

enced teaching fellowships at the university or in New England but a prospective teacher fellowship program is being conducted and we are going ahead with that.

We received funds for audiovisual materials under title VI and we have other programs, education for the handicapped. Now relations with USOE have generally been satisfactory for these programs. There have been some understandable increase in problems of planning and negotiating contracts and I will comment on three of these.

First, too little time provided by USOE between the publication of guidelines and the deadline for proposals. The lack of leadtime between issuance of guidelines and deadlines for proposals is understandable in the first year of the program but not in subsequent years.

For example, prospective teacher proposal guidelines were received on January 28, 1966, for a February 25 deadline the first year of the program. But for the second year the guidelines were received on November 18 with a December 17 deadline. Proposals for interdepartmental and intercollege programs require involvement of many faculty and administrative personnel and planning. Unlike the research proposals developed by individual faculty members, proposals for complex programs for instruction require considerable time for communication in the planning process.

Second, a slowdown in the processing of contracts.

In the period between USOE announcement of an institute award and final contract arrangements, considerable negotiation is undertaken.

In recent years this negotiation has been by telephone with the director of the institute. Such negotiations have involved fiscal as well as curriculum matters. Yet the USOE has not obtained concurrence of the university financial officer in readjustments in a proposal he has already signed before incorporating these adjustments in a binding contract.

In other words, we sign a contract, a proposal, committing ourselves, it goes to Washington and at the last minute it is changed there without our official concurrence. In these negotiations at a date as late as April or May, such items as salaries, allowance for postage and support of activities in a summer institute starting in July have been questioned by USOE although the proposal may have been in their hands for many months.

Under these circumstances the original announcement that a university has an agreement to offer a program is premature. We understand why the announcements come from the Senator's office. It is a little embarrassing if we have not agreed to what is in the contract. We still take the money.

A further difficulty in contract negotiations has appeared as fiscal officers in USOE, unfamiliar with educational programs and process, have made seemingly 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 reasonable and clear communication with professional staff in USOE but not with fiscal officers who may have final veto power over components of the program.

May I interject here in addition to this statement that in my dealings, when I was at the University of Wisconsin, with AID we found the same problem over and over again. When I was an adviser to