

Education

STATEMENT

BY

THE HONORABLE SHIRLEY CHISHOLM

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

BEFORE

BLACK FORUM MEETING

WASHINGTON, D.C.

MAY 21, 1979

Thank you for the opportunity to join with you today in a discussion of the Reauthorization of the Higher Education Act of 1965. As you know, the expiring Act includes a vast array of programs and services critical to ensuring equality of opportunity in higher education for blacks and other low income groups; these programs include student financial aid, federal assistance to black colleges and the Trio programs which direct services to students from disadvantaged backgrounds. Since the Act clearly has a significant impact on student access and retention as well as professional and institutional development, I am especially delighted to accept this invitation from the Black Forum to highlight major issues and share information about this Reauthorization.

The Reauthorization Process

The House Committee on Education and Labor has jurisdiction over the programs which comprise the major portion of Federal aid to the nation's post-secondary institutions. Under the leadership of Chairman Bill Ford from Michigan, the Subcommittee on Post-Secondary Education has been receiving testimony pertinent to extension of certain programs in the Higher Education Act for an additional five years. Many of the most prestigious and powerful lobbying organizations housed at One Dupont Circle here in Washington have been gearing up for this Reauthorization for some time, and many of these groups have already presented their testimony to the Subcommittee. The Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee through its Subcommittee on Education, Arts and the Humanities is not expected to take up consideration of the Higher Education Act until sometime later in the session, so Mr. Ford's Committee will complete a substantial portion of their work before the Senate begins action. Let me make a few general comments about the activities and membership of the House Subcommittee.

By way of comparison, some of you may recall the procedures followed last year during reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The ESEA Reauthorization hearings conducted in 1977 and 1978 spanned 75 days, and the compensatory education study carried out by the National Institute of Education provided a wealth of information for the Oversight and Legislative Hearings the Committee convened. However, the procedures followed thus far by the Post-Secondary Education Committee differ greatly from this previous format. For example, the Committee's hearings seem to be scheduled around specific titles and programs in the Act rather than broad issue areas and themes which cut across various programs. Last February, Chairman Ford set a deadline for individuals and groups to submit recommendations and

the language of specific amendments to the existing Act - all before any substantial number of hearings had been held. Of course, many groups rushed to meet what appear to me to be a totally artificial deadline and tipped their hands on their reauthorization strategy without knowledge of the cards and trumps held by some of the other key players in the game. Mr. Ford is a wily and crafty politician, and I suppose we should expect him to make further use of these skills through the Reauthorization.

One more word about the Subcommittee. I have brought with me a list of the entire membership of the Subcommittee. The list includes a breakdown of the percentage of black votes in each member's Congressional District and a thumbnail sketch of the geographic area encompassed in the District. A glance down this list will reveal some very important information which must be taken into consideration as lobbying plans are formulated. First, the membership of the Committee is dominated by representatives from the Northeast - a section of the country where very few historically black colleges are located. The only member from the Southern region where many of the 105 traditionally black institutions are located is a Republican, John Buchanan from Alabama. I know John quite well and I am sure that he is concerned about the continued survival of these schools, but my point is that many of these Subcommittee members may not feel compelled to sympathetically address the issues confronting Black special purpose institutions as a matter directly affecting their constituencies. To further complicate matters, blacks comprise only a small percentage of the voters in many of these Subcommittee member's districts. Obviously, we have our work cut out for us, and we must devise a sophisticated lobbying strategy in order to preserve and strengthen those programs which serve our needs. I want to now turn to a brief discussion of some of the strategy I have been working on for the Reauthorization.

The Coalition Approach

Some of you may have been present at the meeting of the Education Brain Trust I convened last October after the 95th Congress adjourned. At that time I assembled a panel of experts in higher education to brief the Brain Trust on issues likely to emerge during the Reauthorization this year. I announced my intention to put together an ad hoc coalition on higher education which would bring together blacks and other minorities to work cooperatively to secure the necessary programs and funding for our constituencies. This coalition strategy was based upon the very successful effort many of you participated in during the ESEA Reauthorization; I am a firm believer in the concept that in unity there is strength. In March the National Urban League sponsored a follow-up meeting to the Brain Trust to examine in greater detail a viable Reauthorization strategy for the ad hoc coalition.

