plan is even greater since the amendment provides that approval of such short courses shall rest with the Veterans Administration rather than with the state agencies.

In my discussions just day before yesterday with the educational officer and the legislative officer of the American Legion, they simply did not see the implications of this amendment as it would inevitably work out in practice. It again is one of the proposed amendments that an organization like this can help the Veterans Administration's protective efforts by opposing.

One other amendment would include correspondence courses. That again is a matter of a good deal of discussion. The law at the present time has been interpreted by the Veterans Administration to exclude correspondence courses except in instances where the course is given by institutions that require residence, and is accepted in lieu of that.

The American Legion again favors this and our own Committee opposes it, on the basis of the fact that it will open up a considerable number of opportunities for the fly-by-night schools to develop. Since approval rests also with the Veterans Administration, the veteran may not himself be adequately protected in the list of approved schools.

One other proposed amendment, and with that I shall finish: That is to strike out Section 1505, which is the one you are referring to, calling for the possible deduction from a future bonus. There are three possible actions in this regard. One is the one that you have just now discussed, namely to strike out that section of the bill entirely, on the assumption that some future Congress will change its mind. Anyway, why carry this over the heads of the veterans?

The second is your proposal, to strike out all but educational benefits from any deductions in a future bonus. Our feeling is that that particular proposal, just as you have made it, is unwise, because it puts education in a separate category. The boy who takes advantage of unemployment insurance or of the loans, would have such payments deducted, but not for his education.

The third possibility, and the one which our Committee very strongly favors, is that that amendment be modified so that you exclude only the payments to the institutions, so that any payment by the boy for his education, in terms of maintenance, \$50 or \$75 a month, shall continue to be deducted, just as payments for unemployment compensation are deductible, but that payments to the institution shall not be deducted any more than they are for the hospitalization.

There is one other proposal, one which has been advocated by the Advisory Committee of the Veterans Administration: that only the differential between the established fee and the fees paid for veterans shall be declared not deductible from a future bonus.

Again, the attitude of our Committee is to oppose that suggestion, because it highlights education as being the exclusive beneficiary, and, especially, publicly-supported institutions. The third proposal, it seems to us, should be the way through.

I should like to add one other word, and that is that in all of our considerations we have talked almost exclusively of Public Law 346, the so-called G. I. Bill. Data given to you this morning in terms of enrollment indicate that Public Law 16 is one-half as important now, and will become probably as important as Public Law 346. Yet Public Law 16 gives the Veterans Administration the authority to provide and prescribe courses. In most instances, the Veterans Administration is paying only your established fees. If modification is to be made either by legislation or by regulation, it seems to me that we should be equally concerned with Public Law 16 as we are about Public Law 346.

In a study recently made we found that two and one-half veterans out of every five are in college as a result of Public Law 346, one and one-half are there under Public Law 16, and approximately one in five are there under Public Law 113, which is administered through the State Board of Vocational Rehabilitation. Thus, in the total consideration of the problem, we ought to think in terms of all three bills rather than in terms of any one, for both 113 and 16 will become increasingly important.

It has been my purpose to raise certain basic issues, not new, but certainly demanding immediate decision. They are issues that should and must be made in the spirit of compromise. Certainly we cannot expect the Congress or the public or the solicitor of a state or national office or anybody else to solve our problems or resolve our differences. This is our responsibility. They must be faced realistically and, as far as humanly possible, with an open mind and in the spirit of cooperation. We must be willing to make compromises in order that education may present a united front in effective service not alone to the veteran, but to the nation of the future.

PRESIDENT WEST: I wish now to call for the report of the Nominating Committee, so that there will be an opportunity during the noon hour to rib and raze the new officers rather than to do a hurried job at the end of the meeting a little later on. At this moment I recognize President Newcomb.

PRESIDENT NEWCOMB: Mr. President, your Committee unanimously recommends the following nominations: For President, A. C. Willard, of Illinois; for Vice President, Virgil M. Hancher, State University of Iowa; for Secretary-Treasurer, Deane W. Malott, of Kansas; and for the member of the Executive Committee, President Donovan of Kentucky.

. . . The nominees were duly elected. . .

PRESIDENT WEST: We stand adjourned.

. . . The meeting recessed at twelve-ten o'clock. . .

SATURDAY LUNCHEON SESSION

APRIL 28, 1945

The meeting convened at one o'clock, President West presiding.

PRESIDENT WEST: We will now have the report of the Auditing Committee.

. . . President Melby read the following report of the Auditing Committee and moved the report be adopted. . .

We have examined the accounts of Mr. Deane W. Malott, Secretary-Treasurer of the National Association of State Universities, and find them to be correct.

Signed, A. M. HARDING,
ERNEST O. MELBY, *Chairman*

. . . The report was adopted. . .

PRESIDENT WEST: At this moment I will call on President Donovan to give the report of the Accrediting Committee. I recognize President Donovan.

. . . President Donovan read abstracts from President Tigert's report of the Committee on Accrediting Agencies, which is printed below, and moved the adoption of the report. . .

REPORT OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON ACCREDITING FOR THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE UNIVERSITIES

1. *Subject:* Activities of the Joint Committee on Accrediting since the last annual meeting.

2. *Recommendations:*

a. It is recommended that the activities covered in this report be approved and the Committee continued; also, that an appropriation be authorized in an amount not to exceed \$50.00 for the Committee's expenses.

b. It is recommended that the National Association of State Universities recognize the National Architectural Accrediting Board as an accrediting agency in the field of Architecture and that this agency be substituted on the LIST for the Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture; furthermore, that the Secretary of the National Architectural Accrediting Board be advised that our Associations regard the fees that are proposed as excessive and that it is our hope that the Board may find some other way to finance its activities so that fees need not be exacted from the institutions, or that they, at least, be substantially reduced.

Subsequent to the 1944 annual meeting of the National Association of State Universities, a detailed report was furnished to the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities at its annual meeting in Chicago, October 23-28, 1944, (see Exhibit A attached). This report dealt almost in its entirety with attempts on the part of the Joint Committee to bring the National Association of Schools of Social Administration into a position where it could render its largest usefulness and serve those institutions which have been authorized to cooperate with it. Details were included in the report of a joint conference held in Washington and sponsored by the Chief of the Children's Bureau. Subsequent to the Land-Grant College meeting, copies of the mimeographed report were sent out to all presidents of institutions in the National Association of State Universities. No specific recommendations were made in the report and there is no need for ratification. Exhibit A is filed only as a matter of record.

During the interval which has elapsed since the Land-Grant College meeting in October, 1944, only three matters have been under consideration by the Joint Committee which should be reported upon at this time.

I. FURTHER NEGOTIATIONS WITH REFERENCE TO ACCREDITING IN THE FIELD OF SOCIAL WORK

In pursuance of agreements reached at the Washington Conference on Education in Social Work, the coordinating committee appointed to explore the whole subject matter further, met again in the fall in Chicago. Chancellor C. S. Boucher and President H. L. Donovan, members of the Joint Committee on Accrediting and both serving on the coordinating committee referred to, were in attendance. Dr. Ernest B. Harper, Vice-President of the National Association of Schools of Social Administration and co-chairman of the coordinating committee, also was in attendance. Both he and Chancellor Boucher submitted reports following the meeting in Chicago on October 23, 1944, the substance of which in brief was as follows:

After full discussion on the *Content of the Undergraduate Social Work Curriculum, Levels of Instruction, Administrative Organizations, Undergraduate-graduate Integration, Staff, Accrediting, and Degrees*, representatives of the American Association of Schools of Social Work retired from the meeting and, upon re-assembling, submitted three propositions indicative of their attitude and which they expressed a willingness to recommend to their executive committee and to the Joint Committee on Accrediting, namely:

1. That the American Association of Schools of Social Work was interested in the whole program of education for social work that includes undergraduate and graduate programs. That they recog-

nize and are sympathetic with the needs of the field. (The representatives agreed to recommend consideration of the B.A. Degree in Social Work).

2. That they, representatives of the American Association of Schools of Social Work, were interested and they thought the Association would be interested in studying how the different levels could be accredited. They realized that this involved many problems such as personnel and budget matters and they could not commit the Association, though they would recommend serious and prompt consideration.

3. That the content of an undergraduate curriculum should be worked out jointly by committees made up from the profession, undergraduate departments and schools, and the graduate schools, also the National Association of Schools of Social Administration.

Chancellor Boucher made it plain that the Joint Committee on Accrediting would not let the matter drift for another several years, inasmuch as a definite change in respect to the granting of degrees was being demanded by the state institutions.

At the annual meeting of the American Association of Schools of Social Work held in Cleveland, January 25-27, thirteen representatives of the National Association of Schools of Social Administration were in attendance by special invitation of the former group. The American Association of Schools of Social Work considered the recommendations which had developed at the meeting of the coordinating committee in October, 1944, and took action: as set forth in Exhibit B, attached.

On the final day of the meeting a concurrent resolution was passed by both associations setting up a Joint Committee as follows:

JOINT RESOLUTION

Introduced concurrently in the Business Sessions of AASSW and the NASSA, Saturday, January 27, 1925, and passed by both associations.

In order to carry out the interest in the total process of education for social work expressed in this and in previous meetings, it is hereby resolved that a Joint Committee be established by the AASSW and the NASSA to consist of six (6) members, three from each of the cooperating groups, to study common problems of education for social work. It is recommended that the committee undertake first the study of the relationship between undergraduate and graduate education and ways in which services for consultation and accrediting may be provided.

(It was suggested that a seventh member be selected by the others to serve as chairman.)

While the Joint Committee on Accrediting has adopted as one of its major policies the elimination of duplication in accrediting and would ordinarily recognize only one agency in a given field, until such time as a satisfactory program of accrediting in the field of social work is worked out, acceptable to the institutions represented by the Joint Committee on Accrediting, the two accrediting agencies will be continued on our LIST. It is our hope that eventually all points of difference may be reconciled so that the two associations may be merged into one. Only in this way can they render a real service in the field of their interest as well as to the colleges and universities of the nation.

II. ACCREDITING IN ARCHITECTURE:

Mr. Sherley W. Morgan, Secretary of the National Architectural Accrediting Board furnished the Joint Committee on Accrediting information indicating that the National Architectural Accrediting Board had been designated as the official agency for accrediting schools of Architecture. This allegation was confirmed by Mr. Paul Weigel, Secretary of the Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture. This latter agency has been carried on the LIST of accrediting agencies with which our institutions were authorized to cooperate. Each member of the Joint Committee on Accrediting was furnished a copy of the plans and procedures of the National Architectural Accrediting Board. After considering the plans and procedures, and receiving the approval of all members of the Joint Committee, the Secretary of the National Architectural Accrediting Board was informed that the Joint Committee on Accrediting recommended cooperation with it as the accrediting agency in the field of Architecture. We indicated, however, that our action would have to be confirmed by the executive bodies of the Associations which we represent. The National Architectural Accrediting Board is merely an evolution from the Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture, already approved by both Associations. Numerous inquiries came from institutions through the country inquiring whether this group had been approved and, inasmuch as they proposed to complete accrediting work initiated by their predecessors, the Joint Committee felt disposed to advise all presidents of state universities and land-grant colleges that, in their opinion, it would be satisfactory for them to cooperate with the new group, if they so desired.

The Committee informed the Secretary of the National Architectural Accrediting Board that it regarded the fees proposed as excessive. Also, that as a general policy, the Joint Committee recommends that accrediting agencies find some other way to finance their activities so

that fees need not be exacted from the institutions. We, therefore, recommend in Paragraph 2 (b), above, that this new Board be recognized as the accrediting agency in the field of Architecture; furthermore, that the Secretary be appraised of the views of the National Association of State Universities in regard to fees, etc.

III. ACCREDITING IN THE FIELD OF JOURNALISM

Formerly the LIST of accrediting agencies with which our institutions are authorized to cooperate, included three agencies in the field of Journalism. In 1943 our Associations took action dropping two of the agencies and leaving only one in the field of Journalism, namely, the American Association of Schools and Departments of Journalism. This action was taken after the Committee corresponded with officials of the agencies and with heads of the departments and schools of journalism and had been reliably informed that the real accrediting agency in this field was the American Association of Schools and Departments of Journalism. Two other councils carried on the LIST were of a subordinate nature. Recently correspondence has been directed to members of the Joint Committee on Accrediting to the effect that the American Association of Schools and Departments of Journalism is not and never has been an accrediting agency. It is now contended that a group under the name of American Council on Professional Education for Journalism has been agreed upon to develop an accrediting program. We are advised that the American Council on Professional Education for Journalism is a joint committee of representatives of the American Association of Schools and Departments of Journalism, and of five national and regional newspaper publishers' and editors' associations. The Joint Committee on Accrediting has not yet been supplied with complete information on the policies and procedures of this new agency and until such time as it has had an opportunity to investigate thoroughly the contemplated accrediting program, it is suggested that our member institutions continue clearing all accrediting matters relative to Journalism with the American Association of Schools and Departments of Journalism.

