

A more specialized dissemination function for each laboratory will be making available the findings of its research to other laboratories and other researchers. Individual laboratories can be much more effective in terms of their research, their service, and their program development if they are part of a communication network designed to keep one another completely informed of the activities of their sister institutions. This kind of communication can be accomplished by automatic data processing links, research bulletins, publications of the laboratory network, institutes for researchers, and connection with USOE activities of a similar nature, including the Educational Research Information Center.

Hopefully, a great many different types of agencies, organizations, and institutions will become involved in developing laboratory programs. Although large numbers of people with different kinds of skills are expected to be participants in laboratory operations, it is unlikely that laboratories will ever come to exist at all if every institution that is to be ultimately involved is also represented at the very beginning. In fact, it would appear to be more than likely that the initial steps in the development of a laboratory might be taken by a bold, imaginative, representative group of relatively small size, charged with the responsibility for developing an institution responsive to the needs and interests of all future cooperating elements and capable of performing the desired functions with effectiveness and dispatch. There will be many difficulties attendant upon the operation of regionally based educational laboratories, but perhaps the most impressive of these will be the actual creation of the institutions.

Finally, I would note two additional conditions that should be placed upon the emerging laboratories by their founders. First, difficult though it may be, laboratories should strive from the very beginning to see and create themselves as institutions of the highest prestige. They should be so designed that schools, universities, and states will eagerly call upon them.

Second, great care must be taken to see that the laboratory programs develop in such a way that none of the participating institutions are in any way injured by the creation of educational laboratories. Good things are now being accomplished within existing institutional frameworks. It would be a shame to compromise the continuing success of activities that already are giving fair promise to improve the nation's educational system.

The laboratory program is a challenge to progressive leadership. It is a challenge of broad implications for the relationships between existing institutions. It promises much; it will fulfill whatever the educational community will enable it to fulfill.

Mr. GIBBONS. Now you can tell Mr. LaFrance where the errors are.

Mr. HERZOG. One error is that I am Mr. Herzog. I appreciate the thoughts of the committee staff to make me a doctor, but I am Mr. for a while. This is Assistant Dean Joseph Young, who knows a good deal more than I do on certain points here. So I have asked him to come along. I am delighted you have invited him to sit here with me. A lot of what you hear in these hearings in Washington and here and I suppose elsewhere in the country seem to be complaints, criticisms, or suggestions. I want to go on record at the very beginning in saying that these have been very exciting and productive years, these past 2 or 3 years, since the Federal Government got into the business in a big way of trying to improve and support education in this country.

Commissioner Howe has pointed out that even with this very recent increase in interest and support, the level is still nowhere near that in medicine and some other fields. But there have been some very real accomplishments and many of the complaints I think that you hear are based on how the accomplishment might have been made a little bigger and better rather than general criticism of the whole thing and a lack of appreciation of what the Federal Government has been doing.

Another side of this is that many people in education, both in the schools and in the universities, feel under enormous pressure to sort

of help you in a sense, our friends, to justify these great expenditures and these apparently useless or not immediately useful research and developmental activities. We really feel sometimes that our research on preschool kids should in some people's minds have a payoff in some kind of increase in the number of college graduates, or something like that, in the next year or so even though they are entirely different individuals of course that we are dealing with.

I did want to call your attention to a number of the things that even in the 2 or 3 years of expanded involvement in education that we at Harvard could point to, and which, in a sense, you made possible. These would include studies of mental abilities, and studies of speeded speech, where we make direct recordings useful to the blind people for learning, far more useful and far less time consuming than they have been up to now.

Mr. GIBBONS. Speeded speech? What do you mean?

Mr. HERZOG. A man could take a recording—if we were making a recording of what I am saying and what you are saying, we could, by some carefully worked out splicing of some of the sounds I make now, still permit the whole utterance to be heard and understood in less time but just as efficiently. Instead of a recording of 3 inches on a 33-r.p.m. record, a person could hear and learn from a recording of an inch and a half on the surface of the record. Does this make sense? In other words, many of the sounds we make when we speak normally are not really necessary for communication. It makes for more secure communication, but if you are listening attentively, the recording is good and the dialog is clear, you don't need all the sounds we usually use in making words. Some R. & D. centers have a number of curriculum development projects that we think are going to be producing, and have already produced, some very useful and exciting new materials. There is a new social studies curriculum, 10th, 11th, and 12th grades in Newton High School which has been supported in part by the R. & D. Center, in part by the Newton schools, which is just about finished, is in full use at Newton. Copies of samples have been sent to other schools, although full-scale dissemination has not been attempted yet.

Mr. HATHAWAY. You deal directly with the schools, is that correct, not with the Commissioner of Education?

Mr. HERZOG. The R. & D. center has a kind of autonomy. We wrote an original proposal outlining some of the sorts of things we thought we would be doing during the next 5 years. OE said, "It sounds interesting to us," and gave us a sum of money to do most of those things. But we then decide locally exactly what it is and how it shall be done on a year-to-year basis.

Each year we tell them what we think we will be doing the next year. There, frankly, seems to be less and less room for our own decision making, although this is not a crucial problem yet. But compared to the very first description and inspiration of the program, there seems to be an increasing interest by OE in exactly what it is we will be doing as opposed to the more general topical descriptions. This project came to our attention really after the center got going, but we thought that it was a very valuable one and we were able under the terms of the kind of contract we have to say, "Yes, Mr. Altree and Mr. Douglas and your

staff, go ahead and keep working on this for a couple of years," and they have.

Mr. HATHAWAY. On these projects like the one in Newton High School, you just go to the Newton High School and say we would like to get them to try it out there?

Mr. HERZOG. The other way. The Newton people were working on this and presented their plan to us. They had already started, very much on a shoestring, and we said this is very good, it is within the bounds of what we said we were going to do. We didn't know exactly this would work out, but this is the type of activity, "Go ahead, how can we help you?"

Mr. HATHAWAY. Is the superintendent of Newton brought in on this, and Commissioner of Education of the Commonwealth?

Mr. HERZOG. In the latter case the commissioner was not. The superintendent sat at that time on our executive committee and was perhaps more involved in the decision than might be desirable. This kind of relationship was intended. We are trying to have ideas stem not only from the university community but from schools and educational TV.

Mr. HATHAWAY. I am wondering as time goes on if there will not be friction created between your organizations—the superintendents thinking they are being bypassed—with your going directly to the schools and not getting their approval for these various ideas.

Mr. HERZOG. I think there is friction that we are not going too much to the schools, that too much of our activities and resources are commanded by the university scholars doing sort of esoteric research which the superintendents feel does not help them.

I don't think we perhaps respond enough from their point of view in doing this sort of thing. The State superintendent is on our executive committee, a larger policy board which meets less often. He knew about this. I have no hesitation of saying he is probably delighted about the whole thing.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Who is this?

Mr. HERZOG. The commissioner of education. He is on the executive committee, yes. Vaguely he knows about this and it is the type of thing he would like to see.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Who else is on the executive board?

Mr. HERZOG. In addition to myself and another administrative officer of the center, there are seven members on the executive committee. Generally four professors from the university. Two school superintendents and the dean of the school of education. The policy board has somewhere between 25 and 30 representatives. Perhaps twice as many professors, in this case not only from the School of Education but also from several of the faculties of the university, a representative from each of the six; superintendents from each of the six school systems that we have formal relationships with; the commissioner of education, a representative from WGBH-TV, our educational station; representative from the National Association of Independent Schools, a representative of New England School Development Council, which is a semiprivate association of New England school systems.

I never can complete the roster but there are eight or 10 nonschool, nonuniversity partners, a total of about 25.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Thank you. Go ahead.

Mr. HERZOG. I just want to call your attention to one thing which I think is an example of the very wise policy of the U.S. Office of Education. That is this Project Physics which is being sponsored both by the National Science Foundation and the U.S. Office of Education. This is a physics curriculum development project conceived in part to provide an alternative to the Physical Science Study Commission materials which are much better known which have been in use in the United States I think since the late fifties produced by the organization which is now Educational Services, Inc., Dr. Harold Zacharias. An excellent program, too. But the office has deliberately stimulated two rival curriculum development programs which have basic differences. I think it is an excellent posture to take to avoid this Federal control which people worry about.

There is another thing which I want to call to your attention, another very happy facet of the past few years. We have been sincerely and regularly impressed with the quality of the personnel at the U.S. Office of Education. This is not to say that there are probably not a few who might well be replaced. But this is a very small minority. In general the Office, considering its obscure history and the speed with which it has come into the public scrutiny and given enormous responsibilities, has an outstanding array of sensible and dedicated and intelligent people. Many of the arbitrary things that we experience, and Dr. Arbuckle referred to and I am sure you have heard from other witnesses, are a function of the other side of the problem, that they have been given enormous responsibilities which they are not used to entirely, but which there are certainly not enough of them to handle. The Office is simply too small. When you go down there, when you try to reach them on the phone, when you try to deal with them just through correspondence they quite obviously are running at a steady dogtrot. There is this musical chairs with all the reorganizations they have been through in the last several years, which I think are necessary. A lot of this last-minute business, a lot of this apparent arbitrary business, a lot of the reason that most of us feel we can't get through and talk to these people and we don't know why they are making certain decisions, I think at base is a function of the fact that they are terribly overtasked.

We are, too, and everyone these days is, afraid of increasing the Federal bureaucracy. Maybe for another agency a much better case could be made.

I sympathize very strongly with these men. I don't think Harold Howe made this point very clearly in the hearings. I suspect that as part of the general economy drive he felt it would be impolitic for him to suggest that maybe his agency could use more staff and a higher-level staff through Civil Service upgrading, and so forth, than it now has, but I am free from that restriction, and I think this agency is being mistreated by both the rest of the executive departments and the Congress.

They are given too few horses to do the job that they have been asked to do. Despite this they have performed very ably under the circumstances.

I would like to call your attention now to some of the problems. Another that we are impressed with, and this is where Joe Young can

be particularly helpful, I think, is that while you have—when the Congress initiates legislation there is generally some very considerable and thoughtful investigation and hearings and so forth, and when the Office actually gets into the process of awarding grants and contracts the money for this, that, and the other, this is, we think, a fairly efficient and certainly just system of making awards.

There obviously will be particular examples of bad justice or bad practices and so forth. I don't know about the cases that Dr. Arbuckle just described to you. He may be perfectly correct. I think that there is a process within OE as well as within other agencies in Washington which may be overlooked. That is the process of developing guidelines, which, after all, is a crucial step between the legislation and the awarding of money under the guidelines. I think it is here that the spectre of Federal control, if it ever is going to emerge, will probably emerge first. Ironically, it will emerge in those programs which the Congress has deliberately tried to make as flexible as possible.

Then given all these pressures, these poor fellows are understood to come out with announcements of how you get the money 3 days after the Congress has enacted and the President has finally signed the legislation. The last thing you can really set up in an organizational framework is flexibility, the last you can build into a way of doing things is flexibility.

I am pretty much in the dark, really, about how guidelines are made up. It would seem to be a kind of secretive process, secretive not from the sense that it is deliberately kept from scrutiny but pressures come on, people have decisions to make, deadlines to meet, and a lot of conflicting advice to try to bring into concord one way or another. And they have to go back to their office and hatch something.

Mr. GIBBONS. Let me interrupt you for a moment. We think that perhaps we are going about the legislative process in the wrong manner. We on the congressional end sometimes get the feeling that when somebody has a legislative idea, they turn it into a lot of legalistic terms, what we sometimes call mealy-mouthed words, and they go over and they jockey it through Congress hoping that Congress won't understand it too thoroughly, get the President's signature on it, and then they run back and say, "Oh, boy, look what we got; let us see what we can do with it." And then they put out the guidelines. I think before the legislation comes to Congress there should be some narrative about what they want to accomplish. There should be some guidelines, some regulations, and the package of material should perhaps be at least available for interested Members of Congress and their staffs to study. Then, when we get the legislation passed, there would not be this panicky period that you talk about, where somebody has to figure out what all these words mean. Perhaps I have oversimplified it and I have made it too sarcastic, but I think that is where the problem is.

Mr. HERZOG. I think that is an excellent idea. I would like to see what Joe Young thinks of it. Except one thing, I don't think it would be successful unless you gave the Office another staff to do this.

Mr. GIBBONS. More staff?

Mr. HERZOG. Right. Maybe this particular new assignment or new way of doing it wouldn't require a great many people, but it will be

kind of hopeless to add it to the present burden that they carry. It would be an excellent investment.

Mr. HATHAWAY. What we mean is that they have to write the guidelines anyway. They should write them first and then come to Congress rather than with a draft of the bill. Then we could work backward from there as to what we think the draft of the bill ought to be to cover what they want to do.

Mr. YOUNG. I should make one comment in this connection. You used the word "secretive," John. I wouldn't concur with that. I think it has connotations I don't think you intended, but my experience has been confined to fellowship programs generally under title V. I have been closely associated with the various processes, developing the guidelines, participating in some of the reviews of both the experience and the prospective, and also the committee which Mr. Bigelow set up to look back at the year of action and try to make some sense out of it.

Most of the difficulty I think is the absence of time and the fact that people have not formulated their ideas and a considerable amount of leadtime is required.

Of course that is a very excellent suggestion of trying to do this beforehand, Mr. Gibbons. This Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program, for example, was signed on November 8 and the fellowships were announced on February 10. That is a herculean task because it meant that the guidelines had to be developed and to accomplish this Mr. Bigelow invited a number of people (I was not among them) to develop the guidelines for the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program.

Then the announcement came that they had a thousand proposals. All that action. They had 50 to 75 people around the country to review these proposals. Now he is trying to look at this question of changing the guidelines and so forth, but the time that is involved is enormous in trying to get people freed from the university responsibility, the school responsibility, to come down to Washington to present their views. It is a very difficult problem.

I would like to say I have no idea of this guidance institute issue to which Mr. Arbuckle has referred, but with respect to the title V I know that Mr. Bigelow has involved a number of people in this process and, in fact, in a fashion which I think is quite different from what we would expect in bureaucratic arrangement.

In some of these things he has called the people together, set the charge and then withdrawn himself, saying, "You come up with something that makes sense." It is your responsibility. He has not abdicated his responsibility as a bureaucrat to go into this matter of awards, but he has sought the reaction of the people in the field.

Mr. HERZOG. I agree with what Mr. Young has said. I would like to make a couple of suggestions. First I think USOE is understaffed. It should be looked into. Second, I think the career and professional opportunities of working in the Office should be enhanced, so that the Nation is assured of obtaining the best possible men and women to work there.

Mr. GIBBONS. How do you do that? Pay them more?

Mr. HERZOG. That would be one way. Secretary Gardner, according to the newspapers, has a plan for reorganizing the entire Depart-

ment of Health, Education, and Welfare which would involve making three separate departments within it, the way the Department of Defense is. I understand that this would mean civil service upgrading all along the line. This would enable the Office in general to staff its top positions with a notch or two higher of civil service rated employees. This is one way of doing this. New positions would also mean that new people, perhaps attracted to the Department of Education or whatever it would be called, within HEW, would be recruited to a level and variety of jobs that don't exist now and perhaps another infusion of high-quality people could be obtained that way too.

Again along with Commissioner Howe, we wish to suggest that the present procedure of approving HEW appropriations in August or September is extremely detrimental to the operation not only of the Office but of the schools and universities in which the Office is more and more engaged. I am sure the superintendents have made their feelings clear to you about that. The Federal Government is out of phase with the way the school systems make their budgets. Universities with endowments are a little more flexible but you are out of phase with us too.

The Office also, you know, goes through a summer of almost paralysis, starting in May or June, no knowing what they can get started, hedging bets, talking without seeming to commit itself to everybody. A great deal of tension, anxiety and ill feeling builds up, with nobody knowing what they will have to work with.

Finally, I think it might be possible, and I am confused here and I would like to ask really that maybe you look into this. It would seem that a good bit of the decisionmaking and the hectic atmosphere could be alleviated if USOE were permitted by Congress or if the agency used the authority which it now possesses to enter into more than year-to-year contracts, on a multiple-year contract or grant basis.

I have heard that the Office does have this authority now and I have also heard that the Office does not have authority now—by people you suspect should know in both cases. I am very much confused. There are other agencies such as the National Institutes of Health which say that they have authority to make grants for 7-year periods. They don't usually go to 7, they still stop at 5, but this is still quite a contrast to USOE. And when many of the projects we are engaged in now are of a long-term nature, a 6 months' or 1-year involvement is often just enough to get started. It would seem to me that a more flexible arrangement, if it is not permitted by Congress now, or interpretation by the Office—

Mr. GIBBONS. That is a problem of Congress because most of these acts that we are operating under have 1- or 2-year terms, or perhaps 3-year terms. Elementary and secondary has been on a 1-year basis, now a 2-year basis. OEO is on a 1-year basis. NDEA is on a basis I don't really understand. It comes up for review so often that they probably don't have any statutory authority to go past that.

In drafting legislation for the future that is something to remember—to put the research and development part of it on a much longer basis than some of the operational phases.

Congress has been afraid if we got into the operational phase of some of these programs without getting an opportunity to review them, we might be creating something we were not sure we wanted.

Mr. HERZOG. The grants that NIH makes include a provision that says, "This money is awarded to you subject to congressional appropriation." This is a reasonable request both by the National Institutes and by Congress. There is a degree of control which Congress would always retain because it makes annual appropriations. This might lead to embarrassments if Congress did not quite produce all the money that the contract called for. But the other extreme we are at now, where no one is willing to commit anything beyond the 8 or 9 months of the year they are already in, it is really difficult.

Mr. GIBBONS. I can see that. You talk about pipeline here, and pipeline models. I hope you will get into that.

Mr. HERZOG. I will get right to it. Do you want me to go over these other things?

Mr. GIBBONS. Yes.

Mr. HERZOG. There was an article that I brought along that was passed out which really I think puts this philosophy or way of thinking, whatever it is, in black and white better than I can do, both because I don't believe in it and because I don't have time to do it. But I feel there is a kind of ideology that is guiding the Bureau of Research within the Office of Education, and I think it is shared in other sectors of the Office of Education, that ideas for the improvement of education are generally hatched or come to light, within a rather narrow group of intellectuals, of research people, of university scholars. This ideology would allow that maybe sometimes suggestions can come from the field, but basically teachers' or administrators' suggestions are kind of naive and simpleminded. Their ideas, you know, may be diamonds in the rough, but they have to be carried back to the research shops and worked out there, tested as to whether they are real and true or not.

When they have been tried out, the next step of kind of developing them in real school situations, is taken. Some of your first studies may just have been questionnaires or observational or very much part-by-part attempts to test validity and nature of some new proposition. When you move into the stage of development, you usually go out into some kind of laboratory school or hothouse school or experimental school, or more and more these days the classrooms where a benevolent and openminded school superintendent says, "Okay, you can work in it, we will let you try out your social studies material in these six classrooms in the high school, and you work out the bugs there."

And then, at some usually not-too-clear point, you decide that this stuff works, you have been doing a lot of testing and analyzing and evaluating while you are doing it, you say, "Okay, now we are in a stage of demonstration. We will invite other school people in to see what we have developed." Then they can decide for themselves or maybe we can run training institutes in the summer or after school or during special periods of the school year, so that the teachers or whoever is supposed to be involved in this new enterprise or this new form of activity can really learn what it is all about, see it in operation, have a chance to practice it, practice teaching the new social studies curriculum and so forth, and go back to their own school systems.

You try to involve people from all over the country or region so that there will be a kind of spreading out. When you start doing this

you reach the stage of dissemination which I think is a very obvious stage of trying to promote the adoption of this new idea, usually not in a hucksterish way. Sometimes perhaps some of the textbook companies get a little bit aggressive about the new math or the new this or new that, but I think, in general, and appropriately, every new idea has a lot of competition to be heard and noticed. This essentially is the pipeline model.

USOE is currently in the business through the R. & D. centers, through its reorganization or supposed reorganization of the Cooperative Research Act, through the establishment of the regional educational laboratories, through attempts to build connections between research projects, R. & D. centers, regional labs, title III and title I and general support I would suppose in various ways. This notion of, "whatever is going on needs improvement," is one with which most of us will agree. Programs can be improved through kind of just developing ideas through the process I have just described, and somehow getting school people all over the country, over a hopefully shorter time than it has taken up until now, to adopt these new ideas.

It is my feeling and the feeling of many of us at Harvard that this way of thinking does provide a perhaps needed rationale for the entire range of activity that the Bureau of Research supports, which it didn't have before. It didn't do dissemination before, and so to a much more important degree than I think OE believes, the result of the previous cooperative research works were not widely known. And in my opinion, few deserve to be widely known, not because they weren't well-done pieces of work, but they were not relevant.

Mr. GIBBONS. To get down to the fundamental problem that we have, you get so much research, maybe not enough—and I am not an opponent of research, I support it—but we seem to get a lot of it. The Library of Congress has tons of it stacked up over there in the field of education. If you go into the stacks and start wading through that, you feel like the world is coming to an end when you see all that paper.

It is a little bit here and a little bit there. Who is supposed to evaluate all this and determine whether it is worth anything? Who is supposed to disseminate it? Who is supposed to put it together and put it into some kind of action?

I sometimes think if we did all the things that research found practical, we would never be able to stand it all. Do you get what I am driving at? We have to find some media to turn research into action or to discard it, to at least know where to go in the future in research.

We are often accused and ridiculed in articles about just promoting research for the purpose of research, one of the things that we who have to get elected every 2 years get sensitive about. Can you give us any guidance in that field?

Mr. HERZOG. I agree with this criticism in the sense of urgency with which it is offered to you or by you. I think that really by oversimplifying the problem, the issue can be avoided for a year or two or three, but it will be right back with us because if you try to solve an enormous problem by obviously inadequate methods or ways of thinking the problem will still be there a couple of years from now.

I think a crucial element has been left out, and I am not sure whether it is the greatest, but it strikes me personally because it is the way I

think about things. We are faced with requirements for a very intensive, very time-consuming, very complicated set of relationships to develop between the people who run schools, not just in general but particular schools in school systems, and persons who are interested in new ideas in education and have them think that maybe they have a few ideas that might be of use.

The adaptation of the innovation to the particular situation is one side of it. The X curriculum cannot be taught in school A and school B in the same way. This cannot be imported and exported like that.

On the other hand, school people are doing things now for some reason or other. Maybe we don't agree with them but maybe we would if we knew them better. They do, after all, have a certain pride in what they are doing.

I don't think many school people go to school day after day thinking, "Gee, I am doing a lousy job, I ought to be ashamed of myself." They avoid this issue in a lot of ways and in some cases they are not doing a lousy job day after day either; a few of them, anyway.

I think this need to feel that whatever I am doing now is worthwhile stands in the way of a great deal of useful educational change, and it is simply not dealt with by this particular model. This model assumes that people are standing around in their school system just waiting to be told what these new ideas are, or waiting to be trained to use these new ideas, and everything they have been doing can be just flushed away and we start all over again.

There is an enormous problem, an enormous task of really opening up on both sides: the school people to the new ideas, because they hear and see a university or whoever the researchers or innovators are, paying attention to them as persons with real problems and real concern in investments; and university people on the other hand realizing they are dealing with real people and real institutions.

Not only the people but the institutions have investments in what is going on. We are trying to build this sort of interplay here at Harvard with Boston and Cambridge and to a degree we have had it. It is easier to have with several of our suburban school system friends, Newton, Brookline, Concord and Lexington. We have not had it with Cambridge and Boston.

We think we are on the road to achieving it to a degree here because through the center we have been able to enter into this kind of dialog and see the same problems from each other's view. At the same time we cannot increasingly have the feeling that we are not doing what USOE would like us to do, but that we are doing something very surprising and different because it does not fit into this rather oversimplified model.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Herzog, my pusher back here has needled me twice about the fact that I have run out of time. Usually I get gaveled down. But I am very much interested in what you and Mr. Young have to say. I hope that perhaps you will call on me sometime during your visits to Washington, since you know I have been interested for some time in the field that you both work in.

We are going to put your statement in total in the record at the beginning of this discussion together with the article on the educational laboratory.

(NOTE.—A copy of a letter from Hendrik D. Gideonse, author of the aforementioned article, to John D. Herzog appears below.)

Mr. HERZOG. For a variety of reasons that are in my prepared statement which we have not talked to and some of the ones we have talked about, our greatest problem right now is to continue the interest of our top people in education and Harvard in general in working on education through the U.S. Office of Education.

There are procedures and policies and expectations which really seem to come from the Office which effectively discourage the really top men in various academic disciplines from wanting to work with USOE. This is a tragedy.

In some cases they can go to another Government institution like the National Institute for Child Development, for example, or they can go to foundations and continue their work. In other cases I think the discouragement, and it is a new one, is when an eminent man who is becoming newly concerned with education, may effectively turn his concern to something else which he can go into without this bother and problem.

This really bothers us now and I am sure it should bother USOE. I am sure it does, but I don't think they realize how serious it is here and maybe elsewhere.

Mr. GIBBONS. Thank you very much.

Mr. HERZOG. Thank you.

(Letter from Hendrik D. Gideonse to John D. Herzog.)

(Dr. Gideonse is the author of the article entitled "The National Program of Educational Laboratories," to which Mr. Herzog referred in the course of his testimony.)

WASHINGTON, D.C., January 3, 1967.

Mr. JOHN HERZOG,
Executive Director, Harvard Research and Development Center, Graduate School
of Education, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

DEAR JOHN: I recently became aware of the testimony you delivered before Representative Edith Green's Special Subcommittee on Education in their Boston hearings on December 3, 1966.

You have imputed a number of things to the November, 1965, *Phi Delta Kappan* article and the Office of Education's view of educational improvement which demand comment and correction. Insofar as anyone thinks of the process by which *knowledge* is created and applied about learning and education (or for that matter *any* area of human concern) it makes a great deal of sense to talk about a logical flow from research through development and demonstration to implementation. But that logical flow is vastly different from the process of changing any system so that it can accommodate the newly developed knowledge and its applications in its everyday ongoing operations.

I agree with you, therefore, that the application of anything approaching a "pipeline" model to change in the educational system would be inappropriate. It would be so because it would make it appear that improvement in the schools followed a direct linear route. We both know that is not the case. If you wish to use the word "pipeline" generally, if somewhat infelicitously, in connection with the logical description of the *knowledge-building* process, then I have no objection. But to describe the model of *change* underlying the article using the word "pipeline" is to make a fundamental mistake. One of the principal purposes of the laboratory program is to marry (not merge) more closely the logical process of the development of new knowledge and improved procedures to the empirical processes of change and growth in the educational system as we now find it. Quite to the contrary of your contention, then, the article is about a program part of whose rationale is that the "pipeline" model you describe will not work by itself. (I might add here that even the clearest explication I know

of presenting the research-development-diffusion-implementation model added important caveats to the effect that it was possible to begin the process at any point in the model and that it was always necessary to keep in mind the possibility that flow through it would be less than linear. See David L. Clark and Egon G. Guba, *An Examination of Potential Change Roles in Education* (mimeographed), pp. 4-6, 9, and 10.)

There is a second problem with your critique, however, this one a little more serious. The assumptions which you impute to the supposed pipeline model are neither true, held by me, necessary to the model as you describe it, or present in my article as you implied they were. My belief that generally speaking it makes sense to think about the process of building a foundation of knowledge on which to build educational improvement in terms of a research-development-demonstration-implementation continuum does *not* entail subscription to some of the "dangerous" assumptions which you claim to abstract from the "pipeline" model. In fact, if you will re-examine the article I think you will find many passages which contrast rather sharply with the assumptions you ascribe to the model.

For example, you will find that I make clear over and over again that I am talking about *improvement*, not just change. You will find that I refer to the importance of teachers not only *seeing* demonstrations of new practices but *actually trying them out*, hardly the "hot-house" demonstrations you ascribe to the model. You will find that I specifically mention how little we know about the role and function of change agents in the school but that at least we are coming to the point of asking the *questions*. Even the opening anecdote is a refutation of the last assumption. And as for the sixth, that "assumption" is not present in any way, shape, or form in the article, and it would be foolish to claim that it is! To carry the example further is pointless; the disparity between the article and the claimed assumptions is apparent on a back-to-back reading of both.

If the assumptions *are* essential concomitants of a belief in the long-range effectiveness of well-conceived and balanced research and development efforts then I for one would be the first to recommend we quit our efforts right now. On the other hand, we cannot afford to spend public dollars at any level of government for "messing around." And the only real alternative to messing around is carefully planned cumulative research, well-supported development, *credible* demonstration, and the development of the required capabilities in the army of professionals who must know the improved practices in order to implement them.

If there is a philosophy or model expressed in the article and the laboratory program it is that simple attention to the *logic* of the research-development-demonstration-continuum will *never by itself* get us to any more efficient levels of instruction, learning, or education (in other words, a claim of the insufficiency of the "pipeline" model), but rather that improvement in education depends upon a process of persuasion and accommodation among different identifiable sub-systems in education.

No one understands more fully than those of us here how difficult and complicated educational improvement is. We do not *know* yet how to bring about the general implementation of improved practices on a continuing basis, but we have some clues. We do not castigate anyone or find anyone reprehensible; it is hard to do so when we are all beginners in this effort. We do not believe that all good things in education now stem from research; but in the long run, if there is good, coordinated research and it is well-supported, it is likely that much of what is good in instruction *will* come from there.

Dialog on these matters is important among all parts of the research and education community. You reported, however, that you found it "extremely difficult to reach and talk to USOE officials about these matters." It has been fourteen months since the article appeared. I have yet to hear from you!

I suppose the most disappointing aspect of your testimony is that while it bore all the signs of an act of demolition it offered little in the way of constructive suggestion. It would be foolish to deny that the school is by and large unchanged and inadequately implementing what we already know about human learning and human motivation. But models of educational change can be intellectually criticized all day long. It is a pleasant academic pastime. The problems of the schools, however, be they urban, rural, suburban, segregated, poor, advantaged, or inadequate are numerous and will not wait, and what we need are constructive suggestions which go something beyond your critique.

Let us get the issues out where they count and can be dealt with. Our job is to help, and I am at your service in that effort.

Sincerely,

(Signed) HENDRIK D. GIDEONSE.

Mr. GIBBONS. Now we will hear from the panel of student financial aid officers. We will put all your statements in the record at the beginning of the time you appear in the record.

Mr. Hathaway and I are both very familiar with most of the student assistance programs that the Federal Government has because we sat through the birthing of them and the modification of them in the case of NDEA. So you can keep your remarks on the phase of what is in the act and how it operates relatively short.

We would like to hear from you as to what problems you are having, how the act can be improved and what criticism you might have of how the acts are being administered.

I don't know whether we have any order of seniority here. Being left handed I will start over here on my left and go across. If each one of you will make a brief opening statement and then we will start kicking it around.

STATEMENT OF PANEL OF FINANCIAL AID OFFICERS, ROBERT J. KATES, JR., CHAIRMAN AND DIRECTOR OF FINANCIAL AID, NORTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY, AND PETER GUNNESS, DIRECTOR OF FINANCIAL AID, HARVARD UNIVERSITY, GRANT E. CURTIS, DIRECTOR OF FINANCIAL AID, TUFTS UNIVERSITY, ROBERT J. MORRISEY, DIRECTOR OF PLACEMENT AND FINANCIAL AID SERVICES, UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. KATES. I am Robert J. Kates, Jr., chairman of the group and director of financial aid at Northeastern. We have our group statement.

(The statement follows:)

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Subcommittee, I am Robert J. Kates, Jr., Director of Financial Aid at Northeastern University. Let me introduce to you at this time my colleagues on our panel this morning. Mr. Peter Gunness, Director of Financial Aid, Harvard College; Grant E. Curtis, Director of Financial Aid, Tufts University; Robert J. Morrisey, Director of Placement and Financial Aid Services, University of Massachusetts. Mr. Gunness, Mr. Curtis, and I are also members of the Eastern Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators Steering Committee. As financial aid officers at these institutions, we administer the major programs which we have broken down by levels of activity in the attachment to our statement. My plan this morning is to present a brief opening statement and then to direct questions at my colleagues on the panel and to provide answers to as many of your questions as we can at this time.

We are greatly appreciative of the efforts of Congress to provide the colleges and universities with a complete package of aid implements which we can use to solve the ever increasing financial problems of students and make possible an equality of opportunity in education. There is general agreement that the coordination of grant, loan and employment programs as represented in the Higher Education Act of 1965 provides a sound approach for federal aid to students in higher education. Our mutual problem is to modify these programs in such a way as to improve our ability in the colleges to carry out the intent of Congress. With this in mind, let me voice several general concerns.

One of the major concerns of the aid officers is the gradual departure in the new legislation and resulting administrative procedures from the dependence on

the judgment and integrity of aid officers and the colleges and universities. In both the College Work-Study Program and the Educational Opportunity Grant Program, the guide lines spell out operating procedures in such specific fashion as to make more difficult our job of effectively and efficiently administering these programs. In addition, the great quantity of information required both in the application procedure and later reporting procedures impose a heavy burden on aid offices without appearing to add anything to the effective operation of our program.

We are also concerned that the appropriation time table for these programs imposes severe budgeting, planning, and, in some cases, financial hardships on the institutions since most recruiting, admitting and awarding procedures are completed by the institutions by April 1 of the year in which the students enter college. This year our first indication of an approximate level of support was received in mid-May and was followed by notification of the continuing resolution providing for minimum support levels in mid-August. With the growing importance of these federally supported programs to increasing number of students, it is important that a means be found to move the appropriation time table forward to coincide with the college admission time table.

We are also concerned that the Guaranteed Loan Program be revised to bring a consistency of philosophy regarding financial need to this program, which will play a greater role in over-all student support in the future. The Guaranteed Loan Program must also be made more attractive to the banking community, if it is to achieve the wide-spread support needed to meet the demands which will be placed upon it.

At this point, let me ask my colleagues on the panel to elaborate on some changes which we feel necessary.

Major student aid programs—Levels of activity 1966-67

Tufts University:	
National Defense Education Act loan.....	\$380, 000
Economic opportunity grant.....	43, 000
College work-study program.....	274, 000
Northeastern University:	
National Defense Education Act loan.....	650, 000
Economic opportunity grant.....	353, 000
College work-study program.....	2, 060, 000
University of Massachusetts:	
National Defense Education Act loan.....	434, 000
Economic opportunity grant.....	235, 000
College work-study program.....	358, 000
Harvard University:	
National Defense Education Act.....	1, 300, 000
Economic opportunity grant.....	67, 000
College work-study program.....	500, 000

Mr. KATES. At this time, I should like to introduce to you the following directors of financial aid: Mr. John Madigan, Boston College; Mr. Everett Hicks, Boston University; Miss Nancy McIntyre, Radcliffe College; Miss Jan Gebron, Regis College; Mr. Robert Caswell, assistant director, Northeastern University.

Mr. GIBBONS. We are glad to have their presence noted and we welcome them.

Mr. KATES. I would like to elaborate on one area and that is the problem caused by the funding process of the programs as opposed to our timetable in trying to get the student into college. The two are not tied together.

We are recruiting and talking with students and receiving their applications long before we have any idea of the commitment on the part of the Office of Education. These programs are essential to the students if they are going to attend.

In the case of this past year where we had a longer than usual process, we saw in our own institution a significant increase in the

number of people who dropped out because they had no work, they had no assurance that they would have the funds.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Hathaway and I want to make it perfectly clear. We understand your problem but we are not guilty of any of this delay—but go ahead and criticize. It won't hurt us.

Mr. KATES. We would need to know of our organizations, our firm commitments, by at least January of the year in which the student is going to enter college.

In the case of the Educational Opportunity Grant Program, now we are being asked by the Office of Education what we are doing to make firm commitments to high school students prior to their senior year.

Mr. GIBBONS. You need at least 9 or 10 months of leadtime, is that right?

Mr. KATES. We do because we are telling these students that they must make a choice among institutions by the first of April or the first of May.

Mr. GIBBONS. These are appropriated funds you are talking about?

Mr. KATES. These are appropriated funds. These are the firm commitments that are being made to us.

Mr. GIBBONS. I wish the staff would make a note of the fact that we perhaps ought to investigate some way we could get perhaps an appropriation a whole year in advance. If we could get you an appropriation a whole year in advance—

Mr. KATES. You are doing this I believe with the Opportunity Grant Program where you are making a firm appropriation in one year to be used with the entering class the following year. This is what we need because by the intent you are driving us into making firm commitments to students even earlier than their senior year in high school in order to prevent them from dropping out of high school, in order to encourage them to go on to college programs.

Mr. GIBBONS. Frankly, we want you to get down to the ninth or 10th grade where the family obviously has no chance.

Mr. KATES. Right. We have to put something in their hands to the effect that "this guarantees you the financial resources when you are admitted to a college."

Mr. GIBBONS. You keep your grades up.

Mr. KATES. Right. If you are admitted then you can rest assured of the finances. This would help to keep them in the college programs. But we can't do this unless we have some assurance that when the student arrives at our doorstep we are going to have the resources.

The problem that we had this year left us in a position where we had to tell many of our upperclassmen that we don't have the loan funds for you, for example, because they are needed to match the Opportunity Grant Program.

I think at this point if Mr. Morrissey from the University of Massachusetts would comment on the opportunity grant program and some of their problems it might be appropriate.

Mr. GIBBONS. Is this the first time you have run short on loan money?

Mr. KATES. This is the first year that I, myself, have run short.

Mr. GIBBONS. Is this true of any of the rest of you?

Mr. GUNNESS. We have always been short.

Mr. MORRISEY. Every year.

I wanted to mention along with Bob Kates' remarks along with the Opportunity Grant funds in reference to the matching funds, I would like to preface my remarks by saying that if one could generalize on needy students, which one should never try to do, one might say you could have three groups of needy students.

You have the real needy student who has need of a thousand dollars on up to go to college. You have a student who is slightly needy, needs somewhere between \$500 and \$1,000 and you have the student who is not really needy at all, he might need a \$100 to \$500 but he is not very needy.

OEG funds are going to the most needy group that need at least \$1,000 or more. Now we have to match that. In most cases we do not have enough scholarship money of our own to match. Therefore, we dig very heavily into the National Defense Loan Fund to match. As a result, since OEG came out, our National Defense Loan funds are being used so heavily with this heavy-need group that your middle-need group, the \$500 to \$1,000, which I use as an offhand figure, is hurting in terms of getting National Defense Loan money because we have gone so heavily into using that in matching with the OEG.

Now what I would like to suggest is that it all be amended to allow us to match OEG by culling work-study models as well as National Defense and also by the Guaranteed Loan Program.

This would give us a much greater cushion for the matching of the OEG.

Mr. GIBBONS. That sounds like a good suggestion.

Mr. MORRISEY. I have lots of other things but I told Bob I would stick to that point. So I will turn it back to Bob Kates.

Mr. KATES. One of our other problems was a shift in the basic philosophy on relying heavily on the judgment and integrity of the aid officers and their institutions into a type of control which penalizes the institution and our operations.

I would like Mr. Gunness from Harvard to speak on this problem.

Mr. GUNNESS. This becomes a sort of more general problem, I think, of one that was mentioned earlier by John Herzog. The whole range of control, Federal control, implicit or otherwise, that gets injected into colleges as they administer various programs—

Mr. GIBBONS. When did this begin to take place?

Mr. GUNNESS. As I think back in history, and these are my observations: the NDEA program was set up in quite a remarkable way. Congress was to appropriate money to colleges to give to students. The colleges were to develop their specific standards which, as long as they followed the broad general guidelines set up both in the legislation and in the way that the guidelines were written. A lot of discretion was left to the financial aid officer and to the university to choose those students to whom it would give the money, and how it would report and keep track of the money, as long as it was accountable in whatever way the Office said, but not down to specific operational day-to-day details.

I guess how I see what happened was that at first a lot of colleges didn't go into these programs. Colleges that had loan programs did.

They saw the opportunity and jumped in easily. It was easy for them to add another kind of loan program to their already existing program. They had procedures, styles, operational means whereby they could handle the new money that they were given to lend to students.

As long as the Office of Education defined broad frameworks within which they were to give this money, it was quite easy for the college that had experience to follow these guidelines without having to change many of its own procedures to coadapt to the needs of the Office of Education. Then, as new colleges came into the program that had no experience with loan programs—and this I think might apply to other of the financial aid programs—turned to the Office of Education for guidance. When colleges asked, "How do we do it, what do we do?" the Office of Education probably said, and I would say this was not intentional on their part, "You have to figure out how to do it, we don't want to control you."

The colleges said, "You can't give us this much money and not tell us how to administer it." There was a felt need on the part of some colleges to have more direction.

The response was very obvious. Some guidelines would be drafted which were really not guidelines but in fact rules on how one should run a program. The Office of Education was responding to a request for guidelines which were drafted for colleges who were often new to programs of this type. Those of us who had a lot of experience were confronted with guidelines which really drastically altered the operations of our programs and very often the decisionmaking that we had sort of had as a prize before. We had been trusted instruments, if you will, and we became less so, I think.

I don't think there was any conspiracy or any intentional effort on the part of the Office to take over, to move into an area which we feel is our responsibility, but in fact I think it has happened.

I suppose it is terribly hard to set up guidelines that respond to what I think is the great strength of American education, which is its diversity and variety. Yet you begin to pipe in guidelines to help colleges having many different purposes and many different points of view, and you begin to get a kind of homogenization or standardization. In a way, the colleges are asked to produce whatever it is the Office of Education wants to see at the end of the line. We have to alter our procedures, and maybe we do begin to standardize some of our practices beyond the point that we would want to.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Can you give us an example of how you are restricted now compared to when you were not before?

Mr. KATES. Probably the Work-Study Program was the first major program where they changed the direction of operations. We had to spell out exactly what we were going to do, where the students were going to work, how much they would be paid on a job-by-job category. Our application this year for our own institution runs 70 pages, and I am sure it is not going to be read, absorbed, and really scrutinized in that sort of detail. Nor does it have any effect on our program. Rather, it has an adverse effect in that in dealing with outside agencies who have the same budgetary problems that we do they are apt to say, "Well, we can't tell you specifically what the job would be or how many we can use. We can make a tentative commitment."

They may not want to be bound by this. We say a student can work no more than 15 hours a week as a hard and fast rule, without allowing any flexibility in terms of a longer workweek in one week but no work at all in the final exam week. There is no provision for averaging out a work schedule for a student.

Representative Quie asked the question of whether we took into account a student's academic performance on the job. And we do. If we felt the student was not able to work, we would not assign him to work. We are not going to force him into a job. There is this feeling that we should regulate and spell everything down to the last detail on this.

Mr. GIBBONS. If you can give us a memorandum how you think that Work-Study Program ought to be amended we are probably going to get to that one next year.

Mr. KATES. I would like Mr. Curtis of Tufts to comment on the grant program.

Mr. CURTIS. Any testimony of this kind should not begin without urging you to continue your support of the National Defense Loan Program. The colleges were pretty well concerned last spring when we thought we might lose it. No doubt you saw some evidence of the concern that parents, students, and the colleges themselves felt if this program were done away with. We feel the guaranteed insured loans are helpful, but we urge the continuance of the NDEA program for low- and middle-income families in particular. They are the ones least likely to approach banks. They are the ones least likely to get loans from banks.

Continuance of the program will also allow us to continue to package right in the college where the financial aid officer can work out a reasonable proportion of work, loan, scholarship for students who must get various sources of funds in order to meet the high cost of college.

The guidelines in this program are general in contrast to the EOG's and the college work-study program, where we have seen a gradual erosion of the flexibility of the financial aid officer's opportunity to make flexible decisions. This is an aside, but we think that the Office of Education ought to go back and rewrite the guidelines for the EOG's and the college Work-Study Program more in line with the trust that was placed in the financial aid officer in each of the institutions under the National Defense Loan Program.

The National Defense Loan Program has been attacked from time to time by various sources indicating that the students will not repay their loans, they will treat them as an outright gift or disappear or what have you. No doubt you have seen articles in the New York Times and Wall Street Journal and so on. I do not have the national figures but we submitted our own report to the Office of Education on national defense loans last month. In the last 8 years I have loaned \$2.5 million to over 2,000 students at my university. At the present time, 1,199 persons are under collection; \$1.4 million is under collection; 28 persons have \$4,300 overdue. Two percent of those that have borrowed and are now repaying are overdue by 30 days or more. The amount of money is 3 percent of the total under collection.

My recommendations for the National Defense Loan would be that, as you are no doubt aware, there is a maximum of \$1,000 a year with

a total of \$5,000, which an undergraduate is presently allowed. This is a rather artificial type of demand or law in that some students need to borrow more than a thousand in some years, and in other years they need to borrow less than that. Yet if a student borrows \$500 in one year his total amount of money that he may borrow eventually is cut down by a thousand, not by the \$500. I would urge increasing the maximum loan in any one year to \$2,000, let us say, which will meet the tuition in many of the private institutions of the country. I would urge this not with the intent that you increase the maximum undergraduate loan. In fact, I would suggest they remain at \$5,000 or \$6,000. But give the financial aid officer and the student some more flexibility and some more latitude.

Finally, I don't think I would represent the educational and the financial aid community very well if I did not call your attention to the fact that we would still like to see that oath removed from the National Defense Loan law. We feel that its efficacy still remains to be proved. We are not aware of any studies which indicate that it is helpful. Students treat it in various ways. I have had very few people refuse to sign the oath. I think that in seven years, four students have refused to take the National Defense Loan because of the oath. In each case it usually was a religious prohibition or a religious feeling on their part. So we would hope in future legislation on the National Defense Loans, the oath would be omitted.

Mr. MORRISSEY. If I may, gentlemen, just add a point relative to collection to Grant's fine point. My own president of the University of Massachusetts asked me specifically to comment on this point. He feels strongly—and, of course, you have heard this many times—that the colleges were given quite a burden as far as collection of National Defense Loans were concerned. One of the reasons, of course, for the high default rate in the early days was that institutions were not prepared for this kind of thing and actually did nothing about it for several years until they finally discovered what a dilemma they were in. It is his feeling and mine and that prevalent in good many colleges that the Government could be doing a little more in aiding us financially with the administrative financial burden that we get in terms of the collection process. In a large institution, it means hiring several people to carry this out, do all the paperwork involved, and so on. It is a tremendous burden.

I would be remiss if I didn't bring this point up, that we feel there needs to be a greater aid than the 1 percent that is now allowed for administrative purposes, particularly at the collection end.

Mr. GUNNESS. Could I just add that it sort of follows along with one of my thoughts that money is important, and it helps to make the job of collecting easier. But I have the feeling that this is one of those areas where the problem was recognized perhaps a little later than it should have been recognized. The solution is a rigid set of principles which will then be issued by the Office of Education as to the definitions and ways of handling the problem.

There is too often very little technical assistance, especially to the college who didn't have the expertise in collecting the money. A lot

of misunderstandings developed both on definitions of what was outstanding and bad debt. Default can be defined in many different ways. It seems to me that applying a single definition of default through the collection procedures of 2,000 independent and separate institutions just is impossible. Is it 15 days, 14 days, 13 days? It has to be adjusted to the requirements of the college, some negotiation with the Office of Education on this. It seems to me at times there hasn't been.

