ciency in utilization of existing facilities and programming for new facilities needs.

Small institutions, with limited administrative staffs, may have difficulty in implementing the kinds of systems developed by these projects. For this reason, and because of a need for coordination of Office of Education Surveys with State Commissions comprehensive planning activities and institutional data systems, the Office of Education sponsored an intensive cooperative effort to develop standard facilities terminlogy. The result of this effort, Facilities Classifications and Inventory Procedures for Institutions and State Agencies, was published by the Office of Education in August 1967. This system is the common basis on which future Office of Education surveys and State Commission comprehensive planning studies are being developed.

As a result of these developments, a nationwide data base for analysis of academic facilities utilization, as well as for better long-range planning, is now

in the process of development.

A committee of representatives of State higher education facilities commissions and expert consultants is presently working with the Division of College Facilities to develop proposals for comparable utilization analyses, based on the comparable classifications and inventory procedures now being placed in use. The objectives of this project are to provide helpful methods for use by small as well as large institutions and to improve and strengthen the priority standards dealing with utilization in State plans for Title I of the Higher Education Facilities Act.

SOME IMPROVEMENTS HAVE BEEN TAKING PLACE

Historical series data on utilization of instructional facilities (or any other type of college facilities) are difficult to find. The number of hours per week which classrooms and laboratories were used were reported for 1960 in the Doi-Scott publication on normative data. The same indicator for public institutions was reported in a survey by the Arkansas Commission on Coordination of Higher Education Finance, for 1965. Both studies obtained sufficient returns to be considered generally representative of the situation for the year studied. A comparison of the results is shown in the following table:

AVERAGE WEEKLY ROOM USE (HOURS) IN PUBLIC COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

	General classrooms		Instructional laboratories	
	1960	1965	1960	1965
Low Average High	13. 0 20. 2 34. 0	12. 8 26. 3 38. 0	5. 2 15. 8 28. 6	8. 8 18. 3 34. 0

Note: In round figures, comparison of these 2 studies indicates that as a group, institutions of higher education had increased their average use of general classrooms by about 30 percent between 1960 and 1965, and their average use of instructional laboratories by about 16 percent.

These rough data, however, are little cause for complacency. The average use of classrooms and laboratories remains below the level that should be expected, and roughly half of the institutions studied are using such facilities fewer hours than the average. In addition, hourly use of classrooms does not reflect the degree to which the student stations in those classrooms are used when classes are scheduled there. Also, classrooms and laboratories represent substantially less than half of the facilities operated in most institutions. Not much

⁶ William B. Fuller, Director, Higher Education Facilities Planning Board of Regents of the University of the State of New York presented an interesting illustration of the "Systems" approach to facilities planning being developed by the CRISP project, in a paper on "New Developments in Institutional Studies" presented at the 1966 Working Conference of State Commissions for Higher Education Facilities, Dr. Fuller's example is attached as Exhibit C in this paper.

⁷ Doi and Scott, op. cit., pp. 4-5.

⁸ Cook. M. Olin, "A National Survey: Inventory and Utilization of space in Universities and Colleges." unpublished paper presented at the 1966 Working Conference of State Commission for Higher Education Facilities. Dr. Cook is Assistant Director of the Arkansas Commission on Coordination of Higher Educational Finance.