

I would be pleased to elaborate on any of these points, and I am appreciative of the opportunity to bring my thoughts to the committee.

Thank you.

Mr. ESCH. Thank you for your statement. Your complete statement will be placed in the record at this point, Dr. Collins.

(The document referred to follows:)

TESTIMONY PRESENTED BY EVAN R. COLLINS IN BEHALF OF THE AMERICAN
ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES FOR TEACHER EDUCATION

Madam Chairman and Members of the Committee, I am Evan R. Collins, President of the State University of New York at Albany. I appreciate the opportunity to bring to you this morning views which I feel are representative of teacher educators across the country. Allow me first to express my appreciation of the early extension of existing Acts that is accomplished by Higher Education Amendments of 1967. When the Congress gives colleges and universities, as it does here, time for advanced planning, the usefulness of federal assistance has increased. In general, I join by colleagues here this morning in expressing support for the general intent of provisions of the 1967 amendments. Our suggestions and criticisms are minor in comparison to the total provisions of the Act. You have already heard testimony from other representatives of higher education as to the desirability of retaining the 3% interest rate on loans for the construction of college academic facilities.

To raise the interest rate by a full percentage point or more, as would result from the proposed amendment of Title X, would seriously restrict the advantages of the program for the very institutions it is designed to help most. As has been pointed out to you, the operation of the interest formula would result in an increase of at least $\frac{5}{8}$ of 1% and possibly as much as $1\frac{5}{8}$ %. Such an increase would inevitably constitute a deterrent in the construction of the facilities needed. I am happy to commend and support those provisions designed to broaden and consolidate support to teacher training programs. We especially applaud encouragement of innovative and imaginative approaches to teacher education as in Title V, Section 531. The supply of needed teachers in the elementary and secondary schools will be increased somewhat by the provision of fellowships for college students. A far more important effect, I believe, is accomplished by the encouragement of desirable changes in the pattern of curriculum in teacher education. Too often an aspirant of the provision is repelled by the dull and discouraging program which is said to lead to teaching. This amendment should encourage the development of programs which make courses preparing for teaching more realistic, more meaningful, more clearly representative of the appeals and rewards of teaching. Such a result, all in the profession would applaud.

Similarly, I welcome the proposed provisions for strengthening the programs for the preparation of higher education personnel, especially the development of capabilities for college teaching. The efforts of some 200 colleges and universities now offering or planning to offer such programs would be greatly strengthened by this provision. The shortage of instructors in higher education, especially for the two year colleges, is currently urgent, and will get worse. Provision such as is made in the proposed Act for a range of sub-doctoral programs to prepare college teachers is urgently needed and offers real promise of alleviating the impending shortage. The increased scope and variety of programs eligible for support and the greater flexibility of administration especially in regard to the setting of stipends; these provisions increase the effectiveness of the basic program. I do not share the fears expressed by some of my colleagues in teacher education regarding the authority granted to the Commissioner to contract with private agencies to carry out programs or projects designed to prepare teachers. If the purpose is to prepare more and better teachers, no legitimate resource should be ignored or restricted and if some private agency can present a program more attractive than that of the usual institutions, that program should be supported and the traditional institutions urged to benefit from the comparison. Title V, in creating the new Education Professions Development Program, attacks both the problem of the shortage of teaching personnel and the problem of the multiplicity of overlapping programs and agencies through which the institutions must operate. This latter is so familiar to members of the committee it should need no further emphasis from me. To the extent this present confusion