

THE UNIVERSITY OF SCHOLARLY DEEDS

Burton Blatt and Andrejs Ozolins

I. INTRODUCTION

The sages have taught us that beautiful deeds are to be prized more than beautiful things. And we in the University should know that a good idea is worth more than the paper it's printed on. The point is that a university is better known for its scholarly deeds than for what it owns or how much it spends. The great university shows rather than tells people how we should live our lives. The great university practices its ideals and its wisdom.

Our university--at all universities--the budget is and will be tight. Of course, a budget of approximately \$165,000,000 is tight only in relationship to what is wanted. There are large companies as well as great universities who would view such a budget as extraordinarily facilitating. It may be that our budget is tight; but so is Harvard's, and Yale's, and probably the world's richest man's. It may not be true that everything is relative, but certainly wealth is always relative. And the equally true corollary is that university budgets have been and always will be tight. There will always be a discrepancy between what is wanted and what is available. But there will also be a discrepancy between what is wanted and what is needed. Hence, these remarks have embedded in them the idea that there is virtue in working to discover how much we can save rather than spend, in seeing how little we can get along with rather than how much we can get. The idea is symbolized by the brimming cup, which spills over only when the cup (need) is just smaller than its contents (the resources). How small a cup we are willing to live with will determine how rich we are.

II. NEEDS

Basically, there are three needs in the University which must be satisfied: the need the student has to be educated; the need a faculty member has to get on with his/her scholarship and research; the need to keep the promise implicit in calling our work-place a university, to cultivate and enhance academic traditions and responsibilities.

A student needs to have a good environment in which to study and live-- good professors, sufficiently small classes and laboratories, and a good library. Resources allocated in response to student needs must consider the numbers and teaching capabilities of our faculty, capital improvements of facilities, and allocations to the library. However, preoccupation with student needs to the neglect of other needs causes serious problems as, indeed, preoccupation with other needs to the neglect of student needs will also cause serious problems.

The faculty, in some ultimate reality, can get along without students. Of course, in a more mundane reality they can't, first because students pay a large share of the University's bills and, secondly, because students enrich the life of a university; they even goad or inspire faculty to greater scholarly accomplishments. Nevertheless, responding to student needs may not necessarily be an affirmative response to faculty needs and, indeed, may at times be inimical to faculty needs. But neither are faculty needs always directly met with either increases in their numbers or improvement of physical facilities. What the faculty need and deserve of academic resources is probably no one ingredient, but an amalgam of students, facilities and collegiality combined with no more money than it takes to make it "work."

While the students need a good environment in which to learn, and while the faculty also need a good environment in which to learn--which may not be identical to a good environment in which to teach--the University requires attention to its tradition. One can imagine a situation where students and

faculty are pleased with themselves and each other but where the ideals of the University are neglected or endangered. This is why, as far as a university is concerned zero-based budgeting is a bad idea. Zero-based budgeting is inimical to everything that a university stands for and, also, to the way it has successfully made its decisions through the centuries. Zero-based budgeting denies history. It's as if most things have equal value, and what was just learned is necessarily better than what was once learned. Zero-based budgeting is too reactive to short term fluctuations; it promotes instability; it is too sensitive to political and social influences. It does not acknowledge the role of tradition or history, or the fact that a university has been entrusted to guarantee the continuance of certain lines of inquiry.

Because they are so interrelated, at times in the most intimate manner, it is evident that the needs of students, faculty, and the University cannot be met through a single-dimensional approach to resource allocations. Therefore, we must look at some of the dimensions underlying the interrelationship.

III. FORGOTTEN PREMISES

Perhaps as a result of the affluent times which have just forsaken us, we have developed some peculiar habits in speaking about the university. We have relegated to the category of "unmentionables," certain very important realities of academic life. If we now want to "bite the bullet" and make realistic decisions, we will have to revive these relevant but unpleasant premises.

