The Establishment Of
A Higher Education Facilities Commission

The Higher Education Facilities
Commission Of The State Of Iowa

Fiscal Year 1965

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES COMMISSION

THE HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF IOWA, FISCAL YEAR 1965

In the summer and autumn of 1964, fifty states, the District of Columbia, American Samoa, Guam, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands were confronted with an exciting challenge. It was the designating of an agency and drafting of a plan to effectuate the provisions of Title I of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963. In the months which followed, each agency faced the tasks set for itself in its respective plan, chiefly those of staffing and setting up an office, receiving and processing applications for financial aid, and reporting to federal and state government officials. In all, they comprised as much of a whirlwind assignment as an administrator would care to have.

The full story of the accomplishments is long, for they vary among the individual states and the particular patterns of academic institutions. In fact, the actual completion of the numerous projects for which grants were made is part of a future story. However, the experience of a Higher Education Facilities Commission in a medium-size, midwestern state as it organized itself and completed its first fiscal year will embody parallels with other commissions elsewhere. This is the story of the Higher Education Facilities Commission of the State of Iowa.

I. SETTING UP THE COMMISSION

According to Public Law 88-204, 88th Congress, December 16th, 1963, any state desiring to participate in the grant program for undergraduate academic facilities was to designate or establish a state agency "which is broadly representative of the public and of institutions of higher education (including junior colleges and technical institutes) in the State." Its initial charge was to submit to the U. S. Commissioner of Education "a state plan for such participation." Educators from Iowa had already been writing letters to the Governor and to spokesmen for both public and private institutions. Through the joint efforts of educators and legislators, a bill was drafted and submitted to the State Legislature, Sixtieth General Assembly in Extraordinary Session. Referred to as House File Ten, it underwent several revisions and won its race for adoption before adjournment of the Legislature in May 1964.

The first two sections of House File Ten assured that the federal grants would be administered by a new state agency broadly representative of public and private educational institutions and of the public at large. It was to be known officially as the Higher Education Facilities Commission of the State of Iowa and composed of nine persons, as follows: A member of the State Board of Regents to be named by the Board, the Superintendent of Public Instruction, a member of the State Advisory Committee for Vocational Education, a member of the Senate to be appointed by the Lieutenant Governor, a member of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House, and four additional members to be appointed by the Governor, one to represent the private educational institutions, the other three to represent the general public.

The Commission was directed to determine its own organization, draw up its own by-laws, and do whatever would be necessary and incidental to administering the Congressional Act. A basic difficulty, however, remained to plague the Commission for several months. On the faith that Congressional appropriations for operating funds would be forthcoming promptly, the State Legislature foresaw no need for duplicating these. Thus, even though the Commission had come into being, it did not have the funds necessary to hire a director and staff. After widespread search the Commission engaged the services of an executive who viewed the lack of operating funds, office, or staff as an inconvenience rather than a serious deterrent. He was keenly aware of the urgent needs expressed by and for higher education in Iowa and agreed to lend his leadership to the challenge. For some time there was uncertainty as to whether procedures were to be those of a federal or a state agency. The Attorney General, Executive

Council members, and other State officials were generous with their understanding, however, and within four months the entire operation was officially declared legal.

II. THE STATE PLAN

The drafting of a State Plan was the immediate, primary task confronting the Commission. The submitting to the U. S. Commissioner of Education and his approval of a State Plan constituted the legal basis for federal-state cooperation in meeting needs for undergraduate facilities to accommodate the expanding enrollment. The. Plan would detail the manner of establishing relative priorities and federal grant shares for eligible projects. Through a series of statements and directives, the U. S. Office of Education consulted with executive officers of institutions of higher education and others regarding proposals for determining relative priorities and the extent of federal participation. In mid-June, U. S. Commissioner of Education Francis Keppel wrote that final steps were under way to clear a standard format and instructions for a State Plan and to finalize regulations. Every effort, it appeared, was being made to allow ample flexibility for state commissions to develop standards and methods appropriate to local needs.

The final standard format for state plans contained several stock paragraphs requiring no more than repetition and compliance by the state commissions. Typical of these are the opening sections asserting that the State Commission will accept all formal applications from institutions of higher education in the state and verify that each institution and project proposed meet basic eligibility requirements. It will inform applicants of official actions and determinations regarding their application, retain their files for at least two fiscal years, and maintain a full and public record of all proceedings. In accordance with Section Ten, the State Commission will report to the U. S. Office of Education the action taken on the applications received and considered as of each closing date and forward four copies of each application receiving a priority. It will afford any applicant with a complaint an opportunity for a fair hearing.

The sections of the standard format in which the Commission had to exercise decisions included 2.1, the legal name and official address of the state commission; 2.2, the titles of the principal officers; 2.3, the staff and administrative services; 2.4, the formal provisions for consultations with advisory groups; 2.5, the rules of procedure for conducting business; 6.0, the grouping of applications; 7.0, the criteria for determining relative priorities of projects; and 8.0, the determining of federal shares for projects at institutions of higher education other than public community colleges and public technical institutes.

Most of these decisions were comparatively easy to make. The legal name was already established in the enabling legislation. The titles of the principal officers of the State Commission were designated Chairman, Vice Chairman and Secretary. The Director was given supervisory responsibility for carrying out the objectives of the Commission, engaging necessary staff, and arranging for necessary facilities. In conducting business and reaching official decisions, a majority of the Commission membership constitutes a quorum and the source book is Roberts' Rules of Order. The Commission verifies application data and sets the priorities for projects within 45 days after established closing dates, notifying applicants of priorities within fifteen days after the priority list has been established.

