

The U.S. Government has, through recent congressional action, taken steps to satisfy one of the most pressing needs of this Nation. The massive support to education in general and to higher education in particular, which has been approved in recent legislative sessions, is a bold and dramatic response. The extension of support under the Higher Education Act of 1965, the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, and other legislation aiding both private and public institutions of higher learning, is significant recognition of an important partnership which has existed and which must continue to exist.

In the processing of our applications under the various programs and in subsequent contact during their operation, our experiences with the U.S. Office of Education, in both the national and local offices, have been extremely positive. The administrators in these offices have gone out of their way to recognize our strengths, to understand our problems, and to give us every help within the provisions of the law.

We are impressed with the burden which has been thrust upon the U.S. Office of Education, particularly its national office, with the responsibility of administering a wide variety of new programs under multiple legislation. We offer the suggestion that increased decentralization of authority and the assignment of greater decisionmaking power to the regional offices might provide a way of relieving the burden in Washington. The regional offices, which are well acquainted with the educational panorama in their areas, are in a position to become familiar with the resources of the institutions with which they deal.

Although Roosevelt University is only 21 years old and has a relatively small endowment, it is an institution which is interested in performing its share of public service responsibilities as well as in teaching. Other institutions in the metropolitan area look to Roosevelt University to help provide services in the public interest. We are, because of our location and tradition, willing and prepared to render such services. We welcome those aspects of Federal legislation which will help us perform these tasks.

Nevertheless, we have come to recognize that when we undertake service programs where the total cost of such programs is not provided for, we must divert some of our resources from areas such as our regular teaching program in which they might otherwise have been allocated.

Although the principle of requiring institutions to provide matching funds for Federal grants appears to be sound for an individual program, the total effect on an institution which wants to engage in a variety of programs is burdensome. Congress, in utilizing the principle of matching grants, may have unintentionally created a situation where public institutions with access to State funds and heavily endowed private institutions are able to participate in, and take advantage of, a wide variety of programs that they might otherwise have undertaken at a much higher cost to them.

Private institutions that are less heavily endowed find their resources stretched even further than in the past and, in comparison with the older and wealthier institutions, may be falling further behind in meeting their educational responsibilities. Therefore, we