

Y4
.Ed 8/1
Oc 1/971

1015

9214
Ed 8/1
021

OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1971

GOVERNMENT

Storage

DOCUMENTS

MAR 6 1972

HEARING

THE LIBRARY
KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

BEFORE THE

GENERAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NINETY-SECOND CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

H.R. 7429, H.R. 7988, and sections of S. 659

BILLS TO ASSURE AN OPPORTUNITY FOR OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION (OTHER THAN THAT RESULTING IN A BACCALAUREATE OR ADVANCED DEGREE) TO EVERY AMERICAN WHO NEEDS AND DESIRES SUCH EDUCATION BY PROVIDING FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR POSTSECONDARY OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS, AND TO STRENGTHEN THE CONCEPT OF OCCUPATIONAL PREPARATION, COUNSELING, AND PLACEMENT IN ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES, AND THE ETHNIC HERITAGE STUDIES ACT, AND RELATED PROVISIONS OF S. 659

HEARING HELD IN WASHINGTON, D.C.,
SEPTEMBER 20, 1971

Printed for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor
CARL D. PERKINS, *Chairman*



U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1972

72-127

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

CARL D. PERKINS, Kentucky, *Chairman*

EDITH GREEN, Oregon	ALBERT H. QUIE, Minnesota
FRANK THOMPSON, JR., New Jersey	JOHN M. ASHBROOK, Ohio
JOHN H. DENT, Pennsylvania	ALPHONZO BELL, California
ROMAN C. PUCINSKI, Illinois	OGDEN R. REID, New York
DOMINICK V. DANIELS, New Jersey	JOHN N. ERLNBORN, Illinois
JOHN BRADEMAs, Indiana	JOHN R. DELLENBACK, Oregon
JAMES G. O'HARA, Michigan	MARVIN L. ESCH, Michigan
AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California	EDWIN D. ESHLEMAN, Pennsylvania
WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan	WILLIAM A. STEIGER, Wisconsin
PATSY T. MINK, Hawaii	EARL F. LANDGREBE, Indiana
JAMES H. SCHEUER, New York	ORVAL HANSEN, Idaho
LLOYD MEEDS, Washington	EARL B. RUTH, North Carolina
PHILLIP BURTON, California	EDWIN B. FORSYTHE, New Jersey
JOSEPH M. GAYDOS, Pennsylvania	VICTOR V. VEYSEY, California
WILLIAM "BILL" CLAY, Missouri	JACK F. KEMP, New York
SHIRLEY CHISHOLM, New York	PETER A. PEYSER, New York
MARIO BIAGGI, New York	
ELLA T. GRASSO, Connecticut	
LOUISE DAY HICKS, Massachusetts	
ROMANO L. MAZZOLI, Kentucky	
HERMAN BADILLO, New York	

GENERAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

ROMAN C. PUCINSKI, Illinois, *Chairman*

WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan	ALPHONZO BELL, California
LLOYD MEEDS, Washington	JOHN M. ASHBROOK, Ohio
AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California	EARL B. RUTH, North Carolina
PATSY T. MINK, Hawaii	EDWIN B. FORSYTHE, New Jersey
SHIRLEY CHISHOLM, New York	VICTOR V. VEYSEY, California
MARIO BIAGGI, New York	JACK F. KEMP, New York
LOUISE DAY HICKS, Massachusetts	PETER A. PEYSER, New York
ROMANO L. MAZZOLI, Kentucky	
HERMAN BADILLO, New York	
EDITH GREEN, Oregon	

(II)

CONTENTS

	Page
Text of bills:	
H.R. 7429	1
H.R. 7988	8
Sections of S. 659	9
Statement of—	
Muirhead, Hon. Peter, Deputy U.S. Commissioner for Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, accompanied by Hon. Sidney P. Marland, Jr., Commissioner of Education; Robert M. Worthington, Associate Commissioner, Bureau of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education, U.S. Office of Education; Rue W. Harris, Special Assistant to the Deputy Commissioner for Development and Director, Career Education Development Task Force, U.S. Office of Education; Christopher T. Cross, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Legislation (Education), Department of HEW; and Albert L. Alford, Assistant Commissioner for Legislation, Office of Legislation, U.S. Office of Education	14
Burkett, Lowell A., director, American Vocational Association	41
Statements, letters, and supplemental material, et cetera:	
Breckenridge, Mrs. Arlene, chairman, Legislative Committee, Minnesota Personnel and Guidance Association, letter to persons concerned with "Occupational Education Act of 1971," dated October 1, 1971	94
Burkett, Lowell A., director, American Vocational Association:	
Enrollments in Vocational Education, by program, fiscal years 1960-75 (table)	63
Statement of	41
Supplemental statement of	64
Davenport, Lawrence, chairman, National Advisory Council on Vocational Education, Washington, D.C., et al, letter to Chairman Pucinski, dated September 22, 1971, enclosing statement of the Council	88
Eason, Leo A., president, The College Placement Council, Inc., Bethlehem, Pa., letter to Chairman Pucinski, dated September 24, 1971, enclosing attachment 1	86
Horton, Hon. Frank, a Representative in Congress from the State of New York:	
Letter from Dr. William A. Crombe, superintendent, Wayne Central School District No. 1, Ontario Center, N.Y., dated August 26, 1971	102
Letter from Gordon J. DeHond, commissioner, Board of Education, Rochester, N.Y., dated August 16, 1971	108
Letter from Raymond R. Dulaney, superintendent of schools, Rush-Henrietta Central School District, Henrietta, N.Y., dated August 10, 1971	103
Letter from Raymond R. Delaney, superintendent of schools, Rush-Henrietta Central School District, Henrietta, N.Y., dated August 26, 1971, enclosing a summary of a study	103
Letter from John M. Franco, superintendent of schools, City School District, Rochester, N.Y., dated October 7, 1971	102
Letter from Robert D. Helmer, superintendent of schools, North Rose-Wolcott Central School, Wolcott, N.Y., dated August 18, 1971	106
Letter from John E. Loveless, district superintendent of schools, Ontario-Seneca-Yates Counties, Stanley, N.Y., dated August 5, 1971, enclosing a review	107

	Page
Statements, letters, etc.—Continued	
Horton, Hon. Frank—Continued	
Letter from Mrs. Robert R. Phillips, commissioner, Board of Education, Rochester, N.Y., dated July 31, 1971-----	108
Letter from G. C. Whitaker, chairman, Graflax Division, Singer Education & Training Products, Rochester, N.Y., dated August 6, 1971-----	109
Letter from Ross J. Willink, superintendent, Webster Central School, Webster, N.Y., dated August 9, 1971-----	106
Martin, Robert R., president, Eastern Kentucky University, "Less-Than-Baccalaureate Level Technical Education Programs in Higher Education," a study entitled-----	66
Mensel, R. Frank, director, Office of Governmental Affairs, American Association of Junior Colleges, statement of-----	92
National Association of Manufacturers, statement of-----	81
Springer, Mrs. Elvera, president, Minnesota Personnel and Guidance Association:	
Letter to Chairman Pucinski, dated October 5, 1971-----	93
Letter to persons concerned with "Occupational Education Act of 1971," dated October 4, 1971-----	93
"The Role of the Secondary School Counselor," a pamphlet entitled-----	96
Wisely, William H., executive director, American Society of Civil Engineers, New York, N.Y., letter to Hon. Peter A. Peyser, a Representative in Congress from the State of New York, dated September 30, 1971-----	88

OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1971

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 20, 1971

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
GENERAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION
OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,
Washington, D.C.

The General Subcommittee met, pursuant to notice at 10:15 a.m., in room 2261, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Roman C. Pucinski (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Representatives Pucinski, Quie and Peyser.

Staff members present: John F. Jennings, counsel; Charles W. Radcliffe, minority counsel for education, and Alexandra J. Kisla, clerk.

(Text of H.R. 7429, H.R. 7988, and sections of S. 659 follows:)

[H.R. 7429, 92d Cong., first sess.]

A BILL To assure an opportunity for occupational education (other than that resulting in a baccalaureate or advanced degree) to every American who needs and desires such education by providing financial assistance for postsecondary occupational education programs, and to strengthen the concept of occupational preparation, counseling, and placement in elementary and secondary schools, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as "The Occupational Education Act of 1971".

FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF PURPOSES

SEC. 2. The Congress finds and declares that—

(a) our educational system should be responsible for assuring that every young person leaving secondary school is prepared for and assisted in placement either in productive employment or in further education at the postsecondary level;

(b) the opportunity for postsecondary occupational education in programs which do not directly lead to a baccalaureate or advanced academic degree is severely limited in many parts of the Nation and is everywhere inadequate to meet existing needs, and that this situation adversely affects vital national economic and social goals;

(c) high-quality programs of postsecondary occupational education can be found in a wide variety of institutions, including public and private junior and community colleges, are vocational schools, technical institutes, private proprietary schools, college and university branches, and colleges and universities, and Federal support should encourage the utilization of all such facilities to meet the enormous needs in this field;

(d) the goals and purposes of the Congress in enacting the Vocational Education Act of 1963 and the amendments to that Act of 1968 cannot be realized until there is a widespread understanding of and support for occupational preparation in the general academic community which in turn is reflected in changed attitudes, curriculums, and practices in elementary and secondary schools; and

(e) the foregoing purposes and those of the Vocational Education Act Amendments of 1968 and related Acts cannot be realized without strong leadership and exemplary administration at the Federal level.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 3. For the purpose of carrying out title I of this Act, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated \$100,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, \$250,000,000 for the year ending June 30, 1973, \$500,000,000 for the year ending June 30, 1974, and for each fiscal year thereafter such sums as may be necessary to assure that the purposes of this Act are realized. From the sums appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, 80 per centum shall be available for the purposes of establishing a plan for administration under section 110, making planning grants under section 122, and for initiating programs under title I in those States which have complied with the planning requirements of section 122, and 20 per centum shall be available only for technical assistance under section 125(a). From the amount appropriated for each succeeding fiscal year 85 per centum shall be available for grants to the States for carrying out title I of this Act, and 15 per centum shall be reserved to the Commissioner for grants and contracts pursuant to section 125.

ALLOTMENTS AND REALLOTMENTS AMONG STATES

SEC. 4. (a) From the sums available in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, for allotment to the States under section 3 the Commissioner shall first allot such sums as they may require (but not to exceed \$50,000 each) to Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and \$100,000 to each State. From the remainder of such sums he shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to such remainder as the number of persons sixteen years of age or older in such State bears to the number of such persons in all States.

(b) From the sums available in any fiscal year beginning after June 30, 1972, for allotment to the States under section 3 the Commissioner shall first allot such sums as they may require (but not to exceed \$500,000 each) to Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and \$1,000,000 to each State. From the remainder of such sums he shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to such remainder as the number of persons sixteen years of age or older in such State bears to the number of such persons in all the States.

(c) The portion of any State's allotment under subsection (a) or (b) for a fiscal year which the Commissioner determines will not be required, for the period such allotment is available, for carrying out the purposes of this Act shall be available for reallocation from time to time, on such dates during such periods as the Commissioner may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under subsection (a) or (b) for such year, but with such proportionate amount for any of such other States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum which the Commissioner estimates such State needs and will be able to use for such period, and the total of such reductions shall be similarly reallocated among the States whose proportionate amounts are not so reduced. Any amount reallocated to a State under this subsection during a year shall be deemed part of its allotment under subsection (a) or (b) for such year.

TITLE I—OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

PART A—FEDERAL ADMINISTRATION

GENERAL RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE SECRETARY

SEC. 101. (a) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereinafter referred to as the Secretary) shall develop and carry out a program designed to promote and encourage occupational education, which program shall—

(1) provide for the administration by the Commissioner of Education of grants to the States authorized by this title;

(2) assure that manpower needs in subprofessional occupations in education, health, rehabilitation, and community and welfare services are adequately considered in the development of programs under this Act;

(3) promote and encourage the coordination of programs developed under this Act with those supported under the Vocational Education Act, the Manpower Development and Training Act, title I of the Economic Opportunity Act, and related activities administered by various departments and agencies of the Federal Government; and

(4) provide for the continuous assessment of needs in occupational education and for the continuous evaluation of programs supported under the authority of this Act and of related Acts.

(b) The Secretary shall establish, (or designate) a special unit within the Office of the Secretary which—

(1) shall have the sole function of assisting the Secretary in the discharge of his responsibilities under this Act; and

(2) shall be headed by a person appointed or designated by the Secretary who shall be paid at a rate not less than that for level 5 of the Executive Schedule (title V, section 5316, United States Code).

GENERAL RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION

SEC. 102. The Commissioner of Education (hereinafter referred to as the Commissioner) shall, in addition to the specific responsibilities imposed by this Act develop and carry out a program of occupational education that will—

(1) coordinate all programs administered by the Commissioner which relate to or have an effect upon occupational education so as to provide the maximum practicable support for the objectives of this Act;

(2) promote and encourage the infusion into our system of elementary and secondary education of occupational preparation, counseling and guidance, and job placement or placement in postsecondary-occupational education programs as a responsibility of the schools;

(3) utilize research and demonstration programs administered by him to assist in the development of new and improved instructional methods and technology for occupational education and in the design and testing of models of schools or school systems which place occupational education on an equal footing with academic education;

(4) assure that the Education Professions Development Act and similar programs of general application will be so administered as to provide a degree of support for vocational, technical, and occupational education commensurate with national needs and more nearly representative of the relative size of the population to be served; and

(5) develop and disseminate accurate information on the status of occupational education in all parts of the Nation, at all levels of education, and in all types of institutions, together with information on occupational opportunities available to persons of all ages.

ESTABLISHMENT OF BUREAU OF OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION

SEC. 103. (a) There is hereby established in the United States Office of Education a Bureau of Occupational Education which shall be the principal agency within the Office of Education for the administration of this Act, the Vocational Education Act of 1963, the Adult Education Act of 1966, and functions of the Office of Education relating to manpower training and development.

(b) (1) The Bureau shall be headed by a person (appointed or designated by the Commissioner) who is highly qualified in the fields of vocational-technical and occupational education, who is accorded the rank of Deputy Commissioner, and who is compensated at the rate specified for GS-18 of the General Schedule (5 U.S.C. 5332).

(2) Additional positions shall be assigned to the Bureau as follows—

(A) not less than three positions compensated at the rate specified for GS-17 of the General Schedule (5 U.S.C. 5332), one of which shall be filled by a person with broad experience in the field of junior and community college education;

(B) not less than seven positions compensated at the rate specified for GS-16 of the General Schedule (5 U.S.C. 5332), at least two of which shall be filled by persons with broad experience in the field of post-secondary-occupational education in community and junior colleges, at least one of which shall be filled by a person with broad experience in education in private proprietary institutions, and at least one of which shall be filled by a person with professional experience in occupational guidance and counseling; and

(C) not less than three positions compensated at the rate specified for GS-15 of the General Schedule (5 U.S.C. 5332) which shall be filled by

persons at least one of whom is a skilled worker in a recognized occupation, another is a subprofessional technician in one of the branches of engineering, and the other is a subprofessional worker in one of the branches of social or medical services, who shall serve as senior advisers in the implementation of this Act.

PART B—STATE ADMINISTRATION

DESIGNATION BY GOVERNOR

SEC. 110. (a) The Governor of any State desiring to participate in the programs authorized by this Act shall in accordance with State law designate or establish a State agency which will have sole responsibility for fiscal management and administration of the program, and which will provide assurances satisfactory to the Commissioner that—

(1) such State agency shall submit to the Commissioner a plan of administration which makes adequate provision for effective participation in the planning, design, administration, and evaluation of the programs authorized by this Act of persons with broad experience in the fields of—

- (A) public and private junior and community college education,
- (B) post-secondary vocational-technical education,
- (C) occupational education in private, proprietary institutions,
- (D) economic and industrial development,
- (E) manpower development and training,
- (F) academic education at the college and university level,
- (G) secondary vocational-technical education,
- (H) elementary and secondary education,
- (I) elementary and secondary counseling and guidance, and
- (J) industry, commerce, and labor.

(2) the State advisory council for vocational education will be charged with the same responsibilities with respect to programs authorized by this Act as it has with respect to programs authorized under the Vocational Education Act of 1963;

(3) there is an administrative device which provides reasonable promise for resolving differences between vocational educators, junior and community college educators, college and university educators, elementary and secondary educators, and other interested groups with respect to the administration of programs authorized under this Act; and

(4) there is adequate provision for individual institutions or groups of institutions to appeal and obtain a hearing from the State administrative agency with respect to policies, procedures, programs, or allocation of resources under this Act with which such institution or institutions disagree.

(b) The Commissioner shall approve any plan of administration which meets the requirement of subsection (a), and shall not finally disapprove any plan without affording the State administrative agency a reasonable opportunity for a hearing. Upon the final disapproval of any plan, the provisions for judicial review set forth in section 124(b) shall be applicable.

PART C—STATE OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

AUTHORIZATION OF GRANTS

SEC. 121. From the sums made available for grants under this part pursuant to sections 3 and 4, the Commissioner is authorized to make grants to the States to assist them in planning and administering high-quality programs of post-secondary-occupational education which will be available to all persons in all parts of the State who desire and need such education, and to promote occupation orientation and education in the regular elementary and secondary school programs.

PLANNING GRANTS

SEC. 122. (a) Upon the application of a State under section 110, the Commissioner shall make available to the State the amount of its allocation under section 4 for the following purposes—

(1) to assist the State administrative agency established or designated by the Governor in meeting the requirements of section 110;

(2) to strengthen the State Advisory Council on Vocational Education in order that it may effectively carry out the additional functions imposed by this Act; and

(3) to enable the agency designated by the Governor under section 110 to initiate and conduct a comprehensive program of planning for the establishment and carrying out of programs authorized by this Act.

(b) (1) Planning activities initiated under clause (3) of subsection (a) shall include—

(A) an assessment of the existing capabilities and facilities for the provision of post-secondary-occupational education, together with existing needs and projected needs for such education in all parts of the State;

(B) thorough consideration of the most effective means of utilizing all existing institutions within the State capable of providing the kinds of programs funded under this Act, including (but not limited to) both private and public junior and community colleges, area vocational schools, accredited private proprietary institutions, technical institutes, manpower skill centers, branch institutions of State colleges or universities, and public and private college and universities;

(C) the design of high-quality instructional programs to meet the needs for post-secondary-occupational education and the development of an order of priorities for placing these programs in operation;

(D) the development of a long-range strategy for infusing occupational education (including general orientation, counseling and guidance, and placement either in a job or in post-secondary-educational programs) into elementary and secondary schools on an equal footing with traditional academic education, to the end that every child who leaves secondary school is prepared either to enter productive employment or to undertake additional education at the postsecondary level, but without being forced prematurely to make an irrevocable commitment to a particular educational or occupational choice; and

(E) the development of procedures to insure continuous planning and evaluation, including the regular collection of data which would be readily available to the State administrative agency, the State advisory council on vocational education, individual educational institutions, and other interested parties (including concerned private citizens).

(2) Planning activities carried out under this section shall involve the active participation of—

(A) the State board for vocational education;

(B) the State agency having responsibility for junior and community colleges;

(C) the State agency having responsibility for higher education institutions or programs;

(D) the State agency responsible for administering public elementary and secondary education;

(E) the State agency responsible for programs of adult basic education;

(F) representatives of all types of institutions in the State which are conducting or which have the capability and desire to conduct programs of postsecondary occupational education;

(G) representatives of private, nonprofit elementary and secondary schools;

(H) the State employment security agency, the State agency responsible for apprenticeship programs, and other agencies within the State having responsibility for administering manpower development and training programs;

(I) the State agency responsible for economic and industrial development; and

(J) representatives of business, industry, organized labor, and the general public.

(c) The Commissioner shall not approve any application for a grant under section 123 of this Act unless he is reasonably satisfied that the planning described in this section (whether or not assisted by a grant under this section) has been carried out.

PROGRAM GRANTS

SEC. 123. (a) From the allotments available to the States under section 4(b) (upon application by the State administrative agency designated under section 110), the Commissioner shall make grants to any State which has satisfied the requirements of section 124. Such grants may be used for the following purposes—

(1) the design, establishment, and conduct of programs of post-secondary-occupational education (or the expansion and improvement of existing programs) as defined by section 127 of this Act;

(2) the design, establishment, and conduct of programs to carry out the long-range strategy developed pursuant to section 122(b)(1)(D) for infusing into elementary and secondary education occupational preparation, which shall include methods of involving secondary schools in occupational placement and methods of providing followup services and career counseling and guidance for persons of all ages as a regular function of the educational system;

(3) special training and preparation of persons to equip them to teach, administer, or otherwise assist in carrying out programs authorized under this Act (such as programs to prepare journeymen in the skilled trades or occupations for teaching positions);

(4) planning and evaluation activities designed pursuant to section 122(b)(1)(E); and

(5) the leasing, renting, or remodeling of facilities required to carry out programs authorized by this Act.

(b) Programs authorized by this Act may be carried out through contractual arrangements with private organizations and institutions organized for profit where such arrangements can make a contribution to achieving the purposes of this Act by providing substantially equivalent education, training, or services more readily or more economically, or by preventing needless duplication of expensive physical plant and equipment, or by providing needed education or training of the types authorized by this Act which would not otherwise be available.

ASSURANCES FROM THE STATES; PROVISIONS FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW

SEC. 124. (a) Before making any program grant under this Act the Commissioner shall receive from the State administrative agency assurances satisfactory to him that—

(1) the planning requirements of section 122 have been met;

(2) the State advisory council on vocational education has had a reasonable opportunity to review and make recommendations concerning the design of the programs for which the grant is requested;

(3) Federal funds made available under this Act will result in improved postsecondary occupational education programs, and in no case supplant State, local, or private funds;

(4) provision has been made for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of, and accounting for, Federal funds paid to the State under this Act;

(5) to the extent consistent with the number of students enrolled in nonprofit private schools in the area to be served by an elementary or secondary school program funded under this Act, provision has been made for the effective participation of such students; and

(6) provides for making such reports in such form and containing such information as the Commissioner may reasonably require to carry out his functions under this Act.

(b) (1) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing to the State administrative agency, finds that any of the assurances required by subsection (a) are unsatisfactory, or that in the administration of the program there is a failure to comply with such assurances or with other requirements of the Act, the Commissioner shall notify the administrative agency that no further payments will be made to the State under this Act until he is satisfied that there has been or will be compliance with the requirements of the Act.

(2) A State administrative agency which is dissatisfied with a final action of the Commissioner under this section or under section 110 (respecting approval of a State plan for administration) may appeal to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which the State is located, by filing a petition with such court within sixty days after such final action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Commissioner, or any officer designated by him for that purpose. The Commissioner thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceedings on which he based his action, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code. Upon the filing of such petition, the court shall have jurisdiction, to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part, temporarily or permanently but until the filing of the record the Commissioner may modify or set aside his action. The findings of the Commissioner as to the facts, if supported by sub-

stantial evidence, shall be conclusive, but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commissioner to take further evidence, and the Commissioner may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall file in the court the record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence. The judgment of the court affirming or setting aside, in whole or in part, any action of the Commissioner shall be final, subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code. The commencement of proceedings under this subsection shall not, unless so specifically ordered by the court, operate as a stay of the Commissioner's action.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND MODEL PROGRAMS

SEC. 125. (a) The Commissioner shall make available (to the extent practicable) technical assistance to the State in planning, designing, and carrying out programs authorized by this Act upon the request of any Governor or State administrative agency, and the Commission shall take affirmative steps to acquaint all interested organizations, agencies, and institutions with the provisions of this Act and to enlist broad public understanding of its purposes.

(b) From the sums reserved to the Commissioner under section 3, he shall by grant or contract provide assistance—

(1) for the establishment and conduct of model or demonstration programs which in his judgment will promote the achievement of one or more purposes of this Act and which might otherwise not be carried out (or be carried out soon enough or in such a way as to have the desirable impact upon the purposes of the Act);

(2) as an incentive or supplemental grant to any State administrative agency which makes a proposal for advancing the purposes of this Act which he feels holds special promise for meeting occupational education needs of particular groups or classes of persons who are disadvantaged or who have special needs; when such proposal could not reasonably be expected to be carried out under the regular State program; and

(3) for particular or projects eligible for support under this Act which he believes to have a special potential for helping to find solutions to problems on a regional or national basis.

(c) In providing support under subsection (b) the Commissioner may as appropriate make grants to or contracts with public or private agencies, organizations, and institutions, but he shall give first preference to applications for projects or programs which are administered by or approved by State administrative agencies, and he shall in no case make a grant or contract within any State without first having afforded the State administrative agency reasonable notice and opportunity for comment and for making recommendations.

PAYMENTS

SEC. 126. Payments under this Act may be made in installments and in advance or by way of reimbursement, with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 127. For the purpose of this Act—

(1) the term "State" includes the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and (except for the purposes of subsection (a) and (b) of section 4) Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands;

(2) the term "post-secondary-occupational education" means education, training, or retraining for persons sixteen years of age or older who have graduated from or left elementary or secondary school, conducted by an institution legally authorized to provide postsecondary education within a State, which is designed to prepare individuals for gainful employment as semiskilled or skilled workers or technicians or subprofessionals in recognized occupations (including new and emerging occupations) or to prepare individuals for enrollment in advanced technical education programs, but excluding any program to prepare individuals for employment in occupations which the Commissioner determines, and specifies by regulation, to

be generally considered professional or which requires a baccalaureate or advanced degree;

(3) the term "Governor" means the Governor of a State or the chief executive officer (however described) or any jurisdiction treated as a State under this Act.

TITLE II—CONFORMING AND SUPPORTING AMENDMENTS TO OTHER ACTS

SEC. 201. (a) Section 203(a)(3) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is amended by striking out "and" at the end of clause (B), striking out the semicolon at the end of clause (B) and inserting in lieu thereof ", and", and by inserting a new clause as follows:

"(D) provide assurance that equal consideration shall be given to the needs of elementary and secondary schools for library resources, textbooks, and other printed and published materials utilized for instruction, orientation, or guidance and counseling in occupational education."

(b) Section 303(b)(3) of such Act is amended by redesignating clauses (C), (D), (E), (F), (G), (H), (I), and (J), respectively, as clauses (D), (E), (F), (G), (H), (I), (J), and (K), and by inserting a new clause as follows:

"(C) programs designed to encourage the development in elementary and secondary schools of occupational information and counseling and guidance, and instruction in occupational education on an equal footing with traditional academic education;"

(c) Section 503(4) of such Act is amended by redesignating clauses (A), (B), and (C), respectively, as clauses (B), (C), and (D), and by inserting a new clause as follows:

"(A) the development in elementary and secondary schools of programs of occupational information, counseling and guidance, and instruction in occupational education on an equal footing with traditional academic education."

SEC. 202. (a)(1) Section 104(a)(2) of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 (relating to the duties of the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education) is amended by inserting after "under this title" each time it appears ", and under title I of the Occupational Education Act of 1971,"

(2) Section 104 of such Act is further amended by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d) and by inserting a new subsection as follows:

"(c) State advisory councils also shall perform with respect to the programs carried out under title I of the Occupational Education Act of 1971 functions identical with or analogous to those assigned under this title, and the Commissioner shall assure that adequate funds are made available to such Councils from funds appropriated to carry out title I of that Act (without regard to whether such funds have been allotted to States) to enable them to perform such functions."

[H.R. 7988, 92d Cong., first sess.]

A BILL To provide a program to improve the opportunity of students in elementary and secondary schools to study cultural heritages of the various ethnic groups in the Nation

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Ethnic Heritage Studies Act of 1971".

SEC. 2. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new title:

"TITLE IX—ETHNIC HERITAGE STUDIES

"STATEMENT OF POLICY

"SEC. 901. This title is enacted in recognition of the heterogeneous composition of the Nation and of the fact that in a multiethnic society a greater understanding of the contributions of one's own heritage and those of one's fellow citizens can contribute to a more harmonious, patriotic, and committed populace. It is further enacted in recognition of the principle that all students in the elementary and secondary schools of the Nation should have an opportunity to learn about the

differing and unique contributions to the national heritage made by each ethnic group. Therefore, it is the purpose of this title to assist schools and school systems in affording each of their students an opportunity to learn about the nature of his own cultural heritage and to study the contributions to the Nation made by other cultural heritages.

"ETHNIC HERITAGE STUDIES PROJECTS

"SEC. 902. The Commissioner is authorized to arrange through grants to public and private nonprofit educational agencies and organizations for the establishment and operation of a number of ethnic heritage studies projects. Each such project shall carry on activities related to a single culture or regional group of cultures.

"AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES

"SEC. 903. Each project provided for under this title shall—

"(1) develop curriculum materials for use in elementary and secondary schools which deal with the history, geography, society, economy, literature, art, music, drama, language, and general culture of the ethnic heritage or regional group of heritages with which the project is concerned, and the contributions of that ethnic heritage or regional group of heritages to the American heritage,

"(2) disseminate curriculum materials to permit their use in elementary and secondary schools throughout the Nation, and

"(3) provide training for persons utilizing or preparing to utilize the curriculum materials developed under this title.

"ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

"SEC. 904. (a) In carrying out this title, the Commissioner shall make arrangements which will utilize (1) the research facilities and personnel of museums and of colleges and universities, (2) the special knowledge of ethnic groups in local communities, and (3) the expertise of elementary and secondary school teachers.

"(b) Funds appropriated to carry out this title may be used to cover all or part of the cost of establishing and operating the projects, including the cost of research materials and resources, academic consultants and the cost of training of staff for the purpose of carrying out the purposes of this title.

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 905. There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this title for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, the sum of \$20,000,000, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, the sum of \$30,000,000."

(RELEVANT PROVISIONS OF S. 659)

TITLE II—VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

SPECIAL PROGRAMS FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

SEC. 201. Section 102(b) of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 is amended by inserting after "1972," the following: "and for the succeeding fiscal years ending prior to July 1, 1975,".

BUREAU OF OCCUPATIONAL AND ADULT EDUCATION

SEC. 202. (a) (1) The Vocational Education Act of 1963 is amended by inserting after section 104 the following new section:

"FEDERAL ADMINISTRATION

"SEC. 105. (a) There is established within the Office of Education a Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education, hereinafter in this section referred to as the 'Bureau', which shall be responsible for carrying out those responsibilities of the Commissioner which he is authorized to delegate under this Act, the Adult Educa-

tion Act, and any other Act vesting authority in the Commissioner for vocational, occupational, or career education (including manpower training) or for adult or continuing education.

"(b) (1) The Bureau shall be headed by an Associate Commissioner, who shall be appointed by the Commissioner and who shall be compensated at the rate specified for grade 18 of the General Schedule set forth in section 5332 of title 5, United States Code.

"(2) Additional positions are created for, and shall be assigned to, the Bureau as follows:

"(A) Three positions to be placed in grade 17 of such General Schedule, one of which shall be filled by a person with broad experience in the field of junior and community college education.

"(B) Seven positions to be placed in grade 16 of such General Schedule, at least two of which shall be filled by persons with broad experience in the field of postsecondary-occupational education in community and junior colleges, at least one of which shall be filled by a person with broad experience in education in private proprietary institutions, and at least one of which shall be filled by a person with professional experience in occupational guidance and counseling.

"(c) The Commission is authorized to delegate any of his functions under this Act or under the Adult Education Act, except the approval of State plans under section 123 of this Act and section 306 of the Adult Education Act, to the Associate Commissioner."

(2) The positions created by section 105(b) of the Vocational Education Act of 1963, as amended by paragraph (1), shall be in addition to the number of positions placed in the appropriate grades under section 5108 of title 5, United States Code.

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall be effective July 1, 1972.

CLARIFICATION OF DEFINITION OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION WITH RESPECT TO INDUSTRIAL ARTS PROGRAMS; INCLUSION OF VOLUNTEER FIREMEN

SEC. 203. (a) Section 108(1) of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Such term includes industrial arts education programs in cases where the Commissioner determines by regulation that such programs will accomplish or facilitate one or more of the purposes in the first sentence of this paragraph."

(b) Such section 108(1) is further amended by inserting immediately after the word "employment" the first time it appears in such section the following: "(including volunteer firemen)".

EXEMPLARY PROGRAMS AND PROJECTS

SEC. 204. Section 142(a) of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 is amended by striking out "two" and inserting in lieu thereof "five".

RESIDENTIAL VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS

SEC. 205. (a) Section 151(b) of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 is amended by striking out "the succeeding fiscal year" and inserting in lieu thereof "each of the succeeding fiscal years ending prior to July 1, 1975".

(b) Section 152(a) (1) of such Act is amended by striking out "July 1, 1972" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1975".

(c) Section 153(d) (2) of such Act is amended by striking out "July 1, 1971" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1 of each of the four succeeding fiscal years".

CONSUMER AND HOMEMAKING EDUCATION

SEC. 206. (a) Section 161(a) (1) of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 is amended by striking out "the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972" and inserting in lieu thereof "each of the succeeding fiscal years ending prior to July 1, 1975".

(b) Section 161(c) of such Act is amended by striking out "and the two succeeding" and inserting in lieu thereof "and the five succeeding".

COOPERATIVE VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

SEC. 207. Section 172(a) of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 is amended by striking out "the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972" and inserting in lieu thereof "each of the succeeding fiscal years ending prior to July 1, 1975".

WORK-STUDY PROGRAMS

SEC. 208. Section 181(a) of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 is amended by inserting after "June 30, 1972," the following: "and for each of the succeeding fiscal years ending prior to July 1, 1975,".

CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

SEC. 209. Section 191(b) of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 is amended by striking out "July 1, 1972" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1975".

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL

SEC. 210. Section 104(a) (4) of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 is amended by striking out "two" and inserting in lieu thereof "five".

ETHNIC HERITAGE STUDIES CENTERS

SEC. 404. (a) The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new title:

"TITLE IX—ETHNIC HERITAGE PROGRAMS

"STATEMENT OF POLICY

"SEC. 901. In recognition of the heterogeneous composition of the Nation and of the fact that in a multiethnic society a greater understanding of the contributions of one's own heritage and those of one's fellow citizens can contribute to a more harmonious, patriotic, and committed populace, and in recognition of the principle that all persons in the educational institutions of the Nation should have an opportunity to learn about the differing and unique contributions to the national heritage made by each ethnic group, it is the purpose of this title to provide assistance designed to afford to students opportunities to learn about the nature of their own cultural heritage, and to study the contributions of the cultural heritages of the ethnic groups of the Nation.

