

these facilities—5 libraries, 4 science buildings, 5 general classroom buildings, 2 renovations, 3 library-classroom combination facilities, and 3 specialized facilities, including a swimming pool for instructional purposes—reflects the greatly increased flexibility and scope of the program subsequent to the removal of the restrictions as to subject area.

At about the mid-point of Fiscal 1966, this Commission was designated as the agency to administer for the Commonwealth the program for the improvement of undergraduate instruction, by means of the provision of equipment and materials—Title VI of the Higher Education Act of 1965. Under this Title, closely related to the undergraduate facilities program, during the first year of its operation—Fiscal 1966—we provided somewhat over one-half million dollars—the Fiscal 1966 allotment to Massachusetts—in 29 grants, 10 to public institutions, and 19 to private.

The Higher Education Facilities Commission, composed of 19 members appointed by the Governor, has also been charged with the added responsibility of administering Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965, the program of community service and continuing education. The Commission is assisted on this program by a 17-man Advisory Council, as provided by the Act.

The Federal regulations for the Community Services program were distributed very near the end of the Fiscal Year; but despite the split second end-of-the-year timing, our announcement describing this program and inviting proposals was met with 70 applications from 30 colleges and universities. From among these, we funded 20 projects. These are now in operation. The range of the projects shows both considerable scope and a coordinated pattern:

- 2 on problems of community health
- 1 on regional planning
- 3 on municipal administration and the community economy
- 3 projects on the improvement of educational techniques and content for special groups
- 3 designed to raise the educational potential of the disadvantaged
- 2 on problems of employment and under-employment
- 6 on special problems related to the urban setting.

Again, this fall, in response to the notification and guidelines sent to our colleges and universities, we received 68 proposals, of which, with the same allotment for Fiscal 1967 as for Fiscal 1966—namely \$231,000—we endorsed 15 projects. These are now being reviewed by the Office of Education and upon final approval will constitute our State Plan amendment for Fiscal 1967.

Even handicapped by inadequate lead time on this program, our colleges and universities, both public and private, responded to the challenge and the opportunity, once they learned about it, with what I consider an almost overwhelming demonstration of interest, of alertness, of capacity. They proved beyond a doubt that, at least in this Commonwealth, we have many institutions varied in kind, in size, in sponsorship, in geographic location, that are ready and able to bring their resources—their personnel, their time, their know-how—outside the more traditional confines of the institutional role and program and invest them in the solution of urgent community problems.

It is the high hope of the members of the Commission and of the Advisory Council, representatives of the institutions, and of community agencies, that the Congress in its wisdom will provide for the continuing growth and strengthening of this program.

We thus are working with over approximately 90 eligible institutions of higher learning in this Commonwealth at some of the most critical and essential levels—providing expansion of facilities, equipment for instructional improvement, and direct engagement in the problems of the community.

On many matters in the administration of these programs, we find ourselves in communication with various staff members of the Office of Education. I have been struck by the capacity and the understanding of these people and by the patient skill that underlies the great assistance they have provided. And I would refer particularly to Charles Griffith, Gail Norris, and Richard Sonnergren in connection with Title I of the 63 Act, and to Al Dubbe and Peter Esseff on Title IV. Our relations with the Office of Education regional office have been most fruitful, particularly as reflected in the ready assistance and sound advice always available from the regional representatives for the facilities and equipment programs, John Edwards.