Respectfully submitted,

CHARLES E. FRILEY

C. S. BOUCHER

H. L. DONOVAN

ARTHUR A. HAUCK

PHILIP C. NASH

FERNANDUS PAYNE

By: JNO. J. TIGERT, *Chairman*

EXHIBIT A

REPORT OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON ACCREDITING
ASSOCIATION OF LAND GRANT COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Chicago, Illinois, October 23-28, 1944

1. SUBJECT: Activities of the Joint Committee since the last annual meeting.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS: It is recommended that the activities covered in this report be approved and the committee continued; also, that an appropriation be authorized in an amount not to exceed \$50.00 for the committee's expense.

All associations represented by the Joint Committee on Accrediting, at their annual meetings in 1943, voted to recognize the National Association of Schools of Social Administration as an accrediting agency in the field of social work, and authorized member institutions to cooperate with this group. This action was prompted because the criteria and standards of the American Association of Schools of Social Work, an accrediting agency already established in this field, were adapted to conditions quite unlike those prevailing in publicly supported institutions such as State Universities and Land Grant Colleges. The American Association of Schools of Social Work consists, for the most part, of private institutions which have independent schools of social work and the programs and curricula of which are not necessarily related to the other educational work of the institution. Its program is confined entirely to the graduate level. There are only two or three thousand students in the schools holding membership in this Association whereas tens of thousands of trained social workers are needed each year to meet the demands of the greatly expanded social service programs.

The American Association of Schools of Social Work has been recognized generally by federal agencies including the Social Security Administration, the United States Civil Service Administration, and the Childrens' Bureau.

A canvass was made of all of the state merit and civil service systems regarding any restrictions or provisions which limit admission of social workers in state services to persons who have graduated from schools which are recognized by the American Association of Schools of Social Work. Replies revealed that there are one or two states in which admission to certain fields of social service work would be denied to graduates of institutions not accredited by the American Association of Schools of Social Work. Seven reported federal rules as impediments, stating that the federal agencies had discretion in their decisions regarding state regulations and, in a number of instances, had restricted

employment to graduates of institutions accredited by the American Association of Schools of Social Work.

In order to bring the National Association of Schools of Social Administration into a position where it could render its largest usefulness and serve those institutions which have been authorized to cooperate with it, the Joint Committee on Accrediting approached federal officials with a view to bringing about a conference on education for social work and related problems. As a result, Dr. Katherine F. Lenroot, Chief of the Children's Bureau, sponsored a joint conference in Washington last June for the purpose of considering problems in the general field of training for the social services, with special reference to public service. Problems discussed in the conference were of interest to those responsible for the administration of social services, to educational institutions, and to professional associations and related in general to (1) content of both graduate and undergraduate curricula for education for social services, (2) organization and administration of undergraduate curricula, (3) integration of undergraduate and graduate curricula, and (4) problems pertaining to the recruiting and selection of personnel including the accrediting of programs of education and evaluation of qualifications of candidates for employment.

Approximately 25 persons attended the conference, including representatives of all federal agencies concerned, the National Association of Schools of Social Administration, the American Association of Schools of Social Work, and various colleges and universities. The Joint Committee on Accrediting was represented by Dean Fernandus Payne, of Indiana University, President H. L. Donovan, of the University of Kentucky, and the chairman.

The conference, which lasted an entire day, arrived at certain general principles which were unanimously approved. These were as follows:

1. Social work is developing toward a professional service.
2. A strong liberal arts background is basic to education for social work.
3. Concentration on social studies is essential to education for social work.
4. The basis of professional education consists of a program of instruction and experience in the disciplines of social work with individuals, groups, and communities under professional supervision responsible to the school and involving correlated field and classroom instruction.
5. Because of the great and rapid expansion in public social services, institutions of higher learning, and especially in public institutions, have special responsibilities for contributing toward development of education for social services.

6. As part of the responsibility of institutions of higher learning for contributing to development of public services, student vocational and counselling services should provide information on social services to students in high schools and colleges.

7. Both undergraduate and graduate professional education should be utilized in preparation for social work. These types of training should be complementary and interrelated, with the possibility of opportunity for firsthand experience with social conditions and social problems in the upper undergraduate years as well as in the graduate years, the types of field experience to be worked out to distinguish between full professional responsibility under supervision appropriate to professional graduate education and limited participation in social service programs appropriate to undergraduate work.

It was generally agreed that the conference had been of value in reaching an agreement on the points concerning which there is common interest. It was decided that a committee should be appointed to explore the whole subject further, including clarification of terms and reviewing problems of accrediting of program of study and selection of individual employees. The personnel of the committee agreed upon is as follows:

Dr. Ernest Harper, co-chairman (Michigan State College)

Anne Fenlason, co-chairman (University of Minnesota)

Sarah Ivins, (New York School of Social Work)

H. L. Donovan, (University of Kentucky)

C. S. Boucher, (University of Nebraska)

Dr. Marietta Stevenson, (University of Illinois)

Leona Massoth, (American Association of Schools of Social Work)

It will be noted that the Joint Committee on Accrediting is represented by Chancellor C. S. Boucher and President H. L. Donovan.

It was proposed that another general conference should be called after the committee had had an opportunity to make their study and was ready to make its report.

No other matters have arisen in the field of accrediting upon which a report is required at this time.

Respectfully submitted,

CHARLES E. FRILEY

C. S. BOUCHER

H. L. DONOVAN

ARTHUR A. HAUCK

PHILIP C. NASH

FERNANDUS PAYNE

By: JNO. J. TIGERT, *Chairman*

EXHIBIT B

REVISED RECOMMENDATION SUBMITTED BY THE BOARD OF
DIRECTORS TO THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF
SCHOOLS OF SOCIAL WORK

Evening Session, Cleveland Ohio, January 25, 1945

The American Association of Schools of Social Work is interested in the total process of education for social work. This includes education on the undergraduate level, the first year graduate level, the second year graduate level, and beyond. The Association recognizes the need for further clarification of the content of social work education at these various levels; for the effective inter-relationship of education on these levels; for the accrediting of education at each of these levels; and for the development of some uniformity in the academic and professional recognitions for the completion of various stages of social work education.

The Association adopts the following statement of principles and scientific recommendations. The Association hopes that these principles may commend themselves generally to institutions concerned with social work education; and the Association urges its individual member schools to do everything possible to bring their practices into conformity with these recommendations.

1. Two years of post-baccalaureate professional education as defined by the American Association of Schools of Social Work should be recognized by a professional degree, preferably Master of Social Work.

2. One year of post-baccalaureate professional education as defined by the American Association of Schools of Social Work may be recognized, preferably by a bachelor of Social Work degree or by a certificate.

3. Undergraduate preprofessional education as defined by the American Association of Schools of Social Work may be recognized by the designation of a social welfare major in the Bachelor of Arts or Bachelor of Science degree.

4. In furtherance of this Association's expressed interest in the total process of education for social work, it is recommended that a Joint Committee representing the various organizations concerned be established to study the place of undergraduate education in the total program. It is further recommended that the Joint Committee give special attention to the content, field experience, and ways by which services for consultation and accrediting might be provided.

It is suggested that in this study the Joint Committee consider the

concepts formulated by the Committee on Preprofessional Education of the American Association of Schools of Social Work.

PRESIDENT WEST: I should like to refer one matter to your Committee, President Donovan. Recently through official, or at least semi-official, report, has come the news that all of the U. S. Civil Service examinations have dropped every iota of educational requirement. You will recall that it used to be that, in order to hold a Civil Service position, a person had to be a graduate of an accredited school. In the higher levels, a candidate had to have graduate work for a period of a year. All those requirements have been eliminated now, and there is no reference to education in the Civil Service requirements.

Now this is all-pervading and, if it is within the purview of your Committee, I believe it would be a topic for discussion, because apparently it is just another way of getting along without institutions. Will you take that up with your Committee, sir?

PRESIDENT DONOVAN: I will be very glad to.

PRESIDENT WEST: Thank you.

CHANCELLOR BOUCHER: Mr. President, I do not want to stretch the report of this Committee indefinitely, but I should like to speak on just one phase of that report. I have great respect and much interest in the work that Mr. Tigert has done all through these years, and this problem in the field of social work is one of the nastiest he has had to deal with. Though there is now a joint committee, as Mr. Donovan indicated, trying to find a solution, to bring together the point of view of the state universities and these old guard schools in the social work field, personally I don't look for a favorable solution to come from that joint committee. President Donovan and I have been in session with the old guard enough to know that they are adamant in their point of view, namely, that the professional work in that field has to be at a graduate level and that you have to have two years for the master's degree.

Now they are countering with this proposal, that we introduce some work at the undergraduate level, in the senior year. It will merely be pre-professional, in a sense, or introductory professional, and then on top of that they are still going to have their two years and give the master's degree. So they are trying, out of this issue that has been raised, to add a year to their program without making any concession whatsoever that will meet the problem of the state institutions.

Mr. Harper, of Michigan State College, who is the president of the new association, is a clear-headed man, who sees the problems of the states in this field. The only reason I am bringing this to your attention now is that I am pretty sure that a year hence we are either going

to be in a position of having been given the run-around, like we were six, seven, or eight years ago, or we are going to have to yield to the old-guard position.

I am just warning you now that I hope this Association and the Land-Grant Association, will stick by their joint committee and will stick by this new association that we recognized, in order to try to bring the old one to terms.

PRESIDENT WEST: I am very glad to have that read into the record, President Boucher, because I think that, without a motion or anything of the kind, we can assure you that that is certainly one field in which we can get together.

I am going to read a letter and make another report for President Tigert. This is the report on the vocational bill, Senate 1946.

. . . President West read the following report of the Committee on Vocational Education. . .

REPORT ON VOCATIONAL BILL S-1946, NOW S-619

The Executive Committee of the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities designated me as chairman of a committee to investigate and make recommendations regarding the above bill. Shortly afterwards the Secretary of the National Association of State Universities wrote and asked me if I would also represent the National Association of State Universities. Last August, the Commissioner of Education called a conference in Washington regarding this bill and other bills which involved large federal appropriations. President West attended the conference and thought it desirable to have separate committees representing the National Association of State Universities and the Land-Grant College Association. He thought this desirable because various organizations were voting in the conference and this plan gave us twice the voting power. President Jorgensen was asked to take over the chairmanship of the committee for the National Association of State Universities. Perhaps a summary of what I have done may be helpful.

I circularized all the presidents of state universities and land-grant colleges including information which could be passed to other administrative officers affected by this legislation. In this way we gathered criticisms, suggestions and reactions to S-1946. We also advised presidents to talk with their senators and congressmen regarding this legislation. The American Vocational Association asked for a joint conference with our committee. Our committee, together with other representatives from the state universities and land-grant colleges, met with them in Washington on January 16-17, 1945. Attached hereto is a

summary of the conference, listing all persons attending and the recommendations that were made to the Executive Committee of the Land-Grant College Association.

As a result of this conference the sponsors of S-1946 introduced a new bill, S-916. The new bill contains a great many changes. On the whole, it is a vast improvement on the old bill.

The principal areas of dissatisfaction which remain seem to be the General Extension Service and the Agricultural Extension Service. Difficulties in the fields of administration, research and technical education seem to be largely removed. The definition in the new bill of "education of less than college grade" seems to be the most satisfactory one yet offered. Our committee recommended to the Land-Grant College Association that continuing committees be set up which would represent the American Vocational Association and the Land-Grant College Association and which would work out articulation between our programs in the various special fields and at state and county levels. There is a great deal more to be done than any of us can accomplish and friction and duplication can be eliminated by agreement. It is possible that the present bill, S-619, can be still further amended.

At the invitation of the Association of Governing Boards of State Universities and Allied Institutions, I attended their annual meeting in Iowa City, November 14-16, 1944, and discussed this legislation with them. They passed a resolution, a part of which bears upon this subject, as follows:

"IV. Be it resolved that it is the sense of this Association that: Such federal aid as is now given in the specialized area of vocational education shall be limited to classes not above high school level, or 12th year, and further, no provision shall be included in such appropriation for research and/or extension which might duplicate the activities of land-grant colleges and experiment stations."

I contacted other organizations which might have interest in this bill, among others the United Chapters of Phi Beta Kappa, the Association of American Colleges, etc. Both of these groups are ready, if requested, to send someone to hearings on this bill. I published an article in the *Key Reporter* pointing out that S-1946 (as originally drawn) was a threat to liberal education. Hearings on the new bill, S-619, are scheduled on the first of May. The National Association of State Universities, by all means, should send someone to the hearings. Undoubtedly, President Jorgensen has this matter in hand.

Respectfully submitted,

JNO. J. TIGERT.

