

**Testimony of Dr. Clarence G. Newsome, President, Shaw University**  
**Before the**  
**United States House of Representatives**  
**Committee on Science and Technology**  
**Subcommittee on Investigations and Oversight**  
**Tuesday, May 5, 2009**  
**2:00 PM, Room 2318 Rayburn House Office Building**

Good afternoon Chairman Miller, Ranking Member Sensenbrenner, and members of the Subcommittee on Science and Technology. I thank you for hosting this hearing to learn about how Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs), Predominantly Black Institutions (PBIs) and other intended beneficiaries of the Recovery and Reinvestment Act funds are faring in accessing those dollars targeted for providing “investments needed to increase economic efficiency by spurring technological advances in sciences and health.”

I am delighted to be here as the President of Shaw University, a United Negro College Fund (UNCF) institution, and as a member of the Board of Directors of the National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education (NAFEO).

**Background and Contextual Information**

Shaw University is located in Raleigh, North Carolina, in the 2nd Congressional District, represented by Congressman Bob Etheridge, and adjacent to the 13<sup>th</sup> Congressional District served by the distinguished chairman of this subcommittee. Shaw is the oldest and, I believe, the best private co-educational liberal arts historically black university in the South. Founded in 1865, by Missionary Henry Martin Tupper, Shaw University is affiliated with the Baptist Church. Its former Leonard School of Medicine was the first four-year medical school to train black doctors and pharmacists in the South. Today, the primary mission of Shaw University is teaching with a commitment to maintaining excellence in research and academic programs that foster intellectual enhancement and technological skills. Two colleges, one school, and ten departments employ 120 faculty members to serve approximately 2,800 students by providing a variety of academic offerings that are geared toward today’s employment market.

The University offers thirty (30) undergraduate majors and is accredited by the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools to award the Associate, Bachelor's and Master's degrees. Three of its academic programs also have national accreditation. The Shaw Divinity School is one of only a handful of divinity schools in the state of North Carolina to earn full accreditation from the Association of Theological Schools (ATS) in the United States. The kinesiotherapy program is accredited by the American Kinesiotherapy Association and the teacher education program is accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. The latter program is also approved by the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction. The University’s science program attracts funding from major donors interested in increasing the number of minority students in scientific research.

In addition to its emphasis on teaching, Shaw University stresses character development, which includes religious, cultural, social, and ethical values.

Shaw University is one of the nation's 103 mission-based, equal educational opportunity institutions federally designated as Historically Black Colleges or Universities (HBCUs).

HBCUs, as a class of diverse institutions, were established in America in the mid-1800s to welcome, nurture, and develop the progeny of the slave system. Unlike nearly all other American colleges and universities, however, from their inception, HBCUs have been open to students, faculty, and administrators of all races, colors, creeds, ethnicities, religions and both genders, except in student bodies of institutions whose expressed mission was to provide education to exclusively males or females. HBCUs have, through the years, collectively offered academic and employment opportunities and attendant benefits and privileges to all without regard to non *bona fide* criteria or considerations, except where state law prohibited the same. They have been and to this day, are menders and healers for wounded minds and restless souls. They have produced, and continue to produce, sterling talent that has benefited the Republic immeasurably, not only in material contribution, but also in intellectual, cultural, moral, and spiritual offerings. These institutions have backgrounds of perpetual service to all people, with missions and goals of making educational opportunities a reality rather than an empty expectation.<sup>[1]</sup> They are providing students with the intercultural, interpersonal, and political skills with which to compete and thrive in a diverse yet still Balkanized world.

America's black colleges and universities remain at the creative forefront of American education, offering the tools and skills necessary to prepare students to promote peace at home and abroad; secure our communities and our homeland; meet pressing global and community health care needs; and fight injustice with the power of ideas, and by closing the achievement gap and opening doors of opportunity to those who are ill-served by many of the systems in our communities and the nation. They are continuing to do more for students with fewer resources than any other higher education institutions.

