

I would like to summarize my remarks on this page which is really my feeling of extreme appreciation for the kind of help we have received from the people who are responsible for these three programs in Washington. I think you have some absolutely excellent people, particularly Gail Norris, Charles Griffith, and Richard Sonnergren, who are dealing particularly with the construction facilities program, Al Dubbe and Peter Esseff who are operating title VI, and Paul Delker, Eugene Welden, and Jules Pagano, who have been very creative in developing community services programs.

Mr. GIBBONS. I am kind of interested when you get down to page 7 there. I am glad you made those remarks complimenting some people, but I notice on page 7 you get to be pretty straightforward, Doctor. I wonder if you would be sure to hit that for us. These are some of the things that we need to know. We are glad to hear all the nice things. I want to say the nice things outweigh the things that should be corrected, but we certainly need to know where the problems are.

Dr. McCANN. There are several points I made in this direction, not the one that your eagle eye caught on page 7. I will take that perhaps in sequence with the others.

I will say that even though I feel that these programs have moved very creatively and very imaginatively with scope for institutions to develop new departures, yet I feel that there are improvements that can be made. One of these is a much better communication between the State agency and Washington. They are always available when we initiate the contact. They don't initiate the contact nearly as much as I would like to see, particularly through providing us with stages of development and information and not just final development of information. Particularly, more leadtime is needed in order for us to embody changes in our State plan and administrative procedures, and also to get this information to our participating institutions.

Another problem which I think is worthy of comment here, and I will refer specifically here to the construction program, is that I am very hopeful that in addition to the objective criteria or standards that prevail in the regulations thus reflected in the determination of Federal grant awards, that more programmatic and qualitative aspects will come in. Of course one of the key reasons for this program was the development of the expansion of enrollment capacities in our institutions throughout the Nation. This was proper. This was the focus of the program at first.

In order to meet the tremendous demands for these Federal funds, absolutely objective and fair procedures had to be developed for determining who would be the winners or recipients of these grants. This was done.

Now I think the time has come for adding more qualitative aspects, more programmatic aspects. For example, in our public institutions here I think is going to be the major continuing expansion of enrollment capacity. Our private institutions will probably move more in the direction of specialization. Institutions which do not plan extensive enrollment capacity ought to have the same grounds, shall we say, the same luck, the same chance, the same opportunity to get a grant under the facilities construction program as an institution planning considerable enrollment capacity.