



the green sheet

8P3

Circular Letter No. 11
Edited by Sandra Reeves

October 20, 1982

INSIDE TOPICS

Missouri Governor Christopher Bond and retiring U.S. Rep. Richard Bolling will head the program at NASULGC's 96th Annual Meeting in St. Louis, November 7-10.....1

Congress attended to some major budgetary items, such as the First Continuing Resolution for FY'83, before it recessed on October 1. But the scheduled lame-duck session could wreak confusion in an already complicated legislative agenda2

Debate on an unneeded reauthorization bill for NIH produces several unwanted issues--one of them fetal research.....4

Legislation protecting research animals now seems inevitable, but its form and timing is unsettled6

Congress steps in to cool the debate over indirect-costs reimbursement for research.....7

Student Aid: Congress sends the President a bill clarifying major student aid issues; a commission to study long-range problems in student aid funding sets its agenda; and a spot survey of NASULGC schools shows that enrollment and student aid funding are down.....11

Government and private sources are showing new interest in funding Soviet studies16

The proposal to create a Marine Affairs Division is under study by top Association committees17

Planning strategies to cope with the urban problems of the next two decades will be the focus of Urban Affairs Division delegates to the Annual Meeting19

Two new studies verify what we already knew or suspected: Americans have a deep commitment to education, and the growth in outside interference on the campuses is threatening academic progress22

Items of Note22

Grants26

Published by
The National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges
Office of Communications Services, Garv Hudgins, Director
One Dupont Circle, N.W., Suite 710
Washington, D.C. 20036
Telephone (202) 293-7120

96th Annual Meeting

Republican Gov. Christopher Bond of Missouri and the state's veteran Democratic Representative in the U.S. House of Representatives, Richard Bolling, are the principal speakers for General Sessions of the Association's 96th Annual Meeting in St. Louis, November 7-10.

This year's assembly will be held in the Chase Park Plaza Hotel. Rep. Bolling will speak at the 11 a.m. General Session Monday, Nov. 8, and Gov. Bond at 11 a.m. Tuesday, Nov. 9. The topics for both addresses are expected to relate to the Nov. 2 election results and to the outlook for American higher education.

Gov. Bond is mentioned as a future GOP Presidential prospect and Rep. Bolling is a scholar of the legislative process in Washington, thus both speakers will be speaking from vantage points of wide-ranging experience at the state and federal levels.

Registrations to date indicate that the attendance at this year's Annual Meeting will be 1,000 delegates. The 95th Annual Meeting, held last November in Washington, drew 1,014 delegates, including 103 presidents and chancellors.

Among special guests who will be at the 1982 Annual Meeting are Russell I. Thackrey, Executive Director Emeritus of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, Dr. Herman B. Wells, Chancellor of Indiana University, Dr. Elmer Ellis, former President of the University of Virginia and Dr. David Mathews, President of the Charles F. Kettering Foundation, former President of the University of Alabama and Ex-Secretary of HEW.

The Council of Presidents meets Monday and Tuesday, Nov. 8 and 9, from 8:30 to 10:30 a.m. Sen. Harrison Schmitt (R-NM), chairman of the Science, Technology and Space; the Rural Housing and Development; the Labor, Health and Human Services and the Education and Related Agencies Subcommittees of the Senate, is the speaker for the Presidents' luncheon. On Monday morning, the Honorable Peter McPherson, U.S. Agency for International Development, will address the Council on "International Development Opportunities."

The Senate of the Association will meet from 2 to 5 p.m. Monday, Nov. 8, and from 2:30 to 5 p.m. Tuesday, Nov. 9. NASULGC Divisions, Councils, Commissions and Committees all have scheduled working programs for the Annual Meeting, and these are detailed in the program schedule. Among them is a full series of programs on the impact of information technologies on American education and its implications for campus planning.

Government Relations Conference

The Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE) has scheduled a government relations conference based on the theme of "Building Better State Relations" at the Chase Park Plaza Hotel to coincide with the end of the

NASULGC Annual Meeting. Details about this conference may be obtained from CASE, State Relations, Suite 400, 11 Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036 (Tel: (202) 328-5920).

- - - - -

governmental relations

Moving Toward a Lame-Duck Session

When the Congress recessed on October 1, it had tended to a large number of major issues. A much larger number of issues, however, had been dealt with in part - by one House, or by both Houses without a conference settling differences; by a subcommittee and not full committee; on the floor and not finally resolved. During the eight-week break before Congress reconvenes on November 29, some pending issues could be moved forward dramatically by staff action, awaiting only their principal's approval. Mandatory retirement and immigration legislation, some appropriation bills and more could be prepared for definitive action in the brief post-election session.

Lame-duck sessions are usually characterized by the amount of significant work left undone before the election. Congressmen who have lost seats have greater freedom to act then, and those who have just been re-elected can vote with greater freedom, counting on a two-year hiatus between elections to dampen memories. The Congress generally rolls back to an enormous and complex agenda. After a while, Congress goes home, and generally, we find it has tended to the business it had to take care of, such as action on money bills to keep the agencies running. It has listened to much important rhetoric and accomplished little else.

There have been seven lame-duck sessions since 1945. Unlike the coming of locusts, they do not follow a precise cycle, although their potential for disaster is as great. The biggest danger in these post-election sessions is that they take place at a time when members have earned the right to be tired. They see little wisdom in precipitous action. They want to get some rest before the door opens on the next Congress, and their staffs are even more tired than they. A money bill is enacted with markup sessions lasting into the early hours of the morning, and i's are not dotted, and t's are not crossed because there is not enough time for staff to do that. A missing word or incomplete phrase can wreak havoc in a program or for a constituency unless speedy action in the next Congress provides the necessary correction.

The probability is that Congress will focus almost entirely on appropriations in the scheduled lame-duck session, especially since in recent weeks committees have brought bills very close to the point of enactment. A major bill will be the Continuing Resolution. The current CR for FY'83 runs only until December 17. Only HUD and Independent agencies (including NFS and NASA) are operating on their own appropriation bill. Several other agencies may see bills

passed early on in the lame-duck session, but education and HHS almost certainly will not. Any bill satisfactory to Congress would face a certain veto by the President, one that might not be easily overridden.

The new CR that must be passed before Christmas will confront the same attitude at OMB and the White House that we recall from last pre-Christmas week, when the President vetoed the bill, shut down the government for a day, and, in effect, said I am willing to pay the price if you do not produce a bill I can live with. What the President could live with a year ago was a 4 percent across-the-board cut and other trimming that ate into all higher education programs, with the exception of research in DOD. Is the Congress prepared to play "legislative chicken" with the President? With 10.1 percent unemployment in the country, there may well be many districts that vote against the Administration (if not against still popular President Reagan) and give the Democrats a substantial increase in the number of their seats in the House and conceivably several seats in the Senate. Also, fresh in the minds of members of Congress, is the veto override that was followed by the rejection in the House by a substantial vote of the balance budget amendment. If the number of Democratic seats gained is dramatic, then the President could face a new form of stalemate. The Republicans would be able to run against the obstructionist Democrats in 1984, but progress on the Administration's legislative programs would be negative.

Legislative Update

The First Continuing Resolution for FY'83

The House had begun work on the CR with serious attention given to drafting a measure that would run well into the new year. This was based on the hope that there would not be a lame-duck session, assuming that the new Congress would need time to organize itself before it could turn its attention to major money matters. Once the post-election session was scheduled, the date settled on for the demise of the CR became December.