Mr. GIBBONS. I think the problem is brought about as most problems are brought about: there is always an apple that goes bad in the barrel and they throw out a lot of other apples to get to that one. We have had that problem in the NDEA loan program although it has been extremely minor.

Mr. JONES. [Director of student aid, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.] I have done some consulting with other universities. I am from MIT. I was largely called in because MIT has a very old loan fund of its own, something like 35 years old. We have had a remarkable record of repayment which is probably due to two things:

One, the quality of our students; and

Two, the conservatism with which we have handled the loan fund for a very long time.

For a long time, we had to practically prove you didn't need money to get it. In any case, with a 30-year history involving over \$9 million, we have only written off something like \$25,000.

The point that I discovered in investigating this collection problem with other institutions is in two parts:

One, because of the nature of the collection procedure that was forced on the college, they had to be very inflexible with their students. They had to insist on collection when good educational judgment would have indicated that they should have extended the loan even though it did not match the administrative or legal requirement.

For instance, a girl marries a graduate student and she is in debt, and he goes on to graduate school.

Mr. GIBBONS. A negative dowry?

Mr. JONES. That is correct. I have read letters in folders where these students had every intention of repaying but they simply were not because they were now two and not one—a family rather than a single individual. They didn't have the resources to meet this repayment.

Mr. GIBBONS. You wonder what two of those \$5,000 borrowers would do if they married each other.

Mr. JONES. The second point I discovered was that there is actually a conflict in the law, it seems to me. It seems to me that the Congress had the idea originally that a good deal of risk would be involved in this program if you were trying to reach people who were upgrading themselves, who were probably stretching their potential as it were and consequently the institutions were making loans on quite a risky basis. They were not conservative loans; they were quite liberal; they were definitely risky. You are going to have a higher rate of default with that kind of program than you are going to have if you run a very conservative program which MIT did run for a good deal of its history with its own private loan fund.

We have now gotten very much more liberal with this and it is quite possible that the fine record that we have will vanish, and that

we will have a more serious default problem. Although, again, we have the advantage of dealing with a high-caliber student body and certainly academically, we don't run that much risk.

But in a large municipal-type institution for instance or very large State university, if you are doing the kind of job I think Congress wanted us to do, you are going to have a higher rate of risk involved.

Consequently, if I were a representative in Congress on the committee, I would be very dubious about these national figures. I don't think they tell you the whole story.

Mr. GIBBONS. That is a good observation.

Mr. JONES. I would like to make a couple of other points if I may, simply to round out a little bit—I associate myself with everything that has been said by my colleagues this morning, and they are actually much more experienced in the National Defense Loan Program than we are because of the strength of our own program.

We only got into the NDEA about three years ago. But I would like to say first of all, and this harkens back to Mr. Herzog's testimony, I am most impressed with the quality if not the quantity of the staff of the Office of Education.

I think it is remarkable that a bureaucracy that started in small with such a traditional history behind it has grown to the degree it has and acquired the personnel that it has of this really very high quality.

We find it very easy to deal with these people. It is just that there are so few of them and their attentions are so divided.

Mr. GIBBONS. Do you deal primarily with the regional office or Washington office?

Mr. JONES. Both. The regional office is understaffed. Given that limitation, it does a remarkable job. The quality is high.

Mr. HATHAWAY. You deal with both because you can't get an authoritative answer out of the regional office?

Mr. JONES. No, sir. It is simply because we tend to be a national kind of clientele, you might say.

Mr. MORRISSEY. May I make a point that very frequently I will find myself contacting Washington rather than Dr. Johnson in Boston. Not because Dr. Johnson won't give me a wonderful answer, he is a very fine person, but very frequently I will receive a communication from Washington about our program which invariably says in the last sentence "If you have any problem regarding this, don't hesitate to call me."

So I do.

Mr. JONES. Not only that, Dr. Johnson in any given day is apt to be at Colby or Dartmouth or almost any other place. As a matter of fact, in my little black book, I have Deacon's number or Alexander's number so that I can dial directly.

Mr. HATHAWAY. You think that decentralization is advantageous, too?

Mr. JONES. Yes, it is necessary. At the same time we need contact with Washington, too. By and large, one way or the other, we have had it. I am still speaking to the general thinking that these people have been wonderfully able, effective, cooperative, and generous with their time when they could be.

I would certainly underline Mr. Herzog's statement that you need more staff down there. I think you need more staff in the regional

office. But goodness, you are marvelously served by the quality of people they have pulled in.

The whole thrust, the whole orientation of the Office has been so drastically changed. I go back 10 years and I remember the annual production of statistics by Mr. Swatzenbaum who must have been a furiously busy man, and there wasn't much else.

The statistics were 2, 3, and 4 years out of date at the time. They had to do with the general sort of ideas that ignored the individual college.

I have never been able to use any of that stuff. Now, we have this remarkable new group of people who understand us and our problems. I think the country is extraordinarily fortunate in this.

Going on, I don't know whether it is in the purview of your investigation this morning but I would like to know that eventually you will come around to looking into the accounting procedures.

To speak for my own institution, I would simply have to classify our accountants as practically apoplectic over the problems that they have to contend with in trying to do an accounting job within the guidelines or the administrative rules or the law that they have been handed.

We have had almost to completely retool a very large, complicated, highly automated accounting system in order to do the job that has been demanded in this field. Now, we are talking about an institution that has an annual budget of \$70 million.

It is so big I don't even know about it. But just to handle a fairly small part of it, they have had to do a tremendous amount of work in redesigning their equipment, redesigning their programing, redesigning their categories.

I just wonder if we have not gotten the phenomenon of the tail wagging the dog here. I would like to know that eventually you people will be asking the college, its business officers and accounting officers their views on this aspect of the thing.

Mr. GIBBONS. Have any of you been audited by the GAO on NDEA?

Mr. KATES. Yes.

Mr. GIBBONS. Have all of you been audited by GAO?

Mr. GUNNESS. Two years.

Mr. GIBBONS. How about on the college Work-Study Program?

Mr. KATES. No.

Mr. GUNNESS. No. We have had careful review.

Mr. GIBBONS. Let me ask you something about the philosophy of forgiveness for teachers. What is your practical view?

Mr. JONES. Could I stick an oar in on that? I have a strong view on that. I think the forgiveness feature is marvelous. I am fully in agreement with it. I think it is simply too narrow.

I think there are other occupations which have a high social value which Congress certainly should take into account. That is where the normal economic return to the individual is, let us say, under scale in terms of the actual return of that occupation to society.

I would think generally of two other categories, and I am sure that my colleagues could come up with others. You undoubtedly have others still. In particular, I would think of the importance of social work and the whole apparatus that is now being developed in community action programs, with the underprivileged programs, et cetera, where we ought to be encouraging people by the same device.

Mr. GIBBONS. Are we really encouraging this?

Mr. KATES. Let me speak to that point. I am diametrically opposed because in my experience you design the law to encourage teaching by forgiveness. It does not do that. It works the other way around. The students apply for the loan because they are going into teaching and can take advantage of the forgiveness aspect.

Their concern is, "Where can I get the money? I have these sources, this is most favorable. I will take it."

But if we think we are going to encourage anyone to go into a career with enthusiasm and vigor on the basis of a 10-percent or even 50-percent writeoff over 5 years or a hundred percent over 7 years—that is an amount that is \$1,000 or \$2,000—we are going at it the wrong way.

Mr. GUNNESS. I would be in favor of helping people, giving money to people who are going into higher social need areas, but I don't think you attract them through a device like this.

Mr. JONES. A rebuttal. It is not just attraction. It is driving them out by reason of having too many burdens after they get into the profession. It is to the extent you are preventing a loss, an attrition on the profession after the students go into the work. 'A teacher may have every intention of making a career out of it, but he begins to run into problems of family formation, of carrying a home mortgage, and that sort of thing. If he also has to pay off a lot of NDEA, then obviously you are forcing him to look around for alternative professions.

Mr. GIBBONS. The answer is to pay him better.

Mr. MORRISEY. I think the important point here is that the intent of the law is really not being served. I understand the intent of the law was to get more people into teaching. I don't think the intent of the law is served.

Mr. JONES. I would want to see statistics on that.

Mr. HATHAWAY. I was going to ask you about Work-Study any time you are ready. Will the increase from 10 to 25 percent materially affect your program?

Mr. KATES. This will hurt the on-campus program particularly. We have not found any problem offcampus. We have a fairly substantial off-campus program. The 25 percent does not scare these people off. On campus this would mean an increase in the cost of the Work-Study programs. It would wipe out roughly 30 percent of the proposed tuition increase next year, which is rough.

It also means I can't get as much in scholarship aid which I need to match my EOG funds. So that the increase would have a very serious effect on our total aid program, not necessarily Work-Study. Off campus my feeling is that the increase to 25 percent is beneficial, at least if you are going to run a large and effective program, because it gives the agency more of a stake and perhaps encourages them to more closely supervise the students.

Mr. HATHAWAY. You think they will be able to raise the money?

Mr. KATES. We have hard and firm commitments on our students for next year. We didn't expend our money this year because of a duplication in summer jobs. They file them with several agencies. We are attempting to work on an exclusive arrangement for fixed commitment of people to certain agencies, and they have assured us that they will come up with the funds on the 25-percent basis, and

we will solve that problem because the students have provided a tremendous amount of assistance for them. They are not make-work jobs with these agencies. They are allowing them to expand programs that otherwise might not be expanded. They are perfectly willing to come up with the 25 percent.

As I say, from our standpoint we would almost encourage the increase simply to make the program more meaningful to them. If you give it away there is a tendency perhaps not to evaluate it quite so highly and perhaps not pay quite so much attention. But on campus we would be definitely hurt drastically if it went above the 10-percent level.

Mr. HATHAWAY. You must have had a difficult problem persuading the Office of Education where you have a cooperative program anyway, that these were all new jobs at Northeastern.

Mr. KATES. The bulk of our jobs are off campus and on campus part time. The co-op program in terms of full-time assignments for students while they are not in school is a limited part of our total cooperative program, and I feel can be justified in several areas.

One, it is finding jobs for people in the social agency field that the agencies could not afford at the hundred percent rate. It also provides us with a buffer in that we are totally committed to Cooperative Education for upper classmen and must find assignments for these people. So a limited number of co-op assignments gives us this flexibility of putting fellows in a job that must be done for this period while we are searching for a job in one of the industrial firms or one of the other areas.

Mr. HATHAWAY. All of your cooperative employment is off campus?

Mr. KATES. Well, say the greatest, probably 90 or 95 percent of our cooperative employment is off campus.

Mr. HATHAWAY. In private industry?

Mr. KATES. In private industry, in the same social areas, in municipal agencies, Federal Government. It covers a wide range of fields. Our general way of encouraging institutions to participate in the Work-Study Program is to do it on a combination basis where they will not simply fund their entire program through Work-Study in the case of a school system but would use a fair amount of their own funds to take people who would not be eligible for Work-Study because a student going on Work-Study must meet the same need of employment. If a student can finance his education without the earnings of cooperative education, then he is not eligible for a cooperative full-time job. That Work-Study co-op is a limited aspect, but one that was a great benefit because it is of assistance in an area where the agencies need these people but could not afford a hundred percent.

Mr. GIBBONS. May I ask about the Work-Study? We have limited it to private, nonprofit corporations or governmental agencies. Is it possible or is it desirable to perhaps extend that into some of the other organizations, profitmaking?

Mr. KATES. Conceivably, from one standpoint, if you are dealing with youngsters who need a great deal of training and who perhaps don't have much to offer industry. But our basic philosophy would be no, the demand from private industry for students is far greater

than we are able to supply. So in that area there is no problem, and we would just as soon, I think, stay out of it.

The greater need for funds in this area is for the training and development of Cooperative Education programs in developing institutions, where you could perhaps use the funds under title III to institute and develop a program of Cooperative Education in an institution which does not have one. The funds could be used to train the staff people, help them to set up the machinery for doing this, for going out and recruiting the initial industrial firms to come into the program, and in effect, act as seed money that would be actually withdrawn after 3 or 4 years when the program is in full operation.

We attempted a proposal of this nature which combined funds for the training of cooperative people, the research on the effects of Cooperative Education on attendance, the value of it, with a financial aid package that would encourage the recruitment of students from low-income families, from high-need areas.

It was an interagency or an interbureau committee, but we didn't get it funded. This is a thing where dealing with private industry, you are financing the recruitment of the industry into the program, but let them pay for the people——

Mr. GUNNESS. The one attempt we had this last summer was with a number of the graduates of the School of Design. We would have liked to have placed all the students on jobs, on building sites around the city. It seemed to us that even if the money had been available to pay for something such as this, that this is a recruiting effort on the part of the construction and architectural industry, and a part of the curriculum which it seems to me they should finance.

Mr. GIBBONS. You say there is plenty of demand in this area of the country for that type of operation anyway?

Mr. KATES. Right. Private industry has a wide range of positions which could be filled by Cooperative Students because they in most programs go into industry with 1 year of college under their belt and have a little bit of background and can enter industry without any hardship to industry. They can generally get their money's worth out of a pair of Cooperative Students. They have a year's service. It is tied in with the educational program. There is no lack of demand there. The problem is simply to get more schools to participate in this program so that the demand in major industrial areas can be satisfied.

Mr. GIBBONS. Fine. My pusher is pushing me back here again. Father McHugh is here.

Do you have some other points you want to cover very briefly?

Mr. KATES. One point on the collection. There is no provision that we know of for actually writing off a bad loan when we have determined that it is bad. We are just stuck with reporting that year after year. The other final thing perhaps would be to emphasize again the importance of eliminating the nonsense from the statistical reports, the great burden of administration on us. It creates a problem.

Mr. GIBBONS. What kind of nonsense are you talking about? Give us an illustration.

Mr. KATES. For example, on the educational opportunity grant program, they come around in October and say, "OK, now what have

you actually disbursed since the first of September until the 30th of September? What will you disburse in the next fiscal period?"

We can tell them this without having to identify them by freshman, sophomore, male, female breakdown on the award.

Mr. MORRISEY. They want us to tell them how much money we are going to spend per month under the Work-Study program and the month of August broken down.

Why would it make any difference on the number of students working in two parts of the months? This gets to be nonsense.

Mr. GIBBONS. Why don't you send us some of these requests for information that you feel should be eliminated from the reports.

Mr. KATES. If I might comment on the Guaranteed Loan Program. With the original design of the program to aid middle and upper income family students we are completely agreed. As the program breaks down, as a substitute for National Defense or major supplement to National Defense it does not work because the banks are not interested in the very students who need the money most. The banks are naturally gravitating toward the upper income family students.

Mr. GIBBONS. We really meant the Guaranteed Loan Program to go up and take some of the heat off some of the people with larger incomes, and we set a \$15,000 ceiling on the family income because we didn't want people taking these funds and investing them in the stock market or something like that. We figured we would keep it down reasonably.

Mr. KATES. This is a perfectly reasonable limit. It is a perfectly fine program as long as we don't get the idea that the banking community will now extend this to provide the funds for the total student loan programs that are required. The presidents of the banking associations may indicate that their member associations will cooperate, but like anything else, it depends on persuasion. When you get down to the operating level and the hard cash of how much the banks can commit, they just can not get involved in an extensive program of that nature.

It is unfortunate because the people who suffer are the students who are caught in the middle, unable to get funds at the college, given a razzle-dazzle and showing a display of footwork that would amaze even someone like good old Cassius here by banks who don't want to touch the program with a 10-foot pole. We have a letter of introduction that the students use to try to get the banks to tell us why they won't participate, simply so that we can go back to our own bank and say, "Here is a student who has tried and has been refused." Our bank has agreed to pick these up and go beyond the normal bank accounting, but now the banks are shuffling the student and saying, "Don't talk to us at all."

Mr. GIBBONS. The banks are getting 8 percent on pretty good commercial loans where they used to get 4 percent.

Mr. JONES. The pressure on us comes in part from getting less in the way of National Defense Funds than we need. This forces us to look hard at GILP as a way of supplementing or using our own institutional loan funds in ways that are in a sense dangerous for their own future. We are diverting what investments we may have in cash and lending it out and taking 1 or 2 percent interest income rather than a 6 or 8 percent.

Mr. GIBBONS. Gentlemen, we could go on all day. I would like to but Eastern Air Lines won't let us.

Thank you very much, gentlemen.

Mr. KATES. Thank you.

Mr. GIBBONS. Father McHugh, by having you last—

Mr. HATHAWAY. He understands the last shall be first.

Mr. GIBBONS. Father McHugh, we welcome you here. We will give you as much time as we have remaining. We will even try to stretch that a little.

Father, we can place your written statement in the record at this point, or allow you to read it, summarize it, or say anything you want to.

STATEMENT OF REV. PAUL F. McHUGH, DIRECTOR, NEW ENGLAND CATHOLIC EDUCATION CENTER

Reverend McHUGH. Mr. Chairman, I would like very much the opportunity to read this because I think it does establish the framework for further questioning and sources of information of benefit to you. I understand there is a time factor so if we do adjourn at 12 o'clock, I will understand.

Mr. Chairman, Congressman Hathaway, members of the staff and counsel, I appreciate this opportunity to appear before you today to share with you certain observations concerning the operations of the U.S. Office of Education in implementing the intentions of Congress and the specific legislative provisions of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

May I compliment the committee in undertaking this investigation, which should be of benefit to Congress in further intensifying the major responsibilities toward education, which should be of invaluable assistance to the Office of Education in their operations, and of immeasurable benefit to the recipients of educational legislation, the children of America.

I would like to introduce myself as the director of the New England Catholic Education Center, which was established at Boston College on July 1, 1965, to research and service the educational needs of the nearly half million students in New England whose parents chose Catholic parochial schools for their children. These schools number nearly 900 elementary schools and 300 secondary schools, staffed by 16,000 lay and religious teachers, maintained at an annual operational expense of \$50 million, and which, in current public school expenditures, would represent an annual operational output of over \$2 billion.

During its first year and a half of operation, the center's activities have focused upon research relative to the needs of the pupils and teachers in these schools, has provided services to upgrade the professional competencies of these teachers, has served as a clearinghouse for educational information relative to these schools, and has attempted to relate the needs of these children and their teachers to programs currently forming the mainstream of quality American education.

I hasten to say that the 11 Catholic school superintendents of New England are in full accord with the philosophy and specifications of

the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. I hasten to add that, speaking for these 11 superintendents in New England, I have this opportunity to congratulate the Office of Education, which in spite of many difficulties, has made every attempt to translate this piece of legislation into programs and services of benefit to all the children which this legislation was conceived to assist.

There is a popular notion that children attending church-related private schools are children of parents in favorable economic and social conditions. One of the recent studies supported by the center, however, indicates that nearly 50 percent of the children attending Catholic elementary schools in New England come from families of the lower middle or upper lower class, highly concentrated in urban areas, and, consequently, are in personal need of the programs and services, which are geared to alleviate the handicaps of educational deprivation.

The guidelines prepared by the U.S. Office of Education to implement various titles of ESEA give every evidence of the sensitivity of the Office of Education and its staff to both the intention of Congress in formulating this unique legislation and to the educational needs of the children in all schools that this legislation intended to serve. It is the feeling of the New England superintendents that every effort has been made by the U.S. Office of Education to inform the administrators of nonpublic schools of their opportunities and responsibilities to assist public school authorities in the preparation and conduct of programs and services of benefit to all children.

It is the consensus of opinion among New England Catholic school superintendents that any difficulties arising in the implementation of this legislation finds its source, not in the efforts of the Office of Education, but in breakdowns at the State and local levels, resulting from State constitutional prohibitions or misunderstandings of the bill itself.

I would like to inject in my testimony at this time a substantial agreement among my colleagues to the statement made by the National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children in its report to the President on March 31, 1966, which stated, and I quote, "There are some early indications that the disadvantaged children in private and parochial schools are receiving less help than title I intended for them." And further, "Many localities seem to involve private school pupils in the periphery of a project, or at a time and place that is inconvenient."

The feelings of my colleagues, however, do not attribute this situation to the Office of Education and its efforts, but rather agree to the supplemental report from the Committee on Education and Labor (89th Cong., second sess., H. Rept. 1814, p. II), which urges that, heretofore:

The administration of title I by the U.S. Office of Education will be pursued with strong requirements to assure that there is meaningful and cooperative discourse between public and private school administrators in advising projects in which the special educational needs of educationally deprived children who do not attend public school can be met.

At the present time it is the feeling among Catholic school superintendents of New England that the first year of implementing Pub-

lic Law 89-10 has been marked with considerable success. It is our feeling that these main points have been accomplished:

1. Under title I the educational needs of deprived children attending nonpublic schools have begun to be served by a variety of imaginative and educationally sound programs.

2. That new and strong lines of communication and partnership have been effected between public and nonpublic school personnel.

3. That nonpublic school education at large has become more aware and considerate of the educational problems of public education.

4. That there has been a strong willingness to modify and even abandon traditional administrative and educational patterns that for all too long have been hallmarks of separation rather than cooperation between the public and nonpublic sectors, which serve America's educational needs.

5. There has been a willingness on the part of nonpublic schools to expend additional moneys to implement new programs and services initiated and stimulated by 89-10.

6. Under title II, there has been a concentrated effort to establish a State list of approved textbooks and other instructional materials, which meet the requirements of current legislation and which are of immediate service to the children who attend both public and nonpublic schools.

7. The implementation of title III in New England has not met with the immediate success of titles I and II because of the very nature of supplementary centers, which involves careful planning and the inclusion of educational agencies other than formalized educational institutions.

At this point, I would like to offer some positive suggestions as to the improved operations of the Office of Education.

1. That nonpublic school personnel be encouraged to take a more positive role in the initial planning of programs of service to children.

2. That the Office of Education enlist in a positive manner the advice and counsel of nonpublic school administrators at every level of program approval and evaluation.

3. That the Office of Education encourage State departments of education to enlist the advice and counsel of nonpublic school personnel in their role as program evaluators.

4. That the Office of Education establish clearer and more constant lines of communications with non-public-school administrators in the establishment of regional offices of the Office of Education.

My testimony today is deliberately brief in order to afford the members of the committee ample opportunity for information and questioning. In summary, may I say that the ingenuity of Congress in composing this legislation has not found in the Office of Education any less ingenuity in the implementation of this legislation for which many children in America, previously unrecognized, will be afforded the educational opportunities for developing into intelligent and participative citizens.

Mr. GIBBONS. Father, I thank you. That is a very fine statement and very well delivered. It almost leaves me questionless. I certainly

don't have any disagreement with the recommendations that you make there. I think they are sound. I hope that they are carried out.

Mr. HATHAWAY. How are the parochial school children participating in title I in Massachusetts?

Reverend McHUGH. There is a unique problem in Massachusetts. I prefer not to enter that in the testimony if possible.

Mr. HATHAWAY. That was cleared up by the Attorney General's opinion, but too late this year to do anything about it.

Reverend McHUGH. That is true. I am not talking about culpability. I am talking about lack of full understanding of the local State department of education in interpretation. That has been clarified by the Attorney General's decision.

Mr. HATHAWAY. In title II, you are getting all the textbooks?

Reverend McHUGH. Title II is fine.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Title III, implementation, don't they include in it discussions of proposals of private schools?

Reverend McHUGH. There has been discussion with non-public-school authorities. I think perhaps one of the most imaginative title III proposals is now subject to a planning grant, this is in a rural area of Vermont. This involves planning and new facilities for a new program to meet the needs of children in a cooperative school district.

The nice part of this particular program is not only is it imaginative in terms of new and creative programs of education, but it does take into consideration the religious needs of a variety of religious institutions in that area.

No funds of course are being used for construction purposes, but the various denominations have pooled their resources in terms of placing, adjacent to a new school, facilities for religious instructions of all faiths. I think this is really imaginative and should be watched in terms of a pilot program to be duplicated in other areas.

Mr. HATHAWAY. You are recommending finally that OE just suggest to these local school administrators that they call in non-public-school personnel, not necessarily require them to be on their planning boards?

Reverend McHUGH. Yes, sir.

Mr. GIBBONS. Do you have any contact with the higher education programs?

Reverend McHUGH. I would say tangentially, but it is not my direct responsibility.

Mr. HATHAWAY. You think in general the program in elementary education has worked out fairly well in New England?

Reverend McHUGH. I say given the fact that there are local misunderstandings, given the fact this was a quickly expedited piece of legislation, I think in general it has been satisfactory.

Mr. GIBBONS. I agree with you. I think they have done a remarkable job in the time they have had. They might send out some peculiar questionnaires or something like that, but we send out questionnaires, too. I am getting ready to send out one. I am sure a lot of people will think the material in it is not needed. I really think the Office of Education, from what little we have seen in the field in 3 days, has apparently done a very remarkable job, and that the understand-

ing in the matter of the church-State relationship has been better and more tolerant, and with a greater degree of wisdom than many of us feared.

I have no further questions.

Father, we certainly appreciate your coming.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Thank you very much, Father.

Mr. GIBBONS. You work so precisely you have practically left us questionless. Thank you very much for the thought you have given to this.

Reverend McHUGH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GIBBONS. This concludes our hearings in Boston, Mass.

(Whereupon, at 12 noon, the hearings were concluded.)

U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 7, 1966

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION
OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,
Atlanta, Ga.

The subcommittee met at 9:40 a.m., pursuant to call, in room 318-20, U.S. Post Office and Courthouse, Mrs. Edith Green presiding.

Present: Representatives Green and Erlenborn.

Present also: Maurice Heartfield, research assistant.

Mrs. GREEN. Good morning.

I am Congresswoman Green, and to my left is Congressman Erlenborn from the State of Illinois, and to my right Mr. Heartfield, the student aid officer at George Washington University, who has been loaned to us by the university for study of the U.S. Office of Education.

While Congressman Erlenborn and I are in Atlanta today and tomorrow and in Kansas City on the following 2 days, other members of our subcommittee are holding hearings in Chicago and then in Minneapolis.

The study of the Office of Education started last July 1, on the adoption of a resolution by the Congress. We hope to have the report in January, or at the latest in the early part of February.

The study is primarily directed toward the Office of Education and how the programs that have been enacted by the Congress in the last few years are being implemented. The hearing in no way is to be considered as an attempt to carry on a vendetta against any particular individual. I think the members of the subcommittee have had a very splendid working relationship with the Office of Education.

At times we have had our differences of opinion, but during these hearings, both in Washington and across the country, we hope that attention will be focused upon the legislation itself, and the administration of programs.

Congressman Erlenborn and I have been asked to state what conclusions we have reached. Let me assure you that we come to Atlanta, and we come to the other parts of the country, not with the answers, but rather with the hope that we would have a better understanding of the problems.

As I have said to others, we are concerned, during the study, with all of the programs from the preschool level to the graduate level, but we do hope that we may focus our attention primarily on three specific pieces of legislation, one, the National Defense Student Loan Program; two, the work-study program, and three, title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. We are concerned about the

legislation itself. We are concerned about the guidelines, the rules, and the regulations that have been drawn up to implement that legislation. We do not ask that all of the comments be limited to these three areas. If there are other parts of the legislative program in which constructive recommendations could be made, and should be made, we hope that the witnesses will feel free to do that.

Congressman Erlenborn and I are also very much concerned about the reaction of the educators in this part of the country to the establishment of the regional offices, the decentralization of program administration by the Office of Education.

We will turn to our first witness this morning, Dr. Jack Martin, regional assistant commissioner for the Office of Education, and also charged with the responsibility of implementing title I of the Elementary and Secondary School Act.

Dr. Martin, will you proceed in any way that you wish in presenting your views?

STATEMENT OF DR. C. J. MARTIN, REGIONAL ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER, OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Dr. MARTIN. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

For reasons already explained to you, I am going to have a colleague read my statement, and following that we will have a statement from Dr. A. W. Boldt, who is the regional representative for Higher Education, who will speak primarily to student financial-aid problems, and then following that, Dr. Louis Armstrong, who is the senior program officer of title I, Public Law 89-10.

My colleague, Dr. Childers, will read this prepared statement.

Dr. CHILDERS (Dr. B. E. Childers, regional representative, Adult and Vocational Education) (reading):

My name is C. J. Martin, regional assistant commissioner, U.S. Office of Education, region IV, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

First, I want to welcome you and members of the committee to Atlanta, and tell you that I feel it is a step forward to hold these public hearings in the regional offices where the committee can call in people who do not have so far to travel to testify. In this way the committee should be able to reach the people who know best how the Office of Education operates at the local and State level.

Region IV consists of six States, Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, South Carolina, and Tennessee. At the present time some of our program officers operate in both regions III and IV. Region III is headquartered at Charlottesville, Va., and covers States from Maryland through North Carolina and extends as far west as Kentucky.

In region IV, there are 255 colleges and universities, all of which have at one time or another participated in student financial aid programs. For various reasons some have dropped out of the programs, although we still maintain administrative responsibility to see that these institutions which have dropped out make collections for loans previously made. There are 226 institutions which are now actively participating.

There are 692 school systems in this region, many of which are county systems, and the others are city or independent school systems. There is no record of how many local schools participate in Federal programs, but it is my guess that 97 to 98 percent participate in some kind of Federal program.

Office of Education programs which have program officers in the Atlanta regional office—and these are broken down according to the operating bureaus of the main office—are:

Higher education, which includes National Defense Student loans, guaranteed loans, college work-study, educational opportunity grants, and higher education facilities; grants and loans.

Under adult and vocational education, we have representatives of manpower development and training, agriculture, home economics, business and office education, continuing education and community services, adult basic education, and civil defense education.

In elementary and secondary education, we have school construction in federally impacted areas, Public Law 815; maintenance and operation for schools in impacted areas, Public Law 874; Cuban refugee programs; aid to disaster areas; education of the disadvantaged, title I, ESEA; grants for supplementary and innovative centers; grants for strengthening instruction, NDEA, title III; and grants for guidance, counselling, and testing.

In addition, we also have a small projects program in research which permits the approval of grants up to \$10,000, providing the research can be completed in 18 months. We also have representatives of the Civil Rights Act who work in conjunction with the Equal Educational Opportunities Office in Washington.

A function recently added to the regional office is what we call the information center. The center provides information to the public and assists staff members by providing various data needed in the performance of their professional responsibilities. This has been most valuable and is growing in importance.

There are 20 grant and/or loan programs of the Office of Education that are administered in the Atlanta office. At the present time the regional office staff consists of 27 professional personnel who administer these 20 programs. Three regional representatives, at GS-15, are authorized in the broad areas of: higher education, adult and vocational education, and elementary and secondary education. Two of these regional representatives have been appointed, one in higher education, the other in adult and vocational education. The regional representative for elementary and secondary education will be selected shortly, I understand.

Grades of the program officers range from GS-11 through GS-14. I have been delegated authority to select and appoint personnel through grade 13. Grades 14 and 15 are selected and appointed by the Washington office, but with my concurrence.

Since January 1966, the staff in the Atlanta office has been increased by 15 professional personnel. It was at this time that the decision was made to designate the Atlanta office as a pilot to other regional offices by expanding the staff to effect decentralization of program operations.

The staffing pattern as it now stands calls for a total of 71 clerical and professional positions by July 1, 1967. Whether we reach this goal or not will depend upon how long the present freeze lasts. Selections have been made for three positions, but no reporting dates have been set, since the candidates cannot be appointed until the freeze is lifted.

If a disagreement should arise between the regional assistant commissioner and one of the program officers, and it could not be reconciled at the regional level, it would then be brought to the attention of the Associate Commissioner for Field Services and the appropriate Bureau Director, and the decision would be left to them. So far this has not occurred in the Atlanta office.

The decentralization of functions to the regional office seems to me to be necessary if we are going to serve the clientele adequately in these grant and loan programs. In my thinking, it is impossible to maintain contact that is necessary to the successful operation of the programs from the Washington office.

Certainly the Washington office should establish policy under which the regional offices must operate. The people who are responsible for making a success of Federal programs at the local and/or State level are most anxious to maintain constant contact with the Office of Education program officers. They have many questions concerning these programs to which they desire to receive direct answers. It is much easier to obtain answers from the regional level than it is from the national.

It is my feeling after having worked in this field for a number of years, that all of the schools and institutions want to do a good job with the Federal funds now going into education.

The Deputy Commissioner of Education, Mr. Graham Sullivan, issued a memorandum, dated November 21, 1966, which goes into detail about the decentralization of State grant programs. It also lists programs which are to be decentralized.

At this point, Madam Chairman, I should like to insert for the record, as exhibit No. 1, a copy of Mr. Sullivan's memorandum to which I referred.

The actual decentralization will depend upon the willingness of bureau and division directors to implement the memorandum referred to above.

At the present time, there is no funding of programs at the regional office level. It is my understanding, however, that consideration is being given to decentralization of funding. There are three programs which are now decentralized up to the point of funding. They are: Manpower Development and Training, title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and the small grants program under research.

In fiscal year 1966, the six States which make up region IV received a total of \$430,514,053 for all Federal aid programs in education.

Madam Chairman, here I am inserting, if I may, exhibit No. 2, which is a photostat copy of the breakdown of expenditures by the six Southeastern States.

From all indications, this amount will not decrease in the future, but perhaps will increase. A strong responsibility of the Office of Education in administering funds of this magnitude should be in the field of proper accounting for funds expended.

One of the responsibilities of the program officers in the regional office is to make a determination that institutions and local and State agencies are expending their funds for the purposes intended by Congress. This does not constitute an audit. All audits are performed by Office of Audit, DHEW. This can only be achieved by continuing field trips and working with the constituents.

My immediate superior in the Washington Office of Education is the Associate Commissioner for Field Services, a position which was established early in 1966. The Associate Commissioner is responsible directly to the Commissioner, and provides a direct line of communication for me with the Commissioner himself. This, I think, is a great step forward in the U.S. Office of Education.

Budgeting for the regional office has been consolidated rather than broken down by program areas, as it has been done in the past. It is necessary to use three appropriations: one for manpower development and training, which actually comes from the Department of Labor; one for civil rights; and the third for all other services.

Funds are no longer broken down by program areas. We do have authority to make changes in object classifications. The program officers in the regional office maintain direct contact and communication with the appropriate division and bureau personnel in the Washington office. The bureau establishes an overall work plan, but day-to-day activities are decided at the regional level.

The Regional Director, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in Atlanta, is interested and actively engaged in educational programs. The coordination between the Regional Director's office and the Regional Office of Education is a reality, and not just in theory.

For instance, the Regional Director became interested in an attempt to improve the staffs of the various Negro colleges in the Atlanta area. This came to his attention due to the fact that so few Negro graduates were entering Government employment through the Federal Service entrance examination.

He and the regional representative for higher education have held a number of meetings and have made some progress in bringing into the Negro institutions of higher learning competent people who can help the seniors do a better job on the Federal service entrance examination. The regional director of HEW in Atlanta shows a very great interest in all of our educational programs.

The Regional Office of Education in Atlanta has worked hand in hand with the Office of Economic Opportunity in an effort to obtain better cooperation between the OEO Headstart program and the title I preschool programs. We have had some degree of success, although not as much as we would like. This is due in part to the fact that some communities in the South looked with disfavor on the Headstart program and also the fact that school systems tend to show a degree of independence when Federal funds are available. The Office of Education in Atlanta has also participated in numerous State and regional meetings with community action officials.

Our cooperation with the Bureau of Employment Service, Department of Labor, is constant, because there must be joint approval of manpower development and training programs by the Bureau of Employment Security and the Office of Education.

We have worked very closely with the Neighborhood Youth Corps and have a liaison committee appointed which is interested in establishing some pilot

projects that would be of interest to both Neighborhood Youth Corps and title I (education of the disadvantaged) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

The Office of Education must also maintain close contact with the Department of Housing and Urban Development, since at the present time all architectural and engineering services for construction of facilities are provided by this Department. It is my understanding that eventually these services will be transferred to the Office of Education.

In the summer and early fall of 1966, joint meetings were held in each State with representatives of Health, Education, and Welfare. These meetings were designed to promote better coordination of services.

It is evident that a great deal of overlapping occurs now in the services available for children in the agencies of Health, Education, and Welfare. The States, in turn, have been making an attempt to pass this idea for better coordination down to the local agencies concerned.

The Office of Education in Atlanta maintains contact with all of the professional educational associations in the States, the region, and the Nation. Staff members of the Office hold positions in regional and national associations. The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, which is the accrediting agency for Southern States, is headquartered in Atlanta, and the Office maintains a close relationship with this organization.

We have also been interested in and worked with various foundations concerned with education. There are five regional laboratories which cover some of region IV. The research adviser on the staff of the Atlanta office has made contact with two of these laboratories and plans to work with all of them to promote the cause of education in this region. The research adviser reported for duty about a month ago.

I would like to call to the attention of the committee some areas of needs so far as the office is concerned.

It is a known fact that in student financial aid, this region has the poorest collection record on loans that have been made to students. I would like to call attention to the fact that with the large number of colleges and universities in this region, we need additional staff to serve the institutions properly and to help them in setting up proper procedures for making collections on loans. With the present staff it is impossible to make frequent personal contacts that are necessary to improve the collection procedure.

In the area of adult and vocational education, we need representation in library services and construction. We also need a position in the area of health occupations. There is a great emphasis on training people in this broad category.

If title III projects of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and small research projects are approved here we will desperately need a contracts officer to negotiate the contracts. This is now a bottleneck in the Office in Washington, and if we are going to be of better service to our clients we need someone here on the staff to negotiate contracts. The position has been established, and the person has been selected but cannot be appointed until the freeze is lifted.

I cannot close this statement without emphasizing the need for more travel funds. Personnel who are located in the field and are expected to keep constant contact with clientele are practically useless when sitting in the office.

My understanding is that funds for travel have been cut by approximately 50 percent, and that we are now at the end of the third quarter so far as funds are concerned, even though we are still in the second quarter of the fiscal year chronologically.

Madam Chairman, thank you for the privilege of appearing before you and the committee. My colleagues and I would be happy to attempt to answer any questions which you and members of the committee may ask.

Mrs. GREEN. Thank you very much.

Without any objection, the exhibits to which you refer will be made a part of the record.

(Documents referred to follow:)

EXHIBIT 1

MEMORANDUM

NOVEMBER 21, 1966.

To: Associate Commissioners for BAVE, BESE, BHE, BR, OFS, and Assistant Commissioner for Administration.

From: J. Graham Sullivan, Deputy Commissioner of Education.

Subject: Decentralization of State Grant Programs.

This follows up my memorandum of September 9, *Next Steps in Decentralization*, and recent discussions involving the Assistant Commissioner for Administration, the Associate Commissioners for the operating Bureaus and for Field Services, and myself. It has been decided to transfer State grant programs to the field as soon as possible. These transfers will be made to the maximum extent but consistent with principles of economy and good management.

For many years, such programs have been administered through direct relationships between headquarters offices and State agencies with little recourse to regional staffs. We are convinced that regional offices should be more direct participants with the States in planning and development, and in funds management. We are, therefore, directing that actions to regionalize State grant programs be undertaken immediately.

This in no way changes the concepts of decentralization stated in the Commissioner's memorandum of August 4, in my memorandum of September 9, and in our several discussions of this subject. The headquarters Bureaus retain their responsibility for program planning, policy, and direction. The Associate Commissioner for Field Services, through the Regional Assistant Commissioners, is responsible for coordination and management of those programs in the field. Headquarters Bureaus and Staff Offices are responsible for the technical programmatic direction of field programs.

As we envision the separation of these responsibilities, the headquarters Bureaus would be responsible for the following general functions:

1. Program planning, including annual plan of operations;
2. Program evaluation, including accomplishment of established program goals;
3. Development and revision of overall program policy and objectives;
4. Development and issuance of regulations, instructions, operating manuals, procedures, etc. (NOTE.—To assure consistency and uniformity of systems and methods, a Guidelines Review Committee of both headquarters and field representatives will be formed. The Committee will review, coordinate, and assure consistency and uniformity of all proposed issuances of guidelines materials which affect State grant programs.)

The Regional Offices would be responsible for the following general functions:

1. Authority to review and approve State grant proposals;
2. Maintenance of allotment records, including reports and recommendations for redistribution of funds based on such records;
3. Program reviews, including assessment of programs in relation to cost and appropriateness in relation to objectives;
4. Recommendations of ways to strengthen program administration or to improve level of quality in State education activities;
5. Review and amendment of State Plans, and approval of Annual Projected Activities Reports.

You are requested to examine with your staff the State grant programs for which your Bureau is responsible in order to plan and assess how best to transfer to regional offices the responsibility for review and approval of State grant proposals as well as program review and administration. The entire range of questions should be explored to determine not only what functions should be relocated but how best to staff them and perform them in the field. Where you identify positions to be transferred, we hope that you will also be able to identify personnel who are interested in regional office assignments. This is probably the most critical of the actions you are being asked to consider in planning regionalization of State grant programs. All the actions to be considered should be set forth in a "Planning Document" for each such program. We will need the documents as soon as possible, preferably before Christmas, but not later than January 16, 1967.

I have asked Jim Turman to coordinate the development and scheduling of necessary actions and to receive and evaluate these planning documents. He and his staff will work with you in outlining the steps to be taken, in describing

headquarters and field responsibilities under the regionalization plan, and in developing the time schedule for accomplishing this major management effort. We hope to be in full operation by April 1, 1967.¹

Attached is a list of State grant programs and current organizational responsibilities for them.

Title	Description	Organization
Public Law 89-10, ESEA, title I.....	Programs to aid educationally deprived children.	BESE-DCE.
Public Law 89-10, ESEA, title V.....	Grants to strengthen State departments of education.	BESE-DSAC.
Public Law 89-10, ESEA, title II.....	School library resources.....	BESE-DPSC.
Public Law 89-209, National Foundation on Arts and Humanities, sec. 12.....	Grants to States.....	BESE-DPSC.
Public Law 85-864, NDEA, title III.....	Instructional assistance: Grants for equipment, grants for administration and supervision.	BESE-DPSC.
Public Law 89-329, HEA, title I.....	Community service and continuing programs.	BAVE-DAEP.
Public Law 85-864, NDEA, title V-A.....	Guidance, counseling, and testing.....	BESE-DPSC.
Public Law 88-452, EOA 1964, title II-B.....	Adult basic education.....	BAVE-DAEP.
Public Law 81-920, Civil Defense Act 1950.....	Civil defense education.....	BAVE-DAEP.
Public Law 64-347, Smith-Hughes Act.....	Vocational education.....	BAVE-DVTE.
Public Law 79-586, George-Barden Act.....	do.....	BAVE-DVTE.
Public Law 88-210, Vocational Education Act 1963.....	Grants for vocational education.....	BAVE-DVTE.
Do.....	Work-study program.....	BAVE-DVTE.
Public Law 89-511, Public Library and Construction Act, title I.....	Public library services.....	BAVE-DLSEF.
Public Law 89-511, Public Library Services and Construction Act, title II.....	Public library construction.....	BAVE-DLSEF.
Public Law 89-511, Public Library Services and Construction Act, title III.....	Interlibrary cooperation.....	BAVE-DLSEF.
Public Law 85-511, Public Library Services and Construction Act, title IV-A.....	State institutional library services.....	BAVE-DLSEF.
Public Law 89-511, Public Library Services and Construction Act, title IV-B.....	Library services to the physically handicapped.	BAVE-DLSEF.
Public Law 85-864, NDEA, title X.....	Improvement of statistical services of State educational agencies.	NCES-DDSS.

EXHIBIT 2

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Estimated obligations incurred in the State of Alabama, fiscal year 1966

I. OFFICE OF EDUCATION APPROPRIATIONS

Expansion and improvement of vocational education:

Vocational Education Act of 1963:

	1966 estimate
Grants to States ¹	\$3, 689, 854
Work-study programs.....	503, 159
George-Barden and supplemental acts.....	1, 149, 364
Smith-Hughes and supplemental acts.....	143, 330
Subtotal	5, 485, 707

Elementary and secondary educational activities:

Title I—Assistance for educationally deprived children:¹

Basic grants ¹	31, 455, 281
State administrative expenses ¹	65, 412
Title II—Grants to States for school library materials.....	1, 734, 277
Title III—Supplementary educational centers and services.....	397, 872
Title IV—Cooperative research.....	129, 991
Title V—Strengthening State departments of education: ¹	
Grants to States.....	279, 560
Grants for special projects.....	0

Subtotal	34, 062, 393
----------------	--------------

See footnotes at end of table.

¹ Contingent upon action by the Department on our request for additional positions.

Estimated obligations incurred in the State of Alabama, fiscal year 1966—Con.

I. OFFICE OF EDUCATION APPROPRIATIONS—continued

Higher educational activities:

Title I—Grants to States for community service and continuing education programs ¹ -----	1966 estimate \$184, 740
Title II—Library assistance: Strengthening higher education resources-----	153, 169
Title IV—Student assistance:	
Educational opportunity grants: Grants to higher education institutions-----	1, 394, 448
Work-study programs-----	3, 288, 366
Title V—Teacher programs:	
Fellowships for teachers: Recent graduates-----	78, 400
Strengthening teacher education programs-----	63, 778
Title VI—Improvement of undergraduate instruction: Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling-----	210, 717
Subtotal-----	5, 373, 608

Higher education facilities construction:

Title I—Undergraduate grants: Public community colleges and technical institutes ¹ -----	7, 729, 853
Title II—Graduate grants-----	376, 616
Title III—Loans-----	1, 059, 000
Subtotal-----	9, 167, 469

Colleges of agriculture and the mechanics arts-----

277, 647

Grants for public libraries:¹

Services ¹ -----	457, 209
Construction ¹ -----	543, 258

Subtotal-----1, 000, 467

Payments to school districts (Public Law 81-874)-----	7, 001, 998
Assistance for school construction (Public Law 81-815)-----	870, 642

Defense educational activities:

Title II—Students loans: ¹ Contributions to loan funds-----	2, 888, 361
Title III—Instructional assistance: ¹	
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling: Grants to States ¹ -----	1, 630, 242
State supervision and administration ¹ -----	128, 634
Title IV—Graduate fellowships-----	642, 900
Title V—Guidance, counseling, and testing:	
Grants to States ¹ -----	470, 611
Institutes for counseling personnel-----	323, 159
Title X—Grants to States for statistical services ¹ -----	50, 000
Title XI—Institutes for advanced study-----	292, 932

Subtotal-----6, 426, 839

Educational improvement for the handicapped-----	312, 760
Research and training-----	79, 039

II. TRANSFERRED FUNDS FROM OTHER AGENCIES

Manpower development and training activities-----	\$1, 436, 329
Area redevelopment activities-----	6, 766
Educational television facilities-----	458, 815
Assistance to refugees in the United States: Cuban student loans-----	33, 805
Economic Opportunity Act of 1964: Adult basic education-----	879, 851
Civil defense educational activities-----	75, 392
Supplemental Appalachian grants for construction and equipment of facilities-----	155, 195
Total-----	73, 104, 722

See footnotes at end of table.

Estimated obligations incurred in the State of Alabama, fiscal year 1966—Con.

