

someone better fortified with data than I might comment on. But I would just say this: That to my mind, it has been a crime in the schools all these years to think that you could teach beginning reading to children in the first grade, with just as large classes as you presume to teach in the fifth, sixth, and later on into high school.

I have been quite pleased that our own school superintendent has spoken out in favor of reducing the size of classes in the first and second grades, which has this effect of increasing the per-pupil cost. Now, the per-pupil cost in Headstart runs considerably higher than that. I don't know how much higher it ought to go, or can go, or we can support it.

It is true that with young children it seems to be desirable to have a smaller pupil-teacher ratio than with the older ones.

Mrs. GREEN. Yes; but my point is this: Is Congress justified, is the administration justified, in supporting a program which gives \$1,100, for early education, and does little about following through to sustain what has been gained?

Dr. FINDLEY. \$1,100 for a presumed group that needs special attention, as opposed to the generality of students. It does, there. But I would agree with you.

My criticism of the OEO research to date would be that it has not given evidence of longitudinal effects of what has been done at the earlier period of time.

I like the model of the Denver study, and of our own model, of attempting to not only give the youngster a head start, but then to build upon that head start whatever additional help is mostly likely to carry him further forward, so that he does not slip back.

The Denver study was significant in its finding that those youngsters who were given a great deal of help in kindergarten, and then given less help, gradually lost their advantage over the other students.

Mrs. GREEN. On page 2, you spoke of research funding.

What experience are you having at the present time in the funding of ongoing research programs, or ones for which you have made application?

Dr. FINDLEY. Our experience in the funding of, let's say, the research and development center, is just this: That we are receiving every bit as much as we were promised when we started. We have not been cut back.

On the other hand, I think it is fair to say that the atmosphere that prevailed when the grant was originally made, before the escalation, or whatever you want to call it, of activity in Vietnam, was: "All right, we are giving you this money. If you can conceive of additional areas in which you would like to expand, and you have plans that we see are sound, we will have no difficulty in expanding your program to fund those."

Today, we have not had that. I mean because of what we recognize as other pressures that have made it difficult.

And we have found, I think, a not too unhappy compromise in this matter, of taking on the consultant role with title III areas, with the counties that are using title III funds for innovation.

Mrs. GREEN. Thank you very much, Dr. Findley.

The next witness is Dr. Robert Hopper, director of the Southeastern Education Laboratory.