Most HBCUs are the economic engines in their communities. According to a 2006 report by the National Center for Education Statistics, the short-term economic impact of HBCUs is \$10 billion. Short-term economic impact was defined in that report by the expenditures of the colleges and universities on salaries and other institutional expenditures, and the expenditures of undergraduate, graduate, and professional students attending the institution in the communities in which the institutions are located. This figure does not capture the vast other multipliers for out years.

In testimony before the National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education, April 3, 2009, in Atlanta, Georgia, on "Ending the Cradle to Prison Pipeline, Establishing a Cradle to

---

<sup>[1]</sup> Baskerville, Lezli, President & CEO, National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education (NAFEO) initially included these observations in Supreme Court briefs in The Regents of the University of California v. Allan Bakke (No. 76-811, October Term, 1976) and later in United Steel Workers of America, AFL-CIO, Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Corporation, United States Equal Employment Opportunity Commission v Brian Weber (Nos. 78-432, 78-435, 78-436, October Term 1978). They have been republished in several reports and publications since then with the author's permission.

College and Career Pathway,” Lynn Huntley, Esquire, President of the Southern Education Foundation (SEF), cited Department of Commerce data that also substantiate the major economic benefits provided by HBCUs to the communities and states in which they are located. Huntley noted that the economic impact of HBCUs “is evident not only in the job creation and community investment terms, but in upgrading the skills, earning potential, and taxpaying capacities of their students.” Huntley cited a US Department of Commerce study that found “The total employment impact of ...[101 HBCUs] included 180,142 total full and part-time jobs....To put that into perspective, the rolled-up employment impact of the nation’s HBCUs exceeds the 177,000 jobs at the Bank of America in 2006, which is the nation’s 23<sup>rd</sup> largest employer.”

HBCUs foster innovation, economic growth and social mobility for disproportionate percentages of low-income and middle-income students, and they remain the primary source of new knowledge that will fuel the nation’s economic engine in the future.

These richly diverse institutions, that are stimulating the economies in their service areas and producing excellent, diverse students in disproportionate numbers in the teaching profession as well as in other high need disciplines and growth disciplines (health, the sciences, engineering, technology), are provided voice with public and private policy makers and policy shapers across the country by the National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education (NAFEO).

NAFEO is the 501 (c ) (3) not-for-profit, national membership association of the diverse class of institutions known as HBCUs and the new Predominantly Black Institutions (PBIs) added to the constellation of American colleges and universities by the Higher Education Opportunity Act of 2008.

Founded in 1969, by a group of presidents of Historically Black Colleges and Universities, NAFEO is “the voice for blacks in higher education.” The association represents the presidents and chancellors of the nation’s black colleges and universities: public, private and land-grant, two-year, four-year, graduate and professional, historically and predominantly black colleges and universities in 35 states, the District of Columbia and the Virgin Islands, and the 500,000 students, 53,000 faculty and five million alumni represented by NAFEO member institutions

The 39 private black colleges and universities that belong to UNCF are members of NAFEO, including Shaw University and Saint Augustine’s College, the other HBCU located in Raleigh, North Carolina, as well as Bennett College, Johnson C. Smith University, and Livingstone College, the other accredited private HBCUs located in North Carolina. Elizabeth City State University, Fayetteville State University, North Carolina A & T State University, and Winston Salem State University, North Carolina’s public HBCUs, are among the 47 public colleges and universities that belong to the Thurgood Marshall College Fund, and are also NAFEO member institutions. The NAFEO membership also includes the 18 HBCU land-grant universities, black two-year institution that belong to the American Association of Community Colleges and other equal educational opportunity institutions that belong to the new class of Predominantly Black Institutions (PBIs).

NAFEO was founded to provide an international voice for the nation’s HBCUs; to place and maintain the issue of equal opportunity in higher education on the national agenda; to advocate

policies, programs and practices designed to preserve and enhance HBCUs; and to increase the active participation of blacks at every level in the formulation and implementation of policies and programs in American higher education.