One such unmentionable is the well-known fact that this university--like every other university at every period of history--is a mess. The Public Relations image requires righteous posturing and chauvinistic breast-beating. But we can't both sustain the image and understand the university. It would probably do no harm to acknowledge the mess publicly, but at the least academicians should drop the pretense among themselves. Syracuse University

is a messy tangle of good professors and charlatans, of great programs and merely moneymaking programs, of wisdom and embarrassment. This is an important fact about the place and deserves to be examined and considered. At best, when this fact is sometimes acknowledged, it is swiftly minimized and then dismissed--"we are all human"--so that high-toned pretenses can be resumed on lofty planes. Well, certainly, let's agree that this is a Great University preparing for a Great Future. And then, getting down to business, let's see how we can prepare our Great Mess for becoming a greater mess, because the greatest university is the greatest mess, and because universities advance by increasing their greatness and not by eliminating their messiness.

The mess is an embarrassment in the sense that a university stands for the best scholars and the highest achievements of civilization. But we have to recognize that what it stands for is not what it is. For example, our School of Education stands for the minds and work of a relatively few great professors. But it consists of those and many more for whom no school could stand--or stand for long. We have to stop being embarrassed by this observation. It would be embarrassing and unacceptable in The University of Heaven. But in mortal universities, it is necessary and unavoidable and, therefore, universal. We won't dwell on it except to note that our essential academic freedom can't be secured for anyone if it is intolerant or a mess. But we must always be concerned enough with it not to ignore it. Above all, we must never lapse into thinking that, because a mess is unavoidable, it isn't really a mess. But we mustn't think, either, that to recognize it requires a purge. Both of these views are oversimplifications to which we cannot afford to succumb.

The next unmentionable is that people must judge other people. Especially if we are aware that we have a mess, we must judge which people we stand for and which we merely stand. We are forever hinting darkly at the

existence of some people who are not pulling on their oars. Yet, it remains perpetually a hint, present company is always excluded, and destructive practices go unremarked. The deceitfulness of it would be bad, and ultimately cruel enough in itself. But it leads inexorably to something even worse and often more cruel--the appeal to "objective" measures. It simply has to be understood that the direct, inescapable consequence of this so-called politeness is the adoption of a bureaucratic model of academic assessment. The cultural epidemic of objective criteria, tests, and measures is in every case motivated by the desire to escape the responsibility of individual judgements. In a few cases, this is justified. In most cases, it is an irresponsibility. In university administration, it is destructive, self-destructive.

Scholars are obligated to criticize and judge each other's work. To contrive enrollment trends, fiscal constraints, retirement ages--or even to publish records, professional "honors," etc.--in such a way that they replace a judgment of the individual and his work is fundamentally dishonest and anti-scholarly. The clearest example, of course, is "retirement:" The hypothesis is that professors are struck stupid in their 60's, but the university does not have the honesty to force them out because they are (believed to be) stupid. The university claims to discharge them because of age. The anti-scholarly nature of this practice is not inferential, but explicitly avowed by the university. The university refuses even to consider whether a professor has lost his senses or not. It rests its case on age as the sole and sufficient criterion. The fact that, occasionally, an extraordinary professor can, by obsequious petitions and pleasings, obtain permission to remain after the mandatory expulsion date, only reinforces the alienation of scholarly affairs from "objective" administration of universities. Only an intellectual emergency can override the authority of actuarial norms.

The case is virtually the same in all other areas of academic decision-making. The excellence (or deficiency) of programs is spoken of in terms of

enrollments; job-placement of graduates, or success in obtaining "soft money." By monitoring these objective indicators, the need to judge the work of colleagues can be avoided. When a program or professor is curtailed or passed-over, a column of numbers and facts is responsible. Politeness is preserved.

The point is not that professors should be impolite, but that academic, intellectual judgments among professors are not impolite. The purpose of all the clumsy, mess-producing safeguards of academic freedom is not to remove professors from their colleagues' judgment, but to minimize the dangers of such judgment. The present evasive "objectification" of decision-making has restored the dangers of academic life, while doing away with the illumination that might have come of honest intellectual confrontation. That is, sound decisions based on enrollments and other hard data are completely capricious with respect to academic standards. And debates on how to increase enrollments, what new "markets" to reach, which programs do or don't pay their way--such debates never touch on the genuine academic treasures of the university, never reveal or enhance the sound reasons why more students could honestly be encouraged to attend a good university.