One important result of the March meeting was to assign to one of our most outstanding educational scholars the task of drafting general principles of support around which groups could organize and lobby. I am extremely pleased to report that Dr. Faustine Jones from Howard University's School of Education has agreed to serve in this capacity. Dr. Jones has already completed a first draft of these principles which should be ready for mass circulation within a few days. We then plan to secure endorsement by our major black organizations, so that we will stand united around a general set of concerns. Already the member organizations of the black leadership roundtable are expected to endorse these principles. We expect that the 95 Presidents of National Black Alumni Chapters will also join this coalition effort. Additionally, Dr. Jones has agreed to present testimony on behalf of

the endorsing organizations on the senate side which will elaborate upon the concepts incorporated in the general principles of support. Who said blacks could not be organized to work together.

Title III

Title III is the only source of institutional aid in the entire act. Consequently, many post-secondary institutions have become interested in funding available under this particular title. As many of you know, Title III monies have provided the main lifeline of federal support to historically black institutions. In fact, many people incorrectly view Title III as either a "black program" or as a programs exclusively serving black institutions. However, recent data indicates that historically black schools are receiving a little less than 60% of the Title III funds. Other small institutions-including some women's colleges, community colleges and two-year institutions with an Indian constituency - receive Title III funding. Although black colleges have largely been important beneficiaries of this program, I believe it is a mistake to characterize Title III as a "black program". Already this view has precipitated attacks on this program from a number of factions. Small white private institutions are in financial difficulty because of declining student enrollment. See Title III funds as a potential source of additional institutional assistance. Hispanics have also charged that Title III as presently drafted fails to channel an adequate proportion of federal dollars to their constituency, because they do not control institutions of their own. Further, community colleges want to increase their present set aside from 24% to 35% of Title III monies. The Title III program is a funding mechanism under siege right now from many quarters. The political reality is that a lot of people are unhappy with the fact that black colleges have received the lion's share of Title III funds. This unhappiness prompted a GAO report which characterized black institutions as financially irresponsible and generated questions amongst some of my most liberal colleagues about the integrity and financial viability of black colleges. While I can not support these attacks, I feel that the issues which are raised by many of these groups must be directly addressed, if we are to maintain Title III as a viable federal assistance program for black colleges and other institutions which service minority communities.

First, my legislation would seek to redefine the title and provide a focus as something other than "developing institutions." The current misnomer has provoked a great deal of discussion about the meaning of the terms "developing institution." For example, is there some time frame in which an institution is developed and no longer eligible for Title III? To avoid this subjective dilemma, I feel that the program should be renamed "The Institutional Assistance Program." Eligibility criteria in my bill will follow the current pattern of the proposed HEW regulations for Title III issued last November. These regulations establish firm and objective criteria for federal assistance to institutions and create a preference for distribution of institutional aid to those institutions which are serving low income students who otherwise would not have an opportunity for a college education. So a primary theme of the modified Title III program in my bill will involve access for disadvantaged students.

Some of the eligibility characteristics to be considered in the future are: whether an applicant institution has the desire and potential to make a special contribution to the higher education resources of the nation, and whether it is making a reasonable effort to meet that objective; whether an applicant has taken steps to ensure its survival, and if there is evidence of certain conditions that might be regarded as impediments to an institution's survival; the

institution is to explain what it has done to improve those conditions; and whether an applicant institution was receiving Title III funds in 1978.

Credit is to be given to an institution if it has one or more of the following characteristics: serves a large percentage of low-income students, provides a unique or productive education program, has a strong and effective administration of federal program funds including Title III and student-aid programs, and provides access to students who otherwise might be unable to attend college.

Two quantitative criteria to be used in ranking applicants are (1) average educational and general expenditures per full-time equivalent student, and (2) average basic educational opportunity grant award per fte undergraduate student.

