

It is true that construction now in the pipeline will possibly increase slightly the overall square footage available on a per student basis. That is, it will be true if national enrollment projections are accurate. In the past they have almost invariably been conservative. However, such an analysis is, in our judgment, an over-simplification for several reasons.

First, a great deal of the available space is not really usable on an efficient basis. Much is old and designed for programs of yesteryear. Much is located on campuses where, either by institutional decision or because of the nature of things, enrollment growth will not occur.

Second, there is a change taking place in higher educational programming which relates directly to space needs. The fastest growing enrollments are in graduate and technical education, where much more space is needed on a per student basis than for undergraduate arts and sciences or teacher education.

Third, the more favorable per student space amounts will very shortly be reversed if we slow down now. The impact will be felt in three to five years, a time when enrollment increases will go up again.

Perhaps the most compelling point lies in the perceived needs by states and institutions. Attached to this testimony is hastily compiled data for Title I of the Higher Education Facilities Act as per fiscal year 1968. Please note that applications far exceed the amount available in most states and we know that many more applications would have been filed if the institutions could have seen a reasonable hope for funding. Although no one would suggest that every project is critical, there must have been some evidence of real need or the two thirds of the cost required as matching for the expected Federal funds would not have been provided.

What will happen to the projects which were planned on the basis of one third federal funding? The answer, of course, will vary with every situation.

The first alternative is to go ahead with the project by either reducing its scope one third or securing funding elsewhere. Hopefully, reduced projects won't happen too often since, presumably, the buildings were designed in relation to a particular program or activity. If funds are secured elsewhere, this will have the effect of taking resources away from hard pressed operations budgets or other needed construction. Or the costs will be charged back to students, thus negating somewhat the push to provide more educational opportunities.

The second alternative is to hold up construction until such time as Federal funds do become available. The problem here of course, relates to rising costs and the disruption of planning timetables.

For better or worse, the cuts tend to affect most the private colleges and universities. The basic law, Federal regulations and state plans all put high priority on enrollment growth as such. When funds are sharply limited, the resultant priority ratings almost always favor the large, rapidly growing institutions. These tend to be the public ones. Involved here are some implications for the dual system of higher education.

Our association is fully aware that data and apparent facts are often contradictory. We know that sometimes existing space isn't as well utilized as well as it might be, commensurate with a reasonable physical climate for the educational process. However, we are generally convinced from first hand experience in our various states that much real need still exists. We are reasonably sure that the reduced funding will cause serious problems for the future.