that these professional criteria are considered to be unimportant by the U.S. Office.

B. The U.S. Office would appear to be setting itself up as the developer of a "model" program which must be closely followed by any institution which wishes to be offered a contract for an NDEA institute. The publicly indicated deadline for the proposals this year was November 12, but long before this the Office of the Director of the Division of Educational Personnel Training was soliciting certain institutions for the submission of institute proposals, and was forwarding to these institutions a special set of guidelines. There was also developed a detailed description of the "right" kind of program, which was patterned after that developed by one of the directors of an NDEA institute. Such a procedure might raise some question about the sincerity of the U.S. Office in its stated concern with creativity and innovation, particularly since the professional reaction of counselor educators to this program ranged from all the way from "very good" to "so-so."

This, I might say, is a modest statement.

During this time it was very difficult to determine just what was happening in the U.S. Office, and various officials contacted gave vague "I can't speak to that," or "You'll have to talk to someone else," or "Things here are very confusing," answers. I could elaborate on this but modesty makes it impossible.

Among the institutions which were solicited were the University of Illinois, Michigan State University, and the University of Pittsburgh. On what I believe to be reputable authority, others which were solicited were Ohio University, Ohio State University, University of Michigan, and the University of Texas. There are, of course, others.

The proposal from Illinois was unacceptable to the U.S. Office, and since the university was unwilling to change it to the satisfaction of the U.S. Office officials, it was not, as of 2 days ago, I believe, offered a contract. All of this, again, was done in a highly secret manner, and as far as the general professional individual is concerned, the proposals, submitted up to November 12, are now being evaluated. We can assume, however, that many contracts have already been determined.

C. In keeping with the above, the new manual indicates that "The Office may * * * offer suggestions on how an institution might make a special contribution * * * the Office may take the initiative in approaching an institution."

This statement is being interpreted most liberally. These again are of course innocent statements but they seem to be interpreted liberally. The evidence at least raises this question: Are a few officials in the U.S. Office setting themselves up as the determiners of the criteria of quality in the education of school counselors? Are they, in effect, manipulating and controlling the professional direction of counseling and guidance by their use of Federal funds?

D. The NDEA institutes for the current year present a revealing picture which raises doubts as to the validity of the criteria used in evaluating institutes. It may be noted that in the whole North Atlantic area only one institution, the Universiy of Pittsburgh, was of-