The goal of this approach is to insure that institutions have always served low-income students and continue to do so. This criteria would insure that black colleges continue to receive about the same percentage of the Title III funds. Small white private institutions and/or women's colleges that fit the eligibility criteria described above would also be eligible for Title III support. My bill will also list acceptable institutional uses for Title III funds such as assisting in resource development, improving financial management, faculty development, and joint ventures between institutions.

Since Title X has never received an appropriations it is unlikely that this title will be reauthorized. Therefore, it becomes even more imperative that Title III address the needs of community colleges. I support increased funding for community colleges, because a major segment of their enrollees have traditionally been the low-income, disadvantaged student. In my home borough of Brooklyn, the community colleges are faced with possible extinction because of the financial squeeze in the city of New York. Further, many black and brown students are dependent upon the two-year institution as their only entry into higher education due to costs and poor academic preparation. Most of the above eligibility criteria would include the average community college. However because of the special needs of these institutions (they have no endowment or alumni funds as additional support) and their recent history of a 24% set-aside within Title III, their concerns must be met within this title.

To resolve the problem of unhealthy competition between two year and four year institutions under Title III, I will propose a two-tier system of funding modeled upon the impact aid statute in the ESEA Reauthorization Bill. In Tier I, I propose to create a category of awards exclusively for four year institutions funded at \$120 million, the total authorization level now available under the current Title III law. In Tier II, funds would be available for community colleges or two year institutions at a level which ranges from at least 24% to 35% of the amount paid under Tier I. No awards could be made under Tier I during any fiscal year in which the appropriation under Tier II did not at least equal 24% of the sums appropriated under the first tier. This funding trigger mechanism would tie together appropriations under both tiers and foster a unified approach to obtaining appropriations for the entire statute and alleviate competition among those seeking awards under the program. Since the majority of the hispanic students are enrolled in community colleges, this system should address their concerns about elimination from the Title III program.

Supporters of the black colleges like myself and other members of the Congressional Black Caucus have repeatedly been asked to address or explain the

charges of financial mismanagement at many of our black colleges. Many of the problems evidenced by these schools occur as a result of staff and resource limitations. Because the size and character of the student body has drastically changed at some of these schools, many colleges are almost wholly dependent upon federal support to keep their doors open. Basic Educational Opportunity Grants (BEOG's) are a major source of institutional support for the low-income students who by in large attend these institutions. We recognize that these poor students by virtue of their financial status qualify for a good number of local, state and federal programs. Of course, the paper work which must be processed to administer some of these programs has itself been the subject of legislation in the form of anti-paper work bills passed last session. However, black college presidents are aware that they can not increase tuition beyond the stipend award available under the BEOG's program, or they run the risk of pricing their institutions out of the student market they draw upon. This dismal catch-22 financial situation locks these special purpose institutions into an unrealistic tuition scale which is hardly adequate to pay competitive faculty salaries or purchase modern administrative services.

I might add that the student body at many of our black institutions are unable to find summer jobs which pay enough to set aside a portion of these earnings for tuition contributions, so these schools are loath to pass tuition increases based upon this expectation. Moreover, middle class students who formally enrolled in black colleges in large numbers and who could be expected to make a financial contribution toward their own college education now attend predominately white institutions with greater frequency. In reality, this situation means that 90-95% of the financial support at many black colleges is derived from the federal government either in the form of Title II funds or as the administrative share of student financial assistance monies. The extremely tight financial dilemma at many of these schools has forced college administrators to sometimes use these funds which are earmarked for a specific purpose to meet payroll or other institutional obligations. Furthermore, the lack of modern accounting techniques and machinery sometimes results in the misappropriation of federal categorical funds.