"ETHNIC HERITAGE STUDIES CENTERS

"SEC. 902. The Commissioner is authorized to make grants to, and contracts with, public and private nonprofit educational agencies, institutions, and organizations to assist them in planning, developing, establishing, and operating ethnic heritage studies centers, as provided in this title.

"ACTIVITIES OF ETHNIC HERITAGE STUDIES CENTERS

"SEC. 903. Each center assisted under this title shall—

"(1) develop curriculum materials for use in elementary and secondary schools and institutions of higher education relating to the history, geography, society, economy, literature, art, music, drama, language, and general culture of the groups with which the center is concerned, and the contributions of those ethnic groups to the American heritage;

"(2) disseminate curriculum materials to permit their use in elementary and secondary schools and institutions of higher education throughout the Nation;

"(3) provide training for persons using, or preparing to use, curriculum materials developed under this title; and

"(4) cooperate with persons and organizations in the communities being served by the center to assist them in promoting, encouraging, developing, or producing programs or other activities in such communities which relate to the history, culture, or traditions of ethnic groups.

"APPLICATIONS

"SEC. 904. (a) Any public or private nonprofit agency, institution, or organization desiring assistance to establish and operate a center under this title shall make application therefor in accordance with the provisions of this title and other applicable law and with regulations of the Commissioner promulgated for the purposes of this title. The Commissioner shall approve an application under this title only if he determines that—

"(1) the center for which the application seeks assistance will be operated by the applicant and that the applicant will operate such center in accordance with this title;

"(2) such center will be operated under the direction of a Director who will be selected by the Commissioner, in consultation with, and with the approval of, the applicant;

"(3) such center will carry out the activities described in section 903 and will offer programs and courses of study related to all ethnic groups represented in the area to be served; and

"(4) such center has been planned, and will be established and operated, in consultation with an advisory council which is representative of the ethnic groups in the area to be served and of the cultural and educational resources of such area and which is appointed in a manner prescribed by regulation.

"(b) In approving applications under this title, the Commissioner shall insure their is cooperation and coordination of efforts among the Ethnic Heritage Studies Centers assisted under this title, including the exchange of materials and information and joint projects where appropriate.

"ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

"SEC. 905. (a) In carrying out this title, the Commissioner shall make arrangements which will utilize (1) the research facilities and personnel of institutions of higher education, (2) the special knowledge of ethnic groups in local communities and of foreign students pursuing their education in this country, (3) the expertise of teachers in elementary and secondary schools and institutions of higher education, and (4) the talents and experience of any other groups in the regional area to be served by centers assisted under this title such as foundations, civic groups, and fraternal organizations which would further the goals of the centers.

"(b) Funds appropriated to carry out this title may be used to cover all or part of the cost of establishing, equipping, and operating the centers, including the cost of research materials and resources, academic consultants, and the cost of training of staff for the purpose of carrying out the purposes of this title. Such funds may also be used to provide stipends (in such amounts as may be determined in accordance with regulations of the Commissioner) to individuals receiving training in such centers, including allowances for dependents.

"NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL

"SEC. 906. (a) There is hereby established a National Advisory Council on Ethnic Heritage Studies consisting of fifteen members appointed by the Secretary who shall be appointed, serve, and be compensated as provided in part D of the General Education Provisions Act.

"(b) Such Council shall, with respect to the program authorized by this title, carry out the duties and functions specified in part D of the General Education Provisions Act.

"APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

"SEC. 907. For the purpose of carrying out this title, there are authorized to be appropriated \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and \$20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973. Sums appropriated pursuant to this section shall, notwithstanding any other provision of law unless enacted in express limitation of this sentence, remain available for expenditure and obligation until the end of the fiscal year succeeding the fiscal year for which they were appropriated."

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall be effective after June 30, 1971.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The subcommittee will come to order.

We are very pleased this morning to have with us for the consideration of H.R. 7429, the Occupational Education Act of 1971, the very distinguished U.S. Commissioner of Education, Dr. Sidney Marland, and Mr. Peter Muirhead, Deputy Commissioner, and Dr. Robert Worthington, Associate Commissioner in the Bureau of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education.

We are starting these hearings this morning in order to set the foundation for early consideration in the provisions of H.R. 7429 as an amendment to the Higher Education Act which is now working its way through Mrs. Green's subcommittee.

I want to welcome Dr. Marland and his associates to the committee this morning and at the same time I want to apologize for the fact that we would ask you to come here on a Monday morning, especially during the holidays, but there is an element of urgency on these hearings because we do hope to conclude the markup of the Higher Educational bill this week, if possible, since the other body has included the provisions of H.R. 7429, or at least some form of that concept, in the bill they have adopted.

Unless our subcommittee and our full committee makes some provision for including an Occupational Education Act in the Higher Educational bill, we would find ourselves going to conference with the other body with no provisions of our own to negotiate on and we would find ourselves in the intolerable position of taking their concept and not being able to add anything significantly to it. So this is why we are here this morning.

I am particularly pleased that Commissioner Marland has joined us. We were not expecting him this morning so it is an added honor to have him join in the discussion of this Occupational Education Act of 1971.

Immediately following Dr. Marland and his group will be Mr. Lowell Burkett, the executive director of the American Vocational Association.

Dr. Muirhead, it is my understanding that you are going to present the statement for the administration. We are most pleased to have all of you here.

I said earlier that I was pleased to have Dr. Marland here because I recently had occasion to observe the kind of work that Commissioner Marland is doing in the Office of Education which will make him the chief architect of a new and exciting educational concept in this country.

I am also very pleased to have Dr. Worthington here who has a national reputation for his long and hard work in vocational education. I want to commend Dr. Marland and Mr. Muirhead at this time for the good sense and good wisdom and good judgment of adding Dr. Worthington to the staff of the Office of Education. I think that with his stewardship in that particular division we can see Commissioner Marland enjoying a very strong support in the work that he is trying to do in that department. So I congratulate all of you.

Mr. Peyser, before we begin have you anything to say?

Mr. PEYSER. No, thank you.

I am just delighted you are here this morning and looking forward to hearing this testimony.

Mr. PUCINSKI. All right.

Mr. Muirhead, why don't you proceed in any manner you wish.

STATEMENT OF PETER MUIRHEAD, DEPUTY U.S. COMMISSIONER FOR EDUCATION, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, ACCOMPANIED BY SIDNEY P. MARLAND, JR., COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION; ROBERT M. WORTHINGTON, ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER, BUREAU OF ADULT, VOCATIONAL AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION, U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION; RUE W. HARRIS, SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER FOR DEVELOPMENT AND DIRECTOR, CAREER EDUCATION DEVELOPMENT TASK FORCE, U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION; CHRISTOPHER T. CROSS, DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR LEGISLATION (EDUCATION), DEPARTMENT OF HEW; AND ALBERT L. ALFORD, ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER FOR LEGISLATION, OFFICE OF LEGISLATION, U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Mr. MUIRHEAD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

We are, of course, happy to be here. You were kind enough to introduce our staff.

Mr. PUCINSKI. If you will permit the interruption, I apologize. I should also have the record show that Dr. Alford, the Assistant Commissioner for Legislation, is here. He has been a pillar of strength to us over the years and we are so pleased to have him here.

I want to take this opportunity to tell you how good it is to have Mr. Chris Cross, the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Legislation, here during our deliberations. He is knowledgeable and he has been a big help to us whenever we run into a snarl around here on some issue on these bills.

I better get your name, sir.

Mr. HARRIS. Rue Harris.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Very good.

All right. I am sorry to interrupt you, Dr. Muirhead.

Mr. MUIRHEAD. Not at all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Rue Harris has joined us because he is giving his attention to our career education models. We would like to share some of that education with you.

I think you should know, Mr. Chairman, that all of us are delighted that the Commissioner was able to join us. He has just returned last night from an international meeting in Geneva, Switzerland, in which he represented the United States at a meeting of all international ministers of education from a number of countries. You know and I know that the adjustments that are necessary following such a long trip are not easy, but I think it is a measure of the Commissioner's abiding interest in the important work of your committee that he very quickly made that adjustment and that he is with us this morning.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I might add that I am particularly grateful because I know how difficult it is after getting off an airplane.

I might just add here that I am pleased that Mr. Harris is with us as a Special Assistant in charge of career education development. I should think that he plays a key role in this whole new concept that you are trying to develop, Dr. Muirhead. So we are pleased to have such a prestigious team of educators here.

I only regret that we don't have the other members here because they are missing a rare opportunity to meet with some of the top men

in our educational team today, but I am sure that many of them will be joining us as we go along. The principal architect of all your troubles just walked in.

Mr. QUIE. More on the way.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Why don't you move ahead, Dr. Muirhead.

Mr. MUIRHEAD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. If I may, I would like to read a relatively short statement and then if you wish to we can then have a back and forth discussion on the bill that is before us this morning.

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to be with you this morning to discuss proposed amendments to the Vocational Education Act of 1963.

We understand that you have before you H.R. 7429, the Occupational Education Act of 1971. I wish to assure you that career education is receiving highest priority attention within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

As I will explain more fully in a few moments, we are currently engaged in a major effort to develop new ideas and approaches for career education programs. We are therefore not yet able to determine the proper course of action for these programs. Accordingly, we would like to discuss our specific objections to the provisions of S. 659, which extend and amend the Vocational Education Act.

As you know, the special programs of the Vocational Education Act are scheduled to expire on June 30, 1972. We feel that an extension of existing legislation through Fiscal Year 1975 would be unwise.

This subcommittee conducted extensive hearings into the entire field of vocational and career education in 1968. The Vocational Education Amendments of that year, which made sweeping changes in the entire pattern of Federal assistance to vocational and technical education were the result. No similar congressional hearings of a comprehensive nature have been held since that time.

Earlier this year the administration proposed that vocational education be one of the five areas of national priority included in Education Revenue Sharing. This legislation would bring about a dramatic reordering of the relationships between the Federal Government and the States, providing greater flexibility and responsibility for States and localities to meet their own educational needs. Under Education Revenue Sharing, funds presently available under a variety of categorical vocational education programs would be allotted to the States in a lump sum. States would identify their own priorities of need and develop plans to meet them. We believe the Congress should consider the revenue sharing proposal before it makes a decision on the extension of the Vocational Education Act.

In addition, as I have noted, the field of career education is one of extremely high priority to the Office of Education. For some time now we have been working to develop new and innovative approaches to the problems of education for the world of work. The Office has already committed \$4.6 million to the development of career education models and plans to devote about \$15 million to this effort during fiscal year 1972. Basically, the models will take four forms:

School-based model. The Office of Education will administer the development, testing and installation of a school-based comprehensive career education model through a prime grant to the Center for Vocational and Technical Education, located at the Ohio State Uni-

versity. The model will be developed in six local school districts: Mesa, Ariz.; Los Angeles, Calif.; Jefferson County, Colo.; Atlanta, Ga.; Pontiac, Mich.; and Hackensack, N.J.

The object of the model in these districts will be to develop and test a career education system that will develop in students (1) a comprehensive awareness of career options; (2) a concept of self which is in keeping with a work-oriented society, including positive attitudes about work, school and society, and a sense of satisfaction resulting from successful experience in these areas; (3) personal characteristics, such as self-respect, initiative and resourcefulness; (4) a realistic understanding of the relationships between the world of work and education which assist individuals in becoming contributing members of society; and (5) the ability to enter employment in a selected occupational cluster and/or to go on for further education.

A second model is entitled "employer-based model." The goals of this model are (1) to provide an alternative education program for students, aged 13-18, in an employer-based setting; (2) to unify the positive elements of academic, general and vocational curricula into a comprehensive career education program; (3) to increase the relevance of the world of education to the world of work; and (4) to broaden the base of community participation, particularly by involving public and private employers more directly and significantly in education.

The program will be operated by consortia of employers. Each consortium will encourage the assistance and active support of such diverse community elements as unions, schools, parents, PTA's and Chambers of Commerce. The program contemplates year-round operation and open entrance and exit of students. It will emphasize educational experiences that take place in a variety of settings. The aim is to make the community the classroom.

A third model is entitled "home-based model." The purposes of the home-based model for career education are (1) to develop educational delivery systems into the home and the community; (2) to provide new career education programs for adults; (3) to establish a guidance and career placement system to assist individuals in occupational and related life-roles; (4) to develop more competent workers; and (5) to enhance the quality of the home as a learning center.

The home-based model will have three major components: (1) a career-oriented educational television program with motivation to study for a career and information concerning career opportunities; (2) home- and community-centered education systems, using such media as cable television, audio cassettes, correspondence programs, radio and instructional aids; and (3) career clinics in the community, to provide career guidance and counseling, referral services and information on relevant career-oriented education programs.

The Education Development Corp. of Newton, Mass., is conducting studies in three major areas; in-depth definition of population characteristics appropriate for a Career Education TV series; development of an evaluation plan for the series; and conceptualization and feasibility studies of supporting components for career guidance and in-home study. The Rand Corp. is completing an analysis of successful media-based educational programs so that the Office of Education can develop a prototype for the implementation of the model.

And a fourth model, a residential-based model. The Mountain-Plains Regional Education Center, recently established at the Glasgow, Mont., Air Force Base, will develop and begin to implement a resident career education program with services to disadvantaged individuals and families drawn from rural areas of six participating States which are seeking to develop their economies. Program components in this residential-based model will include education, family life and community services, rural health and health services, economic development services, and research and evaluation activities.

Family units will be brought to the training site, so that each family member can develop an appropriate career role, through employment, study, or home management, or through a combination of these. Employment upon completion of the residency is guaranteed by the home State of each family. Experiences in developing and operating the center will be utilized in assessing the potential for other kinds of institution-based career education programs.

As one part of our efforts to improve the delivery of vocational education in the United States, the Office let a contract on June 30 for a major evaluation study of vocational education programs. The project encompasses several major tasks which will entail considerable activity in the field, including surveys of vocational education graduates from over 100 randomly selected school districts, in depth case studies of over 50 innovative programs, an assessment of the overlap of federally funded occupational education and training programs, and a study of the method of distributing Federal vocational education funds.

The following specific tasks are included in this important project:

(1) An analytical review of recent evaluation projects designed to assess and summarize what is known about vocational program benefits to identify additional evaluation needs.

(2) A national follow-up survey of 1969 and 1972 graduates of secondary vocational education programs to collect data on their characteristics, their vocational education experience, and on their post-program performance and attitudes. This study then is intended to describe quantitatively vocational education graduates and to analyze vocational education services and outcomes.

(3) Case studies of programs involving more than 1,000 students in different types of successful secondary vocational programs to determine those offerings and strategies which seem to be primarily responsible for the success of different types of vocational education graduates.

(4) A study of duplication and gaps in federally funded occupational education programs in urban areas. The purpose of this study, conducted for the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education, is to determine if the current level and allocation of Federal funds provides equitable job preparation opportunities to various student groups, to identify where gaps and overlaps in services exist, and to suggest means for improving the coordination between programs.

(5) A study of the State grant mechanism for distributing Federal vocational education funds to local school districts to determine if Federal priorities are being reflected in the matching and allocation of these funds. Particular emphasis will be placed on analyzing the State's allocation of Federal funds to school districts in economically

depressed areas, and to target groups specified in the 1968 vocational amendments.

Although the complete study will not be finished until fiscal year 1973, the contractor is being required to provide preliminary report data early in 1972 in order that this information will be available for the decisionmaking process and obviously available for your consideration. Action by the Congress to extend the Vocational Education Act this year would mean that the results of this study, totaling about one million dollars, will be of little practical value as a basis for considering program changes and redirection.

S. 659 would also mandate structural changes in the Office of Education. The Senate-passed bill would require the creation of a Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education within the Office of Education. This Bureau would be responsible for carrying out those responsibilities of the Commissioner in the areas of vocational, occupational and career education (including manpower training) and for adult or continuing education.

S. 659 also requires that this Bureau be headed by an Associate Commissioner at the grade GS-18 level and that it be assigned ten additional supergrade positions. Three of these are to be at the GS-17 level, one of which is to be filled by a person with broad experience in the field of junior and community college education. The other seven positions are to be at the GS-16 level, with two of the positions filled by persons with broad experience in the field of post secondary-occupational education in community and junior colleges, a third position filled by a person experienced in education in private proprietary institutions, and a fourth position filled by a person with professional experience in occupational guidance and counseling.

It is a basic principle of public administration that responsibility and authority ought to be in the same hands. Yet, while S. 659 places ultimate responsibility for the effective administration of the Vocational Education Act on the U.S. Commissioner of Education, it removes from his scope of authority the ability to deploy most effectively the resources available to him. We believe that this is both unwise and unrealistic.

The legislative requirement to appoint as the director of this bureau a person at the GS-18 level could seriously disrupt the organizational structure of the Office. At the present time, only Deputy Commissioners are appointed to the GS-18 level in the Office of Education; Associate Commissioners usually serve at the GS-18 level. We do not believe that one particular education official should be mandated by statute at a higher level than those with equal or greater responsibilities.

Moreover, in legislating positions below the level of bureau chief, S. 659 goes far beyond any existing legislation. In the past, when the structure of the Office of Education has been the subject of legislation, it has been limited to the top position in the organizational unit. The administration has consistently opposed such legislation of organizational structure.

S. 659 would go further, legislating down to the GS-16 level and mandating 10 additional supergrades. Furthermore, the bill would set experience requirements for the holders of these positions. This has

never been done in any other legislation and would severely impair the ability of the Commissioner to hire the people he felt best qualified to do the job.

In short, we strongly oppose the statutory creation of a Bureau, specifying positions and grades, and urge the subcommittee not to adopt these provisions. Moreover, it would be most unwise to determine an organizational structure for career education before decisions are reached on the basis of the current study. We believe that the Congress and the Nation would be better served by allowing the Commissioner of Education to determine the best structure and by holding him responsible for the results.

Finally, I should like to turn briefly to the one substantive change which the Senate made in the Vocational Education Act. S. 659 amends the definition of the term "vocational education" to allow the training of volunteer firemen under the act. The inclusion of training for volunteer firemen would be likely to set a precedent for other, more costly, dilutions of the program. We feel that the act's focus should not be diverted into noncareer education programs.

In conclusion, the administration would urge that the General Subcommittee and the House of Representatives not extend the Vocational Education Act until we have had an opportunity to present our Education Revenue Sharing proposals. We feel that the Federal role in assuring effective vocational programs for all deserves consideration in the broader context of the Federal role in education as a whole.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

We would be glad to respond to your questions.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Thank you, Dr. Muirhead, for your excellent statement, and it really is an excellent statement. I was particularly pleased with the detail that you provided to the committee on the three models that Dr. Marland is developing.

As I travel around the country I hear vocational educators talk with considerable enthusiasm about the progress of those models and they ask me a lot of questions, and I must confess I didn't have all the answers. I am pleased with the statement you have given us here because it does spell out a rather exciting program that you are working on and I think when fully implemented it is going to make a very significant impact on vocational education.

Your general approach to the committee this morning reminds me somewhat of a statement that Dr. Willis once made to me when we were talking about the school board. He said, "Well, it is OK to have a school board and it is OK to have active PTAs as long as they don't fool around with the plumbing."

What you are really saying to the committee today in a very polite way is that, "Gentlemen, you go ahead and appropriate the money but you just leave to our good judgment how that money is going to be spent," and I appreciate that position. I think that is the position you ought to take. As a member of the executive branch of Government. I would think that that would be the only position that you could take.

So I have no quarrel with your taking that position but I respectfully disagree with it and I disagree with it for the simple reason that we here in the Congress do have a broader responsibility than just to

appropriate money for programs and then say, "Well, but you go ahead and spend it." Why that would defeat the very purpose and concept of legislative government. We are on the firing line. We are back home talking to people and we see the problems they have. Then we come back here and we try to translate the solution to those problems in legislation. So the bill before us, H.R. 7429, is that further refinement of the progress that we have been making over a number of years now in trying to put in a sharper perspective the role of vocational education.

Now nothing in this bill so far as I know is intended to in any way dilute the powers of the Commissioner of Education. I would be very much opposed to anything like that because I have the highest respect for the integrity and the sincerity of Dr. Marland's desire to really give America the finest educational system this country has ever had, so I would be very reluctant to in any way get in his way. But this bill provides you with additional tools to do a better job and at the same time reflect a good deal of the thinking of people at the operational level.

So when you say, "While S. 659 places ultimate responsibility for the effective administration of the Vocational Education Act on the U.S. Commissioner of Education, it removes from his scope of authority the ability to deploy most effectively the resources available to him." I wonder if you can elaborate on that? I am not sure where in this bill that would do that.

Mr. MUIRHEAD. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would be pleased to respond. I have appeared before you often enough to be able to say this with good grace, that we have the highest respect for the congressional committee and for the congressional committee's responsibility to lead the way and to provide direction for the programs. I think it would be an unfortunate thing if I were to leave with you the impression that we were saying to the committee, "You provide us the money and we will see that it is distributed."

My experience with this committee and others indicates that the committee stands, as I see it, in the posture of the board of directors. You outline the procedures, you do what seems to be in your very good judgment what would be in the best interests of education. I would like, however, to reiterate a point that I tried to make in the testimony that that responsibility clearly rests with you. However, the Commissioner of Education then should be given authority to carry it out and to use the personnel as he sees fit in carrying it out.

I think your point is well taken, Mr. Chairman, in that the use of the word "resources" is probably an unfortunate one. The word that should have been used there, Mr. Chairman, is that the Commissioner should have the responsibility to use the personnel as effectively as he can to carry out the will of Congress. This is clearly our posture before you.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Where is there anything in H.R. 7429, that in any way interferes with the Commissioner effectively carrying out his responsibilities? The fact that we identified certain concepts and then identify the kind of people that we believe ought to be hired for these concepts does not mean that we have taken away from the Commissioner an iota of authority to be the final judge of who are going to be

the people that will administrate his policies. We obviously have an honest disagreement here.

Mr. MUIRHEAD. Yes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. And in this disagreement we don't in any way indicate that we will not respect your view, but I am just trying to see where in this bill does the authority of the Commissioner suffer any kind of dilution?

Mr. MUIRHEAD. Again I would like to underscore a point that I tried to make and that is that I would like to distinguish between the organizational provisions that appear in both S. 659 and H.R. 7429, and the substantive concept of career education that appears in H.R. 7429. We applaud the concept of career education that appears in H.R. 7429, but we do feel that in order to carry out those provisions that the Commissioner of Education must have more flexibility in the use of his personnel. As you know and I know, if we are going successfully to bring about the change that you have so eloquently supported in your book, "Courage to Change," Mr. Chairman, that it will have effect not only upon vocational education but also upon the whole school program. The Commissioner of Education stands responsible for the whole school program and must, I think, have sufficient flexibility to be able to use the personnel available to him to bring about the changes in career education that will affect the whole school program.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Now you also questioned the advisability of making the Associate Commissioner grade GS-18 and you point out that this grade usually is down to 17 and that this GS-18 is reserved only for Deputy Commissioners. Well, I believe that you do somewhat tend to miss the main thrust of this proposal and we want to make the Deputy Commissioner or the Associate Commissioner a GS-18 precisely for the very reason that we want to give him the same coequal status in that department that is enjoyed by others. In other words, the main thrust of this legislation is to put vocational education on a par.

Now I have watched vocational education treated as a stepchild long enough, and if I do nothing else in my career in Congress I am going to try and turn that around because as I travel through this country there is nothing that the mothers and fathers of America want more than a more realistic kind of education for their children.

Now your whole statement, Dr. Muirhead, as inspiring as it is, again talks about vocational education as something separate and apart for that select group of American students who go into vocational education. And it has been my great hope, and you are absolutely right in referring to "Courage to Change" because the main thrust of that book is to so thoroughly integrate vocational education into the educational system that there will be no distinction.

Every child in my judgment must graduate with a marketable skill and that is why we have said and that is why we believe in this separate department. The head of that department ought to be on an absolute par instead of being shutoff in a GS-17 or 16. We want him right up there, right up there with the brass. As a matter of fact, I am going to ask you later in the morning to provide for me a suggested language to make sure that the Associate Commissioner will indeed be a vocational educator.

Now you take issue with us that we have spelled out some positions. But I think that the one glaring short tone in this legislation is that we talk about an associate commissioner for vocational education but we don't in any way guarantee that that Commissioner is going to be a vocational educator. While I know Dr. Marland's great desire to turn the system around as a complete support of its efforts, on my part I don't know if and when he decides to move on to more exciting fields, as some day in the future he may—I am not suggesting anything at this time—his successor may not have Dr. Marland's keen insight and appreciation and dedication to career education. So his successor might appoint someone for this position who knows nothing about vocational education. For that reason, before the morning is over I will be asking you to give us a sharper focus on how we can assure that this position will go.

Now your concern about the GS-18, I wonder if you can elaborate on that because I just don't think it is a valid objection.

Mr. MUIRHEAD. Mr. Chairman, first of all I think it should be very clear on the record that we are in such substantial agreement with the concepts that you are sharing with us on the need for change and the development of career education. It probably is a little unfortunate that we are getting caught in kind of a bramble patch of organizational structure. We have, as you know very well, lived with an organizational pattern that is more or less influenced in very large part by the Civil Service Commission. Jobs of equal rank and equal responsibility and equal importance are graded at the same level.

I would be quite distressed if we were to find that our small area of disagreement concerning organization in any way stood in the way of our great compatibility with the proposals for career education that you have advocated and that we have advocated. We are, of course, tremendously privileged this morning that the Commissioner is with us and perhaps this might be an opportunity, Mr. Chairman, for him to reply to some of the points you make.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Yes, sir; I would like him to very much.

Mr. MARLAND. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to add to the testimony of Mr. Muirhead and reinforce what he has said—that we are tangled up on what I hope is a very minor difference between us, very minor indeed. We are dealing solely with an organizational arrangement as distinct from the large mandates of Congress properly imposed upon the Office of Education and being carried out to the best of our ability now and in the future.

I would welcome any number of GS-18's in more parts of the Office or additional GS-17's, additional GS-16's. I would have to say at the present time the organization of the Office of Education has been constructed extremely carefully over the past 6 months. It has been my privilege to serve you around a management system very carefully balanced with the personnel resources we have.

We have indeed established a Deputy Commissioner whose duty it is as Deputy Commissioner for School Systems to be in charge of career education and all that it implies, including adult and manpower. We have elevated the responsibilities consistent with your earlier expression and the expression of the committee, Mr. Chairman, to a deputy role at a GS-18.

Now you have also called for the elevation of the post of the Associate Commissioner. I don't think that by jockeying ranks 17's, 18's, or 16's or whatsoever that we necessarily attach the importance and the dignity and profile of that office. I think I have to ask for your continued faith in my commitment to this issue. I think that you will see that the performance has been clear so far in my time here that we have elevated the role of the responsibilities of Dr. Worthington to the highest possible expectation and he is fulfilling those expectations extremely well.

The title of Deputy Commissioner for School Systems therefore—and this is the real heart of my argument—provides the resources of the maximum level that you have called for to permeate the entire Office of Education with the theory and practice of career education so that it will affect the Office of the Disadvantaged, so that it will affect higher education, so that it will affect the very large resources of finance in the education of the disadvantaged, so that it will cut sweepingly across the research activities of the office.

Therefore Congress exacts a provision such as that contained in H.R. 7429 or in the Senate bill, specifying organizational structure within a very large and complex and delicately balanced office, it would seem to me that it does handicap the freedom of the chief executive officer in that office to deploy his forces as can best carry out the will of Congress.

I think the word of "resources" was an unfortunate one in our testimony, since it might lead one to think that we were trying to seek authority to depart from the intentions of Congress. Quite the contrary. The many good pieces of legislation having to do with vocational educational research, vocational education building of curriculum programs, vocational education deployment with national priorities are all being pursued very diligently. I only ask educational freedom, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Well, Commissioner, I appreciate what you are saying. What you are saying is that we could use the same argument, for instance, or had you in any way been hampered in your work when we established the Bureau of Handicapped? We created the Bureau of Handicapped because we wanted to give new special emphasis to this aspect of the educational problem. If my memory serves me right, the Department classified four:

Mr. MARLAND. If I had been testifying, I might have wrongly done so, too, Mr. Chairman, but apparently at that time the committee chose to establish the Bureau compatibly with the existing arrangements of structure, authority, and ranks as then prevailed within the Office of Education. This would be a dramatic breach of the existing symmetry and balance that prevails in our office under the restraints of budget and civil service allowances.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Quie.

Mr. QUIE. I would like to ask you a question first of either the Commissioner or Deputy Commissioner, about the employer-based model. You indicated that the employer-based model would apply to students 15 to 18 but you don't have an age limit on the school-based model, home-based model or the residential-based model. Is there an age limitation or an age area on which you are involving people in the school-

based model and so forth? Does the school-based model mean elementary and secondary schools?

Mr. MUIRHEAD. It means elementary and secondary schools and extends to the first 2 years of postsecondary.

As to your question on the age limitation on the employer-based model and the home-based model and the residential-based model, I think it might be helpful if we were to ask Mr. Rue Harris who is with us this morning as to whether or not that particular information is available.

Mr. HARRIS. Currently we are doing the feasibility study on model 3, which is the home-based model. In general our current thinking is that is for the adult, the young adult primarily but not exclusively. As soon as the contract work that we have now underway is concluded—it will be reported on in October—we will have a better idea of the target population. So model 3, the home-based model, is one that is primarily for the young adult initially. At least that is our present thinking.

For the model 4, the residential-based model, which is now underway or just starting underway at Glasgow, it will be primarily for young adults and for families primarily from the rural areas to be trained to put back into the rural area; it is not a training point for departure to other parts of the country. The whole purpose that we are looking at model 4 is for how to train the people in that area to be useful in the job market in that area.

Mr. QUIE. And that residential-based model you say is primarily for young people but there are whole families. Suppose there is a young person 18 years of age and then his father and mother and younger brothers and sisters would be there. Would his father and mother be receiving training as well?

Mr. HARRIS. The 18- or 19-year-old would probably be there without the remainder of the family as a single individual. However, if the mother and father and family were the ones who were being retrained or were the target basically of the residential experience, then the entire family would be there with the mother and father.

Mr. QUIE. How about the mother and father? The way you explain it now I assume they would have small children.

Mr. HARRIS. Yes.

Mr. QUIE. Who would not be in training?

Mr. HARRIS. No, the entire family would be involved in the training. We would have, for example, the school-based model kind of operation even through the schools that would be local to the residential-based model experiment.

Mr. QUIE. Do they have employment opportunities for them?

Mr. HARRIS. There will be some. That is one of the major thrusts of our current investigations—to find out how we match the employment opportunity with the training and education opportunity.

Mr. QUIE. Now what kind of residential families? Would this be how a commune operates?

Mr. HARRIS. Not quite. As a matter of fact, we are to this day in negotiation with the Air Force about the refurbishing of certain houses as well as barracks in various ways. The residential type structures will be for the families, whereas for the single individuals who

come there there may be a barracks-like or perhaps an apartment-like kind of residential facility.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Will this become known as the Mansfield kibbutz?

Mr. HARRIS. Who knows?

Mr. MARLAND. If I could amplify a little with Mr. Harris, I think it is a little early to pin down the age group. On the industry-based model it is to take that youngster who is perhaps a potential dropout from high school to give him an experience in an alternate system. Our ranges in the other categories are wide open. We don't at this stage have any containment about the age groups in the institutional or home model. For instance, it could well be within the frame of reference that Rue is working on that a 65-year-old woman is suddenly widowed so she is learning to be a practical nurse, let's say, through the resources of the home-based model and return herself to useful employment. Likewise, an 18-year-old high school dropout could get into the career of welding, for example. You would have that whole range of persons not now being served by institutions and what would be a newly created institutional home mostly by way of technology.

Mr. QUIE. Would these individuals be people who are jobless or elderly?

Mr. HARRIS. Unemployed.

Mr. QUIE. How about a ranch hand?

Mr. HARRIS. A man whose position may be coming obsolete for reasons in industrial technology and he could retrain himself for a more contemporary role.

Mr. QUIE. What about the promise of the job to provide job performance? They were going to go back to their home State. Their employment would be guaranteed. Now do you have that guarantee beforehand for the welder or the 65-year-old widow and so forth?

Mr. HARRIS. This will be a topic of discussion as a matter of fact this coming Friday at a board meeting of the Mountain-Plains Regional Educational Center. That is the intent and that is to this point the informal agreement as to how it will work with the States, but the details and the particular parameters have not been worked out yet.

Mr. QUIE. You have the location of the school-based model and of course the residential-based model. What about the other two, the employer-based model and the home-based model, are there locations for them? When you mentioned the Educational Development Corp. in Newton, Mass., the way I read it they are specifically handling a home-based model.

Mr. HARRIS. No, those two models will be specified with respect to geography probably within the next 60 to 90 days. There will be a request for proposals go out in both areas. However, I might say that the home-based model may extend a little bit beyond that. We have put some more study into what the composition of that particular program should be before we go out for proposals. So that could be as late as 90 to 120 days.

Mr. MARLAND. May I amplify that, Mr. Quie? I think the committee should be reminded that the whole thrust of this subject began this past January. Where you find that things are not yet in place it is not because we are unmindful of the urgency or the necessity to get at this subject, but because we are trying to undergird it with research

and development under Dr. Harris. We are trying to draw in the resources most responsible and capable that we can such as Ohio University and Rand Corp. Some of these pieces are not all in place yet and we have been at it 7 months. We have been giving it the utmost—I say the utmost top priority in our office during that 7-month period. (Discussion off the record.)

Mr. QUIE. I do want to commend you for having these models set up and proceeding with them. In the long run I think you need something of this nature to really face the innovative thrust of new legislation which I think needs to be done with substantial amounts of money appropriated for it.

Mr. MARLAND. Since we have gone that far, Mr. Quie, Mr. Chairman, I think you should know that the step is now in progress this very week which does not appear in our testimony. Dr. Worthington can speak to what we are doing immediately at this time to follow on with the States on the subject of model buildings which we have made a strong point about.

