5. Experience. The proposal should demonstrate an institutional record of successful exchange program activity, indicating the experience that the organization and its professional staff have had in working with foreign educators.

6. Evaluation and Follow-up: The proposal should include a plan for evaluating activities during the Institute and at its conclusion. Proposals should comment on provisions made for follow-up with returned grantees as a means of establishing longer-term individual and institutional linkages.

7. Administration and Management: The proposals should indicate evidence of continuous on-site administrative and managerial capacity as well as the means by which program activities will be implemented.

8. Cost Effectiveness: The proposals should maximize cost-sharing through direct institutional contributions, inkind support, and other private sector support. Overhead and administrative components of the proposal, including salaries and honoraria, should be kept as low as possible.

Notice: The terms and conditions published in this RFP are binding and may not be modified by any USIA representative. Explanatory information provided by the Agency that contradicts published language will not be binding. Issuance of the RFP does not constitute an award commitment on the part of the Government. The Agency reserves the right to reduce, revise, or increase proposal budgets in accordance with the needs of the program and the availability of funding. Final awards cannot be made until funds have been appropriated by Congress, allocated and committed through internal USIA procedures.

Notification

All applicants will be notified of the results of the review process on or about April 1, 1996. Awards made will be subject to periodic reporting and evaluation requirements.

Dated: November 21, 1995.

John P. Loiello,

Associate Director for Educational and Cultural Affairs. [FR Doc. 95–29287 Filed 11–30–95; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 8230–01–M