My legislation would seek to correct these problems by setting aside funds under Title IV, the student financial assistance section, for the creation of a program known as the Administrative Overburden Program. This program would recognize the contribution of institutions which further the federal policy of access to higher education for low-income students by providing funds for the development of more sophisticated administrative models at these schools as well as in-service training for their financial aid personnel. In this manner, the administrative overburden at these institutions which is traceable to the high percentage of BEOG recipients enrolled at these colleges would hopefully be eased with the availability of additional administrative resources. Institutions, with a student population of at least 40% BEOG recipients would be eligible to participate in the program. In addition to this provision, however, college administrators must take the responsibility for instituting better financial management. Restricted funds can not continue to be used for unauthorized purposes. It is my sincere hope that black college administrators will make the necessary adjustments to enable their schools to survive into the '80's.

In any case, even with changes in the Title III program, many issues still remain unaddressed about the future of black colleges. Can all 110 traditionally black institutions remain open? If all of these schools can not be saved, what criteria should be used to decide which colleges will be maintained?

Further, what implications will desegregation have on historically black schools? These issues and many others must be discussed seriously by the black educational community. I would urge you to raise these concerns within the individual groups that you represent here today. The hour is growing very late for the future of many of these institutions, if we as a people do not make these hard decisions they will be made for us.

Title IV - Student Financial Assistance

Of the FY/1979 appropriation of nearly \$5 billion for the higher education act, approximately 94% - or \$4.7 billion was appropriated for the major Title IV programs for student financial assistance. The federal student aid programs were established for two main purposes. First, they were intended to ensure access to postsecondary education for capable students who might otherwise be denied such an educational opportunity due to their disadvantaged background, and they seek to provide a buffer for middle-income families faced with heavy expenses for postsecondary education. Secondly, they were intended to provide a modicum of choice to both lower and middle-income students who are willing to assume additional burdens of work and loans.

We all know that, no matter how successful we are in incorporating language into the higher education act that seeks to protect the interests of minorities and the poor and to ensure that they have both access and a choice regarding postsecondary education, we will fail to accomplish both goals unless we have the appropriate levels of funding and equitable formulas for the distribution of financial assistance. There has been much debate on the degree of effect that financial considerations continue to have in the determining access. There are those who say that finances are no longer the primary barrier to access and choice. As inflation eats away at the value of our dollars and tuition costs continue to rise, there is little doubt in my mind that the financial status of an individual plays an all pervading role in his or her opportunity for a college education. This is precisely why we must take a very careful look at the financial aid programs contained in Title IV of this act and beware of many proposals that have surfaced, such as tuition tax credits and tuition advance proposals.

During the 95th Congress there was much debate and activity surrounding the current status of financial aid programs and the possible changes that might be considered. The Middle Income Student Assistance Act, signed into law by the President in November of 1978, provides for a substantial increase in financial aid available to students in postsecondary schools. The act was targeted at relieving the heavy burden of middle class families paying for their children's education, and subsequently expand the eligibility for federal student aid programs to income levels that had not previously been covered. The passage of the legislation was appropriate, in that the rising costs of a college education have substantially impacted on families that might once have been able to afford postsecondary educational expenses. At the same time, the expansion of eligibility for aid programs did not have a negative impact on those groups - the poor and minority - that the programs were originally targeted too.

I must stress, however, that in the current atmosphere of fiscal restraint and opposition to the growth of federal spending, we must take care to ensure that the purpose of the Higher Education Act - to enable individuals access to a postsecondary education that they would otherwise be denied - is properly emphasized during the reauthorization process. Expanding the eligibility and access to these programs is a positive step, if in doing so we are

careful to protect those individuals who are most vulnerable to the sky-rocketing costs of higher education.

Briefly, let me turn to the specific aid programs that are contained in Title IV and point out some of the major concerns surrounding these programs which are sure to be addressed during the reauthorization debate. Supplemental grants, college work study, and the national direct loans are referred to collectively as campus-based programs because awards are determined by financial aid officers at postsecondary schools. Basic Educational Opportunity Grants, Guaranteed Student Loans and State Student Incentive Grants make up the federally run components of the financial aid programs.

