

I would like to proceed to first lick and then bite the hand that feeds us. Through imaginative legislation, such as ESEA, the Federal government is making possible some of the practical pipe dreams that educators have had for years. More attention for individual children in oft-crowded classrooms cannot but help. Special programs to fill educational cavities in reading, math, and study skills will pay off. Financially, the local towns—even with State aid—were unable to be adventurous to any marked degree.

While a well-endowed private school might support a ratio of ten pupils to a class, we in public schools often exceed thirty-five pupils in a room. The theory of Federal aid lay dormant for many years while political problems such as parochial school aid, desegregation, and states' rights muddled the looking glass. At last, through a porthole marked Poverty Program, our dream was launched. We thank our Federal legislators for clearing away the puckerbrush and making programs available to help children. A partnership between legislators and educators will doubtless continue to improve the yield in the vineyards of our public schools. It's past time that educators burn the effigy of the venal politician with jowls, graft, and a two-foot cigar, provided our legislators set a match to the picture of a school man as one who does not know what a dollar is and has a head full of impractical ideas stemming from ivory towers such as our University of Maine!

In our progress to the Educational Utopia, I see some curves in the road—not roadblocks—to which I would call your attention. I cannot see why there should continue to be a tie-in to the poverty program other than as a basis on which to award funds. Children's educational liabilities and difficulties do not correlate highly to the Poverty Line. I think the accent should be that, if towns are continuing to support schools without saving on local taxes because of Federal aid, then the programs supported by the Federal dollar within the regular school program should be planned for all in need and not only the poverty stricken. Actually, this is what happens now in practice, but the machinery is administratively cumbersome. I suggest that programs should not be categorical. By this I mean that programs for all instigated by local initiative should be supported—not just those programs which benefit the poor.

A second problem we face is that of evaluation. When using Headstart funds last summer through OEO, when using NDEA funds to buy equipment, and when using the Federal support for the lunch program, no evaluation is required. By requiring this for ESEA programs under Title I, you invite a mountain of paper work and endless unnecessary staff hours. Should evidence be needed in Washington to sell future support under ESEA, let the call go out and we will be there. Our present scientifically unsound methods of evaluation are nothing more than objective window dressing for the much more important factor—our subjective opinions. If money is being wasted, I feel most school people are honest enough to say so if asked.

In conclusion, Federal aid is doing the job for which it was intended under ESEA. I am pleased that continued and increased support was forthcoming from the last session. At the same time, there is room for improvement in the administration of the ESEA program.

Mr. LEWIS. Gentlemen, I am the most unimportant man you will hear from today. I have the smallest school union. You have been hearing from the giants in Maine's education. I hold the distinction of having a town that goes under the name of Grand Falls Plantation, that has no children, no school, and a school budget of \$112; no people of childbearing age. We do use Federal aid, however. One thing Maine superintendents have needed for some time is three psychotherapists to let us vent our spleen and we appreciate your being here.

First off, I would reiterate this business about the difficulty of evaluation of programs. In my opinion under title I you fellows should eliminate the request that we evaluate. You don't require it under the National Defense Act. You don't require it under school lunch. You don't require it any more under Headstart.

What we do when we evaluate is come up with a pseudoscientific four- or five-page report and it is either in such educational jargon