

the judgment and integrity of aid officers and the colleges and universities. In both the College Work-Study Program and the Educational Opportunity Grant Program, the guide lines spell out operating procedures in such specific fashion as to make more difficult our job of effectively and efficiently administering these programs. In addition, the great quantity of information required both in the application procedure and later reporting procedures impose a heavy burden on aid offices without appearing to add anything to the effective operation of our program.

We are also concerned that the appropriation time table for these programs imposes severe budgeting, planning, and, in some cases, financial hardships on the institutions since most recruiting, admitting and awarding procedures are completed by the institutions by April 1 of the year in which the students enter college. This year our first indication of an approximate level of support was received in mid-May and was followed by notification of the continuing resolution providing for minimum support levels in mid-August. With the growing importance of these federally supported programs to increasing number of students, it is important that a means be found to move the appropriation time table forward to coincide with the college admission time table.

We are also concerned that the Guaranteed Loan Program be revised to bring a consistency of philosophy regarding financial need to this program, which will play a greater role in over-all student support in the future. The Guaranteed Loan Program must also be made more attractive to the banking community, if it is to achieve the wide-spread support needed to meet the demands which will be placed upon it.

At this point, let me ask my colleagues on the panel to elaborate on some changes which we feel necessary.

*Major student aid programs—Levels of activity 1966-67*

|                                          |           |
|------------------------------------------|-----------|
| Tufts University:                        |           |
| National Defense Education Act loan..... | \$380,000 |
| Economic opportunity grant.....          | 43,000    |
| College work-study program.....          | 274,000   |
| Northeastern University:                 |           |
| National Defense Education Act loan..... | 650,000   |
| Economic opportunity grant.....          | 353,000   |
| College work-study program.....          | 2,060,000 |
| University of Massachusetts:             |           |
| National Defense Education Act loan..... | 434,000   |
| Economic opportunity grant.....          | 235,000   |
| College work-study program.....          | 358,000   |
| Harvard University:                      |           |
| National Defense Education Act.....      | 1,300,000 |
| Economic opportunity grant.....          | 67,000    |
| College work-study program.....          | 500,000   |

Mr. KATES. At this time, I should like to introduce to you the following directors of financial aid: Mr. John Madigan, Boston College; Mr. Everett Hicks, Boston University; Miss Nancy McIntyre, Radcliffe College; Miss Jan Gebron, Regis College; Mr. Robert Caswell, assistant director, Northeastern University.

Mr. GIBBONS. We are glad to have their presence noted and we welcome them.

Mr. KATES. I would like to elaborate on one area and that is the problem caused by the funding process of the programs as opposed to our timetable in trying to get the student into college. The two are not tied together.

We are recruiting and talking with students and receiving their applications long before we have any idea of the commitment on the part of the Office of Education. These programs are essential to the students if they are going to attend.

In the case of this past year where we had a longer than usual process, we saw in our own institution a significant increase in the