



For so brashly speculative a topic as "The Next Ten Years In Higher Education" I can understand why Elmer Ellis and others in the "Show me State" may have felt it advisable to import a fellow educator from a considerable distance. Realizing that I am expected to stick out my neck, however, I can only hope that I am from a safe distance.

Unfortunately in the past we have not been accustomed to thinking very far ahead with regard to our colleges and universities. Financial support for many of our institutions has been provided on an annual or biennial basis, and this fact alone has tended to discourage far-sighted planning. By force of circumstances as well as habit, therefore, we have tended to come to grips with major problems only after they were thrust upon us. In an era of rapid and sweeping change, such procedures are no longer adequate. The need for expanding and improving higher education in the next ten years is so great that the only kind of sensible planning is long-range planning.

Thinking figuratively in terms of the space age, moreover, we shall have to quit flying by the seat of our pants and direct our radars along a course well ahead of where we now are. What will our needs be? Who should go to college and where? How will social and economic trends affect higher education? How can we best support and control our institutions? Can the efficiency and effectiveness of teaching and research be improved? Does the organization of higher education need changing? How should education be related to governmental and other agencies? What goals should we have? Postponing realistic thought and action about such questions as these not only jeopardizes the forward movement of higher education, but also imperils—in a very real sense—the future of the nation.

In charting our course ahead, some of the steps to

be taken are obvious. The first of these steps involves a projection of the population groups to be directly served. We know, for example, that there will be upwards of 14½ million persons aged 18-21 in this country in 1970 (an increase of 51.7 per cent over 1960), reflecting an essentially continuous rise during the preceding decade. It can also be foreseen with reasonable certainty that the percentage of young persons going to college will continue to increase. The ratio of college enrollment to college-age population—which was less than 5 per cent in 1900—is now 37 per cent and will pass 41 per cent by 1970.

There is nothing inevitable, of course, about who will go to college in the next ten years. Although admission requirements are being raised in many institutions, a recent study showed that 87 per cent of the high school seniors who cared enough to complete their applications did succeed in getting in somewhere. Yet, we also know that freshmen enrollments would be 50 per cent higher if all those qualified for college work would go on to take it. During the coming decade we might institute policies which would raise or lower these and other significant figures about college attendance, but these projections are probably accurate forecasts.

THE KINDS AND LOCATIONS OF INSTITUTIONS which students will attend are also subject to change. At present, about 60 per cent of the enrollment is in public institutions and 40 per cent in private. The division in 1970 is likely to be 65 and 35, unless, of course, we set ourselves to reversing the trend of recent years. Another change now under way in the structure of our system concerns the highest level of offerings by types of institutions. The number of public institutions offering the bachelor's and/or first professional degree only is rapidly decreasing, and today there are

only 98 such public institutions. In other categories—those offering 2 but less than 4 years, those offering the master's, and those offering the Ph.D. or its equivalent—the percentage increase in six years has been 18, 16, and 29, respectively. In other words, it looks as though eventually all of our publicly supported institutions might be either junior colleges or universities!

No such radical change has taken place recently in the private sector. Among these institutions, the largest number is in the four-year college category, and it appears likely that this will increasingly become the domain of private education. Although the number of independent universities offering the Ph.D. or its equivalent still exceeds the corresponding group of public universities—120 to 99—the trend of offerings by types of institutions suggests that in the coming decade the more expensive types of programs will be heavily concentrated in public institutions.

I was unable to find any student projections by fields of study, but the recent rise in bachelor's awarded (1955-1960) by 184 per cent for mathematics, followed by electrical engineering and physics, is suggestive. Equally suggestive, but of a need to reverse the recent trend, is a decline of 1 per cent in the number of medical degrees awarded during the same five-year period.

As most of you are aware, the proportion of women students in American colleges and universities has gone up. Last year, for instance, they accounted for 42 per cent of all first-time enrollments. As we become more conscious in this nation of the importance of highly trained womanpower as well as of manpower, a further rise may be anticipated.

I have implied that entrance examinations bear upon the question of who shall go to college and where. Likewise, it should be noted that advanced standing tests are being more widely used to answer the question, for how long? My prediction is that during the next ten years we shall refine and standardize our testing procedures to the point that great savings in time and money will be effected, both for institutions and for individuals.

If we are to make suitable opportunities available for American youth and get the best results for the time and money invested, there are many other questions confronting us. For example: What guidelines are needed for the establishment of new institutions? Do some popular misconceptions need correcting about the junior or community college as a place where the first two years can be offered "cheaper?" How can we match students and institutions more effectively? Where should graduate and professional level work be given?

