

ingly arbitrary cutbacks in program proposals, without the benefits of professional understanding of the proposal which another branch of USOE could be expected to provide. That is, University faculty have respect for and reasonably clear communication with professional staff in USOE, but not with fiscal officers who may have final veto power over components of a program.

As long as good will prevails on both sides, these crises can be surmounted. However, if contracts are to be honored, they must be concluded at a reasonably early date with *all* parties to the contract fully informed.

Third, late decisions on proposals by USOE disrupt the planning of staff assignments. When proposals are made for programs 6 to 15 months ahead but for which final approval may not be forthcoming until a few months before the start of the program, major difficulties may be experienced in scheduling faculty assignments. Staff cannot easily be recruited at the last minute to replace faculty promised to new programs, yet the University is not in a position to stockpile extra faculty in anticipation of approval of programs.

In summary and conclusion, then, our experiences with USOE have generally been satisfactory in a partnership which has already demonstrated unquestioned values for the State of Maine. The following suggestions are made in recognition that USOE has experienced growing pains in recent years. Fundamentally, the irritations of our experience with the Office would be substantially reduced if Congress itself would provide more lead time for programs. It would assist the orderly process of education if the following suggestions could be adopted:

1. If USOE could approve two-year proposals, planning could be more efficient, staff assignments could be more certain, and a generally more orderly procedure could be followed. From the standpoint of the University manpower devoted to planning could be doubled if it were possible for each program to be funded for a two-year period since it requires no more of a man's time to plan and write a two-year program than a one-year program.

2. Negotiated changes in contracts, while discussed by phone, should be put in writing and approved by all parties before they become binding.

3. Common budget and accounting procedures should be adopted and followed by each agency of the government thus allowing greater efficiency of record keeping in the University business office.

4. Deadlines should be set by USOE to provide more time after receipt of guidelines for preparing proposals and more time for completing negotiations before the program must be operational.

Dr. Young. As you can see from the first page we are concerned with a number of titles. Mr. Grindle will talk about the financial aid for students. The treasurer of the university, Mr. Gordon is in the room in case there is some issue arising about the fiscal affairs.

In the first place, to our university and every State university, Federal money is very important for the continuation of education. We have had it for a long time. We expect to have it in the future.

However, the recent increase has been phenomenal and it has taken us a bit of time to adjust to make the most use of it, but we think it is very successful. These new programs have made a substantial contribution to the improvement of the university. They are helping us to accommodate more students. They are encouraging innovation in teacher education and methods, more graduate education. Our first graduate Ph. D. degree was granted less than a decade ago.

In addition to what we do on the campus we are able to reach out into the State to encourage more young people. We improved the qualifications of teachers in language, history, mathematics, to support education through ETV, and many other effects.

Naturally, certain problems have arisen in connection with these programs. I understand that your interest is with the legislation that might solve or alleviate some of these and therefore I will try to point to specific problem areas.