It is quite likely that between November 29 and December 17, Congress will pass more appropriation bills, taking them beyond the coverage of the CR. Further, one House may pass a bill for some agencies, changing the standard now in the CR to one closer to that House's mark. It is also assumed that Congress will not be able to pass all appropriation bills and have them approved by the President, particularly the one dealing with HHS, Education and Labor, so that at least a limited-coverage CR will be necessary before the 97th Congress adjourns.

The major element in the current continuing resolution--one that achieved a Presidential signature--is the concession made by the House to the Senate on DOD funding. Though theoretically an emergency measure meant to tide the government over until permanent action can be taken, the CR, in its 54 stages of statutory language, manages to cover a considerable amount of legislative territory, including measures determining the eligibility of aliens for assistance

by the legal services corporation, numerous private bills to alleviate the problems of specific citizens, many detailed housing-assistance regulations. The resolution even finds space for the call to the President to designate a "national peace day" with appropriate commemorative activities. Much of the CR is traditional, i.e., given a conflict between House- and Senate-passed bills, the lesser amount prevails. Where one House has passed a bill, then the figure generally is the lesser amount between that level and the current rate of funding for FY'82. There are some complex variations on that theme based on the status of the appropriation bills.

For Labor, HHS and Education, funds are provided to continue activities "under the current terms and conditions and at a rate to maintain current operating levels"--in other words, FY'82 continues until Congress makes a further determination. In their separate CR proposals, the Senate spelled out particularly that this meant NIH was to receive sufficient additional funds over the President's request to allow it to maintain the current number of grants and to reject any need for cutting indirect costs.

Additional ingredients will go into the stew--especially the results of the '82 Congressional election--so that Congress will have other things in mind when it acts before Christmas. If it is forced to stay with the '82 base and give the President an across-the-board cut, student aid, health research and other programs will again be playing catch up in the '84 budget.

- - - - -

NIH Reauthorization

The most important fact about this piece of legislation is that it is not necessary. When the Congress enacted section 301 of the Public Health Service Act, it provided all of the authority needed by the Federal Government to undertake the conduct of biomedical research. Subsequently, Congress did provide specific authorizations for the two largest institutes of NIH--Heart, Blood and Lung, and Cancer--but the work done at those institutes, as well all others, can be conducted under the major authority.

Two years ago, Rep. Henry Waxman, chairman of the House Subcommittee on Health and the Environment, introduced legislation that would treat each NIH institute the same as many research programs in the Federal Government, such as NSF, requiring periodic reauthorizations. The argument presented was that this would assure proper Congressional oversight, and, as Waxman showed in his very high authorization levels, an opportunity for supportive Congressional forces to make more dollars available for biomedical research.

Without questioning Waxman's positive motivations, many in the biomedical research community challenged the wisdom of the regular authorization, noting that such action provided a rich opportunity for amendments to the law that could have harmful implications for the stability of research programs and, ultimately, for the strength of the nation's biomedical research generally. Waxman's proposal was not enacted, as time ran out in the Congressional calendar and the idea did not find equal support in the Senate.

This year was the reauthorization period for the two big institutes, and each House used the opportunity differently. The Senate bill coming out of the

Labor and Human Resources Committee chaired by Sen. Hatch (and on which Sen. Kennedy, the former chairman, is ranking minority) is a basic continuation of the status quo. There are a variety of amendments, including the proposal to establish a new arthritis institute (a tribute to its proponents, since the idea has been contained in every major bill affecting NIH this year).

In the House, Rep. Waxman produced a much more complex bill offering a variety of amendments to NIH. To critics, it appeared to revive the essential debate of two years ago. They saw a weakening of the all-important section 301 of the Public Health Service Act as each of the institutes is authorized in law. The bill also would create an arthritis institute and would amend a number of the mechanisms under which NIH functions. As in the past, the funding levels authorized for the institute are very sound and strongly argued for. When the bill came to the floor in late September, it was met with unusually heated debate. Ranking minority member Edward Maddigan (R-IL) and James Broyhill (R-NC) appeared to be accusing the subcommittee chairman of seeking power to control the operations of NIH. They offered a complete substitute (also endorsing an arthritis institute), which reauthorized everything in place, but at considerably lower funding levels. They also had a provision for a study to be done on the use of animals in biomedical research.

The minority substitute failed, and the Waxman bill was passed on the House floor. But not before another amendment passed, introduced by Rep. William Dannemeyer (R-CA). The Dannemeyer amendment read, "Sec. 8. The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall not conduct or support research or experimentation in the United States or abroad on a living human fetus or infant, whether before or after induced abortion, unless such research or experimentation is for the purpose of ensuring the survival of that fetus or infant." Opponents of the amendment noted that it would prohibit research leading to improved pregnancy outcome and infant health, such as the research that now allows physicians to detect and prevent "RH babies," research on the effects of drugs on pregnant women and developing fetuses, and others. Waxman objected to the amendment on the grounds that it covers research throughout HHS and is not limited, as the parent bill is, to NIH. The amendment was introduced in unusual fashion, to allow it to apply to the minority substitute legislation and at the same time to the committee bill. When the substitute failed, the amendment still could be alive in the committee bill, and it did so survive--by an astounding vote of 260-140.

Professionally, we must admire the skill of a single-interest group timing its actions one month before what promises to be a very tight election for many members. Proponents of this amendment apparently used the best form of political persuasion; it scared two-thirds of the members, many of whom now are praying that the Senate fails to act on the Hatch bill, thereby permitting action on NIH authorization to die with the 97th Congress. If the Hatch bill reaches the Senate floor for consideration, there is a thoughtful supporter of the Dannemeyer no-fetal-research amendment in the Senate who will introduce the model concept as an amendment to the Hatch bill, but this will take place after the election. Approximately one-third of the Senate will not have to run for re-election for six years, another third for four years, and the remainder for two years. They might treat the amendment for what it is: restriction on biomedical research and medical practice that could help no philosophical position represented by serious interest groups on any side of issues today. But there is no way of predicting its chances for passing, given political pressures.

With these developments, the biomedical research community would prefer having no NIH Reauthorization legislation this year. There would be penalties for that, however. For example, the Senate bill would resolve permanently the problem of taxability of National Research Service Awards by removing what the Internal Revenue Service calls the "quid pro quo" element of payback. Proponents of an arthritis institute would have been thwarted temporarily. Schools of public health would stand to lose the benefits from an amendment proposed in the legislation. Still, until Congress can devise a vehicle for authorizing NIH without creating unneeded disruption, no action appears the best choice.

- - - -

The Use of Animals in Research

The dilemma facing higher education in dealing with proposals to create new restrictions on the use of animals in research--proposals that have been with us for a long time, but appear to have increased their support in the Congress--is the degree to which such legislation is inevitable. The recent battle over set-asides of research funds in most agencies for small businesses led some to the conclusion that new strategies and tactics are necessary when--despite all reason and pragmatism--a bad bill has the votes and is going through. It is argued, for example, that in the small business legislation, had the higher education research community accepted the regrettable fact that small business had the votes in this election year, negotiations might have been possible to better protect basic research, an element of lesser interest to small business. This cut-your-losses theory cannot be proved, but provokes thought when applied to animal research.

Several bills prepared in this area for various members of Congress have been so extreme that they could not find a home, even in the prevailing favorable atmosphere. One of them would have had half of NIH's funds set aside for research in alternative methods. Attention has come to focus on the Subcommittee on Science Research and Technology, chaired by Rep. Doug Walgren (D-PA), although all of this legislation is aimed at biomedical research. In an orderly process, it would have been handled by the committee in the House responsible for biomedical research. But with a subcommittee chairman deeply committed to the legislation, it was reported jointly to two committees.