Far more difficult were decisions on questions concerning closing dates, federal shares, and priority factors. Not less than two nor more than three annual closing dates could be set for receiving applications. They were to fall between July 31 and March 31 for each fiscal year and at least two months apart. The last closing date for the fiscal year must be set early enough to allow processing and forwarding of applications to the U. S. Office of Education by May 1. The Iowa State Plan thus sets the regular closing dates at August 31 and January 31. Sixty percent of the allotment to the State would be available for grants as of the first closing date and the remaining forty percent would be available for grants as of the second closing date in each fiscal year.

Methods for determining federal shares of eligible projects were a next major consideration.

For construction projects at public community colleges and public technical institutes, the federal share is forty percent of the eligible construction cost. With respect to the projects for other institutions, however, three main alternatives seemed to be possible: 1) allow a straight one-third federal share of the estimated eligible project development cost, unless the applicant requests less; 2) limit the total amount allowed by setting a ceiling at one million dollars or at a percentage of the state allotment; or 3) formulate a graduated scale limiting the project amount. The Iowa Commission chose the third alternative, with a federal share formula offering institutions other than public community colleges and public technical institutes : a maximum of 33-1/3% of the first $900,000 of the estimated eligible project development cost; 20% of the cost over $900,000 up to and including $2,000,000; plus 10% of the cost over $2,000,000.

Setting standards and methods for determining relative priorities for the projects was by far the most arduous task in setting up the state plan. The federal regulations required that the Commission set these separately for the public community colleges and public technical institutes (Section 103) and for all other institutions (Section 104). Furthermore, under each of the two categories, separate subdivisions were required for new institutions or branch campuses and for established institutions or campuses. A new institution was defined as one which was not in operation and admitting students as of the fourth fall term preceding the date of application for assistance under Title I.

The U.S. Office of Education stressed that the standards and methods adopted should meet the objectives which the Commission wishes to achieve and should consider the circumstances and characteristics of institutions of higher education in the particular state. Two general requirements were to be kept in mind. First, the standards and methods were to be objective, specifying concrete factors and their relative weighting in a point scoring system. Any procedures calling for judgments to be made on the basis of factors or considerations not specifically set forth in the state plan were ruled out. Secondly, the Act required that the standards and methods for determining of relative priorities "shall give special consideration to expansion of undergraduate enrollment capacity."

The regulations developed by the U. S. Office of Education respected these two considerations by requiring that a part of the total list of priority factors be designed to include 1) the planned for and reasonably expected increase in undergraduate enrollment, 2) the increase in assignable area of instructional and library facilities to be provided by the proposed construction project, and 3) the degree of utilization of existing academic facilities (except for new institutions). The regulations specified that for established institutions, each of these criteria was to receive at least fifteen percent of the total possible point score. For new institutions the first or enrollment criterion was to receive twenty percent.

The Commission was permitted to distribute fifty-five percent of the total possible point score. It might emphasize required criteria further or introduce other criteria consistent with the purposes of the Act. These might include 1) the geographic location of the proposed project, 2) the type of institution or academic program to be expanded in conjunction with the facility, 3) the type of academic facility to be constructed, 4) the ability of the applicant promptly to undertake the proposed construction, and 5) the date and amount of the most recent previous grant awarded under Title I. Several factors were inadmissable either in favor of or adverse to an institution. These were the admitting of out-of-state students, the nature of the control or sponsorship of the institution, the fact that the construction of the project had already commenced, or the fact that part of the cost of the project had been incurred before the date of application.

Once the priority factors were defined and listed, they were applied through the assignment of point scores. Various alternatives were possible. The application data could be ranked in specific deciles, quintiles or quartiles. The application data could be measured along a scoring table for the standard and assigned points accordingly. Applications could be compared to a fixed requirement for the standards, and be assigned points if they met the requirements; or denied points if they did not. For example, a factor could carry the question of whether a proposed project was located in a geographical area in which an unfilled need had been documented in a statewide study. If the answer

were "yes," five points would be awarded; if "no," zero points.

The first priority factor in the Iowa State Plan is described as follows: "The planned for and reasonably expected increase in undergraduate enrollment at the campus where the project is to be constructed for the fourth fall term after the fall term preceding the date of application." The second priority factor is the amount and percentage by which the proposed project will increase the square feet of assignable area in instructional and library facilities at the campus concerned.

For each of the first two factors and for the capacity/enrollment ratio as a measure of utilization, a schedule of quartiles is used in the assignment of points. For example, the numerical increase in enrollment between the fall of 1964 and the fall of 1968 is assigned fifteen possible points for the data which falls in the highest or first quartile, twelve points for the second quartile, nine points for data in the third quartile, and six points for the fourth quartile. If the number of eligible projects to be assigned points does not exceed four, the projects are ranked and the one with the largest percentage increase is assigned fifteen points, the second largest twelve, the third largest nine, and the fourth largest six points.

The third required factor is described in the Iowa State Plan as "The degree of utilization of existing academic facilities at the campus where the project is to be constructed, as of the fall term preceding the date of application, as evidenced by the capacity/enrollment ratio, the average weekly room-period use for general classrooms, and the average weekly room-period use for instructional laboratories and shops." The first of these sub-factors is defined on the application form as the ratio of assignable area in instructional and library facilities to the total resident student clock hours of enrollment; its range might be roughly from fifty to six hundred, the highest points of priority going to the lowest figure. After much debate as to whether these were in fact the best measures of utilization, each was allotted an equal number of possible points. The room-period use sub-factors are assigned points according to a standard schedule of hours ranging downward from thirty-five or more hours for ten points in the case of Section 104 institutions, and for five points in the case of Section 103 institutions.