ENROLLMENT IN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION in the decade ahead will be affected, of course, by circumstances other than the mere fact that there will be a more than 50 per cent increase in the sheer size of the college-age group. Also, there will be more parents in the college-trained segment of the population, and we know that such persons tend to send their children on to higher education. There will likewise

be an increased proportion of urban households, with more and more individuals in an improved socioeconomic position to enter upon higher education. Financial aids to students will doubtless continue to grow, and the Federal Government's assistance in this respect will unquestionably be extended.

In a society which is both technological and dynamic, the demand for higher education is virtually insatiable. One evidence of this is the fact that, while unemployment is a manifestation largely of those persons having limited training, there is still a shortage of highly trained individuals in many fields. The Bureau of Labor Statistics estimates that during the decade of the 1960's our labor force will be up by 18 per cent, while our need for professional, technical, and kindred workers will rise by 60 per cent. The next largest increase in kinds of manpower needs foreseen is for clerical and sales workers, followed by proprietors and managers, occupations in which higher education is coming more and more to be a prerequisite. Even at the present time, moreover, no field for which higher education has responsibility shows an oversupply of trained workers.

Aside from the growing pressure for a higher level of technical competence in our trained manpower, there is also the question posed in the current issue of *Daedalus*, the quarterly journal of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences: "What should be the education of the leaders and citizens of a technological society?" As is pointed out in the journal, "The progressive character of society and the social sciences requires of everyone, expert and amateur, redoubled and continuous efforts aimed at refreshing acquired knowledge. . . . It is indispensable that public opinion . . . should be able to understand and consequently to support the action of the governors and the recommendations of the experts."

Under such circumstances, raising the general level of vocational competence is only one of the main tasks confronting our colleges and universities. The other is raising the general level of understanding required for life in an ever more complex society. The forward movement of science and technology must be accompanied, therefore, by corresponding progress in the diffusion of knowledge in the humanities and social studies. And here, it seems to me, educational leaders

Continued on page 19

Dr. Logan Wilson is president of the American Council on Education. The accompanying article is based on his address in Jesse Auditorium on April 8 at the opening of the Missouri Assembly on Higher Education. He is a graduate of Texas and Harvard, and a former president of the University of Texas.



THE NEXT TEN YEARS

from page 7



will have to exert strong efforts to offset the imbalance which already threatens liberal education in some of our colleges and universities.

IT IS CLEAR THAT THE NATION CONFRONTS some critical issues regarding the support and control of higher education. Nobody disputes the fact that a greatly enlarged investment will be required—the only moot point is where the money will come from. And related to questions of support are those of control.

President Robert D. Calkins, of the Brookings Institution, has estimated that in less than a decade we shall have to spend annually a total of \$11.1 billion dollars for higher education. Of this total, \$9.6 billion will be for education, student aid, and organized research with \$1.5 billion for plant. He suggests that the \$9.6 billion figure will be obtained as follows: \$2.4 billion from tuition; \$1.2 billion from endowment income, private gifts, and grants; \$5.2 billion from governments; \$850 million from other sources—giving a leeway of \$83 million. These figures include no allowance for inflation.

Dr. Calkins states:

My calculations suggest that state and local support may have to be increased . . . to about \$4,300 million by 1969-70. Of the latter sum, \$500 million is for plant and \$3,800 million is for operating costs. The plant estimate is only about 36 per cent larger than the 1957-58 support, and it is predicted, in part, on the availability of Federal grants and loans for an increasing share of plant expansion. The general support requirements (\$3,800 million) are the serious part of the problem. As a percentage of GNP they represent an increase from 0.28 to 0.54 per cent.

After discussing other needs in the economy for increased funds, Dr. Calkins comments further:

To meet their expanding costs, state and local governments, since 1946, have already increased taxes and greatly expended their debt . . . from \$15.9 billion to \$52.7 billion. . . . Thus, to

expand state and local support of higher education over the next decade as projected will almost certainly require additional taxes and additional debt. . . . If the GNP grows more rapidly than 3.5 per cent per year . . . the total educational budget can be met with some less difficulty. If GNP grows less rapidly, there will be real financial problems for the public institutions during the next decade . . . it is clear that higher education cannot achieve the new goals that are being set for it by relying solely on state and local support, without substantial help from the Federal government. . . . The Federal role does not imply large subsidies to the institutions; it portends no revolutionary change in Federal policy toward higher education; but it does indicate the continuation of Federal aid on a somewhat larger scale. Moreover, it indicates that Federal policies undertaken in the national interest must in the future not be so administered as to load still heavier financial burdens upon the colleges and universities and their other sources of support. (*Financing Higher Education, 1960-1970*)

The estimates just quoted assume 10 per cent economies by more effective utilization of staff and plant, raising tuition charges by 100 per cent in public institutions and 50 per cent in private institutions, and doubled salaries.