Probably the most vital program enabling poor and minority students access to higher education is the Basic Educational Opportunity Grant Program (BEOG) which provides entitlements to qualified students and acts as a foundation for the further packaging of aid to needy students. The amount of the BEOG award is obtained by determining the student's cost of education and subtracting the expected parental contributions; the remaining amount is the BEOG award. The focus of debate on this programs has been the so-called "half-cost" rule, that is, the grant cannot exceed half the cost of the education, and the limitation of the grant to a maximum award of \$1800. As a result of these limitations, two students may receive identical grants, even though one student may be expected to have a greater family contribution to his education than the other. Proposals to deal with this uniformity in the awards process range from simple limitation of these provisions to requiring a specified contribution by the student in the form of work or loans.

I am certain that the most intensive debate on Title IV of the legislation will involve the role of student loans in the student aid process, the current problems surrounding the program, and the need for some type of reform. Problems that have been pointed to in the loan programs include: ensuring the manageability of the debt that a student may incur as a result of educational loans; easing the burden of repayment and at the same time reducing the incidence of default; expanding the accessibility and availability of loans to students in need, and; revising the current loan process to simplify and streamline award and repayment procedures.

There has been some consideration within the administration to consolidate the loan programs and include them in some type of quasi-governmental national loan bank. At this juncture I believe such a proposal to be ill-advised. With respect to the loan programs, we will be watching the administration's actions and formulating our proposals to ensure the greatest equity for students and the federal government.

Before I close this brief overview of student financial aid programs in the reauthorization process, I would like to make a couple of observations concerning the work-study program and use of the work component in the packaging of financial aid. The work-study program, in which the federal government provides funds to subsidize the employment of needy students both on and off campus, has been tremendously successful. But it can be of far greater significance to the education of our students if it is directed at ensuring jobs with educational dimensions, rather than supplanting such things as clerical assistance at the school. I plan to include in my legislation increased supervision and direction in the work-study program.

There is current discussion regarding the mandating of a student work component in the financial aid award process. The inclusion of a work component in

the aid package can act as a detriment to those students most in need of financial assistance. Packages which require 600-700 dollars of student contribution, predicated on summer of leave term earnings, are an unrealistic burden of financially disadvantaged youth, who more often than not must contribute those earnings to the family income. I will oppose mandating such a work component.

TRIO

The reauthorization of higher education programs certainly would not be complete without placing special emphasis on those programs which offer assistance to the low-income and the disadvantaged. Of course, my bill will include this key component.

Title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 - student assistance - commonly referred to as the trio programs, was designed to increase the enrollment of low income students by providing equal educational opportunities. TRIO includes such programs as talent search, upward bound, special services for disadvantaged students, educational opportunity centers, service learning centers and a training program for trio staff.

The trio programs provide academic support services to bridge many of the gaps low income students face due to inadequate school preparation and lack of exposure to educational systems or the lack of financial resources. Disadvantaged youth face many serious problems in elementary and secondary education and these problems continue to linger on to higher education. The trio program provides a mechanism to address these problems, while expanding its coverage to both secondary and post secondary education.

The trio programs have been among the most successful of many efforts of providing needed educational services for poor and educationally disadvantaged students. The impact of long range assistance which trio provides is virtually immeasurable. Trio has been a major vehicle in dealing with educational inadequacies.

One of the problems faced by Trio is that of adequately defining eligibility criteria. In the past, eligibility criteria has been quite diverse. The various trio programs were enacted at different times over the last few years, primarily in response to divergent needs. Thus, resulting in a multiple definitions of eligibility for each trio program. This lack of clarity very often causes problems at many levels, especially with the issuance of federal regulations governing these problems. The proposed legislation before us should contain clear and definite guidelines on student eligibility for each program under Trio, in order to provide better services to the eligible population and to eliminate overlap among the programs. Clear definitions will allow more of the eligible population to be served.

