

opment and stability. In addition, the assurance of 4 years of legislative authority for support of curriculum improvements can do much to encourage these institutions to plan for significant modifications, to recruit and retain faculty necessary for implementation of these modifications, and to risk venture into some of the areas which could contribute most to curriculum improvement.

Equally important for the schools which are in serious financial difficulties, the 4-year period of time for the continued, assured support under the formula grants, and the special assistance in meeting their operating costs through the special project grants can be a vital incentive to their marshaling of resources to upgrade their programs, or even to remain in existence.

The bill would authorize appropriations of such sums as may be necessary for both the improvement grants and the institutional grants. The portion of the moneys appropriated for each fiscal year which would be available for special project improvement grants on the one hand, and formula institutional grants on the other, shall be determined by the Secretary unless otherwise provided in the Appropriation Acts for that year.

New section 771(a) (1).—The formula would be revised as follows:

The base grant per institution would remain at \$25,000. Of the sums remaining from the available appropriations:

(a) 75 percent would be distributed on the basis of (i) the *relative enrollment* of full-time students, (ii) the *relative increase in enrollment* of such students (over the average enrollment of the school for the 5 preceding school years) with the amount per student computed so that a school receives *twice as much for each student in the increase* as for other full-time students, and (b) 25 percent would be distributed on the basis of the relative number of *graduates*.

Under present law, the formula for determining the amount of institutional support takes into account only one variable: the number of students enrolled. A school receives \$500 for each full-time student. The new formula takes into account two additional factors: (a) increases in number of students, and (b) the number of graduates.

Under the bill, a school would receive twice as much for each student *added* to its enrollment in a given year over the average enrollment of the school for the 5 preceding years. Consequently, the schools would be assisted to a greater extent by the new formula than the old. The increased funding for increased enrollment will encourage the schools to enlarge their enrollment while at the same time helping them with the cost of educating the additional students.

The new formula would provide that 25 percent of the sums remaining from appropriations after the base grant (\$25,000 per school) would be distributed on the basis of the relative number of graduates. This would provide a further incentive for the schools to increase and retain their enrollments, since at graduation the student would again be counted.

This would also provide an incentive for schools to experiment with shortening the length of the training period without diminishing the quality of training, and to try to develop practical means for accepting students at advanced standing—for example, admitting a first-year student with advanced standing in courses for which he had demon-