SUMMARY OF A CONFERENCE BETWEEN REPRESENTATIVES OF THE AMERICAN VOCATIONAL ASSOCIATION AND REPRESENTATIVES OF THE LAND-GRANT COLLEGE ASSOCIATION
HELD IN WASHINGTON, JANUARY
16-17, 1945

This Conference was held in the headquarters of the American Vocational Association, Inc., 1010 Vermont Avenue, on the morning and afternoon of January 16 and on the morning of January 17. Representatives of the American Vocational Association and Land-Grant College Association were as follows:

AMERICAN VOCATIONAL ASSOCIATION

- M. D. Mobley, *President*, American Vocational Association, Inc., and State Director of Vocational Education, Atlanta, Georgia.
- Henry S. Brunner, Head of Department of Agricultural Education, Pennsylvania State College, State College, Pennsylvania.
- L. M. Sasman, State Supervisor of Agricultural Education, Madison, Wisconsin.
- George H. Fern, *Vice-President*, American Vocational Association, Inc., and State Director of Vocational Education, Lansing, Michigan.
- L. H. Dennis, *Executive Secretary*, American Vocational Association, Inc., Washington 5, D. C.
- Paul L. Cressman, *President*, National Association of State Directors of Vocational Education, and State Director of Vocational Education, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.
- John A. McCarthy, *Past President*, American Vocational Association, Inc., and Assistant Commissioner and State Director of Vocational Education, Trenton 8, New Jersey.
- L. R. Humphereys, Professor of Agricultural Education, Utah State Agricultural College, Logan, Utah.
- Charles W. Sylvester, *Treasurer*, American Vocational Association, Inc., and Director of Vocational Education, Baltimore, Maryland.
- Ralph H. Woods, (*Chairman*) State Director of Vocational Education, Frankfort, Kentucky.

LAND-GRANT COLLEGE ASSOCIATION

- R. E. Buchanan, *Dean of Graduate School*, and Director of Iowa Agricultural Experiment Station, Ames, Iowa.
- A. L. Deering, *Dean of Agriculture*, University of Maine, Orono, Maine.

H. P. Rusk, *Dean of College of Agriculture*, and *Director of Experiment Station*, and *Director of Extension Service in Agriculture and Home Economics*, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois.

I. O. Schaub, *Dean of Agriculture*, and *Director of Extension*, North Carolina State College, Raleigh, North Carolina.

William A. Lloyd, *Representative of Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities*, 1372 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

Robert B. Browne, *Director*, Division of University Extension, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois.

Jno. J. Tigert, *President*, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida. (*Chairman, Land-Grant College Committee*).

The representatives of the land-grant group met on the evening of January 15 at the Willard Hotel and discussed plans and procedures for the conference. Dean C. B. Hutchison met with the committee a portion of the evening.

Our committee was armed with a good many suggestions which had been furnished it by presidents and other personnel in the land-grant colleges regarding verbiage in the bill and suggested amendments which might improve it, removing possible conflict and confusion with the work going on in the land-grant colleges. We decided that it would be well to suggest going through the entire bill, section by section, with the representatives of the American Vocational Association and discussing these proposed amendments. It was determined by our committee that our approach should be by way of presenting our objections and not undertaking to force revision of the bill; that we would endeavor to show where there was conflict, overlapping, and other objections, leaving to them the preparation of the legislation and opportunity to provide the remedy. The representatives of the American Vocational Association readily adopted our plan of attack and permitted us to present our objections.

During the morning of the first day of the conference a spirit of cooperation on both sides enabled us to make considerable progress. In the afternoon the discussions became very specific, and somewhat heated differences of opinion largely cancelled the gains that had been made in the morning. Members of our committee offered exact language which would amend the bill and clarify such debatable questions as the meaning of the words "of less than college grade", procedures in preparing and submitting plans, the nature of activities of area schools, and other matters which have generally disturbed members of the Land-Grant College Association. Omitting a detailed report at this time on these discussions, it became clear that there was a differ-

ence of opinion among the representatives of the American Vocational Association and our group on these matters. Some of the problems which we contended could be corrected in the legislation did not appear to them to be capable of solution by legislation, though they admitted that they saw the import, at least in part, of our contentions. In certain matters of policy they were entirely in accord with us. For example they shared with us fears regarding possible federal domination and interference with our programs in the states and localities.

On the second day of the conference a better spirit of cooperative attack on our relationships began to prevail. As Chairman of our committee, I made it clear that it was not our purpose to take responsibility for writing their law or revising it. We were endeavoring to point out certain adverse conditions that might arise from the legislation and which we feared would unfavorably affect not only the land-grant colleges and vocational educational programs, but in the end would bifurcate the educational systems in a good many states. It was our desire that the American Vocational Association should adopt remedies which were deemed by them to be wise. They suggested, first, that they would undertake to rewrite their bill in the light of criticisms that we had offered; second, that the committees of the two associations be made continuing committees which would work on the relationships between the two organizations and their respective services.

It appeared to your Chairman that the kind of committee contemplated would perform a service similar to our Committee of Relationships with the United States Department of Agriculture. It was definitely suggested that memoranda of agreements could be adopted from time to time which would clarify and coordinate the programs of vocational education and of the land-grant colleges. Policies and procedures could be established by these national committees but actual articulation would be carried out on the state level but more especially on the local level between the various services. The two committees unanimously approved these suggestions and your Chairman is, accordingly, recommending approval by the Executive Committee of the Land-Grant College Association.

With this report a letter is going to the Chairman of the Executive Committee requesting that appropriate action be taken. The committee representing the Land-Grant College Association should be composed of persons in the various fields of activities: Administration, Agriculture, Engineering, Home Economics, General Extension, and possibly one or two others. At present the temporary committee is composed of a president and two deans and directors of Agriculture. During our discussions, when members of our Committee were suggesting specific interpretations and amendments to the bill, unfortunately, personalities were injected. It was asserted by one or two of their

group that the Land-Grant College Association was lambasting and fighting their bill. Your Chairman reported that the Land-Grant College Association has taken no action in opposition to the bill; that, unquestionably, there had been criticism and unfavorable reaction by certain persons in the Land-Grant College Association but that neither the Executive Body, nor the Executive Committee, nor the Special Committee had taken any action definitely opposing the bill. Furthermore, I stated that until such time as they were able to rewrite their bill and submit it again for consideration our Committee would use its influence to prevent further adverse criticism and would suggest that comment be withheld until the revised bill is available. This does not, of course, prevent the Land-Grant College Association from finally adopting a position in opposition to the bill, should our present negotiations prove unsatisfactory.

At the close of the conference, Mr. Lloyd made the finest contribution of the entire two days by pointing out that both Associations have a directive from Congress which does not clearly define their fields of service. The laws under which we both operate permit us to get into the same activities. The welfare of both organizations and of the public would be better served if we reach some kind of cooperative approach. He suggested that this could be done by law, by gentlemen's agreement, or in some other fashion. Mr. Lloyd's remarks evoked spontaneous applause.

In closing this brief and summarized report, may I add that I learned confidentially from Mr. Lloyd that the President wrote a letter to Senator Thomas, then Chairman of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, suggesting a study of the various legislative proposals pending before Congress looking toward increased subsidies. Apparently this letter is in line with the suggestion of our Executive Committee that a unified philosophy of education should be developed before any of the several bills involving large subsidies are considered. Very possibly this letter which the President wrote to Senator Thomas was inspired and probably prepared for him by the Bureau of the Budget. Furthermore, it appears that S-1946 was referred to the Department of Agriculture, the Department of War, and the Veterans Administration for consideration and report. None of these agencies has reported on the bill, but informally it is known that both the Department of Agriculture and the Veterans Administration are opposed to it in its present form. The Department of Agriculture has a Committee which is studying the bill.

Some of the members of our Committee may have been disappointed in the failure to secure acceptance of specific language which they desired written into the bill. Your Chairman and the majority of the Committee, however, were not so much concerned about this.

I feel that our Conference accomplished as much as possible under all conditions and I feel encouraged about our future relations with the American Vocational Association.

Respectfully submitted,

JNO. J. TICERT, *Chairman*

. . . After a brief discussion period in which speakers emphasized (1) that there is need for technical training in some sort of intermediary schools or technical institutes, (2) that the work of such schools should not parallel the first two years of the liberal arts course of colleges and universities, and (3) that the work taken in such technical schools must not be transferrable for college credit, President West referred the report of the Committee on Vocational Education to the Executive Committee of the Association for study. . .

PRESIDENT WEST: I am of the opinion that this matter will come up again when we have the report of the Resolutions Committee. We will now go on with the report of the Committee on Radio Broadcasting.

I recognize President Bevis, who will make two reports, one for the Committee on Radio Broadcasting, and one for the Committee on Distribution of War Surplus Commodities. President Bevis.

PRESIDENT BEVIS: Since I last reported on broadcasting for this Committee to this Association, I have been made chairman of a similar committee of the Land-Grant Colleges Association, so that I am now representing a good many of you in a sort of dual capacity.

. . . President Bevis presented a summary of the following report of the Committee on Radio Broadcasting. . .

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON RADIO BROADCASTING, 1945

This first comprehensive report of the Committee on Radio Broadcasting since the Fall Meeting in 1943 will summarize the activities of the Committee during that time and indicate projects which should be continued. This period of a year and a half has been an unsettled one in radio broadcasting due to war conditions. Manpower problems have become increasingly critical, new engineering developments brought on by the war have altered the general broadcasting picture, and the approach of peace has accentuated the importance of the service which universities can render through radio.

The Chairman of the Committee wishes to report that he has recently been appointed Chairman of the Radio Committee of the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities. This should make possible a desirable degree of coordination in the radio activities of the

two associations. There is a considerable amount of overlapping in the institutions represented in the membership of the two groups, and duplication of effort will be avoided. At the same time, a united approach can be made on the common problems in the radio field as they relate to higher education.

I. DEVELOPMENTS IN FREQUENCY-MODULATION BROADCASTING

The possible utilization by state universities of the frequency-modulation channels set aside by the Federal Communications Commission for educational use was touched upon briefly in the 1943 report of this Committee. At that time, FM radio appeared to offer opportunities only for local broadcasting because of the limited coverage of this type of station. The Committee, therefore, suggested a careful study by each institution of the possibilities of frequency modulation with the recommendation that application for an FM station be made only "if the local reception area constitutes a large and important part of the constituency of the state institution. . ."

Since that time, the state FM network scheme has been developed, a factor which makes the situation quite different. In a considerable number of states, plans are being readied for total state coverage by educational FM stations tied together through mutual pick-up and re-broadcast rather than by use of telephone lines. In a few cases these state-wide networks are planned as an extension of the state university's radio system—the four to six high-powered stations necessary for total coverage to be owned and operated by the university itself. In most instances, however, the state-wide FM network would be a cooperative venture among the several interested public-school systems, colleges, and universities, with the state universities thus securing an adequate outlet for significant radio service without carrying the entire burden of programming. These cooperative networks usually involve joint state and local support in their establishment and operation.

Such networks afford a practicable means by which a state university may reach its total state-wide constituency by FM radio. Since channels are reserved for educational FM, while the AM facilities for state-wide coverage have long been unavailable, this offers great opportunities for the many state universities not now operating stations. In addition, it increases the possibilities for service of those institutions which have AM stations with restricted hours and coverage. Your Committee, therefore, has taken a great interest in these developments and the Chairman has actively represented both this Association and the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities in hearings before the Federal Communications Commission.

With the progress of the war, and particularly with the developments in FM broadcasting, which has been widely used in war communications, it became apparent that the postwar period was to see a tremen-

dous expansion in this new type of broadcasting. Indeed, it seemed likely that there would be a general change-over from the present amplitude modulation to frequency modulation in local broadcasting. At the same time, listeners generally are expected to buy sets capable of receiving FM, as soon as such sets are made available after the war. More than three hundred applications for FM stations have already been filed with the Federal Communications Commission. This includes an increasing number of applications by school systems, colleges and universities which already have obtained authorization from their governing boards for establishment of this type of broadcasting service. It is apparent that a major change in broadcasting will take place in the first years after the war.

This has naturally been recognized by the Commission. It, therefore, called a hearing last fall to consider the allocation of the various broadcasting services in the higher frequencies, since changes could readily be made now, with conditions temporarily frozen, which would be all but impossible after expansion had occurred.

Of concern to educators, among the matters to be covered in the hearing, was the allocation of FM and of television. Five out of thirty-five existing FM channels had for some years been set aside for non-profit educational broadcasting. The development of state plans for educational stations indicated that this number was insufficient. The educational representatives, therefore, appeared at the hearings to (1) safeguard the reservation of channels for educational use; (2) urge that the number be increased, probably from five to fifteen; (3) urge that the channels be kept at their present width of two hundred kilocycles to safeguard quality and lack of interference; and (4) urge the retention of this type of broadcasting at a location adjacent to commercial FM broadcasting so that home listening would be facilitated.

As Chairman of this Committee, I appeared personally before the Commission to represent the Association at these hearings. In addition, I was asked to represent the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities. As preparation for my appearance, I wrote to each of the member institutions of this Association both to find the extent of their broadcasting activities and to determine their additional needs and plans. From the replies received from forty-seven of the universities, I was enabled to present an accurate picture of the situation and to make recommendations to the Commission based upon the expressed needs and future plans of the member institutions.

Briefly, it was concluded (1) that public-supported colleges and universities need broadcasting facilities adequately to serve the educational needs of their constituent populations; (2) that those institutions now possessing such facilities have established effective broadcast services within the limitations of their granted time and power but are

not satisfied with their ability to reach their constituencies at desirable hours; (3) that a much larger proportion of the institutions is planning to utilize facilities in the FM band—usually in relation to a state network of educational FM stations—and (4) that these institutions mean to support future broadcasting activities, both AM and FM, with improved equipment, personnel, and finance.