In the fourth factor of the Iowa Plan, the Commission inquires whether the applicant can promptly undertake the proposed construction. It requests acceptable documentary evidence verifying the percentage of the estimated development cost of the project which the applicant has on hand, or by firm commitments is assured of having, if the grant is approved. In the case of the Section 104 institutions, the points are assigned according to a schedule of the percentage on hand. The Section 103 institutions must have their full share of the cost on hand in order to receive fifteen points rather than none.

The final priority factor in the Iowa State Plan examines the previous Title I grants awarded a campus before the current closing date. The possible points are divided between the cumulative amount and the recency of the date, each of the sub-factors utilizing specific schedules. For the cumulative amount of previous grants in the case of Section 104 institutions, five points are designated if the cumulative amount is under $100,000; four points if the cumulative amount is between $100,000 and $299,999; three points if between $300,000 and $499,999; two points if between $500,000 and $699,999; and one point if the cumulative amount is $700,000 or over. If no previous grant was awarded, five points are assigned; if none in the current year or the preceding two years, three points; if no grant was awarded in the current year, one point. Similar schedules with maximums of ten points apply to the Section 103 institutions.

It was ever apparent that the variety of priority factors and of standards and methods for applying them to the data on the applications is very wide. The possible combinations and the prediction of the results defy comprehension. The Commission members considered varied schemes, score point totals, and schedules for each possible factor, asking and re-asking what in fact was the spirit of the legislation and the intent of the Congress. They examined sample application forms with actual and hypothetical data from typical Iowa institutions both large and small, public and private. As the data in each test case began to build up, the Commissioners gradually eliminated dubious alter-

natives and eventually decided upon the factors and methods which appeared most objective.

Throughout the period of drafting the State Plan, an already prevalent awareness of the Iowa pattern of higher education came into sharper focus. For a number of years the undergraduate enrollment throughout the state has been divided almost equally between the public or state institutions and the private institutions. Accordingly, the allotment of points, except for the public community colleges, was balanced equally between the numerical and the percentage subdivisions of the enrollment and the area factors respectively. The private institutions, most of which are small, would thus show up well in percentage increase of enrollment or percentage increase of square feet of construction, although in numbers of students and of square feet, they might lag far behind the large state universities.

In summary, the criteria and point allowance for determining relative priorities for eligible projects in the State Plan in Iowa appear as follows:

	PUBLIC COMMUNITY COLLEGES AND PUBLIC TECHNICAL INSTITUTES	ALL OTHER INSTITUTIONS
A. For Established Institutions		
1. Increase in undergraduate enrollment (15%)*		
a. Numerical	15	15
b. Percentage	5	15
2. Increase in square feet for instruction and library (15%)*		
a. Numerical	30	10
b. Percentage		10
3. Utilization of existing academic facilities (15%)*		
a. Capacity/enrollment ratio	5	10
b. General classrooms	5	10
c. Instructional laboratories and shops	5	10
4. Ability to undertake the project financially	15	10
5. Previous Title I grant(s) awarded		
a. Cumulative amount	10	5
b. Date of most recent previous grant	10	5
B. For New Institutions		
1. Increase in undergraduate enrollment (25%)*	30	30
2. Square feet for instruction and library (20%)*	30	30
3. Projected weekly use of academic facilities		
a. General classrooms	5	5
b. Instructional laboratories and shops	5	5
4. Ability to undertake the project financially	20	20
5. Previous Title I grant(s) awarded		
a. Cumulative amount	5	5
b. Date of most recent previous grant	5	5

* Percentages in parentheses refer to the minimum weighting required by the Regulations.

The State Plan for Iowa was written in five intensive weeks, submitted to the U. S. Office of Education on September 23, 1964, and approved on October 29. The effort enabled Iowa applications to be among the first for consideration in Washington. This dispatch was possible only because of excellent guidance from helpful officials in the U. S. Office of Education, suggestions emanating from the American Council of Education, and the Commission's intensive exploration and evaluation of the variables and alternatives.

At the annual meeting of the American Council on Education, September 30 to October 1, 1964, discussions and remarks could have been disconcerting. From several states one sensed an almost frantic fear that the fiscal year would become history before the State Commission would be established and operating. There was a search by some conferees for persons who would do the work for them--that of drafting a workable State Plan and setting up an office to process applications without delay. The attitude of others was that all but a minimum amount of time spent on making a State Plan highly suitable would be wasted and merely keep the money waiting unduly in Washington. A few said that the legislation was impossible and impractical.

III. THE COMMISSION IN OPERATION

Since President Johnson did not sign the appropriations bill for the Higher Education Facilities Act until September 19, 1964, operating funds could not be available for several weeks. Moreover, the regulations stated that no administrative costs would be met by Washington until after final approval of the State Plan. Nonetheless, even without office headquarters or secretarial assistance, both the Director and the Commission members were optimistic about being able to receive applications for the rapidly advancing closing date, November 30 for the first fiscal year. Through the good offices of the Secretary of the Board of Regents, the Superintendent of Public Instruction, and the President of the Iowa Association of Private Colleges and Universities, the Director maintained contacts with the executive officers of the colleges and universities in Iowa. He informed them of approval of the State Plan and encouraged them to complete and submit applications.