### **HBCU Championship of Inclusion of Higher Education Institutions in Recovery Act**

Having established the reason and context for my appearance before you today, I thank you Chairman Miller and Members of this Oversight and Investigations Committee for holding this important hearing. Your examination of how different groups are faring in accessing and using Recovery Act funds at this juncture is especially important because it gives Congress time before all of the Recovery Act funds are disbursed, to make recommendations for any adjustments that may be suggested by what you learn from these hearings and your other investigative and oversight work.

Shaw University and NAFEO were pleased to be among the early champions of the inclusion of America's colleges and universities in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. Speaking before four Presidential Transition Team work groups on behalf of HBCUs and PBIs, NAFEO President Lezli Baskerville talked about the immediate research and infrastructure needs of disproportionate numbers of HBCUs and PBIs that reported deferred maintenance needs in the billions of dollars, and that had large numbers of shovel-ready infrastructure projects, campus greening and sustainability projects. NAFEO proposed the establishment of a higher education infrastructure initiative to support campus infrastructure projects that would provide jobs immediately, strengthen the academic capacity of colleges and universities, and stimulate the economy of the service areas of the colleges and universities.

In making the case to Members of Congress and the Presidential Transition Team for the proposed HBCU infrastructure grant program, and for additional research dollars, NAFEO made a clear and compelling nexus between the strengthening of HBCUs and stimulating the economy. Among other things, we cited findings from NAFEO's signature publications, The State of America's Black Colleges: Expanding Access, Ensuring Success, Promoting Global Competitiveness (Beckham Publications Group, 2008) and The State of Blacks in Higher Education (Beckham Publications Group, 2009) - copies of which have been provided to every member of this committee. These publications respectively describe the strengths, accomplishments, challenges and promise of HBCUs, and make a compelling economic case for additional investments in HBCUs. They document the tremendous progress that blacks have made in attaining college degrees, disproportionate percentages of whom receive degrees in high need and growth fields from HBCUs. The State of Blacks in Higher Education notes, for example, that HBCUs lead the nation in awarding degrees in the sciences, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM): From 1996-2005, HBCUs accounted for 7 of the top 10 institutions awarding life and medical science degrees to black women and 9 of the top 10 institutions awarding life and medical science degrees to black men. In 2006, 18% of all black Ph.D.s in the life sciences received their bachelor's degrees from HBCUs. We argued additionally that given that HBCUs compose roughly 3% of all institutions, they are doing a disproportionate share of the work in preparing black students for positions and research in the sciences. They must be afforded an adequate level of public funding to shore up their

laboratories, other facilities, and their infrastructures to enable them to continue their great work and keep pace with increasing demands.

The fact that an increasing number of students in the traditional age group of 18-24 years old seek to finish a degree or to learn new skills when the economy stumbles; because an increasing number of persons in the workforce are expected to return to colleges and universities to retool during these austere times, and large numbers of Veterans will be returning to the civilian workforce and look to our colleges and universities to assist in transferring military skills to the civilian labor force as well as learning new skills; and because the cost of a private HBCU is \$10,000 less than its traditionally white counterpart on average, according to The College Board's "Cost of College" report, enrollments are likely to surge at HBCUs in the coming months. Our institutions must be prepared.

For all of the above reasons, NAFEO appealed to Congress as it was acting to shore up our economy and stimulate future prosperity and productivity, to include America's colleges and universities in the plan, especially HBCUs, PBIs, and other Minority-Serving Institutions (MSIs).

We appealed for support for TRIO and GEAR UP programs-- pipeline and retention programs for many of our students. We urged an increase in the Pell maximum, a refundable education tax credit, to assist students during this economic downturn, and an increase in work-study dollars. Along with the Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities (HACU), we appealed for support for the Minority-Serving Institutions Digital and Wireless Technology Opportunity Act of 2008, enacted by the 110<sup>th</sup> Congress in the Higher Education Opportunity Act.

