

three years. Since it takes most students a minimum of four years to earn the Ph. D. degree, it would make sense to liberalize the number of awards that could be made to second year students. The likelihood that the student can successfully complete his graduate program can be judged much more reliably at this stage, and generally he still needs three more years of study.

A possible device for making more efficient use of the available funds might be to divide them among a number of one-year fellowships for first year students, and another, somewhat smaller number of two-year fellowships for those fellows who have given evidence in their first year that they are likely to complete successfully the balance of their Ph. D. studies.

Another area for improvement lies in the amount of the stipend. The stipends have been fixed for some years during which salaries in industry have increased substantially. Therefore, these fellowships no longer compete as well as they should and attract fewer college graduates into graduate study. Also, the fellowship stipends are determined by the number of years of fellowship tenure rather than graduate study. Thus, a second year graduate student who is in the first year of an NDEA fellowship receives a first, not second, year level stipend. It would be more equitable if the stipend were determined by his level of graduate study.

Illinois Institute of Technology is participating in several research and educational projects supported by the U.S. Office of Education. These programs cover an admirably large scope of activities. In general, we feel that there is an adequate range of programs available from which faculty can develop support for important experiments and research.

Without implying criticism, I should like to bring before this committee an area of concern which relates to institutions like the one I represent. It is generally known that those institutions which have established reputations for excellence and eminence have an advantage in the competition for program support. For struggling institutions, there is a most helpful provision under Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965. It almost seems as if those in the middle have the hardest time. I respectfully suggest that it would be appropriate to effect a wider distribution of support in order to assist those institutions which have shown intent, capability and promise to strive for academic excellence.

A further area of support by the Office of Education from which Illinois Institute of Technology has benefited is support for construction under the Higher Education Facilities Act. This program is of tremendous benefit to colleges and universities and addresses itself to one of the major limitations which institutions of higher education face in trying to meet the educational needs of society. Like the programs cited before, this activity is worthwhile and effective. There are, however, some problems of procedure and implementation. While I would accord an "A" to the personnel of the U.S. Office of Education and a high "B" to its program, the procedures of this agency would only earn a "C" in my classroom.

A building for which I have academic responsibility is being completed on our campus with the support of three federal grants. The proposals and reports to be submitted to the three agencies (Office of Education, National Institutes of Health, and National Science Foundation) are not only different in format and content but even require different breakdowns of comparable categories of information. The program under the Office of Education is locally supervised and administered by the local agency of the Department of Housing and Urban Development. This has caused many delays in processing.

A period of as long as a year may elapse from the time of approval of a grant until bids are received for contract. During this period of rising prices, most bids have exceeded budgeted expectations. There is no provision for a quick decision regarding reduction of the scale of the project when bids come in substantially in excess of available funds. Although the college may expend the full amount that it anticipated, and even more, the federal agency insists that it carry out the original project in complete detail. Most projects can proceed only by trimming certain features so that the total costs fall within budgeted appropriations and the government grant. There should be some streamlining of the procedures necessary to secure approval under these circumstances.

Another difficulty of this program is the requirement governing the purchase of equipment. A \$1,000 (and even less) equipment item must follow the same procedure and entails the same amount of paper work as a \$3,000,000 contract for a building. The cost and delays of following this procedure result in inefficient