Walgren's bill, with finer amendments now H.R. 6928, was reported by the full Science and Technology Committee in late summer, and attention turned to the Subcommittee on Health and the Environment, holding the bill in joint referral. Rep. Walgren also is a member of that subcommittee, has worked closely with the chairman on legislation, and the subcommittee would presumably try to accommodate his interest. But study of the bill must have revealed to members of the subcommittee and their staff that, its positive intentions notwithstanding, the bill could provide serious problems for the conduct of biomedical research, which is one of the major responsibilities of the subcommittee. A new animal research bill was prepared in mid-September, conceding the same fundamental concerns of the Walgren bill and calling for more stringent monitoring of the use of animals in research, but avoiding some of the provisions that were of greatest concern to research scholars.

A proposal was presented to Walgren and his staff, with the understanding that if he accepted it, it would become a committee amendment to the NIH reauthoriza-

tion bill shortly to go to the floor of the House. However, it is believed there was also an understanding that passage of this legislation would preclude the committee's dealing with the issue again in the 98th Congress. Walgren apparently rejected the proposal, contending that his own bill, perhaps modified, was the proper vehicle to use, and the bill seemed out of contention for this year.

Now, a bill introduced by Sen. Dole (R-KS) that is almost identical to the Walgren bill sits in the Senate, waiting to see if the lame-duck session will provide an opening for creativity. In the House, such a bill would need to be added to a germane piece of legislation; in the Senate, it could be attached to the morning prayer. A more reasonable probability is that, if the NIH reauthorization bill now reported by Sen. Hatch's committee goes to the floor for action, an animal research bill would be an entirely appropriate subject for consideration as an amendment on the floor. Assuming that the Hatch bill does go to the floor, and the amendment is attached to it, the entire package would have to go to conference with the House of Representatives, where the major differences between the two pieces of legislation could preclude resolution before Congress adjourns.

On the other hand, the determination to have some kind of legislation could lead to compromise on the key provisions affecting NIH. Then the House could refuse to accept the animal research bill, while the Senate, to get its fair shake, could reject the Dannemeyer bill restricting fetal research.

- - - -

Indirect Costs and NIH

Finally, help from the Hill is making the potential impact of this problem on research universities less threatening. There was little belief that the proposals from HHS were to be a one-year solution to a tight money problem, if only because the tight-money problem would not lessen. Major changes in dealing with indirect costs were now on the docket. Congress had several opportunities for acting on this--the appropriations bill for HHS, the Continuing Resolutions, and authorizations bills for NIH. Sen. Hatch (R-UT) put language into the report of his bill reauthorizing NIH institutes that called for cheating indirect costs, as the regulations now require, only until evidence is available to indicate a different approach proper. He sent a sharply stated and precise argument to HHS Secretary Schweiker elaborating on this point and, in effect, calling for a moratorium.

Sen. Hatch's counterpart in the House, Rep. Henry Waxman, chairman of the Health and Environment Subcommittee, chose not to put language into his NIH bill, but sent a precise statement to Appropriations Subcommittee Chairman Natcher calling for adequate funding for NIH to obviate the need for the proposed cuts. Natcher marked up the HHS appropriation bill behind closed doors, so that no official language was available to the higher education community. However, the word soon leaked out that his committee had taken on this problem directly. They had added substantial funds--approximately \$257 million dollars--to NIH appropriations, providing ample cash to fund 4,600 new and competing awards, the same as this year, and enough to preclude any need for cutting indirect costs. (Such an action by the Subcommittee requires the endorsement of many members, but it is understood that Rep. Joe Early (D-MA) was the principle advocate for the universities, and that he found strong support in Reps. Bernard Dwyer (D-NJ) and Carl Pursell (R-MI).

As a statement of Congressional intent, such a bill and its report are most valuable. As a force of law, it can be ignored by agency officials. The same Congressional leadership, with others, turned therefore to the only vehicle for Congress to deal with the situation: the Continuing Resolution. The House version of the Resolution stated that funds were being made available to enable NIH to continue operating its program at the current level, meeting the same program stipulations. For most reasonable people, that Congressional text, used previously, meant that NIH had the necessary dollars to run the 4,600 awards and pay full reimbursement for indirect costs. However, there was some concern that OMB's linguistic deconstructionists might find some way of determining that the obvious was not the case. The Senate addressed the problem.

Sen. Harrison Schmitt (R-NM), with the necessary support of the committee leadership and other Senators, inserted language in the Senate version of the Continuing Resolution that spelled out an increase of \$205+ million for NIH and stated unequivocally--so that even OMB would understand--that indirect costs were to be fully reimbursed, according to existing regulations.

Before Congress had acted finally, word came from HHS staff members that the agency and NIH had pulled in its horns. For now, at least, the original plan of a 10% cut and its improved version affecting departmental administration were not to be implemented.

The final text of the Continuing Resolution is not as explicit as the Senate version, but no one expects a new surge of courage out of the bureaucracy to challenge Congress's clear intent. But the Continuing Resolution runs only until December 17. Congress returns November 29, and its major task will be to write appropriations bills and a Continuing Resolution to take care of federal agencies--perhaps until March 31. Language reaffirming Congress's intention will be needed.

Immigration Legislation

The complexity of the issues in a comprehensive reworking of immigration law and the many special interests involved made those developing the legislation doubtful that it could be enacted into law during this Congress. Although the Senate produced its bill, the internal conflict of the legislation seemed to preclude House action. But strategic compromises led to the bill's being reported out of the Judiciary Committee before the House recessed. It still must go to the House floor, where numerous amendments are waiting, and then must be re-worked in conference to accommodate the differences in the Senate's version--all within a matter of a few weeks. But people want legislation, and enough members of Congress want not to have to deal with the issue again during the next Congress, that a final bill is a real possibility.

The Senate responded to one of higher education's concerns by agreeing to permit 1,500 foreign students to remain in this country annually after graduating, a number that reflects current levels. The House went further, entirely removing the ceiling. However, both bills restrict the students to those involved in science technology and mathematics. An amendment will be offered on the House floor, perhaps by Rep. Barney Frank (D-MA), to remove the disciplinary limitation.

The second area of concern for higher education involves highly accomplished foreign scholars. The current law requires that they enter the United States under the "third preference" category. There is a ceiling on the number of persons admitted within the third preference, and this past summer a number of institutions found that foreign scholars who had accepted offers to teach and do research here could not obtain visas. The Senate moved university academicians into the "first preference," which has no ceiling, but changed the standard for admission by removing the phrase "equally qualified". The House changed the bill to a position closer to current law. The best final text would keep the professors in the first preference and also keep the "equally qualified" language for their admission.

Failure to pass a law would create no hardship for higher education. Also, passage of a bill that accepted the best of the House and Senate would be entirely acceptable. Due to the diligent efforts of a number of university representatives and association staff, the threat of the originally proposed immigration bills seems to have been offset.

- - - -

Mandatory Retirement

As with a number of key bills pending, time may be the determining factor here. The higher education community is united in its point of view. AAUP, ACE, AAU and NASULGC maintain that to protect tenure, a unique element in the academic system, and for other associated reasons, tenured faculty must be exempted from proposed legislation that would remove caps on retirement.

Sen. John Heinz (R-PA) and Sen. Donald Nickles (R-OK), chairman of the subcommittee responsible for the legislation, have been the principal Senate proponents for a change in the law. In the House, the principal advocate is Rep. Claude Pepper (D-FL), the most effective spokesman in Congress for the interests of senior citizens. The Senate leadership probably will not move with legislation that higher education believes can be damaging, and in the House, debates over formulas for timed exemptions have stalled passage to the House floor. (For further information, contact Jerry Roschwalb, Governmental Relations, NASULGC.)