It was therefore recommended (1) that the Commission assign such frequencies and power to existing university AM stations as to enable them to service their total constituencies at suitable hours; (2) that fifteen channels be set aside in the FM band for educational use; (3) that these channels be adjacent to the commercial FM bands, and (4) that these be of sufficient width to ensure high fidelity and freedom from static and interference.

A complete copy of the testimony presented at these hearings is appended to this report.

Since that time, the FCC has announced the proposed allocation of the various services. Its final decision should be announced shortly. It is doubtful if it will differ greatly from the earlier proposed findings. Education fared very well indeed in the Commission's decisions. Not fifteen but twenty channels were set aside for education. These were placed immediately adjacent to the commercial FM channels. The whole number of FM channels was increased from thirty-five to ninety. The width of channels was retained at 200 kilocycles. The whole band was moved from its present location to a higher one—i.e., from the position of 42 to 48 megacycles to the position of 84 to 102 megacycles. While this makes present FM equipment obsolete, there is evidence to support the belief that coverage will be improved at these frequencies.

The Committee will keep in close touch with developments and inform members of this Association of any major changes in the situation.

II DEVELOPMENTS IN CLEAR-CHANNEL BROADCASTING

Of interest to existing university radio stations are the hearings on clear-channel broadcasting scheduled by the Commission for early May. This is the first re-examination of the classification of AM stations since the early days of the Radio Commission. Now that the adequacy of coverage of many sections of the country under the present plan is to be examined, it is possible that drastic changes in the assignments of frequency, power, and location to stations covering rural areas may result. This may ultimately offer some hope to universities now unable to secure adequate coverage at suitable hours. Your Committee will be represented at these hearings if this appears appropriate.

III. COOPERATION BETWEEN RADIO INDUSTRY AND THIS ASSOCIATION

In the report of this Committee in 1943, it was recommended that the universities cooperate with the radio industry in a joint approach to the problems of training personnel for radio broadcasting. As a result of the endorsement of such a policy by this Association, the National Association of Broadcasters was approached with regard to broadening a proposed project by this Radio News Committee so as to include representation from the universities. This suggestion was welcomed and, as a result, there has been established a Council on Radio Journalism with five members appointed by the industry and five by the schools and departments of journalism. This Council has already recommended tentative standards for college training in radio journalism and is now developing plans whereby journalism instructors may secure intensive interne-experience in networks and stations.

In addition, your Committee has cooperated with the Federal Radio Education Committee in developing suggested standards for college courses in broadcasting and hopes to give impetus to the development of detailed industry-university cooperation in other radio areas similar to that in radio journalism.

IV. A SUB-COMMITTEE ON TECHNICAL DEVELOPMENTS

Engineering developments are taking place very rapidly in radio broadcasting. At war's end, there will be unveiled numerous discoveries and inventions in the electronics field. Many of these make changes necessary in university policies and practices regarding broadcasting. The Committee proposes, therefore, the appointment of a Sub-Committee on Technical Radio Developments to be composed of a small number of capable and outstanding radio engineers from the universities. It is proposed that this sub-committee be a joint undertaking of this Committee and of the Radio Committee of the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities. Such a group would prepare at infrequent intervals regular reports of new developments, pointing out their implications for colleges and universities. In addition, special reports would be drafted as the need arose. These reports would be distributed, through the Committee on Radio Broadcasting, directly to the member institutions.

V. STUDY OF BROADCASTING IN STATE UNIVERSITIES

In the fall of 1943, this Association empowered the Committee on Radio Broadcasting to undertake a study of radio policies and practices among the fifty member institutions. This investigation was concerned with the following broad questions:

1. What are the appropriate objectives of the state university in the field of radio broadcasting?

2. What are the appropriate types of intra-university organization for accomplishing these aims?
3. What equipment and facilities are required?
4. What are the sources and extent of financial support required?

The study involved a combination of correspondence and personal visitation. It will result in a series of recommendations formulated as a guide to university administrations.

Because of unsettled war conditions, personnel shortages, and the rapidly changing radio situation, this project has not been completed. The Committee would suggest that there is even greater need for this investigation than there was in 1943, due to the anticipated establishment of FM stations at many institutions not previously operating radio stations. Therefore, we recommend that the Association empower us to continue the study and to utilize for this purpose unexpended funds from the \$500 appropriated in 1943.

Respectfully submitted,

JOHN J. TIGERT

ILA D. WEEKS

HOWARD L. BEVIS, *Chairman*

Testimony of Dr. Howard L. Bevis, President, Ohio State University, and Chairman, Radio Broadcasting Committee, National Association of State Universities, representing the National Association of State Universities, The Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities, at the Allocation Hearings, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D. C., beginning September 28, 1944.

PART I—INTRODUCTION

I appear at this hearing before the Federal Communications Commission as an official representative of public-supported institutions of higher education, the state universities and the land-grant colleges. My statements will be based upon correspondence carried on with the forty-seven institutions in continental United States which belong to the National Association of State Universities. Forty-five of these institutions have submitted statements of their broadcasting activities, needs and plans, and these letters constitute the basic data upon which my assertions will be based. The Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities has also asked me to be its representative before this group on the assumption that the situation with regard to land-grant colleges is similar to that among state universities.

I shall present a series of conclusions which seem to have clear reference to the allocation of frequencies for the various broadcast services. These statements point to the general conclusions that: (1) public-supported colleges and universities need broadcasting facilities adequately to serve the educational needs of their constituent populations;

(2) that those institutions now possessing such facilities have established effective broadcast services within the limitations of their granted time and power but are not satisfied with their ability to reach their constituencies at desirable hours; (3) that a much larger proportion of the institutions is planning to utilize facilities in the FM band—usually in relation to a state network of educational FM stations—and (4) that these institutions mean to support future broadcasting activities, both AM and FM, with improved equipment, personnel and finance.

PART II—SOME CONCLUSIONS

1. *A college or university station is an important channel of educational service.* The modern public-supported college or university does not confine its services to the education of adolescents. It conceives its function to be that of giving educational service and leadership to its entire constituency. It performs invaluable research, which, in time of war, has been directed into channels of incalculable value to the conduct of the war on the fighting fronts, on the production fronts, and on the home front. It has done a magnificent service in the training of men and women for the armed services and for necessary civilian activities. It has aided in the mobilization of food through agricultural extension activities and research. And it has given tremendous assistance in supplying information and specialized knowledge to business, labor, agriculture, and government.

Radio is increasingly being recognized as an effective channel by which the university can serve the educational needs of the people. Farmers are given information on production and marketing and are kept advised of the findings of competent research on seeds, soils, fertilizers, animal husbandry, and government food programs. The boys and girls in the schools are serviced through school broadcasts prepared by educational experts which are heard in countless school-rooms. Housewives are assisted in their heavy burden of home responsibilities through expert home economists. Business men and laborers alike are helped by those who are making continuous study of the problems of labor, management, and production; and citizens, generally, are enabled to inform themselves intelligently with regard to the perplexing problems and issues of the day through talks and forums by university scholars. Cultural resources of music, drama and literature are made available to the people generally through radio courses, and through concerts, talks and discussions.

An institution which takes seriously its responsibility for serving the educational and cultural needs of its constituency finds a radio station necessary and invaluable. It cannot depend alone upon the time given it by commercial broadcasters if it is to render its best service at the

best times. It must be free of the commercial competition for time and facilities.

It should not be forgotten that all of radio is by law to serve "the public interest, convenience and necessity." The non-commercial educational stations exist for this purpose alone. They do not find it necessary also to serve the goal of profit-making.

2. *The college or university station contributes to the improvement of broadcasting.* The existence of a number of public-owned stations as a part of the American system of broadcasting provides healthy competition and serves as a check upon commercial exploitation of public-owned radio channels. This is the "yardstick" idea which has abundant merit in this important field.

Because an educational station is non-commercial, it can contribute in important ways to the development of radio techniques and programming. It is able to experiment with new services and new program forms. In the first place, the university has an obligation to do research and experimentation, and in radio, as in other fields, this goes on continuously. In the second place, its goal is service and not profit and it can thus direct programs to minority interests and needs as well as to the common denominator of listeners. The non-commercial station conceives its job as one of leadership in the field of programming for listener needs and interests.

3. *Present standard broadcast stations of colleges and universities have inadequate coverage and hours.* State institutions consider their constituency to embrace the state which supports them. They feel an obligation to serve the educational and cultural needs of the people in their entire area through radio. Twelve of the forty-five institutions in this study have standard broadcast stations. These are:

- WHCU, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York
- WRUF, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida
- WILL, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois
- WSUI, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa
- KFKU, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas
- WLB, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota
- KFJM, University of North Dakota, Grand Forks, North Dakota
- WOSU, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio
- WNAD, University of Oklahoma, Norman, Oklahoma
- KOAC, University of Oregon (through State Board of Higher Education)
- KUSD, University of South Dakota
- WHA, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin

Practically all of these institutions made statements indicating their dissatisfaction with coverage and hours, although most of them have been in operation since the early twenties or before. This is true, in

spite of their entire dedication to "the public interest, convenience and necessity." They are unable to cover their entire state by day or by night, and most of them have little, if any, night time for reaching general listeners. Their potential audience is both rural and urban and state-wide in extent. Yet, the best hours for reaching serious adult listeners are unavailable and their signals are not adequate to cover their territory. Any re-allocation of frequencies for standard broadcast services should give careful consideration to these stations whose obligation is to state-wide constituencies.

4. All the twelve AM stations are planning expansion of programs, staff and services. Perhaps colleges and universities were slow to recognize the educational usefulness of broadcasting. In addition, the development of techniques for such educational broadcasting required a long period of experimentation. It is true, too, that many of the early educational stations received inadequate support in finance and personnel. But there is clear indication that these twelve institutions now recognize the importance of radio service and are planning to expand in the immediate future. Plans include new studios and offices, new equipment, new antennae, increased staffs, extended hours of operation where possible, and new and improved program services. Educational stations have proved themselves and the colleges and universities fortunate enough to have licenses are giving them increasing support.

5. The state universities, in much larger proportion, are planning to establish FM educational stations. The state institutions recognize the practical impossibility of obtaining new standard broadcast stations. They have come to recognize, however, the importance of broadcasting. Many of the institutions are planning the establishment of FM educational stations after the war. Thirty-five of the institutions (all but ten of the forty-five) are now either actively considering the matter or have already applied to the Commission for a construction permit. This is in contrast to the twelve out of forty-five which have standard stations. The war has, of course, precluded actual construction, but the situation, as reported, is:

FM station in operation (1):

University of Illinois

Construction permit granted (2):

University of Iowa

University of Kentucky

Have applied for construction permit (5):

University of Connecticut

Cornell University

University of Indiana

Miami University (Ohio)

University of Michigan

- Will apply for construction permit (11)
- University of California (2 "immediately"; also 2 relay stations)
 - University of Colorado ("in immediate future")
 - University of Florida ("after the war")
 - University of Minnesota ("very soon")
 - University of New Hampshire ("soon")
 - University of New Mexico ("at once")
 - University of North Carolina
 - University of North Dakota ("now being applied for")
 - University of Oklahoma ("by November 1st")
 - University of Tennessee ("at once")
 - University of Wisconsin
- FM station now under consideration (16)
- University of Alabama
 - University of Arizona
 - University of Georgia
 - University of Kansas
 - University of Maryland
 - University of Nebraska
 - University of Nevada
 - Ohio State University
 - Ohio University
 - University of Oregon
 - Pennsylvania State College
 - Rutgers University
 - University of South Dakota
 - University of Texas
 - University of West Virginia
 - University of Wyoming

There are numerous factors responsible for this greatly increased interest in public-owned FM radio stations. These include: (1) increased recognition of broadcasting as a form of educational service; (2) inability to secure a license for standard station; (3) inability to secure night time on existing standard station; (4) expectancy of better coverage through state network of FM stations; (5) somewhat lower costs of construction and operation of FM; (6) desise to be a part of state educational FM network being developed by schools and state departments of education; (7) the freedom from static and interference on FM; (8) the higher quality of the signal.

6. *The majority of these projected FM stations will be related to state educational FM networks.* In the case of the thirty-five state institutions now considering the establishment of FM educational stations, nearly half have indicated that the stations will be related to

projected state networks of FM educational stations. One institution has plans for its own network of university-owned stations; another to begin with coverage on four university-owned stations, but later to relate itself to a state network; eight institutions expect their stations to be independent, and ten institutions gave no information about their plans. The institutions may be grouped as follows:

Expected relationship to a state educational FM network (16):

University of California (later, if network develops; see next list also)

University of Colorado (through the Rocky Mountain Radio Council)

University of Indiana

State University of Iowa

University of Michigan

University of Minnesota

University of Nebraska

Miami University (Ohio)

Ohio State University

Ohio University

University of Oregon

Pennsylvania State College

University of Tennessee

University of West Virginia

University of Wisconsin

University of Wyoming

Expect to operate through university-owned network (2):

University of California (plans to begin with four high-power stations for state coverage)

University of Illinois (future plans call for network of ten stations for state coverage)

Expect independent station operation (8):

University of Connecticut

Cornell University

University of Kentucky

University of Maryland

University of Nevada

University of New Mexico

University of North Dakota

University of Oklahoma

No information furnished on relation to educational network (10):

University of Alabama

University of Arizona

University of Florida

University of Georgia
University of Kansas
University of New Hampshire
University of North Carolina
Rutgers University
University of South Dakota
University of Texas

7. *Programs from these FM stations will be directed to both homes and schools.* These institutions are thinking of their radio service in terms of distributing education and culture in its broadcast sense to all ages, classes and groups. Farmers, returned veterans, housewives, business and professional men, laborers and children must all be served. Programs must, therefore, be able to reach listeners in their homes at hours when they are not at work, in field, factory or office. Likewise, most of these institutions will be cooperating in directing programs to schoolrooms where the education of boys and girls of elementary and high school age may be broadened and enriched. This assumes that FM broadcasting will become widespread after the war and that homes, as well as schools, will have receiving facilities. It also implies that the FM educational frequencies will be in the standard FM band and not separated from other FM frequencies. Needless to say, it is the expectation of these institutions that they will have such time and hours on the air as best suit the needs of their listeners.