AS WAS MENTIONED EARLIER and as Calkins' predictions show, we shall move increasingly toward public support for higher education. I think we can anticipate that such support, and especially that from the Federal Government, will go to privately controlled as well as to publicly controlled institutions. The precedent for Federal aid to both categories of institutions has already been established in the matter of research, and it undoubtedly will be extended to other programs.

Heavier reliance upon public support for all types of institutions could result in some impingements upon the traditional diversity and autonomy of our colleges and universities, however, so that tendencies toward uniformization will need to be guarded against. It is, therefore, important for educational leaders to forestall fiscal and other restrictions that would unduly interfere with the cherished freedoms which have long been associated with institutional independence.

Whether we prefer it that way or not, all of this seems to me to imply greater involvement of higher education in politics—for politics most certainly will be drawn more and more into higher education. Rather than leave major decisions entirely to politicians, educators, trustees, and others who are intimately concerned with the welfare of our colleges and universities must make their influence more directly felt in the legislative and executive branches of government.

At present, unfortunately, our system of higher education—if it can be called such—is too loosely articulated for unified thought and action. Most of our 2,000 colleges and universities tend to go their separate ways. Even on the single campus of a large institution, in fact, one sometimes encounters very little coordination of total enterprise. For the nation as a whole, we have what is really a congeries of institutions—with resultant wide variations of academic standards, unevenness of educational opportunity, and



the unnecessarily high costs of unilateral actions. The time is now at hand, I believe, when we simply must begin to practice more cooperation and coordination.

Evidence of more joint enterprise is already to be seen in such groupings of similar institutions as the Midwest College Council, the Great Lakes College Association, and other voluntary arrangements. Still another type of cooperation is illustrated in the arrangements worked out in the East among Mount Holyoke, Amherst, Smith and the University of Massachusetts. Likewise, there are the consortia of major universities, exemplified by the Committee on Institutional Cooperation, and other more or less informal groupings for the purpose of exchanging information and staff, joint use of expensive facilities, and even for the purpose of reaching agreements which in the business world might be interpreted as being in "restraint of trade," but which are really for the purpose of avoiding wasteful duplication.

EVEN MORE COMPREHENSIVE ARRANGEMENTS which cut across state as well as institutional lines are to be noted in the Southern Regional Educational Board, the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, and the New England Board of Higher Education. Within some states, presidents of institutions have formed voluntary associations to engage in joint planning and to agree upon divisions of labor. In still other states—often where educational leaders themselves have been either unable or unwilling to get together effectively—politically appointed commissions or boards are getting into the enterprise of institutional coordination.

These recent developments all point up a trend toward more collective enterprise intended to serve state, regional, and national, rather than strictly local, needs. During the decade ahead I think we can expect a further acceleration of this movement toward a more coherent, unified, and meaningful pattern for all of American higher education. Making the transition will not in all respects be easy, for the idea of local support and control is deeply rooted, but in my opinion the exigencies of our era will make it impos-

sible for us to continue paying the price for maintaining a sentiment that is already outmoded.

However, I am optimistic about the prospects for improved communication and cooperation among institutions of higher education. Within states and regions, as I have said, there are already many indications that the movement is under way. On the national level, such an organization as the American Council on Education can be of substantial aid in developing long-range plans and objectives, in improving relations between higher education and the Federal Government, in bringing a focus of attention upon the common problems of academic and administrative affairs, and in relating higher education more effectively to international affairs.

Within particular institutions, I am also optimistic about the prospects for marked improvements in teaching and research. Although I am convinced that we shall never find any substitute for the able and dedicated teacher as a person, I think that programmed instruction, open- and closed-circuit television, and other aids are here to stay and are not passing fads. The decade ahead undoubtedly will witness further experimentation and evaluation of these and other media.

Further, I believe that we shall make progress during the coming decade in eliminating the spacious dichotomy which now exists in many places between teaching and research. By bringing the two into a closer and more harmonious relationship, each will aid the other. Students themselves, I predict, will on all levels be drawn more directly into the exciting process of research, as it becomes incorporated more and more into the modern meaning of learning.

Even though colleges and universities have long had as their basic purpose the conservation, diffusion, and advancement of higher learning, the growth of our educational system has proceeded in the past without very much attention to goals or objectives. Although such unplanned diversity has served our nation surprisingly well, many now are realizing that we must give more careful thought to the means and ends of an increasingly expensive and important enterprise. This is the reason, of course, that we have been reading and hearing much of late about immediate and long-range goals for American higher education.