Recognizing the importance of science and research to promoting short- and long-term economic growth, we urged support for increased funding for science and technology programs targeted at HBCUs, MSIs, low-income, first generation, traditionally underserved students, including the Course, Curriculum, and Laboratory Improvement (CCLI) Program at the National Science Foundation, and an NSF instrumentation acquisition focused on education in the STEM areas, and other targeted stimulus programs.

We worked indefatigably to include a separate line item for educational infrastructure and within that provision, for an infrastructure program for HBCUs that would provide funding to be distributed within 90-days to public and private, two-year and four-year, non-profit institutions of higher education to support "shovel ready" projects to modernize, renovate, repair or construct academic and research facilities and student housing; and for campus greening and sustainability projects. We additionally sought funding for the HBCU Historic Preservation program, administered by the Department of Interior, and for the suspension of the matching funds requirement for that program. We submitted to Members of Congress and the Administration documentation that the HBCU community has hundreds of millions of dollars of infrastructure, greening, and historic preservation projects ready to go, "but for" the funding.

The HBCU Community also sought funding in the stimulus bill for loan subsidies for the HBCU Capital Financing Program (Title III, Part D of the Higher Education Act) that would allow the

Secretary of Education and the Secretary of the Treasury to guarantee an additional \$61 million in loans, including those in the pipeline for FY 2009.

As with all education and legislative processes, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, as passed, included some of the priorities of the HBCU and PBI communities and not others. We were pleased to get HBCU “Recovery Act” Preservation Grants that included the suspension of the funding matching requirement; a \$500 increase in the Pell Grant maximum; funds for higher education institution modernization, renovation, repair of facilities used for instruction, research, student housing, for both public and private college facilities (the letter in the State Fiscal Stabilization Funds for Government Services in DOEd). We were also pleased to have included in the Recovery Act funds for a number of new or enhanced targeted health, math, science, engineering, and teacher preparation programs.

### **HBCU Skepticism About The Award of Recovery Funds Through States**

NAFEO underscored that including HBCUs and PBIs in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act *could* assist HBCUs and MSIs to become equipped to play a central and vital role in stimulating the economy, putting our nation on the path to economic prosperity and returning it to global eminence. We admonished, however, that many in the HBCU community were concerned that if the Recovery Act funds were administered by the states, HBCUs and other institutions and communities of least advantage, that have historically been ill- or under-served by their states, might not fare well in accessing the Recovery dollars. We argued:

“...that the higher education programs not be funded through the states. HBCUs and other institutions and programs serving disproportionately large percentages of low income, first generation, traditionally underserved populations historically and to this day have not fared well in receiving a fair share of public dollars distributed through the sovereign states. In the context of the economic stimulus bill, grants to the states for the benefit of HBCU/MSIs are unnecessary and they introduce a level of bureaucratic decision-making that is unlikely to serve the best interests of our institutions. Existing federal programs can be used to provide funds to HBCUs and to MSIs. We urge you to adopt this approach in your bill. HACU shares our view that this would be in the best interest of the HBCU and MSI communities...”

With funding in the final bill provided through the states, and with no separate line item for educational infrastructures, (although stabilization funds could be used for higher education infrastructure needs), we worked to assist in shaping the report language, procedures and regulations for accessing the Recovery funds that would flow through the states. We urged specifying that in distributing funds the governor shall allocate all funds between public and private higher education institutions, giving priority to those institutions that educate disproportionate percentages of low-income, first generation, traditionally underserved students; those which the have the smallest endowments; and those located in geographic areas of highest distress.

### **HBCU Challenges and Successes Accessing Recovery Act Resources**

With the initial phases of the work of Congress completed on the Recovery Act, the legislation stated that the goals of the Recovery Act as passed include, "... to provide investments needed to increase economic efficiency by spurring technological advances in science and health." The HBCU Community has at all times suggested that one critical measure of success in achieving this goal is the extent to which HBCUs, MSIs, and other under-resourced institutions that are preparing disproportionate percentages of the growing populations in the labor force are able to access Recovery funds, to make improvements to their infrastructures and enhance and expand research capabilities.