Equal educational opportunity can not be achieved without mechanisms to expose and motivate disadvantaged students to the academic environment. That is why, for the most part, these programs have had a tremendous impact on educational achievements for millions of disadvantaged youth. For example, under the Upward Bound Program in 1976, over nine thousand participants completed high school, and of that figure 70% planned to enter some form of post secondary education. In 1975-76 talent search financed educational expenses for 46,895 students in postsecondary educational institutions. Approximately 21,000 dropouts were persuaded to return to school or college as a result of the talent search effort. In a recent study of talent search, figures reveal that approximately

75% of the number of students were female, 44% were Black, 22% White and 34% were Hispanics and Native Americans. These figures demonstrate the critical importance of the trio programs and without adequate funding the impact of these services would be greatly diminished. Therefore, I plan to include the basis trio format in my bill with some fine tuning aimed at clarification and elimination of duplication.

We have before us the unfinished task of providing equal access and increasing the retention rate of low income and minority students in higher education. The trio programs are a major component of strategy to achieve this goal.

Much attention has been focused on equal access for low income students and also much progress has been made in this area. However despite the progress that has been achieved, substantial barriers still remain. Areas of particular concern are:

- * disparate rates of attrition for minority students as well as for low income students as compared to middle and upper income students;

The increasing inability of minority and low-income students to academically compete with their peers because of inadequate primary and secondary training, and;

- * The inability of minority and low-income students in proportionate numbers to complete curriculum in the sciences, math and engineering.

In 1976, I offered an amendment to the higher education reauthorization which increased the trio authorization level from \$100 million to \$250 million. Again this year, I plan to take similar steps.

It is my hope that the momentum generated by this increase has not dissipated. This increase signaled the necessity for providing economic and cultural deprived students with access to postsecondary education.

The investment of supportive services to disadvantaged students in this country will, without a doubt, provide the foundation which has become a simple way of life in America. We can no longer afford to ill prepare American youth by minimizing investments in education. Only an adequate educational investment will support the future economic and social development of this nation.

Conclusion

Let me close by stating that my bill will also include some carefully drafted provisions which continue the theme of the new adult education measures added in the ESEA bill last year. As some of you know, a coalition of several organizations has joined together to draft some amendments geared toward the adult learner in higher education. While I see this adult education focus as a means of providing much needed assistance to the family unit in terms of new opportunities for wage earners--especially those who are single heads of household--to upgrade their education and employment prospects, I am mindful of the need to balance these concerns against the limited funds available for the traditional student population. Finally, let me also state that I will include provisions to expand the cleo program in my bill. I am familiar with the outstanding job CLEO has done to attract minorities and low-income students to the legal profession, and I want to increase the program's capacity to continue this important objective.

I hope my comments have enlightened you about the great task we face with this reauthorization. I will need your support and assistance to achieve my goals. I look forward to your questions and comments.

We have before us the challenge of providing equal access and increasing the retention rate of low income and minority students in higher education. The title program was a major component of strategy to achieve this goal.

###

Much attention has been focused on equal scores for low income students and also much progress has been made in this area. However despite the progress that has been achieved, substantial barriers still remain. Areas of particular concern are:

* disparate rates of attrition among minority students as well as low income students as compared to higher and upper income students;

The increasing inability of minority and low-income students to successfully compete with their peers because of inadequate primary and secondary training; and;

* The inability of minority and low-income students in proportionate numbers to complete coursework in the sciences, math and engineering.

In 1976, I offered an amendment to the Higher Education Reauthorization which increased the title authorization level from \$100 million to \$350 million. Again this year, I plan to take similar steps.

It is my hope that the resources generated by this increase has not dissipated. This increase signaled the necessity for providing economic and cultural deprived students with access to postsecondary education.

The investment of supportive services to disadvantaged students in this country will, without a doubt, provide the conditions which has become a staple way of life in America. We can no longer afford to ill prepare American youth by maintaining investments in education. Only an adequate educational investment will support the future economic and social development of this nation.

