

OE position

As proposed in H.R. 15067, the Educational Opportunity Act of 1968, there is no requirement that institutions match educational opportunity grants. See excerpt from H.R. 15067, below:

"EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY GRANTS

"SEC. 404. (a) An institution of higher education, in accordance with its agreement under this part, may award educational opportunity grants to undergraduate students under which the institution shall pay to any such student not to exceed \$1,000 for each academic year over which such grant, as provided by subsection (b), shall extend. The Commissioner shall, subject to the foregoing limitation, prescribe for the guidance of participating institutions basic criteria or schedules (or both) for the determination of the amount of any such educational opportunity grant, taking into account the objective of limiting grant aid under this part to students of exceptional financial need and such other factors, including the number of dependents in the family as the Commissioner may deem relevant. The Commissioner may also prescribe a minimum amount payable for any academic year under any such grant."

20. *Five procedural changes should be effected to standardize forms and policies within the States, make proceeds of loans payable in two installments per year, have proceeds sent to students in care of their institution, and so forth.* (See ch. VIII, p. 42.)

OE position

(a) The Office of Education agrees with the recommendation that the proceeds of the loan should be sent to the student in care of the educational institution. We do not believe that the lending institutions should be forced to do this, but we will strongly recommend that they follow this procedure.

(b) We believe that the recommendation for loan disbursement in two payments should also be left to the opinion of the lenders and the guarantee agencies. Multiple disbursements not only increase the costs to the lender, but also increase the paperwork for all parties concerned.

(c) The Office of Education has and will continue to make every attempt to work toward standardization. Last year, for example, we made efforts to standardize inclusion of form 1070 in all State applications.

(d) The recommendation to supply education institutions with forms that students might fill out and submit to lending institutions is not practicable as long as we have many varied forms among the State agencies. We agree that it would be a tremendous job for any educational institution to try to stock all of the various forms necessary to serve its students. But as we indicated in the above recommendation, this is an especially difficult area to coordinate.

The Office of Education would prefer to have one uniform application and guarantee form, but as long as the programs are State oriented, we cannot specify the information a State form must contain.

(e) The Office of Education is currently sending to all educational institutions, student confirmation reports. The information from these reports will be supplied to all lending institutions. We are also willing to make this information available to any guarantee agency, which should eliminate the necessity for the State agency to request identical information from the schools.

21. *The proposed merger of the vocational student loan program with the guaranteed loan program should be enacted.* (See ch. VIII, p. 48.)

OE position

The Office of Education concurs, as is recommended in H.R. 15067:

"MERGER OF NATIONAL VOCATIONAL STUDENT LOAN INSURANCE ACT OF 1965 WITH LOW-INTEREST INSURED LOAN PROGRAM OF HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

"SEC. 430. (a) (1) Paragraph (a) of section 435 of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended by this Act, is further amended (A) by striking out 'eligible institution' means an educational institution' in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof 'institution of higher education' means an education institution'; (B) by redesignating the paragraph as subparagraph (2) of paragraph (a) and clauses (1), (2), (3), (4), and (5), and subclauses (A) and (B) and