- - - -

NATIONAL ACADEMY PROPOSES PROCEDURES FOR SECURITY-RELATED RESEARCH

In August, the 26th International Technical Symposium of the Society of Photo-Optical Instrumentation Engineers was scheduled to hold its annual meeting in San Diego. Some 600 papers were scheduled for presentation. But two days before the meeting, about 100 U.S. scientists were notified by phone that they were not to present theirs. Most of the scientists had research funded by one of the armed services, and the reason given for the last-minute censorship was national security.

Since August, numerous meetings have been held with high officials at DOD, and the conclusion drawn is the action was not a change in DOD policy, but a case of mishandling.

The incident focused the issues in the current debate over "Export Control"-- how to maintain the greatest amount of openness in publication and other forms of communication for scientific research and, at the same time, not "give away the store" to U.S. adversaries who would use such information to enhance their military status. There are laws on the books dealing with traffic in arms and control of products that may have national security implications, but what exists now is deemed too crude to apply to the dissemination of knowledge created primarily in university laboratories. The Commerce Department, responsible for export control regulations, appears to have scrapped the recommendations produced over the years and put together an inter-agency task force to address the issue anew.

Of special interest in this fresh examination is the recent study conducted by the National Academy of Sciences called "Scientific Communication and National Security." A panel with the same title, chaired by Dale R. Corson, President Emeritus of Cornell University, presented its report on September 28. Members of the panel were drawn from academic research centers, government agencies concerned with research, law firms and private corporations. Their detailed report establishes the high importance accorded to the open exchange of information for the conduct of university research programs, and states that the vast majority of research should not be subject to government-imposed restrictions.

But, the report notes, where direct military relevance is contained in research findings, such information should be classified. The key area of concern is what the report considers "gray areas."

"These research areas are at the ill-defined boundary between basic research and application, and are characteristic of fields where the time from discovery to application is short," the report says. "At present, the portion of the field of microelectronics is the most visible of these technologies."

The panel recommends that no restrictions be placed on such research unless four criteria are met. The criteria are: 1) The technology is developing rapidly. There is a short time between basic science and application. 2) The technology has identifiable, near-term military applications. 3) Transfer of the technology, including "process know-how," would give the USSR a significant military advantage; and 4) The United States (or other friendly nations) is the only source of information about the technology.

For research meeting all four of these criteria, the Academy proposes a contractual relationship between the sponsor and the University. Papers, lectures and other forms of communication on the sensitive research would be submitted to the sponsoring agency prior to delivery for a 60-day period of parallel scrutiny. The government, if it saw the need, could use this 60-day jaw-boning period to try to convince the researchers to change or withdraw the article or lecture. The university could offer counter-arguments. After such a process, however, the ultimate right of publication would remain with the universities.

Academy President Frank Press, speaking to the NASULGC Executive Committee in September, defended the proposal as a fair and workable compromise between interests of vital concern to the nation. The plan would maintain academic freedom by ensuring ultimate right of publication, but would allow the govern-

ment time, in the cases it considered serious, to present its arguments and use its "powerful jaw-boning advantages": the threat of contract cancellation or government classification.

The initial reaction to the report by senior federal officials was positive, with assurances that it would be given full consideration. The university community is studying the proposals as a point of departure for future negotiations. Even if the recommendations are acceptable, questions remain on how they might be implemented.

- - - -

Student Aid Update

Pell Grant Legislation Ready for President's Signature

Higher education achieved a major victory with the passage before recess of S. 2852, the Student Financial Assistance Technical Amendments Act of 1982. This vital legislation, which had strong bipartisan support from both Houses of Congress, establishes the formulas used in determining students' eligibility for Pell grants and Guaranteed Student Loans for the 1983-84 academic year. The bill is awaiting the President's signature, which is expected.

The final conference version of S. 2852, which now appears to be supported by the Administration, and which passed both Houses without objection, contains the following provisions:

- Establishes the maximum Pell grant for 1983-84 at \$1,800.
- Requires that the current limits for off-campus costs (\$1,100 for room and board, \$400 for books and supplies) used in determining a Pell grant be those used for academic years 1983-84 and 1984-85. The Administration had proposed to lower the \$1,500 allowance to \$1,000 for commuter students.
- Separates the needs analysis system used for the campus-based programs (CWS, SEOG, NDSL) from that used for Pell grants. This is necessary so that the restrictions made in the Pell formula to stay within inadequate funding levels do not have to apply in determining eligibility for other student aid programs.
- Establishes the 1982-83 Pell grant schedule, updated for inflation, as the 1983-84 schedule. It also revises a change made last year regarding treatment of veterans' education benefits. Previously, only one-half of VA benefits were counted as part of the family income, and then only a portion of that amount was considered in determining the Pell grant. Last year, as part of the Third Continuing Resolution, Congress enacted a modified Reagan administration proposal to count 100% of VA benefits as a student resource, so that the combination of family contribution, VA benefits and Pell grant

could not exceed the cost of education. This change resulted in most veteran students becoming ineligible for Pell grants. S. 2852 reserves the change for 1983-84, and for 1982-83 sets aside \$30 million of the \$140 million for Pell grants added in the recently enacted supplemental appropriation bill. This \$30 million will be used to restore awards immediately for these students by only counting one-third of VA benefits as a student resource. This method allows the campus financial aid officer to make the award restoration rather than requiring all veteran students to have their awards reprocessed, which would have resulted in a 6-8 week delay.

- Provides that, if the Secretary of Education does not submit the 1984-85 Pell schedule by April 1, then the 1983-84 schedule, again updated for inflation, will automatically become the 1984-85 schedule. This establishes a safety net to ensure timely delivery of student aid.
- Establishes a linear reduction of Pell awards if there is insufficient funding to fully meet the schedule. This reduction formula protects the lowest income students from cuts.
- Establishes the 1982-83 GSL schedule, updated for inflation, as the 1983-84 schedule, and requires that it be published by April 1.
- Provides that for each of the three campus-based programs, if funding falls below the FY'81 levels, then each state's allocation will be proportionately reduced.
- Expands the student loan information provision required to be given to student borrowers under both GSL and NDSL. This action was put in as a "trade-off" for student loans being exempt from the Truth-in-Lending statute. (This exemption was passed as part of an omnibus banking bill, H.R. 6267.)
- Drops the Senate provision allowing state agencies to consolidate student loans, and terminates Sallie Mae's Consolidation authority on August 1. The conferees called on GAO to do a comprehensive study of student loan consolidation and plan a Congressional review of this issue next year. The bill also extends for two years an important provision dealing with SLMA bankruptcy.
- Requires the National Center for Education Statistics to continue to collect and publish through 1985, tuition, fee, room and board charges for institutions of higher education and to display this data by Congressional district.

- - - -

House Appropriations Committee Reports FY'83 Appropriations For Education

On September 29, just two days before the start of FY'83, the House Appropriations Committee reported the FY'83 Appropriations bill for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education. The bill contains few surprises, and as has been the case the last three years, these agencies will likely be provided for through a series of Continuing Resolutions.

For higher education, the Committee level-funded all student aid programs at the FY'82 level. A total of \$3.569 billion was included, an increase of \$1.769 billion over the President's FY'83 request. The breakdown of this figure is: Pell - \$2.419 billion, SEOG - \$355.4 million, CWS - \$528 million, NDSL - \$178.56 million, and SSIG - \$73.68 million. These are the same amounts these programs would have in FY'83 under the terms of the Continuing Resolution.

The Guaranteed Student Loan program was maintained at current policy, and \$2.485 billion included. This is the amount requested by the President. The Committee report noted, "Since this is an entitlement program, a supplemental budget request will have to be submitted as soon as the full-year cost can be more accurately estimated." Current CBO estimates for FY'83 GSL costs are about \$3.2 billion, down from earlier estimates of \$3.9 billion, due to declining interest rates. Under the CR, GSL would receive the full amount needed for FY'83 to maintain current operating levels.