Conclusion

Let me close by stating that my bill will also include some carefully drafted provisions which continue the thrust of the new title education resources added in the ESEA bill last year. As some of you know, a coalition of several organizations has joined together to draft some amendments geared toward the title program in higher education. While I see this effort as a means of providing such needed assistance to the faculty unit in terms of new opportunities for wage earners—especially those who are single heads of households—to pursue their education and employment prospects, I am mindful of the need to balance these concerns against the limited funds available for the institutional student population. Finally, let me also state that I will include provisions to expand the title program in my bill. I am familiar with the outstanding job CDD has done to attract minorities and low-income students to the legal profession, and I want to increase the program's capacity to continue this important objective.

DATA ON MEMBERS OF CONGRESSIONAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

- The Honorable John Buchanan--R., Alabama
District 6 (Birmingham) 30% black
- The Honorable William Ratchford--D., Connecticut
District 5 (southwestern part of state; Danbury, Meridan, Waterbury,
etc.) 3.7% black
- The Honorable John Erlenborn--R., Illinois
District 14 (outer western suburbs of Chicago) virtually no minorities
- The Honorable Paul Simon--D., Illinois
District 24 (southern part of state; Carbondale, etc.) 3.9% black
- The Honorable John Brademas--D., Indiana
District 3 (northern part of state; South Bend, Michigan City,
Elkhart, etc.) 6.3% black
- The Honorable Tom Tauke--R., Iowa
District 2 (northeastern part of state; Cedar Rapids, Dubuque, Clinton,
etc.) 0.5% black
- The Honorable William Ford--D., Michigan [Chairman of Subcommittee]
District 15 (southwestern Detroit suburbs) 5.1% black
- The Honorable Frank Thompson--D., New Jersey
District 4 (Trenton and surroundings) 13% black
- The Honorable Mario Biaggi--D., New York
District 10 (East Bronx, North Queens, etc.) 13.4% black; 9.4% Spanish
- The Honorable Peter Peyser--R., New York
District 23 (North central Bronx, West Westchester, part of Yonkers,
etc.) 12.5% black
- The Honorable Theodore Weiss--D., New York
District 20 (western Manhattan, Bronx, West Side, Riverdale) 15.3%
black; 9.3% Spanish
- The Honorable James Jeffords--R., Vermont
At-large, representing entire state; less than 0.2% black

*Data gathered from Congressional Districts in the 1970's, 2nd Edition, 1974
(Congressional Quarterly, Inc., Washington, D.C.); and from telephone calls
to newer Congressmen's offices.

DATA ON MEMBERS OF CONGRESSIONAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

The Honorable John Buchanan--R., Alabama
District 6 (Birmingham) 30% black

The Honorable William Rostenkowski--D., Connecticut
District 5 (southwestern part of state; Danbury, Meriden, Waterbury,
etc.) 3.7% black

The Honorable John Erlenborn--R., Illinois
District 14 (outer western suburbs of Chicago) virtually no minorities

The Honorable Paul Simon--D., Illinois
District 54 (southern part of state; Carbondale, etc.) 3.9% black

The Honorable John Brademas--D., Indiana
District 3 (northern part of state; South Bend, Michigan City,
Elkhart, etc.) 6.3% black

The Honorable Tom Yarusso--R., Iowa
District 2 (northeastern part of state; Cedar Rapids, Dubuque, Clinton,
etc.) 0.5% black

The Honorable William Ford--D., Michigan [Chairman of Subcommittee]
District 15 (southwestern Detroit suburbs) 5.1% black

The Honorable Frank Thompson--D., New Jersey
District 4 (Trenton and surroundings) 13% black

The Honorable Mario Biaggi--D., New York
District 10 (East Bronx, North Queens, etc.) 13.4% black; 9.4% Spanish

The Honorable Peter Ravert--R., New York
District 23 (North central Bronx, West Westchester, part of Yonkers,
etc.) 12.5% black

The Honorable Theodore Weiss--D., New York
District 20 (western Manhattan, Bronx, West Side, Riverdale) 16.3%
black; 9.3% Spanish

The Honorable James Jeffords--R., Vermont
At-large, representing entire state, less than 0.5% black

*Data gathered from Congressional Districts in the 1970's, 2nd Edition, 1974
(Congressional Quarterly, Inc., Washington, D.C.); and from telephone calls
to newer Congressmen's offices.

