

tracts and to semi-autonomous agencies such as the present research and development centers.

A third procedural problem which we have faced now twice in our brief existence is USOE's inability or unwillingness to provide in its contracts or grants more than twelve, or perhaps fifteen, months of funding. I have already mentioned our puzzlement over this situation. However, you should know that in our judgement, in order to get the best possible staff members for our various programs and projects, we have to offer two, three, or even five years of employment to various individuals. This offer of several years of employment, instead of just one, has enabled us to secure almost all of the particular staff members we have wished to add. But the resulting multi-year appointments are figurative nooses around the Dean's neck, nooses which twitch perceptibly each year around budget-negotiating time. In other words, the Dean has a two or three or five year commitment to numerous individuals, but has the wherewithall to pay them for only one year. We do not think this is a healthy situation.

Finally, I want to mention that the "time and effort reports", which the Bureau of the Budget is insisting be submitted in connection with *all* Government contracts, have made us, too, extremely nervous. These reports must have been designed by people who have no conception of academic affairs. However, in discussing this issue I am considerably over my head, and would defer to other persons who have already testified before you, or who would be eager to do so if invited.

The results of these particular problems are three-fold. First, I suspect that we take a partially unjustified and undesirable "dog-in-the-manger" attitude towards certain USOE policies and requirements, on many occasions. Since we are unable to talk frequently to the policy makers and since we do not presume always to understand what they have in mind, we tend, like most Americans, to think the worst of the bureaucrats, and our relations with them suffer. Second, we seem to be involved in an awful lot of paperwork, not as much as some of us feared, but still an amount which could be pared. Finally, we are in *serious danger* of losing our most valuable staff members, and prospective staff members, to other forms of Government support, and to foundation-sponsored research, which do not burden them with the variety of general threats and petty annoyances which I have mentioned. This potential loss of top men, whom we at Harvard see as our partial responsibility to attract to the study of education, is the problem which concerns us most at present.

(The following is the article referred to in Mr. Herzog's statement:)

THE NATIONAL PROGRAM OF EDUCATIONAL LABORATORIES

By Hendrik D. Gideonse*

A team of researchers, having completed their experimental efforts to introduce and sustain change in a school setting, dropped in on the principal to express their thanks.

"Oh, not at all," he said. "Please feel free to come back anytime. Why, it's hard to believe that you've been working here at all. We've hardly noticed your presence!"

The tale is not apocryphal, and though it provided a note of humor in a research summary (goodness knows, such notes are rare enough), the conversation also confirmed the team's intention to try the whole project over again, basing the new attempt on knowledge gained from the initial failure.

The story illustrates in bold relief a peculiar difficulty which has long confronted us. *Extremely little of what has been discovered in educational research has ever been made operational.*

In a sense this problem is part of a larger one, namely, the inability of American education to adapt quickly and in an orderly way to the changing

*Mr. Gideonse (Iota 1049) is program development adviser, Bureau of Research, USOE, in which the new Division of Laboratories and Research Development is located. Interested persons may write for the division's "Guidelines for a National Program of Educational Laboratories."