8. *Public-owned stations will utilize resources from their entire region and foster widespread responsible public participation in programming.* Because the public-owned station belongs to the people, the university which administers the programs will cultivate the rich educational and cultural resources of its constituency. While the university's contribution of scholarship and research will be drawn upon, in addition, the station is in a unique position to utilize state and local civic organizations, local and state governmental units, and the host of individuals within the state who have a contribution to make to their fellow citizens. Field recordings, state-wide networks, and short-wave mobile units will facilitate this grass-roots approach.

9. *For adequate service to a state-wide audience, dependable reception free from static and interference is required.* While local AM signals may over-ride static and interference in the city of their origination, rural and distant coverage is frequently unsatisfactory. Frequency-Modulation broadcasting offers much more satisfactory freedom from noise and interference within their areas of coverage. In areas of flat terrain, AM may still afford the best coverage with adequate power and proper frequencies.

10. *High-fidelity reception is more urgently needed by educational stations than by ordinary stations.* The typical university station offers

a greater proportion of high quality classical music than the ordinary commercial station. Satisfactory listening is to a considerable extent dependent upon the quality of the broadcast signal and the receiving set. Programs of this type will gain tremendously by the greater frequency range of FM broadcasting, particularly as more home-receiving sets incorporate higher quality into their circuits. This implies, of course, an improved quality in recordings, but this seems practicable in the near future. Higher fidelity will be a decided gain in the school broadcast field, too, for listening conditions are not too satisfactory, and greater naturalness will make better listening possible. This applies to music, speech and drama as they enter into the education of boys and girls through classroom listening.

11. *Television is generally considered rather remote though universities are interested in future possibilities.* Only one institution among the state universities, the State University of Iowa, has a television license or has applied for one. This station has discontinued operation during the war period. The general attitude of universities is interest; but they are awaiting further developments. It seems clear that universities potentially have greater resources for this medium than any other organizations. They would hope, however, that the Commission would not assign all television frequencies to commercial operation before the field is more fully developed, because the educational institutions will ultimately have so much to contribute to this field.

PART III—SOME RECOMMENDATIONS

From these conclusions, certain specific recommendations are made which are directly related to the allocation of frequencies for various broadcast services.

A. Relating to Standard AM Educational Stations:

1. With the expansion of local FM stations and the consequent probable easing of the tight situation in the standard band, it is recommended that the Commission consider assigning such frequencies and power to university stations as to enable them adequately to service their entire territories at suitable hours. It should be recognized that large areas can only be covered adequately by lower-frequency assignments.

2. It is recommended that a group of medium-distance channels be provided in the vicinity of 2500 to 3500 kilocycles for state-wide coverage on 10 kilocycle channels with power to 5,000 watts, these channels to be used for such service with preference to education and public services where large areas must be covered, and particularly where FM service does not prove practical. Engineers believe such channels would be effective in giving good service from 75 to 300 miles in a manner that cannot be duplicated by

any other frequency range. A minimum of ten channels should be available here for education and public service stations with other channels for entertainment.

B. Relating to FM Educational Stations:

1. In view of the needs and the actual plans for FM development, it is recommended that the Commission assign fifteen FM channels for the exclusive educational use of universities, school systems, and state departments of education.

2. The stations assigned to these channels should have such power and hours of operation as best to meet the needs of listeners in their coverage areas.

3. In view of the service to be rendered to homes and schools alike, it is recommended that these channels be assigned in the band of 41,000 to 56,000 kilocycles.

4. In view of the types of programs offered by educational stations, and their use in classrooms, it is recommended that the assigned channels be of sufficient width to insure high fidelity and freedom from static and interference.

C. Relating to Educational Television Stations:

1. As television develops to the point of being able to serve mass audiences it is recommended that the Commission keep in mind the needs of educational institutions and the natural program resources of universities, so that adequate facilities may not be preempted by commercial stations.

D. In General:

1. As new services develop, the Commission, with a view to the obligation of serving the public interest, convenience and necessity, should make sure that facilities are not preempted for entertainment alone.

SUMMARY

Correspondence returns from 45 out of 47 member institutions of the National Association of State Universities leads to the following conclusions:

1. A college or university station is an important channel of educational service.

2. The college or university station contributes to the improvement of broadcasting.

3. Present standard broadcast stations of colleges and universities have inadequate coverage and hours.

4. All the twelve AM stations are planning expansion of programs, staff and services.

5. The state universities, in much larger proportion, are planning to establish FM educational stations.

6. The majority of these projected FM stations will be related to state educational FM networks.

7. Programs from these FM stations will be directed to both homes and schools.

8. Public-owned stations will utilize resources from their entire region and foster widespread responsible public participation in programming.

9. For adequate service to a state-wide audience, dependable reception free from static and interference is required.

10. High-fidelity reception is more urgently needed by educational stations than by ordinary stations.

11. Television is generally considered rather remote though universities are interested in future possibilities.

These conclusions lead to certain recommendations:

Relating to standard AM educational stations:

1. With the expansion of local FM stations and the consequent probable easing of the tight situation in the standard band, it is recommended that the Commission consider assigning such frequencies and power to university stations as to enable them adequately to service their entire territories at suitable hours.

2. It is recommended that a group of medium-distance channels be provided in the vicinity of 2500 to 3500 kilocycles for state-wide coverage on 10 kilocycle channels with power to 5,000 watts.

Relating to FM educational stations:

1. In view of the needs and the actual plans for FM development, it is recommended that the Commission assign fifteen FM channels for the exclusive educational use of universities, school systems, and state departments of education.

2. The stations assigned to these channels should have such power and hours of operation as best to meet the needs of the listeners in their coverage areas.

3. In view of the service to be rendered to homes and schools alike, it is recommended that these channels be assigned in the band of 41,000 to 56,000 kilocycles.

4. In view of the types of programs offered by educational stations, and their use in classrooms, it is recommended that the assigned channels be of sufficient width to insure high fidelity and freedom from static and interference.

Relating to educational television stations:

1. As television develops to the point of being able to serve mass audiences, it is recommended that the Commission keep in mind the needs of educational institutions and the natural program resources of universities, so that adequate facilities may not be preëmpted by commercial stations.

In general:

1. As new services develop, the Commission, with a view to the obligation of serving the public interest, convenience and necessity, should make sure that facilities are not preëmpted for entertainment alone.

PRESIDENT WEST: Are there any remarks or questions or additions? If not, we will proceed with the second report.

PRESIDENT BEVIS: My second report, Mr. Chairman, has to do with the matter of surplus war property. That subject is at present in a state of considerable confusion, and I haven't seen that it would be useful to undertake to formalize very much of a report in writing, particularly in view of the fact that in the March 15 edition of *Higher Education* about as complete and comprehensive a report of the situation, to date, as I could make is already in print. I assume you have that and, therefore, simply call it to your attention. There is also a bulletin on surplus property distribution, a news letter from the American Council, under date of March 24, which I take it you also have.

I might perhaps say a word with regard to the deliberations of the Committee which was assembled last fall under the general auspices of the Office of Education, during the interval between the operations of the Clayton administration and the incoming board to be appointed then under the new law. That board has since been appointed, but it has not yet very greatly clarified the situation. The committee assembled in Washington by the Office of Education last fall undertook to summarize experience under the Clayton organization and to formulate a philosophy derived from previous action, and to pass it on for whatever it was worth to the new board.

In the view of those who were present, so far as educational institutions were concerned, surplus property might be viewed in three categories: First, a category of property, small in comparison, consisting of things intrinsically educational in their character, like school desks, things you couldn't use very well for anything else but education. It was assumed that that kind of property would be distributed on the basis of what was called "nominal price". Nominal price, as I understand it, in the government lingo, means cost of packing and shipping.

The second category was property not intrinsically adapted to edu-

cation only, but property of a more general description used by organizations engaged in education. Upon the general theory that possession is nine points of the law, it was assumed that if education once had its hands on it it could keep them there and could get such property also at nominal price.

The third category was all other property, and that, of course, is the great bulk of the stuff which is to be distributed. Among such property will be property which education might find useful, but which business and industry and citizens generally might also find useful.

It was assumed that when the war is over there would be a commercial demand for a great deal of that stuff at going market price, and that as long as there was this general demand at a market price, whoever had charge of the stuff would be obliged to sell at such price, until the supply breaks through the market price and disorganizes the market.

There will be many categories of things so large that the continued offering of them will outrun the commercial demand and prices will break. At that point, educational institutions may have the opportunity to acquire this kind of property at nominal price, or at least below the current market price.

The other major thought of this group was that there ought to be established in each of the states some kind of coordinating agency which would act as a go-between, a sort of clearing-house body, which could coordinate demand on the one hand and the available supply on the other.

There is in the existing legislation, as you know, a set of priorities—roughly these: other federal agencies first, with a kind of a loan of that priority to small business corporations, and then state agencies in which education and charitable and philanthropic institutions take high rank. Following that the general public.

. . . The reports presented by President Bevis were adopted and the recommendations approved. . .

PRESIDENT WEST: I think we will depart from the order of business once more and now take up the report of the Resolutions Committee. It seems quite important that a great number of us be here.

. . . President Ruthven presented the report of the Resolutions Committee. In the discussion which followed his report, a number of resolutions were offered from the floor. All resolutions adopted by the Association appear below in the form in which they were adopted. It was voted that the President of the Association be directed to communicate immediately with the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy in regard to Resolutions IV and V respectively. . .

RESOLUTIONS AND VOTES

I. WHEREAS: There is now much confusion in respect to the charges to be made by the schools for veterans education, therefore

RESOLVED: That this Association recommends that S-781, a bill to amend Veterans Regulation Number 1 (a), with respect to payments to educational or training institutions, be amended in the following respects:

1. That the Administrator be directed, and not merely authorized, to provide for payments to institutions.
2. That the payments be based on the *fair and reasonable* cost of furnishing education and training rather than the actual cost.
3. That the payments made by the Administrator to such institutions for the cause of education shall not be chargeable against the veteran in any future accounting.

FURTHER: That this Association approve said Bill, as so amended, and urge its adoption by the Congress of the United States.

II. RESOLVED: That the same fiscal policies as above indicated be made effective also in Public Laws 16 and 113.

III. WHEREAS: The so-called accelerated method of instruction, which requires of students year around attendance in our colleges, has proved to be of value only as a war-training service, and

WHEREAS: It has been demonstrated that this method is financially costly, places too great burdens on the staff, and seriously restricts the educational process; therefore

RESOLVED: That this Association recommends the abandonment of the accelerated programs as rapidly as this can be done without interfering with the war effort or the needs of veterans.

IV. WHEREAS: The R.O.T.C. has for many years been the principal agency for training of reserve officers for the U. S. Army and the records show that over 115,000 officers trained in these units are now in the military service, and that they have assumed great responsibilities for the training of our civilian army and leading that army into battle, and

WHEREAS: The universities and colleges that have R.O.T.C. units are to a degree a part of the War Department and will likely continue to be the chief source of supply for reserve officers, therefore

RESOLVED: That we petition the War Department that such property as may be needed for the training of men in R.O.T.C. units be allotted to these institutions and not declared to be surplus property. To this end, we request the Secretary of War to make this transfer of property in such amounts as is needed in the training programs of the R.O.T.C.

V. WHEREAS: The Navy R.O.T.C. has for many years been an important agency for training of reserve officers for the U. S. Navy and the records show that many officers trained in these units are now in the military service, and that they have assumed great responsibilities for the training of our civilian navy and leading that navy into battle, and

WHEREAS: The universities and colleges that have Navy R.O.T.C. units are to a degree a part of the Navy Department and will likely continue to be the chief source of supply for reserve officers, therefore

RESOLVED: That we petition the Navy Department that such property as may be needed for the training of men in the Navy R.O.T.C. units be allotted to these institutions and not declared to be surplus property. To this end, we request the Secretary of the Navy to make this transfer of property in such amounts as is needed in the training programs of the Navy R.O.T.C.