II. TRANSFERRED FUNDS FROM OTHER AGENCIES—continued

Equal educational activities:	1966 estimate
Grants to local school boards.....	\$406, 265
Institutes for school personnel.....	131, 994
Subtotal	538, 259
Grand total.....	² 73, 642, 981

¹ State allocated programs administered by State agencies.² Preliminary obligation; subject to final adjustment as of June 30, 1966.*Obligations incurred in the State of Florida, fiscal years 1966 and 1967*

I. OFFICE OF EDUCATION APPROPRIATIONS

Expansion and improvement of vocational education:	Fiscal year
Vocational Education Act of 1963:	1966 actual
Grants to States ¹	\$5, 020, 861
Work-study programs.....	805, 821
Research and special projects.....	359, 959
George-Barden and supplemental acts.....	953, 303
Smith-Hughes and supplemental acts.....	187, 558
Elementary and secondary educational activities:	
Title I—Assistance for educationally deprived children: ¹	
Basic grants ¹	27, 883, 033
State administrative expenses ¹	279, 836
Title II—Grants to States for school library materials ¹	2, 604, 055
Title III—Supplementary educational centers and services.....	1, 552, 185
Title V—Strengthening State departments of education: ¹	
Grants to States.....	359, 113
Higher educational activities:	
Title I—Grants to States for community service and continuing education programs ¹	239, 732
Title II—Library assistance:	
Strengthening higher education resources: Grants to institutions.....	252, 597
Grants for training in librarianship.....	19, 440
Title III—Strengthening developing institutions: Cooperative relationships.....	105, 438
Title IV—Student assistance:	
Educational opportunity grants: Grants to higher education institutions.....	1, 332, 655
Work-study programs.....	2, 502, 301
Title V—Teacher programs:	
Fellowships for teachers:	
Experienced teachers.....	173, 500
Recent graduates.....	294, 000
Strengthening teacher education programs.....	234, 432
Title VI—Improvement of undergraduate instruction: ¹	
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling:	
Television equipment ¹	372, 846
Other equipment ¹	
National Teacher Corps.....	169, 071
Higher education facilities construction:	
Title I—Undergraduate grants: ¹ Public community colleges and technical institutes ¹	11, 661, 028
Title III—Loans.....	1, 957, 000
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts: Permanent endowment (Morrill-Nelson Acts).....	317, 693
Grants for public libraries: ¹	
Services ¹	641, 126
Construction ¹	643, 741

See footnotes at end of table.

Obligations incurred in the State of Florida, fiscal years 1966 and 1967—Con.

I. OFFICE OF EDUCATION APPROPRIATIONS—continued

	<i>Fiscal year 1966 actual</i>
Payments to school districts (Public Law 81-874)-----	\$13, 130, 637
Assistance for school construction (Public Law 81-815)-----	1, 026, 321
Defense educational activities:	
Title II—Student loans: ¹ Contributions to loan funds-----	3, 766, 141
Title III—Instructional assistance: ¹	
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling:	
Grants to States ¹ -----	2, 402, 949
Loans to nonprofit private schools ¹ -----	9, 520
State supervision and administration ¹ -----	236, 677
Title IV—Graduate fellowships-----	1, 292, 650
Title V—Guidance, counseling, and testing:	
Grants to States ¹ -----	666, 782
Institutes for counseling personnel-----	321, 821
Title VI—Advanced training in foreign languages:	
Language and area centers-----	117, 608
Fellowships-----	121, 515
Title VII—Educational media research-----	22, 420
Title X—Grants to States for statistical services ¹ -----	50, 000
Title XI—Institutes for advanced study-----	991, 878
Educational improvement for the handicapped:	
Training grants-----	485, 343
Research and demonstrations-----	207, 798
Research and training-----	2, 240, 916
Foreign language training and area studies (Fulbright-Hays)-----	19, 737
Civil rights educational activities: Institutes for school personnel--	1, 054, 001

II. TRANSFERRED FUNDS FROM OTHER AGENCIES

Manpower development and training activities-----	2, 708, 702
Educational television facilities-----	386, 759
Assistance to refugees in the United States: Cuban student loans--	1, 167, 074
Economic Opportunity Act of 1964: Adult basic education-----	888, 277
Civil defense educational activities-----	127, 515
Total-----	² 943, 367, 365

¹ State allocated programs administered by State agencies.² Preliminary obligation; subject to final adjustment as of June 30, 1966.*Obligations incurred in the State of Georgia, fiscal year 1966*

I. OFFICE OF EDUCATION APPROPRIATIONS

Expansion and improvement of vocational education:	
Vocational Education Act of 1963:	<i>Fiscal year 1966</i>
Grants to States-----	\$4, 658, 862
Work-study program-----	621, 168
Research and special projects-----	215, 352
George-Barden and supplemental acts-----	1, 291, 071
Smith-Hughes and supplemental acts-----	172, 456
Elementary and secondary educational activities:	
Title I—Assistance for educationally deprived children:	
Basic grants-----	36, 197, 794
State administrative expenses-----	¹ 114, 568
Title II—Grants to States for school library materials-----	2, 174, 706
Title III—Supplementary educational centers and services-----	985, 982
Title V—Strengthening State departments of education: Grants to States-----	¹ 327, 963

See footnotes at end of table.

Obligations incurred in the State of Georgia, fiscal year 1966—Continued

I. OFFICE OF EDUCATION APPROPRIATIONS—continued

Higher educational activities:		<i>Fiscal year 1966 actual</i>
Title I—Grants to States for community service and continuing education programs-----		\$538, 061
Title II—Library assistance:		
Strengthening higher education resources: Grants to institutions-----		191, 785
Grants for training in librarianship-----		19, 500
Title III—Strengthening developing institutions: Cooperative relationships-----		250, 174
Title IV—Student assistance:		
Educational opportunity grants: Grants to higher education institutions-----		¹ 117, 560
Work-study programs (college)-----		¹ 1, 757, 093
Title V—Teacher programs:		
Fellowships for teachers: Experienced teachers-----		245, 000
Institutional assistance grants-----		118, 000
Title VI—Improvement of undergraduate instruction:		
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling: Television equipment-----		¹ 252, 141
National Teacher Corps-----		400, 064
Higher education facilities construction:		
Title I—Undergraduate grants:		
Public community colleges and technical institutes-----		2, 477, 482
Other undergraduate institutions-----		6, 660, 496
Title II—Graduate grants-----		932, 667
Colleges of agricultural and the mechanic arts:		
Permanent endowment (Morrill-Nelson Acts)-----		² 50, 000
Further endowment (Bankhead-Jones Act)-----		³ 243, 723
Grants for public libraries (Public Law 89-269):		
Services (title I)-----		531, 043
Construction (title II)-----		680, 700
Interlibrary cooperation (title III)-----		102, 685
Payments to school districts (Public Law 81-874)-----		9, 442, 790
Assistance for school construction (Public Law 81-815)-----		520, 300
Defense educational activities:		
Title II—Student loans: Contributions to loan funds-----		2, 927, 892
Title III—Instructional assistance:		
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling: Grants to States-----		2, 543, 469
State supervision and administration-----		259, 087
Title IV—Graduate fellowships-----		1, 399, 300
Title V—Guidance, counseling, and testing:		
Grants to States-----		574, 968
Institutes for counseling personnel-----		539, 033
Title VII—Educational media research-----		214, 201
Title X—Grants to States for statistical services-----		50, 000
Title XI—Institutes for advanced study-----		560, 848
Educational improvement for the handicapped:		
Training grants-----		317, 576
Research and demonstrations-----		224, 190
Research and training-----		732, 968
Civil rights educational activities:		
Grants to school boards:		
City of Atlanta School Board-----		282, 440
Georgia State Department of Education-----		93, 652
Institutes for school personnel:		
Clark College-----		47, 944
Paine College-----		53, 872
Arts and humanities educational activities:		
Institutional assistance: Grants to States-----		17, 022

See footnotes at end of table.

Obligations incurred in the State of Georgia, fiscal year 1966—Continued

IX. TRANSFERRED FUNDS FROM OTHER AGENCIES

	<i>Actual</i>
Manpower development and training activities-----	\$1, 954, 954
Educational television facilities-----	863, 891
Assistance to refugees in the United States: Cuban student loans--	54, 843
Economic Opportunity Act of 1964: Adult basic education-----	1, 363, 872
Subtotal-----	87, 306, 816
National Teacher Corps-----	179, 999
Total-----	*87, 486, 815

¹ These programs are allotted among the States. The Office of Education cannot provide information below the State level.

² This amount is distributed to Fort Valley College (\$15,445) and to the University of Georgia (\$34,555).

³ This amount is distributed to Fort Valley State College (\$75,287) and to the University of Georgia (\$163,437).

* Preliminary obligation; subject to final adjustment as of June 30, 1966.

Obligations incurred in the State of Mississippi, fiscal year 1966

I. OFFICE OF EDUCATION APPROPRIATIONS

Expansion and improvement of vocational education:

Vocational Education Act of 1963:	<i>Actual</i>
Grants to States ¹ -----	\$2, 553, 274
Work-study programs-----	505, 136
Research and special projects-----	
George-Barden and supplemental acts-----	1, 160, 348
Grants to States under Appalachian Regional Development Act ¹ -----	
Vocational student loan assistance:	
Advances for reserve funds-----	
Interest payments on insured loans-----	
Smith-Hughes and supplemental acts-----	107, 308
Elementary and secondary educational activities:	
Title I—Assistance for educationally deprived children: ¹	
Basic grants ¹ -----	21, 558, 851
State administrative expenses ¹ -----	
Title II—Grants to States for school library materials ¹ -----	1, 218, 307
Title III—Supplementary educational centers and services-----	278, 182
Title V—Strengthening State departments of education: ¹	
Grants to States-----	226, 641
Grants for special projects-----	
Higher educational activities:	
Title I—Grants to States for community service and continuing education programs ¹ -----	135, 265
Title II—Library assistance:	
Strengthening higher education resources:	
Grants to institutions-----	120, 157
Special purpose grants-----	
Grants for training in librarianship-----	
Research and demonstration projects-----	
Title III—Strengthening developing institutions:	
Cooperative relationships-----	495, 527
National teaching fellowships-----	
Title I—Student assistance:	
Educational opportunity grants:	
Grants to higher education institutions-----	1, 050, 112
Identification and encouragement of educational talent-----	
Insured loans:	
Advances for reserve funds-----	
Interest payments on insured loans-----	
Work-study programs-----	3, 370, 691

See footnotes at end of table.

Obligations incurred in the State of Mississippi, fiscal year 1966—Continued

I. OFFICE OF EDUCATION APPROPRIATIONS—continued

Higher educational activities—Continued

Title V—Teacher programs:	
Fellowships for teachers:	<i>Actual</i>
Experienced teachers	
Recent graduates	\$117,600
Strengthening teacher education programs	177,301
Title VI—Improvement of undergraduate instruction: ¹	
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling:	
Television equipment ¹	
Other equipment ¹	186,754
Institutes	
National Teacher Corps	150,310
Higher education facilities construction:	
Title I—Undergraduate grants: ¹	
Public community colleges and technical institutes ¹	5,839,902
Other undergraduate institutions ¹	
State administrative expenses ¹	
Title II—Graduate grants	191,186
Title III—Loans	
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts:	
Permanent endowment (Morrill-Nelson Acts)	50,000
Further endowment (Bankhead-Jones Act)	201,772
Grants for public libraries: ¹	
Services ¹	338,375
Construction ¹	421,161
Payments to school districts (Public Law 81-874)	2,409,029
Assistance for school construction (Public Law 81-815)	767,814
Defense educational activities:	
Title II—Student loans: ¹	
Contributions to loan funds	3,150,628
Loans to educational institutions	
Cancellation of student loans	
Title III—Instructional assistance: ¹	
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling:	
Grants to States ¹	800,000
Loans to nonprofit private schools ¹	
State supervision and administration ¹	75,000
Title IV—Graduate fellowships	153,950
Title V—Guidance, counseling, and testing:	
Grants to States ¹	332,639
Institutes for counseling personnel	42,167
Title VI—Advanced training in foreign languages:	
Language and area centers	
Fellowships	
Research	
Title VII—Educational media research	
Title X—Grants to States for statistical services ¹	32,500
Title XI—Institutes for advanced study	380,348
Educational improvement for the handicapped:	
Training grants	192,500
Research and demonstrations	
Research and training	
Foreign language training and area studies (Fulbright-Hays)	
Civil rights educational activities:	
Grants to school boards	407,568
Institutes for school personnel	
Arts and humanities educational activities:	
Instructional assistance:	
Grants to States ¹	7,935
Loans to nonprofit private schools	
Teacher training institutes	

See footnotes at end of table.

Obligations incurred in the State of Mississippi, fiscal year 1966—Continued

II. TRANSFERRED FUNDS FROM OTHER AGENCIES		Actual
Manpower development and training activities.....		\$4,549,839
Area redevelopment activities.....		
Educational television facilities.....		
Assistance to refugees in the United States:		
Cuban student loans.....		
Professional training and placement.....		
Economic Opportunity Act of 1964: Adult basic education.....		331,525
Civil defense educational activities.....		91,514
Supplemental Appalachian grants for construction and equipment of facilities.....		
Total.....		² 54,282,627

¹ State allocated programs administered by State agencies.² Preliminary obligation; subject to final adjustment as of June 30, 1966.*Obligations incurred in the State of South Carolina, fiscal year 1966*

I. OFFICE OF EDUCATION APPROPRIATIONS		Actual
Expansion and improvement of vocational education:		
Vocational Education Act of 1963:		
Grants to States ¹		\$2,944,013
Work-study programs.....		395,415
Research and special projects.....		76,770
George-Barden and supplemental acts.....		954,745
Grants to States under Appalachian Regional Development Act ¹		
Vocational student loan assistance:		
Advances for reserve funds.....		
Interest payments on insured loans.....		
Simth-Hughes and supplemental acts.....		114,757
Elementary and secondary educational activities:		
Title I—Assistance for educationally deprived children: ¹		
Basic grants ¹		22,974,021
State administrative expenses ¹		89,545
Title II—Grants to States for school library materials ¹		1,320,035
Title III—Supplementary educational centers and services.....		222,690
Title —Strengthening State departments of education: ¹		
Grants to States.....		238,401
Grants for special projects.....		
Higher educational activities:		
Title I—Grants to States for community service and continuing education programs ¹		162,373
Title II—Library assistance:		
Strengthening higher education resources:		
Grants to institutions.....		160,507
Special purpose grants.....		
Grants for training in librarianship.....		
Research and demonstration projects.....		
Title III—Strengthening developing institutions:		
Cooperative realtionships.....		235,441
National teaching fellowships.....		
Title IV—Student assistance:		
Educational opportunity grants:		
Grants to higher education institutions.....		532,500
Identification and encouragement of educational talent.....		
Insured loans:		
Advances for reserve funds.....		
Interest payments on insured loans.....		
Work-study programs.....		727,246

See footnotes at end of table.

Obligations incurred in the State of South Carolina, fiscal year 1966—Continued

I. OFFICE OF EDUCATION APPROPRIATIONS—continued

Title V—Teacher programs:	
Fellowships for teachers:	<i>Actual</i>
Experienced teachers	
Recent graduates	\$19,600
Strengthening teacher education programs	
Title VI—Improvement of undergraduate instruction: ¹	
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling:	
Television equipment ¹	
Other equipment ¹	152,385
Institutes	
National Teacher Corps	90,094
Higher education facilities construction:	
Title I—Undergraduate grants: ¹	
Public community colleges and technical institutes ¹	
Other undergraduate institutions ¹	6,163,766
State administrative expenses ¹	
Title II—Graduate grants	198,835
Title III—Loans	2,396,000
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts:	
Permanent endowment (Morrill-Nelson Acts)	50,000
Further endowment (Bankhead-Jones Act)	206,632
Grants for public libraries: ¹	
Services ¹	360,694
Construction ¹	452,087
Payments to school districts (Public Law 81-874)	6,337,432
Assistance for school construction (Public Law 81-815)	886,023
Defense educational activities:	
Title II—Student loans: ¹	
Contributions to loan funds	1,731,603
Loans to educational institutions	
Cancellation of student loans	
Title III—Instructional assistance: ¹	
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling:	
Grants to States ¹	1,577,833
Loans to nonprofit private schools ¹	
State supervision and administration ¹	129,825
Title IV—Graduate fellowships	311,025
Title V—Guidance, counseling, and testing:	
Grants to States ¹	365,752
Institutes for counseling personnel	38,804
Title VI—Advanced training in foreign languages:	
Language and area centers	
Fellowships	
Research	
Title VII—Educational media research	
Title X—Grants to States for statistical services ¹	50,000
Title XI—Institutes for advanced study	654,828
Educational improvement for the handicapped:	
Training grants	81,270
Research and demonstrations	
Research and training	89,625
Foreign language training and area studies, (Fulbright-Hays)	1,135
Civil rights educational activities:	
Grants to school boards	
Institutes for school personnel	
Arts and humanities educational activities:	
Instructional assistance:	
Grants to States ¹	8,725
Loans to nonprofit private schools	
Teacher training institutes	

See footnotes at end of table.

Obligations incurred in the State of South Carolina, fiscal year 1966—Continued

II. TRANSFERRED FUNDS FROM OTHER AGENCIES		<i>Actual</i>
Manpower development and training activities.....		1,684,233
Area redevelopment activities.....		
Educational television facilities.....		286,821
Assistance to refugees in the United States:		
Cuban student loans.....		5,900
Professional training and placement.....		
Economic Opportunity Act of 1964:		
Adult basic education.....		1,344,326
Civil defense educational activities.....		48,806
Supplemental Appalachian grants for construction and equipment of facilities.....		
Total		² 45,878,518

¹ State allocated program administered by State agencies.² Preliminary obligation; subject to final adjustment as of June 30, 1966.*Obligations incurred in the State of Tennessee, fiscal year 1966*

I. OFFICE OF EDUCATION APPROPRIATIONS		<i>Fiscal year 1966 actual</i>
Expansion and improvement of vocational education:		
Vocational Education Act of 1963:		
Grants to States ¹		\$4,011,274
Work-study programs.....		627,728
Research and special projects.....		335,874
George-Barden and supplemental acts.....		1,424,720
Smith-Hughes and supplemental acts.....		159,386
Elementary and secondary educational activities:		
Title I—Assistance for educationally deprived children: ¹		
Basic grants ¹		30,685,715
State administrative expenses ¹		258,397
Title III—Supplementary educational centers and services.....		220,320
Title V—Strengthening State departments of education: ¹		
Grants to States.....		289,119
Grants for special projects.....		26,391
Higher educational activities:		
Title I—Grants to States for community service and continuing education programs ¹		193,954
Title II—Library assistance:		
Strengthening higher education resources: Grants to institutions.....		181,679
Grants for training in librarianship.....		20,000
Title III—Strengthening developing institutions: Cooperative relationships.....		333,734
Title IV—Student assistance:		
Educational opportunity grants: Grants to higher education institutions.....		1,173,214
Insured loans: Interest payments on insured loans.....		
Work-study programs.....		3,120,212
Title V—Teacher programs:		
Fellowships for teachers:		
Experienced teachers.....		153,000
Recent graduates.....		196,000
Strengthening teacher education programs.....		153,721
Title VI—Improvement of undergraduate instruction: ¹		
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling: Television equipment ¹		314,374
National Teacher Corps.....		199,555
Higher education facilities construction:		
Title I—Undergraduate grants: ¹ Public community colleges and technical institutes ¹		8,995,734
Title III—Loans.....		1,397,000

See footnotes at end of table.

Obligations incurred in the State of Tennessee, fiscal year 1966—Continued

I. OFFICE OF EDUCATION APPROPRIATIONS—continued

	<i>Fiscal year 1966 actual</i>
Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts:	
Permanent endowment (Morrill-Nelson Acts)-----	\$50,000
Further endowment (Bankhead-Jones Act)-----	234,786
Grants for public libraries: ¹	
Services ¹ -----	487,040
Construction ¹ -----	622,596
Payments to school districts (Public Law 81-874)-----	4,417,438
Defense educational activities:	
Title II—Student loans: ¹ Contributions to loan funds-----	3,611,330
Title III—Instructional assistance: ¹	
Acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling:	
Grants to States ¹ -----	2,075,005
Loans to nonprofit private schools ¹ -----	11,400
State supervision and administration ¹ -----	70,300
Title IV—Graduate fellowships-----	1,026,250
Title V—Guidance, counseling, and testing:	
Grants to States ¹ -----	490,178
Institutes for counseling personnel-----	88,742
Title VI—Advanced training in foreign languages:	
Language and area centers-----	49,499
Fellowships-----	11,466
Title X—Grants to States for statistical services ¹ -----	50,000
Title XI—Institutes for advanced study-----	410,306
Educational improvement for the handicapped:	
Training grants-----	599,771
Research and demonstrations-----	231,459
Research and training-----	394,081
Foreign language training and area studies (Fulbright-Hays)-----	7,400
Civil rights educational activities: Institutes for school personnel--	428,288
Arts and humanities educational activities:	
Instructional assistance: Grants to States ¹ -----	11,474
Teacher training institutes-----	22,057

II. TRANSFERRED FUNDS FROM OTHER AGENCIES

Manpower development and training activities-----	2,531,536
Educational television facilities-----	487,703
Assistance to refugees in the United States: Cuban student loans--	28,153
Economic Opportunity Act of 1964: Adult basic education-----	1,173,997
Civil defense educational activities-----	63,786
Supplemental Appalachian grants for construction and equipment of facilities-----	696,600
Total-----	² 74,855,747

¹ State allocated programs administered by State agencies.² Preliminary obligation; subject to final adjustment as of June 30, 1966.

Mrs. GREEN. Congressman Erlenborn, do you have any questions to direct to Dr. Martin, before we turn to his colleagues?

Mr. ERLBORN. Yes. I would like to ask about the program of decentralization.

What, specifically, will you be authorized to do, here, at the regional level, that you were not authorized to do before?

Dr. MARTIN. Well, this memorandum, which has been made a part of the record, outlines specifically the duties to be delegated to the regional office, such as approval of State plan, approval of amendments, reception of receiving reports, and even to the point, we hope, of making payments, of funding projects, because that is also being discussed in the Office.

It is a matter of the Commissioner delegating this authority to bureau directors, who, in turn, will redelegate to the Assistant Commissioner and the region. This delegation has not come out as yet.

Mr. ERLBORN. You have not yet been delegated this authority. Is that right?

Dr. MARTIN. No. We have in these three programs I mentioned been delegated the authority as to title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and the smaller projects under research. We have been delegated that authority.

Mr. ERLBORN. How is the extent of the funds available to you determined? Will this be broken down on a regional basis? You will be allocated a certain percentage of the funds in the total program?

Dr. MARTIN. Of course, under most programs, the allocation is made by a formula that is set up in the act.

In the case of research, this small projects grant is a new idea. We have been told that this year we have nothing to base it on, no experience. They will allocate a certain amount of money to us, which can be adjusted accordingly. I mean, if we need more, and more is available, we can get it. And then, of course, after a year or two of operation, we will have the experience on which to base an allocation, a more or less firm allocation.

Now, title III of elementary and secondary has the firm allocation for each State.

Mr. ERLBORN. Prior to this decentralization, there were already regional offices of the Office of Education, I presume.

Dr. MARTIN. Right.

Mr. ERLBORN. And there are nine regions?

Dr. MARTIN. Correct.

Mr. ERLBORN. There are also regional offices of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. How many regional offices are there for HEW?

Dr. MARTIN. There are nine.

Mr. ERLBORN. There are nine, also?

Dr. MARTIN. They coincide.

Mr. ERLBORN. They do coincide? They use the same physical building, offices, and so forth?

Dr. MARTIN. Right.

Mr. ERLBORN. Have you found that the practice that you are now following, of having architectural and engineering services rendered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, has caused any problems?

Dr. MARTIN. Not that I am aware of.

I have my representative of the Office of Higher Educational Facilities in the room. He would be aware of any problems. He would be glad to speak to that.

I don't know of any. I think the question of transferring this is based more on the fact that it is now in a separate department, HUD, a new department, and it might be more difficult to work across departmental lines.

You see, at one time, CFA, the Community Facilities Administration, was an independent agency, and it was not difficult working with them, and I don't know that it is difficult now, but at least in Govern-

ment structure I think when they are in two separate departments, interdepartmental cooperation might be a little more difficult to attain than it would with an independent agency.

That is the thinking that I have received in Washington about the idea of transferring the function.

Mr. ERLBORN. The reason I ask the question is that yesterday in Washington we had testimony from the representative of George Washington University, and he was very critical of the fact that the engineering and architectural services were performed by HUD. His feeling was that they were putting the same commercial tests to the construction of student housing facilities and college buildings, the same sort of tests that they would use for commercial apartment buildings, and so forth. He felt that they were not rendering the kind of service that HEW could and would, or that the Office of Education itself would.

Dr. MARTIN. Yes. Well, Dr. Geiger is here. I don't know whether he has heard of any—

Dr. Geiger, would you speak to that for a moment?

Dr. GEIGER. We have had no objection that I know of, and of course our relationship with the people in the local office, here, is so good, and as far as I know, what they get from Washington is good. But we have had no direct objection in that connection.

Mr. ERLBORN. Thank you.

One last question.

I hear the complaint from many people that there are so many Federal programs now in the field of education, most of them new, or a good many of them new, that the individual colleges and universities and junior colleges have great difficulty in determining which program they are eligible for, which they should make application for, and how to fill out the forms.

Now, will the regional offices be better equipped to handle this sort of problem, once the decentralization has been completed?

Dr. MARTIN. I think they will. And I think we can agree that the programs have become so numerous that many colleges, many institutions, are having to designate an individual just to try to keep up with what they are eligible for, and what they can participate in.

We have established here, as was mentioned in the paper, this information center, and it is growing very rapidly in importance. We have been able so far to answer, I think, all of the questions that have come into the office. If we don't know the answer ourselves, we can get on the phone to Washington and find out. But we are trying to render service to all of the clientele in this region, giving them proper answers.

Mr. ERLBORN. I have heard, for instance, that the practice has grown in Washington of individuals engaging in the business of helping school administrators prepare the forms and make application to the Office of Education, and that they are charging a fee based upon the amount of grant that is received.

And this rather bothers me, that you would have business being developed along the line of this sort of thing, where the remuneration of the person who is rendering the service to the college or university depends upon the amount of the grant that is given ultimately.

And if you find that there are one, two, or three very influential people who have developed this sort of business and are very successful, it doesn't have the right sort of connotation.

Are you familiar with this?

Dr. MARTIN. Yes, I am. Very familiar. There are a number of private consulting firms that are cashing in on it. There is no question about it.

I think in this region, though, we have the State universities rendering this service more than we do the private consulting firms.

I may be wrong. I have no documentation. But I do know that the State universities are furnishing consultant help to the local schools, for preparation of projects.

Mr. ERLBORN. Will the decentralization tend to take the emphasis away from this sort of service, because the place where the application is made, and the advice, will be closer to the institutions?

Dr. MARTIN. I think the program in which this is most prevalent is title III of the Elementary and Secondary Act, and I have my man here on that, too. He may want to comment on it. He is more familiar with it than I am, as to the extent in this region of private consulting firms getting into the act of writing projects.

Joe, would you mind?

Mr. PUKACH (Joseph R. Pukach, program management chief). There is only one project that I know of, from Sarasota, Fla., that has engaged Englehart & Englehart to do part of their work, but basically, they don't charge a fee, actually. They write project proposals, hopefully that the project will be approved eventually, and then they get part of the business. But prior to the time, there is no money exchanged between the local district and the private agency, so there is very little of this going on in the Southeast.

Having worked with the Northeast, I found in the New York area this is quite prevalent, probably where more of the agencies get into the picture.

Mrs. GREEN. I would hope that the regional offices could perform this function of providing services and information.

I am a little bit concerned about the statement you make on page 8.

You say this is due in part to the fact that some communities in the South look with disfavor on the Headstart program, also that school systems tend to show a degree of independence when Federal funds are available.

Dr. MARTIN. Perhaps independence is the wrong word to use. This was perhaps written hastily. But by that I meant they have a tendency not to want to cooperate with an outside agency if they are getting Federal funds for a particular purpose. And I don't guess that would be independence. That would be an unwillingness to cooperate, you might say. When they have Federal funds for themselves, they want their program as they design it and planned it.

The first statement, about the unpopularity of the Headstart program in the South, is true. I mean many of the States look with disfavor on it. It is improving from year to year, though, and I think you understand why they look with disfavor upon it.

Mrs. GREEN. In this region you have six States. What is the average expenditure per pupil in elementary and secondary schools?

Dr. MARTIN. I have those figures in exhibit 2 that I attached to the statement, by States and by programs. I don't recall. Now, let's see. I guess in title I, the total allocation for the six States would certainly run in the neighborhood of \$150 million, don't you think, Dr. Armstrong? For the six States?

Mrs. GREEN. My question is directed to you primarily because I want to know if there is a reaction in this particular region to the title I formula.

In title I, one of the factors in the formula is the amount that the States spend. I am one of those who feel that this formula needs a change, that we should not base Federal programs and Federal aid on the fact that the more you spend the more you are going to get from the Federal Government. It would seem to me that perhaps this region would be well advised to present this case to the Congress, if they have strong feelings on it.

Mr. MARTIN. Naturally, this region would go for that in a big way, because the expenditure per child is lower in this region than in any other part of the country, which they feel does cut them down.

And of course there has been some talk over the region about places like Westchester County in New York and some of the other wealthier areas, where they are spending \$700 or \$800 per child, or even a thousand dollars, some of them, and it is based on one-half of their per capita expenditure, while in the Southern States I suppose the average expenditure would be about \$350.

That is a guess, too, off the top of my head, but my guess is that it would average about \$350 per child.

Mrs. GREEN. In some of the States it is less than that.

Dr. MARTIN. It is in 1968, is it not, that they can take the national figure, or the local, whichever it larger?

Mrs. GREEN. Whichever is the higher. But it still is to the disadvantage of those areas which spend the least.

Dr. MARTIN. Yes.

Mrs. GREEN. Let me turn to title III, to which you referred a moment ago. Do local educators in this region want a change so that the State department of education is not bypassed?

Dr. MARTIN. Very definitely. Well, we get that more, I think, from State departments of education.

Again, Mr. Pukach, who responded a while ago, may have a reaction to that, because he is the one who actually contacts the local agencies where they are designing projects.

Mr. Pukach, could you react to that?

Mr. PUKACH. Having established rapport over the years with the State departments of education, we find, at least in the Southeast, the States that I work with, really no concern with the way the program is operating. In fact, they feel very comfortable with it, because we work with the State department right along with the local educational agency.

We do not bypass them, although, as you recall, in the act itself they are supposed to review and recommend projects, and that is just what they do, but in addition they do have a very important role to play as far as helping us in the Office of Education to administer and supervise the program.

It is a partnership, and we have very little trouble with administering this program. And I think I can identify one or two States where there may be a problem, but I think, working again with the local education agencies, a majority of them would prefer to do it the way we have been doing it.

Dr. MARTIN. I think that would be peculiar to the Southeast. Having worked out of Washington on a national scale, the rest of the country I think would feel otherwise about that.

Mrs. GREEN. How many positions are now vacant in this regional office?

Dr. MARTIN. As I mentioned in the paper, we have three who have actually been selected, and are just awaiting a reporting date, which we can't give them, of course, at this time. We have a number of other vacancies.

We have a total of 26 vacancies uncommitted right now.

Mrs. GREEN. Out of 71?

Dr. MARTIN. Out of 71, yes.

Mrs. GREEN. And how many can you hire, if you can find the personnel?

Dr. MARTIN. We can hire up to the full amount, can't we?

Mrs. KOONTZ. Well, under the freeze—

Mrs. GREEN. Under the freeze, can you hire any of the 26?

Dr. MARTIN. Under the freeze, we cannot put anybody on.

This contracts officer I mentioned is now with NASA. It would just be a lateral transfer, but they still tell us we cannot put him on until the freeze is lifted.

I don't understand that, myself. I am going to be in Washington next week, and I am going to try to find out why.

Mrs. GREEN. One final question.

From where you sit, what would be your reaction to transferring the enforcement of the Civil Rights Act out of the Office of Education and into another department, or into a new department under HEW?

Dr. MARTIN. Into a new department under HEW?

Mrs. GREEN. Or entirely out of HEW into the Justice Department.

Dr. MARTIN. Well, I personally believe that it is impossible to separate programs from enforcement. As much as I would like personally having to do it, because they are now doing it in Washington in the Office of Education, I do think that enforcement of the Civil Rights Act could be accomplished much better at the regional level, with regional people, who are southerners, if you please, I mean who understand the mores of the South, who are educators, who understand what the school systems are like, how they operate.

And I have the firm conviction that it would work more successfully from the regional office than from the Washington office.

I have expressed that a number of times, and we have been told that it will be decentralized. When, we don't know.

Mrs. GREEN. In your judgment, you do not see any conflict when an office is charged with the responsibility of offering educational leadership and at the same time has to perform the role of an enforcement agency.

Dr. MARTIN. Well, it is a necessary evil. Let's put it that way, because if it is transferred to the Justice Department or to HEW or to

some other agency, if they don't have an understanding of school boards and schools and how they operate, I don't care how smart they are, they really can't talk the language of the people they are working with, and as long as you cannot communicate with them satisfactorily, I don't think you can make much progress in solving this in an applicable way.

Now, you know, we all have to take bad medicine sometimes, but we can sympathize with people when we are forcing the medicine on them, and that makes it go down a little bit easier, you see.

So I think the school people, the educators, can attack this problem and conquer it better than anyone else outside of education.

Mrs. GREEN. Thank you Dr. Martin.

We have two other gentlemen from the regional office. We are going to stay on schedule, and because of the time, I am wondering if I might ask the other two gentlemen to summarize their statements, and the full statements will be placed in the record.

Could we ask you to do that, Dr. Armstrong? And also Dr. Boldt? Which one of you would like to go first?

Dr. Boldt?

STATEMENT OF DR. ALBERT W. BOLDT, REPRESENTATIVE, HIGHER EDUCATION, U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION, REGION IV

Dr. BOLDT. Madam Chairman and members of the committee. I am Albert W. Boldt, representative for higher education, U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, region IV, Atlanta, Ga.

It is a privilege to appear before this distinguished committee to report on the Office of Higher Education programs administered by that office in the Southeast.

I have prepared a paper here for you, but I can summarize it.

Mrs. GREEN. Would you do that?

Dr. BOLDT. I have broken down the student financial aid programs by States, the six States over which we have administrative responsibility, and I will say that, in summary, since 1959, the Atlanta regional office has witnessed a growth of nearly 80 percent in the number of colleges and universities.

This is on page 8, Madam Chairman.

In the number of colleges and universities administering Federal student programs of financial assistance, the number of participating institutions and programs have expanded.

In 1959, 142 institutions received approximately \$2.8 million in Federal funds to provide National Education Act funds to their students. Today, 255 region IV higher educational institutions are administering one, two, or three of the student aid programs enacted or amended by title VI of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

I would like to refer to page 8, and talk about the programs which, we experience, have common difficulties in administering.

Experience has shown that administrative problems have generally developed where one or a combination of the following situations exist:

1. Responsibility for award determination and fiscal management assigned to part-time and/or overburdened or undertrained personnel.

2. Frequent turnover of personnel assigned responsibility for the above functions, thereby seriously hindering continuity in management of the program.

3. Inattention on the part of college personnel as to the importance of directives, suggestions, and recommendations contained in program reviews and audit reports.

4. Nonattendance of institutional personnel at regional or State informational meetings and workshops.

5. Failure by responsible institutional personnel in familiarizing themselves with administrative memorandums and procedural manuals distributed by the Office of Education, and to recognize the importance of these issuances.

Perhaps the best example of what can occur when one or more of the above situations exists is the problem of delinquencies in repayment of National Defense Student loans. A detailed report on this problem, as well as the action which has and is being taken in the regional office, has previously been submitted to this committee.

Through such efforts, the institutional reports submitted to this office indicate a marked improvement on collections over the past 6 months.

One of the programs enacted recently by Congress is the Guaranteed Loan Program. I would like to refer the committee's attention to page 10.

In general, the hesitancy of lenders lies not with the applicant, but with a variety of other reasons, including the following:

1. Return on investment insufficient; loans handled at a loss.
2. Tight money market dictates that credit be extended where return is highest.
3. Unwillingness to extend credit over periods up to 15 years.
4. Lenders contend that need should be a factor in the award decision, since this would help insure that available and limited funds are being used to their best advantage.
5. Smalltown lenders often disenchanted because experience shows many of their young people do not return to their home locality after graduation.
6. Lenders want benefit of experience and recommendation of college financial aid officer regarding applicant's need. Currently, it is not the function of the college to make any recommendation based on the applicant's need.

That, Madam Chairman, is a summary of my report.

(Dr. Boldt's full statement follows:)

STATEMENT OF DR. ALBERT W. BOLDT, REPRESENTATIVE, HIGHER EDUCATION, U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION, REGION IV, ATLANTA, GEORGIA

Madam Chairman and members of the Committee, my name is Albert W. Boldt, Representative for Higher Education, U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Region IV, Atlanta, Georgia.

It is a privilege to appear before this distinguished committee to report on the operation of higher education programs administered by that Office in the Southeast.

The U.S. Office of education has maintained field services for some programs in Higher Education since 1960. The scope of these field services varied with the reorganization patterns of headquarters. In 1960, for example, the Regional Offices established liaison with the colleges participating in such programs as

Language and/or Guidance Institutes, Title IV Graduate Fellowships, Educational Research and National Defense Education Act Title II Student Loans.

The passage by the Congress of various acts affecting education added greatly to the functions and responsibilities of the Office of Education. It became necessary to reorganize in order to properly administer the new as well as expanded existing programs. One program materially affected was financial assistance to college and university students. Presently there are six programs to aid students pursuing courses of education beyond secondary school—from the vocational and undergraduate level through the graduate school.

In order to conserve time I shall report the activity of these programs by states and later present the means by which the participating institutions are serviced by the personnel of Region IV, as well as point up some of the problems for which we are presently seeking a solution.

ALABAMA

In fiscal year 1959—at the beginning of the National Defense Student Loan Program—Federal funds approximating \$460,000 were allotted to nineteen participating institutions.

In fiscal year 1967, the expanding student aid programs witnessed the participation of thirty-six Alabama colleges and universities, embracing a total Federal commitment of approximately \$9 million. These funds will provide assistance in the nature of loans, employment, grants, singly or in combination, for approximately 10,000 eligible and needy students.

In addition to the 36 Alabama institutions currently participating, there are eight additional colleges which are ineligible for further program funding, due to failure to sign the Civil Rights Title VI Assurance of Compliance. Under the original Terms of Agreement (National Defense Student Loan Program), these colleges must continue to account for collections and submit progress reports to the U.S. Office of Education. Including these, there are 44 colleges in Alabama with which the U.S. Office maintains liaison.

FLORIDA

For the academic year 1958-1959, Florida had fourteen colleges participating in the National Defense Student Loan Program. Federal funds totaling approximately \$551,000 were allocated to these institutions.

With the expansion of the student financial aid programs, as well as the establishment of new colleges, this participation has grown to forty-five colleges and universities. Our records indicate that approximately 14,000 eligible students will be aided through these programs of Federal assistance. Fiscal year 1967 allotments will approximate 9.5 million dollars.

There has been some merger of Negro colleges with white State-supported colleges in this State; however, no college has withdrawn from the programs because of refusal to comply with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act.

GEORGIA

Approximately \$509,000 was allocated to twenty-nine Georgia colleges to help finance the cost of education for students qualifying for National Defense Loans in the academic year 1958-59.

The expanded programs for financial assistance to more than 10,000 Georgia students required the funding of approximately 5.5 million dollars. In fiscal year 1967, our records reveal the active participation of forty-five Georgia institutions of higher learning.

Two colleges, formerly in the student aid programs, did not apply in time for fiscal 1967 funding. Altogether, there are forty-seven Georgia colleges participating in the student aid programs.

MISSISSIPPI

There were twenty-two colleges in Mississippi which entered the National Defense Loan Program in 1958-59, involving a total outlay by the Federal Government of some \$341,000.

Currently, considering all expanded student aid programs, this participation has increased to thirty-three colleges. The U.S. Office has committed approximately 8 million dollars, which will lend financial assistance to approximately 10,000 Mississippi students.

There are, however, six additional colleges in Mississippi with which the Regional Office has program responsibility because of previous participation. Thus far, four of the six colleges have not elected to comply with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act. Two junior colleges did not make application for fiscal 1967 funds.

SOUTH CAROLINA

South Carolina began participation in the National Defense Loan Program with a roster of twenty-one colleges involving \$341,000 of Federal funds.

Currently the same number (21) of colleges are participating in the expanded student aid programs. At the end of this current fiscal year, more than 3 million dollars will have been granted to these colleges for their student aid programs.

It is estimated that more than 5,000 South Carolina students will be aided through these federal assistance programs.

Our records will show that there are presently twenty-seven colleges which the Regional Office continues to assist with the administration of programs. Six of these colleges are no longer participating; three by reason of the Civil Rights Act, two did not apply for 1967 funding, and the Medical College, which is funding its programs through the U.S. Public Health Service.

TENNESSEE

Tennessee has always had the largest number of actively participating institutions in federally-aided student financial aid programs. In the academic year 1958-59, Tennessee had thirty-seven colleges participating in the National Defense Student Loan Program. This required approximately \$569,000 in grants to Tennessee institutions of higher education.

Funds approximating \$8.7 million have thus far been tentatively committed to forty-six institutions, which will assist over 10,000 students in their pursuit of higher education.

In summary, since fiscal year 1959, the Atlanta Regional Office has witnessed a growth of nearly 80 percent in the number of colleges and universities administering Federal programs of student financial assistance.

The numbers of participating institutions and programs have expanded. In 1959, one hundred and forty-two institutions received approximately \$2.8 million in Federal funds to provide National Defense Education Act loans to their students. Today, 255 Region IV higher education institutions are administering one, two, or three of the student aid programs enacted or amended by Title VI of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

During the 1966/67 academic year, approximately 60,000 students enrolled in Region IV institutions will receive nearly \$44 million in Federal aid to assist them with the expenses of their college education.

Staffing

From 1960 to 1964, the Bureau of Higher Education staffed the Regional Office with one representative, the position which I have held under frequently changing titles denoting varying degrees of responsibility. These titles have ranged from Higher Education Representative, to Student Financial Aid Representative, to Acting Officer in Charge of the Bureau of Higher Education, and, most recently, Regional Representative, Higher Education. This shifting of position titles is, I think, indicative of the numerous changes which the organization pattern of the Office of Education has undergone during the past six years, and is still undergoing. Since 1964, the staff has expanded from one professional staff member to five.

Program Administration

The major emphasis of the staff embraces the philosophy of helpfulness to new and participating institutions. Colleges are encouraged to ask for our assistance with the administration of all programs, including those not specifically administered at the regional level. It must be emphasized here that due to the heavy turnover of student financial aid personnel in the institutions, we feel that the office has a special obligation and responsibility to constantly alert the institutions to the importance of the proper implementation of the rules, regulations, and policy guides which emanate from the Washington office. This is done by regional and state meetings, workshops, on-site visits, and by the constant use of communication media. A detailed description of meetings and procedures for assisting colleges in Region IV has been furnished to the committee.

The Regional Office welcomes the decentralization of those higher education program functions which will provide a greater degree of flexibility and prompt-

ness in its institutional relationships and services, provided that such decentralization is accompanied by adequate staffing.

This office now receives and reviews institutional applications for funding, examining such applications for correctness of computations, completeness, and the extent to which the funds requested are reasonable in view of the institutions' student enrollment and economic status of the area served. A regional panel of financial aid officers then reviews each application and recommends funding. Where such recommendations differ from the institutional request, the Regional Office staff then negotiates acceptance of the panel's recommendation with institutional officials. Final action on fiscal approval and funding is taken by the Washington office.

Programs Having Common Difficulties

To re-emphasize, the Region IV area of responsibility in student financial aid has increased from one program in 1959 to three major programs in 1966, excluding the guaranteed loan program, involving an expansion from some 2.5 million dollars to approximately 44 million dollars. Participation by institutions of higher education has increased by nearly 80 percent.

During this same period, the Regional Office professional staff directly involved with student financial aid has increased from one to four persons, only two of which are in position to spend the greater portion of their time on college visitations. Consequently, visitations must be scheduled to give priority to those institutions where problems are known to exist. This leaves too little time for visits of a preventive maintenance nature, or those that would serve, through proper counseling, to assist colleges in avoiding problem areas, including those listed below.

Experience has shown that administrative problems have generally developed where one or a combination of the following situations exist:

- (1) responsibility for award determination and fiscal management assigned to part-time and/or overburdened or undertrained personnel;

- (2) frequent turnover of personnel assigned responsibility for the above functions, thereby seriously hindering continuity in management of the program;

- (3) inattention on the part of college personnel as to the importance of directives, suggestions, and recommendations contained in program reviews and audit reports;

- (4) non-attendance of institutional personnel at regional or state informational meetings and workshops;

- (5) failure by responsible institutional personnel in familiarizing themselves with administrative memoranda and procedural manuals distributed by the Office of Education, and to recognize the importance of these issuances.

Perhaps the best example of what can occur when one or more of the above situations exists, is the problem of delinquencies in repayment of National Defense Student Loans. A detailed report on this problem, as well as the action which has and is being taken in the Regional Office, has previously been submitted to this committee. Through such efforts, the institutional reports submitted to this office indicate a marked improvement on collections over the past six months.

Guaranteed Loan Program

A non-federal guarantee agency, either state or private, now operates in all six Region IV States. The States of Alabama, Florida, and Mississippi have a designated state agency, which supervises a comprehensive program operated under contract by United Student Aid Funds, Inc. There is no state agency in South Carolina, the program being operated by United Student Aid Funds, Inc., under agreement with the Commissioner of Education. The State of Georgia operates its own comprehensive program, covering all eligible students attending both in and out-of-state colleges. In Tennessee, a state agency operates a limited program for eligible residents attending Tennessee colleges. United Student Aid Funds, Inc., under agreement and the direction of the state agency, guarantees loans for Tennessee residents attending out-of-state schools.

In Region IV, the difficulties encountered under the guaranteed loan program can be separated into two general areas:

- (1) Insufficient understanding of procedures on the part of college personnel;

- (2) Student difficulties in locating lenders willing to consider loan applications.

With regard to problem (1), colleges began receiving inquiries and student applications prior to receiving procedural instructions. This problem was created largely because several of the States were late in establishing a guarantee agency. Thus, procedural information was not available in such instances until shortly before the 1966 fall academic term began.

Problem (2) has caused far greater concern since many students, having overcome the procedural difficulties, have been unable to find a lender willing to consider a loan application. In general, the hesitancy of lenders lies not with the applicant himself, but with a variety of other reasons given, including the following:

- (1) return on investment insufficient—loans handled at a loss;
- (2) tight money market dictates that credit be extended where return is highest;
- (3) unwillingness to extend credit over periods up to fifteen years;
- (4) lenders contend that need should be a factor in the award decision, since this would help insure that available and limited funds are being used to their best advantage;
- (5) small town lenders often disenchanted because experience shows many of their young people do not return to their home locality after graduation;
- (6) lenders want benefit of experience and recommendation of college financial aid officer regarding applicant's need. Currently, it is not the function of the college to make any recommendation based on the applicant's need.

Dr. BOLDT. Madam Chairman, I want to thank the committee for granting me this time to speak about the programs for which I am responsible in this region.

