

7. It is our conviction that Title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act carries with it the fewest number of undesirable side effects. We would support the elimination of the existing 10 per cent line item budget controls. We acknowledge that Title V support at fiscal 1968 levels or above will materially assist the state educational agency in becoming one kind of educational leadership force needed within each state. Title V will develop state agencies to the point where they will provide a far more effective administrative performance than is now possible.

8. We believe that the educational research information centers developed under Title IV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act should serve as clearinghouses of information for state educational agencies which, in turn, should be charged with the responsibility of disseminating information to local school districts within each state. One advantage of this approach is that communication channels from state agency to local district already exist.

9. In view of the increased demands for basic educational data and statistics by the U.S. Office of Education and by the Congress, we would endorse an intensive effort under Title X of the National Defense Education Act to develop, as rapidly as possible, a comprehensive and uniform educational data system for elementary and secondary schools. The development of such a system would insure the transmission of compatible and comparable educational data by state educational agencies to the U.S. Office of Education.

10. The federal government seems to be bending toward even greater specificity and administrative control in its educational aid programs. Prescriptive detail narrows the options available to state agencies and local school districts.

For example, guidelines for Title II programs during fiscal 1967 suggest that the state consider establishing geographic area depositories for library resource materials acquired under Title II. Further details spell out such aspects as annual catalogue lists, circulation, recall inventory, and redistribution regarding the depositories. Preliminary estimates from some of our districts indicate that costs of administering such depositories would consume from 20 to 25% of the district's allocation. This type of program and its underlying philosophy run counter to our state goals of building strong school libraries where students have daily access to these resources.

Another example of such prescriptive detail is found in the proposed guidelines for Title I.

"(g) Each application by or through a State educational agency shall contain an assurance that the State educational agency will make such other reports to the Commissioner as he may reasonably require from time to time to enable him to perform his duties under Title I of the Act. Such reports shall include a disclosure of any allegations which may be made by local educational agencies or private individuals or organizations of actions by State or local educational agencies contrary to the provisions of Title II of the Act or the regulations in this part, a summary of the result of any investigations made or hearings held with respect to those allegations, and a statement of the disposition by the State educational agency of those allegations. It is recognized that the responsibility with respect to the resolution of such matters rests, in the first instance, in the State educational agency."

Having explored various implications of the federal, state and local partnership, we propose that the role of the federal interest should be to stimulate and encourage the development of strong, effective state and local partners. As we recast the traditional roles of the three above-named agencies, we will need to be reminded that strengthening any one of the partners at the expense of either or both of the others will not, in the long run, serve the best interests of education.

In conclusion, we respectfully urge that the Congress consider supplying needed federal resources and funds to the state with a minimum of prescriptive detail and administrative control; that it consider charging the states with the major responsibility of complying with the intent of Congress; and that it consider encouraging the most effective mix of local, state and national resources in order to carry out the interest of all three.

Thank you for offering me the opportunity of presenting these remarks to you. I will try to answer any questions that you may have as well as I can.