Would you care to comment?

Mr. WORTHINGTON. Yes, Mr. Chairman. Of the part C educational funds, half go to the States on the formula basis; the other half is discretionary for the Commissioner. The Commissioner's decision has been to allocate the discretionary funds also to the States on a proposal basis providing the States tie it into the education models which they agree to do. I met this past week with all the State directors and they seem enthusiastic about it.

Mr. MARLAND. If you get the image of that, sir, you get the Office of Education with its resources for development and model building in our research staff and almost in tandem with it now, moving more quickly than I think one expects us to move at this point, and yet very quickly to distribute the resources State by State based upon a proposal that they, too, will be building models in one or more sites in every State within the next 8 months, 10 months.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. The State proposals are coming into our office November 1, many of which will states as Mr. Quie pointed out. We are not going to get this kind of education for so many people that need it unless we take some risks, and unless we are prepared to have some of them fall on their faces. We need to have some of them working and in existence. We can have the model in operation rather than relying on the slow process of reinventing a new concept in every town and community around the country.

Mr. QUIE. What kind of flack do you get from the States themselves wanting to do some on-going programs instead of starting new innovative proposals?

Mr. WORTHINGTON. Having just served as a State director as recently as 6 weeks ago, I recognize that the State directors do want the ultimate in freedom with their part of the funds. However, each of the States, as you know, has a research board and a research coordinating unit under part C of the Vocational Education Act. Each State has exemplary projects. It is interesting to note that of the six School sites, five were involved in State or federally exemplary programs. So the States had begun something. They had not completed a school-based model but they had been concerned about career development

since the Educational Act of 1963 went into effect and established the research coordinating units. In the meeting last week State directors were very enthused about the opportunity to work with the Commissioner using the discretionary fund to establish further what they had already begun.

Mr. QUIE. Good. How long it is going to take to finish this is one question, and second, how long until we get some results on which we can base new legislation?

Mr. MARLAND. Our goal is a very high one. Mr. Quie, and your expectation for us of this 2 million teachers, 16,000 different school districts and boards of education calls for a reform in the largest sense of that word. It will take more time than we would like to have it take. Reform will always be something that we will measure in varying degrees of fulfillment, I am sure. It is short of the idealistic goals that we are setting for ourselves.

I would say there is very little we can count on having in the way of really measurable success in short of 4 years. I think that that in itself in terms of the depth and spread and sweep of this reform would be quite optimistic, and that would probably be in limited numbers of States and cities. I would hope that in 10 years—and I would ask for Mr. Worthington and Mr. Harris to correct me if I overstate or understate that 10 years—might see a significant reform in place with sufficient evidence of successful relevance to the needs of young people coming along so that there could be a national program in force. A beginning of effectiveness within 4 years, a significant national trend in 10 years.

Now do you want to comment on that, either of you?

Mr. HARRIS. No; I think that is reasonable.

Mr. MARLAND. We are not prepared on this by way of conference.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Why so long?

Mr. WORTHINGTON. I think the estimate is fairly accurate because the total system of career education, which permeates the school and goes all through the working life of any individual and which would be the ideal system, requires a retraining of the teachers at the elementary level. It also requires a rethinking on the part of the typical school administrator out there to get career education into the elementary school where young people are working toward a career goal and understanding the world of work.

The man-made environment requires additional training of the elementary teachers and existing teachers. This will take quite a bit of time. Also, the concept of introducing all young children at the middle school and the junior high school—and I said all young children, not just some of those that somebody says are college bound or employment bound. This requires a new kind of person out in the schools, a person who is used to working in a broad type of career education system which is also part of the school-based model.

Mr. QUIE. At the beginning of your testimony and later on you recommended that it not be extended after 1975 and that the special programs of the Vocational Education Act are scheduled to expire on June 30, 1972. So I gather from your testimony that these models are going to be progressed far enough to really give you an indication of what we ought to do prior to the expiration of the act on June 30 next year.

You are planning your budget request now to submit to the process or maybe you have already. Anyway, you are in the process of putting them together and you don't have the authorization for fiscal year 1973 as of now. What are your plans there? I assume that when you do not want to extend to 1965 you must want something different. Is it that you want the Government to present your vocational extension language beginning next year or yet this fall, and if so, for how long do you want extension?

MR. MUIRHEAD. Mr. Quie, what we would like to have you do and this committee do would be to give us a little time first of all to digest the preliminary reports of the study on which you have testimony and second to have before an appropriate committee a hearing on Education Revenue Sharing which will have a very substantial impact upon how we deal with the variety of categorical programs in support of education.

MR. QUIE. Let me stop you right there. It is my understanding on the special revenue sharing you don't propose any changes specifically in the act but rather consolidation, which I strongly favor, consolidating them into those five categories.

MR. MUIRHEAD. That is right.

There is one other point that I should share with you. Of course you know that though the Vocational Education Act does normally expire on June 30, 1972, there is imbedded in the elementary and secondary education amendments, under the General Education Provisions Act, an authority whereby it can be extended for 1 year if the Congress has not taken action. It is our belief that you would be in a better position to take action on the extension of vocational education if we were to wait upon first of all the results of the studies that are going on and until you have had an opportunity to have extensive hearings on Education Revenue Sharing.

This would lead me to suggest, Mr. Quie, that your purposes would be better served and our purposes would be better served if we were to wait upon the duration of additional information and more extensive hearings on this tremendously important legislation in the next session of Congress.

MR. QUIE. We should take more time than we are really given an opportunity to but the Senate kind of forced our hand. The gentleman from Illinois has been working on another piece of legislation that the administration wants very badly, the emergency school aid bill, to say nothing of some other pieces of legislation this year. So we find in the legislative process, every once in a while we are up against the wire like we are now.

MR. MARLAND. Mr. Quie raised the question, Mr. Chairman, whether there may be some amendments or suggested changes from the administration in the existing law. I would think that quite likely there should be, but I think it is early for us to come forward with them at this time until we have had a little more water go over the dam on this subject. I think that merely extending them would not be our intent or merely delaying them but coming back to you with better and wiser suggestions than we are now ready to offer.

MR. QUIE. But you do expect to propose them through the general revenue sharing?

MR. MARLAND. Yes.

Mr. QUIE. I don't recall the length of time. Or consolidate vocational education. It would lose the general education. Even with consolidation?

Mr. MARLAND. It is quite premature for me to predict what might be our position, but even with a consolidation we might want to amplify that in some ways with new evidence growing out of this thrust.

Mr. QUIE. I would like to turn now to the question of setting up statutorily a Bureau of Vocational and Adult Education in the super grades. I don't blame you as an administrator for objecting to the Senate language, and previous administrations did the same thing. We proposed something similar to this in the 1968 amendment but did not enact it into law because of assurances that were given to us by the administration at that time.

With the Bureau of the Handicapped we accepted assurances and went ahead and sent it up. I am personally convinced that we ought to set it up and I don't think you recognize this as really objection to the position taken because as I think the gentleman from Illinois indicated you cannot blame an administrator for wanting all the ability he can get. Some of us have been watching vocational education and that is probably the top of the shortcomings in education in this country. We need to do more there.

If there is anything that would come close to it, it would be the inadequate programs in preschool education but we don't really know as much about that as we do in vocational education. We don't know enough about vocational education but at least we have a history of that and have a certain amount of knowledge.

I think it is sort of like a neighbor farmer of mine said he did not want to learn anything more about farming because he could not put into operation all that he knows now. That is about the way it is with vocational education.

How many people are at the GS-18 level in the Office of Education now?

Mr. MARLAND. Five people, sir.

Mr. QUIE. Five people.

Mr. MARLAND. They are deputies, one of whom is in charge of vocational education—deputy for school systems. And it is in this context that I argue for your consideration of our method of our structure, of our management system installed within these last 6 months—

Mr. QUIE. Who is deputy for the school system?

Mr. MARLAND. Up until very recently this was Dr. Bell. He has been succeeded in the last week or 10 days by Dr. Mathias, also well equipped in career education as well as in elementary and secondary education. He comes with excellent credentials for the task of carrying forward the leadership that you are asking for.

Now reporting to him directly will be the following associate commissioners. Leading to my argument that the integration of career education across the board in the Office of Education is a part of our system, part of our method, part of our thesis, elementary and secondary education reports to the same man. We want elementary and secondary education woven intrinsically with education of the handicapped; both report to the same man. Again to be sure that career edu-

cation and vocational education reaches the handicapped, reporting to the same man, the Bureau of Vocational Education and finally the newly created office having to do with desegregation will report to the same man.

Now this gives us the power and the strength to articulate these resources under one deputy who reports directly to me. I might also add that reporting to me is not a particularly significant constraint. Mr. Worthington reports to me any time he wants to day or night and does. All parties concerned understand and applaud this looseness, if you will, of the formal protocols of the structure. That is also part of our thesis.

So we have indeed established the role which Congress seeks in establishing a deputy at GS-18 for this very purpose. But to exclude him, to isolate him, to establish him in a separate bureau apart from the relationships, the day-to-day shoulder rubbing with the men in charge of the disadvantaged, the women in charge of the handicapped, the people in charge of segregation loses all of the internal concentration of a mass force but that I think is essential to carrying this method forward.

Mr. QUIE. The substantial part of vocational responsibility and training of people comes at the full secondary level. In your case there is none of the rubbing shoulders and the responsibility of that deputy commissioner with the full secondary parts of education.

Mr. MARLAND. I mentioned in my earlier testimony the sweep of the influence of the deputy in the lines of research and development on the one hand, and that is where teacher education is apt to fall and then across into the Higher Education Bureau. You should know that already Dr. Worthington and the High Education Bureau are working hand in glove. The head of our junior college office is Dr. Marie Martin. They are in and out of each other's office. Why? Because of the flow of information that we are trying to establish in this new system of management. And the isolation of the bureau with a new kind of titular head that is implicitly separate will remove a good bit of that freedom from internal critical mass on this theme that we are trying to build.

Mr. QUIE. What is the grade level of the person who heads the Bureau of Higher Education?

Mr. MARLAND. GS-17.

Mr. QUIE. GS-17.

Mr. MARLAND. All of the bureaus are 17's or 16's.

Mr. QUIE. Who does he report to as the deputy commissioner?

Mr. MARLAND. He would report to the Deputy Commissioner for Higher Education. Acting in that capacity now is Mr. Peter Muirhead in addition to his other duties.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Would you yield on that point?

Mr. QUIE. I will yield.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Commissioner, I am honestly confused here on that position in view of this tremendous record that you bring before the committee today on what you have already done in this field, and I think it is the most impressive record that we have seen—at least that I have seen—in the history of education. I think it is the first one really to come here and honestly say, "I am going to do something about vocational education."

Now in light of this excellent record that you have here, I don't understand why we should have a problem of putting the Associate Commissioner of Vocational Education on an equal par with your other associate commissioners. The point is that he still has to work with all the others. For instance, the Department of Handicapped does not have the coequal status and yet if I understand correctly what you and Dr. Muirhead are saying it is that you are going to get at this level adult education, the handicapped and various others. What we are trying to say is that under this bill we would like to have vocational education one step higher so that indeed vocational education would be immediately under you and not bypassing through someone else to get to you.

Now I am sure that what you say here is Mr. Worthington can walk into your office. Of course that is correct. But the problem we have is not the relationship between Dr. Worthington and Commissioner Marland in Washington in OE. The problem that we have is that there is still a large segment of the American educational community down range, down in the hustings down here who continue to think that Voc Ed is for the nonachiever, the kid that is not going anyplace else, and so we are going to put him in Voc Ed.

Now the only way that we are going to break that impasse at that level is to bring Voc Ed right up next to your elbow, right under you, so that there is no question in this country that vocational education is not a fallback position for the nonachiever but on the contrary that vocational education is the basis, the very heart of the educational system. I don't know of any other way that you are going to get the word out.

Now I know no man has spoken out more eloquently than you have for vocational education and yet you know there are people all down the line saying, "Does he really mean it?" They have no basis for challenging or questioning your complete dedication—in my judgment anyhow. Yet because this department is not right next to you like one of the disciples at the Last Supper they wonder. Well, do they really mean this in Washington? That is what I think Mr. Quie is trying to say and that is what I am trying to say.

MR. MARLAND. I would have to say, Mr. Chairman, if they are wondering if we really mean it, there are far better ways for our integrity to be tested than the jockeying of grades and titles.

MR. RADCLIFFE. May I ask a question, Mr. Chairman?

MR. PUCINSKI. Yes.

MR. RADCLIFFE. Did I understand you to say there is a Deputy Commissioner for Higher Education?

MR. MARLAND. Yes.

MR. RADCLIFFE. What is his grade?

MR. MARLAND. He is an 18 and reporting to him are the—

MR. RADCLIFFE. But—

MR. MARLAND. Let me finish, please.

Reporting to him are the bureau chiefs for higher education, for international studies and for the Bureau of Libraries and technology.

MR. RADCLIFFE. All right, but reporting to the GS-18 heading a Bureau of Occupational Education would be for Division Chief for Vocational-Technical Education, one for adult education and one for, manpower programs.

Mr. MARLAND. Yes, and reporting to the Higher Education Bureau Chief, for example, would be student aid, community colleges, school building construction, et cetera, so that each of the bureau chiefs have many deputies and division chiefs reporting to him.

Mr. QUIE. What you are saying is that the Deputy Commissioner has a number of bureau chiefs reporting to him.

Mr. MARLAND. Precisely.

Mr. QUIE. And each bureau chief has a number of division chiefs reporting to him?

Mr. MARLAND. Precisely.

Mr. QUIE. And the three bureau chiefs reporting to the Deputy Commissioner of Higher Education, while vocational educational education there are four of them.

Mr. MARLAND. Yes, and they will vary. Development, for example, has about eight principal officers reporting.

Mr. QUIE. It seems to me the problem that exists here with vocational education is their counterpart in the labor field or the manpower program. You know they are related, you know that in this case there is an Assistant Secretary who has that responsibility.

Mr. MARLAND. I understand that.

Mr. QUIE. The people out in the field who deal with manpower programs don't go to the Assistant Secretary at this level, they deal with some people who are further down. Unless a person is working with Deputy Commissioner Mattheis from day to day he would not realize who to deal with in the vocational education. It would be Bob Worthington who is an Associate Commissioner. I think we have a little peculiar arrangement here, too, in that he is not an Assistant Secretary because I think that there ought to be an upgrading of the levels of everybody in the whole Office of Education.

Mr. MARLAND. I certainly agree with that very warmly, Mr. Quie, and it is not purely for self-interest. I think many of the issues that you are raising by hindsight with the great importance and prestige implicit in the title and rank in Government falls back upon the unfortunate proposition that this office has been in existence since 1967 and many of the other offices of Government, including those that are being established this year, carry with them significant numbers of executive level officers, very significant numbers of GS-17's, 18's, and 16's with a far smaller program in dollars and people.

I am referring to those agencies that have been developed over the last 5 or 6 years in Government. There is a complete incompatibility in rank. I am again not speaking in the way of self-interest or self-service; I am speaking in the way of equity. So the kinds of disparity which you note as between one office and another where one office such as ours may be dealing with far larger sums of money, far larger numbers of people, far larger public issues have inherited a long-standing office that was there even before HEW was and we are bearing the burden of that.

We are not recently created and staffed with the kinds of titles that you imply are appropriate for this office across the board. One would say that higher education in this country today is perhaps a very, very serious problem. Who is to say it is less serious or more

serious than vocational education? The disadvantaged is a very serious problem in this country today.

Now anyone can be an advocate for any one of those and they ought to be a GS-18, they ought to be an executive level 4 or level 5. The truth of it is I count them all very, very important. I think that higher education with its Associate Commissioner title ranked at a GS-17, one could argue pretty well and say this is as fully important as vocational education.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I have a sneaking suspicion, Commissioner, that it is really the higher education lobby that is muddying the waters over here.

Now I am disturbed that we are spending \$2,100 a year for each student and it is much higher in elementary and secondary. We look at the breakdown of personnel in the Office of Education and we find adult and technical has 108 people but higher education has 447.

Now one out of two young Americans go on to college but only about 12 or 14 percent ever complete that college. And it seems to me, and I am just wondering and thinking out loud—perhaps you may want to comment on this and you may not want to comment on it—that a good deal of the opposition to this concept of setting up the special Bureau of Occupation of Adult Education is coming from the higher education academician who somehow sees that maybe this lofty pinnacle he has enjoyed for much too many years is going to be somewhat threatened when we put a new emphasis in this country on vocational education and really get firmly behind you in your efforts to put a greater emphasis on it.

I have a feeling that what they see in this bill is a kind of a threat that may be with that sort of a specific identity of a structure that maybe somewhere along the line somebody is going to start asking, "Well, should we close that gap?" because I must tell you in all honesty, with all due respect to higher education, I cannot justify that spread when I see what is happening at the elementary and secondary level in this school, and when I see a report yesterday that our youngsters are not being prepared at the elementary and secondary level for higher education.

That is one reason they are having one heck of a time at the higher level. Then when I see Al talk about post-secondary vocational education, community colleges, I really believe that some of the opposition to this, and I am not suggesting that is the basis for your opposition but I believe that some of the opposition is that higher education sees here possibly a threat, and that I think is foolish. I think if anything we are going to give them better young people to complete the college course instead of having this huge dropout rate that we now have at the college level.

Mr. MARLAND. I feel compelled to say, Mr. Chairman, since none of the suggested opposition that you are reporting or implying may exist in terms of a disparity as between the career model and higher education model that we are working with, and there have been many allowed there. I receive no criticism as you have.

Mr. MUIRHEAD. May I comment also. First of all with regard to the number of positions that are assigned to the various units in the Office of Education, I think that would be indeed a very erroneous

measure as to the importance of those units. By and large the assignment of personnel is determined by what the rigors of the administration program might be in higher education.

We do have a little different approach because as you know, Mr. Chairman, there are as many private higher education institutions as there are public and that many of the Federal programs are directed toward dealing with colleges and universities individually, whereas many of our other programs in the Office of Education are directed toward dealing with the education departments which in turn deal with schools so that the measure of personnel to the job is really not a fair measure of the importance, really it recognizes the intricacies and the difficulty of the administrator's problem.

With regard to the posture of higher education and career education I would like to share with you and the record that we have had nothing but the most enthusiastic support from the higher education institutions on the concepts of postsecondary career education. There is very definite acceptance in higher education that we must provide the additional diversity beyond the high school and that the road to success is not necessarily the road to a baccalaureate degree.

Mr. QUIE. They must have turned over a new leaf this last year.

Mr. MUIRHEAD. Yes.

Mr. MARLAND. They have not heard our career story.

Mr. MUIRHEAD. We now have in the field of higher education, not only in the community colleges, a support for the career education proposal, but an enthusiastic support for the career education concept in the 4-year institutions that see the possibility of diversifying their first 2 years to provide the diversity that career education would provide.

I think, Mr. Quie, when we talked a few moments ago about the need for research and careful planning and the fact that problem now takes some time for career education, as such, to be firmly imbedded in elementary-secondary education, we have a little different situation in higher education.

We have a situation there where we already have many examples of career education programs going on in community colleges and in other institutions. We might very well carry out some of the concepts that are in Mr. Quie's bill and be able to reach them at a much earlier time than we will effect career education goals in elementary and secondary education, largely because a good deal of work has already been done and we can identify training programs.

So there is no resistance in higher education to elevating and giving more visibility to the concept of career education.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Aside from the setting up of this special Bureau of Occupation and Adult Education, on which I think you have stated your case pretty well—and we obviously have a very honest disagreement—what about some of the other aspects of this legislation; namely, the provision dealing with the provision which would call for the creation in the Office of the Secretary of HEW, a unit for assisting the Secretary in coordinating the manpower program? There is no comparable provision in the Senate bill.

Dr. Marland, do you or Mr. Muirhead or the other gentlemen think that there is a need for this type of responsibility in HEW?

I personally believe that we have much too long had too much separation between manpower programs and the educational community. Now, there is cooperation of varying degrees in the States. If I had my way about it, and I am not suggesting I should be in your position, but I would take the whole manpower program and put it under vocational education.

I was wondering if you have any thinking on that in terms of the bill before us, H.R. 7429.

Mr. MARLAND. Let me respond briefly, Mr. Chairman, and then I will ask Mr. Cross to amplify what might be a Departmental viewpoint on that.

I am very much aware of what I think is a partnership that might be defined as a horse and a rabbit partnership on the subject of manpower responsibilities between the Department of Labor and the Office of Education. I think that this can be corrected.

I think that a more balanced deployment of resources and responsibility can be constructed cooperatively between Labor and HEW. As for the establishment of a still different assistant secretary to accomplish this purpose, I would question very seriously the implicit breach that would lie between the functions of the Associate Commissioner for Vocational Education and somebody else in a different office with a higher rank in charge of manpower.

I would seriously question that as an administrative procedure, but I would rest on Mr. Cross' further testimony.

Mr. CROSS. I think at the moment, Mr. Chairman, that we would want—and the Secretary has made it very clear—that the Commissioner in the Office of Education is the sole focus of education in the Department. To set up a competing structure would not be, in our opinion, wise.

There is also the matter of the pending legislation on the Department of Human Resources which would transfer the manpower programs to the Department of Human Resources from the Labor Department, which as you may remember would be eliminated. I think this would accomplish many of the same things put in the context of a wider reorganization of the Government.

Mr. PUCINSKI. What about that part of the bill dealing with postsecondary vocational brands? There is nothing in the Senate bill along that line, and in H.R. 7429 we do specifically provide a greater degree of assistance to these community colleges specifically for vocational programs.

What is your thinking on that? Anybody on the Panel?

Mr. MUIRHEAD. Mr. Chairman, as I tried to indicate in my testimony, we are in the process of going through what Mr. Quie referred to a moment ago as the budget exercise, and we also are in the process of reviewing our own program to promote and further career education. A very important part of that program planning activity that is going on is for us to analyze and hopefully support a program that would stimulate and indeed assist colleges and all postsecondary education institutions in putting into place career education programs.

An important part of our thinking, also, Mr. Chairman, is the concept in Mr. Quie's bill that in order to do that we have to find a way to coordinate all of the postsecondary institutions, both public and private.

Another important part of our thinking that we must find an effective way within the States to have the State address itself to what is adequate planning for postsecondary career education.

So this is the type of thinking that we are going through at the moment in developing an administration proposal for the support of postsecondary career education. Much of our thinking is quite in accord with the concepts that are in Mr. Quie's bill.

Mr. QUIE. Let me ask you on that, and then back again to the administration, what I have referred to before is that the way the Deputy Commissioner Matheis will be administering this, he will be handling all elementary and secondary school responsibilities, and what we have been referring to here is really the postsecondary level and therefore the rest of it comes under your jurisdiction as Deputy Commissioner for Higher Education.

How do you bring those two together in your whole administrative structure?

Mr. MUIRHEAD. Well, first of all, let me say it is not easy. There is the same problem in the field, and that problem is reflected in the Office of Education, but the fact that it is not easy should not deter us from moving toward its resolution.

What we have done, under Commissioner Marland's direction, is to see to it very pointedly that there are bridges built between the higher education interests of the Office of Education and the vocational education or career education thrusts of the deputy for school systems. Dr. Worthington walks very comfortably between higher education and his present responsibilities.

And when there are problems that have to be resolved, and there are a number of them, the Commissioner's door is always open.

Mr. QUIE. He has to do the resolving, because you have one side and Matheis has the other, and if you don't agree——

Mr. MARLAND. I think we have to add right there, Mr. Quie, that if you can perceive the management concept which I tried to emphasize this morning, these deputies meet with me almost constantly. If there is an issue in higher education, it cuts across something in the handicapped, in the disadvantaged, it cuts across something in the vocational; we are there together constantly. We have regular meetings once or twice a week for an hour, 2 hours, 3 hours, ad hoc.

I am not smart enough to make these decisions all alone, as implied in the refereeing between one or another deputy. We resolve them together, and that is the beauty of what I believe is the management system now before us.

I am in charge and I accept that responsibility fully, but as for refereeing as between deputies, that is not a very good way to run an office, in my opinion.

We come together and reach our decisions in consensus; we have all contributed to them. The disparity between the higher education, or any one of a number of 40 different components in the Office of Education, is subject to implicit conflict. It is resolved right there between the five or six people concerned.

Mr. QUIE. What do the other two deputy commissioners do?

Mr. MARLAND. Let me recall to you our organizational chart. The Commissioner, the Executive Deputy Commissioner, Mr. Muirhead.

The two staff deputies: one the Deputy for Management, Dr. Othina. All of the personnel and management and fiscal and budget and planning activities fall there.

The Deputy for External Relations, which includes legislation—today this meeting was arranged by Charles Saunders—public information, State, and local relationships, management of our infinitely complex advisory commissions, councils, committees, and so on. Those are two staff deputies.

Then we have three line deputies: school systems, which includes the subject we are talking about today, development, which includes research—I call it the breakthrough component. They serve career education. As I say, 50 or 60 percent of our resources in development this year are being pumped into career education. That is our priority.

Experimental schools, statistics, dissemination—these are the categories that fall under development.

Finally, higher education, which, as I said, has reporting to it the Bureau of Higher Education, the Office of International Studies, and the Bureau of Libraries and Educational Technologies.

The five deputies, together with the Executive Deputy and me, are in almost perpetual conference, decisionmaking, collaboration, and keeping the peace.

Mr. QUIE. I guess my way of thinking is not that of an administrator. I look at it from the point of view of a Congressman. It just seems to be that what you need is a Deputy Commissioner for Vocational Education.

Mr. MARLAND. I thought you were going to say that.

Mr. QUIE. And with that, it is written in that the person under him should be a person knowledgeable in community colleges, because out there in the field this has not always worked too well between them.

Mr. MARLAND. We have people who are well established, who are knowledgeable and highly respected in the community colleges, Mr. Quie.

Mr. QUIE. Higher education, not in Matheis' job, I don't believe.

How many supergrades are there in the Bureau of Vocational Education?

Mr. WORTHINGTON. There are three GS-16's and I cannot tell exactly the 15's, but I would say about eight or 10.

Mr. MARLAND. Just supergrades.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. Three 16's and one 17.

Mr. QUIE. How about the Bureau of Higher Education?

Mr. MUTRHEAD. We have the supergrade, the deputy, and four division chief grade 16's, so that there are a total of six.

Mr. QUIE. Six.

How about in the elementary and secondary education?

Mr. MARLAND. I would have to extemporize on that, Mr. Quie, but I would say that you have a GS-17 heading the office, with approximately five division chiefs at 16 or 15. That would be such as the title I, such as the State aid program, and so on.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Would you yield?

Mr. QUIE. Yes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Commissioner, this is not intended to be a "when did you stop beating your wife?" question, but if you have a choice be-

tween the Senate language which says the Bureau shall be headed by an associate commissioner who shall be appointed by the Commissioner and who shall be compensated at the rate specified for grade 18 and so on, and the House bill which says the Bureau shall be headed by a person appointed by the Commissioner who is highly qualified in the field of vocational, technical, and occupational education, as a part of the rank of deputy commissioner, without getting into the question of associate deputy commissioner, assuming that this post is to be established by the Congress, which language would you prefer, the very loose language of the Senate bill or the more specific language of the House bill, which does state that he has to be—he or she has to be highly qualified.

You know, Mrs. Green has really brainwashed this committee. Every time we say “he” now, we have to say “she.”

In the fields of vocational, technical, and occupational education—which of these two languages would you prefer as long as you have to have something?

Mr. MARLAND. If I have this Hobson’s choice only in which to respond, I would say that only on the matter of the principle of less specific language would I recommend the Senate version. I think that the specificity tends to contain the freedom of the Commissioner to do what he must do.

Mr. PUCINSKI. But would the language in the House bill, “who is highly qualified in the fields of vocational and technical and occupational”——

Mr. MARLAND. I would not object at all to having that adopted into the Senate version. I think it is a very appropriate and useful piece of counsel. I think that one may judge within very wide ranges, Mr. Chairman, what is an adequately trained and experienced man in vocational technical education.

I have made my choice in finding the best man in the United States for the job. I expect that I would have done that without the advice of Congress, in all respect.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Well, that is why I was wondering whether this—you know, I said earlier I would be asking for a definition of a vocational educator. I was wondering if this language that is in the House bill would constitute sufficient direction by the Congress that indeed we are looking for a man of Mr. Worthington’s outstanding ability for this spot, if indeed this spot is to be created.

Mr. MARLAND. I would find no quarrel with it, Mr. Chairman. I would say the least specificity in terms of the freedom of the Commissioner to carry out Congress’ policies would be more favorable.

Mr. MUIRHEAD. I think, Mr. Chairman, too, that we should share with you complete agreement that we must give higher visibility to vocational education, but it seems to me that we are running almost in the face of our own progress if we seek to bring about this additional fragmentation. In the long run, the concept of career education that all of us are supporting will require a much closer coordination between elementary and secondary education and vocational education.

The whole theory of career education is that it should be part of the work of the elementary—secondary education program and this type

of movement, it seems to me, runs in the face of that, because it would fragment the organization in the office. What we need to do is to coordinate the organization in the office so that the career education will indeed become an important part of the whole elementary—secondary education program.

MR. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, in the question you asked the Commissioner, it seems to me that the Senate bill gives Mr. Worthington a raise in pay without a raise in position. The House bill gives him both a raise in pay and a raise in position.

MR. PUCINSKI. The point I was making was not so much in drawing a distinction between the Associate and Deputy Commissioners, because Dr. Marland has already discussed that at great length. What I was trying to do is, merely for the guidance of the committee, ascertain whether the language as to the type of Deputy Commissioner that we are seeking, whether the language in your bill would give sufficient direction to point the way toward a person of Dr. Worthington's qualifications.

MR. MARLAND. More than sufficient, sir.

MR. QUIE. The Chairman, I understand, has two quick questions.

MR. PUCINSKI. Two quick questions:

The House bill authorizes money for courses in counseling. We don't have anything comparable in the Senate bill.

MR. MARLAND. We support inclusion of counseling in career education programs, sir.

MR. PUCINSKI. In counseling?

MR. MARLAND. In line with Mr. Muirhead's earlier testimony, anything that can reinforce or strengthen is completely compatible with our position on career education.

MR. PUCINSKI. Also, Dr. Marland, you know the Senate has also adopted a reasonably close facsimile of the bill that I have proposed here in the House on ethnic studies. We have moved the bill out of our subcommittee; it is now before the full committee, and we undoubtedly will be moving to incorporate that into the higher education bill similar to the action taken by the other body.

I was wondering if you would care at this time to perhaps give us some of your thinking on that. Does the administration have a position or do you personally have a position on whether or not we ought to include that in the House bill, since the Senate has already taken that action on the Senate side?

MR. MARLAND. I think our position would be not to resist that action by your committee. I would say that I would counsel the committee as a school man, as a man ultimately charged with helping to carry out the intent of Congress, that there would be some virtue in viewing the ethnic studies legislation as having a more multiethnic task sweeping across the lives of all young people as distinct from applying a categorical segregation of "ethnicity" among whatever the population may be, which implies to me a form of education contrary to most of the things that we have fought for over the years; namely, bringing together many, many parts of the world into this land and working together, in a sense attempting to rise above ethnic differences.

Now, I also recognize the great worth of recording proudly for all of our people what those ethnic differences are and the virtues of the

cultures underlying those differences. I think this should not be exclusive to any one segment of the population, but should be in a generic form of teaching at the elementary and secondary level.

It will be for the reasons portrayed in those different cultures, but if we were to attempt to construct curricula for Lithuanians here, Hungarians here, southern Italians here, and northern Italians there, I think we would go against some of the grain of American educational history.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I am very grateful to you for that observation because that is precisely the purpose of this act. It is not to isolate people more, as you have quite properly pointed out, but rather to bring a greater cross-fertilization of appreciation of those things that make each of us an American.

I said in Chicago yesterday that the American's heritage lies in his diversity of ethnicity. Unfortunately, we can have 30 children in a classroom of different ethnic backgrounds and different races, perhaps even different religious beliefs, and not one of those children knows anything about his neighbor; and then we wonder why we do have the unnecessary tensions and frictions and whatnot.

The testimony before your committee clearly shows that when young children know more about each other and know more about each other's ethnic contribution and cultural contribution, they respect each other as Americans better, and that is the whole purpose of this act.

The testimony before the committee is rather replete with examples of where youngsters have learned more about each other, not necessarily about themselves—and that is the main thrust of this legislation, to help us Americans know something more about each other.

And to that extent, this legislation is designed to provide funds for helping teachers develop curricula which will help them present multi-ethnic programs about the youngsters in that class or the country.

So I trust, then, that the administration would have no objection to this new concept.

Mr. MARLAND. In that concept you have described, Mr. Chairman, none whatsoever.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Marland and Mr. Muirhead and gentlemen, I want to thank you.

I was pleased with one thing you said, Dr. Marland, which I think we should not lose track of. You brought before this committee today an excellent record of achievement in vocational education. You said that you would not want us to get hung up on the very relatively minor differences that there may be in viewpoint on this legislation, because basically this bill has its main thrust in terms of providing funds for occupational guidance, providing funds for greater cooperation with the Manpower Program, providing funds for greater thrust of post-secondary level.

This legislation seeks to complement the excellent job that you are doing and seeks to see if we cannot give you the tools to carry out the very really inspiring goals that you have set out for yourself—you as Commissioner in that office.

So I don't think we have too many differences on this bill. We can work them out.

Mr. MARLAND. I agree, sir. We appreciate your concern and support for this idea.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Thank you for your attendance.

Counsel, do you have any question?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. No.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Counsel?

Mr. JENNINGS. No.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Quie?

Mr. QUIE. No questions.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Thank you. I appreciate your coming here this morning after a very exhausting trip.

Mr. MARLAND. Thank you.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Incidentally, I want to say that the Glasgow project which Mr. Harris has described sounds like a very exciting project. I wonder if perhaps this could not be the answer to some of the problems really plaguing the big cities in how to train or retrain families for a more active role in the economy.

I think you ought to tell Wilbur Mills about what you are doing, because you know he has got the welfare reform program working its way through Congress. I believe that Mr. Mills ought to be briefed on what you are doing in the way of an experiment in Glasgow.

