

Beginning in 1969, there will be an increasing amount of non-government funds in the total PENNTAP budget. First, a total of \$62,465 in industrial or participating institution support has already been included in the budgets of the projects proposed for that Program. Secondly, PENNTAP has begun in its current program to collect fees and contributions which are being held in escrow for use in the 1969 Program. To present knowledge, Pennsylvania is the only state holding funds in escrow for use in succeeding annual programs.

The current PENNTAP philosophy is to use the federal and state tax dollars as "seed money." The idea is for PENNTAP to initiate the projects which, in turn, will become self-supporting as soon as possible.

This "seed money" idea does not mean that federal funds should be eliminated. It would be disastrous to the initiation of new projects to eliminate these federal funds. PENNTAP's successes have resulted from federal support of the original projects. The successful programs would probably continue if federal funds were eliminated, but the initiation of new projects which would lead to other successes, would not be possible.

Also, it would be short-sighted to think that there will be a day when federal support of the program will be completely withdrawn. For example, the library information programs offer an industrial service very similar to that given by the agricultural agent. While some industrial support for many of these programs will be forthcoming, it is unrealistic to believe that such services will ever be entirely self-supporting. Information programs presently striving to be self-supporting through industrial contributions are finding it very difficult.

If the State Technical Services Act is to reach its greatest potential, consideration must be given to longer-range funding. This would give assurance to project personnel that the project, if successful, could continue for more than 12 months. It should be remembered that it is extremely difficult to hire a competent industrial librarian under the conditions of the present grant system.

We, in Pennsylvania, are currently preparing to submit our fourth annual program. This does not mean that we have three years of experience behind us. In reality, PENNTAP is only 22 months old as the first contracts with participating institutions were signed August 1, 1966. Allowing for the transition from "paper" projects to operational ones, most of the first-year projects did not become functional until January, 1967. This means that while we have had some measurable successes, evaluation of the total effort at this time is unrealistic and not truly indicative.

It is interesting to note that, to date, PENNTAP has been able to direct 91.7% of all project dollars towards actual dissemination of technical information. Only 8.3% of the budget has been used for total administration of the program. This administration figure includes the costs incurred by the Advisory Council and the Evaluation Panel, as well as such items as supervision, printing, travel, and coordination of the participating institutions. This figure does not include the cost of such services as accounting and contracting which have been donated by The Pennsylvania State University as the Designated Agency.

As stated before, the STSA is a very promising venture. It can provide a significant stimulus to economic and technological growth. However, there are problem areas whose resolution could result in an improved, more meaningful State Technical Services Act.

In addition to the previously suggested recommendation (longer-range funding), the following warrant consideration:

1. The Office of State Technical Services, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and the Designated Agency must find ways of reducing the long delay between submission of proposals by participating institutions and actual funding and initiation of the projects. The existing lag time discourages some of the more qualified academic personnel from submitting proposals because they are reluctant to commit themselves for such a long period of time in advance. This delay also constitutes a morale factor: proposals are accepted but starting dates cannot be guaranteed.

2. Evaluation is a continuing problem to which there is no easy answer. To achieve a true evaluation of a project, there should be an elapsed amount of time between the completion of the project and its evaluation. It is not only unrealistic, but also impossible, to evaluate a state program in the same calendar year in which its program activity is approved for funding.

The question of how much the experimental phase of STSA should influence evaluation needs to be resolved. If the programs are to be truly experimental in nature, inclusion of unique projects might also adversely affect the chances for a proven success or a positive evaluation.