WITH REGARD TO KNOWLEDGE ITSELF, I doubt that the principal functions of education will undergo any essential change in the decade ahead. Since knowledge is a cumulative thing and the rate of its growth in many fields has been greatly accelerated in recent years, it is obvious that more will have to be learned by more students during the years set aside for formal education. This implies improved methods of teaching and greater demands upon learners. As life becomes swifter paced and more interrelated, we may expect the campus to become even less demarcated from the surrounding world. Population mobility and improved communication will decrease the focus upon local concerns as the awareness of national and in-

Continued on inside back cover

THE NEXT TEN YEARS

from page 20

ternational issues becomes more widespread. As is true of science, many other forms of knowledge will undergo a "de-provincialization." Despite the fact that colleges and universities, will still have their traditional mission of preserving, disseminating, and improving our cultural heritage, within this broad mission the dimensions of knowledge will be enlarged and changed.

With regard to learners or students, I suspect that the college years will witness more emphasis upon utility and less upon enjoyment. I hope personally that we shall continue to look upon our campuses as places where young men and women learn to become happier individuals as well as more useful citizens, but it seems to me inevitable that enlarged curricular demands will make inroads upon time formerly given to extracurricular activities. (What this forebodes for fraternities, intercollegiate athletics, and long weekends is anybody's guess!) . . . I foresee less *laissez faire* in permitting altogether too many students to drift aimlessly, and more emphasis upon guidance. Already the Federal Government, for example, provides fellowships and other incentives in those fields where trained manpower is most needed. Improved means will be devised to minimize the loss of talent to our society on the part of those who are now capable of a college education but lack the opportunity. Furthermore, I believe that in most places higher standards of performance will be exacted of all those who do have the opportunity.

WITH LARGER AND MORE DIVERSE STUDENT POPULATIONS attending college during the next ten years, there necessarily will be a greater variety of educational programs. Even so, I think that localism and provincial-

ism in standards and aims will give way to more uniformity and consensus on a nationwide basis for similar kinds of programs. The increased use of standardized testing is one indication of this tendency, and the continuing growth of federal aid is another. Moreover, the national welfare will demand a high level of trained manpower in all parts of the country.

In short, it is self-evident that we shall have to know clearly what our goals are in higher education. The self-realization and manpower objectives will have to be brought into a more consistent relationship, both from individual and institutional points of view. Human talents, wherever they may exist, will need to be regarded as resources to be cultivated to the maximum extent possible, with more financial aids for those deserving students who lack the money to pay their way. Although we shall require a consensus as to the common goals for all institutions (for example, good citizenship), there unquestionably must be more focus in some institutions on specified and limited objectives. Our educational effort will be diluted if every junior college aspires to become a four-year institution, and if every senior college strives to be a university. Among universities, moreover, there are few, if any, institutions having the human and material resources to spread over the entire spectrum of higher education. In the decade ahead, I hope that more of our colleges and universities will concentrate on those things which they can do best.

During the next ten years, I believe there will be no place in our system of higher education for easy standards and slipshod performance. Even though most institutions, like most individuals, cannot be expected to excel, adequacy and competence are reasonable common objectives, and somehow our total endeavor must rise to a peak of excellence for our nation to survive and prosper in a highly competitive world. Since the American people realize all this as never before, I am confident that the next decade in higher education will be the best years in our history.

Friends honor Stalcup

Wilbur (Sparky) Stalcup ended a decade and a half as head basketball coach for the University of Missouri this season and some 300 friends and fans honored him March 31 with a testimonial dinner.

Stalcup had announced his decision to resign from coaching at the first basketball practice of the 1961-62 season. He will continue with the University as Assistant Director of Athletics.

Three principal speakers honored Stalcup at the evening dinner. Dr. Elmer Ellis, president of the University, paid tribute to Stalcup's ethics as a coach throughout his long service.

Dr. Forrest C. Allen, former longtime opponent of Stalcup as University of Kansas basketball coach, lauded Stalcup's sportsmanship.

Henry Iba, Stalcup's coach at Northwest Missouri State College, and later his opponent as head coach at Oklahoma State, also paid testimony to him.

Following the dinner Stalcup was presented the

keys to a new automobile as well as a plaque testifying to the community's friendship for him and appreciation of his services. There were also tributes and reminiscences by many of the other persons associated with Stalcup during his coaching career. Numerous telegrams and letters were presented from those unable to attend the dinner.

Among the guests were members of the freshman and varsity basketball squads. The varsity players presented Stalcup with an autographed basketball.

Among other speakers was Don Faurot who first recommended Stalcup 16 years ago as basketball coach and who picked him for his assistant when Stalcup decided to quit coaching. Additional speakers included Norman Stewart, now head coach at the State College of Iowa, Cedar Falls; Harold Hull of Maryville; Ray McIntyre of St. Louis and Herman Fisher of Kansas City. Mahlon Aldridge, manager of Columbia radio station KFRU, was toastmaster and G. I. Jackson, president of the Columbia Quarterback Club, made the presentations.