

they are doing so at the price of institutional autonomy and integrity. Across-the-board assistance to well-managed universities would enable such universities to get on with the task of problem-solving. At present, the best-managed university tends to be treated no differently than the worst.

Across-the-board assistance, based on some formula—per student, per semester-hour-generated, etc.—should not be used to replace existing income. A university receiving such support should have to demonstrate maintenance of effort. It should also have to demonstrate annually that the use to which it has put such support in some significant way contributes to meeting nationally recognized educational problems. But such a system would introduce a much-needed flexibility into federal aid to higher education. Institutions with different capacities and needs would develop different programs. A significant change in the present Procrustean Bed of federal aid would ensue.

In conclusion, it is worth repeating that the *U.S. Office of Education is serving the nation well*. The problems encountered by this University must be measured against the very real contribution which the USOE is making and which the University can make because of USOE assistance. It would be far better to retain all of the present system of federal assistance to higher education than to in any way diminish the level of such assistance because of inadequacies in the operation of the system. If we know anything, it is that we must know more about everything. The present system contributes effectively to that goal. We have no guarantee that any change in the system could do more.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Gentleman, if you can, try to summarize your statements. It would be helpful.

Mr. JOHNSON. I will not read the statement. I will comment very briefly about it, Mr. Chairman.

I am Eric Johnson, administrative vice president of Illinois State University located in Bloomington Normal, midway in Illinois from almost any direction, which I suspect is one of the emerging public universities and institutions. We have some 10,000 undergraduates students, with a sizable number of students in our laboratory schools.

We are one of those institutions that went through the phases of being a teachers' college and now a multipurpose institution offering degrees through the doctorate.

We, as other institutions of our type, are very deeply involved with Federal programs of one kind or another, and some listing is made of this in our statement and I will not repeat them here.

We would like to underscore one part of our statement by saying at the very beginning that without exception the officials of the U.S. Office of Education have extended services and assistance to the university far in excess of those required by law and regulations. Our relationships have been very good. We have always been able to secure assistance upon our asking for it, and we are very pleased with this relationship and looking forward to its continuation.

I would like to fairly well confine my remarks and explanations of our statement in one area. I suspect that most institutions of higher education are very much concerned with this matter of institutional autonomy, and I would suspect it underlies much of what all of us have to say about our attitudes toward and our relationships with Federal programs.

Without going into that further, let me say that our principal concern in working with the U.S. Office of Education has to do with the matter of the timing of grants and of loans.

Let me concentrate upon just one of those. We are principally concerned with the guaranteed loan program. Our reason for it is that