I know it is a very small thing now, but I am most encouraged by what you are doing in this whole model program that you are experimenting with. It sounds very exciting.

Mr. MARLAND. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Thank you.

Mr. MUTRHEAD. Thank you.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Our next witness is Mr. Lowell Burkett, executive director of the American Vocational Association.

Lowell, it is good having you here. We are very anxious to get your views on this legislation, and we are anxious to have your views on some of the statements made by the Commissioner which may or may not be incorporated in your statement. Why don't we put your statement in its entirety at this point in the record, because we have all looked at it and we know where you stand on this, and then go right into some of the questions that were developed during this morning's hearing?

Is that agreeable to you?

Mr. QUIE. Yes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Is that agreeable to you, too?

STATEMENT OF LOWELL A. BURKETT, DIRECTOR, AMERICAN VOCATIONAL ASSOCIATION

Mr. BURKETT. Yes. I would be delighted to come back later if time is a factor.

(The formal statement of Mr. Burkett follows:)

STATEMENT OF LOWELL A. BURKETT, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, AMERICAN VOCATIONAL ASSOCIATION

Mr. Chairman and Members of the General Subcommittee on Education: In behalf of the more than 47,000 teachers, teacher educators, supervisors and administrators in the field of vocational-technical education who are members of the American Vocational Association, I wish to express appreciation to the Congress for the support that it has given to vocational-technical education. I especially want to thank the members of this Subcommittee who have devoted much time and thought to perfecting Federal legislation to promote and improve the program.

Vocational-technical education has come a long way since 1963 in meeting the occupational training needs of this nation. However, there is much to be accomplished in the years ahead.

After years of nurturing, we see evolving in America today a concept in which vocational-technical education, practical arts education, and manpower training and development are being recognized in the mainstream of the total education program with academic education an inseparable part. Vocational-technical and practical arts education brings within the grasp of the greatest majority of youth and adults the potential for human fulfillment. Such educational programs are vital to this Nation, for not only do they offer hope to individuals but they also provide assurance for our continuing technological supremacy and national security.

The Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 was indeed one of the most innovative and far reaching pieces of Federal legislation for vocational-technical education ever enacted by the Congress. It ranks along with the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917 which placed responsibility for education and training of people for employment in the public schools.

The impact of this legislation is just now beginning to be felt and therefore we urge the Congress to give attention at this time to the extension of those sections and parts of P.L. 90-576 that expire on June 30, 1972, in order that the states and local communities might continue their efforts to impact on the areas defined in these sections, which include Section 102(b), Part D (exemplary Programs), Part E (Residential facilities), Part G (cooperative education programs), Part H (work-Study), Part F (Consumer and Homemaking), and Part I (Curriculum).

We are making no suggestions for change in the authorizing level other than supporting a simple extension of funding at the levels authorized for the current fiscal year. All sections of the Act are currently funded at less than the levels authorized. The following chart shows the extent to which authorized funds have been appropriated to implement P.L. 90-576 for fiscal year 1972.

FUNDS AUTHORIZED FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION (PUBLIC LAW 90-576)

Program	Authorizations	Fiscal year 1972 appropriations
Grants to States (sec. 102(a))	1 \$675,000,000	2 \$401,843,455
Disadvantaged (sec. 102(b))	40,000,000	20,000,000
Work-study (pt. H)	35,000,000	6,000,000
Exemplary (pt. D)	75,000,000	16,000,000
Cooperative (pt. G)	75,000,000	19,500,000
Demonstration residential schools (pt. E)	35,000,000	0
Grants to States for residential schools	50,000,000	0
Professions development (title II)	35,000,000	7,000,000
Consumer and homemaking (pt. F)	50,000,000	25,625,000
Curriculum (pt. I)	10,000,000	4,000,000
Total	1,080,000,000	499,968,455

¹ Includes 10 percent set aside for research and training activities.

² Includes \$13,000,000 for research and training activities.

Vocational, technical, and practical arts education in the United States today is experiencing its greatest period of growth. Since enactment of the 1968 Amendments, vocational education has shown evidence of becoming an increasingly effective and dynamic force throughout the Nation. An analysis of the information received from the state directors of vocational-technical education in annual reports submitted to the U.S. Office of Education reflects the following facts and future projections:

In fiscal 1970 there were 8,793,960 persons enrolled in vocational education. This was an increase of 10.2 percent of the 7,979,366 enrolled in fiscal year 1969.

In 1970 there were almost a million disadvantaged and handicapped persons enrolled in vocational education. (Disadvantaged—805,384; handicapped—115,219.)

According to projections taken from the state plans for vocational education, graduates from the programs will supply, in 1971, 31 percent of the labor market demands as seen in the United States. In 1975 the projections are that vocational education program graduates will supply only 24 percent of the labor market demands. Enrollments and graduates in vocational programs are and will

continue to be on the increase. However, projected labor demands for these growth years have been estimated by the states to be expanding more rapidly than the program output.

According to follow-up reports from state agencies and the U.S. Office of Education, the average unemployment rate of vocational education graduates between the ages of 18-24 is 5.2 percent. The average unemployment rate of those in the same group who do not have the advantage of vocational education background is at least 24 percent with large variations dependent upon the race and location of the group being studied.

In 1969, approximately 850,000 students completed their studies, and about 50% of these were available for job placement. Of the total secondary and post secondary, 76.9% were placed (73.6% of the secondary and 90% of the post secondary) in fields directly related to their education. The average percentage unemployed was 5.2% (5.7% for secondary students, 3% for post secondary). The balance were employed either part time or in unrelated fields. The 5.2% unemployed compares favorably to the general population for these ages in which the unemployment rate approaches in excess of 30%, depending on age and race.

Under the provisions of P.L. 90-576, Congress has required of the States long-range program plans for vocational education. The Act specifies that planning shall be for a minimum of three years and a maximum of five years. An additional planning feature was incorporated which calls for local comprehensive plans for vocational education. While State plans have always been required under the Federal Acts, for the first time in our history, both the States and local communities have been stimulated to plan for comprehensive programs of vocational education. This fact alone has stimulated growth and development in vocational education and, at the same time, has created a new demand and necessity for programs at all levels.

Programs are on the drawing boards by virtue of the planning that has taken place. It has taken considerable effort on the part of the States and local school systems to identify the needs in these given areas and we hope that the Congress will see fit to carry through for at least three more years to meet the objectives which it set forth in 1968. An analysis of the projected enrollments in the special programs which are covered by the expiring sections taken from the 1971 State Plans reveals the following:

	1971	1972	1975
Disadvantaged (sec. 102(b) and pt. B) ¹	956,648	1,065,566	1,411,731
Secondary.....	650,821	718,849	926,724
Postsecondary.....	126,581	149,474	220,859
Adult.....	179,246	196,943	264,147
Handicapped (pt. B) ¹	191,885	228,561	337,588
Secondary.....	130,942	156,689	231,448
Postsecondary.....	28,070	33,896	53,101
Adult.....	32,873	37,976	53,039
Cooperative program (pt. G only) ¹	166,664	223,352	393,076
Secondary.....	154,430	206,162	359,081
Postsecondary.....	12,234	17,190	33,995
Group guidance (pt. B and D) (prevocational) ¹	839,515	1,532,229	3,452,352
Work-study (pt. H) ¹	89,434	113,581	175,264
Secondary.....	68,973	91,302	144,755
Postsecondary.....	20,461	22,279	30,509
Consumer and homemaking (pt. F) ¹	2,369,685	2,507,765	2,879,074
Secondary.....	1,757,111	1,844,021	2,070,698
Postsecondary.....	77,727	87,240	106,443
Adult.....	534,847	576,504	701,933

¹ Totals for special programs are included in totals by levels.

To achieve the enrollment goals set forth in the foregoing table, the State planning calls for the following amounts of Federal funds:

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION FEDERAL EXPENDITURES (1972 STATE PLANS)—PROJECTED EXPENDITURES

Sec. of Public Law 90-576	1973	1974	1975
102(b), disadvantaged.....	\$31,395,000	\$36,946,000	\$40,644,000
Pt. D, exemplary programs.....	28,064,000	31,998,000	33,077,000
Pt. E, residential schools.....	14,243,000	35,244,000	34,015,000
Pt. F, consumer and homemaking.....	31,596,000	35,119,000	41,165,000
Pt. G, cooperative programs.....	32,737,000	37,178,000	40,773,000
Pt. H, work-study programs.....	17,586,000	19,163,000	21,354,000

In order to make continued progress, and to move even more forcefully in the directions given by P.L. 90-576 we must have a continued authorization for those programs that are just now getting under way.

We especially urge this Subcommittee to continue support for residential vocational education facilities (Part E). This section of the Act has never been funded. On the basis of established need, every state should have at least one residential vocational education facility. The Federal government has supported the construction of residential facilities for practically every college campus throughout the Nation. Such facilities are also needed at institutions that offer vocational education. We must not continue to discriminate against the student who chooses to enter a field of employment that does not require the baccalaureate degree.

As an appendix to this statement, we are including for the record, information concerning vocational education programs funded under the provisions that will expire at the end of the current fiscal year. We believe these are evidence of need as well as evidence of the capability of vocational education to move in new directions to meet social and economic needs of people.

Another recommendation, Mr. Chairman, concerns the education and preparation of vocational education personnel. Quality teacher education is a basic requirement for quality vocational education. This assumption has been a fundamental premise in vocational education for more than a half century.

Projected expansion of vocational education and manpower development programs draws attention immediately to the need for teacher education and personnel development. During this decade, an increase of from 100% to 150% in the number of teachers is anticipated. Currently there is a reported shortage of some 17,000 vocational education teachers—the only teaching field where such a shortage does exist.

The increased personnel need is accounted for by the expansion of existing vocational education programs, by the introduction of new programs, and by making vocational education available to groups of people not previously served by vocational education.

Although the present programs of vocational teacher education may well become the nucleus for expanded programs, new forms of teacher education must be identified and utilized. A major portion of future expansion will take place in the form of in-service teacher education and short-unit teacher education programs for special groups—teachers for the disadvantaged, the handicapped, and a variety of ethnic groups, and others. Certainly the expansion of teacher education, in quantity, quality, and diversity must match the expansion in vocational education and manpower development.

We recommend that Part F of the Education Professions Development Act (Title II, P.L. 90-576) be extended at an authorized level of \$50 million.

I would like to recommend the inclusion of the language in HR 7429 to create an administrative framework and accountability for vocational education at the Federal level.

It is significant to recall that when Congress first enacted legislation for vocational education, it created a strong administrative body at the Federal level. The program of vocational education was administered by the Federal Board for Vocational Education, consisting of the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Labor, the Commissioner of Education, and three members appointed by the President and confirmed by the United States Senate. Such a structure provided for the necessary lines of communication between education and the various occupational areas to the end that people, citizenship development, education, manpower training, and jobs were brought together through the process of vocational education.

In 1933 the Federal Board was dissolved and the administration of vocational education was delegated to the U.S. Office of Education. The program of vocational education has continued to be administered within that structure although it has been subjected to a series of shifts and changes resulting in its virtual disappearance as an effective office for Federal leadership and accountability.

In the allocation of Federal resources, in legislative changes to bring improvement and expansions in vocational education, the United States Congress has taken the leadership. While we are grateful that Congress has continued to respond to the Nation's needs for vocational education, we submit that there are

vital leadership and accountability roles that must be accepted and administered by the U.S. Office of Education. Until and unless that occurs, we will continue a system of priorities in education which are in contradiction to the needs of people and to the social and economic well being of the Nation. To illustrate this point, the Federal government now invests \$14 in higher education for every \$1 that it invests in vocational education. Our Nation spends \$4 in remedial manpower programs for every \$1 that it invests in vocational education as a source of prevention for unemployment and welfare. It should be a matter of more than a passing interest to note that the total Federal investment in 1970 for the 8.8 million vocational education students was approximately \$300 million. At the same time, the Federal government invested through the Department of Labor's various manpower programs more than \$1,360,000,000 for an enrollment of 971,000 persons.

With one-fourth as much funding as is provided for the Labor Department programs, vocational education enrolled nine times as many persons as were served in the various manpower programs.

We believe that these priorities are unrealistic and that they reflect judgments made primarily in the executive branch of our government. Without support and commitment from the executive agency, which is in turn reflected in the budgeting process, vocational education will continue to be understaffed and underfinanced at the Federal level without accountability. In short, there must be national leadership for a total program of vocational-technical and practical arts education.

Vocational-technical education is an integral part of the Nation's system of education. Its programs are designed to meet the social needs of all citizens as well as the manpower needs of our economy. The primary mission of vocational education is preparation for work, retraining, and upgrading which bring purpose to the educational process.

Vocational education can and does occur at all levels of education and in many types of institutions. Vocational education has significance at all levels of government—local, State, and national—and each level of government has an important and vital function relating to the purposes of the program.

The National leadership and accountability role for vocational education has consistently declined over the last decade while during the same period of time Congress has enacted major legislation to expand and improve the Nation's capability for providing vocational education opportunities "for all persons of all ages of all communities."¹ The weakest link in the chain of leadership necessary for implementing the goals and purposes of the 1968 Amendments is without doubt at the Federal level.

One method of measuring commitment is to look at the resources allocated to getting a job done. In looking at the administrative structure for vocational education within the U.S. Office of Education, you will find that it is one of three bureaus under a Deputy Commissioner for School Systems. To place vocational education in this indifferent administrative hierarchy is to overlook the fact that it is a program that cuts across institutional lines and certainly is broader than programs ordinarily conceived as elementary and secondary education. The functions of research and teacher education are delegated to other bureaus and agencies, thus there is no way in which the total program of vocational education can be integrated into all facets of education. Instead it is splintered and fragmented to the point where there is no central focus for vocational education in the U.S. Office of Education.

Aside from an unworkable, inefficient and ineffective administrative structure that cannot provide adequate leadership and accountability, the Office of Education commits virtually no staff to function in vocational education. In January of this year, the American Vocational Association compiled figures showing the existing staffing pattern of the U.S. Office of Education. We include these selected figures for the record,² but I would like to point out that of the 69 employees allocated to the Division of Vocational & Technical Education, 39 are identified as professional vocational educators. Thirty of the 69 employees are secretarial and clerical.

¹ Statement of Purpose, P.L. 90-576.

² See accompanying chart, page 11.

U.S. Office of Education Staffing,¹ January 1971

Bureau of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education:		<i>Employees</i>
Bureau level.....		43
Division of Adult Education		31
Division of Manpower.....		45
Division of Vocational Technical Education.....		69
Total		188
Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education:		
Bureau level.....		55
Plans and supplementary centers.....		74
Compensatory education.....		102
State agencies.....		76
Impact-school aid.....		62
Equal opportunity.....		24
Total		393
Bureau of Higher Education:		
Bureau level.....		55
University programs		42
Academic facilities.....		31
Special services.....		47
Student financial aid.....		117
College support.....		26
Institute for International Studies.....		129
Total		447
Bureau for Planning, Research, and Evaluation:		
Deputy Commissioner's Office.....		11
National Center for Educational Statistics.....		141
National Center for Educational Research and Development.....		143
Office of Program Planning and Evaluation.....		30
National Center for Educational Communications.....		40
Total		365
Office of the Commissioner.....		67
Regional office coordination.....		419
Office of Legislation.....		20
Interns and support positions.....		61
Public affairs.....		38
Office of Administration.....		341

¹ These figures are selected for purposes of comparison and do not reflect total staffing at the U.S. Office of Education.

For several years the American Vocational Association has been concerned about the lack of leadership for vocational education at the Federal level. We have had many meetings on this subject; our delegate body has passed resolutions; we have conducted field studies to determine the nature and extent of services that should be provided by the U.S. Office of Education in leadership and accountability roles in vocational education. In spite of the new legislation enacted during the last 10 year period, and in spite of the rhetoric coming from officials of the U.S. Office of Education (in both Democratic and Republican administrations) there has been no positive action to strengthen vocational education leadership and accountability at the Federal level. We believe that the time has come for Congress to respond to this need through legislation. Therefore, we urge you to include in S. 659 provisions to establish a bureau for vocational education within the U.S. Office of Education. The head of this bureau should report directly to the U.S. Commissioner of Education and he, or she, must be a person with background and experience in vocational education. The Federal administrative agency for vocational education should be organized and staffed on these broad basic principles:

1. Vocational education programs are often developed in cooperation with other departments and agencies of government; therefore, the policy and decision-making level for vocational education in the U.S. Office of Education must be such that its director can deal directly with his counterparts in other departments and agencies of the government where programs must be developed and conducted cooperatively.

2. Vocational education makes a major and unique contribution to the education of youth and adults through the application of knowledge from the disciplines with skills and practices in business, industry, agriculture, health industries, the home, and other occupational supportive services to prepare people for vocations. Such education contributes to national defense, national security, elimination of poverty, economic well-being, and employability. To achieve these goals the services of a vocational education program, including research and teacher education, must be maintained as a major and distinct entity in the U.S. Office of Education.

3. Vocational education as the mainstream for the development of citizenship capabilities and occupational competence threading through all levels of education and all programs of education is concerned with, and is an integral part of, secondary education, postsecondary education, adult education, education for youth and adults with special needs, and higher education. Because of these broad concerns, vocational education services within the Office of Education should fall within the same administrative and policy making levels as coordinate services so that effective liaison is possible within the Office of Education and other departments of government.

4. Leaders in vocational education in the U.S. Office of Education must be competent vocational educators with depth of training and experience in vocational education in the area of their major responsibility. Parenthetically, it should be noted that the vocational administrator is a composite of skills in general education administration and in the occupations of the world of work, the latter as a result of direct experience with them.

We strongly urge you to legislate an administrative agency of this nature for vocational education at the Federal level. The creation of such an agency must accomplish the unification of all the various functions relating to vocational education into one administrative unit with the Office of Education; it should increase the number of staff to enable experienced and competent vocational educators from each of the occupational areas to give guidance and direction to the total program; it should give representation to vocational education at the highest policy level within the U.S. Office of Education. Without this administrative focus and bureau responsibility, the efforts of this Subcommittee of Congress to achieve equality in education may be fruitless.

In conclusion, may I express appreciation for this opportunity to present our views regarding Federal legislation to expand vocation-technical education. We urge you to take action as soon as possible so that P.L. 90-576 can be extended during this session of Congress. You are well aware of the fact that we are only a few months away from the Federal budgeting process for fiscal year 1973. In order for proper planning efficiency to occur, we should have as much lead time as is humanly possible.

We hope you will accept our major recommendations, and we offer our services to you in perfecting the language necessary to implement these recommendations.

Thank you very much.

APPENDIX I

AMERICAN VOCATIONAL ASSOCIATION, WASHINGTON, D.C.

EXEMPLARY PROGRAMS IN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION CONDUCTED UNDER PART D (PL 90-576)

Exemplary programs and projects in vocational education have been initiated in every state and territory. There are two hundred (October 1970) projects currently operational across the nation. In addition, one project has been initiated in each state and territory from the Commissioner's share of Part D funds.

The projects launched under the Part D exemplary funding by the States range over a diversity of problem areas, and are targeted on particular problems which each State has identified as having the highest priority in its particular situation. A major thrust across many of the States has been an attempt to begin structuring the educational system around a career development theme. Examples:

Missouri—Moberly School District, an exemplary project designed to activate a career development program for all students in Grades K-12.

New Jersey—Camden City, sponsored a Pilot Occupational Orientation Program in the elementary grades which became a model for a Statewide program which Governor Cahill is now supporting on a broad scale with funds from the New Jersey State Legislature.

Ohio—Dayton City Schools and Cincinnati City Schools, used exemplary program funding to launch career orientation programs for 7th and 8th grade students as well as four other major school districts across the State.

Virginia—the Petersburg Public Schools, have undertaken a project directed to the pre-vocational development of disadvantaged youth in sixth and seventh grades.

Wisconsin—Shawano Schools, are establishing a career development program from kindergarten through the 7th grades.

In addition to these types of activities, which are directed toward development of comprehensive career education programs, attention has been given to a variety of other problem areas. Examples:

California—San Diego County, an exemplary project involves the establishment of a computer-assisted work experience placement service.

Colorado—Jefferson County, the expansion of the secondary occupational information program is being carried out under an exemplary grant.

Michigan—Genesee School District, has established a computer-based guidance and career exploration system under an exemplary project grant.

Texas—an exemplary grant has made possible the planning and development of a systematic school-industry training relationship in the construction industry.

Other State projects have been noted which relate to emerging vocational training areas such as hospitality, law enforcement, marine science, agriculture, marketing, natural and environmental science, ornamental horticulture, and transportation occupations. Some projects direct themselves specifically to the disadvantaged and/or handicapped, to work experience programs, to individualize learning systems, to bilingual programs, and to mobile skill training and simulated skill training units.

All of the Federally-administered projects (Commissioner's share of Part D) involve the development and operation of a model career development program which begins with broad occupational orientation at the elementary level, continues through exploratory experiences at the junior high school level, provides cooperative vocational education and other forms of job preparation at the senior high school level, and culminates with the placement of all students when they leave the school system. (Placement to be either on the job or in post-secondary education.)

Increased and continued funding is essential to the life of ongoing exemplary programs and projects for which funds have been, in many cases, committed for a 3-year period beginning in FY 1970. As an example, the projects implementing the structure for the career education concept which are federally administered will by the nature of their comprehensiveness and their complexity require a minimum of three years for full development and maximum impact on educational practice in the Nation.

In addition, demand from the local communities for the kinds of vocational education and career development programs now being demonstrated in these projects indicates that full funding of the originally authorized sum would permit a tremendously accelerated pace enabling school districts to move into programs which now appear to hold the key to educational relevancy in America.

Full funding would also permit the Nation's leadership to move vocational education programs more rapidly into emerging occupational areas; into pro-

grams which provide a higher level of partnership with business and industry, including new systems for vocational training; and into the arena of providing retraining and upgrading for young workers who are released from their jobs for the purpose of increasing their educational attainment.

The Exemplary Programs and Projects in Vocational Education are demonstrating what may well be our most effective system for bringing about lasting change within the educational community. The latitude and flexibility built into this part of the 1968 Amendments permits the U.S. Office of Education and the States to move into actual practice those systems, methods, techniques, and thrusts which up to now have, to a great extent, been gathering dust on the shelves of researchers as examples of good ideas.

April 1970.

APPENDIX II

AMERICAN VOCATIONAL ASSOCIATION, WASHINGTON, D.C.

ENROLLMENT IN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

	Enrolled 1970	Anticipated 1971	Projected ¹	
			1972	1975
Special disadvantaged, ² sec. 102 (b).....	80,000	95,000	100,000	140,000
Consumer and homemaking, pt. F.....	2,419,216	2,369,685	2,507,765	2,879,074
Cooperative vocational education, ³ pt. G.....	23,001	166,664	223,352	393,076
Work study programs, pt. H.....	15,522	89,434	113,581	175,264

¹ Projections for enrollment made by the State director of vocational education in each State.

² These students are not reported separately in the annual report for vocational education from the States. It is estimated that nationwide, approximately 10 percent of the reported disadvantaged students are in the category of special disadvantaged.

Projections shown by the State directors for vocational-technical education indicate an anticipated increase of 45,000 students to be enrolled in special disadvantaged programs by the year 1975. This equates to a need for 3,700 new special disadvantaged programs to be established in the United States prior to 1975 (class size in a special disadvantaged program will average 12 students). The need for 63 additional programs to serve the special disadvantaged programs per State anticipated by 1975 impresses the importance of continuing support for vocational-technical education programs.

³ Cooperative education—One of the fastest growing forms of vocational education in the United States today has a projected growth of more than almost double student enrollment for the next school year. The emphasis placed upon relevant business and industry oriented training has caused enrollment projections to increase from 23,000 to 393,000 in 1975.

The projected enrollments for post secondary education are reflecting the emphasis being given to this segment of vocational-technical education. Projections are that post secondary institutions will enroll almost twice as many disadvantaged students in 1975 as in 1971, 126,581 in 1971 and 220,859 in 1975. In addition, the cooperative programs at the post secondary level are expected to expand from 12,200 in 1971 to 33,900 in 1975. The emphasis upon target groups mandated by the 1968 Amendments to the Vocational Education Act are having an impact on the programs in the States.

APPENDIX III

AMERICAN VOCATIONAL ASSOCIATION, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Vocational Education Expenditures by Source of Funds ¹—Fiscal Year 1970

	Total	Federal	State and local
Pt. A 102(b), special disadvantaged.....	\$10,231,731	\$7,600,389	\$2,631,341
Pt. D, exemplary (State).....	4,876,684	3,446,989	1,429,695
Pt. F, consumer and homemaking.....	171,851,985	13,147,682	158,704,303
Pt. G, cooperative.....	13,024,737	7,248,008	5,776,729
Pt. H, work study.....	4,623,910	2,517,395	2,106,515

¹ With the exception of pt. F (consumer and homemaking), the Federal funds do not require State and local matching.

APPENDIX IV

AMERICAN VOCATIONAL ASSOCIATION, WASHINGTON, D.C.

CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT: PART I—P.L. 90-576

FUNDING

	Authorization	Appropriated
Fiscal year:		
1969.....	\$7,000,000	0
1970.....	10,000,000	\$880,000
1971.....	4,000,000	4,000,000

Staffing for curriculum development

Number of professional vocational educators on staff	Dates
1.....	Present
2.....	1968–November 1970

PROJECTS FUNDED IN FY 1970

Several of these projects are still in the developmental stages and must have continuation of funds.

Post-Secondary

One-half of the funds appropriated were used for curriculum development for post-secondary programs.

New and emerging occupations

Urban Planning and Development Technology, Air Pollution Technology—post secondary curriculum guides.

Pediatric Office Assistants—program guide.

Expanding occupations

Police Science Technology, Library Assistant, Teacher Assistant, Medical Radiological Assistant—post secondary curriculum guides.

Upgrading Nursing Assistants (to licensed PN)—program guide.

Air Traffic Controller, Social Work Assistant (Community Service), Educational Media Technology, Veterinary Technology—post secondary curriculum guides.

Use of Vocational Funds in Post High School Programs—(Guide/Handbook).

Other Areas of Vocational Curriculum Development

Occupational Orientation (World of Work information—for grades 1-2 & 3).

Vocational Guidance Handbook—"The Outlook for Careers Through Voc-Tech Education."

Guides/Handbooks, such as:

Cooperative Education Programs in Small Schools (Include employer's role and responsibilities).

Organizing a Consumer and Homemaking Program for out-of-school youth and adults.

Updating existing listing of State developed curriculum materials.

Miscellaneous

Survey of Curriculum Materials produced in cooperation with other government agencies (including the Department of Defense).

CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS FUNDED FY 1971

1. Development of curriculum and multi-media materials and industrial personnel in computer sciences relating to data communications networks.

2. The inventory of Air Force vocational course materials for possible adaptation to the civilian school system.

3. Establishment of the Institute for Education and Technology. (Several Bureaus are providing funding to be handled by the Division of Adult Education Programs.)

4. Balance of available funds to be used for development of career education concepts.

DISSEMINATION OF CURRICULUM EFFORTS

88 curriculum items printed through Government Printing Office during the last 8 years and have been distributed in amounts varying between 5,000 to 10,000 copies each.

8 items have been printed and distributed by non-government sources.

Even with the current appropriation at \$4,000,000, the projects involving curriculum development are few and not nearly covering the needs. Funds designed for curriculum development are apparently being diverted to develop the career education concept and specified for use in some of the models being proposed for career development.

In the past some materials developed have not been published and disseminated for budgetary reasons. This raises again the question of management, emphasis, and commitment to vocational education.

APRIL 1971.

APPENDIX V

AMERICAN VOCATIONAL ASSOCIATION, WASHINGTON, D.C.

EXAMPLES OF PROGRAMS FOR DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS

The following are only a few of many examples of programs being conducted for the special disadvantaged segment of our society through vocational education. These examples highlight the total concern for all students shown by vocational educators today.

PENNSYLVANIA

Area Vocation-Technical School, Fayette County

Building Maintenance instruction is offered to boys of limited academic capacity and potential ninth and tenth grade dropouts. Curriculum includes a wide variety of common construction and maintenance skills and related knowledge. Less than one percent fail to graduate.

A summer Work Experience program was conducted for twenty-five boys and girls recruited and paid by the Federal Neighborhood Youth Corps. Student duties included painting decorating, groundkeeping, and general maintenance of school facilities.

FLORIDA

E. Dixie Beggs Educational Center, Pensacola, Escambia County

The school can accommodate six hundred boys and girls aged fourteen to nineteen years. The students are considered potential dropouts because they cannot relate to an academic high school setting due to their low level of social and economic background. Skill training includes power mechanics, woodworking, horticulture, appliance repairs, health occupations, building maintenance, business, and personal services. Girls can also learn sewing, dressmaking, fashion design, and flower arranging. Curriculum is ungraded and includes basic education training in math, communications, and reading. After completion, students enroll in regular high school or the area vocation-technical center, or remain at Beggs to develop employment skills. The waiting list to enroll in the Center is 1,300 students.

Duval County

One hundred twenty students who are mentally or emotionally retarded or physically handicapped are taught marketable skills during summer programs at three county high schools. Because they have experienced "social promotion" in an academic setting, their efforts are channeled into the area of their natural interests. Skills taught include automotive body repair, machine shop, general construction, short order cooking, office work, and remedial reading. Special features of the program include a survey of careers, small classes, and individual instruction.

NORTH DAKOTA

Bowman High School, Bowman

One-third of the enrollment of Bowman High School is served by Vocational Agriculture. A special section of the program provides the disadvantaged students with individual help and nongraded instruction. Particular emphasis is placed on off-farm options in business, production, and mechanics.

INDIANA

East Chicago

The Manpower Division of the U.S. Department of Labor and the Vocational Education Division of the State Department of Public Instruction cooperate financially to provide training for sixteen to eighteen year olds considered disadvantaged. Pre-vocational counseling, basic education skills, communication skills, work-adjustment skills, vocation counseling, and on-the-job training are all included. Traditional authoritarian methodologies rejected by the youth are replaced by tutoring and programmed instruction. After twelve weeks, improvement in speech is noticeable.

GEORGIA

Atlanta Vocation-Technical School, Atlanta

The Learning, Earning Education Program (LEEP) is designed for drop-outs between ages sixteen and twenty-one. Designed for twelve weeks, it emphasizes extra-vocational tensions that arise on the job. It also includes skill training for entry level, basic academic instruction, and group counseling.

CALIFORNIA

Bakersfield High School, Bakersfield

The Exploratory Business course for educationally handicapped students employs closed-circuit television for job interview training. Their realistic role playing is accomplished through cooperation with the local telephone company.

Orange Unified School District, Orange

CHEER—Consumer and Homemaking Education Environmental Rehabilitation—provides remedial training in consumer and homemaking education for the adult population of two identified, well-defined boroughs of culturally deprived and economically disadvantaged Mexican-Americans. Instruction includes culture cooking, budgeting systems, principles of buying, advertising propaganda, clothing, and home design.

APPENDIX VI

AMERICAN VOCATIONAL ASSOCIATION, WASHINGTON, D.C.

CURRENT DEVELOPMENTS IN VOCATIONAL HOME ECONOMICS EDUCATION

As a result of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968, programs in vocational home economics education at the secondary, postsecondary, and adult education levels are being expanded to reach youth and adults—males and females—who have varied educational and occupational goals, interests, and needs. Part F of the legislation stipulates that these programs should give greater consideration to social and cultural conditions affecting individuals and families, and to professional leadership development in home economics education.

Since our society is consumer-oriented, Part F of the legislation specifies that home economics education programs should include consumer education. A program of *consumer and homemaking education* was authorized, because such a program can help to insure stability for employment, up-grade the quality of family life, and prepare persons for the dual role of homemaker and wage earner. In addition, it stipulated that programs with new approaches should be developed specifically for individuals and families in economically depressed areas or in those with high unemployment rates.

The Vocational Education Act of 1963 gave impetus to the development of *occupational home economics programs*, which are being strengthened and expanded under the 1968 legislation. These programs are designed to equip persons for employment in the current and emerging occupations which relate to home economics education.

Following are selected examples of new and emerging programs of consumer and homemaking education:

High school students in San Diego, California, who had studied consumer education in their homemaking classes, *help to teach* consumer education in local shopping centers to groups of *shoppers*. The San Diego public schools sponsor this activity as part of the adult education program. In Los Angeles County, *students* apply what they learn about consumer education by *helping to teach Head Start parents*.

In Ohio, the decision was made to concentrate on planning, or improving junior high school (grades 7-9) programs for inner-city girls and boys and adult education programs for the homemakers who live in public housing. The "*Impact Program*" for *junior high school students* is underway in Cleveland and will be introduced to schools in other inner-city areas in Ohio. Students from economically depressed areas are recommended by teachers and counselors to enroll in the Impact Program which offers consumer and homemaking courses suited to their needs and backgrounds. Each teacher has no more than 60 students, provides special counseling, visits their homes, and works with their families. The 11 teachers in the program participated in a 1969 summer curriculum development workshop, sponsored by the home economics education staff of the State Department of Education. The new courses emphasize (a) self-development, family development, and community involvement, (b) managing the dual role of homemaker and wage earner, and (c) orientation to employment. To provide opportunities for parents of the students and other adults to gain help with home and family problems, a mobile unit began serving different neighborhoods in the spring of 1970. The unit contains a clothing, food service, and nursery school area; organized classes are held with a teacher to coordinate the program with the help of two Impact aides. Reference materials and equipment such as portable sewing machines are available for loan.

In Cleveland, Ohio, adult programs in consumer and homemaking education are offered in 11 public housing units. Programs in seven other Ohio cities have been initiated. Group and individual instruction is given to homemakers on foods and nutrition, clothing construction, renovation and care of clothing, upholstery and home furnishings, housekeeping, consumer education, and child development. A nursery school is provided for each housing unit. *Connectors*, who are homemakers from the neighborhoods, *assist teachers* in recruiting individuals for group instruction and in working with families in their homes. In one of the new housing centers in Cleveland, all prospective tenants, before moving in, must complete a course in consumer and homemaking education on how to take care of home furnishings and equipment and how to make maximum use of resources available to them.

