

No. 1 is a list of these 20 programs providing financial benefits for students in specialized categories such as war orphans or social security dependents. However, needy students in accredited proprietary schools are currently ineligible to participate in the three major programs designed for needy students; namely, national defense student loans, educational opportunity grants, and work-study programs, which up to this time have not been made available to our accredited students.

The only broad-based across-the-board program for which they are eligible today is the guaranteed loan program. It should be noted, however, that the guaranteed loan program, as Commissioner Howe pointed out in these current hearings to this subcommittee, is designed "to assist middle-income families" who have bank credit. Students enrolled in accredited proprietary business, trade, and technical schools come predominantly from families of a lower income socioeconomic background.

Thus they continue to be excluded from the very programs which are designed to help students in need. They only have access to the guaranteed loan program which is admittedly designed to help middle-class students.

Our statement in this series of hearings is rather short because of the detailed testimony presented to the subcommittee last year on H.R. 6232 and H.R. 6265. It begins at page 245 of the hearings of April 27, 1967. We pointed out that there are some students, a small percentage of the total student population, who feel they are better served by getting an education in their community at an accredited proprietary school. The present exclusionary language of the educational opportunity grants, national defense student loans and work-study programs denies these needy students from getting the aid which they need to further their education.

We recognize the difficulty in trying to describe the merit of the programs offered in independent accredited proprietary schools and the special needs which they meet without appearing to challenge the predominant and overriding role of the public vocational institutions. But some students do choose these independent schools for a variety of good reasons and with satisfactory results. Historically these schools have been a small but important complement and supplement to the mainstream of educational effort. We think they will continue to make this contribution in such a role.

Attached as exhibit 2 is a reprint from the April 1967 issue of the USOE publication *American Education* that discusses why some students choose proprietary schools and quotes some student answers. The article also refers to a report of research financed by the Office of Education with the Stanford Research Institute which discusses proprietary school operations. An excerpt from that SRI report is attached as exhibit No. 3.

I would like to make it very clear that we are not asking this committee to make a value judgment or a choice between the relative merits of independent versus public education. All we are asking is that you open up an additional avenue of opportunity for some needy students who, from our experience, we know can be well served in accredited proprietary schools.