

Harvard's Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) discussed the joint degree proposal last spring, but decided to lay it aside indefinitely, and no recommendation to the faculty was made. Although Harvey Brooks, vice chairman of the CEP, says the proposal isn't dead, it seems clear that its pulse is very, very weak.

An alternative would be for WHOI to accept advanced graduate students and confer degrees in its name alone. Such a course would be open to WHOI under the degree-granting authority sought from the state, and in some cases it may be followed. However, the general view at Woods Hole appears to be that joint-degree programs with high-prestige institutions such as MIT and Harvard will attract the ablest students.

"I think it will add prestige to the degree that will be attractive to the best students," says Paul M. Fye, director of WHOI. Moreover, he says, the

strength and cognizance of two institutions will be behind the degree.

Woods Hole still hopes to have a joint program with Harvard, but the current thinking is that during the next few years it will be best to concentrate on implementing the plans for the program with MIT. In a sense, MIT was a party to WHOI's consideration of the need to start a collaborative graduate studies program with other institutions well before the joint-degree concept evolved; on WHOI's education committee were two MIT men, Jerome B. Wiesner (the MIT provost) and Carroll L. Wilson (a professor of management).

Plans for the joint-degree program emerged during discussions in 1965 and early 1966 between Fye, several of his associates, and Wiesner and two MIT faculty members. The joint program later was approved by the MIT administration, faculty, and Corporation. In the faculty meeting some ques-

tions were asked about how MIT would keep the program under adequate control and supervision, but approval was given with little or no dissent.

Graduate students in oceanography at MIT now number about 50. Not all of them will do their advanced work at Woods Hole. Many of those interested in the theoretical aspects of oceanography, for example, are likely to remain at Cambridge. Nevertheless, accommodating students from MIT, together with those who will continue to come from other institutions, will impose major new burdens on WHOI. While, typically, not more than a dozen doctoral students (and often fewer) have been in residence at WHOI during the academic year, the number of such students is expected to rise to 50 or more in the next 5 years.

The faculty for the degree program will be drawn from WHOI's research staff, now consisting of about 129 persons holding ranks comparable to professorial ranks at a university. A research staff member who participates in the program will teach a one-semester course every other year and, either in addition to or in lieu of teaching, supervise the research of one or two graduate students.

Encouraged by the growing national interest in oceanographic research, WHOI has made plans for a major expansion of its staff and facilities over the next decade, and in these plans the new graduate program figures importantly. By the late 1970's, WHOI, which now has a total staff of about 500, expects to have 400 scientifically trained people and about 800 support personnel. During the next 5 years perhaps as many as 150 additional people will be recruited because of needs arising from the graduate program.

The new expenditures required by the program are estimated at \$1 million a year, of which perhaps 30 percent can be covered by research grants and contracts. WHOI will have to raise \$2.5 million to cover the remainder during the first 5 years. Eventually, \$17.5 million in additional endowment will be necessary. Much of the expense will stem from the fact that that portion of a researcher's time which is devoted to teaching cannot be paid for with research contract funds.

Of course, the financial burdens associated with the degree program will be eased somewhat by the fact that, for the first time, WHOI will be able

NSF: Senate Cuts Appropriations

The National Science Foundation found it had big problems in important places last week, as a Senate appropriations subcommittee cut heavily into the 1968 budget. If the committee's recommendations are upheld on the Senate floor and in a conference with the House (which appropriated more), the NSF will receive reduced funding for the first time in its 18-year history.

The Senate subcommittee recommended only \$459 million for fiscal year 1968—\$21 million below last year's appropriation, \$36 million below the House recommendation, and \$67 million below NSF's original request. The cut is deep, but not as deep as it looks. Because NSF will recover \$21 million that was once obligated to the now defunct Mohole project, this year's actual spending will remain—unless there is a compromise in conference—at the level of the past 2 years, \$480 million.

There are a number of factors that could plausibly explain the reduction: the rising costs of the war, the proposed surcharge on taxes, the summer's riots and subsequent demands to raise domestic spending. Yet, though these pressures may have influenced the committee, they apparently did not control it. The Department of Housing and Urban Development and 22 agencies were also reviewed by the committee; only NSF had its appropriations reduced below the level recommended by the House.

Almost everyone at NSF professed bewilderment about what had gone wrong on the Hill. The usual questions—distribution of funds between "have" and "have-not" schools, the value of research, the alleged inequities caused by "grantsmanship"—were raised. The committee report also asked NSF to submit a survey next year of all publicly and privately financed pure research—though the precise limits of the survey were not specified.

Whatever happened, the committee's action, if upheld, would probably not simply maintain the NSF's present activity. Cash outflows might be the same, but prices are moving steadily upward. "You can't carry on a level program with the same amount of money," said one NSF staff member, "so this really amounts to a reduction."—R. J. S.