In Tacoma, Washington, under the leadership of the Tacoma Community College, one program in consumer and homemaking education is being offered at a housing center. Another is offered two or three mornings a week at *neighborhood locations* such as churches, homes, and community centers to families of low-income servicemen who represent different racial and cultural groups. The lessons begin with the study of foods and nutrition which are of interest to all, and lead into consumer education and other areas of homemaking education as needed. The foreign-born wives of servicemen especially appreciate the help they gain with food preparation and consumer education.

In New York State, *Women's Creative Workshops* (name varies with community) have set up in depressed areas in 18 major cities and two rural areas. One rural area is being served with a mobile unit. During 1968-69 the first center was piloted in Albany, during 1969-70 other centers were developed. They are sponsored by the local board of education and the Home Economics Bureau of the State Education Department. In each local community an advisory committee is set up with representation from public health and welfare agencies, the school, the board of education, and homemakers from low-income neighborhoods. This committee makes the decisions about the location and operation of the center. It surveys the needs of low-income families to determine the programs to be offered. In addition, it helps furnish the center and publicizes the program to local families. *The programs are designed to help people help themselves*. Among those requested have been home sewing and clothing alterations; home decorating, making practical accessories, and furniture refinishing; personal beauty skills such as hair setting and home permanents; and meal planning and preparation using food stamps and federally donated foods with emphasis on

careful food budgeting. *Homemakers come to the center and stay for as long as desired.* They are offered group or individual instruction.

In Chicago, *community centers* are located in some of the high schools. "Skill mobiles" are moved from neighborhood to neighborhood to supplement the parent-child centers in the schools. Homemakers come for help with their home and family problems in groups or as individuals.

Family and Consumer Learning Centers are also being set up in depressed areas in the major cities in New Jersey under the sponsorship of the adult education programs in the local school districts and the State department of education. A program coordinator is in charge of developing the program offerings, a trained person is in charge of the attached day-care centers, and recruiters reach out into the neighborhoods to invite homemakers to participate in the program. Some of the center programs are offered in cooperation with the *Model Cities program*.

Two demonstration programs have been conducted in cooperation with Model Cities programs in Oregon. Personal development and consumer education are two areas of special interest to the homemakers enrolled. One problem faced in that State has been finding teachers with the needed qualifications. In Des Moines, Iowa, two home economics teachers have been employed to work in the Model Cities program.

In New Jersey, several fifth- through eighth-grade middle schools are being developed. The curriculums include units in *consumer education and exploration of careers*.

In Colorado, Arizona, and Texas, many of the occupations home economics programs on the secondary level are offered as *cooperative work-experience programs*. An 18-year-old high school graduate in Texas, who had enrolled in and completed a 2-year cooperative supervised work-experience program in food service, was able to earn \$4,800 with two raises of \$600 within a short time. She lived with her family of five in a one-room home. With the money she earned, two additional rooms were built on the home for the family.

In addition, the Seattle Community College offers a 2-year program to prepare teacher aides. In Ohio, a curriculum for preparing *elementary education technicians* is being developed. *Home Economics teacher aides* received training during the summer of 1970 at Western Michigan University and local directors of vocational education agreed to hire those completing the program.

In the community college at Tacoma, Washington, programs are offered to prepare individuals for *three levels of housekeeping jobs*. The first level prepares for hotel-motel institutional housekeeping jobs; the second level prepares for supervisory housekeeping jobs; and the third level prepares for executive housekeeping jobs. An advisory committee made up of employers who are members of the National Executive Housekeeping Association assisted in developing the curriculums.

Some States have provided facilities for occupational home economics offerings. In North Carolina, a one-room laboratory includes a short-order kitchen, flexible child care facilities, and a management and health services unit. The health occupations laboratory next door may also be used. In West Virginia, a "home economics cluster" laboratory has been set up. It includes a food service area at one end, a small apartment with a bedroom which can be changed from a motel room to a hospital room, a dining-living room area in which home and community services can be taught, and the center of the room is used for teaching a course in clothing services.

Schools have made progress in expanding and strengthening home economics education programs to meet the current needs of youth and adults. Consumer and homemaking education programs are being revised to give greater emphasis to consumer education, nutrition education, child development, and family life; curriculums are being adapted to consider the dual role of homemaker and job holder; and greater attention is being given to professional leadership development. A variety of new approaches are being used to take consumer and homemaking education to disadvantaged families who live in the inner cities and remote rural areas.

Occupational home economics programs will continue to grow as advisory groups from community agencies, businesses, and industries help identify new career opportunities for paraprofessionals in the human service occupations.

As a supporting service to vocational education, home economics education can contribute to the success and well being of workers by helping them to improve the quality of home and family living.

Mr. BURKETT. I might say at the outset, Mr. Chairman, that I received word that I was to speak to the provisions contained in S. 659 which has passed the Senate. I did not direct my testimony to H.R. 7429. I would be delighted to do so if it would be helpful to you.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I wanted to find out what is your view.

First of all, the Department takes the position that they do not believe we ought to extend the 1968 amendments through 1975. I don't see that the extension of these amendments to 1975 will in any way interfere with any of the programs they now have going, or the studies.

Dr. Muirhead spoke of the fact they have got this million-dollar study going and he said that it would be of little practical value as a basis for considering program change and redirections. Well, I don't think that this study is necessarily going to redirect the 1968 amendments.

If anything, the study will probably help them make the 1968 amendments more effective and more operative through administrative and internal changes.

So I wonder if you would care to make a guess?

Mr. QUIE. I think you ought to also point out that he said that we had extensive hearings prior to the 1968 amendments. We have not had extensive hearings.

It seems to me he inferred even though they will not be ready with their models, he didn't want us to wait until 1975 before we have extensive hearings. So I think this would be one problem.

It is good for vocational education to have hearings, because the Congress has always been helpful to vocational education.

Mr. BURKETT. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Quie, it seems to me that what the Commissioner is saying is that the impact study and particularly the models, will reveal some very important findings about vocational education. Certainly I applaud these attempts to evaluate vocational education and to make the program more effective. Nevertheless we have an educational program that is State and locally supported with about \$5 State and local money for each Federal dollar. Planning was mandated in the 1968 amendments. The States have drawn up their blueprint. Their plans are on the books as to what they intend to do.

To interrupt these programs at this point in time would seem to me to be poor administration and management of Federal funds. Although I had said in my testimony that 3 years is sufficient time to extend these expiring sections, perhaps Congress should consider the fact that the Commissioner indicated it may be 4 years before they will have the information needed to evaluate the career education models.

Maybe Congress should think of extending the expiring sections for 4 years, and at the end of the 4 years, there could be an assessment of what has come out of these models. Congress could then hold further hearings and perfect the legislation.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I didn't get the impression from the Commissioner that everything would be just hung up 4 years. What he meant was, I believe, that the input that they are putting into the system all along right now and in the next 3 or 4 years will start having some meaningful measurable effects in about 4 years, and then he thought it would be fully operative within the next 10 years.

Mr. BURKETT. That is, perhaps, the right assessment.

Mr. PUCINSKI. So it does seem to me the greatest service that we can perform around here is to give stability to this program by just renewing it and letting the people down range know what they are going to have at least through 1975.

Now, I am sure that by 1975 there will be many big changes recommended, and those will get adequate hearings and discussion and debate, but I take it then that your position is that renewing this program as provided in H.R. 7429 is—

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, do you want him to answer? There is something I would like to ask him.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I was just going to say the Senate bill extends the gram as provided in H.R. 7429 is—

Mr. BURKETT. Yes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Go ahead.

Mr. QUIE. It seems to me that you, and Chairman Perkins as well, but especially you, could alleviate some of the administration's concern when they mention that they want extensive hearings again, it would be good for vocational education to have hearings, and I do feel that there ought to be. I would think that you could give assurances as chairman of the subcommittee, that, say, next year you will hold extensive hearings on what the local communities and the States have done, because they have made substantial progress in vocational education, and that it may be good for this to be on the record, not only for our colleagues in Congress to find out about it, but for some people down in the administration to find out about it, too.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I think that is an excellent point. We intended to have oversight hearings; we intended to have them this fall. As you know, we have without waiting for formal hearings requested that all 48 State administrations give us a comprehensive report on what they have been doing with these 1968 amendments, and we are now preparing—and counsel advises me that it is now at the printer's—a compendium of those reports; so that we do hope to be able to give all interested parties in this country an opportunity to see what the individual States are doing with the 1968 amendments, so that the States can then borrow from each other on the basis of their experience.

Those school administrators who feel that some State is doing something particularly good will have this kind of cross-fertilization of ideas.

So we are doing that, and very shortly we hope to have available to everybody the reports submitted to the committee by the 50 States, which I think will be a good deal more productive than even if we did hold some hearings here in Washington.

Mr. QUIE. Is there any editorial comment?

Mr. PUCINSKI. No.

Mr. QUIE. You won't run into the same difficulty that Congressman Erlendson had on black lung?

Mr. PUCINSKI. We tried to stay away from that. We were not just publishing the reports or submitting them by the State Directors.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman?

Mr. PUCINSKI. Yes?

Mr. QUIE. One other point I think would be beneficial, with extensive hearings and before the expiration of the act in 1975—I guess

we would do that by extending it 3 years—is that now we are appropriating a little less than half as much as is authorized, and it might be good to point out the need for further funding under the authorization in the 1968 amendments.

You know, a lot of times in education, it is not money that is the most helpful, but I would say in vocational education that is probably the most important.

Mr. BURKETT. It is a big item, certainly. As I pointed out on page 2 of my testimony, Congress has appropriated less than half of the authorization. I would make the suggestion that we don't need any new authorizing legislation, all we need is just to get the appropriations and to extend the expiring sections for 3 more years. You will also see in my testimony that there are some things on the drawing board in terms of the amounts of Federal money needed and in terms of the number of people to be served by the specific programs covered in the expiring sections.

I think the planning that was called for in the 1968 amendments has been most helpful in giving some information as to what the program needs are. The States have done, I think, an outstanding job in planning.

There are always some imperfections in planning. I am giving you in my testimony the actual figures that came out of the State planning that has been done. They are not padded figures in terms of numbers of people or in terms of dollars. It has always been my intent to give Congress the facts, and these are the facts that came out of the State plans.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Of course, the final observation on that point is that there is nothing in the world that precludes this committee and the Congress from offering legislation prior to 1975 if a case can be made out that such legislation is needed or that such changes are needed.

Mr. BURKETT. That is right.

Mr. PUCINSKI. So it seems to me that by moving in this direction we at least establish a floor for vocational education and then we hope to provide some better ceilings to go along.

Now what about the colloquy that we had with the Commissioner and the Deputy Commissioner about the proposal in the House bill for the establishment of a Bureau of Occupation/Adult Education with a Deputy Commissioner?

What is the AVA's position on that?

Mr. BURKETT. We have strongly supported the position of a Deputy Commissioner for many years. You have heard previous testimony from me, but I would like to repeat again that we feel that the leadership and accountability for vocational education within the U.S. Office of Education and HEW has not been sufficient to move the program.

We certainly support the position that is in H.R. 7429. We think that unless this is done vocational education will continue to be a second-class citizen within the Office of Education.

Also, having had to deal with manpower programs and other programs relating to vocational education over the past several years, we see the necessity for having somebody within HEW and the Office of Education who can deal on a par with the other people in these fields. So we strongly support that position.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Now, the question that was raised, Mr. Burkett, about making this a GS-18—what would be in your judgment the practical results or effects of upgrading this title to an 18 and making it a Deputy Commissioner?

Now, you heard the Commissioner counsel against that kind of a move on the grounds that it might somehow or other tie his administrative hands. With your long experience with the Office of Education and particularly in the field of vocational education, what in your judgment would be the precise practical results of that kind of a proposal if it were to be enacted by the Congress?

Mr. BURKETT. Well, we heard the Commissioner say that he was continually in close working relationships with his deputies.

Although I respect Dr. Mathias, who is coming in to serve as Deputy for School Systems, I think we need a vocational educator there as a deputy sitting at the policymaking table in the Office of Education who is thoroughly grounded in the problems of vocational education and the needs for expanding and improving the program.

For that reason, I think we need a GS-18. We need a person designated as a deputy sitting with the Commissioner. As the Commissioner said, he cannot make all these decisions, he needs to have a team effort. He needs somebody on the team that can represent a vocational program that is very critical to this Nation.

Mr. PUCINSKI. What is your reaction to the observation that I made that while I have not the slightest doubt that Dr. Marland works very closely with Dr. Worthington and all the other people involved in vocational education, his position is very clear on where he stands on vocational education, but the fact remains that at the grassroots levels, down range, among those 16,000 school districts that Dr. Marland has some jurisdiction over in terms of Federal legislation, it is at that level that we frequently find the basic educator still thinking of vocational education as something for the least achiever, and it is at that level that we frequently find parents thinking that somehow or other their children are being shortchanged because the children are being directed into a vocational education course.

I made the observation that by putting vocational education in the Washington hierarchy on an absolute par with higher education and the other spectrums of education, this would remove a great deal of this needless diminution of the value of vocational education at the grassroots level.

Is there any merit to that thinking?

Mr. BURKETT. You are absolutely right. Whether it is right or wrong, the States seem to emulate the Office of Education, as far as administrative structure is concerned. The same thing is often true at the local level. The local schools seem to emulate what the State is doing.

If an administrative pattern is established at the Federal level that has a real commitment from the Commissioner's office, to put somebody at a deputy level, then this will also happen in the States and local communities. I have seen the downgrading of vocational education in the Office of Education and I have seen what has happened in the States and at the local level. Whether this is right or wrong, it just happens that way.

I think it is incumbent on the Commissioner to place vocational education at a high level so that he provides the leadership that is needed at the State and local levels.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Finally, Mr. Burkett, I notice there are people who seemingly have seen the light in the Office of Education—and I underscore the word “seemingly.” They are now saying, “Yes, we ought to have a total and complete integration of career education into basic education.”

I have a feeling that what they are really saying is that “OK, we will integrate career education in the basic education and swallow it again”; and what is going to really come out of all this is a kind of a helter-skelter superficial frosting-on-the-cake reference to some aspects of career education without any real sound, firm commitment of vocational education.

I am wondering whether or not career education is not becoming a code word for somewhat ameliorating the VocEd. people but really not doing very much for them.

Again, because of this concern, I feel that the validity of 7429 clearly establishing a Deputy Commissioner who is going to have as his main, principal mission vocational education, has some merit.

Is there any fear of that, or have you any views on that?

Mr. BURKETT. Yes; I certainly do have. I applaud the concept of career education if it means that education has to be more relevant to the world of work and to the needs of people in preparing for employment. I see that a great part of the career education concept is vocational education. That means getting people prepared to go to work.

If we develop a career education program in this country that provides occupational awareness, tryout, experimentation, and exploration, without the capstone of actually preparing people for work, then the career education is no good at all.

I go back in history to one of the great leaders in vocational education, Dr. Charles Prosser, who made the statement that vocational education may eventually be accepted by the schools in this country, but it will be a long, long time. I think we are gaining some in acceptance, but we have a long, long way to go, because many educators in this country do not believe it is the role of the public schools to get people ready to go to work. We have got to keep a focus on vocational education. If we don't, then somebody else besides the schools will be doing that part of education.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Quie?

Mr. QUIE. Do you feel that it is necessary, then, that vocational education be a part of the work of the Deputy Commissioner of the School Systems so that the goal will be set there?

Mr. BURKETT. I think that vocational education in the U.S. office needs a deputy and he needs to be working with all education. This is the point that you so ably made, Mr. Quie. He needs to be working with secondary and elementary education, as well, so that career education is infused into the total education system rather than just the secondary and elementary schools. I think that the designation of a Deputy for Vocational Education would be the best and most appropriate organization for the U.S. Office of Education.

Mr. QUIE. Do you think we ought to have a Deputy Commissioner of School Systems and a Deputy Commissioner of Higher Education?

Mr. BURKETT. It might be helpful.

Mr. QUIE. I think somebody who is knowledgeable and experienced with the handicapped ought to be the one who is the head of the compensatory education, because not everybody knows what the poor child's needs are.

I believe that in vocational education we really have not fulfilled our responsibility sufficiently in guidance and counseling in elementary and secondary education. While in the National Defense Education Act of 1958 we did a great piece of work providing the program for training people in counseling and guidance work, they all seem to have gone—or I would not say “all,” but most of them have gone to the area of academic education; very few had the interest in vocational education.

Now why is it that with the tremendous national interest in vocational education, with Congress probably behind vocational education 100 percent was that mistake made? Why was that blindspot not recognized when that whole program was being developed.

Mr. BURKETT. Since the very inception of vocational education, we have always considered guidance as a very important part of vocational education particularly that part of guidance that helps people identify with the world of work. We have provided a great deal of leadership in that area; however, there have been many people in the field of guidance who have taken a much broader view, which I applaud. This broad view has often dwarfed the vocational aspects of guidance.

I think one of the problems that we have had since 1968 has been the fact that the U.S. Office of Education has not directed a sufficient amount of funds appropriated under the Education Professions Development Act to all aspects of vocational education. Vocational education is employing new concepts, new techniques are being used, and personnel needs to be trained.

I realize that the Office of Education has requested and the Congress has appropriated a lump sum under the provisions of the Education Professions Development Act. The decision on how much is expended on the various programs seems not to be in accordance with what Congress pointed out as the greatest need.

It would seem to me—and I hate to say this because it seems to imply that I want to separate vocational education—that the Congress may need to again earmark money under the Education Professions Development Act and specify the programs they want to be carried out—and guidance and counseling should be one of them.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Would you yield?

Mr. QUIE. Yes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Dr. Worthington made that point, although not that strongly. He pointed out the need for retraining teachers to make them career-aware. I think, Lowell, that you are probably right. You are right, if there is not a significant change voluntarily in the administration of EPDA with a greater emphasis on career counseling, counseling in general, and guidance, I believe that we ought to give serious consideration to putting some sort of a mandatory set-aside in that bill earmarked for these areas of greatest need in education training.

I would say to you that perhaps the committee ought to get a breakdown of the administration of this program, and then perhaps Mr.

Quie may want to join us in offering some legislation that would require some mandatory set-asides.

If you are going to help Worthington do the job he wants to do, and obviously the Commission want to do, then I think we ought to have some kind of mandatory set-asides for guidance and counseling.

Mr. BURKETT. I have great respect for the leadership in the U.S. Office of Education. However, I feel that the management concept that they are using is sometimes a deterrent to the program.

By that I mean, the people who are administering the EPDA have no real feel for some of the problems in vocational education. I think it is unfortunate that the administration of title II of the 1968 amendments moved from the program people within the Bureau of Vocational Education to another bureau. They don't really see the problems of preparing vocational educators that you and some of us see who have been out in the field. These are people who are isolated from the real problems of vocational education.

I think this is another problem in connection with the administration that you are trying to deal with in this particular bill.

Mr. QUIE. Because EDPA is under the Bureau of Higher Education.

Mr. BURKETT. That is right.

Mr. QUIE. And they don't have vocational education. I assume that is what it is. It is under the Deputy Commissioner for Development; it is still outside vocational education.

Mr. BURKETT. That is right.

Mr. PUCINSKI. That probably, though, in the administration of the EPDA and the disbursement of funds, we find probably our strongest argument for H.R. 7429. Because despite everything that is told to us, there is a kind of a built-in prejudice in the Department of many years' standing against vocational education, and no matter how hard the Commissioner tries—and heaven knows he is trying about as hard as anyone has—there is this built-in factor. It has been there for a long time.

I think the only way you are going to break that is to come in with positive legislation. What do you think?

Mr. BURKETT. That is absolutely right. I hoped in 1968 that with the persuasive language Congress gave to the Commissioner and to the U.S. Office, there would be a change, but I have not seen it happen.

Mr. QUIE. You know the reason why—because the administration was opposed to the 1968 amendments. That was all put through contrary to the wishes of the administration. That had nothing to do with the administration. You have to get an administration to be as enthusiastic for the vocational education as the Congress.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Lowell, that is a very interesting statement that Mr. Quie made.

Mr. QUIE. They asked for \$70 million; the next year, \$50 million.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I have a feeling that you cannot blame people like Marland for that.

Mr. BURKETT. That is right.

Mr. QUIE. No, no.

Mr. PUCINSKI. In other words, the appointees, the people who have come here obviously are very deeply committed to this program. But I get the feeling that it is down way deep in the woodwork someplace that you find the opposition to this simply because they have not done it this way in the last 20 years.

I think sometimes that the greatest single argument against civil service is the fact that you just can't change their archaic habits.

Mr. QUIE. I imagine the teacher training institutes, the ones who really have been producing all the teachers' guides for counselors are the ones who would not have the interest in vocational education.

Now, how does this come about?

Mr. BURKETT. I presume it is a built-in bias that they have had against vocational education. It will be slow in overcoming, if ever. I think there has been some change, and some institutions are making some progress, but again, it is very, very slow in terms of supporting good guidance and counselor training as well as vocational teacher education. The good teacher-training institutions are very scarce.

For that reason, I think that there is only one thing Congress can continue to do to meet the needs of all the people, and that is to continue to earmark funds and give direction as to how it is administered.

I regret that very much, because I would like to see vocational education in the mainstream of education, with planning, emphasis, and administration achieved, without any earmarking at all. I am afraid it is not going to be achieved. I think we have the evidence within the Office of Education and we have it within higher education institutions, as you say.

Mr. QUIE. How long will we have to earmark money for homemaking?

Mr. BURKETT. I think Congress did a remarkable job in 1968 in redirecting homemaking to deal with consumer education. I am saying this has worked real well; however, there is a lot of emphasis that needs to be placed on this program yet. It will be some time before we can get this redirection.

I think that consumer and homemaking education is one of the finest programs that Congress is supporting.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. Political pressure caused us to do more than redirect it, but he is earmarking the money. The women have a lot of power in this country. When they think they are being abused a special amendment to the Constitution is brought out which we will all vote for.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Will the gentleman yield?

We obviously have an honest difference of opinion between myself and Mr. Quie on that subject, because I believe that home economics is becoming more and more the keystone of education. We estimate that by 1975, 50 percent of the women of America will be working mothers, so you have got to educate young women for the dual role of homemaker and breadwinner at the same time.

Perhaps equally important is the growing tendency to put young men in the homemaking courses. As the woman of the house becomes not only a homemaker but part of the breadwinner team, the husband is going to have to assume greater responsibilities in the homemaking process.

I have noticed that around the country homemaking people are indeed making available and succeeding in attracting young men into certain homemaking courses, particularly in consumer education. You walk through the average supermarket today on a Friday night, this is not a woman's role any longer; you will find the husband and the wife in the supermarket jointly doing the shopping for the following week.

Mr. QUIE. I have no objection to the teaching of homemaking or consumer education. That is not the idea, that we have to earmark the money. One time we earmarked money for agriculture and industry. We dropped those. The vocational people were frightened to death they would have to compete.

I think that they are still faring well and have some excellent improvement to their programs, too, but the homemaking continues to earmark, and that is how I feel about it, I recognize that and I think that Mr. Burkett and I are together on this. We would like to be able to even eliminate the earmark for vocational education but we recognize full well that they would not get their full share at all, so you will have to continue to have special programs for vocational education for some time to come. In vocational education, I would like to see the day we would not have to earmark for the special program.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Burkett shows an increase in enrollment in 1971 for home economics, but then he shows a big increase in 1972 and a very substantial increase by 1975 in home economics.

Mr. BURKETT. Yes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Is this the consumer education?

Mr. BURKETT. It is the total enrollments under part G of the 1968 amendments.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. How much of that is job oriented?

Mr. BURKETT. I can provide that for the record. I have it, but I didn't bring it with me.

I will be delighted to provide that information for the record.

(The information referred to follows:)

ENROLLMENTS IN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION, BY PROGRAM,¹ FISCAL YEARS 1960-75

Number

	1960	1965	1969	1970	1975 (projected)
Total.....	3,768,149	5,430,611	7,979,366	8,793,960	13,800,000
Agriculture.....	796,237	887,529	850,705	852,983	793,700
(Off farm).....		(55,681)	(205,846)	(268,226)	(348,400)
Distribution.....	303,784	333,342	563,431	529,365	793,600
Health.....	40,250	66,772	175,101	198,044	450,000
Homemaking.....	1,588,109	2,084,351	2,335,755	2,419,216	2,879,074
Home economics (gainful).....		14,169	113,296	151,194	233,800
Office.....		730,904	1,835,124	2,111,160	2,734,800
Technical.....	101,279	225,737	315,311	271,730	564,700
Trades and industry.....	938,490	1,087,807	1,720,859	1,906,133	2,363,900
Other ²			69,783	354,135	2,986,426

Percentage distribution

Total.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Agriculture.....	21.1	16.3	10.6	9.7	5.8
(Off farm).....		(6.3)	(2.6)	(3.1)	(2.5)
Distribution.....	8.1	6.1	7.1	6.0	5.8
Health.....	1.1	1.2	2.2	2.3	3.2
Homemaking.....	42.1	38.6	29.3	27.5	20.9
Home economics (gainful).....		.07	1.4	1.7	1.7
Office.....		13.5	23.0	24.0	19.8
Technical.....	2.7	4.2	3.9	3.1	4.1
Trades and industry.....	24.9	20.0	21.6	21.7	17.1
Other ²			.9	4.0	21.6

¹ Trends in Vocational Education, Vocational Education Information No. 3, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Bureau of Adult, Vocational, and Technical Education, Division of Vocational and Technical Education, Washington, D.C. 20202.

² Includes occupational programs n.e.c. in 1969 and also prevocational, prepostsecondary, and remedial programs in succeeding years.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Counsel, do you have any further questions?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. No.

Mr. QUIE. No more questions.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Burkett, could we ask you to please give us an additional analysis of your position on the parts of H.R. 7429 that you may not have commented on in your prepared statement here?

Mr. BURKETT. I would be delighted.

Mr. PUCINSKI. We would like to have that information just as quickly as possible.

(The supplemental statement follows:)

SUPPLEMENTAL STATEMENT OF LOWELL A. BURKETT, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR,
AMERICAN VOCATIONAL ASSOCIATION

Mr. Chairman and members of the General Subcommittee on Education:

In view of the fact that the testimony which I submitted to your Subcommittee on September 20 did not specifically address itself to H.R. 7429, I appreciate the opportunity afforded me to further extend my remarks in behalf of the 47,000 members of the American Vocational Association speaking specifically to the provisions of H.R. 7429.

The American Vocational Association is indeed pleased to have been consulted in regard to the concepts which this bill embodies and applauds the purposes of the legislation. The Association is deeply concerned that a large percentage of the youth and adults of this nation do not have access to high quality vocational-technical education programs and "that strong leadership and exemplary administration" has not existed at the national level to promote and develop these programs. Our major concerns are for an educational program that prepares people for entrance into employment and for upgrading the employed worker so that he or she might cope with technological change or move up a career ladder. To achieve these goals for the individual it is essential that vocational education be planned and administered as a total program encompassing the broad spectrum of institutional interests and capabilities. The purposes of this legislation clearly have these goals in mind.

First I would like to speak to the title of this legislation. In recent years new words have been coined to replace the term "vocational education" such as technical education, occupational education, human resources development and manpower training. More recently the term career education has come into being and unfortunately is being used synonymously with vocational education. Career education or career development is indeed a much broader concept of education including vocational education as a major component. The reason given for coining these new words is that the new terms will help to improve the image of the program. There is no real evidence that the change of name will improve the image. Those who propose the change frequently do not understand the purposes of vocational education. The membership of the American Vocational Association have given consideration to this matter and are convinced that the interchange of names applied to the educational programs that prepare people for work is creating a dichotomy that is working against the best interest of a total coordinated program. Following is a resolution approved by the AVA House of Delegates on December 10, 1969 in Boston, Mass., which addresses itself to this matter:

"Whereas, educational programs relating to the world of work have historically and traditionally been called 'vocational' and

"Whereas, the term 'vocational' commonly identifies with the American Vocational Association as well as its state affiliates:

"Therefore, be it resolved, that the American Vocational Association strongly encourage the continuing use of the term 'vocational' as a generic term applied to the process and program of preparing, retraining, or upgrading persons for employment; and

"Be it further resolved, that recognition be given to the semantic commonality of vocational education and the terms 'occupational education,' 'career education,' 'manpower training' and 'human resource development.'"

We would urge that the title of this proposed legislation be changed to Vocational Education and that the word vocational education be substituted for occupational education where found in HR 7429.

We are in total agreement with the need for the establishment of a Bureau of Vocational Education within the U.S. Office of Education "which shall be the principal agency within the Office of Education for the administration of this Act, the Vocational Education Act of 1963, the Adult Education Act of 1966 and functions of the Office of Education relating to manpower training and development." This provides for the coordination and administration of much of the legislation enacted by Congress that is concerned with vocational education.

However, we believe there is an inconsistency with this concept in the proposed legislation when it comes to state administration. By giving the Governor of any State the responsibility for designating or establishing a State Agency which will have sole responsibility for fiscal management and administration of the programs under this Act leaves the door wide open for a governor to create a separate agency for the fiscal management and administration of vocational education. In most states the people have elected officials for the purpose of management and administration of educational programs. We believe that having the Governor responsible for designating or creating an agency could lead to further fragmentation, duplication and inefficiency in state administration of vocational education programs.

Every State has a State Board for Vocational Education established for the purpose of administering the Vocational Education Act of 1963. Therefore, the designation of a separate agency is unnecessary. We firmly believe and strongly urge that Congress delegate the State Board of Vocational Education as the sole state agency responsible for fiscal management and administration of the programs under this Act and that the State Board be made responsible for the assurances satisfactory to the Commissioner that are stated in Part B Sec. 110(a). Otherwise, we are firmly convinced that a comprehensive program of vocational education for all people of every age in every community of the State cannot be fully achieved.

We suggest the following wording for Part B Sec. 110(a) "Any State desiring to participate in the programs authorized by this Act shall in accordance with State law designate the State Board created by State law to administer the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 (Public Law 90-576) as the sole agency responsible for fiscal management and administration of the program under this Act and which will provide assurances satisfactory to the Commissioner that—

(1) the State Board shall . . ."

The concept of comprehensive planning for vocational education in a State that was so well conceived in the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 and delegated to the State Board may very well break down if other state agencies are created. The Congress is undoubtedly aware of duplication and overlapping that has occurred when more than one Federal agency plans and administers essentially the same type of program to serve the same clientele. We urge the Congress not to create a situation in the States that could lead to the same condition.

The American Vocational Association urges the Congress to enact this proposed legislation after making these minor changes. The Association is dedicated to an improved, expanded, planned and coordinated program of vocational education to serve all people. We believe the proposed legislation will go a long way in achieving this goal. However, we urge your careful consideration of the suggested changes.

Thank you for permitting me, in behalf of the American Vocational Association to give our views on HR 7429.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Very well. Thank you very much for being with us.

Mr. BURKETT. I certainly appreciate this opportunity.

If there is any additional information we can provide, we will be delighted to do so.

Mr. PUCINSKI. We are going to be working with this very closely in the higher education bill.

Thank you very much, Mr. Burkett.

The committee will stand adjourned until further notice.

(Whereupon, at 12:45 p.m. the General Subcommittee on Education recessed, subject to the call of the Chair.)

(The following material was submitted for the record:)

LESS-THAN-BACCALAUREATE LEVEL TECHNICAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS IN HIGHER
EDUCATION, EASTERN KENTUCKY, RICHMOND, KY.*

FOREWORD

The results of this study are provided as an indication of the current and projected future involvement of institutions of higher education in technical education programs of less-than-baccalaureate level. The rapid growth in programs and enrollments since our 1967 study indicates that a large and increasing number of AASCU and NASULGC institutions have and are continuing to make commitments to programs of less-than-baccalaureate level.

Credit is due Mr. Allan W. Ostar, Executive Director, American Association of State Colleges and Universities and Dr. John D. Rowlett, Vice President for Research and Development, Eastern Kentucky University, for their initial and continuing interest and support throughout this project. Credit is also due Dr. William E. Sexton, Dean, College of Applied Arts and Technology, Eastern Kentucky University and Dr. Albert Spencer, Department of Industrial Education, Eastern Kentucky University, who conducted the investigation and prepared the final report.

Finally, I wish to acknowledge my special indebtedness to the individual representatives of the many colleges and universities who provided the data for this report. Without their interest and assistance, this project would not have been possible.

ROBERT R. MARTIN,
President Eastern Kentucky University.

INTRODUCTION

The historic and current contributions of state colleges and universities to higher education in the fields of teaching, public service, and research is generally understood. In recent years, however, these institutions have begun to make a significant, but little publicized contribution to the preparation of technicians, at the associate degree level, in a wide variety of fields ranging from nursing to law enforcement to pollution control.

It is often thought that only post secondary vocational schools and community colleges are concerned about the preparation, at the less-than-baccalaureate level, of technicians who are badly needed in our complex society, but those involved in state colleges and universities have been aware of their institutions' increasing role in these programs for some time. Unfortunately, there has been very little concrete information made public regarding the nature and extent of less-than-baccalaureate level programs in four-year state colleges and universities. This study, along with its predecessor (conducted in 1967), presents vital information concerning the extent of the involvement of these institutions in less-than-baccalaureate level technical education, as well as the nature of the programs.

The specific questions the study attempted to answer were as follows:

1. To what extent are member institutions of the AASCU and the NASULGC involved in technical education programs of less-than-baccalaureate level on the main campus and in off-campus centers?
2. What is the nature of current technical education programs of less-than-baccalaureate level in terms of duration, student enrollment, and occupational areas represented?
3. What is the nature of planned technical education programs in terms of duration and occupational areas represented?
4. To what extent will technical education programs of less-than-baccalaureate level increase or decrease by 1975?
5. What trends can be identified regarding the development of technical education programs of less-than-baccalaureate level during the period 1967-70?

Definition of Terms

For the purposes of this study, technical education programs were defined as those occupational curricula that combine general education with technical in-

*In cooperation with the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C., and the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C., June 1971.

formation and practical skill development experiences necessary for individuals who wish to enter into and subsequently succeed in occupations that require an understanding of the laws of science and technology and their application in our society.¹

Limitations of the Study

This study was limited to the 412 colleges and universities in the United States and its territorial possessions classified as members or eligible nonmembers of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities and the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges.

