

data. Many recommendations of this committee have already been adopted. These and further recommendations should improve the quality of our evaluation techniques for the current school year, and enable us better to interpret the effectiveness of our programs.

Advantages of Federal assistance

That federally sponsored programs have been of great benefit to our schools cannot be denied. Without such assistance we would have been unable either to extend our compensatory services to disadvantaged children, or to initiate our experimental program. We feel that both of these programs will have a far-reaching effect on the entire school system and will greatly improve the quality of education in Boston. Thus, it now seems obvious that the continuation of these newly-initiated or expanded educational programs hinges upon sustained federal support, and, hopefully, increased federal funding.

Additional views and comments

I have been asked to comment upon the administration of federal programs through the U.S. Office of Education from the viewpoint of the local educational agency. In general, I should like to compliment the Office of Education for the efficient way in which it has handled what must have been a monumental job of organization and administration. The qualifications and reservations that follow should not be taken as adverse criticisms but rather as suggestions that might be helpful in future legislative decisions affecting education.

1. All federal legislation affecting education might better be administered through the U.S. Office of Education rather than through several different agencies, departments, or bureaus. It would expedite matters at the local level tremendously. Evidence of the need for this is the fact that many directors of federally funded programs in our school system are not clear as to which is the responsible federal administrative agency for their programs.

2. We realize full well that Congressional decisions cannot be anticipated. Still, insofar as possible, local educational agencies would benefit greatly from knowing reasonably in advance:

- a. changes in emphasis or interpretation of present legislation;
- b. changes in amount of funding or allocation of funds; and,
- c. proposed new legislation.

3. Allocation of funds for Title I programs should be made as early as possible in the spring, rather than in September. It is in March and early April that most school departments make plans for the coming school year in the areas of supplies, equipment, personnel, and curricular programs.

4. The January 15 and July 1 deadlines for the submission of Title III operational proposals fall at inconvenient times. From the standpoint of the local educational agency, a mid-spring deadline would be more realistic.

5. It would be extremely desirable if ESEA funding grants under Title I were guaranteed for a minimum of three years. This would permit long range planning in previously mentioned areas.

6. More assistance might be given to State Department of Education under Title V to insure staffing adequate to meet the administrative demands arising from greatly expanded federal education legislation.

7. At present, federal funding under Title I is not adequate to meet the needs of all the children for whom the legislation was designed. The present program serves approximately one half of the culturally and economically disadvantaged children in this city. In addition, funds are lacking to extend city wide, proven experimental and innovative programs now being conducted on a limited scale. There is a definite need for at least double the present amount of allocated funds for the two principal reasons previously mentioned.

8. Cooperation and communication between the local educational agency and the community action agency should be encouraged in every way. With this in mind, we have already established a joint liaison committee involving the Boston Public Schools and Action for Boston Community Development. However, it should be made abundantly clear by a clarification of present federal directives that, while either agency may react to the programs of the other, neither may exercise a veto power over such programs or delay the implementation thereof.

In closing I should like to thank the committee for the opportunity of testifying today.