

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE

Science serves its readers as a forum for the presentation and discussion of important issues related to the advancement of science, including the presentation of minority or conflicting points of view, rather than by publishing only material on which a consensus has been reached. Accordingly, all articles published in *Science*—including editorials, news and comment, and book reviews—are signed and reflect the individual views of the authors and not official points of view adopted by the AAAS or the institutions with which the authors are affiliated.

Editorial Board

1982: WILLIAM ESTES, CLEMENT L. MARKERT, JOHN R. PIERCE, BRYANT W. ROSSITER, VERA C. RUBIN, MAXINE F. SINGER, PAUL E. WAGGONER, ALEXANDER ZUCKER

1983: FREDERICK R. BLATTNER, BERNARD F. BURKE, CHARLES L. DRAKE, ARTHUR F. FINDEIS, E. PETER GEIDUSCHEK, GLYNN ISAAC, MILTON RUSSELL, WILLIAM P. SLICHTER, JOHN WOOD

Publisher

WILLIAM D. CAREY

Associate Publisher: ROBERT V. ORMES

Editor

PHILIP H. ABELSON

Editorial Staff

Assistant Managing Editor: JOHN E. RINGLE

Production Editor: ELLEN E. MURPHY

Business Manager: HANS NUSSBAUM

News Editor: BARBARA J. CULLITON

News and Comment: COLIN NORMAN (deputy editor), WILLIAM J. BROAD, LUTHER J. CARTER, CONSTANCE HOLDEN, ELIOT MARSHALL, R. JEFFREY SMITH, MARJORIE SUN, JOHN WALSH

European Correspondent: DAVID DICKSON

Research News: ROGER LEWIN (deputy editor), RICHARD A. KERR, GINA KOLATA, JEAN L. MARX, THOMAS H. MAUGH II, ARTHUR L. ROBINSON, M. MITCHELL WALDROP

Administrative Assistant, News: SCHERRAINE MACK; Editorial Assistant, News: FANNIE GROOM

Senior Editors: ELEANORE BUTZ, MARY DORFMAN, RUTH KULSTAD

Associate Editors: SYLVIA EBERHART, CAITILIN GORDON, LOIS SCHMITT

Assistant Editors: MARTHA COLLINS, STEPHEN KEPPEL, EDITH MEYERS

Book Reviews: KATHERINE LIVINGSTON, Editor; LINDA HEISERMAN, JANET KEGG

Letters: CHRISTINE GILBERT

Copy Editor: ISABELLA BOULDIN

Production: NANCY HARTNAGEL, JOHN BAKER; ROSE LOWERY; HOLLY BISHOP, ELEANOR WARNER; BEVERLY DURHAM, JEAN ROCKWOOD, LEAH RYAN, SHARON RYAN

Covers, Reprints, and Permissions: GRAYCE FINGER, Editor; GERALDINE CRUMP, CORRINE HARRIS

Guide to Scientific Instruments: RICHARD G. SOMMER
Assistants to the Editors: SUSAN ELLIOTT, DIANE HOLLAND

Membership Recruitment: GWENDOLYN HUDDLE

Member and Subscription Records: ANN RAGLAND
EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE: 1515 Massachusetts Ave., NW, Washington, D.C. 20005. Area code 202. General Editorial Office, 467-4350; Book Reviews, 467-4367; Guide to Scientific Instruments, 467-4480; News and Comment, 467-4430; Reprints and Permissions, 467-4483; Research News, 467-4321. Cable: Advancesci, Washington. For "Information for Contributors," write to the editorial office or see page xi, *Science*, 25 June 1982.

BUSINESS CORRESPONDENCE: Area Code 202. Membership and Subscriptions: 467-4417.

Advertising Representatives

Director: EARL J. SCHERAGO

Production Manager: GINA REILLY

Advertising Sales Manager: RICHARD L. CHARLES

Marketing Manager: HERBERT L. BURKLUND

Sales: NEW YORK, N.Y. 10036: Steve Hamburger, 1515 Broadway (212-730-1050); SCOTCH PLAINS, N.J. 07076: C. Richard Callis, 12 Unami Lane (201-889-4873); CHICAGO, ILL. 60611: Jack Ryan, Room 2107, 919 N. Michigan Ave. (312-337-4973); BEVERLY HILLS, CALIF. 90211: Winn Nance, 111 N. La Cienega Blvd. (213-657-2772); DORSET, VT. 05251: Fred W. Dieffenbach, Kent Hill Rd. (802-867-5581).

ADVERTISING CORRESPONDENCE: Tenth floor, 1515 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10036. Phone: 212-730-1050.

Engineering Education and National Policy

We are witnessing a significant transfer of sources of support from the federal government to private industry. But the objectives of industry may differ radically from our previous national policy. Industry is often primarily interested in quick practical applications, and accordingly focuses resources on schools where the research quality is very high and the existing research parallels industrial interests. We need only note the sequence of industrial commitments to major universities such as Massachusetts Institute of Technology or Stanford to envision a narrow concentration of support for excellent engineering education on a few schools by the end of this decade.

The growth of industrial support for engineering education occurs just after the abolition of the National Science Foundation's (NSF's) Directorate for Science and Engineering Education. Since the mission-oriented federal agencies have responsibilities analogous to those of industry, the NSF change means that we cannot anticipate future programs giving support to average or just-above-average institutions.

Possibly this change in national policy is desirable. It may well be true that, with limited resources, we must concentrate on a few institutions and educate a small number of excellent students to the fullest degree possible: the country's economic and social problems may demand relatively few, truly outstanding engineers in the future. But the policy change may lead to a serious national shortage of solidly educated engineers. There may also be less obvious impacts: second-echelon colleges have frequently been the strongest contributors to improving precollege mathematics and science education, to opening engineering careers to minorities and women, and to contributing technological capability to local and state governments and citizen groups. Moreover, the second-echelon institutions frequently carry on research that fills critical gaps. For example, during the 1950's and 1960's, electrical energy research and education remained in a low priority position at the most prestigious schools, where Department of Defense and NASA interests were strong driving forces. When energy problems became a national priority in the early 1970's, a history of strong emphasis existed only at a few schools and state universities.

If the trend toward concentration of excellence in a few schools continues, we anticipate the emergence by the 1990's of distinct groups of engineering schools: perhaps 25 superb schools, 150 schools offering weak programs, and 75 schools which really should not be offering engineering at all. We also anticipate that there will be a large difference between the superb schools and the weaker ones. What are the conditions for future excellence?

Three factors guide us in predicting which engineering colleges will be outstanding: (i) Quality and visibility of present research. These criteria depend on the level of research activity, available facilities, quality of graduate students, and, especially, quality of faculty. To some extent, areas of research are important simply because of strong national interest. (ii) Sources of support. Certain institutions have unusually strong sources of support. Some are located in cities with exceptional civic pride and have developed rapidly with help from local industrial and financial communities. Others are able to capitalize on remarkable state political commitments to the importance of quality engineering education. (iii) Leadership. Occasionally an engineering college has such exceptional leadership that it is rapidly improving research quality and obtaining long-term sources of support. The leadership understands national priorities, has contacts with industrial and political decision-makers, and is able to allocate resources.

There has been no open discussion of the existence, let alone the desirability, of the changes that are occurring. Are the national trends reversible? Certainly, but only if there is open discussion and formulation of an overt national policy on engineering education.—J. G. TRUXAL and M. VISICH, JR., *College of Engineering and Applied Sciences, State University of New York, Stony Brook 11794*