Mrs. GREEN. Thank you.

I wonder if we might turn to you, Dr. Armstrong, then to questions.

STATEMENT OF DR. LOUIS W. ARMSTRONG, PROGRAM OFFICER FOR THE DISADVANTAGED, TITLE I, ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT, REGION IV

Dr. ARMSTRONG. Madam Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am Louis Armstrong. I am pleased to have this opportunity to appear before you on behalf of the disadvantaged children of the South.

As you recall, there are approximately 15 million so-called disadvantaged children, and we are ministering to only a small percent of those in this region. I know you are concerned about what is going on in this region, and we are concerned, also, about many of the things that we would like to be doing better.

We know there are some shortcomings. We know that we are not moving at as rapid a pace as we would like to move.

As a result of projects and reports on programs in operation for some time we have been concerned about the proper use of funds to effect favorable results in the education of educationally and emotionally deprived children.

We have a limited time, and the time that our staff can devote to this situation disturbs us. We are concerned to see some evidence of lack of proper planning, poor project design, limited development, involving staff and community, resources, and poor communications. We are concerned about the lack of private school involvement, with public school officials.

But I would like to bring to your attention the duties and responsibilities of our staff, along with the concerns that we have.

It is our responsibility to establish and maintain relationships with the officials and representatives of State educational departments. It is our responsibility to maintain the same kind of relationship with the local school systems through the State departments of education.

I see our responsibilities as program officers to work cooperatively with and to provide assistance to State educational agencies. And this we feel we have done very successfully in this region.

It is our responsibility, as program officers, to review the assurances and reports and make suggestions where necessary.

At this time there are some differences of opinion as to what the function of the program officer is in visiting local schools. There are those who believe the program officer's function in making such visits is simply to monitor and report the results. Then there are others who believe the program officer should take an active role in the assessment and future direction of the local program.

There is also a strong concern that Federal representatives should not even visit the local educational agencies.

At the present time, and in the light of these various viewpoints, we have attempted to carry out a course of action to some degree that would satisfy each of these opposing viewpoints. These conflicting points of view, of course, will continue to be a problem until such time as the differences are settled.

I should mention that another major objective of our staff is to review and analyze and evaluate the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare audit reports in the title I program in the States in our region, and to negotiate with officials of the State agencies to determine whether disallowances should be sustained as an audit exception.

It is also our responsibility to recommend approval or disapproval of such allowances, or disallowances, in these cases, to make recommendations for the formulation of policy with respect to settlement of similar cases.

Now, our staff, through conferences and workshops and panels and presentations and personal contacts with State educational agency representatives and professional organizations I think stimulates and encourages improvement of established quality systems for the planning of long-range educational programs.

I would like to mention here the recent surveyor budget restrictions, as has been mentioned before, and the freeze on the personnel, and the indecision on the part of the U.S. Office of Education and Congress will restrict our progress in fulfilling our responsibilities as program officers.

As you know, there are some State departments of education that have voiced their strong opposition to a regional system which cannot provide them with decisionmaking personnel.

If decentralization is to succeed, it is vital that the authority to conduct and administer the programs involved be delegated to the regional offices. If this is not done, it is the fear of the States that an extra layer will be built in between them, and the other level will become a reality.

I think also the States are concerned that the appropriation procedures of Congress will seriously hamper the effectiveness of their

programs. This concern is not only related to the lateness of the appropriations, which naturally severely detracts from the administration of a well-planned school project, but also to the cutbacks in appropriations at all levels.

Since our staff is field service, and we are expected to spend a major portion of our time in the field, it will be necessary to reevaluate the duties of the program officer; travel and visitation to the various State departments of education continues to be restricted.

My remarks have been brief, in order to allow this committee to ask questions, to comment, or to suggest ways in which we can do better the job we are all so vitally interested in.

I am pleased to have had the opportunity of appearing on behalf of the disadvantaged children of the South.

(Dr. Armstrong's prepared statement follows:)

STATEMENT OF DR. LOUIS W. ARMSTRONG, PROGRAM OFFICER FOR THE DISADVANTAGED, TITLE I, ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT, REGION IV

Madam Chairman and Members of the Committee.

I am Louis Wilson Armstrong. I am pleased to have the privilege of appearing before you on behalf of the disadvantaged children of the South. My position and title is Senior Program Officer for Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

I know this Committee is here because you have an interest and a concern in what we are doing in the Regional Office. I am glad you have this concern because this program for the disadvantaged that we are administering is in my opinion the most important event that has ever happened in American education.

May I digress just a moment and tell you just what the disadvantaged child is like. There are approximately 15,000,000 of these children who are disadvantaged because they need dental and medical care, because they lack cultural experiences, because they come to school hungry, because they are mentally and emotionally disturbed, because they do not have adequate clothing and a decent place to live. There are many more factors to be considered and members of our staff are concerned about them. We believe we have seen enough evidence in the limited time we have been associated with the program to warrant our praise of what is taking place in our school systems for these children.

At the same time we are concerned, as we should be, about the shortcomings of the progress being made, we are concerned that we are not moving at a rapid enough pace.

For some time, as a result of field visits, program reviews, examination of projects, reports on programs in operation, and recently thorough interviews with persons who have visited Title I project areas, we have come to realize that there is a real and pressing concern for the quality of programs and the apparent lack of funds on the target populations.

The concerns for the proper use of funds to effect favorable results on the education of educationally deprived children is the number one responsibility of our staff in the Title I program of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

The limited staff and the limited time our staff has been in the Region is hardly sufficient to give a comprehensive appraisal of all that is good or all that is bad; or the degree of either concerning programs for the educationally disadvantaged.

We are concerned and see some evidence of lack of proper planning, poor project design, limited development and involvement of staff and community resources and poor communications.

We are concerned about the lack of private school involvement with public school officials in planning projects.

In the time allotted before this committee, I have only been able to mention a few concerns we have at this point in our program.

Now, I should like to bring to your attention the duties and responsibilities of our program staff. It is our responsibility to establish and maintain relationships with officials and representatives of State Educational Agencies, local school superintendents, professional organizations, and representatives of civic

agencies and other federal agencies working for the improvement of the disadvantaged.

I see our responsibilities as program officers to work cooperatively with and provide assistance to State Educational Agencies in the development of administrative policies and procedures. To interpret pertinent provisions, rulings, requirements, regulations, procedures, and standards established under the enabling legislation.

The State educational agency in its formal application to the Commissioner of Education for participation in Title I, includes assurances that it will administer the program and submit reports in accordance with the provisions of the law and the regulations.

It is our responsibility as program officers to review with the State the assurances and the reports and make suggestions where necessary and/or feasible.

The local educational agency is responsible for developing and implementing projects to fulfill the intent of Title I. It is therefore responsible for identifying the educationally deprived children in areas of high concentrations of low income families, determining their special needs, designing projects to carry out the purpose of the legislation with regard to such children, and submitting applications to the appropriate State educational agencies for grants to carry out proposed projects.

At this time, there is some difference of opinion as to what the function of the program officer is in visiting local schools. There are those who believe the program officers function in making such visits is simply to monitor the local program and report the results. There are others who believe the program officer should take an active roll in the assessment and future direction of the local program. There is also a strong concern that federal representatives should not even visit the local educational agencies.

At the present time, and in the light of these various viewpoints, we have attempted to carry out a course of action to some degree that would satisfy each of the opposing viewpoints. These conflicting points of view will continue to be a problem until such time that these differences are settled.

Another major objective of our staff will be to review, analyze, and evaluate the Department of Health and Education Audit Reports of the Title I program in the states in Region IV, and negotiate with officials of the State agencies to determine whether disallowances should be sustained as an audit exception; or whether the State has presented a rationale which will satisfy the acceptance of the questioned expenditures.

It is our responsibility to recommend approval or disapproval of such allowances or disallowances in these cases, and make recommendations for the formulation of policy with respect to the settlement of similar cases.

Our staff, through conferences, work shops, panels, presentations, and personal contacts with State educational agency representatives and professional organizations, should stimulate and encourage the improvement and/or establishment of quality systems for the planning of long-range educational programs and for the efficient economical administration of such programs, including budgeting, accounting, and reporting systems. It is the program officers responsibility to provide advice and recommendations on how to accomplish these ends by making appropriate contacts, suggestions, and follow-ups.

The recent severe budget restrictions, the freeze on personnel, and indecision on the part of the U.S. Office of Education and Congress, will restrict our progress in fulfilling our responsibilities as program officers.

There appears to be some disagreements and misunderstanding among Bureaus as to whether de-centralization is the answer to the successful administration of programs for its educationally deprived.

Some State Departments of Education have voiced their strong opposition to a Regional system which cannot provide them with decision making personnel. If de-centralization is to succeed, it is vital that the authority to conduct and administer the programs involved be delegated to the Regional offices. If this is not done, the fear of the states that an extra layer will be built between them and the decision making level will become a reality.

The states are also concerned that the appropriation procedures of Congress will seriously hamper the effectiveness of their programs. This concern is not only related to the lateness of the appropriations, which naturally severely detracts from the administration of a well-planned, smoothly operated project; but also to the cut backs in appropriations at all levels.

Since our staff is one of field service, and we are expected to spend a major portion of our time in the field, it will be necessary for those responsible to re-evaluate the duties of the program officer if travel and visitations to the various State Departments of Education continues to be restricted.

If this Committee could see just one project for the disadvantaged that I saw a few months ago, I believe it would be highly satisfied that the potential for improvements of our educationally deprived children is all around us, if only we will put all our forces to work.

May I digress a moment and tell you very sketchily of an after school program; one that started around six o'clock in the evening with parents and children coming back to school for a good dinner. Parents, children, teachers sat down together and enjoyed a dinner prepared in the school by volunteer help three times a week. At the close of the dinner, during which time pleasant music was played, the children went to various classes for their improvement in whatever skills they were lacking. The parents, having become a part of the program perhaps for the first time in their lives, went to their various chosen interests.

Here was a program involving children and parents; all were involved in an educational program. No doubt the dinner three times a week played an important part in getting parents and children back to school—These parents and children were hungry; they were hungry for food as well as hungry for the importance of feeling wanted and being a part of a society. I believe that all involved experienced an educational insight that had not been experienced in this locality before.

My remarks have been brief, in order to allow this Committee to ask questions, to comment, or to suggest ways in which we may do better the job we are all so vitally interested in.

I am pleased to have had the privilege of appearing on behalf of the disadvantaged children of the South.

Mrs. GREEN. Thank you, Dr. Armstrong, and Dr. Boldt.
Congressman Erlenborn?

Mr. ERLBORN. Though the Federal activity in the field of aid to primary and secondary education is fairly new, I have already heard some comments from school administrators that categorical aid is not, in their opinion, the best method of giving aid to primary and secondary education. They feel that broad grants, without specific particular categories and particular programs, would be more advantageous to them.

Some say, for instance, that they need additional help with their basic educational program, and instead they are getting the cream on the top—additional programs that are not basic education.

What would be your feeling concerning this?

Dr. ARMSTRONG. I think we hear continuously that they would prefer general aid, and of course a good many of them assume that the aid they are now getting is a forerunner to general aid.

I think that would be the general opinion, from those that I have talked with. They are hoping some day there will be general aid.

Mr. ERLBORN. Is this a hope, or an opinion?

Dr. ARMSTRONG. It is probably hope.

Mr. ERLBORN. The hope was motion to the opinion.

I have no other questions.

Mrs. GREEN. On page 5, Dr. Armstrong, you expressed a concern whether decentralization is the answer for the programs for the educationally deprived.

Is this based solely on the concern that another layer of bureaucracy is being imposed?

Dr. ARMSTRONG. This is not my concern as much as it is that of the State people. They believe if they cannot get the office at the regional level that they are getting in Washington, there is no use in

putting people out in the field and having to go through them to Washington. That is the concern.

Mrs. GREEN. Are you expressing a concern over the total decentralization plan or just that part regarding the programs for the educationally deprived?

Dr. ARMSTRONG. I am not expressing a concern of my own. I am expressing the concerns of those people who think that they are going to have to go through another layer, unless we are equipped to do the job in the region, and that means staff and the money to do it.

Mrs. GREEN. The answer I am trying to find here is whether your remark on page 5, on decentralization, applies to the total decentralization program.

Dr. ARMSTRONG. Total. It is across the board.

Mrs. GREEN. You refer to the cutback and the freeze. What about travel funds?

Dr. ARMSTRONG. Well, they have been restricted, I guess, 50 percent or better.

Mrs. GREEN. Is there considerable travel involved in your job? What do you do? Do you travel?

Dr. ARMSTRONG. Yes; 70 percent of our time is supposed to be in the field. We don't have much of a job in the office. Our job is in the field.

Mr. MARTIN. Madam Chairman, I guess I should react to that.

We have just received word recently that we will have to take a hard look at our estimates for the year, that the overall U.S. Office of Education funds have been cut 50 percent, all of the administrative appropriations are being watched next week, and that is one of the main points on the agenda.

We don't have a figure, as yet. We have not reached a figure as to what we can expect. We have just been told to reassess our travel plans and cut them down where possible.

Mrs. GREEN. Expressing a personal view, I would prefer to see a cut in the travel funds to the moon and places beyond, and less of a cut in this corner of the planet.

It would seem to be that it would be tragic indeed if the cuts have to be absorbed by the Department of HEW and the Office of Education, and I for one will push for economy on the \$20 or \$40 billion raise to the moon program and a few others, and hope we can concentrate on making life here a bit more meaningful to our own people.

Dr. Boldt, on the student assistance programs this committee is concerned about the delinquency rate on collections.

Let me ask you, though, from the standpoint of the Office of Education, and the standpoint of Congress, what is the timelag between the enactment of the law, the beginning of the school year, and the moment when the procedural manuals or the handbooks get into the office of the student personnel man at the college or university?

Dr. BOLDT. Madam Chairman, this has been quite a difficulty with the colleges.

For example, the present manual has been in revision for over a year, and I was in Washington several months ago, and was given a draft copy of the new manual, which was supposed to come out, at that time, next month, which is still not out. And I asked if I couldn't have a copy of this draft, and we came and got permission here to duplicate that, and we have given them to all our colleges.

So this is, again, I think, a fault of the U.S. Office of Education administrators, in failure to get this material out to the colleges, plus some of the enumerations I made about the colleges' failure to go to workshops and such that you provide for them.

We gave you the report here on what we did in Atlanta, and yet we had 40 colleges.

Mrs. GREEN. Is this a neutral responsibility, though? I have had college personnel tell me—and I am not singling out Atlanta; I am speaking more of the west coast, with which I am more familiar—that the reason they do not attend is that they ask a question and don't get the answer.

The manual isn't out, or they don't have the copy of the regulations at that time, and so the answer is, "Well, we can't tell you, because the handbook won't be out until next March."

Dr. BOLDT. We never tell a college we don't know. We get on the telephone, and we will contact the program person in Washington.

And I think your questionnaires that you have sent out to our colleges will speak for themselves as to the relationship of the Atlanta regional office to our colleges.

We attempt, even though the program might not be particularly related to our area, even if it is the Public Health Professions Act, when we get a query, we will answer it, or we will get the answer for these people.

Mrs. GREEN. A couple of quick questions.

What is your judgment of the forgiveness feature in the student loan? Do you think it has accomplished its purpose in attracting more people to the teaching profession?

Dr. BOLDT. No, I don't.

Mrs. GREEN. Would you favor continuing it?

Dr. BOLDT. No.

Originally I think it was a very laudable idea, but in my experience it doesn't attract more students into teaching. I think it is unfair to those students who are not going into it. They are just as much needed in our society, perhaps, from their point of view, as teachers.

Mrs. GREEN. What is your reaction to the Teacher Corps?

Dr. BOLDT. I am very much in favor of that, and especially in our area, because we haven't the depth of teaching skills that are needed, as they, for example, might have in some other areas of the country.

Mrs. GREEN. Is it your judgment that the Commissioner of Education is in a better position to recruit and train teachers than a local school superintendent?

Dr. BOLDT. No, it is not. I think the local superintendent is in a better position than the Commissioner of Education.

Mrs. GREEN. Then why do you think so highly of the Teacher Corps—

Dr. BOLDT. I think there have to be some basic changes in that legislation, to permit this, as to the recruitments in the lower levels, that we are certainly going to pay them and work with them in the program.

Mrs. GREEN. Do you think there would be any question about the loyalty of the individual teacher, if he is paid with a hundred percent Federal funds?

Dr. BOLDT. I think so. Absolutely. Yes. There is no question in my mind about that.

Mrs. GREEN. Dr. Armstrong, Mr. Erlenborn wonders if you would comment on the Teacher Corps.

Dr. ARMSTRONG. Well, my knowledge of the Teacher Corps is pretty sketchy. However, in my own opinion, I don't think there is much place for the Teacher Corps in our system of education. I just cannot see it.

I think that we can operate a good system on the local level, through the State departments of education.

Mr. ERLBORN. Would the gentleman yield at that point?

Would you happen to know if any of the school administrators or the people in colleges and universities dealing with teacher education, the training of teachers, were consulted concerning the drafting of this program of the Teachers Corps?

Dr. ARMSTRONG. It would only be an opinion, and my guess is that they would not.

Mr. ERLBORN. This was the information we got from others in the field, that they were not consulted in the drafting of this program, and pretty generally their opinion is the same as yours, that it is not a very valuable program.

I don't recall the details of the Teachers Corps. Can they receive a short course in education and then be qualified to teach in a State where they would not otherwise be qualified?

Dr. ARMSTRONG. To my knowledge, that has been recommended. Whether that is in force or not, I don't know.

Mr. ERLBORN. It seems to me to be a circumvention of the teacher education laws of the various States, and it was one of the things that bothered me about the proposal. It seemed to me merely a reaction to the dissatisfaction of former Peace Corps people, that though they did not have the formal training, they thought, since they have been educating in Africa or South America or some place, they ought to be teachers when they came back home.

Dr. ARMSTRONG. I believe that the American Association of School Teachers has gone on record against that.

Mrs. GREEN. I must say Congressman Erlenborn and I, although on different sides of the aisle, are in agreement on this particular matter.

Mr. ERLBORN. And a few others, too.

Mrs. GREEN. My deep appreciation to Dr. Martin, Dr. Boldt, and Dr. Armstrong. Thank you for the courtesies you have extended to us.

The next witness to appear before the committee is Dr. Hudson, executive secretary of the Georgia Higher Education Facilities Commission.

Will you proceed Dr. Hudson?

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM E. HUDSON, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, GEORGIA HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES COMMISSION

Mr. HUDSON. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

You have a copy of my statement, and it is intentionally brief. I will save the time of the committee by reading the statement, and then be available for questions.

This is William E. Hudson, executive secretary of the Georgia Higher Education Facilities Commission. The purpose of this commission is to recommend to the U.S. Office of Education the relative priorities of eligible projects for the construction of academic facilities submitted by institutions of higher education within the State of Georgia.

The commission is composed of Mr. John A. Sibley, chairman; Dr. Harmon W. Caldwell, vice chairman; and Mr. James A. Dunlap, Dr. Rufus C. Harris, Dr. Waights G. Henry, Jr., and Dr. Benjamin Mays, members.

I could identify those various individuals. They are college presidents and people connected with the higher education effort in this State.

The foregoing group has served without change since the inception of the program. The commission has an office at 1108 Candler Building, Atlanta, Ga., and, in addition to the executive secretary, who devotes one-fifth of his time to the affairs of the commission, the commission retains the services of Mrs. Jeanne Roe as a full-time secretarial employee.

The State commission-Office of Education relationship is working well. The Federal-State partnership arrangement is most advantageous. The State commission has received no official complaints from any higher educational institution, public or private, in the State, and, in fact, no unofficial complaints have been received.

The commission's business is a matter of public record, and the plan for determining priorities of grant requests is on file at all accredited institutions.

A few facts concerning the program from its beginning are:

1. There are 61 accredited institutions of higher education in Georgia, 34 of which are classified as "privately supported institutions," and 27 are publicly supported.

2. Nineteen grant requests have been received from the private colleges—and this is total from the beginning of the program—and all of these requests have eventually been recommended to the U.S. Office of Education. These grant requests total \$4,272,313. No request has been refused by the commission.

3. Thirty-two grant requests have been received from the public institutions, and with the exception of one request, which was declared ineligible for consideration by the commission, all of the requests have presently been recommended to the U.S. Office of Education. These grant requests total \$13,725,140. No eligible request has been denied by the commission.

4. At the present moment, there remains on hand \$4,529,483 to be allocated during the current fiscal year. Indications are that this amount will be insufficient to cover the requests which will be received.

5. A list of grant requests by institutions is attached.

6. The allotment of Federal grant construction funds to Georgia has been fully utilized to date. No funds have lapsed or have been lost because of lack of demand.

7. The commission has never utilized all of the operation money available to it. Operation expenditures have been kept at approximately one-fourth to one-third of the State's allotment.

As a general comment, the relationship between the State commission and the U.S. Office of Education College Facilities Grants Branch has been of an extremely high order, and most satisfactory. A spirit of excellent cooperation has existed from the beginning of the program.

From the standpoint of the State, we have only praise and no complaints regarding the desire on the part of the Office of Education to render a useful service.

With regard to the programs, we have two suggestions. First, we believe that the level of Federal participation could usefully and helpfully be increased to 50 percent of the eligible project costs for both category 103 and 104 projects.

This is the same level of participation which has existed with most National Science Foundation and National Institutes of Health grants. Some compensation to the Federal participation because of this increase could come from elimination of any participation in administrative and loose equipment costs.

This second item is particularly troublesome, in that an inordinate amount of work in great detail is required for both the applicant and for the Office of Education.

Second, we see or sense a need to assist in increasing the quality of instruction through this construction aid program. We know that increased student enrollment capacity is the base for the grants as now programed. However, increased instructional quality could be productive also, and this aspect of the Nation's educational effort could be studied.

In conclusion, we acknowledge with appreciation the valuable aid that this program has rendered to our institutions, and we see every need for its continuance in the future at an increasing rate.

(Attachments to statement follow:)

LIST OF ALL GRANTS RECOMMENDED BY THE GEORGIA HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES COMMISSION UNDER THE HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES ACT OF 1963 AS AMENDED

Public community colleges—Category 103

	<i>Grant</i>
1. Middle Georgia College.....	\$125, 878
2. Marietta Junior College.....	993, 911
3. Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College.....	121, 359
4. Southern Institute of Technology.....	233, 333
5. Georgia Military College.....	125, 856
6. Albany Junior College.....	655, 497
7. DeKalb College.....	759, 925
8. Middle Georgia College.....	37, 208
9. Gainesville Junior College.....	752, 242
10. Dalton Junior College.....	717, 292
11. Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College.....	106, 362
12. DeKalb College.....	63, 733
13. Columbus College.....	177, 848
Total	<u>4, 870, 444</u>

LIST OF ALL GRANTS RECOMMENDED BY THE GEORGIA HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES COMMISSION UNDER THE HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES ACT OF 1963 AS AMENDED—Continued

Public institutions—Category 104

	<i>Grant</i>
1. West Georgia College-----	\$698, 192
2. Georgia Institute of Technology-----	279, 560
3. University of Georgia-----	998, 993
4. University of Georgia-----	676, 994
5. University of Georgia-----	82, 537
6. West Georgia College-----	234, 437
7. University of Georgia-----	267, 491
8. University of Georgia-----	287, 325
9. University of Georgia-----	1, 000, 000
10. Georgia State College-----	867, 316
11. Georgia Southern College-----	413, 545
12. Georgia Institute of Technology-----	459, 092
13. Armstrong State College-----	323, 886
14. West Georgia College-----	581, 987
15. Valdosta State College-----	583, 333
16. University of Georgia-----	955, 743
17. Georgia Institute of Technology-----	70, 317
18. University of Georgia-----	73, 948
Total -----	8, 854, 696

Private institutions—Category 104

	<i>Grant</i>
1. Morris Brown College-----	\$483, 079
2. Morehouse College-----	200, 000
3. Gordon Military College-----	151, 497
4. Berry College-----	183, 892
5. Young Harris College-----	81, 215
6. Clark College-----	583, 333
7. Berry College-----	124, 137
8. Spelman College-----	212, 228
9. Morehouse College-----	23, 848
10. Wesleyan College-----	242, 980
11. Emory-Oxford-----	200, 000
12. Andrew College-----	75, 000
13. Oglethorpe College-----	576, 130
14. Oglethorpe College-----	514, 914
15. Reinhardt College-----	282, 497
16. Reinhardt College-----	209, 149
17. Young Harris College-----	26, 357
18. Reinhardt College-----	87, 780
19. Berry College-----	14, 217
Total -----	4, 272, 313

Summary—Grants recommended to date

Community colleges (103) (13 grants)-----	\$4, 870, 444
Private institutions (104) (19 grants)-----	4, 272, 313
Public institutions (104) (18 grants)-----	8, 854, 696
Balance of grant funds on hand for remainder of 1966-67 year:	
Category 103-----	2, 308, 190
Category 104-----	2, 221, 293
Total awards plus funds on hand -----	22, 526, 936

Mrs. GREEN. Thank you.

Congressman Erlernborn, do you have questions?

Mr. ERLERNBORN. I don't believe so, Madam Chairman, thank you.

Mrs. GREEN. Do you see any change in this service statistical provided by the Office of Education through the years?

Dr. HUDSON. No, because we don't get very many statistics. The release of this information comes very slowly. It is almost too late to be of any benefit to us.

For instance, in our office, the latest information that we have on enrollments at educational institutions, higher educational institutions, in the State of Georgia, is for the fall of 1965.

Mrs. GREEN. Is this not, in and of itself, a comment on the ability of the Office of Education to provide meaningful statistics at a time when they would be useful to higher education?

Dr. HUDSON. This is my point, Madam Chairman, that by the time we get the statistics, they are of little help to us. We don't rely on them, particularly.

Mrs. GREEN. Has this always been the case?

Dr. HUDSON. Well, I haven't been associated with the program that long, but I think that through the bureaucratic process it proves pretty slow.

Mrs. GREEN. In the State of Georgia, how nearly do you meet the requests for grants and loans under the Higher Education Facilities Act?

Dr. HUDSON. The program for our State, Madam Chairman, is balanced almost perfectly at this time.

Mrs. GREEN. You are able to meet all of the requests?

Dr. HUDSON. We have at the present time met all of the requests and have about \$4½ million left for the remainder of this fiscal year, so it has been, as I said, almost perfect.

Mrs. GREEN. You are in a very fortunate position.

Dr. HUDSON. Yes, we are. We appreciate the fact that we are in this position.

Now, the other side of the problem would be that our institutions lack the other \$2 to go with the Federal \$1. The needs may be there, but they may not be applying because of lack of funds on their part.

Mrs. GREEN. Have you or your commission, or has the regional office, made any study of this, in terms of the needs and the ability of the institutions to match?

Dr. HUDSON. No. We have not made any detailed study of this.

Mrs. GREEN. In many States they do not have anywhere nearly sufficient funds. The applications for the Federal funds far exceed the available amount. With this in mind I am concerned about your recommendation for 50-50 matching.

I am thinking in terms of spreading the available amount of money over more institutions.

Dr. HUDSON. Well, unless the amount of money would be increased, then there is no advantage to going to the 50 percent.

In my judgment, it would be better to remain at the one-third to two-thirds participation level, and let the money be spread to more institutions by this means.

Mrs. GREEN. I think here I should put in a commercial the Congress authorized a few hundred million dollars for the Higher Education Facilities Act more than was recommended to us by the Office of Education. We felt the needs were much greater.

Dr. HUDSON. Yes. And I would like to help you with that.

You have programed for the future increasing education needs, which we think we will be able to match and use very effectively.

Mrs. GREEN. What is your view on categorical aid versus general aid?

Dr. HUDSON. For instance?

Mrs. GREEN. In higher education, originally the Higher Education Act, as you know, said that the funds could only be used for certain categories of academic buildings.

Dr. HUDSON. Oh, we are much in favor of the amendments that were accomplished through the 1965 Higher Education Act. This gave an even break across the board to the arts and the other segments of valuable education subjects, academic subjects, and did not restrict the aid to just science, mathematics, engineering, and this sort of thing. This was a considerable improvement, and this helped us a great deal.

Mrs. GREEN. In the State of Georgia, and if you have knowledge of the other five States in this area, what is your comment on the reservation of funds for junior colleges? Is this desirable, or not? And if it desirable, is the percentage correct?

Dr. HUDSON. We have no quarrel with the percentage, and in our State particularly, the public segment is establishing junior colleges at what could be called a pretty rapid rate, and the help that they have secured through a 40-percent grant rather than the one-third has been very constructive on their part.

We have no quarrel with the two categories, the public community college and the remainder of your higher educational institutions.

Mrs. GREEN. Are your responsibilities limited to the Facilities Act?

Dr. HUDSON. Yes.

Well, we also are responsible for title VI, under the 1965 act, part A, the equipment branch, and this we have just been working with now, of course, since last spring. This program is moving well, and has been oversubscribed. We have lost no Federal funds. We have utilized all that were available to us.

Mrs. GREEN. Turning to the guidelines, what is the timelag between the enactment of the law and the time when the guidelines and the rules and regulations are in your hands, or in the hands of the commission?

Dr. HUDSON. If I may, I will answer that in this way. We knew that the rules and regulations were being changed last summer, in July. The actual changes were not received by us in an official form until November.

We had prepared, using the original tentative regulations, a revised State plan, but we had to hold this until the official regulations came out, because we didn't want to act with unofficial information.

Mrs. GREEN. Were these rules and regulations which governed the action of your people from the 1st of September?

Dr. HUDSON. Yes.

Mrs. GREEN. And you did not receive them until November?

Dr. HUDSON. This is correct.

Mrs. GREEN. Do you think that there is any way that this procedure could be speeded up by the Office of Education?

Dr. HUDSON. Madam Chairman, I don't know what their procedure is, to get these regulations approved, but apparently, they will go, I will say, "upstairs," and it floats around somewhere in a nebulous state, apparently.

This is my own viewpoint. The people that I deal with, the people that I pick up the telephone and talk to, to get answers to my problems—I get answers from them, but they seem to be helpless in trying to speed the regulations through, because it moves to some other level. I speak particularly of Mr. Morris and this College Facilities Branch. They are most helpful and cooperative in perfect measure.

Mrs. GREEN. Have you or have members of the commission ever been consulted on the drafting of the rules and regulations, or the guidelines?

Dr. HUDSON. Yes, ma'am; we have.

Mrs. GREEN. At what point are you consulted?

Dr. HUDSON. We are consulted I think fairly early in the process. They want our viewpoints. They want our reactions as to how to improve the program.

I am perfectly satisfied with this relationship.

Mrs. GREEN. Is it your judgment that this is the policy that is followed across the country, that the State commissions are called in?

Dr. HUDSON. Yes. The executive secretaries and members of these State commissions.

The program has been in effect, and now we are in our third year. We have had two national meetings, and this was an effort on the part of this College Facilities Branch section to get information to the working groups at the State level. Very helpful.

Mrs. GREEN. In your particular job, do you see any evidence of this new profession of grantsmanship?

Dr. HUDSON. Not in our particular program, because we work with the institutions and assist them in preparing the grants.

Our major problem is that of all of us: read the instructions.

I have had grant applications come in, and the institution did not even put its own name in. This is ridiculous. You don't need professional help for this. You simply need to carefully take the time to prepare the applications. I know of no instances in Georgia where, under the title I program, professional help has been employed, other than the architects who develop the plans which serve as a basis for many of the calculations necessary in the grant application.

Mrs. GREEN. Does the small college or university, with limited resources and personnel, have the same opportunity to get grants or loans under the Higher Education Facilities Act as do the much larger institutions with great financial resources?

Dr. HUDSON. Well, except for the limitations of money, the opportunities are there, but if the small institution does not have its two-thirds necessary, then, of course, it is in trouble. And this is the reason for our comment. Somewhere in the long run of this program, we have got to be looking to improvement of quality through construction.

Mrs. GREEN. In Georgia, do you have a variation on the percentage amount of Federal funds? Or do you have a flat amount?

Dr. HUDSON. A flat amount. One-third in the case of higher educational institutions, and 40 percent in the case of public community colleges.

Mrs. GREEN. Because of the differential in the financial resources of individual institutions, would there be any merit, as is done in some States, to have a sliding scale, so that one institution might have 10 percent matching funds, and another 33, and one junior college might have 10, and another 40 percent?

Dr. HUDSON. We appreciate this privilege, and we have it. We could allocate our funds in this manner. However, it is almost impossible for an educational institution, Madam Chairman, to apply for money and not know how much they are going to get, and work out a budget for a construction project.

We want to put up a hundred thousand dollar building. Can we get 40 percent? Do we get 40 or 30 or 20 or 10?

It makes it extremely difficult for the institution to organize a program to get a project constructed, because they would be uncertain about the financial portion of it.

Mr. ERLNBORN. Would you yield to me?

I have a couple of questions now.

Have you had any difficulty in dealing with the Department of Housing and Urban Development in the engineering and architectural services? Do you think this could better be done by the Office of Education?

Dr. HUDSON. Possibly it could. We have not had any difficulty, because the office is located here in Atlanta, and we have personal contact with them. If a problem arises, we can go directly to them and work it out.

Mississippi, for instance, if they had to travel all the way into Atlanta, would be at a greater disadvantage. Possibly the Office of Education could handle this portion of this work. I would think that the coordination would be improved.

Mr. ERLNBORN. It would not be an improvement, however, if they would concentrate that in Washington?

Dr. HUDSON. No. We would lose the local contact. That is true.

Mr. ERLNBORN. That leads me to my next question: How do you feel about the decentralization of the Office of Education, admitting, of course, that it has not been completely effective, even though you are farther ahead here in Atlanta than elsewhere in the country?

Dr. HUDSON. Sir, I am already acquainted with, have worked with, the individual in the college branch section that will be assigned to this region. I will be delighted to have him here in Atlanta, because again our contacts will be much closer.

However, he is only a telephone call away. As long as I can get the answers to questions that I can't answer, that institutions bring to me, as long as I can get those answers, I don't care whether he is located here or in Washington. I think he could possibly do a better job here. He would be closer to our problems.

Mr. ERLNBORN. You really have experienced no difficulty in your relationship with him presently?

Dr. HUDSON. No difficulty at all.

Mr. ERLNBORN. You are not required to travel frequently to Washington and consult with him?

Dr. HUDSON. I am in Washington four times a year, if this is necessary.

The fact is that I can catch a plane from here in the morning and be back here in the evening, and still get 4 to 5 hours of work in Washington. I can tell them all I know in that length of time.

Mr. ERLBORN. Thank you.

Mrs. GREEN. One other question, Dr. Hudson.

Let me read a comment from hearings in one of the New England States made by the person who was administering the Higher Education Facilities Act there:

Several recipients of title I grants, both private and public, but particularly the latter, have found the postaward procedures of grant administration frustrating, particularly the construction supervision. The procedures are bound and tied with inelastic redtape. The staff at HUD in both the Boston and New York offices are, I am told, most helpful in guiding the applicant through the maze of redtape, but are powerless to cut it. The endless approvals, reapprovals, assurance, investigations, conformances, certification, reports, and controls could be streamlined to resemble the procedure of the National Science Foundation, which are simple and direct, without endangering the Federal interest in the project.

Do you have any of this kind of a feeling here in Georgia?

Dr. HUDSON. I think there is a great deal of truth in what is said there, yes.

Mrs. GREEN. Do you have any specific recommendations to the Congress on legislative changes that we might make, or to the Office of Education, on procedural changes, which would make your job easier?

Dr. HUDSON. Well, first of all, Madam Chairman, this does not worry me, as an executive secretary to this commission, because by the time we get through and make our recommendations to Washington, then it is up to the institution to struggle with all of these other matters at some future time.

The public colleges under the State board of regents, here in Georgia—most of their constructions takes place under an agency called the University System Building Authority. This agency will match almost any Federal agency so far as redtape and procedures are concerned, and if we make it through that agency, then it pretty well takes care of the other. But a private institution would have its difficulties. So again I would say that possibly the U.S. Office of Education would appreciate these problems a little more.

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

The next witness is Dr. Warren Findley, director of the Georgia Research and Development Center.

Dr. Findley, we also welcome you to the meetings this morning. We appreciate the time that you have taken out of your official schedule to prepare a statement and give us the benefit of your views.

You may proceed as you wish.

STATEMENT OF PROF. WARREN G. FINDLEY, DIRECTOR, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CENTER IN EDUCATIONAL STIMULATION, UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA

Dr. FINDLEY. May I, in turn, thank you for this opportunity to appear before this hearing.

I am Prof. Warren G. Findley, director of the Research and Development Center in Educational Stimulation at the University of Georgia.

My contacts with programs and activities of the Research Branch of the Office of Education include participation in curriculum improvement projects in elementary written composition and in the teaching of anthropology in elementary schools and in a research project on the sequence of teaching the newer mathematics topics in the intermediate grades at the University of Georgia.

I have served since 1964 as a field reader for small contract proposals and am currently under contract to evaluate proposals of any specified scope in my fields of competence.

Earlier, from 1959 to 1962, I served as a member of the Research Advisory Committee to the Cooperative Research Branch at a time when we operated as a committee of the whole to review and evaluate all research projects submitted for funding.

More recently, I have served as a Headstart observer in the summer of 1965 for a project partially supported by the Office of Economic Opportunity, as a panel consultant to the Office of Education on its equality of educational opportunity survey during 1965-66, and as a site visitor and evaluation committee member for the Office of Education in the summer of 1966 for its projected national program in early education.

This year we have had the experience of providing postdoctoral educational research training in early childhood education to one fellow.

My first reaction, and I feel sure I speak for my colleagues at the University of Georgia, is that the Office of Education has shown a remarkable ability to evolve a progressively more functional program of research and development in a rapidly changing situation.

Starting from scratch 10 years ago, it first developed a program of basic and applied research under not merely the scrutiny, but the control of non-Government research personnel, which earned the confidence of the Congress and the research community.

Each year it attracted greater numbers of acceptable research projects than its appropriations could support, so there was no occasion to discontinue or cut back support. Rather, there developed a small backlog of worthy projects to be carried forward for funding in the next fiscal year, for which gradually increased appropriations were made.

At the same time, the small professional staff looked ahead, conceiving and proposing constructive extensions each year from the solid base of defensible projects in hand. The first extension, in 1962, was into 5-year curriculum improvement projects. These permitted bringing together specialists in substantive knowledge and research design, they permitted maintenance of functioning research staffs on studies that could be planned in sequence in advance with confidence that funding would be available when needed, and they permitted longitudinal studies over time with their promise of definitive findings not obtainable from short-term studies.

A second extension followed successful administration of this program. In 1964, the research and development center concept was broached and adopted. With each center funded for approximately 10 times the amount of the curriculum projects, for a 5-year period, with the prospect of renewal for a second 5 years, substantial interdisciplinary efforts could be mounted, semipermanent research staffs

of professional, technical, and clerical personnel could be assembled, and truly longitudinal studies could be planned.

These centers, as you well know, have also been given the responsibility for demonstrating effective practices and disseminating them. Our own experience has paralleled this development. We moved from individually approved studies to curriculum projects in which materials for seven grades had to be developed and tried out over 5 years through elaborate plans for overlapping and sequencing in particular subject areas.

We now have a research and development center in educational stimulation in which we have been able to plan a longitudinal study over the 10 years from age 3 through age 12 to determine the effectiveness of continuous, structured sequential stimulation of young children over that period in producing greater achievement than might otherwise have been attained.

An excellent example of the kinds of outcomes to be expected from such centers is the applied research study conducted for the past 6 years by the Denver Public Schools under arrangements prevailing in 1960, and just published.

This study had to do with the beginning teaching of reading with 5-year-olds.

In 1966, a third extension has been undertaken. The regional educational laboratories, combining the resources of the advanced training institutions and the State departments of education of several contiguous States, have been given broad responsibilities for dissemination of effective practices.

Dr. Hopper, who has also been summoned to testify, can speak of that extension for this region.

As the fiscal pressures of international commitments have increased, the Office of Education and we collaborating centers have made several adaptations calculated to render our total effort more efficient. We have accepted a reallocation of responsibility, so that our research and development center sees its chief function in the development and refinement of materials and procedures in ongoing field situations, in schools under normal operating conditions.

Basic and applied research studies will continue to need support to encourage exploration of new ideas falling outside the focused efforts of research and developments centers. At the same time, a considerable dissemination responsibility is being assumed by the regional laboratories.

In keeping with our responsibility for refinements of workable innovations, we are looking toward progressively more collaborative arrangements with local districts under title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Both our current major field efforts are in counties where title III grants have been made for related exploratory activities. The arrangements are mutually beneficial and provide a model for extension of our efforts into other areas of exploration and refinement of new approaches.

We have one unique project going in the teaching of a cross section of a community's children 3 to 5 years of age in a public school.

An area I would like to see us explore would be the substantial introduction of male participants in the teaching of children at the preprimary and elementary levels.

We are also taking steps to apply systematically the cost-benefit approach to evaluation of our activities. The materials developed by a project supported by the Office of Education and resulting in a Program Evaluation and Review Technique, PERT, are directly applicable to charting the expected flow of activities and the data they generate into usable findings for further refinement and/or dissemination.

A word about the small contracts program. This has been beneficial in at least two important ways.

First, it has enabled research workers to conduct pilot studies, preliminary to larger studies, so that problems of detail and of instrumentation can be worked out in advance, rather than become hazards to the efficient accomplishment of the larger studies.

Second, a number of doctoral dissertations have been made feasible or broadened in significance by the underwriting of costs that would otherwise have forced the relatively impecunious investigator back into a more limited type of study with correspondingly more limited generalizability of findings.

Another word concerning a further extension of the research and development center concept. The national program in early education, involving a national coordinating center with autonomous satellite centers, seems well designed to meet the demand for accelerated trial of procedures to deal with a rapidly emerging phenomenon requiring innovation, refinement, and systematic evaluation, because of its immediate importance. Other areas might be given similar prompt, systematic exploration when identified. One suggestion I feel might help in achieving the most efficient use of funds appropriated for research and development centers and regional laboratories on one hand, and for title III innovative projects on the other, would be to allocate 10 percent of the title III grant for research and evaluation to administration by an autonomous agency like a center or laboratory. If such funds were under the authority of the evaluators, they might be in a better position to assert considerations basic to objective evaluation.

The idea occurred to me from consideration of the Vocational Education Act of 1963, with its 10 percent for research provision. I cannot claim to have thought it through, or to involve my colleagues in it. It does not arise from negative experience, but from the positive experience of being able to assert positions when contributing to a collaborative effort.

Let me conclude by "praising with faint damns."

Reimbursement procedures for readily justifiable expenses and honorariums of consultants to the Office of Education are unwarrantedly tedious. No State or private organization would tolerate them.

Communication with the Office of Economic Opportunity and with the Educational Research Information Center program leave much to be desired.

In all our major negotiations and communications with the Office of Education, however, we can only pay tribute to the courtesy, effi-

ciency, and professional integrity and imagination of the small, often overworked staff, despite its considerable turnover.

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

Mr. ERLNBORN. Dr. Findley, my first question will relate to research and development work in colleges and universities.

Do you feel that too much of the time of university professors is now being taken up with this sort of activity? Is there more prestige connected with this than there is to teaching, nowadays?

I am thinking of an article that I read in the National News magazine just the other day, where many of the students were complaining that it was the assistant professor, or maybe a teaching fellow, who was teaching them, whereas the prestigious professor was busy going to Washington to get research projects, was busily engaged in research, and was no longer teaching.

Dr. FINDLEY. I am sure such dialog is taking place on every campus, and ours is not an exception. I would not say that in my view the matter has reached serious proportions. It may be treason to my fellow professors to say that sometimes a graduate assistant or teaching fellow, being closer to the learning process himself, may do as good or better job of teaching as the prestigious professor.

However, I do feel that it is well to maintain the balance between construction and research, and thus far at our university that balance has been maintained.

I think a few of us, in order to warrant the Government in supporting us and getting us started in this project, have had to be specified as giving full time at the start, but even within members of my own staff, a man I recruited last year expressed preference for doing some teaching.

We have made it feasible for him to do such teaching, sort of trading off a fraction of his time for a corresponding fraction of another faculty member's time in research.

Mr. ERLNBORN. This is, however, a problem that people are aware of, and something that you think is a cause for concern, that you should watch?

Dr. FINDLEY. Let's put it this way. Right at the time, when we have recognized the need for the research and development activities, there has been this tremendous upsurge in the number of students wanting to go on into college. Someone must teach them. And who is to say, on the point?

Mr. ERLNBORN. There also have been criticisms that within the Federal Government there is no one that knows the totality of research and development contracts that are put out by the various agencies and departments of Government.

Do you have any comment on this? Do you feel that there is not sufficient overall control, across the board, as to where the research and development contracts are going?

Dr. FINDLEY. The research and development contracts with which I am specifically familiar are those in the field of education.

Mr. ERLNBORN. They would all come from the Office of Education, then?

Dr. FINDLEY. The ones I have spoken about do come from there. There are some that come from private foundations into local systems, with which we and others are collaborating.

I would say that the present emphasis in the Office of Education programs is toward a better coordination of a series of programs that have grown up rather rapidly.

Now, as to what to say about other programs: I noticed before this committee in Washington, where testimony was given me to read, there was some question as to whether NSF and other agencies were being properly coordinated with the Office of Education's efforts, particularly since they were attempting to support special efforts to improve instruction in the sciences in the schools.

That I think is a proper program of coordination, but I see that as existing at the national level.

Mr. ERLNBORN. Clearly there is a lack of coordination between agencies and departments. I recall one study, one of the subcommittees of our Congress made, that developed the information that in at least one instance there was a graduate student working for his doctorate who had three separate research and development contracts from different agencies, none of which knew that he had a contract with another agency; and he was at the time going to school, collecting something in the neighborhood of \$25,000 or \$30,000 a year from the Government under these contracts.

Dr. FINDLEY. I can assure you that as far as the University of Georgia is concerned, this would be quite impossible.

Only within the last month I have been negotiating with the controller's office over the propriety of an individual student's obtaining certain support from an outside agency while also receiving some support from our grant, because the checks to him had to process through the same office.

I would suspect that that would not happen, and we are in very good touch with the other departments of the university. For example, the academic year institutes, that are run under the NDEA and science are run by persons who serve on committees with us, in approving the doctorates of those persons if they continue on in further work. So we are quite familiar with what they are doing, and they with what we are doing.

Mr. ERLNBORN. What is your feeling about the possible lack of independent judgment and critical evaluation in universities and colleges that are dependent to a great extent of their income from the Federal Government?

Dr. FINDLEY. Are you saying that Federal funds might distort programs in a local institution?

Mr. ERLNBORN. Not only distort programs, but maybe take away from the ability of the individuals in the school to render a critical evaluation of proposals pending before Congress.

Dr. FINDLEY. Well, now, I am not quite sure what we would be doing, "rendering critical evaluations."

Mr. ERLNBORN. Let me just put this in different terms.

Do you feel that there is any danger in a school becoming dependent to a great extent, because maybe more than half of its total income comes from the Federal Government, through grants and such?