With this in mind, I would now like to share with you some of the challenges that Shaw University has experienced in seeking to access Recovery Act funds. While I will refer to specific instances at Shaw University, I can assure you that private institutions, HBCUs, MSIs, and PBIs around the nation have had similar experiences in trying to access these funds.

One of the largest challenges facing Shaw, or any private institution in North Carolina, is the lack of a mechanism for independent institutions to receive funds through the Recovery Act. The state of North Carolina, thus far, has limited funding to state institutions and state agencies, leaving Shaw University and many others unable to receive even the slightest assistance from these funds. Moreover, it is not clear at this point whether private and independent colleges will be able to participate in any meaningful way in the Stimulus Funding that has been made available to the state.

In reaching out to federal institutions in order to seek assistance from Recovery Act funding, Shaw has continuously been met with uncertainty on the part of the agencies as to a process or procedure to direct these monies to private institutions. In addition, many agencies impose time constraints that make those funds all but inaccessible to such institutions.

One instance of this is the requirement that funds be spent within a certain amount of time after receiving them, or even after applying for them. For many private institutions of higher learning it is nearly impossible to get the three estimates on each portion of the job as required by federal law, sign the contracts, and schedule construction or other work before the time limit has expired.

All of these challenges are made more frustrating by the fact that many of the institutions seeking these funds are not planning to use them to begin a new program, but to take a heretofore isolated program and expand it to improve infrastructure, and vastly improve academic programs by institutionalizing them so they can be studied more extensively and more inclusively than the current arrangement allows.

For instance, Shaw University has a history of success in developing programs through federal grants. In particular, Shaw University has pioneered in the research of photovoltaic/solar energy and in the production of bio-diesel fuel. Our work in the area of photovoltaic/solar energy has been funded by a Department of Defense contract, which was awarded to the University to develop third-generation photo cells for military drones. This contract, however, allows only

enough funds to complete the specific project, and not enough to integrate ongoing study or future development into our science curriculum.

Additional funds would allow Shaw to take these findings and developments and create a solar energy infrastructure on its main campus that would all but nullify the need for external power sources. This would save the institution a great deal of money and possibly generate revenue by selling excess energy to the local power companies. Just as importantly, it would provide instructional opportunities for students throughout our math and sciences programs to help design, implement, monitor, and study a working solar plant of a significant size.

Obviously, with the growth of Green Energy technology throughout the nation and the world, this educational experience would afford our students a remarkable head start on a new career, and set the stage for powerful advancements in the field in the years to come.

Another example is the University's bio-diesel project funded by the National Science Foundation. This program has received over 2.5 million dollars in NSF funding not tied to the Recovery Act. It is beginning to produce results that could revolutionize the energy industry and the farming industry, while helping to economically revitalize Bertie County.

Currently, farmers in Bertie County, a county that has been economically depressed for generations, are being paid out of the grant to grow canola plants. These plants can be used to manufacture canola oil, a healthy cooking oil. Currently, 90% of all canola oil consumed in the United States is imported from Canada.

Even more importantly for this nation's environmental, economic, and energy production future, these crops have been converted into a bio-diesel fuel that is currently being used to power cars and, quite cost-effectively, some Bertie County school buses. This fuel could one day power a large energy production plant. In fact, it is Shaw University's intention to expand this program in order to create the first zero-waste power plant in the state of North Carolina.

This means that farmers who had formerly been totally dependent, for example, on tobacco, cotton, and peanut farming in order to make a scant living, can possibly grow a new cash crop, and play an important role in energy production.

But the program does not end there. This project has also begun to look into the use of bio-waste for energy purposes, and is reaching out to many of the same farmers, as well as expanding to involve other farmers in the Roanoke/Chowan region of the state, to identify possible waste streams and begin to look at new ways to use these materials for energy production.

For example, chicken waste is a known carcinogen and an environmental hazard. Our project is researching ways to convert 95% of this material for energy production, thus all-but-negating the cancer risk, and vastly reducing its adverse environmental impact.