The next step, a month before closing date, included the review of preliminary applications and a visit with the applicants. Such questions as the Director could not answer with certainty, he promptly referred to the Bureau of Higher Education Facilities in Washington. Several times Mr. Gail Norris and Mr. Herbert Deckert, whose names rapidly became synonymous with expertise on facilities, engaged in intricate consultation with others in order to cope with the "gray areas" of the new legislation.

The Commission was scheduled to meet two weeks after closing date. Before this meeting, every application was officially recorded by date of receipt. The mathematical calculations, supporting documentation and overall completeness were thoroughly reviewed. Then followed the considerable tabulation and summarization necessary to arrive at priority determination. Among the forms used were score sheets for the individual priority factors in the State Plan and for grand total of all factors. Samples of these are shown on pages 7 and 8.

After the applications and their data have been neatly drawn together and made ready for presentation to the Commission, the Director is fairly certain that the calculated final results will remain. Yet he reminds the Commission members that the State Plan and regulations specifically ascribe to them the responsibility for the determination of priorities and the recommendation for federal aid. Copies of the applications and a score sheet are placed before each member and then reviewed, step by step, establishing approval of the eligibility of the project and of the scores for each priority factor. Conducted systematically and enthusiastically, the proceedings are efficient and not at all lengthy. Each member's participation was to be far more than perfunctory, giving the office staff an effective source of help.

Higher Education Facilities Commission of the State of Iowa

Score Sheet for Factor Requiring Quartile Ranking

Factor: _____ _____ _____

(section) (closing date)

Quartile and Quartile limits	Rank	Institutions	Increase	Score
First Quartile Quartile limits:				
Second Quartile Quartile limits:				
Third Quartile Quartile limits:				
Fourth Quartile Quartile limits:				

Higher Education Facilities Commission of the State of Iowa

Score Sheet for Grand Total of All Factors

Tabulation of data for _____ (name of institution) _____ (section) _____ (closing date)

State Plan Factor Reference	Description (application form reference)	Scoring	
		Data	Score
(1) a	Enrollment: numerical increase (C 3 F)		
(1) b	Enrollment: percentage increase		
(2) a	Project area: numerical increase, sq. ft. (E 3)		
(2) b	Project area: percentage increase, sq. ft. (E 4)		
(3) a	Utilization: capacity/enrollment ratio (F 3)		
(3) b	Utilization: **average** weekly classroom use (Ga3)		
(3) c	Utilization: average weekly laboratory use (Gb3)		
(4)	Financing: Percentage of cost $\left(\frac{B+D}{A}\right)$ on hand or assured (P) A = Total cost of project; B = Federal grant share; C = Difference or non-grant share; D = Amount of non-grant share available		
	Total:		

Higher Education Facilities Commission of the State of Iowa

Score Sheet for

Section 104 103 Closing date:

Institution *, **, ***														
Eligibility of institution														
Evidence acceptable**														
Application accepted for priority ranking														
Criteria:														
(1) Enrollment increase														
a. Numerical (15)														
b. Percentage (15)														
(2) Area increase														
a. Numerical (10)														
b. Percentage (10)														
(3) Utilization														
a. Capacity/Enrollment (10)														
b. Classrooms (10)														
c. Laboratories (10)														
(4) Financing (10)														
Plan approved****														
Totals (90)														
Rank order (with ties)														
Rank order (ties resolved)														

***Institutions with applications considered for first closing date but which did not receive priorities.**

**Institutions which received only a partial Federal share recommendation.

***New Institution.

****Financing plan approval is decided as a next step after examining evidence.

Note: the 5th criterion (previous grant awarded) in fiscal year 1965 carried the same score for all applicants.

Tie Score	Name of Institution	Enrollment Increase	Area Increase

The role of the Director of the Higher Education Facilities Commission has become increasingly clear. Actually, his services are several. He is in fact the applicant's representative. Having no other direct contact with the Commission members as a whole, the applicant depends upon the Director to put its best foot forward in reporting on his visit at the campus. Secondly, for the Commission, the Director and his staff must ascertain the completeness and credibility of the application information, apply the mathematical criteria presented in the State Plan, and summarize the data for presentation. Finally, his office becomes a clearing house of information on physical facilities, financing arrangements and governmental relations.

IV. EVALUATION AND AMENDMENT

The peak of intensive activity for a Title I Facilities Commission is fairly well reached in March. After the second (or third) closing date of the fiscal year, which is required to be set no later than March 31, the Commission again meets to determine final priorities. Once the institutions are notified, the further burden of orderly applications is shifted to the U. S. Office of Education. An unsuccessful applicant may express any dissatisfaction by requesting a hearing within a fifteen day period (from five to thirty days in the various states). Other than that possible interference, the Commission members and staff have time to review and evaluate the year's performance and discuss possible changes in procedure, amendment of the State Plan, and supplementary activities.

Commission operations in Iowa were smooth and without incident. No hearings were filed. No complaints were registered. At most, a few scattered questions were raised. Largely they were matters of restrictions laid down in the legislation, somewhat out of the province of the Commission. In practice, the answers hardly involved absolute distinctions. For example, a chief priority factor is the increase in enrollment for the next four years; another is the size in square feet of the instructional and library area of the project. How, it was frequently asked, was it possible to separate these basically quantitative factors from the criteria of quality long emphasized in academic objectives?

