

Mr. NICKERSON. Not specifically as such, not always. Now in the beginning five members of the State board of education were chosen because of the positions they held or by a group. The Municipal Association had a representative and the Teachers' Association had one; the private colleges had one, and I guess the Congress of Parents and Teachers had one. But this was taken out of the statute some years ago, and the Governor appoints all 10 members at the present time. But the makeup in the membership of the State board of education does include people who have served or are serving on the staff of some of the private colleges.

Mr. QUIE. And the university as well?

Mr. NICKERSON. I don't think there is anyone connected with the university except the commissioner—he is not on it, the commissioner of education is secretary of it but he is a trustee of the university by virtue of his position. That is as close as it has come on that.

The State board of education I would say did not seek this function but due to a section in our statutes that says we shall have charge of the expenditure of any Federal funds available for construction, they seem to have been the designated agency for that—although the higher facilities act was not even thought of at the time that statute was enacted.

I have a few conclusions or suggestions that I would like to make. The first point listed on this is a repetition of what I have said before. Perhaps as a foreword or preface, our experiences have been harmonious with the State operations.

The next point I make is that the Department of Education is in concurrence with the established policy of the Council of Chief State School Officers, that more general Federal educational aid should be dispensed through State regulations or State laws. Such aid would be preferable to the so-called proliferation of categorical aids unless—and this is part of the chief's policy—unless this need cannot be met by general aid. And there are certain areas, like Public Laws 874 and 815, that general assistance would not necessarily cover.

The Department strongly favors Federal legislation which would include funds for the administration of particular programs which require a large amount of State work. Examples I have previously mentioned are the school lunch and milk programs, the aid to federally impacted areas, both of those statutes. Funds should be provided for adequate supervisory services when new subject areas are added, such as NDEA, title III. For example, the first three subject areas, the mathematics, science, and foreign language were funded. The next three were also. But the latest subject additions, such as industrial arts and arts and humanities, had no such a provision and we have had to absorb these in our State administration services.

There is also the problem of meeting the increased workloads that are not identifiable with any specific program. This may sound a little indefinite, but it does constitute quite an item.

The chiefs at their recent meeting in Louisiana have made a suggestion I believe that title V funds be made available to cover these workloads not identified with any specific program. I don't know all the backgrounds on that but that is a suggestion that has been made.

Mr. QUIE. Title V of which act?