If there is some mystery, then, about allocating resources in the university, it must be approached by first making clear judgments of the constituency. In some cases, it will be impossible to act on the basis of the judgment; the safeguards of academic freedom will prevent it. Nevertheless, such judgment is the only legitimate basis for decisions, and the safeguard-machinery is there to be used, not avoided. If particular schools or individuals grab a bigger share, there should ensue not a debate over who has more students or money, but a debate over the place of that school's or individual's work in the academic constellation. One view which no academic could argue against very strenuously is that the fundamental mission of a university is to comprehend the world and to gain understanding

of what it is to be a human being. On this basis level, certain schools make fundamental contributions and others are peripheral. But, we are not urging this as a settled matter. A debate would be inevitable--and important and illuminating as well.

This introduces a third major unmentionable: The idea that fiscal or management problems do not constitute the sole or greatest danger to a university. For some reason, it seems forbidden to consider the possible danger of ideological erosion. Progress, growth, change, development are frequently mentioned--invariably with reverent approbation. It never gets seriously asked whether all this evolution has been to the good or not. We don't like to think that, while dinosaurs evolved from some sort of toads or lizards, only the toads and lizards survived. In particular, the university's shift from understanding the world to mastering it, from educating students to training them, from cultivating humanness to metamorphosing the being into a marketable item--these shifts are so fundamentally mistaken that, in any meaningful sense, universities may be going extinct. We may be wrong about this, of course. But, because we may be right, it is an important question which our devotion to "progress" must not be permitted to obscure.

The "old" ideals of scholarship are still paraded around, and most academics like to say they hold to them as noble standards. Then it must be taken as a very serious question whether the enormous and preponderant job-training role of the university is one that should be allowed to continue, must less grow. To the extent that such a role is adopted by the university, it must be recognized that the procedures, standards and values of the old order will also have to be revised to fit these new aspects of our practice. Indeed, we would argue that one of the most mischievous results of the unnoticed shift in the university's character is evident in the application of scholarly pretenses to purely technical activities. Too many students who have been badgered into the university by economic arguments are demoralized

by the dissonance between economic goals and the academic experience. Therefore, in discussing our allocations of resources, we must be more conscious of the effect our decisions will have on the way our ideals survive or develop.

It should be pointed out that, as far as resource-debates are concerned, the assumption is made that individual benefits are inflexible. That is, the debate is usually about who will get resources, not how much resources he will get. We make adjustments in the university in the same way we do in the nation, by manipulating access and not by manipulating rewards. To reduce the budget for faculty salaries, we reduce the number of faculty; we never reduce salaries. If we have begun to realize that resources are limited, we nevertheless continue to believe that the world is infinite. This is the only hypothesis that can sanction excluding an individual from participation as a means of economizing--the idea that he will get work elsewhere. We have not appreciated the fact that the ultimate "elsewhere" is the dole--which all of us finance anyway. We can't escape the fact that a finite pool of resources is circulating among all members of the society which includes our academic society, and the budget advantage we gain by sending a man away is lost in other ways.

What has to be raised as at least a possible response to hard times is that we might decrease salaries rather than decrease faculty. To deny this possibility is to deny that times really are hard. Because the habitual clamor for more money continues, it really is time for someone to begin pointing out that if a professor doesn't enjoy working at a university enough to do it for 10% or 15% less real earnings, he probably shouldn't stay. Many benefits of academic life aren't even "intangible"--tenure, sabbaticals, travel, freedom are concrete benefits. It is exasperating to hear people talk of economic crisis while demanding substantial increases in pay as though these individuals were exempt from the realities of their society.