Another frequent question related to the nature of the private or public control or to the church or non-church sponsorship of an institution applying for a federal grant. In no case were these to be considered as conditions either in favor of or adverse to an institution. Yet, the law clearly states that no part of the facilities provided through Title I funds is to be used for religious instruction. One private college applicant interpreted the restriction with calm understanding; the registrar need merely schedule classes so that religion is taught elsewhere on campus, there being ample place for it by the removal of science and modern language classes to the new federally supported construction. A more dogmatic or literal mind queried, however, "Is this not affording indirect federal aid to religious instruction?"

The law's favoring of instruction in the areas of science, engineering, mathematics, and foreign languages played havoc with the curricula of Section 104 institutions. How could any institution, especially one with only two or three buildings, agree to "freeze" the scheduling of classes in accordance with this curricular partiality? Is not twenty years, which is the period of federal interest in any construction for teaching these subjects, unreasonable and unrealistic? As in the restriction against teaching religion, so also in the favoritism for teaching in these areas, an applicant stated that he was forced to distinguish between literal compliance and practical operation. For the latter again, the registrar would merely need to schedule classes appropriately and, with added facilities for the Title I teaching, he would relieve space elsewhere on campus for other curricular areas. The federal auditor would look over the schedule of classes every two years or so, to see that only eligible courses were being taught in the federally supported facility.

Early in its operation, of course, the Commission had discussed comments on the legislation itself. College and university administrators might recall whether they had individually and collectively exercised their influence during the long formative stages of the legislation. Now they had no recourse but to accept it. Moreover, they must realize that in any legislation and any program, the avoidance of all problems of interpretation and application is necessarily impossible. Those remaining in this law were not excessive, as witnessed by the fact that

once the appropriations were made, the program quickly progressed in most states. While causing hardships on some institutions, the restrictions of the federal law itself were no target for a Commission self-study.

An evaluation of the activities for the year centered on the commitments and procedures of the State Plan. It was now possible to take a total second look at the Plan and, more specifically, at exactly how the various provisions were applied during the year. Moreover, valuable data were now at hand through Mr. Charles Griffith of the U. S. Office of Education and from other state plans. Samples of the comparative studies prepared for the evaluation and amendment meetings of the Iowa State Commission follow.

A. Closing dates for Receiving Applications for Title 1 Grants*

Only the seven states indicated in Table A have three closing dates for the Section 103 institutions. For the Section 104 institutions, the same states except for Mississippi have three closing dates. The first and last closing dates in the fiscal year are as follows:

Table A	Section 103		Section 104	
	First	Last	First	Last
Colorado	7 31	3 31	7 31	3 31
Georgia	8 31	3 31	8 31	3 31
Indiana	8 31	3 31	8 31	3 31
Mississippi	10 31	3 31		
New York	9 15	2 15	9 15	2 15
North Carolina	7 31	3 31	7 31	3 31
Tennessee	8 31	3 31	8 31	3 31

Those states which have funds apportioned by closing dates are shown in Table B. Of these eight states, six have two closing dates; only New York and North Carolina have three closing dates. In the case of North Carolina it would appear that the third closing date applies only if funds are still available. New York is the only state to have three closing dates, together with a three-fold apportionment.

Table B	Section 103	Section 104
Iowa	60-40	60-40
Kansas	50-50	50-50
Louisiana	50-50	50-50
Massachusetts	90-10	60-40
New York	40-40-20-	40-40-20
North Carolina	60-40	50-50
Pennsylvania	50-50	50-50
Texas	50-50	70-30

According to the regulations, Section 170.14, the State Plan must specify not less than two nor more than three annual closing dates for receiving applications. The closing dates must be between July 31 and March 31 of the Federal fiscal year and at least two months apart. If no apportionment of funds is provided, as is the case with all but the above eight states, a second (or third) closing date each fiscal year is effective only if funds are available in the allotment as of each later closing date.

While it is possible to have a closing date as early as July 31, any second closing date after September would allow a different base for "enrollment," "available facilities," and "utilization" statistics between the first and later closing dates. More specifically, the application form calls for priority data "as of the fall term immediately preceding the date of application," and "as of last September 30." These data would differ between a set of applications submitted before October and a second set submitted after October 31. However, as apparent from Table C, more than half of the states endure this differentiation.

Table C

Number of States and First Closing Date

	7/31	8/1	8/15	8/31	9/1	9/15	9/30	10/15	10/30	10/31	11/1	11/15	11/30	12/15	12/31
Section 103	16	1	1	9	3	1	2	1	1	4	3	3	2	1	1
Section 104	16	1	1	8	3	1	3	1		3	2	4	4		1

Number of States and Last Closing Date

	1/15	1/31	2/15	2/28	3/1	3/15	3/17	3/31
Section 103	1	7	3	3	7	4	1	
Section 104	1	7	2	3	9	4	1	

* Based on data supplied by the U. S. Office of Education, April 1965.