Other higher education programs were either level-funded or received small increases--\$9 million for TRIO, \$1 million for International Education, and \$1.3 million for Graduate and Professional Opportunities Program (GPOP).

- - - -

Student Aid Commission Sets Research Agenda

The National Commission on Student Financial Assistance, established in the 1980 Education Amendments, has approved an overall research design to accomplish the studies mandated by the Congress.

The Commission is composed of 12 members, four each appointed by the President, the Speaker of the House, and the President Pro Tempore of the Senate. Among members of the Commission are David Gardner, President of the University of Utah; Kenneth Ryder, President of Northeastern University; John Brademas, President of N.Y.U.; Sen. Robert Stafford (R-VT), chairman of the Senate Education Subcommittee; Sen. Claiborne Pell (D-RI), ranking Democrat of the subcommittee; Rep. William Ford (D-MI) and Rep. Wendell Bailey (R-MO), both members of the House Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education, and David Irwin, Director, Washington State Friends of Higher Education. The Commission is chaired by David Jones, director of development at Vanderbilt University, selected by President Reagan.

To date, the Commission has completed two reports: Guaranteed Student Loans: A Background Paper, and A Study of the Insurance Premium Charged to Borrowers Under the Guaranteed Student Loan Program (still in draft form, but available for comment). Other reports soon to be released cover the in-school interest subsidy and the special allowance in GSL.

To carry out the remaining studies, four subcommittees have been established. They include:

- 1) Appropriate Balance (Chaired by David Gardner) - will examine the question of "What is the appropriate balance of grants, loans and self-help that ought to be required of students and their parents in financing postsecondary education?" Among specific topics within this subcommittee's purview are loan burden, investment returns on postsecondary education, generation shifts of the loan burden, default rates, the effects of different types of aid on educa-

tional performance and career choice, an analysis of future family incomes, the interaction of federal, state and institutional programs, and the effect of student aid on costs of postsecondary education.

2) Sources of Funds Subcommittee (chaired by Ken Ryder) - will primarily deal with the sources, availability, and costs of loan capital for students.

3) Graduate Education Subcommittee (chaired by John Brademas) - will complete specific studies required by the legislation: to analyze sources of support available to graduate students (including support from the federal, state, and local governments, foundations and corporations, institutions of higher education, the student and the family) in general and by academic discipline; to examine whether students are dissuaded from pursuing graduate education; to investigate graduate student indebtedness; to assess the desirability of establishing a new federal graduate student assistance program in which students are selected based on merit and/or need; and to examine methods to enhance the participation of disadvantaged students in graduate education.

4) Governance and Administrative Issues Subcommittee (chaired by Dave Irwin) - is responsible for investigating appropriate mechanisms for: the effective and efficient delivery of student financial assistance, including ways to reduce default, fraud and abuse; the packaging of student aid; the effective origination, servicing and collection of student loans, and adequate and timely information about aid programs to students and their families.

For those desiring to contact the Commission directly, the chief executive officer is Richard T. Jerue, 412 First Street, S.E., Washington, DC 20003 (202) 472-9023.

- - - -

Preliminary NASULGC Data Show Declines In Enrollment, Student Aid Funds

Responses to a brief survey sent by President Robert L. Clodius to 25 NASULGC member institutions, representing a cross-section of the membership by region and size of enrollment, show that of 24 campuses providing data, total enrollment declined by 1,513 students (-0.3%) to 526,573 in 1982-83, from 528,086 in the 1981-82 academic year. Twelve campuses had reductions in enrollment, ranging up to a drop of 1,048 students (-6.3%) at the University of Oregon. Other schools showing enrollment declines were: University of California, Los Angeles (555 students, -1.7%); University of New Hampshire (275 students, -2.5%); University of Kentucky (431 students, -1.9%); University of Vermont (210 students, -1.9%), Oregon State University (873 students, -5.0%), University of California-Berkeley (593 students, -1.9%), Southern Illinois University (258 students, -1.1%), Purdue University (342 students, -1.0%), Washington State University (548 students, -3.2%), and University of Missouri, Columbia (179 students, -0.7%).

Eleven schools showed an increase in enrollment, with the University of Puerto Rico gaining 1,365 students (+2.7%). Other schools which responded to the survey with increased enrollments were: Rutgers (+54 students, +0.1%), University of Connecticut (+63 students, +0.3%), Iowa State University (+704 students, +2.9%), Southern University, New Orleans, (+156 students, +6.1%), Southern University, Shreveport (+32 students, +4.9%), Southern University,

Baton Rouge (+63 students, +0.7%), University of Utah (+377 students, +1.6%), University of Maryland, Eastern Shore (+96 students, +9.3%), University of Wyoming (+265 students, +2.8%), and New Mexico State (+219 students, +1.8%).

The University of Florida projected no change in enrollment.

The preliminary data seem to counter some press reports that show large enrollment shifts from private colleges to state-funded institutions. While some of our schools increased in size, the net effect was a decrease.

Regarding student aid funds, of the 19 schools responding, total recipients of federal aid decreased significantly--down by 8,431 (-5.4%) to 148,216 from 156,647 in 1981-82. Actual dollars received dropped at a rate more than twice that, down \$24.3 million (11.1%) to \$195.2 million in 1982-83 from \$219.5 million the previous year.

Eleven campuses had a drop in the number of recipients, with Purdue showing the largest decline of 4,000 recipients, a 22.6% drop from 1981-82. Five other schools had a decline of over 10%: University of New Hampshire, Rutgers, University of Connecticut, University of Maryland, Eastern Shore, and University of Missouri, Columbia.

Fifteen institutions had a drop in total federal student aid dollars available, with Purdue showing the steepest decline of \$8.9 million, a 24.3% decline, largely resulting from fewer Guaranteed Student Loans. Eight other schools (University of New Hampshire, Rutgers, University of Connecticut, University of Vermont, University of Maryland, Eastern Shore, University of Wyoming, University of Florida, and University of Missouri, Columbia) also had a greater than 10% loss of funds.

The biggest increase in student aid dollars was at New Mexico State, which had a \$1.2 million increase (23.1%). The only other school with a greater than 10% increase was Southern University, New Orleans. (For further information, contact Joel Packer, NASULGC Office of Governmental Relations.)

- - - -

international programs

BIFAD Names Members for Newly Merged Joint Committee

Approving a reorganization that merges its two former committees, the Board for International Food and Agriculture Development (BIFAD) has announced the appointment of new members to its joint committee. The Joint Committee on Agricultural Research and Development (JCARD), as it will be called, will be co-chaired by Hugh Poponoe, director of international programs at the University of Florida, and Jack Robbins, AID Director for Agriculture, Bureau of Science and Technology, and former dean of agriculture at Washington State University.

Other university representatives are: Fred Humphries, Tennessee State University; Ralph Smuckler, Michigan State University; Rodney Foil, Mississippi State University; Jean Kearns, University of Arizona; Francille Firebaugh, Ohio State University; Charlie Hess, University of California, Davis; Ed Shuh, University of Minnesota; and Alan Christensen, California State, Pomona.

The new committee replaces the former Joint Research Committee (JRC) and the Joint Committee on Agricultural Development (JCAD). It will continue to have representatives from AID and other government agencies, and the private sector.

- - - -

Colorado State Signs First AID "Memorandum of Understanding"

Colorado State University and the Agency for International Development (AID) signed on October 4 a memorandum to establish "an efficient and effective long-term partnership and working relationship" between the two organizations.