Also, the study was limited to the extent that the participating institutions accurately represented the entire population of such institutions included in the study.

The accuracy of the data was limited to the extent that the respondents correctly interpreted and supplied valid responses to the items on the information forms. Comparisons of the results of this study and those of the similar study carried out in 1967 were limited to the extent that the populations and respondent groups for the two studies were not identical. The 1967 study was based on responses from 282 institutions, of a population of 367. The current study was based on responses from 328 institutions, of a population of 412.

SOURCE OF DATA AND METHOD OF STUDY

Population

Members and eligible nonmembers of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities and the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges were invited to participate in the study. Each of these institutions was mailed an introductory letter,² a copy of "Information Form for Technical Education Programs of Less than Baccalaureate Level Offered *On the Main Campus*,"³ and a copy of "Information Form for Technical Education Programs of Less than Baccalaureate Level Offered *Off the Main Campus*,"⁴ and an addressed return envelope.

Of 412 institutions contacted, 328 or 79.6 per cent returned usable information forms, as indicated in Table I. (See page 4)

¹ Technical Education: Less than Baccalaureate Level Programs in Higher Education, Eastern Kentucky University, 1967.

² See Appendix A.

³ See Appendix B.

⁴ See Appendix C.

TABLE I.—DISTRIBUTION OF ELIGIBLE AND PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS

State or territory	Number of AASCU institutions		Number of NASULGC institutions		Total		Percent of response
	Eligible and contacted	Participated	Eligible and contacted	Participated	Eligible and contacted	Participated	
Alabama.....	7	4	3	3	10	7	70.0
Alaska.....	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Arizona.....	1	1	2	2	3	3	100.0
Arkansas.....	6	4	2	1	8	5	62.5
California.....	20	12	4	3	24	15	62.5
Colorado.....	7	5	2	2	9	7	77.8
Connecticut.....	4	3	2	1	6	4	50.0
Delaware.....	0	0	2	2	2	2	100.0
District of Columbia.....	2	0	0	0	2	0	0
Florida.....	4	4	3	3	7	7	100.0
Georgia.....	12	9	3	3	15	12	80.0
Guam.....	0	0	1	1	1	1	100.0
Hawaii.....	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Idaho.....	3	2	1	1	4	3	75.0
Illinois.....	7	7	2	2	9	9	100.0
Indiana.....	2	2	2	2	4	4	100.0
Iowa.....	1	1	2	2	3	3	100.0
Kansas.....	4	4	2	1	6	5	83.0
Kentucky.....	4	4	2	2	6	6	100.0
Louisiana.....	8	7	2	1	10	8	80.0

TABLE I.—DISTRIBUTION OF ELIGIBLE AND PARTICIPATING INSTITUTION—Continued

State or territory	Number of AASCU institutions		Number of NASULGC institutions		Total		Percent of response
	Eligible and contacted	Participated	Eligible and contacted	Participated	Eligible and contacted	Participated	
Maine.....	6	3	2	3	8	6	62.5
Maryland.....	7	7	2	1	9	8	88.9
Massachusetts.....	12	8	2	2	14	10	71.4
Michigan.....	10	10	3	3	13	13	100.0
Minnesota.....	6	6	1	0	7	6	85.7
Mississippi.....	5	5	3	2	8	7	87.5
Missouri.....	8	7	4	3	12	10	83.3
Montana.....	4	4	2	2	6	6	100.0
Nebraska.....	4	2	1	0	5	2	40.0
Nevada.....	1	0	1	1	2	1	50.0
New Hampshire.....	2	2	1	1	3	3	100.0
New Jersey.....	8	6	1	0	9	6	66.7
New Mexico.....	4	2	2	2	6	4	66.7
New York.....	16	9	5	5	21	14	66.6
North Carolina.....	10	10	4	3	14	13	92.8
North Dakota.....	4	4	2	2	6	6	100.0
Ohio.....	7	6	4	4	11	10	90.9
Oklahoma.....	8	7	4	2	12	9	75.0
Oregon.....	5	4	2	2	7	6	85.7
Pennsylvania.....	14	8	1	1	15	9	60.0
Puerto Rico.....	0	0	1	1	1	1	100.0
Rhode Island.....	1	1	1	0	2	1	50.0
South Carolina.....	2	2	3	3	5	5	100.0
South Dakota.....	5	5	2	2	7	7	100.0
Tennessee.....	6	6	2	2	8	8	100.0
Texas.....	14	11	6	4	20	15	75.0
Utah.....	2	1	2	1	4	2	50.0
Vermont.....	3	2	1	1	4	3	75.0
Virgin Islands.....	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Virginia.....	11	7	3	3	14	10	71.4
Washington.....	4	3	2	2	6	5	83.3
West Virginia.....	9	9	1	1	10	10	100.0
Wisconsin.....	8	9	2	1	10	10	100.0
Wyoming.....	0	0	1	1	1	1	100.0
Total.....	298	235	114	93	412	328	79.6

Treatment of Data

The only source of data was completed information forms and explanatory letters received from the 328 participating institutions. The data were classified in four categories, based on the enrollment of the participating institutions, (1) less than 5,000, (2) 5,000-10,000 (3) 10,000-15,000, and (4) over 15,000. This was done in order to make the presentation of the data more meaningful and to make the results more useful to interested institutions. For similar reasons, the data were classified according to their membership or eligibility in the two organizations involved, the AASCU and the NASULGC, further classification was made according to the nature and purpose of the individual tables.

The distribution of participating institutions by enrollment and institutional classification is presented in Table II.

TABLE II—ENROLLMENT SIZE AND CLASSIFICATION OF PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS

Institutional enrollment	Member or eligible non-member of AASCU	Land grant	Total
Less than 5,000.....	123	17	140
5,000 to 10,000.....	71	22	93
10,000 to 15,000.....	26	13	39
Over 15,000.....	15	41	56
Total.....	235	93	328

STATUS OF LESS-THAN-BACCALAUREATE LEVEL TECHNICAL EDUCATION IN HIGHER
EDUCATION

Status of Current Technical Education Programs

Of the 328 participating institutions, 113 (34.5 per cent) offered no technical education programs, as indicated in Table III, (see page 9). The 1967 study indicates practically the same per cent (34.4) of responding institutions not offering technical education.

Seventy-three, or 22.2 per cent of the institutions, offered technical education at the baccalaureate level only. This compares with 25.2 per cent of the total in 1967.

Less-than-baccalaureate level programs were offered in 142 institutions, 43.4 percent of those participating. The corresponding figures for 1967 were 114 institutions, 40.4 per cent of the total. Of the 142 institutions offering less than baccalaureate level programs, 94 were AASCU institutions. This was 40.0 percent of the total number (235) of responding AASCU institutions.

Table III also indicates that less-than-baccalaureate level technical education programs were available in 40.3 per cent of the institutions with enrollments of 10,000 or less, whereas 50.5 per cent of institutions with enrollments of over 10,000 had such programs available. In 1967, 32.2 per cent of the less-than-10,000 group offered less-than-baccalaureate level programs, while 53.6 per cent of the over-10,000 group offered such programs. This indicates a fairly substantial increase in the percentage of smaller institutions offering less-than-baccalaureate level technical education programs, and a slight decrease in the percentage of larger institutions offering such programs.

TABLE III.—LEVEL OF TECHNICAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS OFFERED ON AND OFF THE MAIN CAMPUS
IN PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS

	Number of institutions by enrollment ¹					Total	Percent of totals (AASCU— 235, NASULGC— 93)	Percent of combined totals (328)
	Less than 5,000	5,000 to 10,000	10,000 to 15,000	Over 15,000				
Baccalaureate level only:								
On campus.....	21 (6)	23 (4)	8 (2)	6 (1)	58 (13)	24.7 (14.0)	21.6	
On and off campus.....		1 (1)			1 (1)	.4 (1.1)	.6	
Less-than-baccalaureate level only:								
On campus.....	20 (2)	4 (1)	1 (1)	1 (7)	26 (11)	11.1 (11.8)	11.3	
Off campus.....	1 (2)			(2)	1 (4)	.4 (4.3)	1.5	
On and off campus.....	3	1 (1)		(1)	4 (2)	1.7 (2.2)	1.8	
Both levels:								
On campus.....	22 (4)	17 (6)	8 (1)	5 (8)	52 (19)	22.1 (20.4)	21.6	
Off campus.....				(2)	(2)	(2.2)	.6	
On and off campus.....	2	2 (1)	1	(4)	5 (5)	2.1 (5.4)	3.0	
Program level:								
Baccalaureate level on campus, less-than-baccalaureate off campus.....	1		(1)	(1)	1 (2)	.4 (2.2)	.9	
Both levels on campus, less-than- baccalaureate level off campus.....	2	1 (1)	2		5 (1)	2.1 (1.1)	1.8	
Both levels on campus, bac- calaureate level off campus.....				(2)	(2)	(2.2)	.6	
No technical education offered.....	51 (3)	22 (7)	6 (8)	3 (13)	82 (31)	34.9 (33.3)	34.5	
Total.....	123 (17)	71 (22)	26 (13)	15 (41)	235 (93)	100.0 (100.0)	100.0	

¹ Figures for NASULGC institutions in parentheses.

Program Duration of Current Offerings

Data presented in Table IV, indicate that a great majority, 78.3 per cent, of the less-than-baccalaureate level technical education programs was of two years duration. A total of 132 institutions offered 859 two-year programs. The number of programs per school ranged from one to forty-five, the average being 6.5.

TABLE IV.—DURATION OF PROGRAMS PRESENTLY OFFERED IN PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS

Duration	Number of programs in institutions with enrollments				Total	Number of institutions	Range	Mean
	Less than 5,000	5,000 to 10,000	10,000 to 15,000	over 15,000				
More than 3, less than 4 years.....	4	4	—	—	8	4	1-4	2.0
3 years.....	10	10	1	1	22	5	1-9	4.4
		(1)	—	(4)	(4)	(5)	(-1)	(1.0)
2 years.....	214	199	88	45	546	86	1-45	6.3
	(41)	(36)	(20)	(216)	(313)	(46)	(1-42)	(6.8)
1½ years.....	—	—	—	1	(11)	(1)	(-11)	(11.0)
1 year.....	14	25	8	—	48	23	1-12	2.1
	(3)	(8)	—	(13)	(24)	(14)	(1-6)	(1.7)
½ year.....	2	18	—	—	20	3	1-18	6.7
	(21)	—	—	(2)	(23)	(2)	(2-21)	(11.5)
Less than 1 year.....	5	59	—	—	64	5	1-55	2.8
	—	—	—	(13)	(13)	(2)	(1-12)	(6.5)
Total.....	249	315	97	47	708	126	1-55	5.6
	(65)	(45)	(20)	(259)	(389)	(69)	(1-42)	(5.6)

Note: Figures for NASULGC Institutions in parentheses.

Programs were concentrated at the one- and two-year levels, with only 3.2 per cent of all programs greater than two years in length and 10.9 per cent less than one year in length.

Over all, there was a 13.4 per cent increase in the number of institutions offering less-than-baccalaureate level technical education programs since 1967 (172 in 1967, 195 in 1970). The number of programs offered by these institutions increased from 619 in 1967 to 1097 in 1970, a 77.2 per cent increase. AASCU institutions accounted for 708, or 64.5 per cent, of the 1097 programs offered.

Student Enrollment in Present Programs

The data presented in Table V (see page 13) indicate that a great majority (83.8 per cent) of the students were enrolled in two-year programs. This was to be expected, considering the number of programs at this level. The total enrollment in programs at all levels was 57,145 students. Since a total of 1092 programs reported, the average enrollment per program was 52.0.

Programs in AASCU institutions alone had a total enrollment of 32,363 students.

The most significant aspect of Table V is the increase in enrollment since 1967. The total of 57,145 in 1970 represents an 81 per cent increase over the 31,551 total in 1967.

TABLE V.—STUDENT ENROLLMENT IN PRESENT PROGRAMS¹

Duration of program	Student program enrollment in institutions with enrollment				Total program enrollment	No enrollment data given—Total number of programs
	Less than 5,000	5,000 to 10,000	10,000 to 15,000	Over 15,000		
More than 3, less than 4 years.....	96	125			221	
3 years.....	158	962(2)	4	(230)	1,124(232)	1
2 years.....	8,260(2,039)	7,556(1,182)	5,992(682)	3,320(18,777)	25,128(27,680)	2
1½ years.....				(500)	(500)	
1 year.....	201(25)	933(341)	317	5(218)	1,456(584)	2
½ year.....	25	450		(10)	475(10)	
Less than ½ year.....	97	3,862		(776)	3,959(776)	
Total.....	8,837(2,064)	13,888(1,525)	6,313(682)	3,325(20,511)	32,363(24,782)	5

¹ Figures for NASULGC institutions in parentheses.

Addition or Expansion of Less-Than-Baccalaureate Level Technical Programs in Institutions Currently Offering Such Programs

Institutions currently offering less-than-baccalaureate level technical programs were asked whether or not they planned to add additional programs or expand existing ones by 1975. Those who planned to add or expand were asked to indicate the nature of the programs to be added or expanded, and the year this was to be done. Those who did not plan to add or expand existing programs were asked to indicate reasons for not doing so.

Table VI indicates that 62 or 43.7 per cent plan to add or expand programs by 1975. However, there was a large number of institutions (56) which either indicated that they were not sure whether programs would be added or expanded or failed to respond to the question. The 1967 study indicated that at that time, 49.1 per cent of the participating institutions offering less-than-baccalaureate level programs planned to expand them or add others by 1970.

TABLE VI.—ADDITION OR EXPANSION OF LESS-THAN-BACCALAUREATE LEVEL TECHNICAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS IN INSTITUTIONS PRESENTLY OFFERING SUCH PROGRAMS¹

Institutional enrollment	Plan to add or expand programs	Do not plan to add or expand programs	Unknown or no response	Total
Less than 5,000.....	21 (3)	6 (1)	20 (4)	47 (8)
5,000 to 10,000.....	14 (5)	2 (0)	9 (5)	25 (10)
10,000 to 15,000.....	8 (2)	2 (1)	2 (0)	12 (3)
Over 15,000.....	1 (8)	2 (10)	3 (13)	6 (31)
Total.....	44 (18)	12 (12)	34 (22)	90 (52)

¹ Figures for NASULGC institutions in parentheses.

Of the 98 programs to be added or expanded by 1975, 74.4 per cent (73) were to be of two years duration as indicated in Table VII (see page 15). One half of the programs were planned to be implemented by the end of the 1972-73 academic year.

TABLE VII.—PROGRAM DURATION AND YEAR TECHNICAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS OF LESS-THAN-BACCALAUREATE LEVEL ARE TO BE ADDED OR EXPANDED IN INSTITUTIONS PRESENTLY OFFERING SUCH PROGRAMS

Planned program duration	Year programs are to be added or expanded in institutions with enrollment													Total
	Less than 5,000						5,000 to 10,000							
	1970-71	1971-72	1972-73	1973-74	1974-75	Year unknown	Total	1970-71	1971-72	1972-73	1973-74	1974-75	Year unknown	
More than 3 years but less than 4														
3 years														
2 years														
1 year														
6 months														
Duration unspecified														
Totals:														
1970-71														
1971-72														
1972-73														
1973-74														
1974-75														
Year unknown														
Program total														

Year programs are to be added or expanded in institutions with enrollment

Planned program duration	10,000 to 15,000						Over 15,000						Program total	
	1970-71	1971-72	1972-73	1973-74	1974-75	Year unknown	Total	1970-71	1971-72	1972-73	1973-74	1974-75		Year unknown
More than 3 years but less than 4.....														
3 years.....														
2 years.....	1	2 (1)	3	3	1	1 (1)	11 (2)		1 (3)	(1)	(1)		(2)	1 (7)
1 year.....														
6 months.....		1				2	2		1				1	2
Duration unspecified.....														
Totals:														
1970-71.....	1	(1) 3							(3) 2					
1971-72.....			3							(1)				
1972-73.....														
1973-74.....				3							(1)			
1974-75.....					1	(1) 3							(2) 1	
Year unknown.....														
Program total.....							(2) 14							(7) 3 (18) 70

More than 3 years but less than 4.....

3 years.....

2 years.....

1 year.....

6 months.....

Duration unspecified.....

Totals:

1970-71.....

1971-72.....

1972-73.....

1973-74.....

1974-75.....

Year unknown.....

Program total.....

Twenty-four, or 16.2 per cent, of the institutions currently offering less-than-baccalaureate level technical programs indicated that they did not plan to add or expand programs by 1975. The three reasons given most frequently were (1) technical education was a function delegated to other state institutions, (2) insufficient funds available, and (3) insufficient demand for additional programs (see Table VIII).

TABLE VIII.—REASONS WHY LESS-THAN-BACCALAUREATE LEVEL TECHNICAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS ARE NOT TO BE ADDED OR EXPANDED IN INSTITUTIONS PRESENTLY OFFERING SUCH PROGRAMS¹

	Frequency of response by institutional enrollment				Total
	Less than 5,000	5,000 to 10,000	10,000 to 15,000	Over 15,000	
Reasons given for no addition or expansion of programs:					
Technical education is a function delegated to other State institutions.....	9 (1)	4	3(1)	3(10)	19(12)
Insufficient funds available.....	6 (1)	1 (1)	1	-----	8 (2)
Inadequate facilities available.....	4 (1)	1 (1)	1	-----	6 (2)
Difficult to locate qualified staff.....	1	-----	-----	-----	1
Lack of student interest in present program.....	4 (1)	2 (2)	-----	-----	4 (3)
Insufficient demand for additional programs.....	4 (1)	2 (2)	-----	1	7 (3)
Sufficient number of programs presently offered.....	-----	1 (1)	1	1 (2)	3 (3)
Other.....	1 (1)	-----	1	1 (1)	2 (2)
No response.....	35 (4)	22 (7)	8(1)	2(12)	67(24)
Total.....	64(10)	31(14)	15(2)	7(25)	117(51)

¹ Figures for NASULGC institutions in parentheses.

Addition of less-than-baccalaureate level technical programs in institutions not presently offering such programs

Very few of the 187 institutions not offering less-than baccalaureate level technical programs planned to add programs by 1975. Only seven institutions indicated such plans (Table IX), and they planned only nine programs (Table X, page 18). Table XI, page 19, indicates that the three reasons given most frequently for not adding programs were: (1) Technical education was a function delegated to other State institutions, (2) Technical education was inconsistent with institutional purposes, and (3) Insufficient funds available.

TABLE IX.—PLANS FOR ADDITION OF LESS-THAN-BACCALAUREATE LEVEL TECHNICAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS IN INSTITUTIONS NOT OFFERING SUCH PROGRAMS AT PRESENT

Institutional enrollment	Plan to add programs	Do not plan to add programs	Unknown or no response	Total
Less than 5,000.....	5	(6) 42	(3) 25	(9) 72
5,000 to 10,000.....	1	(4) 30	(7) 14	(11) 45
10,000 to 15,000.....	-----	(5) 11	(5) 3	(10) 14
Over 15,000.....	(1)	(7) 6	(8) 4	(16) 10
Total.....	(1) 6	(22) 89	(23) 46	(46) 141

¹ Figures for NASULGC institutions in parentheses.

TABLE X.—PLANNED DURATION AND YEAR TECHNICAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS OF LESS-THAN-BACCALAUREATE LEVEL ARE TO BE ADDED IN INSTITUTIONS NOT CURRENTLY OFFERING SUCH PROGRAMS

Planned program duration	YEAR PROGRAMS ARE TO BE ADDED IN INSTITUTIONS WITH ENROLLMENT															
	Less than 5,000						5,000 to 10,000						Over 15,000			
	1970-71	1971-72	1972-73	1973-74	1974-75	Year known	Total	1970-71	1971-72	1972-73	1973-74	1974-75	Year known	Total	Total	Total
2 years.....		3		1	1	1	6				1			1	(1)	(2)
Unknown.....																(2)
Totals:																(2)
1970-71.....																(1)
1971-72.....		3														(1)
1972-73.....																(1)
1973-74.....				1							1					2
1974-75.....					1											1
Year unknown.....						1							(1)		(1)	(1)
Total.....							6							1	(2)	(2)

TABLE XI.—REASON WHY LESS-THAN-BACCALAUREATE LEVEL TECHNICAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS ARE NOT TO BE ADDED IN INSTITUTIONS NOT CURRENTLY OFFERING SUCH PROGRAMS¹

Reasons given for not adding programs	Frequency of response by institutional enrollment				Total
	Less than 5,000	5,000 to 10,000	10,000 to 15,000	Over 15,000	
Technical education is inconsistent with institutional purposes.....	28	12 (13)	6 (3)	5 (7)	51 (13)
Technical education is a function delegated to other State institutions.....	40 (5)	30 (5)	11 (7)	8 (9)	89 (26)
Insufficient funds available.....	8 (1)	4	1	1	13 (1)
Insufficient facilities available.....	7	2	1	1	11
Insufficient student interest in such programs.....	1 (1)	2	(1)	-----	3 (2)
Insufficient demand in this geographical area for graduates of such programs.....	(1)	1	-----	-----	1 (1)
Faculty opposition to such programs.....	4	-----	-----	-----	4
Other.....	6 (1)	5 (3)	1 (1)	1	13 (5)
No response.....	16 (3)	9 (2)	2 (3)	1 (4)	28 (12)
Total.....	110 (12)	65 (13)	22 (15)	16 (20)	213 (60)

¹ Figures for NASULGC institutions in parenthesis.*Program titles*

Table XII presents the program titles reported by responding institutions. Sixty different titles are reported in the table, but many of the titles include several related programs. "Business and related," for instance, includes programs in accounting, business administration, and other areas.

TABLE XII.—TECHNICAL PROGRAMS OF LESS-THAN-BACCALAUREATE LEVEL PRESENTLY OFFERED IN PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS

	Institutional enrollment				Total
	Less than 5,000	5,000 to 10,000	10,000 to 15,000	Over 15,000	
Area unspecified.....	4 (9)	194 (19)	30 (25)	33 (148)	462
Secretarial and clerical.....	38 (4)	13 (3)	4 (2)	1 (7)	72
Business and related programs.....	23 (2)	25 (3)	11 (1)	1 (3)	68
Medical and health.....	10 (6)	6 (7)	6 (1)	1 (17)	54
Nursing.....	23 (3)	6 (5)	2 (1)	1 (6)	47
Agriculture.....	3	4 (15)	1 (7)	1 (4)	34
Drafting, design and drafting.....	16	8 (1)	1	2 (2)	30
Electronics.....	13	5 (2)	3 (1)	3	27
Law enforcement.....	10 (1)	7	4	2 (2)	24
Electrical.....	8 (7)	2	2	1 (1)	21
Automotive.....	13	(1)	1	(1)	16
General mining.....	(16)	-----	-----	-----	16
Data processing.....	6 (2)	3	2	2	15
Food management.....	(1)	2 (1)	(8)	1 (2)	15
Civil engineering technology.....	6 (1)	2 (1)	1	(3)	14
Engineering technology (area not specified).....	8 (2)	-----	-----	(2)	12
Aviation technology.....	-----	-----	3	1 (7)	11
Computer technology.....	3 (2)	(2)	1	(3)	9
Building and construction.....	5 (1)	(1)	1	(1)	9
Forest technology, wood technology and related.....	2 (1)	2 (1)	-----	(3)	9
Graphic arts.....	3 (1)	2	1	(1)	8
Metals.....	6	1	1	-----	8
Industrial technology.....	3 (1)	2	1	-----	7
Mechanical technology.....	5	(1)	(1)	(1)	7
Mechanical engineering technology.....	3	(1)	1	(1)	6
Air-conditioning.....	2	1	1	1	5
Chemical.....	4	1	-----	-----	5
Education.....	4	-----	1	-----	5
Vocational industrial, technical teacher education.....	-----	-----	(4)	(1)	5
Electro-mechanical.....	2	-----	-----	(1)	3
Homemaking supervision.....	-----	-----	1 (1)	1	3
Industrial engineering technology.....	1	-----	(1)	(1)	3
Merchandising.....	(1)	-----	1	(1)	3
Resource management technology environmental health technology water resources.....	2	-----	-----	(1)	3

TABLE XII.—TECHNICAL PROGRAMS OF LESS-THAN-BACCALAUREATE LEVEL PRESENTLY OFFERED IN PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS—Continued

	Institutional enrollment				Total
	Less than 5,000	5,000 to 10,000	10,000 to 15,000	Over 15,000	
Transportation technology.....	(1)	(1)	1	-----	3
Welding.....	3	-----	-----	-----	3
Commercial art technology.....	-----	-----	1	(1)	2
Cosmetology.....	1	(1)	-----	-----	2
Instrumentation.....	-----	(2)	-----	-----	2
Library science.....	1	-----	-----	(1)	2
Social science.....	-----	1	-----	(1)	2
Architectural engineering technology.....	(1)	-----	-----	-----	1
Base hydraulics.....	(1)	-----	-----	-----	1
Broadcast technology.....	1	-----	-----	-----	1
Cyrotechnology.....	-----	(1)	-----	-----	1
Airdrome and powerplant technology.....	1	-----	-----	-----	1
Industrial management.....	-----	-----	-----	(1)	1
Industrial media.....	-----	1	-----	-----	1
Industrial relations.....	-----	-----	-----	(1)	1
Materials technology.....	-----	-----	(1)	-----	1
Paper technology.....	-----	-----	(1)	-----	1
Physical science technology.....	1	-----	-----	-----	1
Plastics.....	1	-----	-----	-----	1
Radio-TV servicing.....	1	-----	-----	-----	1
Recreation supervision.....	-----	(1)	-----	-----	1
Science technology.....	-----	-----	1	-----	1
Small arms process.....	1	-----	-----	-----	1
Technical writing.....	-----	-----	-----	(1)	1
Tele-communications.....	-----	-----	-----	(1)	1
Tool and manufacturing technology.....	-----	-----	-----	(1)	1
Total.....	237 (64)	288 (70)	84 (55)	48 (227)	1,073

Trends from 1967-71

One of the purposes of this study was to identify trends in the development of of technical programs of less-than-baccalaureate level during the period 1967-71.

TABLE XIII.—CHANGE IN ENVIRONMENT AND NUMBER OF LESS-THAN-BACCALAUREATE LEVEL PROGRAMS FROM 1967 TO 1971

	1967	1971	Change (percent)
Number of programs.....	619	1,097	Up 77.2
Total student enrollment.....	31,551	57,145	Up 81.1

The most significant changes during this period was the great increase in both the number of programs and the student enrollment in the programs, as indicated in Table XIII. The number of programs increased from 619 in 1967 to 1097 in 1971, a 77.2 per cent jump in a four-year period. Student enrollment in these programs likewise increased greatly, from 31,551 in 1967 to 57,145 in 1971, or an 81.1 per cent increase.

Findings and Conclusions

The interpretation of the data collected and presented by this study leads to the following conclusions, based on the purposes of the research as set forth on page 2.

1. Member institutions and eligible nonmembers of the AASCU and the NASULGC are involved to a considerable extent in less-than-baccalaureate technical programs and furthermore, their involvement increased sharply during the period 1967-71.

2. The less-than-baccalaureate level programs offered in the participating institutions were mainly two-year programs, but there was a broad range of individual program titles. The average enrollment in the 1097 programs reported was slightly over 52 students per program.

3. Programs planned for addition or expansion by 1975 varied widely in individual titles, but the great majority were planned to be of two years in length.

4. If all the 97 programs planned are implemented by 1975, this would be a substantial increase in the number of programs presently offered, although not nearly so great as the increase from 1967-71.

5. The most significant trend in the development of less-than-baccalaureate level technical programs from 1967-71 was the very sharp increase in both the number of programs offered and the student enrollment in these programs.

APPENDIX A

EASTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY,
Richmond, Ky., October 26, 1970.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Eastern Kentucky University is cooperating with the American Association of State Colleges and Universities and the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges in a research project designed to ascertain the current status of less than baccalaureate level technical and occupational education programs in institutions of higher education. From this study we hope to identify the extent of *current* involvement in such programs, the *projected* involvement by 1975, and the trends since 1967 in the development of these programs. This study was first carried out in 1967, and the report has been very valuable to many people and organizations concerned with higher education.

For the purpose of this study, technical education programs are defined as those occupational curricula that combine general education with technical information and practical skill development experiences necessary for individuals who wish to enter into and subsequently succeed in occupations that require an understanding of the laws of science and technology and their application in our society. I would emphasize, however, that we are concerned with all associate degree and less than baccalaureate level programs.

I will appreciate it very much if you will assist us, in the following manner, in gathering the data that we need for this study:

1. Complete the enclosed information forms and return to me at your earliest convenience. The forms have been constructed to facilitate speed in completion and thereby minimize the imposition being made upon your busy schedule.

2. Send copies of pages 23, 24, and 25 of your institution's Higher Education General Information Survey, "Degrees and Other Formal Awards Conferred Between July 1, 1969, and June 30, 1970." These pages contain data regarding less than baccalaureate level programs.

You have my assurance that *all* information contributed will be treated in a manner that will not identify institutions or individuals, and you will be provided with a summary of the study. Please accept my thanks, in advance, for your cooperation.

Cordially yours,

ROBERT R. MARTIN, *President*.

APPENDIX B

INFORMATION FORM FOR TECHNICAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS OF LESS-THAN-BACCALAUREATE LEVEL OFFERED ON THE MAIN CAMPUS

Directions.—Please respond below to items 1, 2, 3, and others applicable as indicated. Although the form is designed to facilitate ease and speed in completion, please feel free to expand response categories where necessary.

1. What is the current total student enrollment on the main campus of your institution? -----

2. Are *baccalaureate* level technical programs being offered at your institution?
---- Yes ---- No

3. Are technical programs of *less* than baccalaureate level currently being offered at your institution? ---- Yes ---- No

If you checked YES in 3 above, please complete *only* applicable items 4 through 7 and item 11 below.

If you checked NO in 3 above, please complete *only* applicable items 8 through 10 and item 11 below.

4. In the table below, please provide information regarding approximate total student enrollment and occupational areas (e.g., nursing, electronics, data processing, etc.) represented in programs of differing length *currently* offered at your institution.

Program Duration	Number of programs of this duration	Occupational areas represented	Approximate student enrollment
More than 3, less than 4 years			
3 years			
2 years			
1 year			
6 months			
Less than 6 months			
Others (specify)			

5. Do you plan to *expand* existing or *develop new* technical programs of less than baccalaureate level at your institution by 1975? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Do not know at this time.

6. If you *PLAN* to *expand* technical offering or *develop new* programs of less than baccalaureate level by 1975, in which occupational area(s), of what program duration(s), and in which year will these changes be implemented?

Anticipated program duration	Anticipated occupational areas	Anticipated year programs are to be added or expanded

7. If you do not plan to *expand* technical offerings or *develop new* programs of less than baccalaureate level by 1975, please indicate the reason(s) for this decision.

Technical education is a function delegated to other state institutions_____

Insufficient funds available_____

Inadequate facilities available_____

Difficult to locate qualified staff_____

Lack of student interest in present programs_____

Insufficient demand for additional programs_____

Sufficient number of programs presently offered_____

Other reasons: (Specify)_____

8. Although technical programs of less than baccalaureate level are not presently being offered at your institution, do you plan to *add* such programs by 1975? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Do not know at this time.

9. If you *PLAN* to *add* technical offerings of less than baccalaureate level by 1975, in which occupational areas, of what program duration(s), and in which year do you anticipate these additions at your institution?

Anticipated program duration	Anticipated occupational areas	Anticipated year programs are to be added or expanded

10. If you do not plan to *add* technical programs of less than baccalaureate level by 1975, please indicate the reason(s) for this decision.

Technical education is inconsistent with institutional purposes_____

Technical education is a function delegated to other state institutions_____

Insufficient funds available_____

Insufficient facilities available_____

Insufficient student interest in such programs_____

Insufficient demand in this geographical area for graduates of such programs_____

Faculty opposition to such programs_____

Other Reasons: (Specify)_____

11. Respondent: Name _____ Title _____
Institution _____ City _____ State _____

APPENDIX C

INFORMATION FORM FOR TECHNICAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS OF LESS-THAN-BACCALAUREATE LEVEL OFFERED IN OFF-CAMPUS EXTENSION CENTERS, COMMUNITY COLLEGES, ET CETERA

Directions : Please respond below to items 1, 2, 3, and others applicable as indicated. Although the form is designed to facilitate ease and speed in completion, please feel free to expand response categories where necessary.

1. How many off-campus centers are operated by your institution? -----
What is the total current enrollment at these centers? -----

2. Are *baccalaureate* level technical programs offered at your off-campus centers? ----- Yes ----- No

3. Are technical programs of *less* than baccalaureate level currently offered at your off-campus centers? ----- Yes ----- No. If so, in how many centers are such programs offered? -----

If you checked YES in 3 above, please complete *only* applicable items 4 through 7 and item 11 below.

If you checked NO in 3 above, please complete *only* applicable items 8 through 10 and item 11 below.

4. In the table below, please provide information regarding approximate total student enrollment and occupational areas (e.g., nursing, electronics, data processing, etc.) represented in programs of differing length *currently* offered in off-campus centers of your institution.

Program Duration	Number of programs of this duration	Occupational areas represented	Approximate student enrollment
More than 3, less than 4 years.....			
3 years.....			
2 years.....			
1 year.....			
6 months.....			
Less than 6 months.....			
Others (specify).....			

5. Do you plan to *expand* existing or *develop new* technical programs of less than baccalaureate level in off-campus centers by 1975? ---- Yes ---- No ---- Do not know at this time

6. If you PLAN to *expand* technical offering or *develop new* programs of less than baccalaureate level by 1975, in which occupational area(s), of what program duration(s), and in which year will these changes be implemented?

Anticipated program duration	Anticipated occupational areas	Anticipated year programs are to be added or expanded

7. If you DO NOT PLAN to *expand* technical offerings or *develop new* programs of less than baccalaureate level by 1975, please indicate the reason(s) for this decision.