VI. WHEREAS: There has been introduced into the current Congress a confusing variety of bills which would authorize large federal appropriations for general and specialized educational purposes and programs,

WHEREAS: Such bills would inaugurate new and in some cases conflicting principles and practices in the area of federal, state, and local control and support of education at all levels—including collegiate instruction and research—and

WHEREAS: Several such bills would create new agencies unrelated to our present schools, colleges and universities, or would impose upon them new duties and direction, therefore

RESOLVED: That the National Association of State Universities hereby petition that the Congress of the United States may establish a special joint committee of the House and Senate expressly commissioned to formulate sound principles of federal-state relationships in the area of educational administration and support for the guidance of the Congress in the consideration of all pending proposals for federal participation in educational planning and support.

VII. RESOLVED: That the National Association of State Universities oppose H.R. 2601, authorizing the Veterans Administration to pay the full established fees up to the present maximum of \$500 for any course of short, intensive training of less than 30 weeks in length.

VIII. RESOLVED: That the National Association of State Universities oppose H.R. 2610 to authorize the utilization of correspondence schools which do not require resident instruction.

IX. RESOLVED: That the National Association of State Universities views with growing concern reports of the violation of the principles

of intellectual freedom at the University of Texas and hereby authorizes its Executive Committee in its discretion, on the basis of facts found by responsible and appropriate agencies, to make unmistakably clear the support of intellectual freedom in the University of Texas by the National Association of State Universities.

X. VOTED: To instruct the Secretary to write to Representative Lanham of the Congress, calling attention to the serious situation faced by the colleges and universities with respect to housing married veteran students, and suggesting that consideration be given to:

1. Priorities for construction of housing by the institutions.
2. Permission of student veterans to rent government housing facilities which may become available, where properly located.
3. Providing temporary housing on or near the campuses.

XI. RESOLVED: That the Association direct its Secretary to express to the appropriate committees of the Congress the positive interest and support of the Association in the strengthening of the U. S. Office of Education through increased financial support and the reorganization and expansion of its staff.

PRESIDENT WEST: Is Dr. Johnson of Maryland in the room? (Not present). I should like it to be read into the record that he was to have been on the program but was called away by an emergency.

May we pass now to the report of the Committee on Relations with Foreign Students, President Ruthven.

. . . President Ruthven presented a summary of the following report of the Committee on Relations with Foreign Students and Universities. . .

FOSTERING INTERCULTURAL RELATIONSHIPS THROUGH THE INTERCHANGE OF STUDENTS AND TEACHERS

I. Statement of the Problem and the Purpose of this Report. For many years increasing numbers of foreign students have been coming to the United States to study in our colleges and universities, and American students have continued to go abroad to round out their education. There is every indication that when the war is over this interchange will be accelerated. It is not only likely but desirable that this should occur. With the more general acceptance of the principle of international cooperation, there is growing realization of the fact that satisfactory relations in government and commerce are difficult if not impossible without such harmony and sympathy as may be had only through a mutual understanding of minds and cultures. And there is no better way to establish and maintain this understanding

than through a reciprocity in education provided by the interchange of students and teachers.

These considerations imply a great opportunity for our government and our schools and place upon them a weighty responsibility. Because of our favorable economic situation and because we have escaped the worst calamities of the war as many other nations have not, we are placed in a position which will enable us to render exceptional service in a United Nations' program for the restoration of educational opportunities in occupied and devastated countries and for the promotion of a broader intercultural understanding throughout the world.

Perhaps the aspect of the problem which is of most pressing concern just now is that of dealing with the large numbers of foreign students who are expected to come to the United States after the war. If we are to perform our full function at this critical juncture, it is important that the issues be clearly understood and that foresight be exercised and careful preparation be made to meet the demands of the situation. Only through the adoption of a definite and clear-cut program shall we be able to avoid the dangers of haphazard expansion. A mere increase in the number of foreign students coming to our schools might, for example, eventuate in overloading some institutions and in creating situations conducive to friction. If students from foreign countries are carelessly selected and badly oriented the end is likely to be disillusionment, if not antagonism. There is also the problem of avoiding both an education which is narrowly technical and intellectual and one that is tainted with indoctrination. The desirable mean is to give these students an adequate opportunity to understand our own democratic principles and ideals as they may be accommodated to technical and scientific achievements, together with sufficient acquaintance with the peculiarities of our culture to promote friendly, tolerant attitudes.

It is also important that careful plans be laid for a long-range program for the direct interchange of students and teachers with foreign countries. International understanding can be no one-way affair. It is not enough that foreign students and teachers shall learn from us, we must also learn and benefit from what other nations have to offer. In order to do this, our own people must be encouraged to study abroad and they must be provided with the means of doing so in large numbers.

The purpose of this report is to offer a program designed to facilitate the achievement of the ends suggested in the foregoing paragraphs. The major part of the report is devoted to the problem of making provision for the imminent postwar influx of foreign students, both because it requires immediate attention and because our experience permits a more comprehensive treatment of it. The situation with regard to the direct interchange of teachers is still in an exploratory

stage. It is of vast importance and the potentialities for its development are great; but it will receive only preliminary consideration at this time. How foreign institutions will handle the problem of dealing with American students who make independent arrangements to study abroad is, of course, not within the scope of this report.

II. Provision for Foreign Students in our Schools and Colleges. Among the many contingencies that past experience indicates we must be prepared to meet in making provision for foreign students in our colleges and universities the most urgent are comprehended under the following heads: the selection of students in their homeland, health precautions, orientation and admission to American colleges, financial provisions, housing, preparation in English, and courses of instruction.

1. **SELECTION.** The present method of selecting foreign students calls for some revision. There exist such wide variations in the conditions under which these students are chosen and in the kind and degree of their preparation, such differences in financial arrangements, and such diversity in the many agencies through which they are channeled that inequities and confusion are unavoidable.

In order to secure a greater degree of uniformity it is recommended that the Institute of International Education or some other private or cooperative organization be designated as the civilian agency through which educational institutions, on the one hand, and governmental agencies (foreign and domestic), on the other, will clear applications for the admission of foreign students.

It is further recommended that a committee representative of all types of educational interests in the United States be set up by the Department of State to assist in the development of policies.

The Institute of International Education should continue and extend its practice of using Screening Committees in the various countries, and interested institutions in the United States should rely on these committees so as to avoid duplications. The pattern now in use, of a chairman who is native to the country, a secretary who is a United States citizen well informed on American colleges and universities, and three or four additional native and United States citizens, seems promising. The cultural attaché, where available, should be used as an *ex officio* member to assist in securing visas and whatever diplomatic clearances may be necessary.

Since the success of the plan depends upon encouraging the best people to apply, as well as upon the right process of selection, the members of the committee should be men of the highest qualifications, whose posts and experience enable them to seek out potential candidates and to make a careful and valid appraisal of all who apply. Where cultural institutes exist, as in Mexico at present, selection should probably be made through them.

It will be expected that students selected by such agencies will be among the best in their respective countries, and that the choice will not be affected by social or political influence. The worth of these students should be attested by the records of their previous educational experience as set forth on uniform blanks. Formal degrees do not have a common meaning in different countries; it may, therefore, be found advisable to administer a record examination in the prospective student's native language. Obviously, all incoming students should be prepared to adapt themselves to our system of higher education, with its relatively inflexible curricula and definite requirements for degrees.

2. **HEALTH PRECAUTIONS.** The maximum of educational benefits contemplated under this plan cannot be achieved if our colleges are unduly burdened with the medical care of visiting students. It is therefore essential that only those who are in sound health should be admitted to our institutions. Applicants should have passed a thorough health examination by a recognized medical agency before they leave their homelands; and, in addition, each applicant should be equipped with adequate health insurance, either as such insurance is provided through the Institute of International Education or as it may be obtained through an agency of the state in which the institution is located, as in Michigan.

3. **ORIENTATION AND ADMISSION.** The students selected by this method should proceed to the United States before the opening of the school year and should be received at orientation centers in designated colleges and universities which have had considerable experience in dealing with foreign students. At these centers the candidates' command of English may be tested and, if necessary, improved; here, also, they may make their initial adaptation to North American environment and customs.

From these centers the students should be channeled by the Institute of International Education into colleges and universities which can best satisfy their educational needs. Each institution should be free to establish its own requirements for admission, and students should be distributed among as many as possible of our colleges and universities, large and small.

There should be no interference with the student's freedom of choice except as determined by the admission requirements of the institution and its capacity to receive the student and to give him the kind of instruction he seeks.

4. **FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS.** The question of finance in relation to foreign students in the United States is a highly complex one. Present practices show great diversity in means of support, and it is inevitable, and probably desirable, that a considerable degree of variation shall continue.

Under present conditions foreign students are maintained in the following ways: (1) some are entirely self-supporting; (2) certain selected individuals are financed by their home governments; (3) a considerable number are aided by scholarships furnished by private agencies, such as the Institute of International Education, the China Institute of America, the Harvard-Yenching Institute, and the Rockefeller, the Guggenheim, the Rosenwald, and the Kellogg Foundations; (4) others receive tuition scholarships from the institutions in which they enroll; (5) and still others derive partial support from indirect Federal grants—a practice of recent origin dictated by the exigencies of war.

A particular problem in finance is presented in the frequent differential between the tuition fees of a given university and the per capita cost of instruction, a disparity that sometimes runs as high as 1 to 3. Where for one reason or another there would be a heavy concentration of students in a college or university charging only moderate tuition fees, the resultant strain on the financial resources of the school might be considerable, even to the extent of seriously impairing the quality of its services, or of placing an additional burden upon the taxpayers.

In view of these facts, it is recommended that the prevailing diversity in the means of support for foreign students be recognized as a logical concomitant of the situation, and that private agencies now lending aid to foreign students in our schools be especially encouraged to continue and expand their program. The small beginnings so far made by the Federal Government should become the basis of an enlarged program of substantial aid to foreign students in American schools. This program, which would presumably be carried on by the Division of Cultural Cooperation, should take two forms: (1) a policy of immediate generous aid to foreign students who wish to prepare themselves in our schools for more effective service at home and (2) a long-range policy of direct aid to foreign students in the United States through scholarships and loans, and of indirect aid through the reimbursement of colleges and universities to the extent of the differential between tuition charges and the actual per capita cost of the educational facilities afforded.

5. **HOUSING.** Since one of the main objectives in educating foreign students is to create mutually friendly relations and understanding among all concerned, favorable housing conditions are of paramount importance.

The term *favorable* is applied here not to conditions that may be immediately expedient but to those that promise a maximum of the benefits desired. Thus, in larger cities it may be easy for students to find places to live among people of their own nationality and tastes, but such segregation means a distinct loss in international understand-

ing. On the other hand, situations that may result in friction between groups with strong racial prejudices can only lead to the defeat of the true ends of international education.

The best housing conditions are those in which foreign students may lead a pleasant normal life under as few artificial restraints as possible, with full opportunity to mingle on an equal social plane with each other and with other students on the campus.

Principles that should guide schools where numbers of foreign students are in attendance may, then, be stated as follows: Care should be taken to provide these students with comfortable housing, on a par with that available to the general student body. Except in special cases, where for the sake of rapid acquisition of our language, groups of students may be brought together for a given period in a single residence, segregation into national or even international units should be avoided. Where dormitories are a part of the housing system on a given campus, they should be open to foreign students.

If need arises, provision should be made for additional dormitories— at government expense where conditions warrant such aid. Special attention should be given to the problems of the married foreign student, to whom, if he is to realize the benefits of the American way of life, low-priced but tasteful and well-equipped apartments or small houses with a reasonable degree of privacy must be available.

6. PREPARATION IN ENGLISH. It is hardly necessary to say that if a foreign student is to get anywhere in his studies in our schools, he must have sufficient command of our language to know what is going on in his classes, to read texts with some ease and a fair comprehension, and to communicate ideas, in both oral and written form, in reasonably competent English. The question remains as to when, where, and how he is to acquire this ability.

Varied experience has suggested the following general principles as applicable to the problem:

(1) So far as possible, foreign students should have a fair command of English before coming and should, in fact, be urged to improve their knowledge of English before applying for a fellowship. Since the English required through second- or third-hand instruction is likely to be inadequate, foreign authorities should be encouraged to use American or British born teachers of English in their schools. Special institutes for intensive training in English, similar to that which has been tried in Mexico City, in cooperation with our own and foreign governments, may be established.

(2) For foreign students who have come to our schools with an inadequate knowledge of our language there should be maintained at the orientation centers institutes for rapid training in English, where

students live with their teachers and are offered the benefits of the best known methods of class instruction.

(3) Wherever a college or university has enough foreign students enrolled to warrant the procedure, special classes for the teaching of English to foreigners should be established.

7. COURSES OF INSTRUCTION. Although, as has been stated, foreign students must be prepared to adapt themselves to our educational procedures, American educators should recognize that the foreign student's background and expectations in education are different from our own practice and outlook in such matters and that the advantage may not be altogether on our side. Our educators should be prepared to make such well-considered changes in our courses and curricula as may be suggested by the educational theory and practice of other nations. Such adaptations may result not only in greater convenience to our foreign students but in improvement of the education of our own.

On the other hand, the institutions concerned should see to it that their foreign students are provided with a balanced educational program. No student's program, for example, should consist solely of technical or professional studies but should include such courses of a broad social and cultural content as will afford opportunity for a critical understanding and appreciation of our way of life. To this end, formal courses in American culture and institutions should be made available to the foreign student, so devised as to afford a maximum of insight and a minimum of indoctrination. The student should, moreover, be encouraged to elect further courses in which he will be able to build upon the general knowledge gained in the introductory courses.