CSU is the first university in the country to be chosen to sign such an agreement, but two other institutions, the University of Florida and Purdue University, are also negotiating for similar agreements.

The "memorandum of understanding" calls for joint planning and implementation of international food, nutrition and agricultural development programs between CSU and AID to help solve problems of developing countries. The memorandum is in effect for five years and may be renewed annually for one year.

- - - -

New Interest in Support for Soviet Studies

A proposal for a \$50 million endowment by the U.S. Treasury to support a Soviet Bloc Research and Training Fund (S. 2919) has been introduced by Sen. Richard Lugar (R-IN) and Sen. Joseph Biden (D-DE). John Ryan, President of Indiana University and International Affairs Committee chairman, testified on behalf of the bill for NASULGC during hearings held September 22 by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

The \$50 million endowment would be self-sustaining after the initial appropriations, with the interest from the endowment supporting leading umbrella organizations in the field of Soviet studies, such as the National Council for Soviet and East European Research, the International Research and Exchanges Board (IREX) and the Kennan Institute for Advanced Russian Studies.

Under its National Manpower Development program, the program would fund scholarships for the entrance of about 10 scholars each year for an average of four years training, amounting to a total program of about 40 students. There is strong bipartisan support for the bill, but no action is expected this year, unless a possibility arises during the lame-duck session. However, it is expected to resurface next year. A similar House version may be introduced by Paul Simon (D-IL) and Lee Hamilton (D-IN).

Private funding sources also appear to be interested in the Soviet studies field. W. Averell Harriman, former U.S. ambassador to the Soviet Union, is expected to announce a \$1 million gift to Soviet studies at Columbia University, and the Rockefeller Foundation is reported considering a plan to provide two grants of \$1 million each to major American universities.

- - - - -

Foreign Students Earned Half of U.S. Ph.D's In Engineering Last Year

More foreigners than U.S. citizens earned doctoral degrees in engineering from U.S. universities in 1981, according to an annual survey by the National Research Council. Of 2,528 Ph.D. degrees in engineering in 1981, 49.1% went to foreigners and 46.2% to Americans. The nationality of 4.7% was unknown. It was the first year since the annual survey began in 1958 that the number of doctorates awarded to foreigners exceeded Americans in a broad field such as engineering. (For further information, contact Margaret Fahs, NASULGC.)

- - - - -

marine affairs

Marine Division Proposal Elicits Detailed Study by NASULGC Committees

At the September 28th meeting of the NASULGC Executive Committee, University of Delaware president E. A. Trabant, chairman of the NASULGC Marine Affairs Committee, presented a memorandum proposing the establishment of a Marine Division within the Association. He emphasized the importance of marine issues in higher education today and pointed out that a coherent national group was essential to the maintenance and advancement of the marine sciences. He also said that the division could provide a forum within the Association in which universities that participate in such organizations as the Sea Grant Association, Joint Oceanographic Institutions, Inc., and the University National Oceanographic Laboratory System would be able to formulate plans and programs for the conservation and development of the marine environment.

Executive Committee members raised questions about membership, affiliate membership and staffing and financial arrangements for the division. President Trabant responded by saying that participation fees would be solicited from NASULGC members which wanted to be represented in the division, and noted that the Sea Grant Association would reduce its membership to partly offset the NASULGC participation fee. He also proposed that a limited number of non-NASULGC members which have major ocean programs be permitted to join the division by paying the participation fee. The division proposal need not require adding staff to NASULGC, said Trabant.

Members of the Executive Committee suggested that the NASULGC Policies and Issues Committee review the questions involving membership, affiliate member-

ship and financing, to decide how best to resolve these issues in the interest of marine affairs and the Association as a whole.

University of Florida President Robert Marston, chairman-elect of the Executive Committee, agreed that the marine sciences are very important to the nation and to the universities, that the opportunity to bring together the various interests in the Marine community was very important, and that an integrated approach through the Association would be effective in representing marine and university interests to the Congress and the Executive branch. Because of the significance of these matters and his concern that "it be done correctly," President Marston urged that the subject of division status be reviewed by the Policies and Issues Committee for further recommendation to the Executive Committee.

Recognizing the consensus on Dr. Marston's views, the subject of the Marine Division was referred to the Policies and Issues Committee with the understanding that the committee would report back to the Executive Committee at its next meeting in November. This meeting will take place on November 7, during the NASULGC Annual Meeting in St. Louis.

- - - -

Sea Grant Funded at \$25 Million in the First FY'83 Continuing Resolution

On October 2, President Reagan signed PL97-276, providing Continuing Appropriations for FY'83 through December 17.

Under the provision of this resolution, all programs funded under the FY'83 Commerce, Justice, State Appropriation Bill, in which Sea Grant funds are provided, are to be funded at the lower of the levels provided in bills reported to the House (H.R. 6957) or to the Senate (S. 2956). Neither House of Congress had passed an FY'83 Commerce, Justice, State Appropriation Bill by October 1. The House Committee Report provides funding for Sea Grant at an annual rate of \$25 million. The Senate Committee Report provides for funding at \$35 million, the level of the FY'82 appropriation. The House traditionally acts first on appropriation bills, but House consideration of H.R. 6957 has been held up by a still unresolved controversy concerning the Federal Trade Commission provisions of the bill.

The period covered by the Continuing Resolution, October 1 through December 17, represents 22% of FY'83. Commerce Department officials anticipate that approximately 22% of \$25 million, or roughly \$5.5 million, will be available for the Sea Grant program between now and December 17. Only the Puerto Rico program will be up for renewal during this period.

During the lame-duck session of the 97th Congress, which begins on November 29, Congress will resume consideration of the FY'83 Commerce, Justice, State Appropriation Bill. In recent years, controversy over school prayer amendments to this appropriation bill has prevented its enactment and has resulted in funding departments and agencies covered by the bill through Continuing Appropriation Resolution.

- - - -

urban affairs

Planning Strategies Project to be Focus of Division's Annual Meeting Program

Intense discussion of how urban university leaders can best confront the internal and external problems facing them will highlight the Division of Urban Affairs Program at the 1982 NASULGC Annual Meeting in St. Louis, November 7-10. Both plenary and small working sessions will allow delegates and chief executive officers opportunities to examine the progress of the Division's major project, begun in 1981, to conduct a strategic analysis of the urban university in the last two decades of the century. Other Division sessions will focus on specific, critical issues urban universities will increasingly be called upon to address in the next several years.

The Division's program will open with a plenary session on Sunday afternoon, November 7, during which the first-phase results of the planning strategies project will be presented and discussed. (In preparation for this discussion, a copy of the first phase report will be sent to each Division voting delegate and chief executive officer later this month.) The Sunday plenary session and a subsequent working session will provide significant opportunities for reaction, comment and contribution to the current stage of the project and to its future development.

On Monday afternoon, November 8, the application of computer learning technologies to the needs of "non-traditional" students will be discussed, with a particular "case study" focus on programs developed by the University of Delaware. A Tuesday morning, November 9, session will feature problems and opportunities in urban university-urban public school collaboration, with particular attention to the Division's pilot project in five cities to build closer linkages between urban university chief executive officers and urban school superintendents. An afternoon session on November 9 will focus on the changing nature of urban university student body composition in the face of current Administration budget cuts, with particular attention to minority student concerns and to the urban student survey currently being conducted by the College Board.

Finally, an open meeting of the Division's Executive Committee on Wednesday morning, November 10, will restate the issues raised during the previous two days and suggest avenues for continued involvement by Division member institutions in the future stages of its strategies project.

Undergirding formal sessions will be a small working discussion, to be offered during the evening of November 8. Participation is especially encouraged in this intensive, strategies-oriented working session, in order that the project may respond as closely as possible to the needs and concerns institutions may be dealing with as they try to implement their urban mission.