Dr. FINDLEY. I can conceive of an institution that carelessly entered into a program of expansion, based so much on external support that if that support should for any reason be withdrawn, they would then be embarrassed.

I can only say, with respect to our own particular center, that if the funds should be withdrawn next year, that would simply save the dean one year's recruiting pay for his teaching staff.

Mr. ERLNBORN. Now, talking about Project ERIC, is this operative, at the present time, or merely being toolled up?

Dr. FINDLEY. Well, it is in the stages where certain preliminary documentary digests have been forwarded to us. I think a first step on a financial scale with respect to our urban communities, if I am not mistaken, came through in the last week. They are tooling up. Our only misadventure, and I think we would not complain about it too bitterly, because we think the position taken was properly sound, was that we were busily trying to do something which it had already been decided was going to be done in a different way.

Mr. ERLNBORN. Generally speaking, is information concerning the result of your educational research on individual projects published and disseminated within a reasonable length of time, or is there such a timelag that it may no longer be valid or useful by the time it becomes published or available?

Dr. FINDLEY. I would say that the publication of such research as is done is rather well provided for within the grant made to us for the conduct of the center, that we might in some way say that we are better prepared to disseminate things than we are to have things to disseminate.

Yet it so happens that in this State we have had a bureau of field studies, under Dr. Doynsmith, which has received national recognition, and he is sort of standing there ready to disseminate anything we have to disseminate, and has the contacts that we have helped to support this last year with elementary principals and others that we think we will want to have ready to hear us when we have something more definitive to offer.

Mr. ERLNBORN. How are your reports published? Locally? Or does the Office of Education in Washington publish them?

Dr. FINDLEY. Each of the research and development centers has a budget for dissemination, and this dissemination is provided in part by others participating, particularly the school systems in which we might be carrying on experiments.

But there is also provision for distributing reports and studies, and these can be done on a quite varied and informal basis.

I was quite impressed by the reports recently received from the project at the University of Pittsburgh, where they simply adopted a convenient identifiable format for an outer cover, and they put inside of them all sorts of reports, some blueprints from professional journals, some mimeographed short reports of studies they had done, some accounts of things that they were starting upon.

I think probably we and they are better prepared to disseminate in-process information than has been true in the past, and I look forward to the ERIC operation when it gets into full swing to pick up more of what might be called casual publications, publications that are made locally for local purposes, and sometimes don't get distributed unless somebody knows somebody has it and asks for it.

I think this would bring quite a lot of useful, less formal publication to people who need it.

Mr. ERLNBORN. This would not be applicable to the particular type of research that you do, but just recently in Washington we had testimony from some people concerned with higher education that when there is partial funding or complete funding by the Office of Education of a particular study, the Office has a blanket rule now that there can be no copyright attached to the results of the material when it is published, and therefore they felt that often the university press or the other methods of obtaining printing and publishing were not available to them, because of the lack of copyright, and that many of the researchers did not care to engage in research where they could not protect their end product through copyright; not necessarily because of the monetary consideration, but its use and possible changes in the wording.

Dr. FINDLEY. We have not been disturbed by the copyright provision, that sometimes is referred to as the public domain policy. We have found that it is natural to publish in order to, on the one hand, make more information as widely available as possible, and on the other hand, to obtain whatever prestige comes with having furnished this type of information.

I know copyright has its values, but I would say that we would be most happy to have anything that comes out of our operation generally available. I think only certain special instruments would be the sort that would need a close copyright, and insofar as Uncle Sam has paid us to develop them, I think he is entitled to let other people use them. After all, a copyright is only a right to sue.

Mr. ERLNBORN. You don't necessarily want to buy a lawsuit, then.

Do you feel that the Office of Education does the job of determining today what the needs of business and industry will be 12 or 16 years from now, when the student presently entering the educational system will be going out into the field, where his knowledge will be used? Is this sort of work being done? Does the Office of Education have the ability, or are they making the attempt to predict what educational requirements will be needed over this period of time?

Dr. FINDLEY. The Office of Education has participated in sponsoring at more than one institution conferences on education for 1980 or 1990, and I am sure they have included in this the drawing together of, let's say, projections as to manpower needs and things of that sort that would be relevant to considering what kind of output you want from your educational process.

I know of specific processes at Stanford, and I think at Pittsburgh, of this kind of work. I think much could be done to explore this matter. It is a matter of real concern.

I remember being struck, some 4 or 5 years ago, by Gilberg Rehm's publication, "A Counsellor in a Changing World," prepared by the American Guidance Association, in which he made the statement, which I have not heard challenged, that every student which was then being counseled in the high school should be counseled with the notion that on the average twice during his working career he would have to change jobs, not because he was doing the job poorly, or that his company was doing its work poorly, but that the process by which they were operating had become obsolete.

Mr. ERLNBORN. Again, in our testimony in Washington, we had some criticism of our educational system as really being no system

whatsoever—individual school districts really determining what the curriculum will be, and so forth, and along with this a criticism of the development of some of this curriculum, some of the teaching methods, particularly the new math.

Now, what is your opinion of the new math? The opinion expressed yesterday was that it was not designed to be useful. It maybe was great theoretically, but it was not good in application.

Dr. FINDLEY. Well, I would have to say that although I did major in mathematics as an undergraduate, I would hesitate to pose as any kind of authority.

To answer your question, let me simply say that I have read statements by persons in the area of mathematics, and physics, and some of the other areas in which newer curriculum developments have come along, suggesting that some of the new approaches have not been entirely helpful. I can quote the head of the physics department on our own campus because this has been in the newspapers as his opinion.

Some of the PSCC physics, as it is called, the newer curriculum there, has had the effect of perhaps upgrading the curriculum in physics for certain students who, as you might say, can take it and enjoy it, but being pitched at such a level as to overreach the average capabilities of students, so that a smaller proportion of students are being channeled into physics than before. So that you can have effects of that sort.

I would not want it to appear that this is a general condemnation of those newer approaches, but there gets to be a stage after the early effort, in which our subject matter specialists are anxious to bring things up to date, you might say, where matters have to be tried in the operating situation, and adaptations made, when disproportions such as the one I have just talked about seem to appear.

Mr. ERLNBORN. To get into a different subject, and maybe one a little closer to your experience: Preschool education—what do you think about Project Headstart? Is this validly carried on by the Office of Economic Opportunity, or is this really just an integral part of education, and should it be handled by the Office of Education?

Mr. FINDLEY. Well, actually, as you know, support for public education has been a local matter. At the present time there are many State and local school systems, that support kindergarten for 5-year-olds. We know of almost none in which something is done at lower age levels than that. In fact, in inquiring, I have almost come to the conclusion that our little experiment out here in Clayton County is unique in having 3-year-olds and 4-year-olds, a cross-section of the public school population there, actually in a public school, as contrasted with private schools or otherwise.

I would say that our Headstart approach is one of two approaches that are in the field at the moment, which are in effect contradictory to each other. The Headstart program is proposed for those who need a head start in order to be better able to take full advantage of the type of program that will be offered them in the first grade.

For years, we have had another program for those who were so advanced as a result of favorable background that they could profit from the present arrangements for first grade, even before they reached the normal age for entering first grade.

So we are giving it to some because they can take it without having to fix it over any. We are giving it to some others because they need to have something to bring them up. And the great bulk in between is not being touched.

The thesis of our center, and the emphasis in our research is on the usefulness of this type of earlier education for all, and that is what we are trying to explore.

Mr. ERLNBORN. Would you feel that Operation Headstart, however, is an educational process, and should be handled through the Office of Education?

Dr. FINDLEY. Well, I don't know whether Headstart would have gotten started off with the bang it did if it had been limited by some of the process that we would ordinarily go through in trying to plan and put something like that into effect.

Headstart got started, and I am glad it got started. I think it was good for us. And I would say that it should not present any unwanted competition, but rather should show something that can be done. And perhaps when more people see it, the question will arise quite naturally, "Why don't we have this for all children?"

Mr. ERLNBORN. Am I getting the correct impression, that what you are saying in a way is that the old established agencies such as the Office of Education, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, are so set in their ways that they are not ready to innovate, and we have to go outside of the regular structure to create something new?

Dr. FINDLEY. Well, in a way you might make that criticism but I think one has to recognize that local school officials are dependent on local taxpayers for support of what they do.

Now, for many years, here in Atlanta, when the public schools were supporting, as they are now, kindergartens, out of local taxation, since there is no State aid for kindergartens, there would be mention on the part of some that a good way to save money would be to do away with the kindergarten.

Well, it so happened that that would generally trigger off all the first-grade teachers and PTA people in the community, to ringing doorbells to make sure that it did not happen, because the first-grade teachers were glad that the children had had kindergarten. And so, I would say that we have been quite limited in extending education downward.

I think now some of the reason for our starting our center with the age level we did is that there is rather good research evidence that so much goes on at this early age level, and so much of a youngster's readiness to benefit from the regular program seems to depend upon it, that we do well to try to help.

Any of us who have had any broad experience can think back that we came from homes that were, shall we say, educationally advantaged, and that there are things which were done for us which others don't get. I personally recall having learned to tell time to the minute long before I went to school, out of a little book my mother bought for me that had a little watch face on it, and you could "Tell what time Timothy got up." I knew those things. On most school records I think the grade level for which some of these things are expected is second or third grade.

There are many other things that are done, particularly in Headstart, by way of producing conversation between children and adults who are interested in conversing with them, which helps build them up.

To my mind, the principle of early education is very sound. If I did not feel that way, I would not have sent my older daughter to nursery school at age two and a half, when I could ill afford it.

Mr. ERLBORN. Thank you very much.

Mrs. GREEN. Let me just pursue that for a moment, Dr. Findley.

If I understood correctly one of the previous witnesses, there was resistance in this region to the Headstart program. Would you comment on this?

Dr. FINDLEY. I would have to wonder whether that was as widespread as stated.

I do know this, and I am quite sure I am right about this: that the Atlanta public schools had been in conversation with the Ford Foundation about an educational improvement program by the spring of 1965, when Headstart was broached, and they were so far along that they simply shot in their proposal to the U.S. Office, or to the OEO, I should say, with the suggestion that they would be glad to undertake it with 400 children, 100 in each of four schools, and it came back with the request "Why don't you do it in 26 schools?"

And their approach was used as a model for suggesting to others as to how they might do it. I would say that here in Atlanta there was a very avid acceptance of Headstart.

Mrs. GREEN. Have you made any evaluation in your research department on the effectiveness of Headstart?

Dr. FINDLEY. No. We have not. The Headstart people have tended to prefer a kind of national evaluation that they direct, and we are only beginning to enter into conversations with them about ways in which we might participate.

Mrs. GREEN. Did I understand you to say that the national people only prefer an evaluation that they direct? Is that what you are saying?

Dr. FINDLEY. That was the way it was conducted during the first year, and even into the second year.

Mrs. GREEN. By the Office of Economic Opportunity? Or the Office of Education?

Dr. FINDLEY. The Office of Economic Opportunity.

Mrs. GREEN. Do you think this is a good procedure?

Dr. FINDLEY. Well, no, and I think they have broken out of it. They have now entered into a million and a half dollar contract with the Institute for Educational Development in New York City to try to set up studies over a longer term basis. But their initial studies were all quite short term, and I would say quite inadequate from my thought of the fact you can often get very quick results.

Mrs. GREEN. Let me go to a couple of other questions.

It seems to me that in education, and especially with the tremendous amount of growth and the tremendous amount of research that is being done, we are inclined to go for any new program just because it is new.

When there is a proliferation of agencies, as there is, and a following fragmentation of programs, do we lose a continuity of programming? Do we lose the advantages of one individual or one group, look-

ing at the whole child from the time he is two or three until he gets in high school?

I refer specifically to Headstart. What justification is there from an educational specialist's viewpoint in saying that we will spend in Headstart \$1,100 on the child when he is 3 years old, and 4 years old, and 5 years old, and then, when he is 6 years old, place him in the overcrowded classroom, with little counseling and guidance little clinical attention, and little attention to medical needs?

What real justification is there for this?

And would you react to a suggestion that was made yesterday, that we need the equivalent of the Food and Drug Administration in the field of education, to say whether or not we should use the recommendations and findings of educational research?

Are they good for education? That is an oversimplification, but would you react to that?

Dr. FINDLEY. To react to this last point first, I would say that it would certainly be helpful to have a body serving to guide people in the interpretation of the significance of findings and new approaches.

I have felt it has been of great advantage to those of us who are in the field of educational measurement, which happens to be my specialty, that there have been the mental measurement yearbooks, which are published at about 5-year intervals, under the editorship of Prof. Oscar Burroughs of Rutgers University.

These are, you might call them, a consumer's research kind of publication with respect to the tests that have come out during the period, and those of us who are professionally responsible in the field take considerable pride in being asked to contribute to that, and considerable care in our responses, because Dr. Burroughs has the very happy device of having not one but three people review every test, so your review will be laid alongside of everybody else's.

I think this notion of having a body that might pronounce on the significance of studies is a good one. I think that this should be in the form of advice, rather than dicta.

I think a great deal of research that comes out is rather carefully controlled and designed to give leads, but much of the research in education needs to be conducted on the level of what is now dignified by the term "systems approach," in which you develop something to meet a purpose in an ongoing situation, and you evaluate how well it has worked on the first go-round. You then attempt to improve how you will do it. You then attempt at a later time to see how well that has come about. In other words, the research is of a great variety of sorts, and I think we need to draw on all of it, and have this type of advice.

Now, as far as separating the function of the early education of children from that of the later education of children, I feel that there is a definite inefficiency in this separation.

I think, however, until such time as we gain acceptance of support of education at more levels, the fact that an experiment was tried, even by an agency that some might want to say is not qualified to conduct such inquiry, has had the effect of bringing something forward faster for consideration than would have been the case otherwise.

With respect to the matter of reducing the amount per child as you go further up through the schools, I think that this is a point that

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.

Dr. Hopper, welcome to the subcommittee session this morning.
Are you fairly new in this position?
Dr. HOPPER. That is correct. Since July of 1966.
Mrs. GREEN. Fine.
Will you proceed as you wish?
Dr. HOPPER. Thank you.

**STATEMENT OF ROBERT L. HOPPER, DIRECTOR, SOUTHEASTERN
EDUCATION LABORATORY**

Madam Chairman, Members of the Congress, I am pleased to appear before this committee today as it proceeds with its significant review of the Office of Education.

It is certainly most thoughtful of the committee to provide a series of regional hearings to facilitate the appearance of interested citizens throughout our Nation.

Let me identify myself as the director of the Southeastern Education Laboratory with offices at 3450 International Boulevard, Hapeville, Ga.

Our laboratory is one of a network of 20 laboratories funded under provisions of title IV, Public Law 89-10. The primary purpose of the laboratories is to promote educational change and development, translating research findings into improved school practices.

We are, in fact, a new bridge which has been developed to make certain that our schools have the opportunity to accelerate their growth by taking advantage of technological developments in all fields of endeavor. Especially are we concerned that schools make use of curriculum innovations which have come into being primarily as a result of the leadership of our Federal Government.

It is not necessary for me to labor the point of the compelling need for educational advancement in our Nation's school system. We know of the dramatic progress which has been made with Federal funding in such segments of our society as health, defense, space exploration, science, public housing, and highway development.

All of us are equally sensitive to the fact that our educational system is not developing as fast as other areas of human endeavor. If our people are to perform effectively in modern society, nonetheless, it is imperative that they be provided new kinds of educational opportunities now.

Our regional education laboratory serves the States of Alabama, Georgia, and Florida. We have a 62-member regional council which represents the educational and civic interests of the three-State area.

The regional council elects a board of directors, consisting of 12 people. The board serves as the policymaking body of the laboratory. The board selects the director, and approves the appointment of three associate directors in the central office, as well as the appointments of eight component office directors.

Four of the laboratory's component offices are located in Florida, two in Alabama, and two in Georgia.

Each of the laboratories throughout the Nation has a primary program focus. Our focus in the Southeastern Laboratory is on the amelioration of educational deprivation.

The sources of educational deprivation in our region are obvious. Problems resulting from desegregation of schools, problems relating to the inner core city and small rural schools, and problems related to the education of children from families of migratory workers are all a part of this program focus.

Although our laboratory was placed on a formal operational basis only in July of 1966, we have been able to move quickly and develop responsible activities which meet these problems head on. We are, for example, helping to—

1. Disseminate information through the ERIC system.
2. Develop supporting research projects which seek new ways to ameliorate education deprivation.
3. Initiate system of 24 pilot demonstration schools in educationally deprived areas of the region to secure accelerated educational advancement.
4. Implement a continuous system of newsletters and daily news releases to provide up-to-date information on new technology and programs to all persons interested in educational advancement in our region.
5. Provide technical supporting services to accelerate planning and development at both a local school district and regional level.

In all of our program activities, we have a variety of relationships with the Office of Education, as well as with other Federal agencies. Deepest involvement at the moment is with titles I and III of Public Law 89-10, where we assist school systems in educationally deprived areas with the development of significant projects and provide for their evaluation.

This technical assistance through our component offices results in more efficient and effective utilization of Federal funding in schools where such financial assistance is most sorely needed.

Our laboratory is also involved with such other activities as title IV, Public Law 89-10; title IV, Civil Rights Act; Vocational Education Act of 1963; and the Higher Education Act of 1965.

While the laboratory is working with a number of Federal programs, it should be noted that our direct funding comes from title IV, Public Law 89-10, and that no further funding of our operations is derived from other authorizations to the Office of Education. We have received, and I should assume we would continue to receive, financial support from a variety of Federal agencies, other than the Office of Education.

For example, we have received funds from the United States Department of State to assist in building a bilingual educational materials center.

Here we find an illustration of the laboratory seeking to be effective in interrelating various groups and institutions to meet national needs and concerns. In this instance, the concern is to provide appropriate educational opportunities for Cuban refugees. We know that in Dade County, Fla., alone there are 25,000 non-English-speaking children, and this number continues to increase at the rate of about 250 per month.

Materials to meet the unique educational needs of these children are the same needed by American-sponsored schools in Latin America,

which are supported by the State Department, hence the need and desirability of our cooperative endeavors with the Department of State.

It is my belief that the Office of Education continues to build a strong staff and a system of organizational relationships across the Nation which is much needed by our educational system.

As the many new Federal programs have been implemented, the Office of Education, State agencies, local agencies, as well as other groups, have been faced with numerous problems along with many new opportunities. The pressures of administrative problems—mostly growing pains—are certainly to be anticipated and most will be short lived. The remarkable thing to me is that we can observe such a tremendous amount of progress after the very short period new Federal programs have been in operation.

On the other hand, I am certain that I, as well as other persons, both in Washington and throughout the Nation, can identify continuing concerns. These concerns for me this morning might best be framed in four broad questions:

1. Are our systems of evaluation of these new programs continuing to mature so that we may make certain the highest payoff in achievement is being obtained?

2. How can we insure that congressional intent is correlated with Office of Education action and regional and local implementation?

3. Is there a way in which the administration of our Federal programs can provide greater stability and continuity, as opposed to program renewals from year to year?

4. In the process of considering the national organization for the administration of educational programs, is it not time to consider relating programs in a more meaningful fashion rather than in the present system of discrete administrations of such programs in a variety of departments and agencies?

I believe that the initial tediousness of initiating new programs and negotiating contracts will continue to subside. I also believe that we are seeing responsible parties across our Nation from every walk of life beginning to build respect for each other as the Federal-State-local partnership matures. In my opinion, an Office of Education continues to emerge which is sensitive to its own problems, and will continue to effect changes ultimately to provide an appropriate national administrative unit for our educational system.

Finally, we must recognize that never before has the Office of Education had the leadership and financial responsibilities which it has today. I believe that through the work of this committee we may all continue to sharpen our concerns and our performance so that the Office of Education will become the viable administrative agency which the Congress and the Nation idealizes, needs, and deserves.

Let me say again how much I appreciate this opportunity of appearing here today.

I shall certainly be delighted to respond to any questions which you may care to direct to me.

Mrs. GREEN. Thank you very much, Mr. Hopper.

You were with the Office of Education?

Dr. HOPPER. That is correct.

Mrs. GREEN. You were administering title V?

Dr. HOPPER. Title V, Public Law 89-10.

Mrs. GREEN. And you came here in July?

Dr. HOPPER. Yes.

Mrs. GREEN. What is your relationship to the regional director of HEW?

Dr. HOPPER. It is one of having known the individual for several years, but no official day-to-day responsibilities. The coordination of our laboratory is with the Laboratory Division, Bureau of Research, in Washington.

Mrs. GREEN. And it is completely separate and apart from the regional Office of Education?

Dr. HOPPER. Yes.

Mrs. GREEN. Do you think this is good?

Dr. HOPPER. I think so; yes.

You see, our laboratory is a private corporation, nonprofit, so certified by the Internal Revenue Bureau, and as it represents the educational civic forces of the three-State area, it needs to be independent, and has such independence from the Office of Education.

Mrs. GREEN. It is entirely independent from the Office of Education.

Dr. HOPPER. Yes.

Mrs. GREEN. To whom are you responsible?

Dr. HOPPER. I am responsible to a 12-member board of directors.

Mrs. GREEN. For this region?

Dr. HOPPER. That is correct, which employed me as the director.

Mrs. GREEN. And you are not responsible to the Office of Education at all?

Dr. HOPPER. Not as such; no.

Mrs. GREEN. And yet, the funds come from the Office of Education?

Dr. HOPPER. That is correct. We make application to the Office of Education. We have a contract through which the funds flow.

Mrs. GREEN. What is the relationship of your office and the other regional labs to the State departments of education?

Dr. HOPPER. It varies from laboratory to laboratory, since, under the wording of title IV, 89-10, groups of people in various regions could develop their own structure to form a laboratory.

In this particular region, our structure provides for representation from the State agencies, so of the 12 board members, two are from State agencies, to whom I report. The Governor of each State appoints representation to our 16-member council, and this council elects the board, so that we have direct activity with the State agencies, in situations of higher learning, local school systems, the whole network of educational operations.

Mrs. GREEN. I am not confining my remarks to this region, but because we are here, let me direct them to you.

Do you see any basis of conflict when the regional labs are entirely funded by the Federal Government, and by the Office of Education, and you are in no way responsible to them in reporting and you have no responsibility to report to the regional office.

Do you see the possibility for conflict with State departments of education?

Is this a good, healthy situation, from an educational standpoint?

Dr. HOPPER. I believe it is. This is one reason, obviously, why I am with the laboratory. It seems to me we have a new opportunity for excellence in education, with the laboratory being a vehicle for change to create new opportunities for our young people as well as adults.

Mrs. GREEN. What can you do there that you cannot do in the other offices?

Dr. HOPPER. Well, we might start with one of our three States, with which we are working now, local systems, where less than one-third of the title III funds of 89-90 have been committed. That is the State of Alabama. At the present time, we are working with a whole variety of school districts there to assist them in developing new and innovative programs where leadership is not otherwise available.

It is one thing for a group of people to come together and say, "We are going to make certain that our systems have the opportunity for growth, for development, rather than be dependent upon the legal structure." We are in the legal structure. We are related to the Office of Education through funding and reporting, through approval of our activities. On the other hand, we are a free agent to move for educational change.

This has not been present before. The best parallel would be in the field of agriculture, where we have established agricultural experiment stations to demonstrate change, the possibility of change, the feasibility of change.

Mrs. GREEN. In developing programs under title III, why cannot the State superintendent—or, if we follow on through the regional offices—offer leadership and service in this area.

Dr. HOPPER. This is a possibility. We know that the quality of State educational agencies varies from State to State. We know that the climate within States, the receptivity to Federal funds, the receptivity to change, varies from time to time, obviously. Therefore, from time to time, I would presume that there will be need for additional leadership capacity if we are to have consistent, continuing growth of our educational system.

On the other hand, I think that our role is quite different from that of the regional office of the Office of Education. It is one thing to be responsible for approving projects, and to be responsible to the Congress, the Executive, for their actions. It is another thing—well, you almost have a competition for excellence in making applications for many of the Federal funding programs.

One would be to raise the question of to what extent it is appropriate to assist in research design, on the part of a Federal agency, because this prejudices their attitudes toward the particular systems with which they have provided consultant assistance in developing project designs.

What I am suggesting is that it is possible for our laboratory, as a supporting technical service, to provide such assistance in design of research, without any charge to anyone.

We are not in this group of for-profit consultations. There is no charge for our service, where we assist local systems who are members of the laboratory itself, to develop reasonable research

designs, reasonable project designs, in order to qualify for the funds which Congress intended the districts to use in the first place.

Mrs. GREEN. You make reference to the non-English-speaking children in Dade County, Fla.; and I take it that you are working with them.

Dr. HOPPER. Yes. We have a component office in Miami.

Mrs. GREEN. Why isn't the department of education in Florida capable of doing this? And are they not doing it? And again, is there the potential for conflict?

Dr. HOPPER. I suppose any time that you have changed programs in effect, there is the possibility of some conflict.

Mrs. GREEN. I was not speaking about the change in programs. I am thinking of duplication.

Dr. HOPPER. The duplication in function?

Mrs. GREEN. Yes.

Dr. HOPPER. Ours would be quite different.

May I just take a moment on this?

Sometimes, I know, we ask for a drink of water, and you get the firehose turned on you. Not only in Florida, but through Texas and along the Mexican-United States border, we have this same problem of bilingual education. Throughout Latin America we have the same problem, as we have intensified in Dade County, and also coming up through Florida—Tampa, and the like.

In each school system, and sometimes almost in each school where the problem is felt, or faced, they have proceeded to develop materials for a bilingual kind of educational program.

The literature is now beginning to contain references but, on the other hand, in effect, everybody has been discovering America over and over again in the various States, as well as in Latin America itself.

No one has pulled these materials together, has brought together experts to say what is the quality of the various instructional materials which we are providing for Spanish-speaking children to help them to speak English and be effective in our society.

So the thing that we are doing here is bringing materials together, bringing together panels of experts to say these materials at these grade levels, and these subject areas, appear to be the most efficient and effective, and then we will have the tryout in different kinds of settings of these materials, rather than having each of the communities develop discretely without the benefit of experience elsewhere.

Mrs. GREEN. I have read of various programs where this has been done by State departments.

For instance, California, obviously, has not ignored the problem of the non-English-speaking children. We have passed legislation authorizing institutes for teachers of English when it is a second language.

I still do not understand why we have to have an agency that is separate and apart from the Office of Education, or from the State departments, carrying on this kind of program.

Dr. HOPPER. Certainly I think you are illustrating the problem, as we see it. California has done certain things, and Arizona, Texas, Florida, but nowhere do we have an assimilation of the activity both

in the State departments of education and the U.S. Department of State, in the terms that they are funding elsewhere also. So in this case, we are a catalytic agent, using this as one illustration of our activity.

Mrs. GREEN. When we set up a separate laboratory that is not responsible to the Federal Government, and across the country employees in the labs have the highest salaries of anybody in education; what does this do, in terms of potential conflict? And to whom do the people in education then turn for counsel and guidance?

I really have a deep concern: Are we building something into the educational system as a result of congressional action that someday we may really regret?

Dr. HOPPER. You are quoting some figures which I am unaware of.

Mrs. GREEN. Well, let me quote them, then.

The regional director here for Atlanta gets \$20,000. Your State superintendent, your chief State school officer, gets \$22,000. In Florida, \$24,000. In Alabama, \$10,000. In Mississippi, \$16,000. In South Carolina, \$15,000. In Tennessee, \$20,000.

And I believe your salary is \$30,000, which is even higher than the Commissioner of Education in the Office of Education in Washington, D.C.

What kind of a superstructure are we building into the educational system, and to whom are people going to be responsible?

Dr. HOPPER. The figure you quote for my salary is just a bit high. I wish it were that.

Mrs. GREEN. I have \$30,240; is that not correct?

Dr. HOPPER. No, that is not correct. I have provided a statement, I think, to the committee \$28,800.

Mrs. GREEN. Do you have an expense account with that, then?

Dr. HOPPER. Expenses are paid, yes.

Under our contract with the Office of Education, an average of \$16 per diem.

To continue to respond to your question, the Office of Education did develop guidelines for expenditures by or allowable under the contracts to operate the regional laboratories.

Under the Office of Education guidelines, increases may not be provided of more than 20 percent of what a person has been earning previously. And having come to the laboratory in July, I would be in no position to discuss having knowledge of action prior to that time with regard to the development of guidelines and the salary structure.

When I was contacted concerning this laboratory, it was stated very frankly that the board of directors had established the salary schedule in accordance with the leadership structure in this three-State area, relating the laboratory director's salary to that of the State universities, and scaling the other positions within the laboratory comparable to university activity. Having served as dean of the University of Alabama, and knowing something of this, my general understanding was that this salary schedule was in line and consistent with the institutions in this area.

If this is to be a leadership kind of operation, one in which we derive new opportunities, we provide for greater change, then I don't believe any but the ablest kinds of talent can be provided in this case.

Mrs. GREEN. With regard to the regional laboratory directors, out of 20 that I have here listed, 10 receive salaries higher than the Commissioner of Education. Now, what does it do to our main structure if we build this kind of a superstructure?

Dr. HOPPER. Well, I think one of the responses is my being in this laboratory, since I was in the Office of Education and found this to be an attractive kind of opportunity.

I would raise questions about the salary level of the staff members in the Office of Education. Of course, it is within the civil service system. Certainly the number of chief State school officers in this land that make more than the Commissioner of Education raises an interesting kind of question, whether it be the State of Michigan, Pennsylvania, New York. You can go all around.

There must be at least, just offhand, 10 or 12 State school officers who make more than the U.S. Commissioner of Education.

Mrs. GREEN. I only find six. The chief State school officers in this region, all of them, are below.

Dr. HOPPER. Below what the Commissioner of the U.S. Office of Education makes?

Mrs. GREEN. Yes.

The only States that pay more than the Commissioner of Education are: Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Michigan.

Dr. HOPPER. Most of them are much lower, and, of course, some of them are elective offices, some of them are without professional requirements. They vary in their requirements for the position.

On the other hand, one might look at State university presidents. Certainly there we get another view of people. It raises a series of questions.

Mrs. GREEN. I believe, though, when you take these people in the regional laboratories that are being set up, and in the other departments, then it seems to me——

Dr. HOPPER. I would dare say that the laboratories would have——well, to put it bluntly—I don't know whether I would have joined the laboratory program from the Office of Education without a salary increase.

It is customary in all walks of life to receive a salary increase, and as long as a reasonable one, which does not involve any contrary forces, then I think in our free enterprise system, most of us are inclined to——

Mrs. GREEN. I am not raising any personal issue.

Dr. HOPPER. I understand; there is a matter of principle here.

Mrs. GREEN. What we are doing in terms of building superstructure, and to what extent are we really weakening the authority that for instance the regional director would have under this decentralization program.

It seems to me that his authority is weakened, if he has a salary, for example, of \$8,000 or \$9,000 less than yours.

We pass legislation in the Congress to strengthen the State departments of education, on the principle that the leadership must come from the local and the State level, and the Federal Government can at best be a junior partner in it.

What we are doing is saying out of one corner of our mouth that we want to strengthen the State department, but at the same time establish another department that has a great deal more in the way of finances, and which will have more authority and more travel funds and everything else to go out and work with the local people. That is my concern.

Dr. HOPPER. Yes. Well, it seems to me we have a variety of different kinds of functions involved here. First off, we have in the Office of Education responsibilities for administering the actions of the Congress. I do not see our work in a regional laboratory conflicting with at all the work of the regional office, here. It is not a matter of authority—

Mrs. GREEN. Let me interrupt there, if I may.

To refresh my recollection on the original legislation, we did not provide that nonprofit corporations run the regional laboratories. How was this arrived at?

Dr. HOPPER. You mean in the original co-op research back in 1956, when that was initiated?

Mrs. GREEN. Under what authority is your regional lab supported?

Dr. HOPPER. Title IV of 89-10.

Mrs. GREEN. There is nothing in the law that sets up a regional lab as a nonprofit corporation to be run by a separate board?

Dr. HOPPER. No. Not as such. But a general statement appears in the legislation, which has been further spelled out in the implementation of the guidelines.

Mrs. GREEN. This is the Office of Education, then?

Dr. HOPPER. The Office of Education.

Mrs. GREEN. Through its guideline it has set up the nonprofit corporation. Is that right?

Dr. HOPPER. No. No; the people in this region have set up the nonprofit corporation.

Mrs. GREEN. Where did they get the authority to do this?

Dr. HOPPER. Just like any group can get together and form a private corporation.

Mrs. GREEN. From what Federal legislation did this authority stem?

Dr. HOPPER. Public Law 89-10, title IV, provides the opportunity for nonprofit educational corporations to receive funds.

Mrs. GREEN. And then the Office of Education wrote the guidelines and the rules and regulations, setting up the regional lab. Serving on that committee, I never visualized this.

Dr. HOPPER. Frankly, once again, I can only speak from my understanding since July of this year, but in the discussions as I was working over on another title, in a different kind of administration, I heard something about the laboratory development.

To me, contemplated in the legislation is a series of educational laboratories. It didn't specify the number, precisely. It didn't say how large, but it provided a network for the entire Nation to carry research findings and interpret those research findings for use in a particular part of the country, this sort of thing. This is my understanding.

Mrs. GREEN. One very small question. Has your board cut your travel funds?

Dr. HOPPER. You mean have they specifically cut back on the number of dollars I personally may spend for travel?

We have specified in our contract a budget, including a specific amount for travel. We seek to operate within that budget, and we are certain that the budget is considerably less than we requested of the Office of Education. So once we get the contract, my responsibility is to operate within that budget.

Mrs. GREEN. I was thinking of the regional commissioner. He said they had had a 50-percent cutback. Would yours compare to that?

Dr. HOPPER. What we would like to do, I suppose, might approach that, but the laboratories, as a new educational force, have not been funded at a level where any of them were able to operate as they probably should to have the greatest impact.

Mr. ERLBORN. If I might interrupt at that point. Since this is under a contract, it would appear to me the Office of Education will have lost control once this has been cut into. They could not cut back on the educational items for travel, nor could they provide for a freeze in hiring, because once the contract has been entered into for the contract period, the Office of Education no longer has any control.

Is that correct?

Dr. HOPPER. Except reporting control.

Mr. ERLBORN. But they could not vary the terms of the contract to reduce the amount of funds available?

Dr. HOPPER. There are, as in all Federal contracts, of course, provisions for amendments of contract; yes.

Mr. ERLBORN. Renegotiation?

Dr. HOPPER. Renegotiation; yes.

Mr. ERLBORN. Might I ask: Prior to the establishment of the regional laboratories, what was the extent of the research done by the Office of Education in curriculum development?

Dr. HOPPER. As Dr. Findley indicated, in the National Science Foundation, as well as in other localities, with other sources of support, there has been a growing research base. The Office of Education, of course, was starting out with less than a million dollars in 1956, building it on into, oh, as late as 1964 and 1965, when it passed the \$10 million level.

The National Science Foundation had a much heavier investment. I don't have the figures at my fingertips, but I think most people estimate that in this day and age the Federal Government is spending in excess of a hundred million dollars a year now.

Mr. ERLBORN. In curriculum development?

Dr. HOPPER. In curriculum development, not only in the Office of Education, but the National Science Foundation and elsewhere.

Mr. ERLBORN. As I understand it, the National Science Foundation develops curriculum only in the physical sciences. Is that correct?

Dr. HOPPER. In sciences and mathematics. They do have some materials now in the social sciences.

Mr. ERLBORN. Is there any overlapping of the curriculum development in the Office of Education? Do they get into the same areas as the National Science Foundation? Or do they try to coordinate their efforts so that they stay out of the field in which the National Science Foundation is involved?

Dr. HOPPER. I suppose that there might be some considered overlap. Certainly the Science Information Exchange has sought to index research and development activities, and probably it has not been as successful as it might have been, operating in a rather loose fashion, with the strong Federal departments.

We are having larger expenditures of Federal dollars in the same areas, but what we are getting now is second-, third-, fourth-, and fifth-generation material, coming down the road not this year but 2 or 3 years from now and 5 years from now.

We know that minimath, the new math science in elementary grades, which we are seeking to test in this area, sponsored by the National Science Foundation, appears to have considerable merit, and perhaps will take us beyond where some of the Yale math took us.

I wouldn't see needless duplication at this time, even though one could identify a whole host of, say, math science curriculum programs. But we are getting a layering now in maturing of them, the same as we are having with computers and other technological areas.

Mr. ERLNBORN. With the development of the regional laboratories, is there any cutback in the activity of expenditure of the Office of Education in their curriculum development activity?

In other words, are the labs taking the place of the efforts of the Office of Education in curriculum development, or are they in addition to?

Dr. HOPPER. Oh, in a sense. But just using the minimath as an illustration, the National Science Foundation in the last fiscal year spent approximately a million dollars on that particular program at the University of Minnesota. This year, in my understanding, they are spending close to \$800,000, and the regional educational laboratories are assisting in the trial of materials to see how effective the materials are in different regions of our country.

The Office of Education probably has never had sufficient funding, until the last few years, to support massive curriculum development. The National Science Foundation has been doing it for years, of course—some of the first generation new curricula you alluded to this morning. I would say in some instances there are cases where funds have been saved because of these regional laboratories, and this, we are saying, is only after 5 months of operation, since I have been there less than 5 months, at this point.

In the future, the great value comes in opportunities for young people through educational development for much stronger programs than we have now.

Mr. ERLNBORN. Do I understand correctly that your principal objective, here, in this region, is to conduct research and develop the curriculum for this region? In other words, are you responsible to the three or four States that form your region?

Dr. HOPPER. We are not responsible for the development of curriculum offerings directly. The concept of the labs is obviously so new that I am certain that from laboratory to laboratory you may get some disagreement on precision, and of course this is one of the very strengths of it.

As I would propose, in our U.S. way of life, here we are having an opportunity to see how an independent group, unfettered

by particular local restrictions, or State restrictions, can move to accelerate educational development.

This has never happened before.

Mr. ERLBORN. What my concern is: What are you responsible to? This three-State area?

Dr. HOPPER. This three-State area. That is correct.

Mr. ERLBORN. In other words, you would not be conducting research nor rendering advice outside of the three-State area?

Dr. HOPPER. Under the guidelines of the Office of Education, these laboratories—no. But our laboratories are primarily dissemination and development units, and complement, as Dr. Findley has said, the R. & D. centers.

Mr. ERLBORN. You are not involved too deeply in research?

Dr. HOPPER. That is correct.

Mr. ERLBORN. What is your relationship to the ERIC project?

Dr. HOPPER. We have initiated some workshops to help people understand what ERIC is, and see what this resource may mean in the field of education.

In addition to that, we use the ERIC microfiche, analyzing research results and pilot programs elsewhere, interpreting those and making them available within this three-State area, so that they can serve children in this part of the country, and adapt it in an appropriate fashion.

Mr. ERLBORN. Is this your major source of interchange of information with laboratories and research and development in other areas of the country?

Dr. HOPPER. No. This is one means. But certainly through publications, through various professional meetings, we would see a host, the institutions that are part of our laboratory.

We have a variety of sources from which information is received. However, to me the great advantage of ERIC is that in the field of education, like in all scientific areas today, the volume of research results is so tremendous, or is becoming so tremendous, that one person cannot take the time to read all the publications.

Here is a system of coding research results, pilot activities which permit an individual to zero in on a problem through the coding system, and find what is best known at this time, identify the best practice, and seek to tailor it, then, to a particular local community.

Mrs. GREEN. Would you yield at that point?

In this laboratory, you say that you are not primarily concerned with research?

Dr. HOPPER. That is correct.

Mrs. GREEN. This would vary from region to region, then; would it not? Some laboratories would be involved in research?

Dr. HOPPER. Well, we are involved to 10 percent of our endeavors in seeking to research new materials, and their reception and accomplishment.

Mrs. GREEN. Your job is dissemination?

Dr. HOPPER. More dissemination and development, yes, ma'am.

Mrs. GREEN. Would you take a specific case and outline to me the procedure that you will follow?

Dr. HOPPER. Surely.

And obviously, I am talking once again with 5 months of background on this point, which may not be long enough to give the best kind of responses, the most meaningful responses.

Let me take one of the illustrations a step or two further that I have heard mentioned here this morning—the minimath.

Here is a new system of teaching mathematics in the elementary grades, different from what we call the new math, which is in effect the Yale math system, supported by the National Science Foundation.

These materials eventually will be available to correlate or interrelate the teaching of science and mathematics, from kindergarten through at least the sixth grade, being the immediate plan, which might achieve increased learning rate on the part of children.

Mrs. GREEN. I am interested more in the procedure, rather than the substance of it. How would you get it out to the local school systems?

Dr. HOPPER. The first thing that we are doing now is testing these materials in two schools, because once you start, you need to begin to go through three or four grades. So we now have nine teachers that are using this particular—

Mrs. GREEN. How do you go to the school, and how do you select the teacher, and how do you get the material for that teacher?

Dr. HOPPER. We are using the normal educational protocol, where involved is an understanding on the part of the State department of education that this is a kind of activity that we are trying out. From there, the staff member goes to the superintendent, to determine if there are schools that would be interested in his system, and there is discussion with the faculty to see if they are interested in this kind of innovation, of trying out new materials, to evaluate materials, to find out how they work with young people, assisting in the standardization of material.

Then the teachers are consulted, in the PTA meetings in the two schools in which they are being tried.

From this point, assuming that some significant success is obtained, that is, learning beyond that normally anticipated in the early grades, then we will provide opportunities to move these materials into the 24 pilot demonstration schools, in order to have broader testing around the region.

Now, it is this ingredient of the trial and test of new materials which has really blocked educational development in the past.

Mrs. GREEN. Can you go to the superintendent and then to the individual school, and then to the teacher?

Dr. HOPPER. That is correct.

Mrs. GREEN. We will adjourn until tomorrow morning in this same room, beginning at 9:30.

My thanks to all of you people who have given us the benefit of your views.

The committee is adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 12:45 p.m., the committee adjourned, to reconvene at 9:30 a.m., Thursday, December 8, 1966.)

U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 8, 1966

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION
OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,
Atlanta, Ga.

The subcommittee met at 9:25 a.m., pursuant to adjournment, in room 318-20, U.S. post office and courthouse, Mrs. Edith Green presiding.

Present: Representatives Green and Erlenborn.

Present also: Representative Flynt, and Maurice Heartfield, professional staff member.

Mrs. GREEN. The meeting will come to order.

This morning we have, as the first witnesses, officials from the Georgia State Department of Education: Dr. DeFoor, representing Dr. Nix; Dr. George Mulling, Director of Vocational Education; and Dr. Robert Beemon, Coordinator for title I.

STATEMENT OF DR. JOE T. DeFOOR, DIRECTOR, DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES, GEORGIA STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Dr. DeFoor. Madam Chairman, I am before you on the direction and instruction of Hon. Jack P. Nix, State superintendent of schools.

I assure you if I had had my wish, Mr. Nix would have been before you in person, but this is biennium budgetmaking time in Georgia. In accordance with a previous engagement, he and the associate State superintendent of schools are today briefing some important members of the 1967 General Assembly of Georgia which convenes in January 1967. He requested me to convey his regrets to you.

Complying with the committee's request, it is my purpose to supply you with some information concerning our experiences, especially at the State level, in dealing with the U.S. Office of Education that may help you identify some areas of concern.

However, I feel it incumbent on me to mention to this committee some factual statements concerning the current status of public school education in our State.

During the past 4 years in particular the General Assembly of Georgia, the Governor of the State of Georgia, the State board of education, the State department of education, our professional education associations and civic groups, have been taking a serious look at our public school education program. Under the leadership of these groups, every hamlet of Georgia has heard the story that public schools

exist solely for the education welfare of children, and that instruction is the basic purpose of schools.

It is our contention that when lay people and our State and national leadership accept this philosophy of public school education, then and only then will our public schools be permitted to do that which they were established to do—instruct children.

After some years of self-evaluation and study, the 1964 General Assembly of Georgia acted on the basis of the foregoing philosophy in accordance with the following quotation:

The General Assembly of Georgia, recognizing the importance and extreme necessity of providing improved educational opportunity for all Georgians—children, youth, and adults; of establishing equality of educational opportunity for Georgia's children and youth regardless of where they may live or what their station in life may be; of establishing and maintaining minimum standards for public schools so that every Georgia child and youth can attend an accredited public school; of improving the quality of education through continued development and improvement of balanced programs designed to provide academic and occupational preparation of Georgia's children and youth for adult life in this age; of developing a public school program that will attract, hold, and fully utilize competent professional personnel in the public school systems of this State; of establishing and maintaining adequate planning, research, and experimentation programs so as to assure continued future improvement of public school education in Georgia; of providing for better efficiency in the operation of public schools, elimination of waste, and better utilization of existing school services and facilities; of the need to finance adequately the improvement of Georgia's public education program and facilities; of the need to assure Georgia's children and youth of receiving an improved minimum level of education; and of the need for providing a method whereby all Georgians shall pay their fair share of the cost of such program, and recognizing fully its responsibility to provide a means whereby the foregoing needs might more readily be met, does hereby establish a State Minimum Foundation Program for the education of Georgia's children and youth.

Stemming out of this act, our State board of education began to assert its full leadership in moving toward the kind of instruction asked for by the people and required by our State legislature.

A study financed by our State board of education and conducted by Dr. W. D. McClurkin of George Peabody College for Teachers on the "Organization of School Systems in Georgia" has pointed us in the direction of larger area school systems and larger schools which would provide the necessary financial support for quality instruction.

Our State department of education, with assistance from local school people, are involved in an 8-month study and evaluation of an instrument to evaluate local schools and local school systems. "Standards for System Wide School" evaluation have never been attempted before by any of our States.

We also have the benefit of a recent 11 Southern States' study of "School Size and Program Quality in Southern High Schools," which included Georgia high schools, conducted by Dr. Joe L. Jackson of George Peabody College for Teachers. The composite thinking of these studies, and our new MFPE law point us in the direction of the quality of instruction Georgia wants. They also point up the kind of organizational vehicle on which we must travel to obtain the kind of instruction Georgia wants. These spectacular reports and this law are serving as a basis and foundation for what we think is a good education program. This is an effort on Georgia's part to help ourselves attain this objective, the attainment of which objective will of necessity require time, leadership, patience, and money if we can only

keep before our people the basic purposes of schools—the instruction of our children.

In 1964–65, the financial receipts for maintenance and operation of public school education were as follows:

	Amount	Percent
Local sources.....	\$91, 277, 036.00	30.0
State sources.....	194, 479, 945.12	63.9
Federal sources.....	18, 433, 971.36	6.1
Total.....	304, 190, 952.48	100.0

Georgia's proposed biennium budget is as follows:

	1967–68		1968–69		Biennium	
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
Local.....	\$63, 854, 065	12. 79	\$69, 202, 060	13. 38	\$133, 056, 125	13. 09
State.....	359, 018, 452	71. 93	367, 423, 802	71. 05	726, 442, 254	71. 48
Federal.....	76, 273, 593	15. 28	80, 525, 653	15. 57	156, 799, 246	15. 43
Total.....	499, 146, 110	100. 00	517, 151, 515	100. 00	1, 016, 297, 625	100. 00

Georgia employed 42,104 teachers during the 1964–65 school term. If all the Federal money had been available to finance teachers' salaries, it would have taken care of only 2,568 teachers. This is a ratio of about 20 to 1, which illustrates the meager contribution the Federal Government makes toward the maintenance and operation of public school education in Georgia. Percentagewise, the Federal effort will not be expected to be too much better in the next biennium.

