

The Nebraskan question

In the not too distant future, it appears that the Board of Regents will be conducting a poll on the issue of mandatory student fees to the *Daily Nebraskan*.

Although the Regents have not yet specified what type of poll they will be conducting, their public directive seems to suggest that it will be one of an either/or nature. Either you favor or you oppose the use of student fees to support a student newspaper. It is also possible that the Regents will solicit opinions on other aspects of the paper.

Rather than reduce this question to a simple either/or situation, the *Daily Nebraskan* believes that it would be more beneficial if the Regents decided to take some action in assisting the newspaper in becoming an independent student daily.

However, this type of arrangement would undoubtedly cause many procedural problems.

First, it would take at least three years to change over from student-fee subsidy to none at all. And then after three years, there's no promise that the paper would be able to survive on its own. In addition, there's no promise of what type of newspaper the students would have, since the paper would no longer be affiliated with the University. And the reliability factor for the paper would necessarily be low, since there would be no guarantees that the paper would not go bankrupt due to mismanagement or some other pitfall of non-professionals. But as was pointed out, these are only a few of the problems of the independent newspaper on a college campus. To be sure, marketing analysis would suggest many more problems associated with the independent college newspapers, and local market analysis would easily

entail more work than the average doctoral thesis in marketing.

But despite all the problems, it would be a noble goal for students to aim for. And if enough thought and work went into such a study, the goal could be achieved. Without question, there is the best alternative available.

Others which have been suggested include having the University School of Journalism produce the paper. But there are hang-ups there also. One is that the paper would probably still require subsidy. Another is that censorship would probably be employed. After all, University professors are not going to go out of their way to attack their employer and publisher, the University.

The other popular alternative is simply to cut off all student fees, in effect, stop publishing the paper. That really isn't much of a solution, as it would seem to present many more problems: yellow (sensational) journalism, political propaganda and irresponsible reporting.

Thus, although it is with some regret, the *Daily Nebraskan* favors the continuation of the use of student fees. But ultimately the decision will be made by the students.

In the meantime, if there are still areas which you feel confused about or specific questions about newspaper policy which you want answered, just call, write or visit.

Mick Murphy

President asks for legislation to higher education

By CHERYL M. FIELDS

Noting that most basic higher education legislation is due to expire at the end of June, President Nixon has again asked Congress to enact a broad restructuring of the laws.

In a special message recently, the President emphasized that his proposals were aimed at equalizing opportunities for all youths to attend college regardless of family income, and at broadening reform and innovation in high education through a National Foundation for Higher Education. Existing categorical grant programs also would be extended.

Spokesmen for several higher education associations said they wanted time to study the proposed bills before commenting, but a few expressed doubt that the measures really would provide enough aid to all the low- and middle-income students who needed it.

Administration sources, however, contended that the President's fiscal 1972 budget requests would provide enough to cover eligible students whose family incomes were \$10,000.

Under the new student aid proposals, the most controversial section of the President's plan, students from families with adjusted incomes of \$10,000 or less would be eligible for a package of grants, work-study payments, and subsidized loans. Students from the very-lowest-income families could get maximum grants of \$1,000 and subsidized loans of up to \$400.

As their income increased, families would be expected to make greater contributions toward student support, and the amounts of grant and work-study money to the students would decline. Most students could still get \$400 in subsidized loans.

Officials emphasized that the family-income ceiling the expected family contribution could vary from year to year. They said that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would issue a new schedule of aid and family-contribution levels each year.

In addition, the subsidized loan plan this year would incorporate features of the popular National Defense student loans, which would then cease to exist separately. Under the new plan, students would pay no interest while in school and 3 per cent thereafter, with the government paying the difference between 3 per cent and the total interest rate.

In addition, students eligible for subsidized loans who wanted to attend schools costing more than \$1,400 annually could borrow up to \$1,500 more in subsidized "cost-of-education" loans. This provision, according to Commissioner of Education Sidney P. Marland, Jr., would keep needy students from being excluded from higher-cost institutions.

As in last year's bill, most students from families earning more than \$10,000, unless they had several children or unusual family expenses, would be eligible only for federally guaranteed, unsubsidized loans. There would be no interest ceiling on these loans, but, according to government officials, "Lenders would be required to allow the student to defer payments of both interest and principal while the student was in college."

In the House of Representatives, Rep. Edith Green (D-Ore.), chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Education, and Rep. Carl D. Perkins (D-Ky.), head of the Education and Labor Committee, criticized the

Administration plan for lacking aid to private colleges and universities, a frequent complaint about last year's legislation.

Commissioner Marland acknowledged the institutions' need for general support, saying: "It is a need. There is no question that it's a need. I hope the time is not far off when federal money can be turned to this grave and dangerous situation."

However, he said that for the present student aid had been given a spending priority and that no satisfactory formula had yet been derived that would fairly compensate all the nations diverse institutions.

Marland suggested that the proposed national foundation could study this question, along with developing good models for career education programs, one area dropped from this year's higher education proposals.

The foundation, proposed in a separate bill, would concentrate on financing promising programs designed to encourage excellence and reform in postsecondary education, to open postsecondary opportunities to people of all ages and circumstances, and to strengthen the individuality and "sense of mission" of postsecondary institutions, officials said.

In his message to Congress, President Nixon said the foundation "would have as its mandate a review of the overall needs of the American people for postsecondary education. It would have as its operating premises the principles of selectivity and flexibility."

The President asked an appropriation of \$100-million for the foundation. It would not take over the authority to finance several existing categorical grant programs

as was proposed last year, a suggestion which prompted strong criticism from the higher education community.

Other important provisions contained in the President's proposed "Higher Education Opportunity Act of 1971" included:

A two-year authorization of community service and continuing education programs.

A five-year extension of programs for strengthening developing institutions.

A five-year extension of programs for strengthening developing institutions.

A five-year authorization for the student aid programs. Matching requirements for institutions would be dropped for educational opportunity grants, but work-study matching requirements would remain. They could be waived, however, for institutions or work programs they might hamper.

A five-year extension of the Education Professions Development Act.

A two-year extension of the Higher Education Facilities Act. Authority for construction grants would be extended, although the Administration has not requested funding for fiscal 1972. The federal guarantee for construction loans obtained in the private market would be extended to private, nonprofit institutions.

A two-year extension of the language-training and area-studies provisions of the National Defense Education Act.

A new prohibition of discrimination on the basis of sex in any federally assisted education program, "except where sex is a bona fide ground for differential treatment."

Reprinted with permission of
The Chronicle of Higher Education.