Opportunities for socializing will also be provided to Division delegates and friends, including a reception on Sunday evening, November 7, featuring welcoming remarks by Vincent Schoemehl, mayor of St. Louis and an alumnus of the University of Missouri, St. Louis. Informal cash bar social hours will also be provided on Monday and Tuesday evenings.

Complete program information has been sent to voting delegates and chief executive officers. To obtain copies, and for answers to questions about the Annual Meeting, please contact Nevin Brown, assistant director for Urban Affairs, in the NASULGC Washington office.

- - - - -

November Workshops Slated on Meeting Urban Students' Needs

The Division of Urban Affairs will sponsor two regional workshops next month on meeting needs of urban students. The first, sponsored in conjunction with the University of Houston, will be "Addressing the Needs of the Underprepared Student: A Model for the 80's," held on the University of Houston's Downtown College campus on Saturday, November 13. It will focus on a two-part program developed and successfully implemented by the university to assist the underprepared student, a major problem facing urban colleges and universities in the coming decade. Combining a rigorous entry program of testing and orientation with a series of foundation courses in mathematics, English, and reading skills, the program has lowered the university's attrition rates, raised re-enrollment rates and helped underprepared students reach their full potential in the higher education setting.

The Houston workshop is oriented particularly to needs of urban university administrators and student service personnel in the Southwest; it will immediately follow a conference of the Southeast Texas Association of Colleges and Universities on serving underprepared students, which will feature Martin Trow, professor of higher education at the University of California, Berkeley.

The second workshop will be sponsored in conjunction with the University of Missouri, Kansas City, and will repeat the highly successful workshop held at UMKC in April, 1982. Entitled "Reducing the Dropout Rate: Retention with Integrity", the workshop will be held Monday, November 15, on the UMKC campus. It will focus on programs developed by the university's Student Learning Center to reduce attrition and increase levels of academic performance not only by underprepared students, but by "traditional" and graduate students as well. This workshop will be oriented particularly to needs of urban university administrators and student service personnel in the Midwest and Great Plains states.

Information on both workshops may be obtained from Nevin Brown in the NASULGC Washington office and is also available by calling Alice Laine, Department of Behavioral Sciences, University of Houston Downtown College (713) 749-2051, or Deanna Martin, Director of the Student Learning Center, University of Missouri, Kansas City (816) 276-1174.

- - - - -

Cooperative Education Program Development to be Topic of Conference Series

The National Commission for Cooperative Education, an organization which involves a number of NASULGC institutions, is offering a series of conferences during the 1982-83 academic year for university chief executive officers, administrators, faculty members, and cooperative education professionals on cooperative education program development. The conferences will focus both on improving linkages between the college classroom and the world of work through cooperative education programs and on the opportunities offered by Title VIII as a funding source to support development of such programs.

In addition to discussion of external funding sources, the conferences will address the uses of strategic planning, budgeting, and institutional consensus building in supporting effective cooperative education in colleges and universities.

Six conferences are scheduled through January, 1983, in all parts of the country. They are: November 8-10 in San Diego; November 17-19 in Boston; December 6-8 in Denver; December 13-15 in Tampa; January 6-7 in Seattle; and January 6-7 in Chicago. Specific conference information may be obtained from John Dromgoole, the Commission's associate director (617) 437-3768 or Arthur J. Lendo, director of special projects (617) 437-2439. General information on the Commission and its programs may be obtained from either person at the Commission's mailing address: 360 Huntington Avenue, Boston, MA 02115.

- - - -

Higher Education and the Handicapped Resource Directory Available

The HEATH Resource Center has released its 1982-83 Higher Education and the Handicapped Resource Directory, an expanded, updated version of the previous directory circulated widely to NASULGC institutions. It contains information about 72 organizations and agencies with particular relevance to higher education and the handicapped. Included is a brief look at the Section 504 regulations of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 as they relate to higher education, and sections on Federal resources, awareness, employment, and support and funding resources. The Directory is organized according to specific disabilities and is indexed for easy reference. It is suitable for distribution at conferences, training sessions, and workshops, as well as for inclusion in student orientation packets. Sufficient copies have been printed to make multiple copies available at no charge to interested institutions.

The Directory is available from Nevin Brown in the NASULGC Washington office, or from HEATH Resource Center; One Dupont Circle; Washington, DC 20036, Attn: Rhona Hartman, Telephone: (202) 833-4707.

- - - -

Report on National Urban Policy Meeting Now Available

"Urban Universities and National Urban Policy: Report on a Meeting of Urban University Presidents and Chancellors," is now available from the NASULGC Division of Urban Affairs. The report is a detailed summary of the discussion by urban university leaders last June of critical urban issues now facing Ameri-

can cities and the implications of such problems for urban higher education in the 1980's.

With assistance from members of the Committee on National Urban Policy of the National Research Council and other resource persons drawn from the political and practitioner levels, urban university presidents and chancellors from both NASULGC and non-NASULGC member institutions offered perceptions and comments at the meeting which are timely and relevant to leaders of all NASULGC institutions. The urban university strategies project currently being implemented by the Division, and additional meetings for urban university leaders during 1983, will continue to integrate the themes of the June meeting as fundamental reference points for the Division's future work.

Copies of the report may be obtained through Nevin Brown, NASULGC.

- - - - -

items of note

New Carnegie Report Cites Academic Peril of Increasing Outside Interference

What many university presidents already knew has been verified and examined in a new report by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching: intrusion by outside agencies at the state, federal and even corporate levels of society is threatening academic goals and effectiveness.

"The Control of The Campus--A Report on the Governance of Higher Education," prepared under the direction of Foundation President Ernest L. Boyer, former U.S. Commissioner of Education and former NASULGC Chairman, says that increased demands for accountability by agencies beyond the campus "have caused confusion about where authority is lodged and have worn down the traditional governance structures of higher education." It calls on colleges to increase their efforts in self-regulation, and offers a new governance framework for higher education, comprising 45 detailed recommendations aimed at protecting campus integrity while also providing for public accountability.

In releasing the report October 10, Boyer cited particularly the increased interference of state agencies in academic governance. "There used to be widespread concern about federal intervention in university life, but the ground rules have changed dramatically in the last two years," he said. "State agencies and independent accrediting bodies are now much more interventionist than the federal government."

Since 1950, state operating funds for colleges and universities have grown from \$490 million to \$17.6 billion. In the same 30-year period, the number of states with coordinating or governing boards for higher education has risen from 19 to 47.

But the increased oversight accompanying such expenditures has not necessarily been synonymous with greater efficiency or effectiveness, the report says. State budget considerations now heavily influence academic decision-making in such states as Pennsylvania, where state approval is required for all state university expenditures of more than \$1,000, Arkansas, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Florida, and New York, said Boyer. State legislatures in Arizona and Nevada dictate student-faculty ratios at their state universities, he noted, and in New York, business and professional trips by state university faculty are screened by state agencies.

The report also decries the new clout of specialized accrediting groups in controlling campus personnel and program considerations and warns that the growing relationship between universities and corporate concerns "imperils colleges and universities in much the same way as the church and the state have threatened university integrity in the past."

Copies of the report, now being prepared for publication, may be obtained by contacting the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue, Washington, DC 20036. Telephone: (202) 387-7200.

- - - -

Survey Assesses American Attitudes Toward Higher Education

At an October 8 press conference featuring Notre Dame University President Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C., the results of a major nationwide public opinion poll on attitudes toward colleges and universities were released. The survey, sponsored by 11 higher education associations and conducted by Group Attitudes Corporation of New York, involved interviews with a stratified sample of 1,188 persons aged 18 and over, representative of the U.S. adult population as a whole. Results showed surprising depth in the public commitment to federal support for higher education, though such commitment appeared to have a practical rather than a philosophical basis.