This program is exactly the type of program the federal government appears interested in funding, and it has had successes well worth the investment made by the government. Recovery Act funds, if accessible to Shaw University, would allow us to expand the program. We could

involve more farmers, create more renewable energy, and make new strides in developing bio-waste applications. In addition, we could partner with the agricultural high school in the county to improve their access to the project for study, enable more Shaw students to have hands on experiences, and improve the distance education facilities of our satellite campus in Bertie County.

In addition, our Institute for Health, Social, and Community Research could connect to the bio-diesel fuel project in order to study the health challenges and needs of minority and impoverished farm communities. This research could help to identify and address some of their particular concerns. In addition to addressing the need for better diagnosis, treatment, and care of diseases such as hypertension, diabetes, etc., the IHSCR could also explore the unique health needs of the farming community, such as the one in Bertie County, including possible environmental factors that could be creating health issues.

Many institutions are not asking to start programs, but merely to expand and institutionalize them. Without access to these, or other similar, funds, these projects could grow, blossom, and then run the very serious risk of dying on the vine.

Other institutions in the HBCU community have experienced similar challenges to accessing the Recovery Act funds. In the few days since we received the invitation to appear and testify this afternoon, we learned from NAFEO members that, because of the 90-day expenditure requirement, in order to learn about the funding opportunities and respond in a timely manner, institutions have had to reassign staff members so that one person monitors multiple websites several times, weekly. For many member institutions, including Shaw, the economic downturn has forced layoffs of many staff, meaning that there is no one to track down funding opportunities, so these resources prove to be unavailable to them.

Because of the tremendous needs and breadth and scope of disciplines spanning many federal and state agencies, staff with a clear understanding of the mission and priorities of the colleges and universities, and ideally with expertise in institutional advancement and government relations must monitor their state website and multiple websites of federal agencies. They report that the state stimulus accountability websites and [www.Recovery.gov](http://www.Recovery.gov) website are helpful. Our members have found very useful the regional briefings provided by NAFEO, UNCF, TMCF, and the White House Initiative on HBCUs, none of which would have been effective without close collaboration with frontline administrators in a wide range of federal agencies and their regional colleagues.

Our members report challenges in communicating with the states because, in many instances, there is only website access or access to information through the respective congressional districts, all of which are overwhelmed by the volume of activity in the abbreviated timeframe. Without sufficient staff persons to assign a full- or even majority-time staff member to the function of reviewing information on the various websites and culling from the information sufficient details to make a recommendation as to whether their institution is eligible to participate and if the solicitation is aligned with the priorities of the institution, several NAFEO members reported missing funding opportunities. Our members are relying on our membership services associations to augment the work of our staffs in tracking and reviewing Recovery Act opportunities. These include not only NAFEO, UNCF, and TMCF, but also CIC, NAICU,

NASULGC, and ACC, each of which was reported as being helpful by one or more NAFEO members. Several noted that their congressional offices and the websites and newsletters of their Members are helpful.

Some members who are able to track and identify opportunities online or through other channels in time to make use of them reported other barriers to participation, including the short turnaround time between the posting of the opportunity and the required submission of the proposal. A common concern was the lack of adequate time to prepare competitive submissions. Those colleges and universities in which the personnel in the Office of Sponsored Programs “wear several other hats,” as is true in most HBCUs, are at a particular disadvantage in this accelerated information dissemination/gathering and grant-making process.

The gravest concerns appear to be related to the processes by which some states are notifying constituent institutions about the opportunities. Many report that the traditional notification and publication requirements appear to have been dispensed with or abbreviated in an effort to move resources rapidly. This truncated process could only be equitable in this economic crisis if there were a concurrent affirmative outreach and notification requirement to those communities and institutions in targeted stimulus communities, including communities of highest distress and institutions that serve disproportionate percentages of people from distressed districts.