B. Alternative Suggestions for Closing dates, specifically applied to the available funds for the State of Iowa.

Amount of available funds for fiscal year
Section 103 - $ 948,388
Section 104 - $2, 895,116

Dates and percentages of apportionment	Section 103 (Public community colleges)	Section 104 (Other institutions)
July 31 (30%)	$284,516	$ 868,535
October 31 (40%)	379,355	1,158,046
March 31 (30%)	284,516	868,535

	Section 103 (Public community colleges)	Section 104 (Other institutions)
July 31 (40%)	$379,355	$1,158,046
October 31 (40%)	379,355	1,158,046
March 31 (20%)	189,678	579,023

	Section 103 (Public community colleges)	Section 104 (Other institutions)
July 31 (50%)	$474,194	$1,447,558
October 31 (50%)	474,194	1,447,558
March 31 (balance if any)		

Present Method:

	Section 103 (Public community colleges)	Section 104 (Other institutions)
October 31 (60%)	$569,033	$1,737,070
March 31 (40%)	379,355	1,158,046

C. Summaries of State Plan Procedures concerning Federal Shares*

1. The institution (both Sections 103 and 104) left with only a partial federal share is offered the balance (or part of the balance) of its full requested federal share from funds apportioned for a later closing date, in the following eight states:

Iowa	Massachusetts	Vermont
Kansas	Tennessee	Virginia
Louisiana	Texas	

2. Four state plans offer (Section 104 institutions only) lesser shares for additional projects from the same institution:

Florida	Michigan
Kansas	Pennsylvania

3. Twenty state plans limit the total federal share by a specific amount:

California	$1,000,000
Connecticut	500,000
Delaware	80% of state allotment
District of Columbia	200,000
Georgia	1,000,000
Louisiana	500,000
Maryland	1,000,000
Massachusetts	750,000
Michigan	750,000
Minnesota	1,000,000
Missouri	1,000,000
Montana	1,000,000
New York	1,500,000
North Carolina	1,000,000
Oklahoma	1,000,000
Rhode Island	500,000
South Carolina	10% of state allotment
Texas	1,500,000
Vermont	300,000
West Virginia	1,000,000

4. Ten state plans limit the federal share by means of a graduated scale:

Alaska	Oklahoma	South Carolina
Iowa	Oregon	Tennessee
Maine	Pennsylvania	Virginia
Maryland		

5. Sixteen State plans specify no limitation on the amount of the federal share:

Alabama	Kentucky	New Mexico
Arizona	Mississippi	Puerto Rico
Arkansas	Nebraska	South Dakota
Hawaii	Nevada	Washington
Idaho	New Hampshire	Wyoming
Indiana		

*Based on data supplied by the U. S. Office of Education, April 1965.

D. Summaries of Priority Factors Used in State Plans*

1. Frequency of numbers of points assigned to the factor: Increase in undergratuate enrollment at the campus where the facilities are to be constructed.

a. Established Institutions

Numerical Increase

Number of points	5	6	7	7.5	8	10	11	12.5	13	15	16	20	22.5	25	30
Section 103	2	1		2	4	12	1		1	14	1	6	1	3	2
Section 104	3	1	1	3	2	10		1	1	14		7	1	4	2

Percentage Increase

Number of points	5	7	7.5	8	9	10	12	12.5	15	16	18	20	25
Section 103	6	3	3	1	1	15	1		14	1	1	1	2
Section 104	2	1	4	1		17	1	1	15		2	4	2

b. New Institutions

Numerical Increase

Number of points	13	25	30	35	40	45	50	60
Section 103	1	19	14	4	11		2	1
Section 104	1	17	13	1	13	1	5	1

Percentage Increase

Number of points	15	25
Section 103		2
Section 104	1	2

*Based on data supplied by the U. S. Office of Education, April 1965.

2. Frequency of numbers of points assigned to the factor: Increase in square feet of assignable area in instructional and library facilities at the campus where the facilities are to be constructed.

a. Established Institutions

Numerical Increase

Number of points	5	7	7.5	8	10	14	15	20	22.5	30
Section 103	2		2	5	20	1	5	1	1	2
Section 104	3	1	3	3	21		4	2	1	1

Percentage Increase

Number of points	5	7	7.5	8	10	14	15	20	25	30
Section 103	4	4	3	1	19	1	9	2	1	1
Section 104	3	1	4	3	22		9	4	1	

b. New Institutions

Numerical Increase

Number of points	10	15	20	24	25	30	35	40	50
Section 103	1		20	1	7	17	3	1	2
Section 104	1	1	16	1	9	19	1	2	2

Percentage Increase

Number of Points	20	25
Section 103	1	1
Section 104	2	

3. Frequency of numbers of point assignment to the factors of the degree of utilization of exsisting academic facilities at the campus where facilities are to be constructed (established institutions).

Section 103

Number of points	3	4	5	7.5	8	9	10	13	15	16	20	30	40
Capacity/enrollment ratio		1	3		1		17		11		5	1	
Average weekly classroom use		2	8	2			14	1	6	1	1		1
Average weekly laboratory use	1	1	11	2	1		10	1	6	1	1	1	
Combined classroom and laboratory use			1			1					1		

Section 104

Number of points	4	5	6	7.5	8	9	10	13	15	16	20	30
Capacity/enrollment ratio		1					18		11		5	1
Average weekly classroom use		7	1	2	2		15	1	8	1	1	
Average weekly laboratory use		8	1	2	2		13	1	8	1	1	
Combined classroom and laboratory use		1				1					1	

4. The more common additional (optional) factors used in state plans.

a. Financial ability to undertake the construction without delay, including amount and percentage of non-grant funds on hand or assured: forty state plans, including Iowa.

b. The date and/or amount of previous Title I grants awarded: forty state plans, including Iowa.

c. Geographic location and/or need: Section 103, twenty-one state plans; Section 104, eleven state plans.

d. Numerical or percentage of undergraduate full-time enrollment in preceding recent years: six state plans.

e. Amount or percentage of assignable area of instructional and library facilities now housed in temporary, obsolete, or unsafe structures for which renovation is economically not feasible: six state plans.

f. Relationship of the project to a long-range plan for institutional development: four state plans.