We appreciate even this contribution, I assure you. However, from the noise that is being made by the minor partner, you would infer that the Federal Government is underwriting the total program of instruction in Georgia.

I do not agree with the concept that our national education goals should be to implement basic national goals such as national defense, economic growth, full employment, civil rights, and others, as important as these may be.

Instruction of children is the basic purpose of schools. As a matter of fact, such objectives and the limited thinking producing such end results have only scratched around the edges of the vehicle on which we must travel toward all goals.

Helping children through instruction to obtain the necessary skills to communicate intelligently, to live with each other, to sharpen their native ability to think, and to be informed will produce adults individually and collectively who will compose a society that cannot only shape worthy goals, but can implement them as well.

To help the legally constituted local and State boards of education implement this concept of elementary and secondary education, I hold to the belief that all Federal funds should come to the State board of education as a general financial grant for the purpose of instruction. The State board of education would then allocate to local boards of education through its regular legal formula used to allocate State funds.

Of course, if necessary, the State board of education should submit a plan for the use of the money. Just as State moneys are audited, so should Federal moneys be audited. However, the word of a State auditor should be sufficient.

Instead of a simple general Federal aid law, what do we now have?

Today we have a multiplicity of "programs," each with a Federal grant. There is no overall approach to financing instruction: the basic purpose of schools. The result is that we have a multiplicity of "little U.S. offices of education" in Washington, and now area offices are springing up, all of which have mushroomed into existence generally as special-interest groups have been able to pressure Congress.

Nowdays, financially, in Washington, "The wheel that squeaks the loudest gets the grease."

Now, don't let me mislead you. There are some excellent school people in the U.S. Office of Education. However, generally speaking, they have become administrators over fiscal affairs, reports, and guidelines for programs. They are not personnel who offer consultative assistance in instruction development, except as they attempt to control the use of Federal money.

Let's strengthen this local-State-Federal partnership through financial assistance to instruction, rather than through a multiplicity of programs, each having a confusing set of rules and regulations, guidelines, and directives. I personally feel that this "program approach" of Federal assistance is the basic cause for much of our dissatisfaction.

Without having time to thoroughly research our records, I found our Department of Education has coded 32 individual Federal programs. Many of these programs, of course, will have one or more titles or subsections, which will add to this number. However, the July-August 1965 issue of the "American Education" magazine of HEW lists 65 grant programs financed by the U.S. Office of Education for 1966.

Our records show that program administrators of the Department have made 52 trips to Washington to get Federal interpretations and instructions since January 1, 1966—and I might ad lib that the year is not over. The total travel expense was over \$7,000. I did not try to determine the number of telephone communications made.

Every new program necessitates new personnel at all three levels, and new administrative expenses.

I would like to point out some experiences we have had that seem to indicate little acquaintance with local and State operations.

Decisions are made in the U.S. Office of Education to initiate a specific activity that does not lend itself to sound administration of State and local school systems.

A specific example is a telegram from N. Karsh, Assistant Commissioner for Administration, Office of Education, dated June 16, 1966, to Mr. E. B. Davis, State auditor, relative to withdrawals of Federal funds by letter of credit:

Current reports indicate the use of letter-of-credit is operating in a manner that appears contrary to intent of the system. Funds are being withdrawn at a rate which makes it appear that payments are being made to LEA's and others considerably in advance of the actual need for cash. To enable us to determine actual need, no further withdrawals of Federal funds shall be made until further

notice. Please take inventory of each balances at the State level and in each LEA, and submit following information:

LEA NEEDS

1. Total disbursed to LEA's to date.
2. Remaining balance in LEA's as of 6/11.
3. Thirty-day requirement for LEA's.

STATE NEEDS

1. Cash balance at State level as of 6/11.
 2. Thirty-day requirement for cash disbursements for all purposes.
- All balances in excess of thirty (30) days needs shall be returned to the Office of Education as soon as possible. Upon review of above data, you will be notified to resume withdrawal of Federal funds. Submit above data to Director, Finance Branch, Room 40070, USOE, 400 Maryland Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C.

Information copy to all State Treasurers.

N. KARSH,

Assistant Commissioner for Administration, Office of Education.

Our chief State school officer was shocked that the U.S. Office of Education would initiate this action, and in this manner.

1. The State superintendent of schools did not receive a notice of this action, but was advised through his staff members, who were, in turn, notified by other State officials. This violates traditional lines of communication between the U.S. Office of Education and State education agencies.

2. No other State agency could have supplied the information requested, because accountability for Federal funds for educational programs at the State level is the responsibility of the Georgia State Department of Education.

3. There had been no prior indication from the U.S. Office of Education that the use of letter of credit was operating in a manner contrary with the intent of the system.

4. The telegram was sent to all States, without limiting the criticism to States in violation of the intent of the letter-of-credit system.

5. The request for cash balances at the State level was ill timed, because of end of fiscal year pressures, and would have required unwarranted additional hours of work by accounting and administrative personnel.

6. The request would have necessitated contact with local educational agencies, and imposed the same interruption upon their end of the fiscal year procedures as those imposed upon the State agency.

The above comments were transmitted to the Commissioner, and the congressional delegation from Georgia, with the request that this action be rescinded.

Our State superintendent of schools later learned that other chief State school officers had taken similar action, and this specific request was rescinded.

To point out specifically how little attention was given to the practical administration of State and local agencies, the telegram specifically asked for cash balances as of June 11, 1966.

A natural question would be, "What agency maintains an accounting of funds as of the 11th day of any month?" The normal reporting date would be at the end of the month, quarter, or fiscal year.

Another example of creeping intervention on the part of the U.S. Office of Education to exert itself in the administration of education at the State and local level was evidenced in a letter from Commissioner Howe dated September 9, 1966.

In this letter, he asked for—

1. Summary of enrollment and staff of each school system.
2. Enrollment and staff of each school within the system.
3. Inventory of public school systems.
4. Inventory of public elementary and secondary schools.

All of this information was to be submitted on the basis of race. Providing this information was a real chore on the part of the individual school systems.

The State superintendent of schools did not take issue with the Commissioner's authority to request this information, but in Mr. Howe's letter he asked that a specific staff member, by name, within the State department of education, be designated to assemble this information.

It is our contention that it is highly irregular for the U.S. Office of Education to request specific personnel assignments within the State. This is a prerogative of the State that should not and must not be delegated to a Federal office, regardless of the agency.

Superintendent Nix's position was transmitted to the Commissioner in a letter dated September 15, 1966, and on September 22 an apology for this specific request was received from Mr. A. M. Mood, Assistant Commissioner for Educational Statistics.

It is Superintendent Nix's contention that local and State agencies are being requested to furnish information to the U.S. Office of Education that has no relevance to the proper administration of a Federal law. Much of the information requested, in our opinion, is at the whim of some individual staff member, according to his specific and personal area of interest.

It is our contention that a more efficient and economical administration of Federal education laws could be accomplished if less specific direction was given by members of the U.S. Office staff.

Our staff is experiencing almost daily telephone calls from specific individuals in the Washington Office, concerning rather insignificant items of administration. They refuse to put many of these questions in writing, and this brings about confusion and uncertainty.

School administration, to be successful in the fulfillment of the basic purpose of schools, must of necessity be kept as close to the child, the teacher, and the classroom as possible and practical, for it is within this pupil-teacher relationship that instruction and learning actually take place.

All the available money available to this triune partnership should be channeled into this pupil-teacher relationship, if we are really concerned about the learning we want the children of this country to have.

Therefore, in conclusion, I would suggest the following recommendations:

1. That the major contribution of the Federal Government to this partnership be in the form of a basic financial contribution for the instruction of schoolchildren, regardless of where they live or what their station in life may be.

2. That the amount of funds to which individual States are entitled should be determined on objective formulas, thereby reducing the discretionary power of Federal authorities to a minimum.

3. That amounts of funds earned be somewhat predictable, so as to enable State and local school people to do long-range planning.

4. That the present program approach of allocating Federal funds be curtailed and move toward general aid for instructional purposes.

5. That auditing and accounting provisions be provided, but not necessarily in addition to the State requirements.

6. That local and State plans show the use to be made of the funds allocated.

7. That the triune partnership, local, State, and Federal education agencies, recognize that the basic purpose of our elementary and secondary schools is the instruction of children, and unite our resources in this direction.

Thank you, Madam Chairman, and members of your committee.

Mrs. GREEN. Thank you very much, Mr. DeFoor.

Dr. DeFoor. May I say that here are some copies of this.

Mrs. GREEN. Did this telegram go to every chief State school officer in this country?

Dr. DeFoor. I assume it did, by the way it ended. As a matter of fact, I have a copy of it here.

Mrs. GREEN. I understand that we are going to have a chance to visit informally with Mr. Nix and some of the rest of you, so I am not going to take very much time in questioning. I would like to read, however, a section that is in almost every education bill passed by the Congress.

Let me quote:

Nothing contained in this title shall be construed so as to authorize any officer, employee, or agent of the United States to exercise any supervision or control over the curriculum, the program of instruction, or the personnel of any educational institution or school system, or over the selection of library resources, textbooks, or other printed or published instructional materials by any educational system or school system.

This is the law.

Dr. DeFoor. That is a good statement.

Mrs. GREEN. And it does seem to me that if I were in your position, and I received requests which I felt perhaps were contrary to this law, I would fire back a similar telegram and quote it.

I say this as a person long interested in civil rights, but one who supports Federal aid for education, yet is deeply committed to the local and the State control of education, and one who insists that the Federal Government be the junior partner.

May I also say to you and to others that today I intend to send a telegram to the Commissioner of Education, asking for a breakdown of the employees of every regional office of the U.S. Office of Education in the United States, on the basis of race. It seems to me that this may be interesting.

Congressman Erlenborn, do you have questions?

Mr. ERLBORN. From your statement, I certainly can see that one of your major concerns is the time that is taken up by your staff in answering queries that are directed to you from the Washington Office of Education, filling out forms, and all the other requirements that must be time consuming and somewhat irritating.

Are you familiar with the present move to decentralize the authority of the Office of Education, particularly here in Atlanta, which is the first region that is being geared up for this purpose?

When this is completed, and the local regional director does have the real authority to go through your program applications, to make grants, and to have the final word, and not just be another layer of administrative personnel between you and Washington, do you think that this will eliminate many of the problems?

Dr. DEFOOR. I would rather say it this way: I think that is a far better scheme of administration—the U.S. Office of Education—than what we now have. And the one thing that I would base this statement on, too, that is, for the success of it, would be for these people to have sufficient authority to work among us.

Mr. ERLBORN. This, of course, is the key. If they don't have the authority, this will not work, but if they do have the authority to make final decisions here, I think it will work.

You have some hesitancy about whether they will ever have the authority, I imagine.

Dr. DEFOOR. Right. But the thing that I have tried to say in my statement is that administration must be just as close to the pupil-teacher relationship as it possibly can be, in order to do what we think instruction ought to do.

When it is as far removed as it is, I think we are illustrating some of the experiences we have, in order to get direction.

I spent 2 days in Washington Thanksgiving weekend, with two of our staff people, myself, and I could do better by being here working.

Mr. ERLBORN. Just one other question, in the area of the enforcement of the civil rights laws.

Do you feel that the authority for this enforcement is properly lodged with the Office of Education, or would you prefer that the enforcement of these laws be given to some other agency of the Justice Department, for instance?

Dr. DEFOOR. Well, let me say it this way: I am jealous of public school education. I am jealous of instruction. I don't care what it is. I don't like the idea, personally, of using instruction as a means of doing things of that nature.

I am talking about using it as a stick by which to do it. I just never have liked that. I don't want anything to interfere with good instruction. I don't care what race they are. I have had personal relationships in this matter, now, and I know it can be handled if the local people see that they have to do it.

Mr. ERLBORN. Accepting for the fact that we do have Federal laws concerning the desegregation of schools, and they are going to be administered by someone, would you prefer that they be administered by the Office of Education, or by the Justice Department, or do you have any thoughts?

Dr. DEFOOR. Well, I have this thought. Too frequently, I feel that the U.S. Office of Education tries to control that which occurs, shall we say, in the classroom, through the control of money, and that is a wrong thing to do, in my opinion.

I believe as people learn, given time to learn, they will do it, and if education is part of that learning process, I would accept it.

Mr. ERLNBORN. Thank you.

Mrs. GREEN. Dr. Martin, were you ever given any advance notice of the telegram from Mr. Karsh?

Dr. MARTIN. No, ma'am. Mr. Nix called me about it. We were in Washington the week after that, and Mr. Karsh was put on the spot—the chief State officer at the meeting, there. The telegram went to the State treasurer, the State comptroller, and the State superintendent, and in about six States the State comptroller did not get it, through State distribution of mail, you see, and we caught it.

Mrs. GREEN. There was no consultation with you in advance?

Dr. MARTIN. No. I said at the time if Mr. Karsh had just called us, we could have gotten this across to the State superintendent very easily.

Mrs. GREEN. May I call on George Mulling, the State director of vocational education.

STATEMENT OF GEORGE MULLING, STATE DIRECTOR OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION, GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Dr. MULLING. Thank you, ma'am.

Madam Chairman and members of the subcommittee, my name is George W. Mulling. My position is State director of vocational education, Georgia Department of Education.

I appreciate the opportunity to discuss with you my ideas and recommendations for the strengthening of relationships between State departments of education and the U.S. Office of Education as regards improved leadership for the national program of vocational and technical education.

Generally, concern within the States regarding relationships has grown out of the reorganization of USOE which has taken place in recent months. Let me say first there is no argument with the necessity for such action, for we in the States have also been reassessing and restructuring our vocational department staff organizations. The Vocational Education Act of 1963, as an outgrowth of an exhaustive study of the Nation's vocational education program, dictates that we approach program leadership activities at both the Federal and State levels in ways more imaginative and in keeping with the signs of the times.

Specifically, our concern in vocational education—and it has been well voiced through the American Vocational Association—is that due recognition and status in the organizational pattern has not been given to vocational and teaching education. It is our conviction that vocational and technical education should and must have recognition within its own right, at least equal to higher education and/or elementary and secondary education.

It is contended further that the matter of status for vocational and technical education should be equated with, and not inferior in rank to, its counterparts in other Federal agencies having similar or shared responsibility for the development of manpower resources.

Thus, we are pleading just recognition for an educational enterprise that historically grew out of neglect on the part of our educational leadership, which failed to see occupational training as a necessary

part of the educational process. Being, as it is now, an economic and social necessity, it would seem that the cause for a place in the educational hierarchy would have been overcome, and indeed a groundswell of superrespectability would have developed. How long can it wait? This question defies answering. But the longer we wait, the firmer becomes the grip in our system of the class education which too often prescribes the "classical" and shuns the practical. Direction or redirection for recognition must come from the national level, if acceptability is gained on a widespread basis.

We have seen a growing concern in the Congress that vocational education be provided substantial increases in funds so that established and continuing educational forces can pick up responsibilities within their purview, but unmet, and therefore assumed by other agencies through various stopgap legislative acts.

Representative Perkins' proposed amendments to Public Law 88-210 stand in evidence of the fact that vocational education can and must play a larger role in solving this national problem.

Vocational educators welcomed two announcements recently whereby the matter under discussion here will hopefully be clarified.

The congressional appropriation of \$150,000 to the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to study the effects of overlapping by the several agencies engaged in training, with the use of Federal money, is one.

The other is the naming of members to the national advisory committee to evaluate vocational education. Leadership must be forthcoming, because it seems now that perhaps the shifting of responsibility for matters belonging under the umbrella of education away from educational forces is reversing.

Nor do we claim that education can solve all our problems. It is a known fact, however, that a great change is coming about in the minds of educators generally with regard to enlarging considerably on the scope and nature of the public school program.

We were pleased to learn that the Education Commission of the States has included a study in vocational education in its outline of seven priority areas of study, and that a task force has been appointed to study and improve vocational-technical education.

Dr. Grant Venn, Associate Commissioner for Adult and Vocational Education, U.S. Office of Education, has recently proposed a four-point program which, if adopted and funded, would revolutionize the whole scheme of elementary and secondary education.

In essence, it would provide, beginning at the junior high school level, an orientation to the world of work for all youngsters. For how can we be completely surrounded in a world of technology and leave the business of work out of the program of education?

The second aspect of this program would include work experience.

Third, there would be expanded vocational and technical training opportunities afforded.

And finally, high schools would assume responsibility for entry job placement for all its students—dropouts and graduates.

What a dream. What a hope. What an opportunity.

And all it takes is commitment. But commitment comes through leadership, and it is in this realm of activity that I would recommend we concentrate.

Many groups are hard at work in education to improve and enlarge on their efforts. None is more important than the effort needed in the Office of Education, Bureau of Adult and Vocational Education.

We are pleased with the new leadership and direction in the Bureau, but the plan for increasing their effectiveness is not complete. The regional offices as well as the central office in Washington desperately need professional staff to assist us in the States.

We must have stimulation, direction, and a coordinated effort. There must be leadership training for administrative people, researchers, vocational counselors, and teacher trainers. We must have practical research and project demonstration that will give us basic devices of measurement and approaches to total program planning and development.

Organized instructional materials in vast quantities and variety are and historically have been needed. Recommendations regarding the planning and construction of facilities are long overdue. National, regional, and local institutes and other forms of instructor training in the areas of technical and professional skills require acceleration. Evaluation and accreditation in recognition of quality instruction must be forthcoming. The need for these and many other things has been substantiated by a survey conducted by the American Vocational Association, and you have this report. We support it 100 percent.

And again I say we appreciate the opportunity of appearing before this subcommittee.

Mrs. GREEN. Thank you very much, Mr. Mulling.

Would you tell me, here in Atlanta, how many vocational high schools you have?

Dr. MULLING. None.

Mrs. GREEN. None at all? How many would there be in Georgia?

Dr. MULLING. Vocational high schools, as such, we do not have. We have a few that are called comprehensive high schools that have vocational.

Mrs. GREEN. What kind of vocational training is given in the Atlanta high schools?

Dr. MULLING. We have a few programs in cooperative training, primarily in the areas of industrial cooperative training, distributive education, and a few in office occupations.

Mrs. GREEN. Would you say it is anywhere near adequate?

Dr. MULLING. I would say, by all means, it is not.

Mrs. GREEN. Do you have the per-pupil expenditure per year for a school offering good vocational training, and the expenditure per pupil per year in an academic program?

Dr. MULLING. As a comparative sort of thing? We do not. We have some figures that we have accumulated recently in the operation of our adult vocational programs in the area schools, and I think we have arrived at a figure of something like 50 cents per student hour, which compares to some figures in the national cost operations, and we were at about half level.

Mrs. GREEN. Let me make just a couple of comments, because your paper strikes a very important note, as far as I am concerned.

I have said that I thought that in the next Congress we really ought to stop, look, and listen. We ought to give the country time to digest

the bills we have passed, with the one exception, and that is vocational education.

This is an area where we must expand the programs. Otherwise, we are going to pay for it in other ways which will be much more expensive.

The reason in Oregon that we have not provided adequate vocational education is that it is more costly than just an academic program.

Across the country, we have refused to provide the funds that are necessary for vocational education for those who are not going on to college, and we have refused to spend the few hundred dollars per pupil per year, and now, when the youngster drops out of school, we turn to a crash program such as the Job Corps, where the average cost per boy per year, in 1965, was \$9,100, and the average cost per girl per year, in 1965, was \$8,400, with the individual costs in certain Job Corps camps going up to \$13,000 per year per student.

If there is anything that proves the statement that society is going to either pay for the education of the boy, or the ignorance of the man, I think these statistics prove it.

But with that in mind, I hope that there will be a real push for the program that Dr. Venn has outlined. In Dr. Venn we are going to find outstanding leadership.

Dr. MULLING. We are quite pleased.

And I want to say, so that you don't misunderstand me, we have developed a rather extensive system. At the completion of our construction program next fall, we will have 25 of these in operation, and we think this is making a considerable difference in the educational pattern.

However, at the high school level, we do not have very much. We are making a move at the high school level. It is slow, but we feel it is significant, and will be more so.

Mrs. GREEN. I hope my State of Oregon and your State of Georgia both push on this

But where do we have the dropouts?

Dr. MULLING. They are in the high school program. No doubt about it. And we are losing nearly half of ours before they get through high school. And we think this is critical.

And I think one of the points Dr. Venn makes, that we must give some orientation at the junior high school level, is essential if we are to ever do anything about this.

We are very much in favor of it, and I hope some provision will be made for the funding of this program, because it has been left out in everything that has been done.

Mrs. GREEN. Congressman Erlenborn?

Mr. ERLENBOORN. In your statement you say that there is concern in the States growing out of the reorganization of the Office of Education. Can you explain why?

Dr. MULLING. Well, let me say to you at this point our concern is not as great as it was before Dr. Venn came on the scene. We had a great deal of concern about this business of levels, and whereas vocational education now is a division within a bureau, it is not comparable to higher education, or elementary and secondary education, and we feel it is just as important.

As far as organization offices are concerned, the breakdowns at the regional level, of course, are quite a move, and the matter of who in the business community you can go to for an answer and get an answer is really important to us.

In the national office, we had a breakup that left us without representation in several of the areas of vocational education, and we do not feel that you can generalize staffing in a program as critical as vocational-technical education and really care for it as it should be. You cannot have generalists who can give you the type help you need.

Now, in the regional office, here, we are getting some specialists, and we feel that this is good.

Now, if they can have the authority to approve programs and give us answers, I think we will deliver.

Mrs. GREEN. Thank you very much.

Now may we hear from Mr. Beemon, the State coordinator for title I?

STATEMENT OF R. C. BEEMON, COORDINATOR, TITLE I, ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965 FOR THE STATE OF GEORGIA

Mr. BEEMON. Yes, Madam Chairman.

I am R. C. Beemon, coordinator for title I, Public Law 89-10, for the Georgia State Department of Education. My office counsels with local educational agencies with regard to title I, reviews and approves their project applications, and serves as the central coordinating service center for the State administration of the title I program.

In my opinion, title I, the Elementary-Secondary Education Act program, has done a great deal of good for the educationally deprived children who have received the benefits of projects designed to help them. Reports which I receive from various locations over the State testify to improved attendance, better health, and greater educational attainment on the part of children who are recipients of title I services.

This program is making a considerable impact for good upon those who are in greatest need. Also, the existence of the program indirectly exerts a positive influence on the educational experiences of children who are not specifically included in title I projects.

Many young people are now benefiting from educational and supplementary services which were not previously available to them, certain inadequate services have been expanded, and some promising new instructional materials and methods have been put into operation.

The fact that there is a national concern for the educational well-being of children of economic and educational deprivation and a translation of this concern into tangible interest and assistance for these children brings to them new hope, new aspirations, new ambitions, and new self-confidence, which will make for a more productive and satisfying adult citizenship on their part.

In the operation and administration of the title I, Elementary and Secondary Education Act program by the U.S. Office of Education, most of my contacts with that Office have been with the Director of the Division of Compensatory Education and with the staff of Area Desk

No. 2. These people have always been polite, courteous, good listeners, and have displayed an attitude of helpfulness.

Conferences set up and conducted by the U.S. Office of Education for the purposes of disseminating information and exchanging ideas relative to the title have proved to be very helpful.

It has sometimes been difficult to secure adequate copies of printed materials, such as copies of the act, of the guidelines, the regulations, and the audit guide, or to learn if and when such copies would be provided by the Office, while we sometimes receive more copies than we can use of publications which we have not requested, such as "A Chance for a Change," and "National Conference on Education of the Disadvantaged."

Some written communications from the Office have not been as specific as I would have liked; in my opinion, being subject to different interpretations.

Answers to correspondence have sometimes not been as prompt as I desired.

Expenses in connection with conferences have not always been paid promptly by the Office.

The changing of guidelines, application blanks, and instructions for completing application blanks during the course of a given fiscal year have presented some minor problems.

One of my areas of concern is the late date in a given fiscal year on which firm figures are available for the amount of money which may be used by the various local educational agencies.

Another concern is the altering of legislation affecting title I operations for a given fiscal year after much of the fiscal year has passed.

I would suggest that legislation and appropriations be established well in advance of the fiscal year in which they are to become effective. This would, I believe, make for better planning, more effective programs, and wiser use of the money available.

Mrs. GREEN. Thank you very much, Mr. Beemon.

May I say that in all of the hearings we have been conducting the point which you raised in your last paragraph has become abundantly clear: that Congress is still operating on the time schedule which existed prior to a major involvement by the Federal Government in education. I think that Congress has not taken notice of the problems of the school year in authorizing legislation or appropriating the funds.

Mr. BEEMON. I appreciate your recognizing that fact.

Mrs. GREEN. At the beginning of your statement, in paragraph 2, you cite things that specifically were done under title I. If the funds from the Federal Government went to the States in the form of just general funds, do you think the innovative programs which you outlined would have occurred in Georgia?

Mr. BEEMON. Well, perhaps not in the same way. It would depend, of course, on the State guidelines that would be developed, as to whether encouragement was given to extended services—say, in welfare agencies—as well as in educational levels.

I think we have had perhaps a lack of initiative on the part of many local school systems to spend title I moneys in the areas of welfare, because they have not seen that that was perhaps an educational service, and perhaps they continue to look to the Department for that.

So in the beginning, perhaps, it would not; but with a program of guidelines developed, it might develop along the same lines.

Mrs. GREEN. Congressman Erlenborn.

Mr. ERLBORN. You mentioned some of the difficulties that you have had with changing regulations and rules and forms, and so forth. Have you been contacted by, or are you familiar with some of the commercial services that are now being offered by, oh, say, Commerce Clearing House, or Prentice-Hall, to give you a looseleaf annotated service with the guidelines and forms and so forth?

I understand that these commercial services are now being made available.

Mr. BEEMON. Available to State people, or to local people?

Mr. ERLBORN. Anyone that wants to buy them.

Mr. BEEMON. Well, I am not too familiar with that.

Mr. ERLBORN. I was wondering if you felt that something more could be done by the Office of Education, in furnishing not just the directives and the forms, but annotated compilations, so that you would know which is the latest form, and what changes have been made in regulations, and so forth.

Mr. BEEMON. I believe that my office is advised and kept up with what the latest forms are, and if we do not get sufficient copies of them from the U.S. Office, we have them duplicated or printed and promulgated among the local educational agencies.

I don't really believe that we have a problem in that regard.

Mr. ERLBORN. This is not a problem?

Thank you very much.

Mrs. GREEN. Thank you very much, Mr. Beemon.

We are very pleased to have now with the committee several representatives from school board associations.

I believe that the representative of the Tennessee School Board Association—and forgive me if I do not pronounce your names right—is Mr. Brewer; Mr. Acree from the Georgia School Boards Association; Mr. McLaurin from South Carolina and M. Bement from the Kentucky School Boards Association; and Mr. Vittetow, the superintendent of schools in Kentucky.

Is Mr. Entwistle here?

Would you come up, too, and join us?

I will ask permission for inclusion in the record at this point of a telegram which I received yesterday from a board of education in Arkansas, and a letter from the Virginia School Boards Association.

(Documents referred to follow:)

STUTTGART, ARK.

Congresswoman EDITH GREEN,
Congressional Hearing Chambers,
Old Post Office Bldg., Atlanta:

Because of late notice the Stuttgart, Ark. School Board cannot send witnesses to appear before your committee, although we desire to do so. If under committee rules this telegram may be considered, this school district objects to the basic concepts of the Commissioner of Education's guidelines for the following reasons:

1. The HEW agency is withholding or threatening to withhold funds because of refusal of districts to confirm to undeviating language in their published forms, thereby threatening to deprive children of funds voted for their use without a determination as to whether the district is in fact desegregating.

2. The whole congressional concept of punishing school children by withholding money from them because persons in local authority refuse to carry out specific social concepts or refuse to do any other act is contrary to the basic constitutional principle that the innocent shall not be penalized for the offenses of the guilty.

3. It destroys all confidence on the part of those who have thus far worked to meet the law with courage and sincerity because we find that we cannot trust the authorities who approved our original plan.

4. The HEW agency has arrogated to itself legislative authority beyond the powers delegated by Congress both by verbal contacts with this district and in its guidelines by publishing the guidelines as part of Federal regulations thereby imposing an unlawful tyranny over our schools destroying faith in representative government. We consider our elected Members of Congress our representatives. But are we being represented in this instance?

BOARD OF EDUCATION,
STUTTGART SCHOOL DISTRICT No. 22,
By L. M. STRATTON, *President*.

DECEMBER 5, 1966.

EDITH GREEN,
*Chairman, Special Subcommittee on Education, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MRS. GREEN: The Executive Board of the Virginia School Boards Association, at its session which was held on December 3, 1966, directed us to express to you its concern over the confused state of communications that exists between the local school boards in Virginia and the United States Office of Education. Particular concern has been expressed from all areas of the Commonwealth about the manner in which communications are received and the lack of definiteness as to what is expected in the operation of various programs.

The school boards are experiencing great difficulty in securing written communications from the U.S. Office of Education upon which to base their actions. It appears that the Office of Education relies too heavily upon the use of the telephone as a means of communication.

As you know, it is imperative that school boards plan the operation and administration of a school system well in advance of the initiation of any program, and that these programs must have continuity. Under the present methods of operation intelligent planning and continuity of programs are almost impossible.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE W. HOLMES III,
*Executive Secretary by Direction of the Executive Board, Virginia School
Boards Association.*

Mrs. GREEN. We are delighted to have our colleague, Congressman Flynt, join us at the hearings this morning.

Our very cordial welcome to you. I hope you will feel free to participate.

I wonder if I might ask you to summarize your statements, not leaving out the important points, but to summarize them, and then the full statements will be made in each case a part of the record.

May we start out with Mr. Acree, the executive secretary of the Georgia School Boards Association.

STATEMENT OF JACK ACREE, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, GEORGIA SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATION

Mr. ACREE. Madam Chairman and members of the committee, may I say that we appreciate this opportunity of appearing before you.

I would hasten to say that I have presented to you a brief which I hadn't intended in the first place to read to you. It is a brief that is

rather comprehensive, for two or more reasons, the first reason being the very nature of our responsibility and of our contacts with the several school systems throughout the State.

Of course, the second important reason is that the very seriousness of our complaints suggested that we not only excerpt statements, possibly out of context, but that we provide you with information to which you could refer that would indeed give you the feeling that exists in our school systems.

Thus, this is more comprehensive than it would have been otherwise.

In my remarks I shall briefly refer to the contents of the brief.

We have attempted to do three things, simply, first, to state to you our position as a State school boards association.

We would respectfully call your attention to the fact that our position is one that is constructive and costly, so far as we are capable of making it. It is not intended to be evasive or negative in any sense of the word.

Secondly, I would assure you that our association has the highest regard for all of the intents of Congress with regard to assistance to education.

We feel that Federal assistance to education is essential, but we do feel this assistance must be so administered as not to encroach upon the control of our local school systems, our duly constituted agencies.

Then I would suggest that our position emphasizes and actually extends to you an appeal to preserve our very precious heritage, of local control of all governmental affairs, education in particular, in this instance.

We would likewise insist that we subscribe to the position that our schools exist for a singular purpose, for the education of our boys and girls.

And as worthy as the objectives of other programs designed and administered by other agencies, or even under agencies to which we refer, as worthy as those objectives may be, we do not feel that our schools should be used for the accomplishment of certain of those objectives.

We underscore the fact that we do have a deep appreciation of the laws which you, our Congress have passed, and we take no issue with any laws which you have passed, per se. Our statements, in the main, will be addressed to the Civil Rights Act of 1964, for two reasons.

First, the fact that we do not engage in the direct administration of any of the programs, as Mr. Beemon and Mr. DeFoor know.

The second reason, and we think of course the overriding reason, is that the Civil Rights Act, or, pardon me, the administration of the Civil Rights Act, has very gravely affected the administration of all of the other programs of education.

The complaints which I shall refer to in a moment have affected the effectiveness, the efficiency, at each local unit of administration, in some degree, with regard to all of these programs.

In the second instance, we would respectfully call your attention to our complaints. They are briefly listed in my initial statement in the brief, and they are documented.

Our first complaint is that we take issue with the promulgation of policies and guideline statements or directives by the U.S. Commissioner of Education or his staff members which are in conflict with the provisions of the law, the Civil Rights Act of 1964, in this instance.

We have called your attention to specific sections of the law, which we feel, very strongly feel, are being violated consistently by these policies, guidelines, and directives from Washington.

Secondly, we complain of the evasive, conflicting, and confusing meaning given to certain key words and expressions which are being used daily by HEW officials, State officials, and local officials, because of the necessity that they must be used, such words as integration, desegregation, imbalances, freedom of choice, dual school systems.

In my personal conversations with certain of our HEW officials, as well as contact with these many pieces of documented evidence which I have, some of which I make available to you, we find abundant evidence of the fact that there is no common agreement on the meaning or the proper usage of the meaning of these terms to which I refer.

And then we of course would hasten to follow by calling your attention to the fact that we are astounded, as a matter of fact, at the contradiction by HEW representatives of their own guidelines, memorandums, and directives, as they proceed to visit school system after school system.

This, we feel, is evidence of their being unqualified and/or inefficient in the administration of even their own guidelines and policies.

Our next complaint, of course, pinpoints that to which I referred. That is the use of personnel by the Office of Education in administering these very comprehensive and very delicate and very meaningful laws, if they are properly administered, the use of personnel who are not qualified by training, experience, or temperament.

Further, we complain that the administrative practices and tactics these people use are unprofessional, ineffective, and detrimental.

I trust that we have provided you with documented evidence which will substantiate this complaint.

We complain specifically as to the practice of HEW people of issuing memorandums. These memorandums are included in the brief.

Upon being requested to issue these memorandums on official letterhead from the duly constituted office, many of our school people have failed to get a response to this.

We have many copies of these memorandums issued in longhand on pads or other paper, which is very unbecoming such important and far-reaching documents as they suggest these to be.

Mrs. GREEN. May I interrupt you?

Are those included here in this brief?

Mr. ACREE. Yes, ma'am. They are. And I shall call your attention to the exact location, if I may.

I believe you will find, in exhibits N, O, and P, an exact replica, 46, 47, and 48.

I have other copies that I can make available to you in addition to the three copies included herein.

Mrs. GREEN. May I interrupt you here?

I have seen some of these memorandums before.

What is your reaction to the fact that in the regional office at Atlanta there is one Negro employee?

Mr. ACREE. One Negro employee in the office?

Mrs. GREEN. At a GS-1 level.

Mr. ACREE. Again, my reaction would be, immediately: This is further evidence of the inconsistency of the application of even their

own philosophy and guidelines, which I have referred to previously in my statement, and to which I shall refer later.

Mrs. GREEN. I think it does point up to the people in Washington that there are problems which must be taken into consideration.

Mr. ACREE. Yes, ma'am.

We take no issue with the problems. We recognize that we have problems, Madam Chairman. It is primarily the manner in which these problems are approached, the way the solutions are developed and administered.

If I may proceed, our next complaint, Madam Chairman and members of the committee, we consider this to be a very grievous complaint. It is the fact that many of these representatives—and these are in some instances part-time employees, this past summer even college students, but not always part-time people—who go into a school community.

Possibly they have called the administrator, saying, "We will be in your community on such-and-such a date." Just that brief. Then they will proceed into the community, and they will proceed to interview certain select citizens. How they select them, I don't know. And they will garner from them opinions and information that they will refer to later, which we consider highly unfounded from the point of view of professional information.

The most important complaint we have on this score is the fact that they then proceed back to the administrator and his board members, and in essence accuse them of being out of compliance, or not in accord with the guidelines of the policy statement.

In essence, they are accusing these responsible school officials of being guilty in the first instance until they prove themselves innocent, based on such information as they have gathered in the manner in which I indicated.

We even complain, and seriously so, of the practice of their going into school systems, into the classrooms, and visiting—I am speaking of duly constituted officials from the Office of HEW—and questioning pupils and teachers, and then inviting someone from the office, maybe the principal of that school, to accompany them.

We think that is disruptive. We think it causes uneasiness, and finally leads to a deterioration in the morale and the good atmosphere, to say nothing of the administrative practices and policies.

Mrs. GREEN. May I interrupt you again?

Do you mean to say that this was done without even a courtesy call to the State superintendent's office?

Mr. ACREE. So far as I know, they didn't even call the State superintendent.

Mrs. GREEN. Or the city superintendent's office?

Mr. ACREE. But they, in many instances, possibly did call—I don't know of any instance that I could pinpoint where they didn't call sometime in advance, saying, "We will be in your community at such-and-such a date," but upon their arrival, they did not go to the office of the superintendent and pay their respects, and let him know they were in the community.

The first they knew of their being in the community was when they returned to his office, having visited these people and having garnered certain evidence which they proceeded to use in suggesting that these responsible school officials were out of compliance.

Mrs. GREEN. May I comment here that Members of Congress would be sharply criticized, and rightfully so, if Congressmen from outside this district, though duly authorized to visit and make studies, first did not notify Mr. Landrum, who so long served on the Education Committee, and other Members from the area, and if we did not first of all make contacts with the duly authorized officials who bear the responsibilities and burdens of administering the programs.

I consider what you have described as a very bad situation, and certainly a very unwise use of authority.

Mr. ACREE. Thank you, ma'am.

We consider it as being one of the most serious complaints. It is really so diametrically opposed to our American way of life, it not only conflicts with good administrative practice in any profession, but it is in violation of our basic American tenets of Americanism.

And, of course, the next complaint we consider equally serious and contradictory to our American way of life. This is the demand for closed meetings, secret meetings, by these same officials.

They go to the State administrators. Of course, they have made an appointment, in this instance, where they want to meet with the board members and the superintendent.

Upon arriving, they not only let it be known, but they will sit for as long as is necessary, or they did, until one of your colleagues, the one who arrived this morning, where this last instance happened—it did happen more than once—until the local press, the Georgia Press Association, and Hon. Jack Flynt, intervened.

And then, of course, we received all sorts of apologies, saying that this was not intended, the Commissioner having made the statement that it was not intended, that there was some misunderstanding.

And, of course, one of our basic complaints is about these misunderstandings in every phase of the administration of these policies.

But we have furnished you with a lengthy transcript of what transpired. Mr. Flynt sat in on most of this meeting himself.

This is so grievous that we felt you should not only have a brief excerpt, but you should be able to get into the feel of the situation as it developed.

And lastly, we strongly complain of the suggested practices of the use of intimidation and coercion in an effort to achieve racial balance, or to do away with imbalances, whatever interpretation you might want to use of the terms.

You will find a notarized statement from one the finest citizens in Georgia, one of the finest members of the board of education, the Union City Board of Education, Union City, Ga.; a very distinguished gentleman, who has notarized to the effect that he and his board members were advised that if a teacher will not accept the assignment you give them, "Fire them, and then take steps to see that they are blacklisted, that they cannot secure a certificate, that they are barred from the profession."

You have that included in the material in the brief. Those are the sorts of things we are complaining of.

Mrs. GREEN. Did you say this was a directive?

Mr. ACREE. This was a directive given verbally to the members of the Union City Board of Education, in the presence of Mr. James Beavers, Jr.

I believe that is exhibit K, on page 41.

On page 41 is the statement to which I referred.

Mrs. GREEN. Who gave that directive, Mr. Acree?

Mr. ACREE. A Mr. Rich, who wrote most of the memorandums, I believe all of those I have submitted to you in this brief.

The documented statement from the Griffin-Spalding County Board of Education, and a similar statement documented by the officials of the Telfair school system, included in our brief, substantiate our position in this area.

I was speaking of the coercion matter, which we have in our brief.

Those constitute our complaints, and in conclusion, unless there is some other question at this juncture—

Mrs. GREEN. May I again read the law: "that nothing shall be construed so as to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States, to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of construction, administration, or personnel."

Mr. ACREE. It happens that the honorable gentleman was present at the board meeting when this particular subject was discussed, and I am sure he will have some observations to make in this connection.

I realize the time is running very tight, and I shall conclude my observations by suggesting to you that we respectfully request of you Members of Congress, and all of our other fine Congressmen, that somehow, some way, we all shall be brought to recognize the fact that the schools exist for a singular purpose: that policies and guidelines for the implementation of any and all Federal aid to education shall be construed in accordance with the purpose and intent of the public law; that we have valid interpretations that are consistent and practical for the implementation of all the provisions of these laws; that qualified personnel by training, experience, temperament, and otherwise, be used for the administration and implementation of the provisions of your laws; that the administrative structure be decentralized.

There has been some previous discussion on this. We heartily endorse the decentralization of the administrative proceedings, and insist that as such is done, the duly constituted State and local agencies be used in the administration, and that one and all recognize the fact that communities differ in personal and impersonal composition, and that no set of arbitrary standards, particularly involving percentages and other arbitrary formulas, can apply alike to all communities, where the human element is so terrifically involved.

We further, of course, appeal to one and all for the preservation and perpetuation of our own system of local control of our educational programs.

And in conclusion, we are most hopeful that immediate action will be taken by all concerned to prevent the utter deterioration of our school system, where we are losing administrators, board members, teachers, where bond issues hang in the balance, some failing, where education generally, the structural program particularly, is suffering, as a result of the complaints which we have registered today.

Thank you very kindly.

Mrs. GREEN. Thank you.
Congressman Erlenborn?

Mr. ERLBORN. No questions.

(The prepared brief of Mr. Acree follows:)

STATEMENT OF JACK K. ACREE, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, GEORGIA SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATION

I am Jack K. Acree, Executive Secretary of the Georgia School Boards Association, and the presentation which I shall make represents the position and attitude of the Association.

We of the Georgia School Boards Association wish to express our appreciation to each member of the Committee for this opportunity to appear before you in behalf of the local boards of education throughout Georgia.

Our presentation concerns the administration of federal laws pertaining to the public schools of our state, particularly the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

We commend you and the other members of our Congress for enacting laws which contribute to the total well-being of the people of our great nation, especially their educational welfare. We know that it is your will and the will of the people whom you represent that these laws always be administered in a way which will achieve the immediate purpose of the legislation in the most efficient and effective manner.

OUR POSITION

We of the Georgia School Boards Association are dedicated to the proposition that the very best possible educational opportunities must be made available to all of our youth.

Furthermore, we are committed to provide these educational opportunities in keeping with our American traditions which have nurtured and perpetuated the principle and practice of local control of our public school systems.

We believe that our schools exist for the singular purpose of educating our youth, and we hasten to take issue with the U.S. Commissioner of Education or anyone else who indicates that, "If I have my way, schools will be built for the primary purpose of social and economic integration."

We respect all local, state and federal laws concerning public school education. Furthermore, the boards of education we represent have the same high regard for the laws of our country.

We recognize the need for and completely endorse necessary statements of policy and guidelines for the implementation of all laws in a realistic, legalistic, and effective manner.

In other words, the position of the Georgia School Boards Association is and shall continue to be positive and constructive, not negative or evasive.

OUR COMPLAINTS

1. We vigorously protest the promulgation of policy and guideline statements by the U.S. Commissioner of Education, Harold Howe II, and his staff members which go beyond the provisions and intent of laws passed by Congress.

Specifically, we make reference to all policy and guideline statements which conflict with the following provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1964:

(a) Title 4, Section 401, Paragraph B, "Desegregation means the assignment of students to public schools and within such schools without regard to race, color, religion, or national origin, but 'desegregation' shall not mean the assignment of students to public schools in order to overcome racial imbalance."

(b) Title 6, Section 604, "Nothing contained in this Title shall be construed to authorize action under this Title by any Department or agency with respect to any employment practices or any employer, employment agency, or labor organization, except where a primary objective of the federal financial assistance is to provide employment."

Subsequent references and documented information will show beyond any question of doubt that Commissioner Howe and members of his staff have consistently formulated policy and exercised judgments which either conflict with or extend beyond the provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

2. We deplore the absence of valid definitions and workable interpretations of key words and expressions in constant use by everyone involved in the application of the provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

The broad and constant application of the interpretations placed upon these words and terms affect both the integrity and financial solvency of many school boards. The following examples are submitted to substantiate this complaint:

(a) "Integration"

An interview with Education Commissioner Harold Howe II, carried in the December 5, 1966, issue of *U.S. News and World Report*, clearly reveals a degree of vagueness and uncertainty on the part of the Commissioner as he responds to the following questions:

Q. "Another word that's being used a lot today is 'integration.' What is integration in a school?"

A. "I don't know in any quantitative sense. This is like the racial-balance question. Obviously, the word means bringing together the races in the context of this discussion.

Q. "Is integration required by law? Or just desegregation?"

A. "The Supreme Court has said that segregated schools are discriminatory by nature. So you certainly have an implication that, in order not to be discriminatory, you have to have a degree of integration."

(b) "Segregation"

In the same interview referred to in (a) above, Commissioner Howe again contributes to the current state of indecisiveness and confusion when he responds to the question:

Q. "Even the word 'segregated' raises questions. Is a school segregated simply because it is all white or all Negro? Wouldn't it help for Congress or somebody to clarify all this and tell school boards just what is required of them?"

A. "What we have is a highly decentralized governance of education—and I think Americans want it this way.

The notion of imposing some kind of order on education, either in terms of pupil arrangement or in terms of curriculum or in terms of any other major area of policy, is not something that the Congress or the President or I or anybody else that I know of would subscribe to.

There is clearly a concern—in both the North and the South—about the problems of segregation and desegregation and integration, and the whole mix of issues that are involved in these words."

(c) "Racial imbalance"

Still further evidence of Commissioner Howe's uncertainty and/or evasiveness is evidenced in the same interview referred to in (a) and (b) above as he answers the question,

Q. "You have used the phrase 'racial imbalance,' haven't you? What is racial imbalance?"

A. "I suppose it would be racial imbalance to have a school 90 per cent Negroes and 10 per cent whites in a community where you have 90 per cent whites and 10 per cent Negroes.

But I really don't know what this concept amounts to as an exact definition. The lawyers don't seem to know. I've asked them. I think it would be useful to pin down a definition."

(d) "Discrimination"

This complaint is further substantiated by evidence found in the following exhibit:

Exhibit D: Griffin-Spalding County Board of Education, page 17, through paragraph 3, page 18.

(e) "Dual school system"

This complaint is again substantiated by evidence found in the following exhibit:

Exhibit E: Griffin-Spalding County Board of Education, page 20 through paragraph 3 on page 22.

(f) "Freedom of choice"

The complaint is still further substantiated by evidence found in the following exhibit:

Exhibit D: Griffin-Spalding County Board of Education, pages 16-19.

3. We are appalled at the arbitrary, ambiguous, and inconsistent interpretation and application of existing HEW guidelines by Commissioner Harold Howe II and his staff members.

The confusion, resentment and damage caused by these practices in many of Georgia's school systems is beyond description as well as immediate repair.

This complaint is substantiated by evidence found in the following exhibits:

Exhibit B: Griffin-Spalding County Board of Education, pages 12-13.

Exhibit G: Griffin-Spalding County Board of Education, page 26.

Exhibits N, O, P which are exact replicas of arbitrary memoranda, found on pages 46-48.