There is one more unmentionable we have to pose as central to a university's allocation of resources: The community consists of many people who are not professors. There is a huge number of devoted, hard-working and well-working support staff without whom the scholars would be nearly paralyzed. Many universities have historically exploited their dedication and work as though they were not only sub-professorial but nearly sub-human. (Has ours?) For the most part, this insensitivity has happened because the support staff have allowed it to happen--allowed it by not kicking up a fuss. But is it not unknown for even some great universities to go to considerable lengths to silence the fuss where it has occurred.

Now that the economy of the nation has soured a bit, some professors are disturbed that their relatively discretionary income is eroding--while their work is being supported by people whose genuinely subsistence income is falling below subsistence. The administration is no doubt concerned by the steady approach of further staff unionization. Prudence would suggest that the professoriate had better take notice of it too. True, professors are a very special group in society. But they are not so special that they should be exempt from the obligation of all human beings to notice the fate of other human beings around them. Indeed, by the privileges they enjoy, their obligation to seek justice is increased. An important part of the specialness of professors should be the commitment and ability to do the "right thing" because it is right, and to value what is right above personal gain. But beyond such lofty judgments, this will become a concrete and practical issue for us all to face, if a fully adversary relationship is evolved by the unionization of everyone, professors included.

We realize that these "unmentionables" are awkward to bring up, difficult to discuss and seemingly out of place in the realm of practical decision making. Nevertheless, since they touch on the reasons for our

existence, they should also figure in our plans for continued existence. If we keep our talk to matters which are more comfortable, we can do so only at the expense of what is more important.

III. RESOURCES

a. Finite

Although, in one sense, it may be claimed that every university has insufficient resources--everybody is poor--in another sense, we must view ourselves as rich. Even universities which do not live off endowments can consider themselves rich if they wish to be compared with other businesses (and we are so eager to claim that we are a business when it suits our purposes) or government. As a matter of fact, it is exactly those very universities who live off endowments who are today doing the most crying because their endowments have dangerously eroded during the recent market slump. This is by way of asserting that, either for individuals or universities, there is never sufficient protection and insurance if one expects to be unaffected when the worst occurs. But there is always plenty if one has both reasonable optimism and capability. The state of a person's resources is a measure of both his fiscal health and mental health.

b. Competing Values-Collegial Values

A School of Education or a School of Management may be a good example of the conflict within any academic unit, but especially among the professional schools, to see itself both as different from and as a part of the larger university. It's difficult for a professional school, especially a school with rapidly rising enrollments, to easily accept its overburdened status in order to keep the classics alive. It's even harder for a School of Management or a School of Education to "need" to bring in the students or the sponsored resources in order to feel safe, when such schools know that the philosophy professor is "safe" until the very end of a university itself. Certainly the thought has crossed the mind of people in Education or Engineering that their need to solicit external funding in the university is in a way their

tribute or rent. Conversely, arts and sciences do not need to make such efforts partly because outside funds aren't as readily available, but more because colleges of arts and sciences don't need outside funds to justify their existence or importance. Arts and Sciences own the University because, in the deepest sense, they are the University. This doesn't mean that classics departments don't have to worry about enrollments. They do need students. But, whereas a professional school needs students in order to survive, a classics department needs them because it is "good" to have students. Based on the last 20 or 30 years, if we project the curve of the size of our Philosophy Department, we might expect its extinction. But fortunately, when it comes to that irrevocable decision to kill off philosophy or the classics in the University, we trust that everyone will have the good sense to resist as if our very academic lives depend on resistance, which of course they do. The point is that even the professional schools know this. And this leads to the reminder that, if the word "college" has come to seem like a misnomer, that's only because we've allowed our idea of the university to change. And if we want it not to be a misnomer, then we had better remember that we are a community, all together. In the deepest sense, it doesn't matter who has more students or less students, or brings in more money or less money, but only that we are together to engage in the common purpose to study and teach.