5. The manner in which state plans assign points to the enrollment factor: numerical and percentage increases. Section 104, established institutions*

The left half of the table represents those state plans which assign a numerical score greater than a percentage score. The right half represents those state plans which assign a percentage score greater than a numerical score. Columns B and F, C and G give the maximum possible scores under the headings of numerical and percentage respectively. The far right colums, D and H, give the difference in point emphasis. The left columns, A and E, identify the state by number as decoded in a following footnote.

Numerical score greater than percentage score				Percentage score greater than numerical score			
A. ** state	B. maximum num. score	C. maximum per score	D. diff.	E. ** state	F. maximum num. score	G. maximum per score	H. diff.
18	30	10	20	12	0	15	15
33	22.5	7.5	15	4	0	15	15
24	15	0	15	36	7	18	11
11	25	10	15	30	5	15	10
5	25	10	15	27	6	12	6
2	15	0	15	49	5	10	5
35	30	18	12	21	20	25	5
43	20	10	10	19	5	10	5
41	25	15	10				
26	20	10	10				
16	10	5	5				
9	10	5	5				
6	15	10	5				
28	13	10	3				
51	8	7	1				

Summary

	Number	Percent of Total
States with equal scores	29	55.77
States with numerical score greater than percentage score	15	28.85
States with percentage score greater than numerical score	8	15.38
Total	52	100.00

*Based on data supplied by the U. S. Office of Education, April 1965.

** 1. Puerto Rico, 2. Wyoming, 3. Wisconsin, 4. West Virginia, 5. Washington, 6. Virginia, 7. Vermont, 8. Utah, 9. Texas, 10. Tennessee, 11. South Dakota, 12. South Carolina, 13. Rhode Island, 14. Pennsylvania, 15. Oregon, 16. Oklahoma, 17. Ohio, 18. North Dakota, 19. North Carolina, 20. New York, 21. New Mexico, 22. New Jersey, 23. New Hampshire, 24. Nevada, 25. Nebraska, 26. Montana, 27. Missouri, 28. Mississippi, 29. Minnesota, 30. Michigan, 31. Massachusetts, 32. Maryland, 33. Maine, 34. Louisiana, 35. Kentucky, 36. Kansas, 37. Iowa, 38. Indiana, 39. Illinois, 40. Idaho, 41. Hawaii, 42. Georgia, 43. District of Columbia, 45. Delaware, 46. Connecticut, 47. Colorado, 48. California, 49. Arkansas, 50. Arizona, 51. Alaska, 52. Alabama.

6. The distribution of points among the various utilization sub-factors in state plans. Section 104, established institutions.*

In the adaptation of the factor of utilization of existing academic facilities, three main sub-factors prevail in state plans. The table which follows shows the distribution of points, and thus weighting, given for each of these sub-factors in the various state plans.
Column A gives the total number of states as identified in column B by reference numbers (decoded in the footnote on page 18). Columns C, D, and E give the respective weighting within the utilization factor to the sub-factors of capacity/enrollment ratio, average weekly room period use of general classrooms and average weekly room period use of laboratories and shops. Column F gives the percent of the total numbers of states which favor the distribution of points shown in the three preceding columns C, D, and E.

A Number	B State * *	Distribution of points			F Percent of total
		C Capacity Enrollment ratio	D Class-rooms	E Labora-tories	
12	1, 3, 5, 10, 17, 25, 26, 27, 43, 44, 50, 52	0	1/2	1/2	23.08
11	7, 9, 18, 20, 21, 24, 29, 30, 39, 48, 51	1	0	0	21.16
11	2, 12, 14, 16, 19, 34, 37, 38, 42, 45, 47	1/3	1/3	1/3	21.16
7	4, 13, 23, 31, 33, 46, 49	1/2	1/4	1/4	13.46
2	6, 8	3/7	2/7	2/7	3.86
1	41	0	1	0	1.92
1	40	1/4	1/4	1/2	1.92
1	36	0	4/7	3/7	1.92
1	35	0	2/3	1/3	1.92
1	22	3/5	1/5	1/5	1.92
1	15	10/36	13/36	13/36	1.92
1	32	2/3	1/3		1.92
1	28	0	1		1.92
1	11	1/3	2/3		1.92
52					100.00

*Based on data supplied by the U.S. Office of Education, April 1965.

**See Section IV. D. 5. for Decoding of State Identifying Numbers.

E. Distribution of Application Data Between Closing Dates

One measure of any set of standards for determining scores is the reliability of distribution of data from one occasion of use to the next. While recognizing that the data they were examining held for only two closing dates, the Iowa Commission noted that they reflect considerable similarity. This is very marked in the sample tables which follow. In the case of percentage increase in enrollment, Table A, the third quartile carries an identical number of applications. Table B, average weekly room-period use for general classrooms, approaches a semblance of normal curve, with most of the data clustering in the center of the range of the standard and poetentially fanning out at both upper and lower extremes.

Table A. Distribution of the application data in Iowa. Comparison between the first and second closing dates for the factor of enrollment percentage increase. Section 104.

First Closing Date			Mathematical quartiles	Second Closing Date		
Rank	Increase	Score		Rank	Increase	Score
1	75.74	15	First	1	64.11	15
2	72.18	15		2	59.56	15
				3	53.17	15
3	59.56	12	Second	4	46.41	12
4	50.38	12		5	46.26	12
				6	45.14	12
				7	44.30	12
5	46.26	9	Third	8	40.35	9
6	46.17	9		9	40.16	9
7	45.14	9		10	40.16	9
8	42.23	9		11	38.41	9
9	40.16	9		12	35.27	9
10	25.48	6	Fourth	13	23.58	6
11	23.58	6		14	20.17	6
12	20.17	6				
13	19.76	6				

Table B. Distribution of the application data in Iowa. Comparison between the first and second closing dates for the factor of average weekly room-period use of general class-rooms. Section 104.