We received a report from the State of Arkansas that one NAFEO member institution was included in the state’s plan because a member of the board happened to be in the governor’s mansion at the time the finishing touches were being added to the plan. Another, which has fared especially well in recent years in strengthening the institution and its service area and garnering both public and private resources, was not aware of the time or process for decision making. In Mississippi, one institution was incorrectly informed that as a private institution, it did not qualify for any state Recovery funds. The Department of Education’s website clearly indicates that under the State Fiscal Stabilization Funds for Government Services provision, modernization, renovation and repair funds are available for both public and private college facilities.

One university that has adequate staff to be positioned well in this process, and which prepared 25 submissions for funds under the Recovery Act, has made no headway at the federal or state level, despite being vigilant, and maintaining continuous connections via telephone, e-mail, and pounding the pavement.

One of the large, two-year public college systems reported faring well in accessing Recovery dollars. They received \$1.5 million for a seven-week summer program to train WEA certified, inner city youth ages 19-24 years old, for jobs the city needs to fill immediately. While training, the students will work on the campuses in positions not covered by union agreement. The students will earn between \$9 and \$12 dollars per hour. This system was also included in the Community Development Dislocated Worker plan. Even in this instance, concern was raised about the level of bureaucracy as a barrier to securing the grant. The institution had to seek inclusion at the state level, in the city plan, and in the plan of the workforce board to ultimately access the resources.

In the two days provided us to gather information from our members for this hearing, we received no reports about efforts to access NSF funds. We anticipate forthcoming reports that we will forward to the Subcommittee. The National Science Foundation (NSF) has a long history of making limited awards of research, facilities and program dollars to HBCUs. For example, according to data from NSF, six of the top 20 predominantly white universities received more federal funds for research than 79 HBCUs combined. (Richard J. Bennof, "FY2005 Federal S&E Obligations Reach Over 2,400 Academic and Nonprofit Institutions; Data Presented on Minority-Serving Institutions," National Science Foundation NSF 07-326 (revised), Directorate for Social, Behavioral, and Economic Sciences, October 2007).

The NSF report shows that despite a clear and quantifiable record of success at educating African American scientists and engineers, HBCUs continue to receive disproportionately fewer federal dollars. The data show that among public four-year colleges, 31.1% of black students are majoring in engineering or science compared to 25.9% at non-MSIs. At private not-for-profit four-year colleges, 27% of black students at HBCUs major in engineering and science compared to 20.8 % at non-minority-serving institutions. (William E. Spriggs, "*Major Trends Facing Historically Black Colleges and Universities*" in The State of America's Black Colleges (NAFEO, 2008. Beckham Publications Group, p.2). The data also demonstrate that roughly 50% of black students who receive a four-year degree in the natural and physical sciences, do so from an HBCU. The State of Blacks in Higher Education (NAFEO 2009, Beckham Publications Group, p. vii).

We are eager, therefore, to determine how HBCUs fared at accessing NSF funds for research grants. While we had no member reports at the time we submitted this testimony, NAFEO was disappointed to learn from a review of the NSF Website that while NSF will receive an additional \$2 billion for Research and Related Activities, the Foundation plans to primarily fund proposals that are already in house. "[T]he Foundation does not anticipate a substantial increase in proposal submissions or requests to review proposals beyond what has already been put in place for FY 2009. "

Relative funding priorities, the NSF notes on its website, "Funding of new Principal Investigators and high-risk, high-return research will be top priorities. With the exception of the Academic Research Infrastructure Program, the Science Masters Program, and the Major Research Instrumentation Program, the majority of proposals eligible for Recovery Act funding include those that are already in-house and will be reviewed and/or awarded prior to September 30, 2009. NSF also will consider proposals declined on or after October 1, 2008." We hope that in spite of these public pronouncements, NSF will use some share of its additional funding to expand opportunities and funding to institutions like HBCUs, that can serve as incubators for research on eliminating all of the major disparities in this nation in order to restore it national eminence. These institutions have also developed models of excellence in health and wellness, greening and sustainability, teacher preparation, and in so many other fields that are central to stimulating our economy and strengthening our communities.