III. Interchange of Teachers. The interchange of teachers between institutions in the United States should be encouraged in every way possible. To secure effective international intellectual cooperation, teachers should have firsthand information of world conditions and an understanding of the culture, the institutions, the social concepts, and the psychology of other peoples.

Provisions for the interchange of teachers can probably best be made by arrangements between specific institutions. It is suggested that each of our colleges or universities might to good advantage affiliate itself with a foreign college or university, not with the idea necessarily of limiting exchange of its teachers to this one institution but rather of insuring a home for visiting instructors and of providing facilities for contacts with other schools.

. . . The report was adopted. . .

PRESIDENT WEST: We now come to the last committee report, that of necrology. I recognize President Atkinson, of Arizona.

. . . President Atkinson named the five members of the Association who had passed away during the past year and reported that the Committee would prepare appropriate resolutions and send them to the Secretary. The report received by the Secretary is printed below. . .

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON NECROLOGY

Your Committee on Necrology regrets to report the passing of five of its members during the past year:

William Bennett Bizzell, President of the College of Industrial Arts of Texas for four years, President of Texas A. and M. for eleven years, and President of the University of Oklahoma for fifteen years, was an administrator and leader who made a large contribution to the development of higher education. He came into administration after very complete training in the field of economics and possessed the personal qualities which made him a very successful administrator. He gave generously of his time to this Association and served as its President during 1937-38. He will be missed from the councils of the Association.

Campbell Blackshear Hodges, President of Louisiana State University. After completing his training in Louisiana, he graduated from the United States Military Academy and served with distinction in the Army in this country and abroad. He brought to university administration effective administrative experience in the field of military science and this, combined with his attractive personality, made him a successful administrator. He was active in the affairs of this Association and was highly regarded by the Association.

James Rion McKissick, for many years President of the University of South Carolina, was a scholar and an administrator of distinction. His preparation was in the field of journalism and law, and he had a successful career as an editor and publisher. He was interested in the public life of his state and his section of the country and was honored by the journalistic and other associations with which he was affiliated. This Association enjoyed the advantages of his fine talents and his spirit of cooperation.

Alfred Horatio Upham, President of Miami University and, prior to this service, President of the University of Idaho, will be greatly missed from the councils of this Association. He served as President of the Association during 1935-36 and was its very efficient Secretary from 1927 to 1935. He enjoyed the advantages of very extensive preparation for his field of English literature and had worked in this field for a number of years before undertaking general administration. His publications in the field of English literature are very generally recognized. As its Secretary, President Upham had an influential part in the

upbuilding of this Association. His administrative skill, his attractive personality, and his efficiency will long be remembered.

James Fulton Zimmerman, for many years President of the University of New Mexico and President of the National Association of State Universities in 1940-41, will be greatly missed from the councils of the Association. His formal preparation for work in higher education was in the field of political science, and his contributions in this field are recognized as very valuable. President Zimmerman was actively interested in the improvement of relations between the United States and the other Americas lying to the south and was known and honored by our southern neighbors. He was a skillful administrator, a most attractive personality, and gave generously of his talents to this Association.

THE COMMITTEE ON NECROLOGY

JOHN L. NEWCOMB

ALFRED ATKINSON

PRESIDENT WEST: A number of years ago I had occasion to speak with President Benedict, now deceased. Being a freshman in the game at that time, I asked him to relate some of the circumstances or at least the elements which contributed to such a long and successful life.

He said, "I have one formula, and if you will follow that you will live long and be highly regarded by everyone. That formula is: praise them and thank them." He said, "If my legislature gives me a generous appropriation, I praise them and thank them. If they don't give me a generous appropriation, I praise them and thank them. If my wife gives me toast, nicely done, I praise her and thank her. But if she gives me burned or scorched toast, I still praise her and thank her."

So, he said, in his relations with faculty, and family, and his associates, he had gone through life praising and thanking people. And I know of no better way to close a meeting than to praise and thank the Executive Committee, who worked so faithfully and unselfishly in arranging the program; to praise and thank the Secretary, who has done such wonderful work; to praise and thank the speakers and guests; to praise and thank President Thompson of Saskatchewan, and also the Association of Canadian Universities for sending him; and in an atmosphere of praise and thankfulness, I declare the fiftieth session of the National Association of State Universities adjourned.

. . . The meeting adjourned sine die at three o'clock. . .

APPENDIX

I

CONSTITUTION OF THE NATIONAL
ASSOCIATION OF STATE UNIVERSITIES

The purpose of this Association shall be the consideration of questions relating to the promotion of higher education in all its forms in the universities of the several states of the Union and the discussion and prosecution of such questions and plans as may tend to make more efficient in their work the institutions included in the membership of the Association.

NAME—The name of this Association shall be the National Association of State Universities.

MEMBERSHIP—The membership of this Association may include:

(1) All colleges or universities in the states or territories of the United States which are founded wholly or in part upon those grants of land made by Congress to the states upon their admission into the Union, which grants are commonly known as seminary or university grants.

(2) Any college or university in any state which may be designated and recognized by the state as the state university.

REPRESENTATION—Every institution recognized as a member of this Association shall be entitled to representation in each meeting of the Association through the president or chief executive officer of the institution, or some proxy specially appointed by him.

Any officer, being a member of the faculty or board of regents of any institution belonging to this Association shall be entitled to all the privileges of a representative excepting the right to vote.

Each institution recognized as a member of this Association shall be entitled to one vote on any question before the Association, the vote to be cast by its accredited representative.

***OFFICERS**—The Association shall elect at each annual meeting a president, a vice president, a secretary and treasurer, who shall be charged with the duties usually connected with their respective offices. The president, vice president, secretary-treasurer, together with the retiring president and his immediate predecessor, and three elective members shall constitute the executive committee of the Association. The elective members shall be chosen for a term of three years for overlapping terms, one to be chosen each year. At the 1937 meeting the first three members shall be chosen for one, two, and three years respectively. The Executive Committee shall hold at least one interim meeting each year at Washington, to which the United States Office of Education and American Council on Education shall be invited to send advisory members. The election of officers shall be by ballot. The terms of office shall be one year

**As changed by action of the 1937 and 1939 meeting of The National Association of State Universities.*

beginning at the close of the annual meeting. The president or chief executive officer of any institution connected with the Association may be elected to office. The president of the Association shall be ex-officio chairman of the executive committee.

MEETINGS—At least one meeting of the Association shall be held in each calendar year. Unless otherwise ordered by the Association or by the executive committee, the annual meeting shall be held during the period and the place in which the annual meeting of the National Education Association of the United States is held. Special meetings may be called by the executive committee, provided that four weeks' notice of the same is given to each institution connected with the Association.

Additional provisions duly adopted as parts of this Constitution:

"The voting representatives of nine (9) institutions members of this Association shall be necessary to form a quorum for the transaction of business.

"The Association may enact By-Laws for its own government, not inconsistent with the provisions of this Constitution.

"The executive committee is authorized to fill vacancies *ad interim* in the offices of the Association.

"Amendments to the foregoing Constitution may be offered at any regular annual meeting, and shall be in writing signed by the mover and two (2) seconds. They shall then lie on the table until the next annual meeting, and shall require for their adoption the affirmative vote of two-thirds of the members then present."

AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION

1. Under article "Name," at the end of article "Name," insert "and allied institutions."
2. Under Article 2, insert the following after Section 2: "And such other allied institutions as the Association may elect."
3. The Association may elect individuals as special members without votes, men of distinction or who have retired from presidencies or professorships in the institutions.

II

ACTIVE MEMBERS OF THE ASSOCIATION

- UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA, University, Ala., R. R. Paty, President, 1942.
- UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA, Tucson, Ariz., Alfred Atkinson, President, 1937.
- UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS, Fayetteville, Ark., A. M. Harding, President, 1941.
- UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, Berkeley, Cal., Robert Gordon Sproul, President, 1930.
- UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO, Boulder, Colo., R. G. Gustavson, President, 1943.
- UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT, Storrs, Conn., Albert N. Jorgensen, President, 1936.
- UNIVERSITY OF DELAWARE, Newark, Del., W. Owen Sypherd, Acting President, 1944.

- UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA, Gainesville, Fla., John J. Tigert, President, 1928.
- UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA, Athens, Ga., Harmon W. Caldwell, President, 1935.
- UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF GEORGIA, Atlanta, Ga., S. V. Sanford, Chancellor, 1935.
- UNIVERSITY OF IDAHO, Moscow, Idaho, H. C. Dale, President, 1937.
- UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS, Urbana, Ill., A. C. Willard, President, 1934.
- INDIANA UNIVERSITY, Bloomington, Ind., Herman B. Wells, President, 1937.
- STATE UNIVERSITY OF IOWA, Iowa City, Ia., Virgil M. Hancher, President, 1940.
- UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS, Lawrence, Kan., Deane W. Malott, Chancellor, 1939.
- UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY, Lexington, Ky., Herman Lee Donovan, President, 1941.
- LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY, University, La., W. B. Hatcher, President, 1944.
- UNIVERSITY OF MAINE, Orono, Me., Arthur A. Hauck, President, 1934.
- UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND, College, Park, Md., Harry Clifton Byrd, President, 1935.
- UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN, Ann Arbor, Mich., Alexander G. Ruthven, President, 1929.
- UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA, Minneapolis, Minn., J. L. Morrill, President, July, 1945.
- UNIVERSITY OF MISSISSIPPI, University, Miss., A. B. Butts, Chancellor, 1935.
- UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI, Columbia, Mo., Frederick A. Middlebush, President, 1935.
- MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY, Missoula, Mont., Ernest O. Melby, President, 1944.
- UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA, Lincoln, Neb., C. S. Boucher, Chancellor, 1938.
- UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA, Reno, Nev., John Moseley, President, 1944.
- UNIVERSITY OF NEW HAMPSHIRE, Durham, N.H., Harold W. Stoke, President, 1944.
- RUTGERS UNIVERSITY (UNIVERSITY OF NEW JERSEY), New Brunswick, N. J., Robert Clarkson Clothier, President, 1932.
- UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO, Albuquerque, N.M., John Philip Wernette, President, July, 1945.
- CORNELL UNIVERSITY, Ithaca, N.Y., Edmund Ezra Day, President, 1936.
- UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA, Chapel Hill, N.C., Frank P. Graham, President, 1930.
- UNIVERSITY OF NORTH DAKOTA, Grand Forks, N.D., John C. West, President, 1933.
- OHIO UNIVERSITY, Athens, Ohio, John C. Baker, President, 1945.
- MIAMI UNIVERSITY, Oxford, Ohio.
- OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY, Columbus, Ohio, Howard L. Bevis, President, 1940.
- UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA, Norman, Okla., George Lynn Cross, President, 1944.
- UNIVERSITY OF OREGON, Eugene, Ore., Harry K. Newburn, President, July, 1945.
- OREGON STATE SYSTEM OF HIGHER EDUCATION, Eugene, Ore., Frederick M. Hunter, Chancellor, 1935.

- PENNSYLVANIA STATE COLLEGE, State College, Pa., R. D. Hetzel, President,
1927.
- UNIVERSITY OF PUERTO RICO, Rio Piedras, P.R., Jaime Benitez, Chancellor,
1943.
- UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA, Columbia, S.C.
- UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH DAKOTA, Vermillion, S.D., I. D. Weeks, President,
1935.
- UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE, Knoxville, Tenn., James D. Hoskins, President,
1933.
- UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS, Austin, Texas, Theophilis N. Painter, Acting President,
1945.
- UNIVERSITY OF UTAH, Salt Lake City, Utah, LeRoy E. Cowles, President, 1941.
- UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA, Charlottesville, Va., J. L. Newcomb, President, 1931.
- UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON, Seattle, Wash., Lee Paul Sieg, President, 1934.
- WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY, Morgantown, W.Va., C. E. Lawall, President,
1939.
- UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN, Madison, Wisc., E. B. Fred, President, 1945.
- UNIVERSITY OF WYOMING, Laramie, Wyo.
- U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, OFFICE OF EDUCATION, Washington,
D.C., John Ward Studebaker, Commissioner, 1934.

III

SPECIAL MEMBERS

According to Amendment 3, former members of the Association may be elected as special members. Only the living former members are listed. (A list of all former members was published on pages 221-226 of the 1932 Proceedings). Errors should be reported to the Secretary.

- CHARLES WILLIAM DABNEY, Tennessee 1887-1904; 2376 Madison Road, Cincinnati, Ohio.
- DANIEL BOARDMAN PURINTON, West Virginia 1901-1911; President Emeritus, 85 Grandview Ave., Morgantown, W.Va.
- JOHN WILLIAM ABERCROMBIE, Alabama 1902-1912; State Department of Education, Montgomery, Ala.
- CLYDE AUGUSTUS DUNIWAY, Montana 1908-1912, Wyoming 1912-1917; 622 Salvaticia St., Stanford University, Calif.
- RUFUS BERNARD VON KLEINSMID, Arizona 1914-1921; President, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, Calif.
- JOHN ANDREAS WIDTSON, Utah 1916-1921; 47 E. South Temple St., Salt Lake City, Utah.
- EDWARD CHARLES ELLIOTT, Montana 1916-1922; President, Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind. (Now chief of the division of professional teaching and training, War Manpower Commission, Washington, D.C.)
- AVEN NELSON, Wyoming 1917-1922; President Emeritus and Professor of Botany, University of Wyoming, Laramie, Wyo.