Why do people in the School of Management want to be part of the University? Why don't they remove themselves to a Business Institute or create their own business school? They're here for the same reason that education is here, and engineering, and law, and social work, and the rest. After all is said and done, the professional schools "buy in" to the idea of university and its collegial value system. The Management School knows that, in the university, the truth will make the students and professors free, while at the separate business institute, the truth will only make them rich.

c. Quality

Most of us are sick of talking about, but continually fascinated with, the notion of quality. What is the relationship between the prestige of a university's school and its budget? Probably zero. Possibly negative. Is good teaching enough? What's good teaching? Is there, in fact, a latent but strong academic view that physics is "better" than engineering, that philosophy is "better" than social work, that mathematics is "better" than management? And when you have to make a last ditch effort to keep the ship from sinking, who must abandon the ship? Of course, if the University is a community, then all its members are equally valuable, in spite of the greater centrality of the work of one person as compared to the work of another. But it seems that a university often engages in ruthless games concerning money and power, and is rather tame about ideas, especially when it comes to resource allocations. And that is why, while issues of quality reflect what is most important in the university, they should not be expected to reflect financial considerations. For one thing, academic quality is not correlated with lucrativeness. For example, "basic" research is the core of academic work but, in the main, "applied" research secures the external contracts. For another example, the value of poetry is entirely independent of financial success or failure; there are even those who would suggest that, by their very nature, poets must be poor.

Certainly, we can contrive artificial and objective benchmarks of quality--national rankings of our schools and colleges, or of departments and programs; lists of who's in Who's Who; compilations of sponsored funding; grade point averages, graduate record examinations scores; percentages of students admitted and rejected; faculty publications and, even more "precisely", faculty publications in monitored journals and books published by commercial presses. While all of these suggest measures of quality, each of them is notoriously unreliable for making judgments of academic quality.

And then, what would we do with such measures of quality, even if we could obtain them to our satisfaction? Academic work of extraordinary quality cannot expect proportionately extraordinary rewards, even if lucrative. (How much is a beautiful poem worth? Can we put a price tag on a unified field theory?) Such a system would nail down for all times the fact that the University not only does business, but is in every sense a business. That would be the beginning of our end.

V. DECISION MAKING

a. The Process

Because there is no doubt that resource allocations represent a value statement, promoting the dialogue about resources is far more important than the criteria for assigning resources. That process should aim toward a search for common ground. It should avoid pitting one school against another or gangs of schools against the administration. There is too much of the adversarial mentality already present in the University. Everywhere we find one scholar doing battle with another, the goal being to slay competing theories and to attract followings rather than to uncover hidden truths.

For the decision making process to work well, participants must be given facts. Unfortunately, there seems to be a fleeing from rationality today, even in the University. We've surrendered the notion that giving people facts can influence their behavior. Consequently, there is the pernicious assumption that, if people were told how much money is available, everyone would grab for all they could get. We believe people can be told the truth and remain sane, and our responsibility at the University is to make this belief true.

b. The Significant Factors

Resource allocations must give priority to programs more than support for transitory events. Therefore, a university must support the program of

elementary education before it supports open schools, and it must support the program in epistemology before it supports training of elementary teachers, and it must support the program in sociology before it supports social work.

Teaching is but one part of a university's mission. However, we can't swindle students or pack them into the Journalism School to keep the professor of Greek on the payroll. Consequently, the hard questions concerning expansion and contraction must continually be asked. Unfortunately, there is no good formula to inform us when an area which happens to be lucrative has been asked to take on too much of a common load. But there is a good formula to inform us who must stay until the very end.

c. The Decisive Voice

As long as the University decentralizes operating responsibility for its resources, one person has to be relied upon to make the decisive decisions. In the system such as ours where each school is allocated resources to employ with a near-free hand, there must be a final authority to determine allocations and settle appeals. Without a decisive voice, our collegial structure, fragile as it might be, would be replaced by a gladiatorial structure which would not be fragile. And that which we can enjoy in a community would become the burden of our anarchy.

At this university, the Decisive Voice must reside in the office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. However, while decisions are exercised by the person, their authority is not the will of that person but, rather, obtains from the tradition, the common understandings, and the premises of the University. Consequently, a decision of the Vice Chancellor may be challenged, but not by questioning his responsibility to make final judgments. A challenge should only be examined on how well he implements the authority of our University. We should remember that, for priests and rabbis, authority is in the Scriptures and not with the individual who reads the Scriptures. But everyone must see it that way, or such a system won't work. And if that is so, whatever problem we have with current procedures for allocating

academic resources is not because the system can't work well but that some people want it to be a different system.