Technical education is a function delegated to other state institutions -----

Insufficient funds available -----

Inadequate facilities available -----

Difficult to locate qualified staff -----

Lack of student interest in present programs -----

Insufficient demand for additional programs -----

Sufficient number of programs presently offered -----

Other reasons: (Specify) -----

8. Although technical programs of less than baccalaureate level are not presently being offered in off-campus centers of your institution, do you plan to *add* such programs by 1975?—Yes—No—Do you know at this time

9. If you *PLAN* to *add* off-campus technical offerings of less than baccalaureate level by 1975, in which occupational area(s), of what program duration(s), and in which year do you anticipate these additions at your institution?

Anticipated program duration	Anticipated occupational areas	Anticipated year programs are to be added or expanded
-----	-----	-----
-----	-----	-----
-----	-----	-----

10. If you do not plan to add off-campus technical programs of less than baccalaureate level by 1975, please indicate the reason(s) for this decision.

Technical education is inconsistent with institutional purposes.-----

Technical education is a function delegated to other state institutions.-----

Insufficient funds available.-----

Insufficient facilities available.-----

Insufficient student interest in such programs.-----

Insufficient demand in this geographical area for graduates of such programs.-----

Faculty opposition to such programs.-----

Other reasons: (Specify) -----

11. Respondent: Name----- Title-----
Institution----- City----- State-----

STATEMENT OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MANUFACTURERS ON VOCATIONAL AND OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION

American industry, like the Congress, has strongly supported Vocational-Technical Education since it first became a separate but major component of the American public education system less than 55 years ago. The National Association of Manufacturers is grateful for the opportunity to present its views on this important subject to this Subcommittee.

Representing almost 13,000 industrial firms who employ approximately two-thirds of the industrial labor force, the NAM in early 1970 created a special task force to examine the general effectiveness of vocational education in meeting the needs both of students and employers. Our member firms are potential employers of many vocational education students and they recognize the desire of students to achieve meaningful employment.

American industry in its roles as corporate citizen, taxpayer and potential employer of vocational education graduates, as well as long-time supporter of the vocational education movement, is increasingly seeking to cooperate in improving public secondary vocational education programs in order to meet the occupational needs of students and society, as well as its own personnel requirements.

The social and economic well-being of large numbers of high school students who seek employment directly upon graduation is largely dependent upon the effectiveness of their elementary and secondary education programs in preparing them for participation in the world of work.

Vocational education programs have increased steadily since the enactment of the Smith-Hughes Act in 1917, but the most marked expansion has occurred since the passage of major vocational education legislation in 1963 and 1968. Five years after the passage of the landmark Vocational Education Act of 1963, the Congress realized that its purposes and goals were not being satisfactorily fulfilled and it adopted the 1968 Amendments. This legislation broadened the concept of vocational education from that of providing occupational training in a few selected occupational categories to providing training in all occupations. Too, the legislation provided for special programs to be developed to meet the occupational needs of academically, economically or otherwise handicapped persons.

Since that time, over three years have passed. Circumstances have changed. The nation's manpower requirements, skill requirements and training techniques have changed. After three years it is time to take another serious, in-depth look to determine whether or not the intent of Congress is being achieved. It is particularly important to determine whether the students of the nation are being served adequately. It is time to determine exactly how effective the various vocational education programs in the nation are because an increase in enrollments and expenditures is not sufficient evidence to prove the success of the previous legislation.

The intentions of Congress and all others associated with the passage of existing vocational education legislation have been good. Unfortunately, in the real world, the results of good intentions do not always live up to expectations. The pace of change has been so fast that, despite favorable Congressional and state funding and increased enrollment of students, many vocational education programs have not kept pace with the needs of our society; especially sad is the fact that these programs have not kept pace with the needs of the nation's students. This Association believes that many vocational education programs do not adequately meet the occupational training needs of the student or industry's manpower requirements.

Despite tremendous growth in enrollments and expenditures during the last eight years, vocational education is being criticized from many sectors on the ground that it is not adequately meeting the needs of students, industry or society. Although the statistics and research available in this field are not as complete as seems desirable, the best data suggest that the quality and overall effectiveness of vocational education programs are less than satisfactory.

While it is true that the number of students enrolled in vocational education programs has doubled since 1963, the composition of student enrollment suggests that manpower needs are not being met adequately. Only one-half of the total number of vocational education students are enrolled at the secondary school level. Another 10% are enrolled in postsecondary programs and the remaining 40% are in adult or special needs programs. Total vocational education enrollment at the secondary level is only a little over four million. Further, of this number, almost one-half are enrolled in home economics courses. As desirable and valuable as home economics instruction may be, most of these students are not being trained to seek employment in this field. In fact, less than 20% of students in 9th-12th grades are classified as vocational education students if home economics is not included. It is incorrect to assume, from a doubling of enrollment figures, that large numbers of high school students are being trained in vocational education programs.

Yet one study has indicated that industry would require 31.5 million new employee entrants with less than four years of college between 1967 and 1975. About 75% of these, or 23 million, would need some occupational preparation. Further, a June 1970 United States Bureau of Labor report states that "eight out of ten jobs to be filled over the next ten years will be filled by young workers with less than a college degree."

The inability of existing secondary vocational education programs to attract large numbers of high school students is, to a large extent, explained by four factors:

1. The current social emphasis placed on obtaining a college degree.
2. Students view some jobs as menial, dirty and undesirable. As a result, students do not enroll in vocational programs for these jobs even though both the programs and jobs are available.
3. The higher cost of some vocational educational programs as compared with academic programs makes expansion of these vocational education programs difficult.
4. Many vocational education programs do not develop and utilize viable feedback and evaluation systems. As a result, administrators cannot effectively set objectives, control or plan for the future occupational needs of the students and their community's manpower needs.

In addition to the problem of too few students receiving occupational training, there are problems associated with "dropping out, program relevancy and job placement" caused in part by a significant shift in the makeup of the vocational education student body over the last several years. Several recent research studies indicate that the majority of today's vocational education students are from "poor families" and generally have "below average" verbal and mathematical abilities. At the same time, increased numbers of middle-class white students are

avoiding vocational programs in order to enroll in college preparatory programs.

The average national dropout rate in secondary vocational education programs is close to 45%, which is considerably higher than the rate in nonvocational education programs. Although it is difficult, if not impossible, to identify any one cause, a number of contributing factors can be identified. As we previously noted, a large percent of vocational education students are from socially, economically, and intellectually disadvantaged backgrounds and thus have special needs. Despite a few exemplary programs, there are only a few programs especially designed for the "disadvantaged" and of these only a small percentage is effective in reducing the number of dropouts and meeting the special needs of these students. As a result, many vocational education students are unable to see how vocational education will benefit them. They become frustrated and "drop out".

One indication of the lack of relevancy in many vocational education programs is that large numbers of their graduates are not placed in jobs for which they receive school training. Taking into account that education-related placement statistics are both incomplete and weak, and since little detailed analysis of this type has been applied to other types of educational programs, comparative evaluation is difficult. However, a national study of vocational graduates from "trades and industry" programs showed that "only 50% of vocational education graduates were placed on jobs related to their training." This condition is attributed to overspecialized and obsolete skill training in many "trades and industry" programs. After taking into consideration slippage caused by union contracts, marriage, and a number of other factors, overspecialized, narrow skill training may hinder chances of getting work in the field for which training was received, since technological changes may have made these skills obsolete.

This explains, at least partially, a United States Department of Labor report which claims that industry depends upon on-the-job training more than any other program to train its employees, except in the professional and technical occupations. Many business firms have no contact whatsoever with vocational education programs.

Three other very important conditions contribute to the ineffectiveness of some vocational programs:

1. The lack of student familiarity with the "world of work" prior to reaching high school.
2. The lack of vocational education program flexibility.
3. The limited occupational counseling received by vocational education students.

There is an increasing awareness on the part of many laymen and especially vocational education officials that high school students generally receive little acquaintance with the "world of work" prior to choosing a career occupation and enrolling in a vocational education program. As a result, many students are not familiar with occupational alternatives available to them in other fields, thereby increasing the chances that a student may find his needs are not satisfied by the program chosen. Current efforts of the U.S. Commissioner of Education to infuse the concept of career education into all grade levels of the school system is encouraging news to the employers of the nation.

Further, once a student enrolls in a particular vocational education program, he has little opportunity to transfer to another program; he has little choice but to continue in his program until graduation and then seek employment in another field or drop out. Greater flexibility and transferability must be instituted.

A third factor contributing to the inability of vocational education to satisfy the needs of students is the limited career guidance provided. It is necessary to provide all students in elementary and junior high school with an appreciation and understanding of various occupations, rewards, required skills and proper attitudes. It is unfair to attribute this deficiency solely to the guidance counselor's limited knowledge about job opportunities and requirements in business and industry. However, this is one of the major reasons for improper career counseling. Other contributing factors are:

1. Counselors and secondary schools are often judged on the basis of their ability to place students in college, not in jobs. Therefore, the majority of teachers and administrators direct their efforts principally toward placement of the college-bound student.

2. Counselors often perceive vocational education as a program which offers the student only a limited number of choices; a program which is separate and apart from the rest of the "regular" academic school; a program which is con-

cerned only with turning out skilled technicians and craftsmen; and, as a result, capable high school students are discouraged from enrolling in vocational education programs.

3. The negative attitude of parents and nonvocational educators toward vocational education influences counselors not to direct students into vocational education except as a last resort.

Consequently, most vocational education students receive only limited occupational counseling. In addition, the above factors help to explain why high-ability students have to fight to get into vocational education programs, whereas many low-ability students are "dumped" into them.

So far, this discussion of the major causes of secondary vocational education's failure to meet the occupational and educational needs of the student and of society has, except for its comments on the public's negative attitude toward vocational education, concentrated on weaknesses within the vocational education system. A major external contributor to this condition is limited business and industry involvement in shaping the directions and programs of vocational education. Unfortunately, vocational education programs are too frequently initiated and continued without major input or consultation with prospective employers. This occurs despite the existence of state advisory councils.

Industry has for years contributed equipment to schools, participated in cooperative programs, and occasionally served on an advisory committee. Even these forms of participation can be helpful in making vocational education more meaningful to the student, but the evidence of direct involvement and resulting change is quite small. The cooperative programs in which industry participates have evolved into one of the more successful types of vocational education programs but local, state and Federal laws, as well as union policy, tend to restrict their expansion. Despite numerous well-intentioned efforts, industry's impact and contribution to vocational education have been limited and new concepts of vocational education-employer partnerships must be developed if meaningful contributions are to be made.

There are many complex reasons to account for the limited involvement of employers in secondary vocational education programs. Many educators are hesitant about inviting industry to become actively involved in vocational education, perhaps for fear of precipitating major changes, and in other cases union contracts minimize involvement. Many firms have become disillusioned with vocational education programs and have been forced to establish their own programs to train and educate all types of high school graduates and dropouts in order to maintain their work force.

The lack of meaningful involvement on the part of industry and business explains at least partially why vocational education programs, in some cases, have been perpetuated in a very similar fashion to what they were 25 years ago. A major flaw is that administrative attention is focused on inputs rather than outputs . . . the students. Results, not intentions, must be the gauge of effectiveness. Job training and placement are the purposes and greater involvement of employers in all phases of vocational education is essential if the students' best interests are to be served.

The NAM task force did not find, and does not believe, that all vocational education programs are ineffective. It did conclude that there are too few good programs specifically designed to meet current manpower needs and student requirements. There are numerous highly effective, specialized vocational education programs, but in general, improvements are necessary if the effectiveness of vocational education in providing students with the qualifications needed to get and hold a job is to be increased.

In this regard, this Association believes that:

1. All students' learning experiences should include general orientation to the world of work beginning with the elementary grades, and that programs should be kept up-to-date to reflect advancing technology and current practices.

2. Secondary vocational education students can be served better by programs which integrate both academic and occupational training into a total environment education to provide students with the opportunity to develop social and self concepts, proper work attitudes, adequate reading and computational skills, a desire to achieve, as well as general occupational education rather than overspecialized training.

3. The diverse educational and occupational needs of vocational education students can be satisfied better by a broader, more flexible range of programs. Furthermore, cooperative programs should be expanded even when this requires modification of existing statutes.

4. Systematic and standardized methods of evaluating programs based on results (job placement data) should be utilized.

Because of the real need to bring about these changes, it seems inappropriate to extend the current law, P.L. 90-576, for a lengthy period of time. A lengthy extension simply provides more of the same, ignores the need to improve and penalizes students. The U.S. Office of Education has already funded several career education experiments. The potential benefits from these programs alone to students' occupational knowledge requirements is so great that their introduction should not be unduly delayed if the experiments prove successful.

The present law expires on June 30, 1972. In view of all the above circumstances, it is respectfully suggested that an extension not be legislated beyond June 30, 1973, so that needed improvements may be incorporated into new legislation as soon as possible.

We would also like to comment on H.R. 7429, The Occupational Education Act of 1971. This Association and its members are aware of the significant growth which community colleges have experienced during the last several years. We are even more cognizant of the advantages they offer to students and of the potential which they possess for responding to the nation's manpower needs through the offering of occupational programs.

There are approximately 1100 public and private community colleges. During the last ten years, total enrollments have increased from slightly over 500,000 to about 2½ million today. This represents 30% of all college undergraduates in the nation. Of the 2½ million community college students, approximately 960,000, or 39%, are enrolled in occupational programs. The balance are classified as academic students. Nationally, students have available to them over 20,000 occupational courses pertaining to 750 different occupations. Perspective can be gained by pointing out that in 1965 community college occupational programs only covered 320 different occupations. In only five years, the number of programs for different occupations more than doubled.

Two points should be stressed. Given the enormous growth in occupational enrollment, the corresponding increase in the number of courses offered and the number of different occupations covered, the provisions of H.R. 7429 to "develop and carry out a program designed to promote and encourage occupational education" [Title I, Part A, Sec. 101(a)] seem totally unnecessary and create a situation whereby the elaborate Federal machinery proposed might hinder the further development of quality occupational course offerings.

Secondly, the method of allocating funds stipulates that after a specified sum per state (\$1,000,000 in Fiscal Year 1973) has been allotted, the remainder shall be distributed based upon a ratio of the number of persons 16 years of age or older in each state to the number of such persons in all states.

At present, seven states (California, Florida, Illinois, Michigan, New York, Texas and Washington) enroll 66% of all community college students. These seven states would receive, based upon total population figures, approximately only 39% of all funds allocated. The allocation of funds based upon population figures irrespective of student need and enrollment is an ineffective and inequitable method of distribution.

S. 659, as well as Section 103 of H.R. 7429, would create a Bureau of Occupational Education to administer the Vocational Education Act of 1963, the Adult Education Act of 1966 and The Occupational Education Act of 1971. In view of the shortcomings and ineffectiveness of many vocational education programs, it must be pointed out that the elevation of the Federal administrator to a higher rank is unlikely to resolve any program deficiencies to the benefit of vocational education students. If, in the considered judgment of this Subcommittee such an action seems beneficial over the longer run, this Association would suggest that consideration be given to the following comments.

Fourteen job positions within the Bureau are set forth in Section 103; nine of these have specific requirements attached to them. The degree of specificity seems restrictive, inflexible and could prove counter-productive. Although two positions specified in para. (2)(A), and three positions in para. (2)(B) do not contain specific requirements, the failure to mention the employers of the nation denotes a major weakness. The administration of occupational education programs without the direct involvement of employers from all sectors of the economy is a glaring failure of most existing vocational education programs and should not be perpetuated by new legislation.

THE COLLEGE PLACEMENT COUNCIL, INC.,
Bethlehem, Pa., September 24, 1971.

Re H.R. 7429 and Title III of S. 659.

Hon. ROMAN PUCINSKI,
Chairman, General Subcommittee on Education,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: The College Placement Council, Inc. (CPC), the national professional association of college placement officers, and their counterparts in business, government and industry submit this statement on the substantive issues related to occupational counseling of H.R. 7429 and the provisions of Title III of S. 659 establishing national foundations and institutes for education. It is requested that this statement be included in the record of hearings held on that Bill. If further hearings are held, CPC requests the opportunity to testify at such hearings.

The purpose of H.R. 7429 is to assist in preparing individuals for employment through education, career planning and placement counseling. Its educational aspects are directed to training other than that which leads directly to college. This is sound policy in that the lockstep of going from secondary school to the baccalaureate degree must be rethought. The thrust of H.R. 7429 is to encourage programs of occupational education as a viable alternative to that degree. This dignifying and enhancing of vocational pursuits is long overdue. It is especially important as the rapidly multiplying community colleges assume greater responsibility in this area.

In its present form, H.R. 7429 provides for the encouragement and support of career planning and placement counseling in elementary and secondary schools but does not include post-secondary institutions. In short, the proposed bill provides for post-secondary occupational education but fails to provide for an accompanying career planning and placement counseling program.

At the same time, the career planning and placement officers of the two-year and four-year colleges are simultaneously overwhelmed by the volume of students and increasingly deprived, by shrinking budgets, of the wherewithal to meet the demand.

As the one organization representing the interface between higher education and the employers in business, government, and industry, the College Placement Council is in a unique position to raise an authoritative voice as to the urgency for meaningful consideration of career planning and placement counseling as a continuum through all grades of education.

Since November, 1970, three major reports on higher education have been made public. In differing words but with the same logic, all three call for a reassessment of higher education and an end to the academic lockstep provision for the interruption of studies, opportunity for adults to resume their education in a meaningful manner, and an intermingling of work, study, and off-campus experience as a basis for careers.

That career planning and placement counseling will have an even more substantive role to play on both the two-year and four-year campuses as these reforms take effect would seem obvious. Already, the demand of college students for relevance in their studies, the believability problem among minority students, and the disaffection of many with traditional employment are evidence of our failure to convey an adequate sense of vocational goals to those in our post-secondary institutions.

While H.R. 7429 properly addresses itself to inequities of vocational training at the secondary level it fails to recognize that hundreds of thousands of young men and women are completing two-year and four-year college courses with little if any more understanding of career opportunities than those completing high school requirements. In both types of institutions, capable but underimplemented people are trying to meet the demand. In the instance of the secondary schools, H.R. 7429 offers a solution. For the post-secondary institutions where career planning and placement counseling could be enhanced at a substantially lower cost, nothing is provided.

In relatively normal times it is regrettable to have students leaving two-year and four-year colleges with little or no counsel as to their life work and few if any employable skills. In a year like 1971 with about a million graduates leaving two-year and four-year institutions to face massive unemployment, it is tragic.

Again, in normal times, fifty percent of college graduates change jobs in the first three years of work after employers have expended an estimated \$240,000,000 a year to recruit them. While some turnover is to be expected, this degree of uncertainty gives evidence of the need for vocational awareness among post-secondary graduates.

In the words of the Task Force on Economy and Employment of the White House Conference on Youth, "With the cry for relevance a key word in youth's challenge to higher education, no notable evidence is available but that which suggest that young people *at all levels of education* (emphasis added) are being offered only the traditional generalist preparation with little or no career consideration". To answer their needs by the simple expedient of making the career planning and placement counseling benefits of H.R. 7429 available through post-secondary as well as secondary education is both an obvious and a relatively inexpensive solution.

The placement offices of the two-year and four-year colleges and universities already exist. They are understaffed and increasingly limited in operating funds but dedicated to the career development of the very young people from whom must come tomorrow's leadership. To assist them to do a better job could be one of the most effective aims of H.R. 7429—and among the least costly.

Not only is it necessary to assure that students are effectively counseled to find the most suitable two-year and four-year college programs but, after matriculation in these institutions, to provide them with career planning and placement counseling until they are ultimately employed. Only such an endeavor is consonant with the broad goals of H.R. 7429 and likely to improve the imbalance between the supply of and demand by employers for all students in postsecondary education.

Title III of S. 659 also provides a valuable tool for improving career planning and placement counseling and making the best use of our educational and human resources. It provides for a national foundation/institute on education. The Council recommends that among the mandates be the studying of career planning and placement counseling in educational institutions.

The substantive proposals of H.R. 7429 and of Title III of S. 659 are in our view appropriate. We do, however, request certain changes to strengthen their approach by providing for study of, and aid to, career planning and placement counseling in post-secondary schools. These requested changes are listed in attachment 1.

Sincerely yours,

LEO A. EASON, *President.*

Enclosure.

ATTACHMENT 1—H.R. 7429

(a) Sec. 102, add a new paragraph (5) :

"(5) assure effective career planning and placement counseling is available in primary, secondary and post-secondary schools.";

(b) Sec. 121, add at end :

"... and to promote career planning and placement counseling facilities in primary, secondary and post-secondary schools.";

(c) Sec. 122(b) (1) add a new sub-paragraph (F)

"(F) the development of career planning and placement counseling in primary, secondary, and post-secondary schools.";

(d) Sec. 123(a), add a new paragraph (5) :

"(5) the design, establishment and conduct of programs for career planning and placement counseling facilities in primary, secondary and post-secondary schools".

TITLE III OF S. 659

(a) Sec. 403(a) (2) add a new subparagraph (F) :

"(F) to encourage effective career planning and placement counseling in primary, secondary and post-secondary schools.";

(b) Sec. 403(d) :

(i) by inserting after "educational" and before "institutions", or "educational service"¹; and

¹ The purpose of this change is to clarify that nonprofit civic groups with expertise in career planning and placement counseling could participate in projects of the Institute.

- (ii) Add a new subparagraph (9):
 "(9) the design, introduction and establishment of programs in career planning and placement counseling in primary, secondary and post-secondary schools".

AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CIVIL ENGINEERS,
 New York, N.Y., September 30, 1971.

Hon. PETER A. PEYSER,
 U.S. House of Representatives,
 Washington, D.C.

H.R. 7429: THE OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1971

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PEYSER: Civil engineers provide professional services concerned with the design, construction and operation of facilities needed for man's life process; provision of water and power and transportation systems; reduction of air and water pollution; renewal of our cities; planning and building of whole new communities. Providing these services in the form of public works involves a whole spectrum of technical competence, including contributions of professional engineers, technicians and engineering aides at several education levels.

The engineering profession is heavily dependent upon para-professional personnel as part of the technological team, and is deeply involved in their recruitment and training. A current concern is that present and future needs for qualified technicians are not being met. Existing programs of education and training simply cannot keep up with anticipated demands. New programs are urgently needed.

Educational opportunities for disadvantaged youth, including minority groups, in these fields have been all too few. Moreover, societal pressures have over-emphasized baccalaureate education and have discouraged young people from becoming skilled technicians and craftsmen.

Available resources are not adequate to support the guidance and educational programs needed to recruit and train the anticipated technical manpower needs of this country. The Occupational Educational Act of 1971 would provide additional federal support and would help improve vocational education, including the education of technicians, which is of specific interest to this Society.

This Bill (H.R. 7429) has been studied carefully. As a result, we support the interest and provisions of this bill. We believe this legislation to be very much in the public interest.

Be assured that we will be glad to furnish qualified professional testimony if requested to do so.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM H. WISELY,
 Executive Director.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION,
 Washington, D.C., September 22, 1971.

Hon. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI,
 Chairman, General Subcommittee on Education, U.S. House of Representatives,
 Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PUCINSKI: The National Advisory Council on Vocational Education welcomes both the formulation of this long awaited legislative measure and the opportunity to testify in favor of its behalf.

At no time in this nation's history have the products of education been under such scrutiny as is now the case. Criticism has been voiced in every pulpit, from the actual students, to the administrators, to you, the Congress. And yet, to merely castigate leads us nowhere down the path of constructive change.

To implement the necessary educational transformations that our economy requires and the children are in dire need of calls for Congressional initiative—initiative in the form of a bill such as H.R. 7429.

It is our profound hope that this legislative measure, so long in the making, will not be easily dismissed. The interests here should lie not with a form of education, career or vocational, anymore than it should emphasize the needs of a particular type of student, be he technically or occupationally oriented. The provisions of H.R. 7429 can offer renewed optimism for all education, all of its constituents.

It is in this spirit that we hope the Occupational Educational Education Act of 1971 will be examined and rightfully assessed.

Sincerely,

LAWRENCE DAVENPORT,

Chairman,

DON McDOWELL,

Chairman,

Legislation and Finance Committee.

Enclosure.

STATEMENT OF NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On behalf of the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education, I am pleased to have this opportunity to testify before your Committee on H.R. 7429, the Occupational Education Act of 1971, the bill introduced by Mr. Quie, along with bi-partisan co-authors. The National Advisory Council on Vocational Education was established by the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 to evaluate the operation of vocational education programs throughout the country and to make reports and recommendations to the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare for transmittal to Congress. The Council consists of 21 members appointed by the President. The members represent labor, industry, education, the general public and other groups concerned with vocational education. The Council meets officially every six weeks in Washington, D.C. with subcommittee meetings also held intermittently. The Council is assisted by a full time professional and clerical staff, headquartered in Washington, D.C.

Since its inception two years ago, the National Advisory Council has issued five reports that call for Congressional implementation of vocational education needs. The First Report, issued June 15, 1969, deals with the image problem facing vocational education. It recognizes the fact that this country suffers from the national sin of intellectual snobbery which considers vocational education only good for someone else's child.

The Second Report, issued November 15, 1969, examines the relationship between vocational education and manpower programs and suggests that the government show as much concern for preventive vocational programs as it does for remedial manpower projects. The report also recommends methods for improving cooperative efforts between vocational education and manpower programs.

The Third Report, issued July 10, 1970, studies the problems of the disadvantaged and makes the following recommendations: (1) that each secondary school serve as an employment agency and be responsible for the placement of students in its vocational education programs; (2) that as much money be allotted to follow-up and counseling services for dropouts as is spent on students who remain in school; (3) that priority be given to the disadvantaged without separating them from the mainstream; (4) that the community participate in the development of vocational education programs; (5) and that residential vocational schools be funded and established.

The Fourth Report, issued February 16, 1971, considers the financing of vocational education. In this report, the Council attributes many of the difficulties experienced by educational programs today to an antiquated system of finance which precludes flexibility at the local level. In lieu of this system, the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education suggests that the Federal and State governments absorb cost differences between career and academic education, thus leaving the local schools free to select their courses based solely on student needs.

The Fifth Report, issued June 21, 1971, chides the educational establishment for the career education concepts it has fostered in word only and failed to implement into realistic programs. To counter this situation, the National Advisory Council made the following recommendations: (1) that the educational leaders of our universities, professional and educational associations, State and local administrative positions, and Federal agencies lend their support to Commissioner Marland in actively endorsing career education; (2) that legislation for programs in vocational and technical education that have parity within HEW

organizational structure continue to be enacted; (3) that an Assistant Secretary for vocational and technical education be established within HEW to advance the goals of career education; (4) that full authorizations for vocational and technical education be appropriated to actualize implementation of programs.

The National Advisory Council emphasizes these reports as they have been instrumental topics of discussion in meetings with both the Secretary of HEW and the Commissioner of Education, and because the Administration has issued statements during the year that imply concurrence with much that has been in the National Advisory Council reports.

Mr. Pucinski, the Chairman of this Committee, in a speech delivered to the joint meeting of the State and National advisory councils on vocational education two months ago, indicated:

"Vocational education is not a passing thing. It is here to stay. This is just the beginning. So we offer H.R. 7429 the Bureau of Occupational Education because we want to make sure by law that there is an agency in the Office of Education that is going to continue to propagate the principles that vocational education is good for every American kid who is in this country, whether he's going to college or not."

As for the Congressional aspect of others, Congressman Steiger (R-Wisc.) has given some indication what directions the Congress can be expected to assume in the future. Speaking before the Annual Conference of the National Advisory Council on Supplementary Centers and Services, Title III, he said:

"... we're going to have to put a far greater emphasis on alternative forms of education other than four year baccalaureate education. And so among other things in terms of goals, in terms of direction, I think you're going to see the Congress moving clearly, forcefully, and substantially in support of vocational-technical education. I think the Administration's budget frankly this year in this field is not good; I think they have made a mistake. But you're going to see career education, technical education stressed every bit as hard as any other form of education and frankly, I think you're going to see it stressed harder."

Speaking before the State Directors of Vocational Education last month, Commissioner of Education, Sidney P. Marland, stated:

"I propose now to make Career Education one of five high priorities, along with aid to the disadvantaged, education of the handicapped, racial integration, and educational research and development. And I intend to give it more funds, more people, and a larger sense of national prestige than it has yet achieved."

These statements, Mr. Chairman, make it abundantly clear that the Administration, Congress and the public servants of our Federal government have assumed a committed role to strengthen vocational education throughout our country. Call it whatever you will, vocational education, technical education, career education, or occupational education, as this bill brings out, the name attached to the learning is not as important as the learning itself carries with it. For this reason, we hope that the terminology will not provide the basis for consideration of H.R. 7429, but rather the inherent provisions which make this bill one of multiple definition and opportunity for the whole educational structure.

All along the line, the Council has called for what H.R. 7429 now provides. This legislative measure can single-handedly change the course of direction for all of education. At long last, legislation has arrived of imperative importance to all educators. It is the sincere hope of this Council that this bill will not be easily dismissed but studied from its every vantage point to determine its value, rather than its assailability.

The reasoning behind the crucial needs for such legislative enactment should be obvious. In 1970 there were 8,793,960 persons enrolled in some form of vocational education. This was a 10.2% increase over the 7,979,366 enrollment of 1969. Of this encroaching nine million figure, almost two-thirds of these persons are engaged in secondary, not post-secondary or adult education fields.

At present, 40% of all high school graduates enter college. Of this number, only one-half, or in other words, 20% receive degrees. This means that 80% of the nation's young people enter the world of work without a college degree. Is not a figure of 80% a concern to be reckoned with? By adding to this figure the USOE and Labor Department estimate for 1980 which calls for 8 out of every 10 jobs still not requiring a baccalaureate degree, only points up the need to expand vocational education, now, not in 1980. Yet the Federal government continues to spend \$14 for higher education for every \$1 it invests in vocational education. Is the Federal government unaware of these facts or merely intolerant of them?

To take another tact only to reach the same conclusions, let us consider the high school guidance and counseling system of this country. At present, guidance counselors are encouraging the students to enter college. This is fine, but with this all out push towards academica, many students who literally can't make it or don't want it, are being misguided.

Likewise, vocational education remains the pot for the dropouts, the children other than our own. Vocational education is made to look like the last educational resort. The saddest part is that eventually the children of vocational education start believing that they are second-rate citizens too.

At the outset of this testimony, we stated the importance of Mr. Quie's bill, the Occupational Education Act of 1971. We would like to reiterate this statement by briefly highlighting the value of the major provisions of this bill for vocational education.

First and foremost, the bill will give strength to occupational education concepts. As Mr. Quie himself said when introducing the bill:

"In my judgment this is an important bill because it addresses itself to the vital but unfulfilled needs in America's educational system. Moreover, while the Administration shares the concerns which this bill reflects and has been exploring with care the possibilities for further Federal legislation in this field, this bill is a Congressional initiative."

This bill directs itself to education that leads directly to a job, not a degree. I think we have already indicated that this is where our country's needs are and will be for some time, at job levels requiring specific skills, not degrees.

The bill also calls for strengthening and re-directing of our guidance and counseling services. Counselors need to become more fully acquainted with student abilities, and must be trained to provide proper job placement services. Counselors now provide college placement services to the would be academic education students. However, the vocational education students are too often ignored and forgotten, while our nation continues to worry about its unfilled jobs. Guidance should consider the student as well as the country's needs but presently fails to achieve this end. H.R. 7429 will assist in bridging this gap.

Mr. Javits made clear this last point when introducing his complementary bill, S. 1856, to the Senate where he stated:

"American education must not be strangled by "degrees"—there is an expanding and unfulfilled need for occupational education at less than the baccalaureate level and there is work to be done by those who receive such training, as technicians and at the subprofessional level. Occupational education must now come into its own, and this bill attempts to achieve that advance."

We, the Council, feel that the need for such an act are obvious and imperative to the state of our nation. Yet, we offer a third argument in support of H.R. 7429. In the Council's *Fourth Report*, we indicated that State plans are not effective mechanisms of evaluation and assessment at present. Lack of data has hampered accurate reporting and made the submission of State reports little more than acts of token compliance. Mr. Quie's bill takes this problem into specific account by providing planning grants for the purposes of developing comprehensive State plans. Only when these plans are found to be acceptable will funds be allocated in form of project grants. This safeguard will weed out in short order State inefficiencies and demand accurate data in its place.

And finally, this bill provides for the establishment of the all important Bureau of Occupational Education, under the leadership of a Deputy Commissioner, to carry out the provisions of this act.

Gentlemen, the bill H.R. 7429, should speak for itself if the state of our country did not speak louder and longer for the apparent need of such legislation. If the position of the current Administration in regards to vocational education were not one of heresy, if the children were not so important, if we, the public servants did not have ethical obligations to fulfill, then maybe we could afford to look away from this issue.

But we cannot ignore and as a result, this bill is now under scrutiny. The National Advisory Council on Vocational Education strongly urges this Committee to consider the fact that this bill is the only one of its kind, and can achieve more for all education than any legislation of the past. Rejection of this measure will not only bring educational setback but years of wait our country can ill afford at this time. The National Advisory Council will be glad to cooperate with members of Congress and/or the Administration in the further development of the positions outlined in this testimony.

Thank you.

STATEMENT OF R. FRANK MENSEL, DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS, AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF JUNIOR COLLEGES

On behalf of the junior and community colleges represented by the American Association of Junior Colleges, I wish to thank the Subcommittee on Education for the opportunity of commenting on H.R. 7429.

Congress has done much to provide support and direction for vocational-technical education in this country and should be complimented for continued efforts in its work on H.R. 7429.

AAJC generally supports H.R. 7429. The addition of this vital legislation to the landmark legislation of the 1968 Vocational Educational Amendments would greatly enhance the educational activity of American educational institutions in the area of occupational education at the post-secondary level.

This segment of education is the fastest growing force in American education today. Almost nine million persons were enrolled last year in vocational education, an increase of 10 percent over the previous year.

The graduates of occupational training make important contributions to American society. Not the least of which is the return to the public treasury of tax dollars which amount over a lifetime far in excess of costs of education.