4. Administration of certain Federal laws by personnel not fitted for this responsible position by either training, experience or comprehension.

Specific reference is made to the administration of the provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 which refer to the desegregation of schools. Education as a profession is entrusted with the responsibility of both practicing and teaching efficiency and effectiveness. Nothing can be more disruptive and detrimental to the administration of educational programs by professionals than to have totally unqualified people advising, admonishing and even intimidating these responsible school people. This situation has been imposed upon school officials throughout Georgia.

Abundant evidence exists to substantiate the complaint that many representatives from the Office of HEW do not possess the necessary qualifications to properly administer the delicate provisions of the Civil Rights Act applying to our public schools.

5. Use of administrative practices and tactics which are unprofessional, ineffective, and highly detrimental to the educational processes.

An examination of the abundance of available evidence testifying to the afore-stated practices by representatives of the Office of HEW strongly suggests that never before has such a comprehensive and potentially fine a program been so ineffectively administered.

Special attention is called to the following administrative practices by HEW officials:

(1) Lack of any consistent system of communications with local school officials concerning their problems, shortcomings, etc.

(2) Use of form letters to call attention to deficiencies and unacceptable practices. It is readily concluded that such letters cannot possibly serve to communicate judgements and instructions to several school systems which differ appreciably in many respects.

Exhibit M: This exhibit, which is a form letter and found on pages 46-48, is representative of the practice mentioned above.

(3) Lack of fixed responsibility and direct lines of communication.

Exhibit L: This exhibit, found on page 42, testifies to the confusion experienced by one system superintendent.

(4) Use of the telephone by HEW officials for transmitting judgements concerning compliance with HEW Guidelines by local school officials. Innumerable school officials have stated to me that upon receipt of such calls, they requested that the communication be reduced to writing and forwarded to them. This was either not done or done so belatedly that it contributed to the complaint registered in this instance.

6. Practice of issuing memoranda, usually in long-hand, labelled as "Suggested Amendment to Desegregation Plan" by HEW field representatives.

Exhibits N, O, P found on pages 46-48 provide copy of memoranda in question.

An examination of these exhibits reveals an absolute disregard for even the provisions of the guidelines as promulgated by the Office of HEW, to say nothing of the provision of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. These memoranda have seriously impaired the good relationships which should and must exist between all agencies responsible for the administration of public school systems.

7. Practice by HEW representatives of by-passing school officials upon visiting in a school community to determine the degree of compliance with HEW guidelines.

This widespread practice violates any code of ethics and further characterizes those engaging in such practice as lacking the necessary qualifications for the responsible position which they hold.

Furthermore, and most disturbing, is the fact that these tactics result in HEW representatives confronting school officials with arbitrary and unfounded opinions garnered from a few hand-picked citizens of the community and declaring them guilty of unsatisfactory compliance—*guilty until proven innocent*. This despicable practice violates one of the basic tenets of our American way of life.

The following exhibits substantiate this complaint:

Exhibit I: Griffin-Spalding County Board of Education, pages 34-35.

Exhibit J: Telfair County Board of Education, page 38, paragraphs 11-18.

Exhibit K: Letter from Member of Newman City Board of Education on page 41.

8. Demands by HEW representatives for closed school board meetings.

The persistent demands by HEW representatives that representatives of the school community, including the press, be excluded from school board meetings where problems concerning compliance with HEW Guidelines were to be considered are in direct conflict with Georgia law which requires that all board meetings be open to the public. Furthermore, such demands glaringly contradict one of the most common admonitions from HEW officials to local school officials, that is, that they should solicit the assistance of citizens of the school community, particularly its leaders, in resolving problems pertaining to the desegregation of their schools. This practice clearly violates another one of the basic tenets of our American way of life.

This practice by HEW officials was not abandoned until considerable pressure was brought to bear by the local press, the Georgia Press Association, and Congressman John J. Flynt, Jr., in whose district the last in the series of such incidents took place.

The Exhibits referred to below furnish documented evidence of this complaint:

Exhibit A: Griffin-Spalding County Board of Education, pages 1 through 11.

Exhibit J: Telfair County Board of Education, pages 39-43.

9. Intimidation.

HEW officials have resorted to practices which might be characterized as acts of intimidation or even coercion in attempting to secure the transfer of teachers of one race to schools of another race.

The substance of the Exhibits referred to below substantiates this complaint:

Exhibit H: Griffin-Spalding County Board of Education, page 30, paragraph 2.

Exhibit H: Griffin-Spalding County School Board, page 31, paragraph 5, continued on page 32.

Exhibit J: Telfair County Board of Education, page 36, paragraphs 1-5.

Exhibit K: Letter from James Beavers, Member of Newnan City Board of Education, on page 41.

We respectfully request and shall aggressively pursue the following:

(a) An acceptance of the fact by all responsible officials that our public schools exist for the singular purpose of educating people, and are not to be used under any circumstances in an effort to reform society, fulfill political expectations, or to achieve the objectives of other branches or agencies of government, no matter how worthy these objectives may be.

(b) Statements of policy and guidelines for the implementation of a given law which are strictly in keeping with the intent and provisions of the law.

(c) Valid definitions and interpretations of words, expressions, and objectives embraced in or suggested by laws passed by Congress. We respectfully request Congress to see that we are provided with such valid information.

(d) Responsible and professionally qualified personnel to interpret and administer federal laws in keeping with the provisions and intent of the laws.

(e) The decentralization of the administrative structure for the administration of all federal programs and projects and the channelling of all administrative policies and directives through duly constituted state and local agencies.

(f) Recognition by one and all of the well established fact that each community differs from every other in both personal and impersonal composition and that no arbitrary formula or set of criteria based upon ratios and percentages can be imposed upon all communities under any circumstances.

(g) An abiding respect by one and all for our democratic precepts and institutions. More especially do we seek to preserve and perpetuate our unique American policy which provides for local control of our public school systems.

(h) Lastly, we respectfully request that you and your fellow Congressmen take immediate action to deal with the fact that policies and practices documented in this presentation are defeating the primary purpose of your legislative action, which was, in the case of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, to up-grade educational experiences for all our youth. We submit that as a direct result of those things about which we complain many of our most *needy* children are being deprived of the benefits of your action; local school bond issues are failing because of the increasing confusion and lack of confidence; school board members, superintendents, and classroom teachers are leaving our public schools in

increasing numbers when we most need them; and, as a result of these critical developments, both the efficiency and effectiveness of our public school programs are being seriously affected.

EXCERPTS FROM THE OFFICIAL RECORD OF THE MEETING OF THE GRIFFIN-SPALDING COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION ON AUGUST 11, 1966, WITH THE FOLLOWING REPRESENTATIVES FROM THE OFFICES OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, WASHINGTON, D.C.: MR. RICH, MR. HAZEL, MR. PERLMAN

(The following people representing the Griffin-Spalding County School System were present: Board of Education Members: C. T. Parker, Chairman, Taylor Manley, John West, Mrs. Edith Newton, Miss Anne Hill Drewry, Russell Smith, Bill Westmoreland, Billy Brooks, and Don Jackson; Superintendent of Schools, George Patrick, Jr.; Assistant School Superintendent, Ben Christie; School Board Attorney, J. C. Owen, Jr.; and School Board Secretary, Mrs. Carter.)

EXHIBIT "A": CLOSED MEETINGS, ETC.

MR. RICH. We are. I think we might have an initial problem here, that is, skipping the introductions, I would ask are some people here members of the public as opposed to members of the Board and school officials?

MR. PARKER. Yes, Sir, there are visitors here other than members of the Board of Education. Notice of this meeting was in the local newspaper and there are probably 4 or 5 visitors who are interested citizens, who are interested in Griffin-Spalding County Board of Education and our school system. Now, we are perfectly willing to take the time to have positive introductions all the way around.

MR. RICH. I think rather than the necessity of that, the point is, that we are authorized to speak on these matters only with the Board and the school officials, because it's a similar kind of thing to a jury, for example, whereby things are expressed in the confines of the jury room, and perhaps there might be some things involving individuals that will come up, or other things that the Board will, naturally, want to keep out of public view until they have discussed the thing, and then they can talk about it with the public. We would certainly have no reservations about your talking to any members of the public or the press after we have had our meeting about what has gone on, but the meeting, itself, we will have to ask that we meet with the Board and school officials.

MR. PARKER. Mr. Owen is our attorney. Are we authorized under the Georgia law to hold a closed meeting of this public body? This is a constitutional body elected by the people of this county.

MR. RICH. We are familiar with the law, sir, and we have gone through this several times on this trip, and also, the times in the past, and we are also familiar with the practice of many Boards, for example, where they are discussing teachers, as to whether they should be re-elected or not, or teachers being fired, or new teachers being elected, often do hold executive sessions, and we, in addition to that, we would only be authorized to meet with the Board and the school officials. It is certainly a very common practice for Georgia Boards to meet only among themselves.

MR. CUMMING. My name is Cumming, J. R. Cumming. I am head of the Savings and Loan Association in Griffin. I am an attorney. This is a public body, public officials, this is public business affecting every child in this county. I fail to see what is secret about it. This is public business.

MR. RICH. Well, sir, the same—by the same token a jury—

MR. CUMMING (interposing). This is not public business?

MR. RICH. Yes, sir, it certainly is.

MR. CUMMING. There is no connection with all the people, with the man there? This is a public body on a matter that affects every one of us.

MR. RICH. Well, I would say I will have to disagree with you.

MR. CUMMING. Are your instructions are that no citizen of this county can sit in this meeting that you are attending with the Board of Education?

MR. RICH. Yes, sir.

MR. CUMMING. No other reason? If that is your instruction, I would like to know that. I would not embarrass the Board by holding the meeting up.

MR. RICH. Yes, sir, that is our authorization.

MR. CUMMING. Does that come from Washington?

MR. RICH. Yes, sir.

Mr. CUMMING. I would like to know that.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, irregardless of how the Board feels as to executive session and open session, I want to go on record that this be a public meeting as such, called for public interest, to handle public matters, and nothing be withheld from the public.

Mr. CUMMING. Getting back to one point that you mentioned, speaking of teachers, hiring and firing, if I, as a citizen of this county, wanted to sit in at a meeting where the teachers were being procured, I don't think the Board could prevent me from doing it.

Mr. RICH. Well, the Board does sometimes meet in executive session.

Mr. CUMMING. I will leave, but, actually—I am leaving on your statement there that your instructions from Washington are that this meeting you will not meet with any citizen of Spalding County sitting in on it other than members of the Board.

Mr. RICH. And the school officials.

Mr. PARKER. Joe, and the other citizens here, we recognize your feelings in this matter. The members of this Board have nothing whatsoever to hide. Before any visitors leave, I would, on behalf of our Board, like to make a brief statement, at which time, in order to avoid any further delay, we will ask the cooperation of our interested citizens and taxpayers that they leave in order that the meeting might proceed. But before you leave, I would like to read a brief statement, my personal statement, to open this meeting. The purpose of this meeting is to discuss with representatives of the United States Office of Education alleged inadequacies in our school desegregation plan. Board members have received copies of letters recently dated June the 7th, July the 11th, and July the 18th. We understand that certain other school systems in Georgia have received similar letters. Before the meeting gets under way, I want to review briefly for these representatives what has transpired in Griffin-Spalding County. When the Courts directed that the school districts make a prompt and reasonable start toward desegregating the schools, this Board acted promptly and in good faith to determine from all possible sources a plan that would constitute compliance and that would still give our children, both white and black, the best possible educational opportunities.

At this point I want to get the record straight. There has never been a group of public spirited citizens who worked harder or more conscientiously to do what was fair and just for all. The Court ordered plan and a voluntary plan based on freedom of choice was studied for long and difficult weeks; colored and white citizens were consulted at great length. The decisions to follow a voluntary plan based on freedom of choice was based on our feelings that the people themselves should have a free choice in selecting the school where they felt their children could get the best opportunity. This choice has been given to everyone on a fair and equal basis as prescribed by the United States Office of Education. In the 1965-66 school year 63, or 2.1% of the negro students were freely given permission to attend schools that were formerly all white. Because of the dedicated work of these Board members, our administrators and teachers, and the public in general, there was not a single incident in this county throughout the school year. When the 1966 guidelines were issued, re-registration was held in exact compliance with the rules, and 161, or 4.8% of the colored students requested attendance on a desegregated basis for the coming year. Assignment has been made on these choices without exception. We submit that this is a reasonable progress towards peaceful, orderly, and intelligent desegregation of the schools in compliance with the law. I appreciate your position here, and I also appreciate your cooperation.

Mr. RICH. I might add that we appreciate it also, and we certainly would encourage that the Board and the Superintendent do talk to the members of the press and members of the public about what has transpired.

Mr. OWEN. Just let me ask one question to get the record clear. Mr. Chairman, the way I understand it, this meeting was called as a Board meeting, as a public meeting. Now, the Board is not going into executive session, but since Mr. Rich has stated that he is forbidden by his instructions from Washington with this rule to inform the Board as to what he has come down here to tell us, that our visitors are leaving voluntarily without this Board actually excluding them, and we are still in public session as far as the meeting goes, but they are leaving voluntarily.

Mr. PARKER. That is correct. Now, is there any visitor that understands it otherwise? Thank you very much.

Mr. Rich, the little statement that I have made summarizes what we have done and the feeling of this Board that in good faith we have adopted a plan based on freedom of choice, and we have followed that plan.

Mr. RICH. May I just state as one addendum along with what we are talking about, as far as members of the public, that we certainly can't object to recording minutes and having minutes taken on it. We just do ask that, here, again, this not be played to members of the public. Certainly, if the Board wishes to use it to review what has been discussed, we have no objection to that, but that it should not be played for members of the public.

Mr. PARKER. Feeling that we represent all of the people, Mr. Rich, we always have a secretary present at our Board meetings to record what transpires.

Mr. RICH. Yes—well, you would not release the transcript of what had happened, you might wish to go back over it and make an announcement to the press, or something like that.

Mr. PARKER. We always have an announcement to the press on the morning following our meetings, and the press is always welcome to come and sit in on meetings. Any citizen is welcome to come and sit in on any of our meetings, and this meeting is proceeding no different from any of our others.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, could any interested citizen come over and look at these minutes or any other minutes, if he so desired?

Mr. PARKER. They are a matter of public record.

Mr. SMITH. A matter of public record.

Mr. PARKER. To give you one more step in the Georgia law governing this, our financial records are audited once each year by the State auditing department, and a copy of that audit is transmitted to the press and there is a specific law requiring that that be done. Nothing that we do is hidden, and can not be hidden, our attorney tells us, from the public. We would like for you to proceed with anything you would like to tell us.

Mr. RICH. I think we still have a problem in effect in that if there is a verbatim transcript and notes made available, this is the same sort of thing, and we do ask that it not be made public.

Mr. PARKER. How can we represent the public and hold a secret meeting?

Mr. RICH. It is not unusual for public bodies, bodies representing the public, to meet among themselves and to afterwards report the results of that meeting to the public, which is not at all unusual.

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Owen, as our attorney, would you answer that?

Mr. OWEN. Well, if the public asks to see the results of the meeting, can we keep these minutes secret by law? I think by law, under the Georgia law, our minutes would be public.

Mr. RICH. I know some Boards in Georgia—it is going to the extent that some of the school records have been kept from Board members that didn't agree with the majority of the Board. I am sure there are a lot of things that—I have never heard of that law being pressed upon—

Mr. OWEN. Well, this is just—

Mr. RICH (interposing). We are simply faced with a situation of authorization, and in effect, this is a public meeting where the notes are made public—

Mr. OWEN. Well, what our Chairman—I think, Mr. Rich—was the Georgia law saying that all meetings would be public, and of course, the minutes of these meetings, as I understand, would also be public. And if this law is on the books because other people don't observe it, then I think it is obligatory that we observe it.

Mr. RICH. Well, we are faced with a situation where we are not authorized to meet with members of the public, are present, and where exact records will be made which will be released to the public.

Mr. PARKER. Would it be fair if we request that you show us some authorization, because we—

Mr. RICH (interposing). There is no written authorization, we simply have instructions.

Mr. PARKER. We can't conceive of a situation where a public official from the taxpayers payroll would come out and say "We want to meet with you, you can't take any notes".

Mr. RICH. We didn't say that, sir. What we said is that you certainly can take notes, but you can't release it to the public. You can talk to the public about what has transpired in the meeting, but to have an exact copy of everything that goes on in the meeting—

Mr. PARKER. Has anyone said that we are going to issue a verbatim report?

Mr. RICH. But I say, if an individual can come in, if any member of the public can come in and look at the record, which includes the verbatim record of the meeting, as opposed to notes, simple notes about what has transpired at a meeting, it is quite a different thing.

Mr. PARKER. We take the position that any taxpayer in this county has a constitutional right to come in and examine any records in the office of the Superintendent of Education or the official records of this Board.

Mr. RICH. We haven't run into a problem whereby the Board has had someone who has taken exact transcript of what transpired in the meeting. And, so, we haven't run into a situation like this before. It is the same thing as holding a meeting in public, if any member of the public can come in and read an exact transcript, whereas, notes would be a summary of what transpired.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. Rich, I don't believe the Chairman had in mind calling the press in tomorrow and saying, "We want to release this to the newspaper". I don't think that is the intent of this at all.

Mr. RICH. No, sir.

Mr. OWEN. But here, I mean, to take minutes down at meetings, and if some member of the public asks about a specific point to come back and refer to the record on this specific point that had transpired, I don't believe we could refuse them the transcript of the minutes of the public record in this office under the Georgia law.

Mr. RICH. When it conflicts with the orders we have, I am sure you could, yeah.

Mr. OWEN. Well, I mean, we don't know of any law it conflicts with.

Mr. RICH. I am telling you, we have instructions not to meet with members of the public, including a record which would be made available to the public.

Mr. OWEN. Well, suppose we do this, Mr. Chairman. If it's all right with Mr. Rich, suppose we go ahead and take these and transcribe them at the meeting, and then maybe we can thrash out the point as to whether we can refuse or not after we conduct the meeting.

Mr. RICH. Well, no, the problem with that is, if you decided you would make it available, then what could we do at that point except say that you were acting in bad faith.

Mr. OWEN. No, I mean, if it is in compliance with the law that we can not refuse people to see these, then, of course, we would have to let them see them. But if it is in compliance with some law or instructions you refer to—

Mr. RICH. It is not a Federal law, sir, it is our authorization. If we must bring it down, the alternative would be us not meeting with you, or a meeting with you where no exact transcript be made available to the public.

Mr. OWEN. I know the Board wants to meet with you, and would have the benefit of what you have to tell them. But as far as making it public, I can't tell the Board that it is not my opinion—I will say this: I can only say that it is my opinion that a meeting of this sort must be made public. I don't believe we can have a meeting that is not public and take any official action. Now, I think you can have executive sessions where you don't take official action, but any meeting where you take official action, it would have to be public. Then, if we have a meeting and have minutes of this meeting, in my opinion, I think these minutes would be public records, and if they asked me "Can I,—can they refuse to show these records I would have to tell them "No" they could not refuse. They would have to show the records.

Mr. RICH. We would not anticipate that the Board would take any official action at this meeting, anyway, so, that perhaps the meeting would be an executive session at which no official action was taken.

Mr. OWEN. Well, I don't know whether the Board would want to take official action or not. If they did, certainly, that part would have to be for the public. Now, perhaps you could have the executive session, Mr. Chairman, transcribe your notes, where no official action is taken. Now, perhaps these notes that you take here would not be minutes in the sense that official action was taken to go in your minute book. Is that the point, Mr. Rich?

Mr. RICH. Yes, sir.

Mr. OWEN. In other words, what these gentlemen have to report to you, if you are in executive session and receive that report from them verbatim and transcribe it, for your information and your use, at a session where no official actions were taken, perhaps these gentlemen are correct that you could refuse to allow that to be seen by an inquisitor or some member of the public coming

in to see it. Certainly, any meeting that you take official action and have minutes of that meeting, I don't believe you could refuse to show that to someone, if he came to ask for it. Is that your understanding of the law?

Mr. RICH. Well, I am not sure what it would come to, but we certainly don't anticipate that the Board will take any official action. And meetings where we felt the Board would not take official action were generally worked out—in presenting a proposed recommendation or amendment to the plan, the desegregation plan, and then the Board has considered at a later date what action it will take on a proposed amendment, and I think that's what we are going to end up with this evening.

Mr. PARKER. Well, now, our understanding of this meeting is this: Every Board member here feels conscientiously that our plan of desegregation has been orderly and in accordance with the law, and that our progress toward desegregating the schools has been reasonable. We have tried mighty hard to cooperate and to comply. We have suffered some criticism for trying so hard and for going as far as we have gone, and we don't believe there is a citizen in Spalding County that can stand up and face us and say that we haven't made an honest, sincere, effort to comply with the law. We know that there is not a citizen that will stand up and face us and deny that we haven't made such an effort. Our only purpose in hearing you is to see wherein you criticize what we have done and what do you say that we should do in addition to what we have done, and our decision as to whether that is reasonable and under all the conditions in this county will be decided upon after we have had time to give it due consideration.

G. W. PATRICK,
Superintendent, Griffin-Spalding County Schools.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 7th day of December 1966.

J. C. WEBB,
Notary Public, Georgia, State at Large.

My Commission Expires March 6, 1970.

(The following excerpts are taken from the official records of the Meeting of the Griffin-Spalding County Board of Education on August 11, 1966, referred to on page 1 of Exhibit "A".)

EXHIBIT "B": ARBITRARY AND INCONSISTENT JUDGEMENTS

Mr. PERLMAN. Well, although I think this increase does represent some progress, I think it does fall short of what the Commissioner's expectations were. The Commissioner's expectations were expressed in terms of substantial progress. But the review we have made of the system has led us to conclude at this time that—if we look at the total picture, both student performance, coupled with the fact that faculty desegregation does not measure up to what the Commissioner's requirements were in the faculty area, we can say that we have concluded that this number, although it is some progress, it does not meet the Commissioner's expectations of substantial progress. And we are going to—I think one of our purposes in coming tonight is to make a few suggestions as to what the—

Mr. PARKER (interposing). What you have just said is merely an expression of an opinion. I expressed an opinion that it was substantial progress, and you expressed—

Mr. PERLMAN (interposing). The Commissioner has suggested that when we review the results of a school system's desegregation plan, we look at the total picture, the amount of student desegregation, and coupled with the amount of faculty desegregation, and when we look at this total picture, the suggestions that the general plan that the Commissioner sets up, has suggested that we apply, would lead us to conclude at this time that this does not meet the Commissioner's expectation of substantial progress, and I believe—

Mr. PARKER (interposing). In other words, in your opinion it may not meet his expectations?

Mr. PERLMAN. Well, I will have to say that we were given—

Mr. RICH (interposing). The pertinent thing is that I am sure Mr. Patrick went to some of the meetings where Dr. Kruger spoke and explained the guide-

lines during March and April, and at that time I am sure that he gave you a more definite idea of what the Commissioner's expectations were. And certainly, the guideline experience, for example, there is a smaller percentage of students picking up the second paragraph such as 4 or 5 per cent, transferred from segregated schools for the 1965-66 school year, a substantial increase such as tripling would be expected for the school year. Then he goes on "If a lower percentage of students transferred for the last school year, then the rate of increase would normally be expected to be proportionately greater, so, it would be, say, 4 or 5 times what it had been the year before", which would mean somewhere, oh, let's say, I guess it would be 10 and 12%, or something like that, I guess, based on that. But this is sort of the expectation the Commissioner had, and as Mr. Perlman has mentioned, it is the total picture that the Commissioner looks at, and the Commissioner has decided in this case, upon review, that the total picture does not meet his idea of substantial progress, and, therefore, he would ask some additional steps be taken.

Mr. PARKER. In other words, what you are saying is, that all those who voluntarily requested transfer is not sufficient? By the same token, is it lawful to arbitrarily move them?

Mr. RICH. We are—we haven't made any proposal at all yet, and one of the proposals we would make would be that there would be an additional transfer period to further aid the movement toward the ending of the dual school system.

G. W. PATRICK,

Superintendent, Griffin-Spalding County Schools.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 7th day of December, 1966.

J. C. WEBB,

Notary Public, Georgia, State at Large.

My Commission Expires Mar. 6, 1970.

(The following excerpts are taken from the official records of the Meeting of the Griffin-Spalding County Board of Education on August 11, 1966, referred to on page 1 of Exhibit "A".)

EXHIBIT "C": EXTRA LEGAL REQUIREMENTS

Mr. RICH. Let me point out first what the whole theory of what freedom of choice is, and this is that,—we are all working to comply with the law, and the law has stated as long ago as 1964 that what we have to do is end the dual school system completely. In 1964 the Congress

Mr. PARKER. Wait just a minute now. Will you quote me that law again?

Mr. RICH. Brown v. Board of Education.

Mr. PARKER. Said what, now?

Mr. RICH. Pardon?

Mr. PARKER. It said what, now?

Mr. RICH. Said there must be no dual school system.

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Owen, Will you check that for us?

Mr. RICH. It didn't say there must be part of a dual school system eliminated, —said there be no dual school system.

Mr. OWEN. I—

Mr. RICH. Said there must be no dual school system.

Mr. OWEN. Is this a statute?

Mr. RICH. Brown v. Board of Education, and the Civil Rights Act reiterated this, and through the acts of legislative history along with it, and that is what we are all working to do as the eventual goal, is to end the dual school system. And the freedom of choice plan, the guidelines which have been published in the Federal Code of Regulations, which are part of the law authorized under the Civil Rights Act of 1964,—as they have stated, the freedom of choice plan,—and the Courts, themselves, have said,—that the freedom of choice plan is simply a device by which we can accomplish the ending of the dual school system, or at least, we can work towards it. But, if it doesn't work as a device, just as using a hand plow to plow a field is not necessarily the best way to do that, a tractor is much better, freedom of choice plan is not the best way to accomplish the ending of the dual school system. So that there may be some other step that is required to be taken in order to meet that goal. But the Commissioner

has stated that we will allow a gradual rate of desegregation. We won't say, "Do it all at once", because we are doing things that would affect people's lives to a great extent, and we are asking people to change social mores that have existed over quite a long period of time. And we are not saying, "Junk the free choice plan here". We are saying that one of the recommendations that we would make would be that there would be an additional choice period of possibly two weeks under which there would be a possibility of any student transferring.

G. W. PATRICK,
Superintendent, Griffin-Spalding County Schools.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 7th day of December, 1966.

J. C. WEBB,
Notary Public, Georgia, State at Large.

My Commission Expires March 6, 1970.

(The following excerpts are taken from the official records of the Meeting of the Griffin-Spalding County Board of Education on August 11, 1966, referred to on page 1 of Exhibit "A".)

EXHIBIT "D": FREEDOM OF CHOICE—PLAN, DISCRIMINATION, ETC.

Mr. RICH. Well, let me finish this, because I think this will clear up what you are thinking. This would not be a choice period open to all students who wanted to transfer to any school. This would be only a choice period whereby students could make a choice which would further desegregation, further work toward ending the dual school system. In other words, any white student could choose a negro school, or a negro student who has not already chosen to attend a formerly white school, could so choose at this time. But there could not be, say, a white student who had chosen a negro school going the other way. There could not be a negro student who had chosen to attend a formerly white school, choosing to attend a negro school. I think this is what you were getting at.

Mr. PATRICK. Because I already have about 15—

Mr. RICH. Yes, sir.

Mr. PATRICK. Requests to go back, and I refused those requests.

Mr. RICH. That's what I thought you were talking about. But this, again, would still be subject to scrutiny by the Commissioner. If the results did not work out so that there was substantial progress, then there would still have to be further steps taken. If I might continue with this,—the way the office has set it up, it would be possible, certainly, if we speak realistically, it would be unlikely that there would be white students choosing to attend a negro school. If the district so desires, they could simply make forms available, and possibly we would suggest that they be mailed to the negro students who have not chosen to attend the formerly white schools, so you could limit the number of students to whom you would provide these forms.

Mr. PARKER. How can we discriminate against certain of our students just to accommodate an opinion of an administrator? This is discrimination what you just said,—you said, "Only to a limited group".

Mr. RICH. Number.

Mr. PARKER. You said only open it to negro students—

Mr. RICH. (interposing). You could certainly have everyone make the choice. We are simply saying as a,—an administrator easing the burden for you, that districts have preferred that they only provide these forms for the negro students who have not chosen to attend white schools.

Mr. PARKER. And discriminate against those others? Who would do the choosing of the students who want to transfer?

Mr. RICH. Transfer,—this plan is open to anybody who wants to transfer from a school where there are races in the majority to other races in the minority.

Mr. PARKER. In other words, the plan is open to suit your limited purpose only.

Mrs. NEWTON. That is discrimination.

Mr. RICH. What are you discriminating against? I think we ought to stick to this point, now, because any white student who wishes to choose a negro school is certainly free to do so. It is just that the fact is, I have not come across an

instance in the State of Georgia where a white student has chosen to attend a formerly negro school.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. Chairman, in order to get it clear, let me ask Mr. Perlman,—the Superintendent referred to 15 negro students that had indicated a desire to transfer back from a white school back to a negro school. Now, is it your suggestion that he disallow these 15 to transfer back? Maybe for scholastic reasons they feel like they made a mistake.

Mr. PERLMAN. It is required by the guidelines, yes, that he disallow.

Mr. OWEN. That he disallow that. Now, would not that be discrimination against those 15 negro students, if they thought it would be to their best educational interest to go back to their own educational level classroom?

Mr. PERLMAN. No, sir, this is certainly not discrimination. What we are saying,—the policy is open to all students so that they may,—first of all, let's get at this notion, which may be behind this, that there is some sort of constitutional right to a freedom of choice, so far as schools are concerned. There is no such thing. And I am sure that you will agree with us that the freedom of choice plan is a unique, odd, and very difficult, and educationally speaking, probably the worst kind of plan that any school system can have. It is much easier to have other kinds of plans that most school systems in the country use, namely, to operate on a neighborhood school basis where there is a zone around the school and all the students attend that school. But we have permitted the device to be used.

Mr. OWEN. This is our Congressman.

Mr. PARKER. Come in, Mr. Flynt. Mr. Flynt, that is Mr. Rich on the left of us here. Mr. Rich, Mr. Flynt, and Mr. Hazel, Mr. Pearlman, and Mr. Walter. Have a seat, Mr. Flynt. Where were you,—you were telling us about the "device".

Mr. RICH. Yes, sir. It is not the most workable device. It is about the worst, as a matter of fact. You don't know how many students you are going to have where in the coming year. And it makes it extremely difficult to make long range educational plans. But, what we are all working towards is the ending of the dual school system. Now, this is another device which we, and the office of the Commissioner, has suggested as a means by which under operation of the free choice plan and a further extension which is also a regular part of all geographical zone plans, I may add, there is a minority transfer policy where choices may be made to further desegregation and ending of the dual school system. So, it is not a question of discrimination. It is a question of a device which is open to all students regardless of race to further desegregation.

G. W. PATRICK,
Superintendent, Griffin-Spalding County Schools.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 7th day of December, 1966.

J. A. WEBB,
Notary Public, Georgia, State at Large.

My Commission Expires Mar. 6, 1970.

(The following excerpts are taken from the official records of the Meeting of the Griffin-Spalding County Board of Education on August 11, 1966, referred to on page 1 of Exhibit "A".)

EXHIBIT "E": DUAL SCHOOL SYSTEM—PERCENTAGES, IMBALANCES, ETC.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Rich, you have referred on two or three occasions to the dual school system. We contend that we do not have a dual school system. What is your definition of a "dual school system"?

Mr. RICH. Where a system has been operated so that schools have been set up intending for members of one race or another, and we are having to work to erase the stigma of what has existed where it has been intentional, and the first time it was not intentional it was under the plan.

Mr. PATRICK. A school system operating under one school superintendent, one Board of Education, all faculty meetings, and all principal administrative meetings integrated, with freedom of choice of any child to attend any school he desired, how could that still be designated as a dual school system?

Mr. RICH. Well, sir, up until 1964 or '65, up until last school year would we agree that this was a dual school system?

Mr. PATRICK. I will agree,—no, I won't agree it was a dual school system. I would agree we had separate faculty meetings, and so forth.

Mr. RICH. It was not intended for the memers of one race or the other? That is what a dual school system is.

Mr. PERLMAN. That is what these guidelines are attempting to do. But you do have to work with that term, though, whether you—

Mrs. NEWTON (interposing). If we don't have it, we don't have to work with that term.

Mr. RICH. Well, you would—

Mr. PARKER. If everyone would stop talking, we would get more accomplished. Mr. RICH. It was operated as such up until this agency started working with these school districts, and Congress has said, and the Commissioner has issued his guidelines in accordance with this, that this is what we must work to overcome, and by this definition, and this system was intentionally operating schools for one race or another, in a dual system,—and it is eliminated when there is no,—well, let's see,—when the schools are,—I don't know how obviously we can say it, but—

Mr. PATRICK. What you are saying is that we should no longer have any racial imbalance?

Mr. RICH. No, sir.

Mr. FLYNT. What is your authority for saying Congress said that?

Mr. RICH. Through the Civil Rights Act of 1965.

Mr. FLYNT. Which Title?

Mr. RICH. Title VI, sir.

Mr. FLYNT. What about Title IV?

Mr. RICH. Title IV refers to something entirely different. I don't understand the significance of Title IV with what we are talking about, the ending of the dual system.

Mr. FLYNT. Title IV says specifically that there shall be no assignment or transfer of any pupil for the purpose of overcoming racial imbalance.

Mr. RICH. I believe, sir, that there is a term of,—well, the,—overcoming racial imbalance,—yes, sir, we are talking there about the assignment of students to public schools in order to overcome racial imbalance. We are talking here about a—

Mr. FLYNT (interposing). Read it. What does it say?

Mr. RICH. Well, the definition of desegregation means the assignment of students to public schools, within such schools, without regard to their race, color, religion or national origin, desegregation shall not mean an assignment of students to public schools in order to overcome racial unbalance.

Mr. FLYNT. That is what I said.

Mr. RICH. Well, I don't understand the effect as far as Title VI is concerned. I don't think that is relevant to what we are discussing as far as a dual school system is concerned.

Mrs. NEWTON. If you are saying the Commissioner feels that we have not made reasonable progress and certain percentages of our schools being more integrated, isn't that the very crux of the matter? You are asking us to increase the number of negro students entering into our formerly all white schools, which is certainly asking for more of a racial balance, isn't it?

Mr. PARKER. You are telling us, in effect, to make some more students transfer, are you not?

Mr. RICH. No, sir, we are not. No,—we are asking you to take further steps mainly by running a minority transfer of further choice. I would also say that,—we are talking here on the one hand about Title IV, and Title VI is a separate section than this Title IV.—but I would go on further to state that the Commissioner has simply followed after what some of the Courts have said, in that there is a way of looking at how a desegregation plan is doing. He is not requiring that a certain percentage of students choose or be assigned, or whatever, from negro schools to formerly white schools, or from formerly white schools to negro schools, or any such thing. He is not requiring any racial balance. What he is requiring is that there be some substantial progress towards the ending of the dual school system, which necessarily involves some students moving across racial lines, but does not require any racial balance. Furthermore, requiring racial balance in schools is what Title IV talks about, and we are talking about a system, not a particular school. You certainly could have one school totally desegregated and another school completely segregated, and this would not be any different in our

eyes than having one school which was half desegregated, and the other school which was half desegregated.

G. W. PATRICK,

Superintendent, Griffin-Spalding County Schools.

Subscribed to and sworn to before me this 7th day of December, 1966.

J. C. WEBB,

Notary Public, Georgia, State at Large.

My Commission Expires Mar. 6, 1970.

(The following excerpts are taken from the official records of the Meeting of the Griffin-Spalding County Board of Education on August 11, 1966, referred to on page 1 of Exhibit "A".)

EXHIBIT "F": ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICES

Mr. PATRICK. That is true, Mr. Rich. The statement was made that additional steps might be required. But I want to ask two or three questions. First, does the Office of Education have any concern for education, or do they only have concern for integration; second, did we not present to the Office of Education at the end of May, two months ago, 2½ months ago, factual information about how much integration we had in our public schools? And is it not a fact that we did not hear until only a week ago any fault with the amount of integration that we had, although we had the feeling that possibly it wasn't enough? But is it not a fact that your guidelines prohibited us during the period of freedom of choice from influencing any child to integrate or to segregate, or in any way as far as his choice of schools might be concerned, and the employees of the Board of a school system, would include the Board of Education, would include the Superintendent, would include the Assistant Superintendent, the Principals and teachers, and they were not allowed in any way to influence registrants, although we felt that perhaps not enough students crossed. But we did everything according to your guidelines, and now you come up when our school system is ready to open, the classes are balanced with approximately in every school an average of about 28 or 29 children to a class, and it's in only one school, and that's an all white school, that runs over 30 students to a class. And yet you tell us now a school system that doesn't have any extra classrooms, that we are going to have to move children into these already crowded classrooms in order to obtain integration at the sacrifice of education. I think you are making a drastic mistake not to take a look at education at the same time you are looking at integration.

Mr. PARKER. Look at the welfare of the youngsters.

Mr. MANLEY. Let Mr. Rich answer the question about education.

Mr. RICH. We are certainly interested in education, and certainly the Office of Education is. And we are looking for,—that is why we have come to talk to you, rather than simply, like a fiat, or by a cold, impersonal letter, saying that the Commissioner would require such and such steps, or would recommend as alternative, such and such steps. We feel that by coming and talking to you in person, and by discussing things with you, that we can have a better idea, we could work out something that would work in the system that would better the school system, that would work in the community, and that would be adaptable for all the purposes that we particularly need. Now, so far as the other points that you raised, if I can recall them,—

Mr. PATRICK. I contend that the U.S. Office of Education has failed miserably in keeping school systems informed as to the fact that our progress was not adequate. I contend that August,—the middle of August, is a mighty late date to tell us that we are going to make adjustments in our school system. If the U.S. Office of Education is really interested in education, they would immediately upon receipt of information that I sent them, they would immediately inform me that "This is not enough", and given me means by which we could have made some corrections at that time. My hands were tied.

G. W. PATRICK,

Superintendent, Griffin-Spalding County Schools.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 7th day of December, 1966.

J. C. WEBB,

Notary Public.

(The following excerpts are taken from the official records of the Meeting of the Griffin-Spalding County Board of Education on August 11, 1966, referred to on page 1 of Exhibit "A".)

EXHIBIT "G": ARBITRARY JUDGMENTS CONCERNING PUPIL TRANSFERS, ETC.

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Rich, I assume that you would be willing to write down for us the things that you suggest we do?

Mr. RICH. I have a printed copy of the suggestions.

Mr. PARKER. Allright, sir, will you proceed with the next one?

Mr. RICH. O.K. As an alternative,—well, I would also, by the way, disagree so far as,—you were talking about forcing you to,—I don't remember the exact terms, but to,—force,—I don't know—

Mr. PATRICK (interposing). I said that you,—to integrate any change of students in this county to another would overcrowd the classes in that given school, because all of our classes are fairly well balanced. We do not have empty classrooms, and if we have to allow anyone to move, we will have to allow overcrowding.

Mr. PARKER. Suppose you go ahead with your next suggestion.

Mr. RICH. Yes, sir. As I understand it, the Northside Elementary school and Moore Elementary school are located close together, and so are the Fourth Ward Elementary school and the Annie Shockley school. Now, a further recommendation might be that all students who live in the second Ward, and who would be in the first grade would attend Northside Elementary school, and all those in the second grade would attend the Moore Elementary school. And a similar sort of arrangement, this would be run either way, you could have the first grade students, say, in Moore Elementary, and the second grade in Northside. Similarly with the Fourth Ward Elementary and Annie Shockley, that first grade students attend one school and the second grade students attend the other school.

G. W. PATRICK,
Superintendent, Griffin-Spalding County Schools.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 7th day of December, 1966.

J. C. WEBB,
Notary Public.

(The following excerpts are taken from the official records of the Meeting of the Griffin-Spalding County Board of Education on August 11, 1966, referred to on page 1 of Exhibit "A".)

EXHIBIT "H": ARBITRARY JUDGMENTS RE FACULTY TRANSFERS, ETC.

Mr. RICH. Yes, sir. The guidelines do state that the general expectation, general requirements of the Commissioner, is that there be at least on full time classroom teacher teaching in a school where the majority of the faculty are of the opposite race in each school in the system. Now, there is flexibility in the guidelines, but this is the general requirements. However, the reason that the requirement,—general requirement is stated in this fashion would negate for the most part part time teachers, especially where they are teaching in all the schools in the system, because the basic reason is that everybody in the community, and we, ourselves, also, at the present time, think of one school as the white school, and another school as a negro school. People don't think of it as intended for everyone, but intended for members of one race or another, based on the path, and based on where students and faculty have attended in the past. And at the present time the regular faculty of the school is either a white faculty or a negro faculty. These are the faculty members who are resident there and who teach regular classroom subjects there, and for that reason the Commissioner has asked for a very gradual beginning of breaking down that identity through desegregation of faculties. Now, some courts have gone so far as to require total desegregation of the faculty immediately. Suppose there were 100 faculty members, 60 white and 40 negro, and there were 10 schools, then what they have required has been that there be 6 white and 4 negro teachers in each and every school in the system. Now, this is a much more drastic thing than what the Commissioner is asking. And he is just asking that there be a start toward this.

There are advantages in this, in that every teacher is in the same situation, and they can all say, "Well, I didn't get picked on, I am in the same boat everybody else is in". But the Commissioner in line with what we were discussing before about allowing things to take place more gradually, has simply asked that the general requirement be that there be at least one full time class room teacher in each school. There is some flexibility in this, and perhaps we can work out something at this time that would accomplish the same purpose in a slightly different fashion.

Mr. PARKER. You haven't stated a definite recommendation.

Mr. RICH. Well, the general recommendation would be that there be a full time faculty member in each of the schools of the opposite race from the majority of the faculty members in that school. But there is another possibility,—let me ask you, you have how many schools in the district?

Mr. PATRICK. 17.

Mr. RICH. 17? Now, if you had, let's say—

Mr. PARKER. $8\frac{1}{2}$? How are you going to get the half?

Mr. RICH. No, sir, if you had 17 full time classroom teachers teaching where races are in a minority on the faculty, you can say, only 13 of the schools, so that there would be 2 or maybe 3 teachers in some of the schools. Then this would be acceptable. This would accomplish most of the purpose that the Commissioner is looking for, and perhaps in some way, as I have pointed out before, we are not talking about total desegregation where every teacher is in the same boat, still, there are advantages in gaining assurances of teachers that they will, either voluntarily, or after a time, teach in a school where there are races of the minority. There would be two or maybe three teachers who would be in the minority racially in that particular school.

Mr. PARKER. Assign them against their will?

Mr. RICH. Well, sir, first of all, let me ask—the contracts of the teachers are with the Board of Education, are they not?

Mr. PARKER. Yes, sir.

Mr. RICH. They are not with a particular school, they are with the Board?

Mr. PATRICK. They have my agreement. But teachers became wise this Spring, and they have from the Superintendent his promise that he will place them as of September in a given school. I have lost about 14 teachers—short at the present time. I have missed getting several fine prospective teachers, white teachers, because I tried to assign them to negro schools as they came in. Two young gentlemen that the Board authorized me to double their local supplements to teach shop at the negro school, which would have given them almost double salary, and they saw that salary and they said, "Yes, sir, we will do it". And the next day they came in and handed me their contracts and said, "Now, we will either stay where we are, or you can have these". And we have two weeks notice in our contract. I have lost teachers, we have tried to assign teachers. We have tried to find teachers to go over voluntarily, and the attitude of the teachers is, "We don't have to have this job". But the boys and girls in Spalding County need teachers.

Mr. RICH. We would certainly agree with that, sir, and we would not want to have the school system faced with a shortage of teachers.

Mr. PATRICK. My shortage is with negro teachers, also. And if I am unable to place my white teachers in negro schools, is it fair to leave the little negro children without a teacher and put that teacher over in a white school?

Mr. PARKER. We are talking about the practicability of this thing, now, and if we do some faculty desegregation more than what we have done, it has got to be related to the practical matters of finding the school teachers. Go on to your next recommendation.

Mr. RICH. Yes, sir. Well, going along with this, we would ask that the Board which always does have the responsibility of making assignments regardless of whether it makes it to the school where the teacher has been teaching before, or to a new school, as an example,—and I might point out that,—let's start with your freedom of choice plan that you had 1,000 students choosing schools that they had not formerly attended, say, they were negro students choosing formerly white schools, they might be white students who decided they would like to go to school on the other end of town. Then you would have had to transfer a significant number of teachers from their usual positions to some other position, to a school that they hadn't taught at formerly, and we can liken this in this situation. Now, so far as the practicalities are concerned, we

would ask that if it became necessary that the Board assign a teacher, obviously the Board can not force a teacher to teach in a school, the teacher can always resign the position. But, it is the responsibility of all of us to comply with the law, and complying with the law is to comply with the guidelines, and the guidelines do require significant progress and a substantial beginning in desegregation of the faculty, and this has not been achieved at this time. Let me ask you, sir, have you spoken, or has the principal spoken to the teachers individually, or in two's or three's?

Mr. PATRICK. I have talked to,—I have asked various members of my faculty to help me locate people who were of a liberal attitude toward this matter, and I have gone to these individuals and talked to them. And they are frank to give me, "No, sir, if you demand it of me, you can have my contract". I actually have one situation where I can't even assign a white teacher from one white school to transfer to another white school. They feel so strongly and they are so independent, and they will tell you frankly that "We don't have to teach. We are teaching because we feel that the children need us, and we know that you have a problem." But I would say that better than 50% of our teachers are local housewives. Judge Cumming that was speaking to you earlier, his wife is a teacher, for instance, he is worth enough that she would never have to even get out of bed, somebody could take care of her and completely feed her, and everything in bed. But she feels that she is needed. If I told her she would have to go over there and teach music at the school, she would tell you, "Thank you, Mr. Patrick, here is your contract."

Mr. RICH. How many teachers do you have in the system?

Mr. PATRICK. I will have 380, I will have a little better than 400 if Title I continues, so I can't answer that.

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Rich, let me put it this way. We will do everything possible to make reasonable progress on this score. Some can be done, possibly some more than what has been done already, but we have got to open these schools with a teacher in every classroom, if at all humanly possible. Now, this is just the practical matter of it. We will do the best we can on this score. Let's go on to the next item.

Mr. RICH. Well, sir, the point is that the Commissioner does have some requirements, and what we are talking about is maybe 4% of the teachers you would ask to make this move. We know from our own experience, having talked to teachers that some of them have said that if the superintendent, or even the principal, came and said to them, "Will you teach in a school where you would be in the minority racially" that they would say "no," they didn't want to be a trail blazer. They didn't want to stick their necks out. But that if they were assigned to cross racial lines, or teach across racial lines, to teach where their race would be in the minority, that they would be happy, and certainly willing, to accept that assignment. And we would ask that you, obviously, do not select someone who has stated—that obviously do not have to teach—and has stated their opposition to this kind of position. But we think that it would be normal for most teachers to not want to—just as Mr. Perlman pointed out earlier, the very individual who is in a bad position to make this move being the one who is asked to change the status quo, so, with teachers there is a reluctance. And we would ask that you, we would advise, and this is certainly up to you as to which teacher you would assign, but it would seem that the teacher who was dedicated to education above all would look on this as an educational challenge and would be willing to accept the assignment.