VI. PROPOSAL FOR A PROPOSAL

Because we haven't offered rules for conduct here, what we have offered may not seem practical or helpful enough to those who want more than these premises. However, "Guidelines for Mathematics" might look equally impractical if only the axioms were presented. Yet, exactly from the axioms, are thousands of practical theorems, equations, and solutions derived. In the deepest sense, axioms are practical. And while we cannot compare the wisdom or elegance of the United States Constitution with this statement, our intentions are similar. Without regard to the solution of practical problems, the Constitution nevertheless provides us with ways for dealing with every conceivable particular situation. In that sense, the Constitution is not only practical but one of the most enduring guides to action the world has known. And the reason it is enduring is that it does set up premises and not particulars. The University, it seems to us, must similarly resolve to live by its "first principles" and bear the responsibility of a continual need to exercise judgment.

There seems to be a malaise around. Many of us feel that we can't do what's right. We respond to pressing economic and political forces as if there were little we could accomplish beyond getting through another day. This pattern of reacting has to be broken. Perhaps we can break it with an "exercise in virtue,"--hence the attached Minority Fellowship Proposal as an example of something through which we could consciously do what is right, what is in the best interests of this University, and which can get us working together positively on resource allocations. It is offered for adoption, but we'll settle for consideration in order to see how our beliefs could meet the test of action. Perhaps it is not necessary that we take this particular test. But it is very important whether we could pass it.

If not the entire University, our School of Education has made insufficient progress in recruiting capable low-income minority students. We have tried all sorts of remedies for this situation, but we're frank to admit that, in spite of the efforts of our Minority Affairs Committee and others in the School, there are few black faces seen, Spanish surnames heard, or native Americans found in this School. We've sent teams of faculty to visit Southern schools to recruit minority graduate students and we came home with little to show for the effort. For a time, we thought that it might have been the answer had we been able to recruit such faculty. We once blatantly advertised for minority students in a rehabilitation journal, indicating that we would give preference for federal scholarships to such applicants, the result being we recruited no candidates but we were warned by a civil rights organization that we would be sued if we didn't cut out such discriminatory practices. After repeated failures to recruit minority students, the faculty at this point seems to be in a state of suspended embarrassment, hoping that the situation will be rescued someday by a benevolent government or philanthropist, but secretly knowing that the government is sure to gum things up and that the philanthropy line is too long and usually too late to help when your number is called. In essence, we find ourselves with a situation where, on the one hand, Washington and the Administration Building extol us to recruit minority students and, on the other hand, hardly anyone believes such students can be recruited at S.U. in sufficient numbers to make a difference. It seems the right time to think differently about the problem.

What have been missing from our previous plans to recruit minority students are opportunities for individuals here to do good. As it's written in the Old Testament, it's a sin to tempt an honest person to commit a crime (e.g. one who leaves his money lying around so that honest people are tempted to steal is not without blame for the crime). But we're also to blame when we don't give people opportunities to do good deeds. This proposal is founded on the premise that faculty members, the larger University, industry, and labor want to contribute to expanding higher educational opportunities for deserving minority students.

Current plans call for approximately 86 full time faculty in the School of Education for the 1978-79 academic year, with a faculty payroll of \$1,936,670. If each faculty member contributes 3% of his or her academic salary to a minority scholarship fund, and if that amount would be matched ten times over by Syracuse University, and if that match would be doubled by a combined industry-labor contribution, in one year we would raise a principal of almost two million dollars, which at 8% would yield at least 20 full scholarships, including approximately three thousand dollars for room, board, and incidentals. (See chart). If these contributions were repeated for a second year, we would of course have a base of near four million dollars and forty scholarships to award. Or, if faculty contributed 4% (or 5%) the base would similarly change. The fact is that if the faculty, the University, industry and labor wished to recruit minority students, we could achieve this goal without enormous sacrifices.

