

Mrs. GREEN. Your full statement will be made a part of the record at this point.

Mr. MORTON. Thank you.

(The document referred to follows:)

STATEMENT OF DR. BEN MORTON, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, MISSOURI COMMISSION ON
HIGHER EDUCATION

My comments today will focus on the proposed amendments, including a few additional suggestions for your consideration, on Title VI, Part A, of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (the Federal grant program for instructional equipment and materials), and Title I of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 (the Federal grant program for the construction of undergraduate academic facilities). Also, we would like to offer some general comments concerning the two programs, growing out of our experience in administering them at the state level. Finally, if you will allow it, we wish to comment on levels of funding.

GENERAL COMMENTS

The majority of our members indicate that the Facilities Act, particularly Title I, has stimulated construction of badly needed facilities. At least in some cases, the program has been the impetus needed to produce the rest of the necessary financing from both private and public sources.

The easiest demand to defer, under financial pressures for ever higher faculty salaries and allied rising operational costs, is that for capital facilities. One can "make do" for a time with overcrowded conditions and the use of surplus barracks and rented houses. However, such a situation over any period of time, can have serious consequences for the educational program. The Facilities Act has been a healthy counterbalance. The need still very much exists.

The instructional equipment and materials program (Higher Education Act of 1965, Title VI, Part A) has served a similar purpose. For several reasons, faculty salaries have been rising at a rate of five to seven percent per year. Competition for professors has been keen because of rapidly expanding demand caused by rising enrollments and the establishment and expansion of many colleges and universities. The supply and demand imbalance has also created demands for higher teaching loads. Personnel costs at institutions of higher education, particularly for able faculty members, are thus somewhat dictated by the cited market conditions. The natural course to follow is to cut purchases of teaching equipment, library materials, and the like. Again, as in the case of the Facilities Act, Title VI is acting as a healthy counterbalance.

Now, I would like to turn to a review of the specific suggestions our group, as a collection of administrative officers at the state level, would like to offer.

Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, title I

The main suggestion we would like to make has not been proposed in amendments offered for the Facilities Act. It relates to that portion of Section 106 of P.L. 88-204, dealing with institutional eligibility. As presently enacted, it says:

"An institution of higher education shall be eligible for a grant for construction of an academic facility under this title only if such construction will, either alone or together with other construction to be undertaken within a reasonable time, (1) result in an urgently needed substantial expansion of the institution's student enrollment capacity or capacity to carry out extension and continuing education programs on the new campus of such institution, or (2) in the case of a new institution of higher education, result in creating urgently needed enrollment capacity or capacity to carry out extension and continuing education programs on the campus of such institution".

Please note we are talking about the basic institutional eligibility and not the way priorities are established.

We believe that considerations other than raw enrollment growth criteria should play some part in determining the eligibility, or expressed another way, the basic need for the facility.