- SAMUEL PAUL CAPEN, Director, American Council on Education 1919-1922; Chancellor, University of Buffalo, Buffalo, N.Y.
- ROBERT ERNEST VINSON, Texas 1916-1923; Former President, Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio. (Retired).
- DAVID PRESCOTT BARROWS, California 1919-1923; Professor of Political Science, University of California, 85 Parkside Dr., Berkeley, Calif.
- EDWARD ASAHEL BIRGE, Wisconsin 1901-1903, 1919-1925; President Emeritus, 2011 Van Hise Ave., Madison, Wis.
- ALBERT FRED WOODS, Maryland 1920-1926; Director of Scientific Works, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.
- CLOYD HECK MARVIN, Arizona 1922-1926; President, George Washington University, Washington, D.C.
- WALTER MARSHALL WILLIAM SPLAWN, Texas 1924-1927; Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D.C.
- RAYMOND MOLLYNEAUX HUGHES, Miami, 1911-1927; President Emeritus, Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa.
- DAVID SPENCE HILL, New Mexico 1919-1927; Depot Historian, Jefferson Quartermaster Depot, Jeffersonville, Ind.
- THOMAS ELIOT BENNER, Puerto Rico 1924-1929; Dean, School of Education, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.
- CLARENCE COOK LITTLE, Maine 1922-1925, Michigan 1925-1929; The R. B. Jackson Memorial Laboratory, Bar Harbor, Me.
- DAVID KINLEY, Illinois 1920-1930; President Emeritus, 1203 Nevada St., Urbana, Ill.
- STRATTON DULUTH BROOKS, Oklahoma 1912-1923; Missouri 1923-1930; Executive Director, DeMolay, 201 E. Armour Blvd., Kansas City, Mo.
- JOHN MARTIN THOMAS, Rutgers 1925-1930; President's Office, Norwich University, Northfield, Vt.
- FREDERICK J. KELLY, Idaho 1928-1930; Director of Higher Education, U.S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C.
- THOMAS FRANKLYN KANE, Washington 1902-1914, North Dakota 1918-1933; 1810 Hills Ave., Tampa, Florida.
- MELVIN AMOS BRANNON, Idaho 1914-1917, Montana 1923-1933; Hibiscus Park, Gainesville, Florida.
- HARRY WOODBURN CHASE, North Carolina 1919-1930, Illinois 1930-1933; Chancellor, New York University, New York City.
- MATTHEW LYLE SPENCER, Washington 1927-1933; Dean, School of Journalism, Syracuse University, Syracuse, N.Y.
- WALTER ALBERT JESSUP, Iowa 1910-1934; President, Carnegie Foundation, 522 Fifth Ave., New York, N.Y.
- HAROLD SHERBURNE BOARDMAN, Maine 1925-1934; Orono, Me.
- HARCOURT ALEXANDER MORGAN, Tennessee 1919-1934; Tennessee Valley Authority, Knoxville, Tenn.
- GEORGE FREDERICK ZOOK, U.S. Office of Education 1933-1934; Director, American Council on Education, 744 Jackson Place, Washington, D.C.

- WILLIAM JASPER KERR, Oregon 1932-1936; 1633 N. E. Knott St., Portland, Ore.
- JOHN ROSCOE TURNER, West Virginia 1928-1935; 706 Riverside Dr., New York City.
- HOMER LEROY SHANTZ, Arizona 1928-1936; 454 Pasco del Descanso, Santa Barbara, Calif.
- CLARENCE VALENTINE BOYER, Oregon 1934-1937.
- WILLIAM LOWE BRYAN, Indiana 1902-1937; Bloomington, Ind.
- GEORGE HUTCHESON DENNY, Alabama 1912-1937; Chancellor, University of Virginia, Lexington, Va.
- MERVIN GORDON NEALE, Idaho 1930-1937; School of Education, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.
- WALTER E. CLARK, Nevada 1917-1938; 524 Cheney St., Reno, Nevada.
- FRANK LEROND McVEY, Kentucky 1917-1940; 249 Shady Lane, Lexington, Ky.
- EUGENE ALLEN GILMORE, Iowa 1934-1940; Dean of Law School, University of Pennsylvania, Pittsburgh, Pa.
- ARTHUR GRISWOLD CRANE, Wyoming 1922-1941; 3221 Dey Avenue, Cheyenne, Wyo.
- GEORGE WASHINGTON RIGHTMIRE, Ohio State University 1926-1938; Royal York Apts., 1445 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
- GEORGE THOMAS, Utah 1921-1941; 1317 East South Temple St., Salt Lake City, Utah.
- HERMAN G. JAMES, Ohio University 1935-1943; Apt. 505, 143 N. Parkside Ave., Chicago, Ill.
- JOSEPH G. BRANDT, Oklahoma University 1941-1943; University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill.

IV

PAST OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION

No records of any meetings are to be found for 1897-1898, 1899-1900, or 1900-1901. No meeting of the Association was held in 1902. The officers for 1896-1897 were elected for 1898-1899. The records seem to indicate the same officers were also re-elected for 1901-1902.

PRESIDENTS

- 1895-1902 *ROBERT BURWELL FULTON, Chancellor of University of Mississippi.
 1903-04 *GEORGE EDWIN MACLEAN, President of State University of Iowa.
 1904-05 *ELISHA BENJAMIN ANDREWS, Chancellor of University of Nebraska.
 1905-06 *RICHARD HENRY JESSE, President of University of Missouri.
 1906-07 *JAMES HUTCHINS BAKER, President of University of Colorado.
 1907-08 *CHARLES RICHARD VAN HISE, President of University of Wisconsin.
 1908-09 JACOB GOULD SCHURMAN, President of Cornell University.
 1909-10 *BROWN AYERS, President of University of Tennessee.
 1910-11 *WILLIAM OXLEY THOMPSON, President of Ohio State University.
 1911-12 WILLIAM LOWE BRYAN, President of Indiana University.
 1912-13 *EDMUND JANES JAMES, President of University of Illinois.
 1913-14 THOMAS FRANKLYN KANE, President of University of Washington.
 1914-15 *BENJAMIN IDE WHEELER, President of University of California.
 1915-16 *FRANK STRONG, Chancellor of University of Kansas.
 1916-18 *GUY POTTER BENTON, President of University of Vermont.
 1918-19 *A. ROSS HILL, President of University of Missouri.
 1919-20 *THOMAS DUCKETT BOYD, President of Louisiana State University.
 1920-21 EDWARD ASAHEL BIRGE, President of University of Wisconsin.
 1921-22 *HENRY SUZZALLO, President of University of Washington.
 1922-23 FRANK LEROND McVEY, President of University of Kentucky.
 1923-24 DAVID KINLEY, President of University of Illinois.
 1924-25 *ERNEST HIRAM LINDLEY, President of University of Kansas.
 1925-26 *JOHN CLINTON FUTRALL, President of University of Arkansas.
 1926-27 *WALTER ALBERT JESSUP, President of University of Iowa.
 1927-28 *ALBERT ALEXANDER MURPHREE, President of University of Florida.
 (Died December 20, 1927).

* Deceased.

- MELVIN AMOS BRANNON, Chancellor of University of Montana.
- 1928-29 HARRY WOODBURN CHASE, President of University of North Carolina.
- 1929-30 *LOTUS DELTA COFFMAN, President of University of Minnesota.
- 1930-31 GEORGE HUTCHESON DENNY, President of University of Alabama.
- 1931-32 WALTER ERNEST CLARK, President of University of Nevada.
- 1932-33 *WALTER HULLIHEN, President of University of Delaware.
- 1933-34 *ELMER BURRITT BRYAN, President of Ohio University. (Died Oct. 15, 1934).
GEORGE THOMAS, President of University of Utah.
- 1934-35 RALPH D. HETZEL, President of Pennsylvania State College.
- 1935-36 *ALFRED H. UPHAM, President of Miami University.
- 1936-37 *EDGAR ALBERT BURNETT, Chancellor University of Nebraska.
- 1937-38 *WILLIAM BENNETT BIZZELL, President of University of Oklahoma.
- 1938-39 ARTHUR G. CRANE, President of University of Wyoming.
- 1939-40 JOHN J. TIGERT, President of University of Florida.
- 1940-41 *J. F. ZIMMERMAN, President of University of New Mexico.
- 1941-42 ALEXANDER G. RUTHVEN, President of University of Michigan.
- 1942-43 HERMAN G. JAMES, President of Ohio University. (Resigned February 1, 1943).
HERMAN B. WELLS, President of Indiana University.
- 1943-44 JOHN L. NEWCOMB, President of University of Virginia.
- 1944-45 JOHN C. WEST, President of University of North Dakota.

SECRETARY-TREASURERS

- 1895-96 *RICHARD HENRY JESSE, President of University of Missouri.
- 1896-1902 *JOSEPH SWAIN, President of Indiana University.
- 1903-04 EDWARD ASAHEL BIRGE, President of University of Wisconsin.
- 1904-15 *GEORGE EMORY FELLOWS, President of University of Maine.
- 1910-15 *GUY POTTER BENTON, President of Miami University and University of Vermont.
- 1915-22 FRANK LEROND MCVAY, President of University of North Dakota and University of Kentucky.
- 1922-26 HARRY WOODBURN CHASE, President of University of North Carolina.
- 1926-27 RAYMOND MOLLYNEAUX HUGHES, President of Miami University.
- 1927-35 A. H. UPHAM, President of Miami University.
- 1935-42 HERMAN G. JAMES, President of Ohio University.
- 1942-45 DEANE W. MALOTT, Chancellor of University of Kansas.

* Deceased.

Index

- Accrediting Agencies, 87
- Active Members, 132
- Addresses by:
- Francis J. Brown, 77
 - W. B. Donham, 48
 - J. W. Fulbright, 58
 - C. E. Hostetler, 65
 - Fred J. Kelly, 19, 31
 - Harry K. Newburn, 34
 - James S. Thomson, 56
 - John C. West, 10
- Addresses on:
- A Professional Dean Looks at Liberal Arts, 48
 - Behind the Scenes with a Senator, 58
 - Federal Assistance to Higher Education, 77
 - Greetings from National Conference of Canadian Universities, 56
 - Legislation of Interest to State Universities, 19
 - Plans for Revision of the U.S. Office of Education, 31
 - Reorganization of Liberal Arts Curriculum at University of Iowa, 34
 - The State University and Its Neighbors, 10
 - The Veteran Vocational Rehabilitation and Education Training Program, 65
- Appendix, 131
- Appointment of Special Committees, 10
- A Professional Dean Looks at Liberal Arts, 48
- Auditing Committee, 10, 87
- Behind the Scenes with a Senator, 58
- Canadian Universities, Greetings from National Conference of, 56
- Committee Reports:
- Accrediting Agencies, 87
 - Auditing, 87
 - Distribution of War Surplus Commodities, 118
 - Group Life of Students, 59
 - Military Affairs, 25
 - Necrology, 129
 - Nominations, 86
 - Perpetuation of R.O.T.C., 25
 - Postwar Educational Problems, 34
 - Radio Broadcasting, 103
 - Relations with Foreign Students and Universities, 122
 - Resolutions, 119
 - Vocational Education, 97
- Constitution, 131
- Distribution of War Surplus Commodities, Special Committee on, 118
- Federal Assistance to Higher Education, 77
- Greetings from National Conference of Canadian Universities, 56
- Group Life of Students, 59
- Joint Committee on Accrediting Agencies, 87
- Legislation of Interest to State Universities, 19
- Members, Active, 132
- Members, Special, 134
- Military Affairs, Committee on, 25, 28

- | | |
|---|--|
| Necrology Committee, 10, 129 | Reports: |
| Nominations Committee, 10, 86 | Committees, Special and Standing (See Committee Reports) |
| Organization of the Association, 4 | Secretary-Treasurer, 17 |
| Past Officers (Presidents and Secretary-Treasurers), 137 | Resolutions Committee, 10, 119 |
| Perpetuation of R.O.T.C., Special Committee on, 25, 28 | Roll Call, 9 |
| Plans for Revision of U.S. Office of Education, 31 | Secretary-Treasurer's Report, 17 |
| Postwar Educational Problems, Special Committee on, 34 | Special Committees, Appointment of, 10 |
| President's Address, 10 | Special Committees, Reports of, 25, 34, 86, 87, 97, 118, 119, 129 |
| Program, 7 | Special Members, 134 |
| Radio Broadcasting, Committee on, 103 | Standing Committees, Reports of, 25, 59, 87, 103, 122 |
| Relations with Foreign Students and Universities, Committee on, 122 | The State University and Its Neighbors, 10 |
| Reorganization of Liberal Arts Curriculum at University of Iowa, 34 | The Veteran Vocational Rehabilitation and Education Training Program, 65 |
| | Treasurer's Report, 18 |
| | Vocational Education, Special Committee on, 97 |

183669

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA



3 1262 05240 7615