First Closing Date			Second Closing Date		
Use and Score	Rank	Average	Use and Score	Rank	Average
35 hours or over (10)	1 2	39.31 36.80	35 hours or over (10)	1	35.50
30-34.9 hours (8)	3	34.38	30-34.9 hours (8)	2	34.38
25-29.9 hours (6)	4 5 6 7 8 9	29.70 27.85 27.10 26.67 26.57 26.28	25-29.9 hours (6)	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	28.25 27.84 27.10 26.69 26.57 26.28 26.20 26.20
20-24.9 hours (4)	10 11 12	24.41 23.50 23.09	20-24.9 hours (4)	11 12 13	24.41 23.09 20.00
15-19.9 hours (2)	13	18.50	15-19.9 hours (2)	14	18.50
Under 15 hours (0)			Under 15 hours (0)		

The status of applications throughout the country, as reported by the U. S. Office of Education, was also examined by the Commission. It was apparent that for the first year the Commission determinations in some states had overwhelmingly favored the public institutions. In others, it appeared that small and obscure colleges or projects were favored. Wherever such occurrences were results contrary to the desires of a representative state commission, one could suggest that the cause was a faulty state plan, with priority factors insufficiently tested before adoption.

After considerable study, the Iowa Commission decided to make very few changes in its State Plan. Three rather than two closing dates were set: August 31, January 31 and March 31. Sixty percent of the available funds are apportioned for the first closing date, forty percent for the second and any remaining balance for the third. In the case of the applicant receiving less than a full calculated federal share because insufficient funds remain as of the first closing date, supplementary funds sufficient for the full share will be made available from funds apportioned to the second closing date. When an institution files more than one application for the same closing date, a new provision limits any priority recommendation for the additional project(s) to ten percent of the estimated eligible project development cost. If any unused Section 104 funds remain after the third closing date, they will be distributed among those applicants which did not receive a full one third share of the eligible construction cost; in no case, of course, to exceed one third.

The amendment concerning any unused funds related in particular to the pending decision of Congress to approve a double allotment of grant funds for the second fiscal year. Actually, the legislation had made provisions for the fiscal year 1964, but delays in effecting the legislation

resulted in an appropriation only for fiscal year 1965. To support the former, the Commission had, with guidance from the American Council of Education, encouraged executives and friends of Iowa colleges and universities to write their congressmen to support the full appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Director informed the senators and representatives from Iowa, as well as the chairmen of the respective appropriations committees of the results of the Iowa priority determinations and the need for more funds than the first year allowed.

With or without the prospect of these additional moneys, Commission members had very real questions concerning their role and duties. Granted an efficient staff to gather and coordinate voluminous data, they asked how they might best avoid becoming a rubber stamp to the statistical results. Should the staff assume broader responsibilities by searching out needs and making elaborate surveys for their debate and action? Should it help in locating the matching funds, the most frequent issue raised during deliberations on whether to apply? To what extent should time be spent by the staff in completing applications? Should the prospect of unused funds be embarrassing?

In the matter of initiative in applying, the perspective after the final closing date priority determinations was not without ironies. In letters to the Governor and others over a period of two years, such plights as "our facilities are being used to fullest capacity," "enrollment applications are overwhelming in number," had no necessary or apparent relationship to receiving a priority or even filing an application. An institution in dire need of a grant had diligently prepared necessary data many months in advance and had submitted an excellent application. Yet it did not receive a requested federal share during the first year. While a college might have been forced by need to begin construction without a grant, others with a grant recommendation might be intending to take as long as two years before beginning construction. It was difficult to suggest that in the latter case the need was as urgent. Moreover, an institution in need of funds, but in opposition to federal sources of loan or grant, questions the value of the legislation. Wherever this cautious attitude continued, it was becoming less adamant.

It is a simple matter to point out ironies and peculiarities in a turn of events. It is easy to be critical of laws that are new. How could it be otherwise? A myriad of lawyers, organization experts, professional advisors, and administrators had dreamed and inscribed a myriad of visions and revisions between the enactment and the effectuation of the legislation. Dozens of times the less virile accomplice asks himself whether the objective or the result is worth the intricacies of an application. The Iowa Commission from the beginning wished no one who was interested in higher education to despair or to witness undue delay. Its members were determined to meet the needs of higher education, and they looked upon the success of a first year of operation as an encouragement to consider even broader service.

Some critics feel that the new commission is a growing arm of government which must be carefully watched. Many educators look at it as a panacea toward which they long have toiled. Citizens may see in it merely another use of their tax money, albeit more desirable and acceptable than military expansion. For the press, the State Commission's priority determinations may have less news value than the Washington announcement of the actual awards. With more deliberate objectivity, an analyst points to the hopelessness of government stability, national security and economic progress without educational programs which are strong even beyond the initially designed areas of science, engineering, mathematics, and foreign languages. The new commissions for higher education are dedicated to restoring the hope and bridging a serious gap.

Prepared by Dr. Jay W. Stein, Director

Higher Education Facilities Commission of the State of Iowa

1300 Des Moines Building
Des Moines, Iowa 50309

June 1965