The following points are made in support of this proposal or some variation of it:

1. University faculty will be asked to contribute relatively little to achieve something we nearly unanimously claim to want very much. Also, for everyone concerned, it is a one-time or certainly no more than a two-time contribution. As far as the University itself is concerned, it should be remembered that interest earned on the principal will pay full tuition for all participating students, not only for those students supported by University dollars. And lastly, the addition of basic opportunity grants, New York State TAP Awards, and other such financial aids could significantly stretch the number of students participating.

2. Labor and industry should be supportive, labor because it has a commitment to minority opportunities, and industry because it appears to be seeking ways to invest in minority education: Our Development Office should have a relatively "easy" time securing support for this program. It will also be welcome to many to have the University speak with leaders of industry and labor concerning "real" problems which are of mutual importance.

3. This program should be for undergraduates. A four-year undergraduate education is much more expensive than the typical one year's masters programs. Insofar as doctoral students are concerned, most of our advanced students are on some sort of stipend, assistantship, or fellowship. The bottleneck seems to be with entering freshmen. If a minority student is able to receive a solid University education, graduate doors seem to open.

4. Why the \$3,000 stipend in addition to full tuition? Support should be such that the student does not go into great debt. Partial support which may make college "less impossible" still leaves it impossible for the truly poor student. Minority people, even with college degrees, have enough to worry about without monstrous debts to pay off. Most importantly, people who choose Education as a career are not destined for wealth. Teaching is a relatively low paying profession and, consequently, it may not be reasonable to ask the poor minority students we want to recruit to assume large debts against a relatively meager financial future.

5. It is most appropriate that a School of Education make a special effort to attract minority students. Black faces are embarrassingly rare in our School. And aside from our foreign affiliations which don't properly bring "minorities" but rather "foreign minorities" to Syracuse University, the student body represents Middle America. Of our current graduate applications, only 3% are from Blacks, and 2% from other minorities. On the undergraduate level, the picture is equally dismal. And since Education is a major factor in diminishing the grip of the ghetto, we should teach teachers who might have an edge in helping others to achieve freedom of choice. It should be observed that, as a social institution, we have failed in two ways: we have failed to make the benefit of professional training directly available to

minority members; but we have also failed to foster an educational system which makes minority students likely to become candidates for our professional training. Thus, it is doubly important that we attract minority students--first to offer hope to individuals, and, second, through them to promote systematic change.

6. Why should the faculty be asked to participate? If self-interest must be invoked to justify our actions, then the gesture has only remote recommendations. But it does have recommendations. During the past half century, our country has come to delegate social concerns to government. By doing this, it has acquired an astronomical debt which in one way or another must be paid. By contrast, this proposal involves one or two years payment, and no debt. Thus, we can have a significant amelioration of a major social problem, through a process which will continue to operate after the "taxation" has ceased; and we can have it accomplished cheaper than if the government did it. It might also protect us from government intervention if we do voluntarily what eventually would have to be forced upon us. If all this doesn't add up to a self-interest incentive, at least it doesn't go against our self-interests beyond the very short run.

The above are of course preliminary ideas which have yet to be tested by people in financial aid as well as by other experts in these matters. However, I decided to put this before you in the hope that the idea if not the particular proposal interests you.

PROJECTED REVENUE FOR U.G. MINORITY SCHOLARSHIPS

(Based on total SED 78-79 Professional Salaries of \$1,936, 670, and undergraduate tuition, room, board, incidentals of \$7,800).

Participation	@ 3% contribution	4%	5%
a. From faculty @ 8% interest	\$ 58,100 4,648	77,467 6,197	96,833 7,746
b. Faculty and 10x match from S.U. @ 8% interest	639,100 51,128	852,137 68,170	1,065,163 85,213
c. 1.2 Industry-Labor match @ 8% interest	1,917,300 153,384	2,556,411 204,512	3,195,489 255,639
Scholarship Yield	21	29	36