SUMMARY OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965
(as amended in 1968, 1972, and 1976)

TITLE I--COMMUNITY AND CONTINUING EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Community Service and Continuing Education Programs provide funds to designated state agencies which in turn solicit, review and approve grants to colleges and universities to 1) strengthen community service programs at their institution; 2) to support the expansion of continuing education; and 3) to support resource materials sharing programs.

Part A has four distinct authorities: the State-grant program; the Special Projects program; the Special Program for the Elderly; and the Technical Assistance Authority.

Part B, although authorized since 1977, has never been funded. Lifelong Learning authorizes the Assistant Secretary to make funds appropriated available to appropriate state agencies, institutions of higher education, and public and private non-profit organizations to develop research into and coordination of lifelong learning opportunities.

TITLE II--COLLEGE LIBRARY AND LIBRARY TRAINING AND RESEARCH

This title is primarily concerned with college library research and development, updating library procedures and management, and training future librarians.

TITLE III--STRENGTHENING DEVELOPING INSTITUTIONS

The purpose of this title is to assist in raising the academic quality of colleges which have the desire and potential to make a substantial contribution to the higher education resources of our Nation but which, for financial and other reasons, are struggling for survival and are isolated from the main currents of academic life, and to do so by enabling the Commissioner to establish a national teaching fellow program and to encourage and assist in the establishment of cooperative arrangements under which these colleges may draw on the talent and experience of our finest colleges and universities, and on the educational resources of business and industry, in their effort to improve their academic quality.

TITLE IV--STUDENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

This title contains two sections. The first, Student Financial Assistance authorizes funds for the following financial assistance programs: National Direct Student Loan; Basic Educational Opportunity Grant (BEOG); Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant (SEOG); College Work-Study; and Guaranteed Student Loan. The second section is Special Programs for Students from Disadvantaged Backgrounds (TRIO) These programs include: Talent Search; Upward Bound; Special Services; and Educational Opportunity Centers.

TITLE IX--GRADUATE AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Recipients of the Graduate Professional Opportunities Program (GPOP) must be pursuing programs which will lead to a degree of doctor of philosophy, doctor of arts or an equivalent degree. This also applies to law degrees (J.D.) and masters degrees when the MA (MSW, MS, MBA, MSEE) is terminal. Other programs in this title include Public Service Fellowships, the Domestic Mining Program, and the Council on Legal Educational Opportunity (CLEO).

TITLE X--COMMUNITY COLLEGES

The Commissioner is authorized to make grants to new community colleges to assist in planning, developing, establishing and conducting initial operations in areas of the states where there have been no existing community colleges or where existing ones cannot adequately provide post-secondary educational opportunities for all of the residents who desire and can benefit from post-secondary education.

Title X has never received an appropriation, partly due to its emphasis on building community colleges as opposed to addressing current needs of community college students and the surrounding community.

TITLE XI--THE LAW SCHOOL CLINICAL PROGRAM

This title provides funds for clinical training of law students. The recipients of a clinic's services are often indigent clients who can not afford to pay for legal services.

TITLE XII--GENERAL PROVISIONS (STATE POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSIONS)

The Commissioner is authorized to make grants to any State Commission established to enable it to expand the scope of the studies and planning required in Title X through comprehensive inventories of, and studies, with respect to all public and private post-secondary educational resources in the State, including planning necessary for such resources to be better coordinated, improved, expanded, or altered so that all persons within the State who desire, and who can benefit from post-secondary education may have an opportunity to do so.

Assistance authorizes funds for the following programs: National Direct Student Loan; Basic Educational Opportunity Grant (BEOG); Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant (SEOG); College Work-Study; and Guaranteed Student Loan. The second section is Special Programs for Students from Disadvantaged Backgrounds (TRIO). These programs include: Talent Search; Upward Bound; Special Services; and Educational Opportunity Centers.