

ment and materials, be amended to include closed-circuit television as only one of the many sophisticated educational media available today. This particular instructional approach has had two years of special emphasis under Title VI. The Association believes that it is appropriate at this time for closed-circuit television projects to compete along with projects utilizing other educational media. Increasingly, the various types of educational hardware are used in integrated teaching approaches. And we should approach funding in terms of programmatic needs.

As a final reference to Title VI, we must point out that current funding levels do not nearly meet the needs. Many state plans reflect the fund limitations in that the Federal share is set at well below the fifty percent allowable. Institutions are aware of the limited funds available so they frequently do not apply for needed equipment and materials because the chances of receiving a grant are relatively slim, or the probable reduced Federal share makes it impossible for them to finance the balance.

Title III of the Higher Education Facilities Act

Although our commissions do not directly have any responsibilities for facilities loans, nevertheless, we do interest ourselves in total facilities development. In this context, we would point out that raising the interest rate will ultimately reduce income available for other purposes in higher education or increased costs to students.

IDEAS FOR THE FUTURE

The Association recognizes that the proposed legislation and our suggestions alike, simply represent efforts for improvement in existing legislation. For longer term purposes, we recommend consideration of some more far reaching changes as soon as possible.

In particular, we are concerned with having a more direct and coordinated relationship among all the Federal programs for capital improvements and equipment. Academic facility needs are directly related to residence facilities. Library items are an important consideration in the total equipment and materials situation. In fact, one can argue that very direct relationships exist among all the physical requirements of a campus.

As a practical step toward a more integrated aid program, we suggest consideration be given to transferring the loan program for self-amortizing facilities such as dormitories and student unions, to the U.S. Office of Education. This proposal is currently appropriate since the Office of Education is establishing its own construction service in field offices.

We believe there is merit in broadening the Higher Education Facilities Act to make it the basic program for Federal participation in the construction of higher education facilities. Title VI could perform a similar role with respect to Federal participation in the purchase of instructional equipment and materials.

In general, it would appear the concept of state agencies for higher education, working in close partnership with the U.S. Office of Education, can achieve two objectives. First, desirable national educational goals can be pursued. Second, local variations can be adequately accounted for. We have found the ongoing partnership with the Facilities branch most conducive to creative administration of the programs. The individuals involved at the Washington level have provided strong and positive leadership. At the same time, they have given the State Commissions the needed flexibility to properly account for particular local differences. The arrangement has worked well to the end of advancing American higher education.

LEVEL OF FACILITIES FUNDING

As you might suspect, we feel compelled to comment on the abrupt change in level of funding and the subsequent impact. For if American higher education is to prepare at all adequately for the responsibilities of the near future, the facts seem to us to point toward even higher levels of construction activity and planning.