Junior and community colleges are increasingly at the forefront of this effort. A total of 435,015 persons were enrolled in career education programs at community junior colleges in 1970 and an estimated 14 percent more are reported for 1971. Appendix A lists the results of an inventory of occupational education programs in community junior colleges.

We support section 101 which links manpower needs with the development of training opportunities; but suggest that a great deal of money has been dispersed to highly specialized and narrowly conceived manpower programs. Occupational programs enroll nine times as many students as were enrolled last year in all manpower and special education programs. The thrust should be toward broad based occupational training and not to narrow manpower training.

AAJC also supports the creation of a special bureau in the Office of Education to administer this and other related acts. We think it is particularly appropriate that community and junior college personnel be included in the administration of the proposed bureau. The Office of Education is at present not adequately staffed to serve the needs of the two year schools.

We again thank you for the opportunity of commenting on H.R. 7429 and ask that community and junior colleges be made an important part of occupational training as envisioned by the legislation. We urge that the legislation insure that the two year institutions are treated equally for their equal contributions to educating the youth of this country.

APPENDIX A.—REPORT ON OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS IN COMMUNITY JUNIOR COLLEGES (TAKEN FROM THE INVENTORY MADE BY THE WESTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY AS OF NOV. 30, 1970)

	Associate degree		Certificate		Community service or continuing education		In planning process
	Programs	Students	Programs	Students	Programs	Students	
Agriculture and agricultural resources technology.....	885	22,125	157	3,140	233	4,660	329
Allied health and medical technologies.....	1,388	41,640	616	12,320	128	6,400	916
Applied arts technologies.....	364	14,560	125	2,620	289	11,560	134
Business and commercial technologies.....	3,538	106,140	1,056	21,120	751	22,530	629
Engineering and science technologies.....	2,950	59,000	823	16,460	376	7,520	1,033
Public service and related technologies.....	1,210	36,300	256	5,120	258	6,450	659
Skill-oriented vocational programs.....	389	7,780	675	20,250	372	7,440	270
Total.....	10,724	287,545	3,710	80,910	2,407	66,560	3,969

Note: A total of 435,015 people are enrolled in career education programs at community junior colleges in 1970. Enrollments are up from this about 14 percent in preregistration reported for 1971.

MINNESOTA PERSONNEL AND GUIDANCE ASSOCIATION,
October 5, 1971.

HON. ROMAN PUCINSKI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PUCINSKI: As a key leader and sponsor of the "Occupational Educational Act of 1971," you are receiving the attached two page summary of my concerns at the omission of the American Personnel and Guidance Association as a consultative group and the seeming omission of the guidance counselor as a facilitator of this legislation. This seems like a serious omission. I am sure you will give this matter your serious attention.

The guidance counselor has been trained to do occupational guidance and for many years has been anxious to get support in performing this necessary service. We wish to be a vital part in implementing the intent of this bill. I have written in more detail of my concerns to the Honorable Albert Quie of Minnesota. I hope the matter can be thoroughly discussed with the above request in mind to provide this implementation.

The bill has so much to offer and is exactly what we have felt should be provided each youth. You are to be commended for your time and interest in this matter.

Your response will be reported to our state-wide conference. Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

MRS. ELVERA SPRINGER, *President.*

Enclosures.

OCTOBER 4, 1971.

To: Persons Concerned with House File 7429 and Senate File Number 1856—
Occupational Educational Act of 1971

From: Elvera M. Springer, President, Minnesota Personnel and Guidance Association

Re: Need for amendments to this legislation to show specific support for involvement of guidance counselors and state guidance supervisors in carrying out the intent of this bill

The Minnesota Personnel and Guidance Association Executive Board and The Minnesota Personnel and Guidance Association and the American Personnel and Guidance Association (as a Government Liaison Workers Committee) have recently met and feel the need to express some concerns over the wording and intent of the Occupational Educational Act of 1971 as introduced by Representative Quie of Minnesota under House of Representatives File Number 7429 and Senate File Number 1856.

Guidance counselors of Minnesota are most pleased and proud to see that Representative Quie has shown this deep concern for all educators to become more involved in helping students plan for the future. The guidance counselors for many years have been concerned about the need for occupational counseling and career development education through the elementary and secondary school systems. Funds for materials to do this important work and allocation of counselors time for this area has been very limited in the past. Very few administrators or teachers have seen the need to allocate time to work with youth in this important phase of their developing plans. The economic picture of today now seems to have suddenly made others aware of the great need we have in this as an important part of education. Finally, the guidance counselor might get some support for moving into work in this area for which he has been trained. It was disappointing, therefore, to read the bill and find little mention of the guidance counselor.

It appears that consultations were held with The American Vocational Association, The American Association of Junior Colleges, The American Association of State Colleges and Universities and The United Business Schools, Inc. There is no mention of any involvement of The American Personnel and Guidance

Association. It seems timely to ask why this has happened since a major charge to the members of this organization is helping the youth of today in a way which makes each one develop to his fullest potential and toward a goal which is commensurate with his interests, aptitudes, and abilities.

It is further stated that an attempt has been started through the 1968 Vocational Educational Educational Act which would be expanded now by involving general educators, vocational educators, post secondary educators, and higher education in a cooperative effort to effect change. Again, it would seem this is exactly what the guidance counselor has been trained to do and has as his charge. For some time he has needed to have others in education aware of this. It would certainly help the counselor now to have his efforts directly facilitated through support and through being specifically mentioned in this bill as a person trained and able to do this work.

It is mentioned in the Summary of the Bill under "Other Features" that there is encouragement for 'Continuing occupational counseling as a normal function of the educational system.' Why then is not the counseling profession as represented by the American Personnel and Guidance Association and its component organizations used as a major vehicle to accomplish this? The structure for doing this needed educational work is already in existence and functional, with support such as proposed by Representative Quie, this group could quickly move into this important area that Representative Quie has so ably set forth in the bill. It is exactly the kind of bill that guidance counselors have felt the need for and would strongly endorse. These groups in the State of Minnesota are large and well organized and are waiting to move into action.

State guidance supervisors are well aware of these needs, have long supported this and should be very much involved in each state in helping to speed up this occupational planning. Publication after publication dealing with these very areas have come from our Minnesota State Department.

It is the hope of our Minnesota groups, and would certainly be supported by all guidance counselors, that you will review the wording of this bill carefully and amend it as needed to make this group of professionals the principal group to act as facilitators.

MINNESOTA PERSONNEL AND GUIDANCE ASSOCIATION,
October 1, 1971.

Need for amendments to this legislation to show specific support for involvement of guidance counselors in carrying out the intent of the bill

The MPGA (Minnesota Personnel and Guidance Association) is aware of your vital interest in the youth of our state and our nation. Your record is indicative of your concern about youth employment, attitudes of our youth, and equal educational opportunity.

The MPGA wishes to lend its support to the "Occupational Education Act of 1971" (H.R. 7429 and S. 1856). We have read the bill and background material and discussed it in the MPGA Executive Board meeting last week and in the MPGA Legislative Committee meeting yesterday. We support the perceived intent of the bill to vastly increase the currently inadequate provisions for occupational education. We support the concept of making vocational education equal to college education. However, we submit that to be truly equal, all kinds of post-secondary educational opportunities need to be offered through the people who do have contact with all the youth, namely the elementary and secondary counselors. Therefore we respectfully request consideration for amendments to the bill to specify the following:

1. Expanded, up-to-date career materials on all types of careers of any degree of expertise (audio-visual cassettes, tapes, slides, filmstrips, films; computer banks; attractive print materials) for youth to use in guidance centers in every secondary school in the country as they explore possible careers with counselors.
2. Salary support for year-round extended school day time for guidance counselors to work with youth beyond the time bounds of the average 10-month school year and regular work day.
3. In-service programs for guidance counselors to increase their occupational and career educational counseling skills.

We feel these additions would tend to implement support for the guidance counselors to actually do what the bill frequently mentions wanting secondary counselors to do. But the bill as written neglects to fund counseling specifically at all. Counselors have perennially been given too much to do, and not sufficient resources nor time to do the career guidance job they have been trained to do and have for years wanted to do. To make the same mistake with this bill would be to repeat a disservice to the youth of our nation. Rather than further splintering emphases into vocational versus college education, we recommend unifying of all possibilities for future planning for our youth through the guidance counselors. Everyone eventually needs occupational or career education. The college student as well as the vocational school student needs career planning help. The counselor is in a unique position to give it to all according to their interests, preparation, and goals if granted resources and time sufficient to do a complete job.

We know you will be concerned. We would appreciate your personal attention to this bill. We have also asked the President of MPGA, Mrs. Elvera Springer, to communicate with you on this most serious matter. You will also hear from her. The 1200 counselors in Minnesota are interested in your reply. Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Mrs. ARLENE BRECKENRIDGE,
Chairman, Legislative Committee.

The Role of the Secondary School Counselor

*A condensed statement
based on the ASCA
"Statement of Policy
for Secondary School
Counselors" and "Guide-
lines for Implementation"*

American School Counselor Association
a division of
AMERICAN PERSONNEL AND GUIDANCE ASSOCIATION

The Role of the Secondary School Counselor

A condensed statement based on "Statement of Policy for Secondary School Counselors" and "Guidelines for Implementation" approved by the membership and adopted by the Governing Board of ASCA, 1964.

It is the purpose of this folder to present, in brief form, the essential ideas contained in the larger documents from which it is drawn concerning the role and functions of the secondary school counselor. It is based on an extensive study by many school counselors and represents a description of what should be, rather than what is.

The School Counselor—Who He Is

A secondary school counselor is:

1. A professional educator with specialized, graduate-level training in counseling and related guidance services whose major concern is for the normal, developmental needs and problems of all the pupils for whom he is responsible.
2. An integral part of the school staff, a member of the "pupil personnel services" team.
3. A person who is dedicated to the idea that a pupil will enhance and enrich his personal development and self-fulfillment if given an opportunity to experience an accepting, non-evaluative relationship in which he is helped to better understand himself and his environment and the relationship between them.
4. A person who perceives:
 - each pupil as a unique individual who has a right to acceptance, self-development, self-fulfillment and self-direction and who has a responsibility for making decisions and living with the consequences of these decisions.
 - the school as a democratic institution which may, in its necessary emphasis on group instruction and variety of program, create some conflicts for individual students, the mediation of which is an important part of his role.
 - society as an ever-changing, complex structure offering endless challenges and opportunities to its individual members, the strength of which is ultimately dependent upon the contributions of each of its members.

- himself as a member of the school staff with the professional competencies, behavioral science understandings, philosophical orientation, and position within the school necessary to provide professional counseling and related guidance services to pupils.

The School Counselor— What He Does

1. He helps to plan and develop the guidance program and the curriculum in relation to the needs of pupils.

2. Through the counseling relationship, he helps each pupil to:

- understand himself in relation to the social and psychological world in which he lives.
- accept himself as he is.
- develop personal decision-making competencies.
- resolve special problems.

3. He assumes the role of leader and consultant in the school's program of pupil appraisal by:

- coordinating the accumulation and use of meaningful information about each pupil.
- interpreting information about pupils to them, to their parents, to teachers, and to others who are professionally concerned.
- helping to identify pupils with special abilities or needs.

4. He collects and disseminates to pupils and their parents information concerning:

- school offerings.
- opportunities for further education.
- careers and career training opportunities.

5. He ~~coordinates the use of~~ services available beyond those he can provide by:

- making pupils and their parents aware of the availability of such services.
- making appropriate referrals.
- maintaining liaison and cooperative working relationships with other pupil personnel specialists and with agencies in the community where special services are available.
- encouraging the development and/or extension of community agencies for meeting special pupil needs that are not already adequately met.

6. He assists in providing placement services for pupils by:

- planning with teachers and administrators for the grouping and scheduling of pupils.
- helping pupils make appropriate choices of school programs and develop long-range plans of study.
- helping them make the transition from one school level to another, from one school to another and from school to employment successfully.
- coordinating his placement work with others for the most effective use of the placement services available in the school and the community.

7. He helps parents by:

- acting as a consultant to them regarding the growth and development of their children.
- providing them with information about their children (with due regard to the child's desire for confidentiality).
- providing them with information about educational and occupational opportunities and requirements and about counseling programs and related guidance services available to them and their children.
- assisting them to develop realistic perceptions of their children's development in relation to their potentialities.

8. He serves as a consultant to members of the administrative and teaching staffs in the area of guidance by:

- sharing appropriate individual pupil data with them (again with due regard for the pupil's desire for confidentiality).
- helping them to identify pupils with special needs and problems.
- participating in the in-service training programs.
- assisting teachers to secure materials and develop procedures for a variety of classroom group guidance experiences.

9. He conducts or cooperates with others in conducting local research related to pupil needs and how well school services are meeting those needs by:

- contacting graduates and dropouts.
- comparing scholastic aptitudes with achievement, selection of courses of study, and post high school experience.

- studying occupational trends in the community.
 - evaluating the school's counseling and guidance services.
10. He carries out a program of public relations by:
- participating in programs of various community groups.
 - furnishing information regarding the counseling and guidance programs to local publishers, radio and TV stations.

The Secondary School Counselor— His Working Environment

The contributions of the secondary school counselor to pupils, school and society are dependent upon the existence of certain environmental conditions.

- First, he should be free from administrative and clerical assignments which would interfere with his responsibilities as a professional school counselor.
- Second, he should have the physical facilities appropriate to his work. This would include a private office which offers visual as well as auditory privacy, and provides a relaxed, comfortable atmosphere in which he may communicate with pupils and others in confidence and without interruption.
- Third, he should have paid clerical assistance and such equipment as will help him to carry out his functions as a counselor and guidance specialist.
- Fourth, he should have the opportunity to initiate and carry on conferences with pupils during school hours but with due regard for their academic programs.
- Fifth, his employment should be on a full-time basis and should extend beyond the normal school year. His salary should be commensurate with his level of training and experience and should compensate him for the time he works beyond the regular school year.
- Sixth, the number of pupils for whom a counselor is responsible should be such that he can carry out his functions effectively for all of them. It is recommended that this pupil load should not exceed 250 to 300 pupils per counselor.

- Seventh, he should have a time schedule which will enable him to grow professionally and which will permit him to pursue such activities as research, participation in professional conferences, and visitation of other schools, colleges, places of employment, etc.
- Eighth, budgetary provision should be made that will allow the school counselor to have the equipment, materials, travel allowances, etc., necessary for him to carry out his functions.
- Ninth, he should have access to professional supervision and consultation as needed. His role as a member of the pupil personnel services team, as well as his relationship to other members of the team and to teachers and administrators, should be firmly stated.

CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT,
Rochester, N.Y., October 7, 1971.

HON. FRANK HORTON,
U.S. Representative,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HORTON: Thank you for the copy of H.R. 7429, the Occupational Education Act of 1971, introduced to the Congress earlier this year by Congressman Quie, and the opportunity to react to it.

A careful study of the bill and the introductory remarks by Congressman Quie as published in the April 7, 1971 Congressional Record has been made and we are pleased for the opportunity to convey our ideas about this far-reaching bill.

As a general statement, it hardly seems necessary to say that educators and others are finally accepting the fact that college is not the ultimate goal for ALL students. It is fair to say that educators have not done as well with skill training for tradesmen and technicians as they have with the humanities, the sciences, and the professions. Educators are also beginning to see, as Congressman Quie puts it "we can no longer strive to encourage all secondary school students to graduate from high school without recognizing the need for infusing occupational education and counseling on an equal footing with the traditional academic offerings."

While the bill seems quite inclusive, we feel provisions should be made to induce colleges to alter their teacher-training programs so that newly trained teachers are as familiar with and conversant about all the objectives sought in this bill as they are with the traditional educational jargon. Experience tends to show that most teachers, like parents, aspire to have all students graduate from high school and head for college. We agree with Dr. Marland that this route is adequate for half of our students; the proposed bill should help the remaining half. In other words, the same efforts should be placed on preparing academically oriented teachers, both potential and practicing, to know and understand occupational education, just as Sec. 123 of the Act provides for "programs to prepare journeymen in the skilled trades or occupations," to qualify for teaching positions.

In view of the several Vocational Education Acts, amendments and proposed amendments, we are happy to see a trend developing whereby occupational education, particularly at the elementary and secondary level, will be encouraged to keep pace with the academic program to the end that we serve "all of the children of all of the people" rather than just those who are able to accept what educators keep telling them is best for them.

Once again, thank you for your interest and concern.

Sincerely,

JOHN M. FRANCO,
Superintendent of Schools.

WAYNE CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT No. 1,
Ontario Center, N.Y., August 26, 1971.

Representative FRANK HORTON,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE HORTON: Thank you for your recent letter concerning the Occupational Education Act of 1971.

I referred your letter to Mr. Emory Faulks, our High School Principal and he had these comments to make:

"My reaction is quite favorable provided strong emphasis is placed upon paragraphs two and three on page 7 of the bill where occupational preparation, counselling and job-placement is provided by the secondary schools.

"Community colleges, vocational education and manpower development and training have done a splendid job, but, in many cases are geared to high school graduates and drop-outs. We need a program to prevent the drop-out and to reach the student who is floundering before graduation—who will not go on to further training after high school but needs this type of instruction very much."

Very truly yours,

Dr. WILLIAM A. CROMBIE, Superintendent.

RUSH-HENRIETTA CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT,
Henrietta, N.Y., August 10, 1971.

HON. FRANK HORTON,
*Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR FRANK: Thank you for the copy of H.R. 7429 which you sent me along with a request for my views on occupational education.

In my judgment vocational education has not fulfilled the dreams of Congress since the Smith-Hughes Act. Many of the problems are inherent in the practice of building a separate "but equal" physical structure and instructional program. In many cases once the building opened there seemed to be a mad scramble to compete with the Ivy League by establishing rigid academic entrance requirements for the few spaces available. In some states boys and girls aged 13 and 14 are forced to make an early decision regarding an occupation with no opportunity to change their minds without making up three or four years of other high school requirements.

I hope occupational education avoids these ills by de-emphasizing bureaucratization, jurisdictional disputes and false values about respectability.

We now admit that most of one's education takes place outside the classroom—yet, nearly all our efforts in public secondary education seem to ignore that fact. I would like to see much more off campus, work experience or home base school programs for most of our high school youth. Experiences could be geared to the arts, social and community services as well as commerce and industry. Perhaps a thirteenth or fourteenth year secondary school program could be provided for those areas requiring great skill for entry occupations.

Most employers I believe desire beginning young employees who want to learn rather than those who may have been trained in a skill that is obsolete or already representative of surplus labor in another section of the country or economy.

Unfortunately, my experiences with categorical type financial support have not been anywhere near what was intended by a well meaning, statesmanlike legislator or congress.

H.R. 7429 appears to be limited in general to youngsters who have left school. I believe the task should be completed in high school for all but a few who would then enroll in a technical institute or a joint school-industry sponsored apprenticeship.

I probably have rambled too long. I have strong feelings about the inadequacies of our high school program. Perhaps we should talk about it further when you are in the area.

Sincerely,

RAYMOND R. DELANEY, *Superintendent of Schools.*

RUSH-HENRIETTA CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT,
Henrietta, N.Y., August 26, 1971.

HON. FRANK HORTON,
*Congress of the United States, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.*

DEAR FRANK: Thought you might be interested in this summary of a study conducted by the New York State Education Department.

Sincerely,

RAYMOND R. DELANEY, *Superintendent of Schools.*

[From the Newsletter, May-June 1971]

OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION GRADUATES

In the decade of the 1970's, the economy will be faced with the challenge of absorbing the greatest number of prospective workers in its history. Because of this challenge it is expected that high school occupational training will become increasingly more significant, especially for those individuals who do not go on to college.

A recent study entitled "Employment Status and Attitudes of Secondary School Occupational Education Graduates in New York State" has examined various aspects of the above economic problem by analyzing the educational and occupational patterns of selected June 1969 high school graduates. The study includes an analysis of student attitudes toward work and toward academic and vocational courses in high school.

Among the conclusions and recommendations of the study are:

(1) The majority of graduates did not enter a job area in which they were trained nor did the majority of graduates aspire to work in the same job for which they were trained.

(2) Specific occupational training may be inappropriate or limiting for many high school students currently enrolled in occupational education programs.

(3) Flexibility should be maintained in providing each student with a variety of skills and understandings related to a number of occupational areas.

(4) Occupational guidance programs must play a more important role in identifying and counseling young people in terms of selecting high school occupational programs.

(5) Guidance counselors are urged to demonstrate more interest in, and understanding of, adolescents since the most frequently stated dissatisfaction during the interviews related to the competence and attitudes of counselors.

Single copies of the above study may be obtained by writing to the Bureau of Occupational Education Research, Room 468 EBA, New York State Education Department, Albany, New York 12224.

WOMEN AND WORK

"The controversy over the proper method of educating women for identity in work has been somewhat blurred as the result of its immersion in the general educational crisis facing America today." So say the co-authors of "Educating Women for Identity in Work" which appears in the May 1971 edition of the *American Vocational Journal*.

The authors have determined that two major points can be derived from available information on the education of women:

1. Women have little knowledge concerning the technology of our society.
2. Women are confused about their identity in work.

Unfortunately, American society's many years of neglect and refusal to recognize new moral and ethical standards of female conduct have forced many women into a almost self-defeating radicalism in an effort to draw attention to their plight.

In an attempt to find a solution acceptable to all parties concerned, the authors have briefly traced the manner in which women have come to their present position of needing special attention to become an equal and integral part of the work world. Based on their research findings the authors present a number of recommendations, some new and some already suggested by the Women's Bureau of the Labor Department and other organizations concerned with the educational and occupational growth of women in our society. Two of the recommendations are:

1. Girls should be encouraged to enter a ~~wide range of skill training~~ programs, including apprenticeships.
2. Occupational programs for girls should be instituted in all junior high schools.

For a more in depth analysis of the problem the readers of this *Newsletter* are encouraged to read the above article in its entirety.

The same issue of *American Vocational Journal* contains an article by Arthur Lee, President of the American Vocational Education Research Association who continues to call for a national research policy. The April 1971 issue of this *RCU Newsletter* carried a summary of a communication that Mr. Lee sent to members of the American Vocational Education Research Association. In his communication Mr. Lee urged the members to consider alternative AVERA positions on vocational education and vocational education research and suggested a national research policy as one alternative.

* * *

EVALUATION OF RCU SERVICES

The staff of the New York State Research Coordinating Unit wishes to obtain feedback from users of our services and the services of our cooperating institu-

tions throughout the state. We are interested in obtaining any suggestions which will help us to improve the *RCU Newsletter* and/or the activities of either the RCU or the ERIC cooperating institutions. Without such suggestions we cannot become aware of needed changes.

Anyone who is interested in responding to this request is invited to do so by writing to:

Mr. Whitney Wilkes, Editor, Bureau of Occupational Education Research, Room 468 EBA, New York State Education Department, Albany, New York.

Some questions you may consider responding to are:

1. Have you visited a cooperating institution?
Which of their services did you find favorable?
Unfavorable?
What suggestions do you have for improving their service?
2. Have you found the *RCU Newsletter* helpful to you?
If so, How? If not, what suggestions do you have for changing the *Newsletter* to better meet your needs?
3. Have you utilized the services of the Research Coordinating Unit?
If so, have you benefited from the materials and/or services obtained?
What suggestions do you have for improving these materials and services?

* * *

The following studies have been added to the ERIC collection and should be of interest to educators. The New York State RCU will supply abstracts of these or any other ERIC documents upon request. When ordering documents please include the ERIC identification Number, ED — —, and whether you want the abstract or microfiche.

Build Our American Communities: A Community Development Program for High School and Young Adult Groups, ED 045 832

Educational Activities within Business-Industry: Implications for Public Education, ED 044 619

Man, Education, and Manpower, ED 044 782

Occupations and Education in the 70's: Promises and Challenges, ED 045 852

The Production and Validation of Educational Systems Packages for Occupational Training of Depressed Area Students; or Black Student Versus Teacher Evaluation of Urban Vocational Programs. Final Report, ED 045 778

Research Visibility: Educating Women for the World of Work, ED 045 849

Résumés of Exemplary Programs in the States. State Planning for Vocational Education Innovative Programs, ED 045 855

The Development of a Project for Educable Mentally Retarded Children to Receive Vocational Training in Food Service. Final Report, ED 044 874

Vocational Education: The Bridge Between Man and His Work. Publication 1. Highlights and Recommendations from the General Report of the Advisory Council on Vocational Education, 1968, ED 045 474

A Comparison of Two Methods of Providing Information to Ninth Grade Students About the World of Work, ED 044 722

Counselor Bias and the Female Occupational Role, ED 044 749

Total Career Capability for All. A Career-Development Program Model, ED 045 632

Drugs on Campus and in the Secondary Schools, ED 044 724

Guide to Ideas on Drug Abuse Programs and Policies, ED 044 712

Review and Analysis of Curricula for Occupations in Public Services. Information Series No. 29, ED 045 813

Review and Analysis of Curricula for Occupations in Transportation. Information Series No. 28, ED 045 814

Review and Analysis of Curricula for Occupations in Environmental Control. Information Series No. 30, ED 045 817

Review and Analysis of Curricula for Occupations in Food Processing and Distribution. Information Series No. 32, ED 045 820

Dissemination and Implementation of Research Findings, ED 045 834

Current Developments in Vocational Home Economics Education, ED 045 825

Industrial Arts/Industrial Technology, ED 045 801

Five-Year Plan for the Department of Industrial Education and Technology, ED 045 806

WEBSTER CENTRAL SCHOOL,
Webster, N.Y., August 9, 1971.

Hon. FRANK HORTON,
District Office, House of Representatives,
Rochester, N.Y.

DEAR MR. HORTON: Thank you for giving me an opportunity to review and comment on H.R. 7429, the Occupational Education Act of 1971. While I do not feel qualified to comment on the specific wording of this bill as a proposed piece of legislation, I think the intent of the bill is commendable and from that viewpoint I would consider it an excellent bill to co-sponsor.

It would provide greater support for the area vocational education programs, work-study programs, and apprentice programs along with other similar activities of the local schools which to date have suffered from under-funding. It would also provide monies that would allow schools to improve their vocational placement activities so that more emphasis could be placed upon placing students in post high school training programs of worth, or of matching up their specific high school skills with employment opportunities available in the area.

One of the areas that also must receive serious consideration is that of providing public information about the worth and value of vocational education programs and the importance of trained and skilled craftsmen. Our culture has long highlighted the importance of a college education, and the television ads showing the closing of the gates of the college campus to that unprepared gives a definite indication that our society certainly values college and university training above all other forms of activities. A national effort to place higher value on trained and technical occupations is much needed. One of my favorite quotations is one of John Gardner's when he wrote, "We must have respect for both our plumbers and our philosophers or neither our pipes nor our theories will hold water."

One aspect of Federal Funding for Education that concerns me is that in the past the amount of paper work connected with obtaining and accounting for these funds means that an inordinate amount of administrative and clerical time and money must go into that phase of the program. While I am not suggesting that accountability is not important, it often appears that too much of the Federal Funds are eaten up in this fashion thus reducing the impact that these programs should have on the specific target area.

I there is any other information that I might supply you which would help you in your decision relating to introduction and support of H.R. 7429 please let me know.

Sincerely,

ROSS J. WILLINK, *Superintendent.*

NORTH ROSE-WOLCOTT CENTRAL SCHOOL,
Wolcott, N.Y., August 18, 1971.

Hon. FRANK HORTON,
Representative to Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HORTON: I have reviewed H.R. 7429 and have read Mr. Quie's statement to the House of Representatives. I am delighted to see such a bill introduced.

Additional support for secondary occupational education is vitally needed. This district is in an area where a large proportion of our young people go into the labor market without any specific training. While our area occupational schools are growing and developing, too few of our youngsters take advantage of this opportunity. Not only do these young people need the initial training, but they need the life-long opportunity for retraining as our technology changes.

I believe that our elementary and, particularly, secondary education programs need greater information and counseling in the occupations. I further believe that more exploratory activity should be available. However, I have strong reservations concerning concepts in developing occupational education on equal footing with traditional academic education at the elementary level. It is my belief that there is a basic body of knowledge, skills, concepts and attitudes which are critical to all people no matter what their occupations may become. In our way of life, it is vital for all people to be contributing voting citizens. If we infuse in our elementary and secondary educational programs too much occupational education, we may be reducing basic skills and be restricting the mobility of our citi-

zens. When we attempt to prepare a person for a specific job, we must pinpoint selected basic skills and understandings that are required to assume a specific occupational role. In so doing, we can, if we are not careful, reduce his ability to change his occupation or, for that matter, to improve his skills in that occupation. Compounding the problem is the fact that invariably an early occupational choice has little relationship to the individual's real talents or what his interests may be at an older age. In summary—yes, I believe that we must improve awareness of occupations and the qualifications for such responsibilities. However, I believe that any attempt to narrow the background and training of youngsters at an early age may, in the long run, make them less effective as workers and citizens in a free society.

Thank you for the opportunity to express my thoughts in this matter.

Very sincerely yours,

ROBERT D. HELMER, *Superintendent of Schools.*

BOARD OF COOPERATIVE EDUCATIONAL SERVICES,
OF ONTARIO-SENECA-YATES COUNTIES,
FINGER LAKES EDUCATIONAL CENTER,
Stanley, N.Y., August 5, 1971.

Mr. FRANK HORTON,
Member of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HORTON: Thank you for your letter of July 27, 1971 relative to H.R. 7429, The Occupational Education Act of 1971. I asked Mr. Elliott Johnson, Director of our Finger Lakes Occupational School, to review it and give his comments. They are enclosed.

We endorse the bill with these suggestions.

Very truly yours,

JOHN E. LOVELESS,
District Superintendent of Schools.

Enclosure.

AUGUST 5, 1971.

To: John E. Loveless.
From: Elliott H. Johnson.
Re: Horton Letter/Bill H.R. 7429.
Statement of Purpose a-e.
Excellent

Authorization of Appropriations, Allotments and Reallotments.

Fine if they'll do it!

Fed Admin—Part A.

Page 6, lines 7-12 Suggest all such programs come under *one* agency—*Commissioner of Education.*

Bureau of Occupational Education, Establishment.

Pages 8-9 It is most important that we have a special Bureau of Occupational Education, properly staffed in Washington. Right now it's a "step child"

State Administration—Part B.

Pages 10-12 All AOK

State Programs and Grants—Part C.

Page 13, lines 17-25 Most important that the program follows the regional approach we already have started.

Area Vocational Schools, Community Colleges, etc.

There should be a closer liaison at the state level between Occupational Education Bureau for Area Centers and the Community College staff.

Page 15—most important

Program Grants.

Pages 16-17 Important to include grants to train teachers—particularly those journeymen coming from the skilled trades so that there will not be high costs for the individual teacher in taking the required education courses.

Some aid should be given Area Centers for instructional salaries when courses are expanded.

Provisions (page 17, lines 9-18) are important that will mandate nonduplication of courses—equipment, etc. in a given area.

Judicial Review.

Pages 17-20 No Comment

Technical Assistance—Model Programs.

No comment other than mandating that the "bulk" of the aid should go out to state schools involved in Occupational Education with some limit on the amount kept at that state level for additional departments and staff.

Guidance/Counseling starting in elementary school and continuing up to the time a student makes his occupational choice is a must if we are to reorient our thinking on college vs. skill training. All students should be concerned with making some occupational choice. It should be a continuous process. Present indications are that in 1980 we will need only 30% of our work force with bachelor's degrees or higher. The other 70% will need vocational or technical training. That is not what we in education are doing now.

BOARD OF EDUCATION,
Rochester, N.Y., July 31, 1971.

HON. FRANK HORTON,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRANK: Thank you for sending me a copy of "The Occupational Education Act of 1971", introduced by Congressman Quie. I have read it completely and consider it to be a measure meriting strong support. I hope you will decide to become a co-sponsor.

I have had experience in the field of vocational education and read widely on the subject. There are some provisions in the Act that impress me as particularly important in today's educational climate. Creation of a Bureau within the Office of Education headed by a deputy commissioner, coordination of all occupational education programs including those at the post-secondary level, beginning counseling for occupational education in the elementary grades, and change in emphasis giving more dignity and stature to education leading to a job are major points.

May I point out that this Act will come to naught without proper funding. Congress has authorized approximately three times as much money for education as it has appropriated. Pledge yourself to fund the Act if you become a co-sponsor.

Sincerely,

Mrs. ROBERT R. PHILLIPS, *Commissioner.*

BOARD OF EDUCATION,
Rochester, N.Y., August 16, 1971.

HON. FRANK J. HORTON,
Cannon Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRANK: I'm sorry I haven't gotten an earlier chance to reply to your July 27, 1971 letter on the Quie Occupational Education Act, H.R. 7429.

I think the direction of the legislation is correctly placed for it recognizes the importance of post-secondary development of technicians. I am less enthusiastic about the need for application to the elementary and secondary level, per se. I guess I do not feel the need at this level as much as in the post 12th grade area.

On this second point, I concur that if aid is to come forward, elementary and secondary education monies should not be prejudice against occupational education.

Sincerely,

GORDON J. DEHOND, *Commissioner.*

SINGER EDUCATION AND TRAINING PRODUCTS,
GRAFLEX DIVISION,
Rochester, N.Y., August 6, 1971.

Subject: H.R. 7429—The Occupational Education Act of 1971
Hon. FRANK HORTON,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRANK: Based upon observations made during five years of successful Job Corps operations at Breckinridge for disadvantaged young men, plus vocationally oriented training in Rochester's "Operation Young Adults," for potential High School dropouts, as well as Work-Study education at R.I.T., I am firmly convinced that the objectives of the subject Bill H.R. 7429 are sound.

Experience shows that the interrelation of academic and occupational training is important in reducing "dropouts," and in accelerating the rate and effectiveness of the learning process.

The true objective of education for most people is to accommodate better in our economic and social environment, and the acquisition of an academic degree does not necessarily achieve this.

Furthermore, with the need for realizing greater mileage from a reduced expenditure, which the public is beginning to demand, for education, we need to re-examine our order of priorities—and this Bill seems to be directed to this end.

Sincerely,

G. C. WHITAKER, *Chairman.*