We urge and encourage NSF to set aside some of its Recovery funds for science instruction instrumentation purposes at HBCUs. This proposal was advanced by Congresswoman Eddie Bernice Johnson as an amendments to the American Recovery and Revitalization Act of 2009. It

would have been inestimably helpful to HBCUs, many of which are not major research institutions, but which, nonetheless, prepare disproportionate numbers of African American students to pursue advanced and terminal degrees in the sciences, technology, engineering and mathematics. These funds would permit HBCUs to purchase sorely needed science instrumentation for instruction, not research.

We eagerly await the results of the solicitations under the NSF Math and Science Partnership Program. NSF Targeted Partnerships seek to improve student achievement in math or the sciences. Its Institute Partnerships seek to meet the national needs for “teachers who have deep knowledge of disciplinary content and are school-based intellectual leaders in mathematics and science.” Given the record of HBCUs in preparing disproportionate numbers of diverse students in math and the sciences, and its record of graduating 50% of African American teachers, we anticipate that our members will fare well in this competition.

NSF funds are especially important to HBCUs to assist them to continue to attract, retain, adequately train, and graduate highly talented students in the growth and high need disciplines.

HBCUs also have special interests and capabilities in securing their communities and our Homeland; greening their campuses and communities; championing resource management and conservation; promoting energy conservation, energy efficiency and renewable energy and the range of issues relating to the sustainability of our campuses, communities and our planet. We would like to be a good and long-term partner with the federal government, the states and our service communities in these regards. We have the will and many of our institutions are today poised to lead in some of these efforts. We need adequate resources.

## **Recommendations**

To provide HBCUs a better opportunity of accessing the Recovery Act dollars they need to make the investments in their infrastructures and research capabilities, and to better position these equal educational opportunity institutions that are serving disproportionate percentages of the growing populations of the states to better meet the education, training, economic, research, civic, social, ecumenical, health and human services needs of the communities in which they are located, we propose the following:

1. Because large numbers of HBCUs and MSIs may not be able to participate fully in playing their important role in stimulating the economy and preparing the next cohort of scientists, teachers, health professionals, engineers and others using the state funding processes, we recommend requiring federal agencies to set aside funding for the nation’s historically black colleges and universities and other minority-serving institutions and provide Recovery funds for these institutions and their constituents directly to eligible institutions via programs already authorized by Congress to benefit these institutions and the communities they serve;
2. Require federal agencies to encourage and reward states that establish a goal of including HBCUs, MSIs and other institutions of higher learning that educate disproportionate

percentages of low-income, first generation, traditionally underserved students, and students that are underrepresented in high need and growth industries in the states and the nation in their Recovery activity;

3. Because the federal agencies over which this Committee has jurisdiction (NSF, the Department of Energy, Environmental Protection Agency, NASA, Homeland Security, Federal Aviation Administration, Federal Emergency Management Agency, and National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration) are central to the scientific and technological advancement of this nation, and because some of the agencies have an especially poor record of supporting HBCUs and MSIs, require these agencies establish goals and take affirmative outreach actions to include HBCUs, PBIs, HSIs, TCUs and other MSIs among grantees, contractors, and partners for the important stimulus and recovery work, and the long-term work of these agencies.

The above are just a few recommendations. We welcome the opportunity to continue dialogue with Members of this Committee and your Committee staffers about other ideas and ways in which we can be of assistance to you.

Mr. Chairman and members of this Subcommittee, I thank you once again for hosting this important hearing and for inviting me to participate. I hope that my comments today, and my written testimony, provide you a snapshot of some of the challenges incurred and opportunities created for Shaw University and other HBCUs as the result of passage of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. I hope that I was also able to put in clearer perspective for some members of the Committee and to underscore for others the vitally important role of HBCUs in shoring up the economy, stimulating future prosperity and productivity, returning the nation to eminence and achieving the national goal of having 60% of Americans hold a two- or four-year degree by 2020.

---