Here are highlights from the survey report:

- ° A substantial proportion of Americans view aid to education as a priority item in the federal budget. Aid to education ranked fourth of nine budget areas. In terms of federal programs that Americans think should be cut back the least, respondents feel that school lunch programs, defense spending, aid to agriculture, welfare programs and the space program are all more deserving of budget cuts than is aid to higher education. The following percentages of respondents feel these programs "should not be cut back at all": medical care for the aged (68.0%), cancer and medical research (62.0%), energy research and development (43.1%), aid to higher education (42.2%), school lunch programs (33.5%), national defense spending (32.5%), aid to agriculture (28.6%), social welfare programs (22.5%), and the space program (19.9%).
- ° Americans especially favor continued government support of collegiate research in medicine and the physical sciences. Eighty-one percent think the federal government should continue to underwrite medical research at American universities, and 64.0% think government should continue to fund research in the physical sciences. Fewer favor federal support of research

in the humanities (41.8%), the social sciences (39.0%) and programs in the arts (25.9%).

- If declining enrollment should lead colleges to cut back on certain curricula, a majority of Americans think programs in engineering and the applied sciences (81.6%), professional fields (80.1%), the hard sciences (72.5%) and the social sciences (53.7%) should be cut back only slightly, if at all. Given the choice, Americans would sooner see substantial cuts in remedial learning programs (48.1%), the fine and performing arts (54.4%) and the humanities (32.5%).
- A large majority of Americans (72.5%) think the overall quality of higher education in the United States is "good" or "excellent". Another 32.1% rate the quality of a collegiate education as "fair", and only 3.6% rate it as "poor". Better than a third of all Americans (38.8%) believe the quality of higher education in the United States is improving, and a similar proportion (36.1%) think it is staying about the same. About one-fourth (23.6%) think the quality of collegiate education is getting worse.
- Nine out of 10 Americans (90.2%) think the things a person learns in college are important for later life. Of those polled, 54.1% regard a college education as "very important", 36.8% think it is "somewhat important", and only 2.3% think it is "not at all important" for later life. Clear majorities of Americans agree that a college-educated person is more likely to be a community leader (71.5%) and more likely to be self-supporting (68.7%) than would be an individual who never went to college.
- A majority of Americans who have plans to help finance a college education for their children are very concerned that they may not have sufficient funds to do so. Only 11.1% are confident they will be able to pay for higher education for their children, while 53.7% are not sure there will be sufficient funds. Another 32.5% have some concerns, but think there will probably be enough money for a college education.
- An overwhelming majority of Americans feel that the opportunity to attend college should be made available to all qualified students. By a margin of 84.0 to 6.9%, they agree that all young people who have the ability and motivation necessary to profit from higher education should be given the chance to pursue a college education.
- Clear majorities of Americans favor continued federal support for needy students and institutions. Better than three-quarters (77.4%) think the federal government should continue to provide low-interest loans to middle-income students; 70.6% favor federal grants for low-income students; and 66.4% favor continued federal aid for colleges and universities having a large proportion of low-income students.

Full results of the survey are available at \$12.00 per copy (with reduced rate for multiple copies) from CASE Publications Order Department, P.O. Box 298, Alexandria, VA 22314.

- - - -

Engineering Deans Support Limits on Engineering Enrollments

A resolution in support of engineering schools that limit or even decrease their enrollments to bring them into balance with instructional resources was passed unanimously by the American Society for Engineering Education's (ASEE) Engineering Deans Council this summer, in order to protect the quality of education engineering undergraduates receive.

The deans passed this resolution and the ASEE board of directors endorsed it during the Society's 90th Annual Conference at Texas A&M University, June 20-24.

The dean's resolution comes at a time when applications are rising sharply at the 286 U.S. engineering schools with accredited programs. According to the Engineering Manpower Commission, last fall's enrollments were up 6.2% over 1980, (the National Center for Education Statistics reports that the comparable increase for all undergraduates was 2.6%). The increase in undergraduate enrollments--which in the past ten years have doubled--is coupled with an engineering faculty shortage. According to another recent EMC survey, an overall 9% of budgeted faculty positions are unfilled in the nation's public and private engineering schools.

The faculty shortage may be even more serious than the 9% figure indicates, however. "The shortage is more on the order of 40% to 50%," says Lionel Baldwin, dean of engineering at Colorado State University and chairman of the Council. "The shortage is far higher than 9% if you consider unbudgeted positions that we need, but that universities will not approve because of tight money or, in some cases, an unwillingness to reallocate positions to growing schools away from ones with declining enrollments."

The resolution reads: "The Engineering Deans Council is committed to maintaining the quality of education as our foremost priority. We recognize that unless resources can be brought into better balance with enrollments, the result will have to be a reduction of engineering enrollments nationwide to assure the level of quality we consider imperative. We endorse the activities of all schools seeking to balance enrollments and resources, even though this may lead to a decrease of new engineering student enrollments. We urgently seek strong actions by universities, industry and various levels of government to ameliorate the present situation."

The resolution has the broad-based support of engineering deans. Prior to the ASEE Conference, it was sent to 240 ASEE-member schools and no disagreement with the document's wording was registered. The call for limiting enrollments also reflects a profound change in attitude among engineering deans. While medical schools view limited enrollments as a fact of life, engineering schools have traditionally kept their doors open to whoever is qualified to enter.

grants

The University of Florida has been awarded the largest contract in its history, \$16.1 million from the U.S. Agency for International Development to establish a new college of agriculture in Cameroon.

- - - - -

The University of Georgia Research Foundation, Inc. has received a \$9.85 million grant from the Agency for International Development--the largest single research grant in the university's history--to support a five-year international research program for peanuts, to be conducted collaboratively between the United States and developing countries. The university will have overall management responsibility for the program, which will involve other U.S. universities and countries in Africa, Southeast Asia and the Caribbean.

- - - - -

The University of Michigan Graduate School of Business Administration has been awarded a \$2.5 million challenge grant by the Kresge Foundation for the construction of a new library.

- - - - -

The Student Learning Center at the University of Missouri, Kansas City has received a grant of more than \$500,000 from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Grant money will be used to attract and retain a larger portion of minority and disadvantaged students into the UMKC Schools of Medicine, Dentistry and Pharmacy.

- - - - -

A \$1 million grant to establish a Mineral Technology Center at the University of Nevada, Reno's Mackay School of Mines has been funded by the U.S. Bureau of Mines. It was one of four similar grants awarded nationwide.

- - - - -

The Lilly Endowment has awarded Alcorn State University \$150,000 and Delaware State College \$124,000 for programs to improve instruction in the social sciences.

- - - - -

A group of researchers in the University of Washington school of dentistry has received a five-year, \$600,000 grant from the National Institute of Dental Research to study the proteins that make up the outer layer of the body and the soft tissues of the mouth.

- - - - -

The University of Utah computer science department has been awarded a five-year, \$2.85 million grant from the National Science Foundation, to expand and consolidate its research into using computers to design complex integrated circuits and such major mechanical systems as aircraft.

- - - - -

The Florida Department of Natural Resources has paid the University of Florida \$1.175 million for 560 acres of woodland donated to the University by Charlie Mack Overstreet, a Florida Cattle and timber rancher. The money will be matched by \$800,000 from the state to establish two million-dollar Eminent Scholar chairs of neurosurgery at the University to study the possibility of regenerating or repairing spinal cords. The gift brings to 13 the number of chairs UF has established under the state's 1979 Eminent Scholars Act.

- - - - -