Mr. PARKER. I will repeat what I said before. We are going to do everything we can to go along in this area, and if we get 6 or 8 volunteers, we will be mighty fortunate. We may get as many as 8, Mr. Patrick, before this mess ever came along, before the guidelines ever—

Mr. PATRICK (interposing). These people that are teaching are not teaching white and negro schools, the white teacher teaching altogether in negro schools, but she—

Mr. PARKER (interposing). Moves to several schools.

Mr. RICH. I understand, sir.

Mr. PARKER. All right. We will do the best we can on this score. Let's go on to the next one.

Mr. CHRISTIE. If you had one math teacher that wanted, I mean, that would go to a colored school, and you are three math teachers short, and you can't find any math teachers, what would you do with the 150 students you had? That's the question I would like to ask.

Mr. PERLMAN. In this situation, sir, would there be a math teacher in the negro school?

Mr. CHRISTIE. We have got three—we are short three already.

Mr. PERLMAN. You would still be short, if you got a negro teaching in a negro school.

Mr. PATRICK. We were talking about that she was in an automobile wreck yesterday, Mr. Christie and I were talking about it, and the negro teacher was in an automobile wreck yesterday, and she will be out until about November. And, therefore, Mr. Daniel is frantic for a teacher, also.

Mr. PERLMAN. I thought we were just talking in the abstract.

Mr. PARKER. Can't we be frank about just one point and say we will do the best we can about it, and I think we can pretty well get some reasonableness about that, and go on to the next point.

Mr. RICH. Well, I think that is the only other point. But I do think that the Commissioner has set some sort of requirements. He certainly will listen to whatever recommendations, whatever the Board states is the further action that it will take. But as Mr. Patrick has pointed out, the school year is about to begin, and it is not likely that many more changes will occur, and as to the satisfying of the Commissioner's expectations and the over-all picture so far as this district is concerned, they have fallen short in both of the major phases and he is faced with a situation where it's expected that the situation will be resolved for the coming year. We are faced with a situation where it doesn't look like it is going to be, and so far as we know, I mean, the steps haven't been taken whereby the teachers have been assigned, and where they have been faced with a situation of teaching or not teaching.

G. W. PATRICK,
Superintendent, Griffin-Spalding County Schools.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 7th day of December, 1966.

J. C. WEBB,
Notary Public.

My Commission Expires Mar. 6, 1970.

(The following excerpts are taken from the official records of the Meeting of the Griffin-Spalding County Board of Education on August 11, 1966, referred to on page 1 of Exhibit "A".)

EXHIBIT "I": BY-PASSING LOCAL SCHOOL OFFICIALS, ETC.

Mr. PERLMAN. My only purpose in coming into the community is to find out the reasons that negro students have chosen or not chosen to attend a white school. And I only think once did I have to make it clear to somebody that I was not there to suggest which school he was going to attend. I was only there for the purpose to see the particular reasons why the number of students who chose to attend the former—the number was not higher or lower—so we can make a suggestion to the Board when we met with it. Now, in this particular—well, I would not be the person who was in Griffin-Spalding—I have been in neighboring communities. But there were members of our team talking to members of the community, and the only purpose is to see if this is the type of community where this additional transfer period would be advisable in the community, the reasons why negro students have failed to choose a white school would make it such that this would not be the advisable recommendation. In this case where you have a community where negro students don't want to be the trail blazers, which is a perfectly human trait, we feel this type of plan, this amendment, is perfectly adapted to this type of situation.

Mr. PARKER. I pointed out briefly in my opening statement that I made, some of the things that we have done about talking to our white and negro leaders. We had this room full of negro leaders before this thing was ever started, telling them what we proposed to do, asking their suggestions and their help and support. And we have had it. And I pointed out, also, in this statement, we had not the first incident of any kind whatsoever when we put 60 some odd negro students in white schools for the first time. Not the first incident did we have. Now, I have had literally hundreds of negro and white people to come to my office and tell me about how the thing was handled in this county, and

how proud they were of the fact that it was proven. It was a community concerted effort that this thing could be done in an orderly fashion, and that we are just boiling mad that we get penalized for the tremendous effort that we put on it, when we should have,—the many hours that we put on it, when we could better have been doing something else we would have been paid for, and then to have somebody 'way off at a distance try to penalize us for saying that we hadn't made an honest effort, we hadn't made enough progress,—we don't like it.

G. W. PATRICK,
Superintendent, Griffin-Spalding County Schools.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 7th day of December, 1966.

J. C. WEBB,
Notary Public, Georgia, State at Large.

My Commission Expires Mar. 6, 1970.

EXHIBIT "J": CLOSED MEETINGS, ETC.

Mr. E. M. Rountree, County School Superintendent, Telfair County opened meeting by introducing Board Members and presented the following people:

Dr. Frank Mann, Chairman of Board
Mr. Barclay Williams, Board Member
Mr. Rob Stanley, Board Member
Mr. Z. T. Wooten, Board Member
Mr. Billy Walker, Board Attorney
Mr. Joe Smith, Principal of Telfair County High School
Mr. Marvin Dixon, Coordinator, Title I, Telfair Co. Board of Ed.
Mr. Howard Purdue, Foreman of Grand Jury presently in session
Mr. Jeff Smith, Past president, McRae-Helena PTA
Mr. Foster Poore, President, McRae-Helena PTA
Mr. Dave Billings, President, Roydon Wear, Past president PTA
Mr. Murphy McRae, President, Chamber of Commerce

Mr. Rountree—"We had a two hour discussion with these people Tuesday afternoon, July 26, 1966, and they had two major points they wish to present to us. They went through the ramifications of the guidelines and meaning of it, so I'll turn the meeting over to them to discuss it, and we will begin questioning."

Mr. Hazel—"Mr. Rountree do you feel sir that in a business like this we are discussing the school boards problems and situations that we should have people here that are not members of the board."

Mr. Rountree—"Board meetings are always wide open Mr. Hazel by law, and we wanted some of our patrons to know what we are facing because this matter has to be brought to the public, and these people represent various organizations and this is not what we call an open meeting at all."

Mr. Rich—"I believe I called you earlier and talked to Mr. Dixon and made it clear that since we expected to get down to brass tacks that we did not expect any members of the press or members of the public to be present, and I think we made our position clear the other evening."

Mr. Rountree—"That we would not have press representatives".

Mr. Rich—"And members of the public and we stated that pretty clearly the other day, I thought."

Mr. Rountree—"You just don't want the public to know what we are required to do?"

Mr. Rich—"No, I think we made it clear that you could certainly speak to members of the public afterwards, but we felt a meeting itself should remain confidential, because when we are discussing these matters, we are supposed to keep it between the board and us."

Mr. Rountree—"Mr. Rich, since it is your word against mine and you tried to prove me out a lie about what Mr. Kruger said—I think we need somebody to uphold and support us; Mr. Barclay Williams, what did Mr. Kruger say about a faculty member who refused to transfer?"

Mr. Williams—"He said, fire him."

Mr. Rountree—"Mr. Rich, you said he didn't say it, didn't you?"

Mr. Rich—"I said I didn't believe he said it—I don't think we need to get on that."

Mr. Rountree—"Since you think I was lying about it, I think we need some kind of support because you don't have any confidence in me."

Mr. Rich—"Well sir, what we are talking about here is we are certainly happy to meet with you and your board, and that's what we said the other day, and with school officials of the school system, but we are not authorized to discuss this sort of business with the members of the public at large, and we feel that this is an advantage to you as well as to us, plus the fact that of course, as we made it clear, we don't expect this tape recording to go outside the school officials, but we also made it clear that you certainly could talk to the newspapers, and tell them what you wanted to and we didn't restrict you. We restricted ourselves, and we discussed this about half an hour the other day, and called you up to remind you."

Mr. Rountree—"We told you we were recording this for our own purposes, and we were not going to release it to the press."

Mr. Billy Walker—"Mr. Rountree has just not invited people at random off the streets for the sake of having someone here, only people whom he feels should be here—he has a position as other members of the Board of Education, quite responsible, and they need the support of the community and county, otherwise their programs are hopeless; they cannot achieve their purposes and it is quite difficult to tell the people of this county and McRae and this school system that we must do this in order to comply with this or that. On the other hand, we have a group of people here who hold positions in other organizations that will be interested in issues that will come up here. It makes it somewhat easier to them; they are not trying to shift the burden, but they are trying to get in position whereby they can substantiate whatever position they must take at the conference. Mr. Rountree is not trying to deter you in any way, but this is aid to the purpose. That's the whole matter."

Mr. Purdue, Foreman of Grand Jury in session at this time stated that they had statutes to support their stand on not opening Grand Jury discussions to the public, and asked Mr. Rich if he had such statutes to support his position.

Mr. Rich—"Yes sir, there is something in the guidelines, and there may be."

Mr. Purdue—"In the what?"

Mr. Rich—"The guidelines."

Mr. Purdue—"I said in the law"

Mr. Rich—"That is part of the law"—"these were issued under the Civil Rights Act 1964"—"These require that certain matters remain confidential."

Mr. Walker—"Mr. Rich, you can't very well accomplish your purpose by holding confidential those matters you seek to promote here. The public must know about it."

Mr. Rich—"We do not feel that we have been directed to make these matters public on our side."

Mr. Williams—"We cannot keep these matters we are going to discuss here tonight confidential under no conditions."

Mr. Rich—"We cannot state them to the public—you can go out and talk to the public afterwards."

Mr. Williams—"The Board of Education has nothing to hide."

Mr. Rich—"I'm sorry, our director and directive of the guidelines, which are part of the law, and therefore we try to avoid a discussion such as we are in before the group."

Mr. Rountree—"Does your director say that when you come down in a community that you are to contact only the Negro patrons, and not the white patrons?" "Does your director tell you that?" "To visit only the colored schools and not the white schools." Did you contact anybody except the colored people?" "Monday when you came into our community, did you contact any white people or white patrons?" "The other day you said you didn't."

Mr. Rich—"White patrons—what do you mean?"

Mr. Rountree—"Citizens, the people in the county."

Mr. Rich—"Other than school officials?"

Mr. Rountree—"Anybody, did you contact any white people Monday when you were visiting around."

Mr. Rich—"We called you ahead of time."

Mr. Rountree—"I'm talking about Monday."

Mr. Rich—"No, we didn't but we notified you we were coming down."

Mr. Walker—"I cannot to save me understand how you can take position that anything could be more public by nature than a matter that concerns the public schools. How could it be.—"These people aren't here to criticize you or to make

an assault upon you, they are here simply to gain for themselves information, that we wish for them to have, which is to understand your purpose in being here." "They are not here to criticize, they are not here to quiz, you are not going to be subjected to any ridicule." "Now, if we had planned some sort of meeting whereby you would have been brought in here to be humiliated by some method—that would be a different matter, but all these people hold some responsible position, and they are people that the Board of Education needs the support of." "You say that after you leave here that we can discuss the matters with the public, now, you justify your position."

Mr. Rich—"We do not expect to work out problems with the public." "Our deliberations on this matter are to remain from the community."

Mr. Walker—"Will you discuss those general sections of the guidelines which are at issue here without any particular applicability, and then subsequently perhaps they could leave and then you could discuss particular problems with our school officials in detail."

Mr. Rich—"No, we are not authorized to do that—and furthermore the actual deliberations, we are not allowed to conduct in public."

Mr. Walker—"We might as well get down to the blunt question." "Will you or will you not meet with the people who are here, and if you will not, the Board of Education will meet with you without them."

Mr. Hazel—"We are prohibited from meeting with the public to discuss the affairs of the school district."

At this point the gentlemen not directly connected with the school board withdrew from the meeting.

I certify that the above statements are verbatim excerpts taken from taped record of the meeting on Friday night, July 29, 1966 in the Grand Jury room of the Telfair County Courthouse with representatives of the Office of Education, James H. Rich, Civil Rights Advisory Specialist; Marion W. Hazel, Program Specialist; William Hermelin, Program Specialist, and a negro woman not identified, and members of the Telfair County Board of Education, the County Attorney, the County School Superintendent, and others included in introduction.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 1st day of December, 1966.

BONNIE S. TUCKER,
Notary Public.

EXHIBIT "K": INTIMIDATION

NEWNAN, GA.,
October 13, 1966.

Mr. JACK ACREE,
Georgia School Boards Association,
Biltmore Hotel Arcade,
Atlanta, Ga.

DEAR JACK: The following statement was made by Mr. James Rich, a representative of the U.S. Department of Education, to Newnan Board of Education on August 13, 1966.

The problem concerned the placement of white and colored teachers in schools of the opposite race. Mr. Rich was informed that the Newnan Board of Education had asked for volunteers and received none. Also that the teachers had threatened to resign if they were assigned to schools of the opposite race. Mr. Rich was asked for a solution to the problem. A summary of his suggestion was as follows:

"The teachers are under contract to the Newnan Board of Education and should teach wherever they are assigned. Assignment being the prerogative of the board as the employer. Furthermore, if such teachers resigned because of such assignment, they should be blacklisted and kept from securing jobs with other systems since teachers with such little dedication to the profession should be driven from the profession and not allowed to teach."

JAMES A. BEAVERS, Jr.,
Member, Newnan Board of Education.

This is to certify that the above statement to the best of my knowledge is true and accurate.

JAMES A. BEAVERS, Jr.

Attest:

EDWARD F. ADDISON,
Notary Public (Seal).

EXHIBIT "L": ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICES

HENRY COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION,
McDonough, Ga., November 30, 1966.

Mr. JACK ACREE,
*Executive Secretary, Georgia School Board Association,
Atlanta Biltmore Arcade, Atlanta, Ga.*

DEAR JACK: I am enclosing three (3) copies of The Henry County Weekly of Thursday, August 18, 1966. If I can locate any more copies I will mail them to you.

I would like to explain to you about the letter to Mr. Harold Howe II from the Henry County Board of Education. This letter was dated August 16, 1966. I received an answer to this letter which was dated September 29, 1966 and was received in my office on October 5, 1966. I am enclosing a copy of this letter.

I had been informed through the State Department of Education that Henry County had been put on the deferred list for Federal funds. I was never officially notified when our funds were released. I talked to a member of the State Department of Education staff and was informed that Henry County had been taken off the deferred list about September 12, 1966.

Very truly yours,

CHARLES A. WAITS, JR.,
Superintendent, Henry County Schools.

GEORGIA, *Henry County:*

I, Charles A. Waits, Jr., Superintendent Henry County Schools, hereby certify and affirm that the facts stated in above letter are true and accurate to the best of my knowledge.

CHARLES A. WAITS, JR.,
Superintendent, Henry County Schools.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 30th day of November 1966.

LUCILE ROWAN,
Notary Public.

EXHIBIT "M": ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICES

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
OFFICE OF EDUCATION,
Washington, D. C., July 14, 1966.

DR. PAUL D. WEST, *Superintendent, Fulton County Schools, 500 Fulton County
Administration Building, Atlanta, Georgia.*

DEAR DR. WEST: The report of anticipated student enrollment for the 1966-67 school year submitted by you for the Fulton County School System has been received by this Office. A review of this report indicates that the anticipated enrollment for 1966-67 of Negro students in previously all-white schools falls substantially short of the increased enrollment expected for your free choice plan to be considered effective in eliminating the dual school structure.

You have reported that in the 1965-66 school year, 13 of your 4,329 Negro students (0.3%) attended school on a desegregated basis and that for the 1966-67 school year you expect that only 63 of 4,619 Negro students (1.3%) will attend school on a desegregated basis. All of the white students are attending schools originally established for white students only. We do not believe that your desegregation plan, as it has operated thus far, can reasonably be considered adequate to accomplish the purpose of the Civil Rights Act. As such, under the Departmental Regulation, the plan would no longer provide a basis for continued participation in Federally assisted programs, unless the lack of adequate progress can be remedied.

As you know, the *Revised Statement of Policies for School Desegregation Plans Under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964* makes the assumption that a voluntary desegregation plan based on freedom of choice can be a viable means in the initial stages of desegregation. The *Revised Statement of Policies*, in Section 181.54, also indicates, however, that if such a plan is used, it must operate fairly and effectively, and that "The single most substantial indication as to whether a free choice plan is actually working to eliminate the dual school structure is the extent to which Negro or other minority group students have in fact transferred from segregated schools."

The *Revised Statement of Policies* also indicates certain criteria (Sec. 181.54) which will guide the Commissioner of Education in scheduling free choice plans for review due to a lack of effectiveness. These criteria (Sec. 181.54) indicate the approximate number of Negro students that should transfer from segregated schools for the 1966-67 school year if your free choice plan is to be determined as adequate with respect to student desegregation.

Before any full compliance review is conducted by this Office, however, there are additional steps which the school system itself may take to increase the effectiveness of its free choice plan without abandoning the results obtained by previous efforts. Such additional steps may include the reopening of the free choice period (although if your community does not give the free choice plan more support in the future than it apparently has in the past, giving students and their parents a further opportunity to make a choice of schools would probably be a futile gesture), meetings with parents and civic groups, further arrangements with State or local officials to limit opportunities for intimidation, and other further community preparation. Another method which may be utilized is the amending of the desegregation plan presently in use to include a provision for minority transfer. This type of provision, already applicable to geographic zoning plans, specifies that:

"A school system may (1) permit any student to transfer from a school where students of his race are a majority to any other school, within the system, where students of his race are a minority, or (2) assign students on such a basis." (Section 181.33(b))

If the school system proposes to assign students, the criteria for assignment must be approved by the Commissioner of Education in advance of such assignment.

Since the identifiability of schools as being intended for students of a particular race, because of staffing practices such that teachers of a particular race concentrated in those schools where all, or a majority, of the students are of that race, most certainly has an effect on free choice, further faculty and staff desegregation beyond the minimum required by the *Revised Statement of Policies* might be a most practical means of achieving additional student desegregation. Should the Commissioner conclude that a free choice plan is not operating fairly, or is not effective to meet constitutional and statutory requirements, he will require substantial further changes in staffing patterns to eliminate such identifiability, in addition to such others steps as he may require to further desegregation.

In addition, Section 181.11 of the *Revised Statement of Policies* describes other types of desegregation plans that a school system might implement in order to carry out its responsibility to eliminate the dual school system and all other forms of discrimination as expeditiously as possible. Other plans which may be acceptable include the closing of schools which were established for children of one race, and assigning all teachers and students to desegregated schools, the reorganization of grade structures so that schools are fully utilized, on a desegregated basis, although each school contains fewer grades, or the establishment of non-racial attendance zones. If the Commissioner concludes that further steps taken under a free choice plan have failed to remedy the defects in the existing free choice plan, he may require the adoption of a different type of desegregation plan, such as those described above.

Please inform us within the next 10 (ten) days of additional steps which you feel may be profitably undertaken in your school district. Measures voluntarily taken now which produce a significant increase in minority transfers may make further review of the operation of your district's plan for 1966-67 unnecessary. If any administrative procedure of the types suggested, or others, would modify your existing desegregation plan, as amended by the 1966 *Revised Statement of Policies*, approval as a plan amendment should be secured from the Commissioner of Education before the procedure is implemented. My staff is prepared to assist you in any way we can, so please do not hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely yours,

W. STANLEY KRUGER,
Director, Area II (Ga., Fla., S.C.),
Equal Educational Opportunities Program.

EXHIBIT "N": ARBITRARY JUDGMENTS RE PUPIL TRANSFERS

RECOMMENDED AMENDED PLAN FOR TELFAIR COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION FOR THE 1966-67 SCHOOL YEAR

I. STUDENTS

1) All Negro and white first grade students of the two Milan Elementary Schools (one Negro and one white) shall attend classes together.

All second grade students of the two Milan Elementary Schools shall attend classes together.

2) All white and Negro first and second grade students at the two Lumber City Elementary Schools shall attend class together.

3) All white and Negro first and second grade students at Central Elementary and at Telfair County Elementary Schools shall attend classes together.

In all of these cases, there will be total desegregation of each and every classroom.

II. FACULTY

1) There shall be a total of at least nine teachers teaching in schools where their race is in the minority in the schools mentioned above, with no more than four (if only nine switch) teachers crossing racial lines in any one of the schools.

2) All of these teachers must be full-time classroom teachers.

3) At least four of these must be white teachers, teaching in a Negro school.

4) The assignment of teams of teachers is suggested.

III. TRANSPORTATION

As the guidelines state, all students will be provided with transportation to the nearest formerly white or Negro school, whichever they have chosen to attend or whichever school they are assigned to under this recommended amended plan.

1) Monitors will be provided to see that students are permitted to wait for buses (wherever necessary because the student(s) rides more than one bus) within local business establishments at the pick-up points, and that no incidents occur on the buses.

2) Where buses pass by a student's house and his school, they will pick him up and drop him at the school, at an entrance to the school.

This plan is a package plan, with the approval by the Board of all parts necessary for recommendation to the Commissioner of Education.

The Office of Education stands ready to offer further assistance wherever it can on any matters pertaining to the operation of the Telfair County desegregation plan, and hopes that voluntary compliance will be achieved.

EXHIBIT "O": ARBITRARY JUDGEMENTS RE PUPIL TRANSFERS

RECOMMENDED AMENDED DESEGREGATION PLAN FOR THE HENRY COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION FOR THE SCHOOL YEAR 1966-67

Students: All 1st and 2nd grade students residing in the McDonough area shall attend the Henry County Training School. All 3rd grade students in this area shall attend the McDonough Elementary School. All 1st and 2nd grade students residing in the Stockbridge area shall attend the Stockbridge Elementary School. All 3rd grade elementary school children in this area shall attend the Smith-Barnes Elementary School. All students who reside in the Hampton area in the 1st grade shall attend the Hampton Rosenwald School. All students in this area in the 2nd and 3rd grade shall attend the Hampton Elementary School.

In each case, all 3 grades are interchangeable, that is, 1st & 3rd or 2nd and 3rd may be substituted for 1st and 2nd grade. All other choices shall be honored.

Faculty: There shall be at least 11 teachers, full-time classroom teachers at one school, with at least one in each of the 8 schools in McDonough, Stockbridge, and Hampton.

The Board is asked to submit whatever proposal it adopts to the Commissioner, who will make the final determination of the acceptability of the Henry County plan.

August 12, 1966.

/s/ JAMES H. RICH.

EXHIBIT "P": ARBITRARY JUDGMENTS RE PUPIL TRANSFERS

SUGGESTED AMENDED DESEGREGATION PLAN FOR THE JONES COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION FOR THE SCHOOL YEAR 1966-67

Students: A. All first & second grades will be zoned, that is, geographic zones will be established around all the elementary schools in the district for the first & second grades.

B. All first grade students residing in the Gray area shall attend the Maggie Califf School. (All those students may attend the Jones County Elementary School instead.) All second grade students residing in the Gray area shall attend the Jones County Elementary School (all these students may attend the Maggie Califf School instead).

C. Whichever of those alternatives is adopted, all other choices shall be honored.

Faculty: Either there shall be at least one full-time classroom teacher teaching in a single school & in which he is of the minority race in the faculty of that school in each of the schools in the system or the same number of teachers shall be teaching in at least four of the schools in the system. (Each teacher shall teach full-time in one school only.)

JAMES H. RICH.

August 12, 1966.

Mrs. GREEN. May I call on Mr. Brewer, from the Tennessee School Boards Association.

**STATEMENT OF JULIAN BREWER, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY,
TENNESSEE SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATION**

Mr. BREWER. Madam Chairman, members of the subcommittee, we are pleased to have the opportunity to make a presentation of our views on Federal administration of various acts.

I will not read all of my statement, in view of your crowded schedule.

Resolutions of prior years by the Tennessee School Boards Association advocated broad Federal support for education, without Federal control. This was also the accepted goal of the various educational professional organizations in the State of Tennessee.

Furthermore, the accepted goal was that this type of general support should be on an equalizing basis; that is, greater amounts of Federal support per pupil should go to States of low wealth, similar to many State aid or foundation programs.

The dissatisfaction with the various categorical grants of recent years prompted school board members in Tennessee to approve resolutions expressing concern and disagreement with recent Federal legislation.

Excerpts from resolutions passed by the most recent convention of the Tennessee School Boards Association indicate the following points of view:

1. That future Federal legislation affecting either elementary or secondary schools should be enacted only after considerable consultation with local and State boards, superintendents, and their selected personnel.

2. That the U.S. Congress and the U.S. Office of Education be urged to consult with local and State boards and their administrators in adopting guidelines for implementation of existing legislation.

3. That categorical aid programs are a threat to the control of education at the State and local level.

Categorical aid programs are fragmented and piecemeal in nature. Most categorical programs do not reflect priorities determined at the local and State level: That it would be desirable to reexamine the present types of categorical grants and work toward changing Federal policy to provide a general type of aid to be distributed through the State departments of education in accordance with a State foundation plan developed by local boards, administrators, and State departments and approved by the U.S. Office of Education.

4. That Federal funds should flow from the U.S. Office of Education to State departments to local education agencies.

5. That leadership be provided for the encouragement of further study of the proper roles of the local, State, and Federal Government in public education.

6. That at least equal weight be given to educational excellence, as well as the promotion of socioeconomic goals and ideals.

7. That it would be desirable to know that various guidelines prepared by Federal agencies are in keeping with the intent of the Congress.

8. That provisions be included to provide for judicial review of legislation.

These concerns were also expressed by consensus statements developed in table discussions in a series of nine conferences held jointly by the Tennessee Education Association, the Congress of Parents and Teachers, and the Tennessee School Boards Association.

The debate and discussion on the control of education has stimulated considerable evaluation of local and State efforts in meeting responsibilities for education. Most are willing to admit that we have not measured up to our educational responsibilities in many areas, for various reasons, such as lack of finances, lack of understanding, unwillingness to deal with issues, and other reasons. This, no doubt, is a worthwhile outcome of the debate.

Most educators in Tennessee now accept the fact that Federal involvement in education, at all levels, is here to stay, and that it is likely to increase; if so, other questions quickly follow.

What will be the nature of the involvement, and how is it to be managed?

Is there anyone to speak for the States as a whole?

Does the Federal Government speak with one voice?

In general, how is the partnership to be implemented?

Partners are supposed to have intimate and constant communication, and each is to have influence upon the other. It appears to many that where previous programs were organized to provide fiscal support for programs determined in the States, we are now engaged in programs written in Washington and determined to be good for the States.

The Headstart program is an example of this. The point is not whether the program is good or bad, but that it was not determined or recommended by the States.

This indicates a trend, if continued, of Federal establishment of programs within the States, rather than Federal support for the States' programs.

This trend toward program writing in Washington should be reversed. Federal involvement should be largely financial, in support of State plans made in States independently, and these plans should be controlled by the Federal Government only within broad policy objectives.

The States would become true partners in the enterprise, not applicants for participation in new programs about which they were not consulted.

A Tennessee superintendent recently stated:

Categorical aid may have been necessary in the beginning to by-pass the historical roadblocks of church-school and segregation issues. Is there a chance that this type of aid may continue because the philosophy of those who initiate legislation deem it desirable?

Perhaps too many are naively assuming a happy marriage between Federal assistance and local administration of the money made available. Just as marriage has been defined as a compromise, the compromise intelligence makes with nature, perhaps with Federal aid we made a compromise between what was urgent and what was important.

On the question of philosophy, the U.S. Commissioner of Education, Harold Howe II, who, in a publication entitled "Education 1965: A Report to the Profession," said:

The 88th and 89th Congresses, responding to the desires of the people, enacted laws enabling the Federal Government to take its place in the local-State-national educational partnership—toward this end, the Congress has enacted 24 major pieces of education legislation in the past three years. These new laws are channels through which billions of Federal tax dollars will go into our elementary schools, vocational schools, colleges, and universities.

But this money is not simply handed out in the pious hope that it will be put to good use. Each of the education laws is quite specific. Categories and conditions of aid have been established to insure that these funds are spent in an efficient and prudent manner.

Dr. Eric Lindman, writing in the September issue of the *School Administrator*, states that:

This new federalism in education rests upon four rather clear premises:

First, it assumes that State and local school leaders, including State legislators and local boards of education, will not spend Federal funds prudently and in the national interest without specific Federal direction.

Second, it assumes that a series of Federal categorical aids for selected services or programs, with accompanying guidelines, audits, and reports, will result in better local school management.

Third, it assumes that public schools throughout the nation have uniform strengths and weaknesses which can be remedied by categorical aids applied uniformly throughout the nation.

Fourth, it assumes that State and local tax sources will provide in the remaining 90 percent of the school budget the funds needed to improve existing programs and services.

These conflicts suggest a reexamination. For this examination, each partner should look at the problem through the eyes of the other partner. Perhaps, if this were achieved, the word "improvement" would become more significant than the word "innovation," and elementary and secondary aid to give every child the opportunity to develop according to his potential would become a reality.

I have some additional statements, and two or three letters from one particular board of education, which I won't read at this time, in the

interest of others that want to speak, which are self-explanatory, I think, in my prepared statement.

(Mr. Brewer's prepared statement follows:)

STATEMENT OF JULIAN BREWER, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, TENNESSEE SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATION

Resolutions of prior years by the Tennessee School Boards Association advocated broad federal support for education without federal control. This was also the accepted goal of the various educational professional organizations in the State of Tennessee. Furthermore, the accepted goal was that this type of general support should be on an equalizing basis, that is, greater amounts of federal support per pupil should go to states of low wealth, similar to many state-aid or foundation programs.

The dissatisfaction with the various categorical grants of recent years prompted school board members in Tennessee to approve resolutions expressing concern and disagreement with recent federal legislation. Excerpts from resolutions passed by the most recent convention of the Tennessee School Boards Association indicate the following points of view:

1. That future federal legislation affecting either elementary or secondary schools should be enacted only after considerable consultation with local and state boards, superintendents, and their selected personnel.
2. That the United States Congress and the United States Office of Education be urged to consult with local and state boards and their administrators in adopting guidelines for implementation of existing legislation.
3. That categorical aid programs are a threat to the control of education at the state and local level;

Categorical aid programs are fragmented and piecemeal in nature. Most categorical programs do not reflect priorities determined at the local and state level: That it would be desirable to re-examine the present types of categorical grants and work toward changing federal policy to provide a general type of aid to be distributed through the State Departments of Education in accordance with a state foundation plan developed by local boards, administrators, and state departments and approved by the U.S. Office of Education.

4. That federal funds should flow from the U.S. Office of Education to state departments to local education agencies.

5. That leadership be provided for the encouragement of further study of the proper roles of the local, state, and federal government in public education.

6. That at least equal weight be given to educational excellence, as well as the promotion of socio-economic goals and ideals.

7. That it would be desirable to know that various guidelines prepared by federal agencies are in keeping with the intent of the Congress.

8. That provisions be included to provide for judicial review of legislation.

These concerns were also expressed by consensus statements developed in table discussions in a series of nine conferences held jointly by the Tennessee Education Association, the Congress of Parents and Teachers, and the Tennessee School Boards Association.

The debate and discussion on the control of education has stimulated considerable evaluation of local and state efforts in meeting responsibilities for education. Most are willing to admit that we have not measured up to our educational responsibilities in many areas for various reasons such as lack of finances, lack of understanding, unwillingness to deal with issues, and other reasons. This, no doubt, is a worthwhile outcome of the debate.

Most educators in Tennessee now accept the fact that federal involvement in education, at all levels, is here to stay and that it is likely to increase, if so, other questions quickly follow.

What will be the nature of the involvement and how is it to be managed?

Is there anyone to speak for the states as a whole?

Does the federal government speak with one voice?

In general, how is the partnership to be implemented?

Partners are supposed to have intimate and constant communications and each is to have influence upon the other. It appears to many that where previous programs were organized to provide fiscal support for programs determined in the

states, we are now engaged in programs written in Washington and determined to be good for the states. The Head Start Program is an example of this, the point is not whether the program is good or bad, but that it was not determined or recommended by the states. This indicates a trend, if continued, of federal establishment of programs within the states rather than federal support for the state's program. This trend toward program writing in Washington should be reversed, federal involvement should be largely financial, in support of state plans made in states independently, and these plans should be controlled by the federal government only within broad policy objectives. The states would become true partners in the enterprise, not applicants for participation in new programs about which they were not consulted.

A Tennessee superintendent recently stated—"Categorical Aid may have been necessary in the beginning to by-pass the historical roadblocks of church-school and segregation issues. Is there a chance that this type of aid may continue because the philosophy of those who initiate legislation deem it desirable?

"Perhaps too many are naively assuming a happy marriage between federal assistance and local administration of the money made available. Just as marriage has been defined as a compromise, the compromise intelligence makes with nature, perhaps with federal aid we made a compromise between what was urgent and what was important."

On the question of philosophy, the U.S. Commissioner of Education, Harold Howe II, who, in a publication entitled *Education 1965: A Report to the Profession*, said:

"The 88th and 89th Congresses, responding to the desires of the people, enacted laws enabling the federal government to take its place in the local-state-national educational partnership—toward this end, the Congress has enacted 24 major pieces of education legislation in the past 3 years. These new laws are channels through which billions of federal tax dollars will go into our elementary schools, vocational schools, colleges and universities.

"But this money is not simply handed out in the pious hope that it will be put to good use. Each of the education laws is quite specific. Categories and conditions of aid have been established to insure that these funds are spent in an efficient and prudent manner."

Dr. Eric Lindman, writing in the September issue of the *School Administrator*, states that—"this new federalism in education rests upon four rather clear premises:

"First, it assumes that state and local school leaders, including state legislators and local boards of education, will not spend federal funds prudently and in the national interest without specific federal direction.

"Second, it assumes that a series of federal categorical aids for selected services or programs, with accompanying guidelines, audits, and reports, will result in better local school management.

"Third, it assumes that public schools throughout the nation have uniform strengths and weaknesses which can be remedied by categorical aids applied uniformly throughout the nation.

"Fourth, it assumes that state and local tax sources will provide in the remaining 90 per cent of the school budget of the funds needed to improve existing programs and services."

These conflicts suggest a re-examination. For this examination, each partner should look at the problem through the eyes of the other partner. Perhaps, if this were achieved, the word "improvement" would become more significant than the word "innovation, and elementary and secondary aid to give every child the opportunity to develop according to his potential would become a reality.

In conclusion, I would like to make a few general statements pertaining to the administration of various federal programs and the U.S. Office Guidelines for complying with the Civil Rights Act.

It would be helpful if we could have some idea of funds available at the time budgets are being prepared for presentation to Boards of Education. It is rather difficult to recommend a desirable intelligent program in April which is going to make use of an undetermined amount of money which may be available in August.

Fiscal years of the federal government and state and local agencies are different, which creates some problems.

In general, school systems don't have the personnel to keep up-to-date on what is available much less prepare necessary applications for obtaining aid.

The paper work, etc., is involving too much time and some administrators are neglecting other tasks to prepare and administer projects under various legislation.

Numerous conflicts have developed between local education agencies and OEO officials, especially in the development and administration of the Head Start Program. I am including statements from officials in Coffee County relative to their experiences and beliefs about Head Start.

Superintendents over the State feel that they have experienced a certain amount of unfair pressure brought about by articles in magazines, newspaper releases, and speeches made by various officials.

As to complying with Civil Rights Act of 1964—many school boards have the following concerns:

1. Are the requirements of the guidelines in keeping with exact intent of Congress?
2. Clearer definitions should be provided for many terms such as desegregation, discrimination, dual systems, etc.
3. In many cases, USOE officials have changed requirements, interpretations, instructions, and opinions from week to week.
4. The inability of school officials to secure from USOE officials timely and pertinent information in writing.
5. In several school systems of West Tennessee during the month of August, one or two weeks prior to the opening of school, local school officials were told that Freedom of Choice Plans were ineffective, therefore, it would be necessary to pair certain schools, close certain schools, or to close a few grades in some schools. At any rate, these demands, in fairness to local officials, should have been made weeks in advance of school opening dates.

COFFEE COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Manchester, Tenn., December 5, 1966.

Mr. JULIAN BREWER,
Executive Secretary,
Tennessee School Boards Association,
Nashville, Tenn.

DEAR MR. BREWER: Enclosed you will find an article which was approved in the local newspaper the day after Dr. Evans, Clyde Evans, and myself talked with Robert Moore, of the Atlanta Regional OEO office, via a three-way telephone hookup. Neither of us had talked with the news media concerning the conversation and as you can see in the article there are quotations from each of us. This article is almost word for word the conversation which was carried out on the three-way hookup. At this time they were trying to get one "Head Start" program for the entire county which consist of three school systems.

Enclosed also you will find a copy of a letter which was written to a person who is doing a paper, in a course in Public School Administration at MTSU, on the effects of OEO Programs at the local level. The chairman of our board wrote her this letter, which sums up our feeling toward Federal programs which do not come through the proper channels.

I hope this information will help you get across to the Congressional Subcommittee some of the things which are happening to us at the local level with respect to Federal programs.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES G. JARRELL,
Superintendent, Coffee County Schools.

[From the Manchester Times, May 13, 1966]

"HEADSTART" PROGRAM FOR COFFEE IS URGED

The Federal Office of Economic Opportunity has proposed that school systems of Tullahoma, Manchester and Coffee Counties operate a consolidated "Headstart" kindergarten program for children of low-income families this summer.

The proposal by Robert Moore, of the OEO office in Atlanta, provides for a total budget of \$40,962 in Federal funds for one center in Tullahoma, one in Manchester and six in the rural areas of Coffee County.

Coffee County, which participated in the "Headstart" program last summer, and Manchester have filed separate applications for programs this year. Coffee County has asked \$32,724 in Federal funds and Manchester has asked \$9,400.

However, James G. Jarrell, superintendent of Coffee County schools, and Clyde Evans, superintendent of Manchester schools, said they would not object to a consolidated program if details can be worked out.

WON'T PARTICIPATE

Dr. Ralph Evans, superintendent of Tullahoma schools, said the Tullahoma School Board considered the program when it was started last year and decided against participation. He indicated that the board's position has not changed, and that Tullahoma will not participate this year.

Dr. Evans said the Tullahoma School Board decided against participation last year because a preliminary application of eligibility rules indicated a very small number of children would be involved.

He said he informed Mr. Moore that the Tullahoma School Board had not expressed an interest in the kindergarten program.

"We feel a responsibility to examine all these programs as they are presented and see which would be of benefit to us," Dr. Evans said. "We participate in many Federal programs, but it was not felt that 'Headstart' would be of great benefit at this time. We feel we have an obligation as citizens to turn down any program unless we can wisely spend the dollars—even though they are Federal dollars."

He said Tullahoma has a few children eligible to attend the kindergarten, and that these could attend centers at Jones Elementary School or Hickerson Station School.

ESTIMATE "TOO HIGH"

Dr. Evans said an OEO estimate that 60 children in Tullahoma would be eligible is "entirely too high." He pointed out that the largest first-grade class is at Bel-Aire School, where only eight would have been eligible for "Headstart" classes.

Coffee County's application is based on an estimated enrollment of 192 children, and Manchester's is based on about 50 children.

In a telephone conversation recently with the three superintendents, Mr. Moore pointed out that a jointly-administered program would be more economical because it would eliminate duplication in administration.

Mr. Moore's proposal calls for one director, eight head teachers, eight teachers, 20 teachers' aides, eight cooks, one dietitian, one bookkeeper, one transportation supervisor and one maintenance supervisor.

TO PROVIDE BUILDINGS

The school systems' contributions to the program would be to provide buildings for the centers.

Supt. Clyde Evans and Supt. Jarrell said they had no objections to a combined program if the details could be worked out.

"I don't know whether it would be possible," the Manchester city superintendent said. "If some school system with transportation ability and centers wanted to take it over, it might do well. We have no transportation potential and couldn't do it."

Supt. Jarrell noted the time involved in the job of administering the program in the county system last year and felt that each system should be free to make its own determination.

"I feel this ought to be left up to the individual school system whether it wanted to participate or combine," he said. "I know I can only speak for my system. It might be all right to combine the programs if the problems could be worked out through the board of education. I certainly wouldn't want to administer the city's program, but we might let them run ours."

Both superintendents said they did not know what might come of the proposal to combine the programs but were awaiting word on their fund applications.

DECEMBER 1, 1966.

Mrs. SARAH BENET,
Murfreesboro, Tenn.

DEAR MRS. BENET: In a special session on November 8, 1965, the Coffee County Board of Education unanimously adopted the following policy:

"The Coffee County Board of Education will consider conducting or making their facilities available only, for those programs which come through the State Department of Education, or those initiated by the Coffee County Board of Education."

We feel that the local Board of Education should be permitted to perform the following functions with regard to any program for which it is to be held responsible.

1. Determine which programs, within the guidelines handed down from the Federal and State levels are suitable for the people who come under our jurisdiction.
2. Develop the program and a budget to carry out said program.
3. Set up employment standards and employ all personnel to carry out program.
4. Maintain all personnel and financial records which meets with the approval of the "Internal Accounting Code."
5. Carry out periodic evaluations to determine whether or not program is doing what it was designed to accomplish.

OEO Programs which come through Community Action Agencies do not permit many of the things which we have listed above. Some of our experiences and guidelines of OEO are as follows:

1. We have been told by authorities, the Regional OEO Office in Atlanta, that we have no choice as to the programs we will conduct at the local level.
2. The guidelines under which you develop your program are changed one week after the program has begun.
3. They withheld our "Head Start" funds because we refused to participate in a companion program called "Home Start."
4. The guidelines state clearly that a citizens advisory committee will select the "Head Start" director.
5. The guidelines state that one-half of Teacher Aides shall be parents of target children.
6. They ask you to submit a budget for your program which they change in the Regional Office in Atlanta.

We could list others but we think the above is more than enough to justify the action which our Board has taken.

Sincerely yours,

CLYDE WOOTEN,
Chairman, Coffee County Board of Education.

Mrs. GREEN. Thank you very much, Mr. Brewer.

I think I will withhold any questions until we hear from the other people on the panel.

Mr. McLaurin, from South Carolina.

STATEMENT OF JOHN N. McLAURIN, JR., REPRESENTING SEVERAL STATE SCHOOL BOARD ASSOCIATIONS

Mr. McLAURIN. You notice, I have a very short statement.

Our executive director happened to be in the hospital. Our vice president found out at the last minute he could not attend, so I am the goat today, appearing for them.

I am also appearing in the capacity of chairman of a representative group from several State school board associations.

At a recent meeting of these representatives in Atlanta, Ga., on November 2, I was authorized to appear before the special congressional subcommittee if and when hearings were scheduled.

I wish to express my appreciation to the members of this subcommittee for providing me with this opportunity to appear.

The primary purpose of State school boards associations is to assist local boards of education with common problems. The policies of each State association dictate a positive and constructive approach to those common problems to which the association addresses itself.

In no instance does an individual association, or combination of associations, propose to engage in activities of an evasive or negative nature.

Representatives of the associations meeting in Atlanta unanimously concluded that a cooperative course of action should be carefully formulated by the associations in developing good relations with the U.S. Office of Education, and with other Federal agencies affecting the operation and administration of our public schools.

The following objectives appeared to command the immediate interest of these associations:

- (1) The preservation of local and State control in the operation and administration of our public schools.

- (2) A clarification of the intent and the legal limitations of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 with regard to school desegregation.

- (3) The promulgation of policies and guides for the implementation of proper legal interpretations of the 1964 Civil Rights Act which are in keeping with the law.

- (4) The administration and implementation of policies and guidelines by representatives of HEW and other Federal agencies who are qualified both by training and experience to work with State and local school officials in a highly professional, ethical, and constructive manner.

This coordinated approach by the several State associations was deemed advisable due to the following policies and practices of certain Federal representatives:

Inability of State and local school officials to secure from HEW and other Federal officials timely and pertinent information in writing.

Instructions, interpretations, and suggestions from HEW and other Federal representatives which have been inconsistent, vague, and thus most confusing.

People assigned by the Office of HEW to work with local school officials who have proven inefficient and ineffective.

The practice of many HEW representatives in bypassing local school officials and securing fragmented information and unfounded opinions upon which to base judgments with regard to the degree of compliance of local school officials with HEW guidelines.

The development of a state of uncertainty and suspicion by some Federal representatives in their relations with State and local education officials.

In conclusion, I respectfully request that the members of this committee and other Members of Congress take necessary action to clarify the provisions and intent of all Federal legislation concerning public education.

Thank you.

Mrs. GREEN. Thank you very much.

And now may we hear from Mr. Bement, from the Kentucky School Boards Association.

**STATEMENT OF MAURICE D. BEMENT, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR,
KENTUCKY SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATION**

Mr. BEMENT. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

Members of the committee, I am Maurice Bement, the executive director of the Kentucky School Boards Association.

We would like to say that we really express our appreciation to you for giving us this opportunity, and also we want to express to the Congress through you the appreciation of the Kentucky School Boards Association and its 200 local school district facilities for the renewed interest and concern of the Congress in public education in this country.

We feel that recent Federal support programs are helping Kentucky local school districts to provide new and improved educational opportunities to the children and youth of our State.

Our association, through Kentucky Members of the Congress, supported Public Law 89-10. We did so with the understanding that the Federal Government would not exercise unreasonable or arbitrary controls. We did so after reviewing section 604 of the 89-10 act—and, Madam Chairman, you have already quoted it this morning—which states:

Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution or school system, or over the selection of library resources or printed or published instructional materials by any educational institution or school system.

After a review of experiences of our State education agency and our local school districts in the administration of programs under Public Law 89-10, we raise a question as to whether all departments, agencies, officers, and employees of the United States have acted in compliance with section 604 of the act.

This association has accepted the philosophy as reflected in this statement:

American education—a local function, a State responsibility, and a Federal concern.

Acceptance has also been given to the junior partner role of the Federal Government in the development of education programs under appropriate Federal-State-local relations.

In considering the three partners, it must be understood and accepted that the Federal Government is farthest removed from the classroom where teaching and learning take place. The Federal Government is least able to plan and provide for the specific needs of certain communities, schools, and children.

If we are to strengthen State and local education agencies and if we are to plan for specific education programs to meet the needs of specific schools and children, then we must reassess the Federal grant programs which employ a fiscal mechanism of control and administration.

In order to make the best use of the Federal, State, and local tax dollar, to efficiently coordinate all education programs where teaching and learning occur, and to preserve State and local control of education, we respectfully present, for the consideration of the Congress, the following criteria:

1. General Federal support to education should be made to the States under a basic foundation program principle determined on the basis of need and ability of the States.

2. General Federal aid to elementary and secondary education should be available to all pupils and programs, without discrimination, as determined by State and local plans for improving educational opportunity.

3. Federal funds for education should be made to State governments to be allocated to local school districts by the States in accordance with State plans.

4. Federal funds should be made available to the States, to be allocated to local school districts, for the purpose of school construction.

5. Federal funding should be made known and available to the States in time to permit proper planning in order to insure efficient use of all available funds. Any expenditure of funds without planning and without the properly trained personnel can lead to waste. Our educational needs cannot justify waste.

6. Accounting and auditing procedures of Federal funds made available to the States should be in accordance with procedures required by the States. Separate accounting procedures should not be superimposed on State requirements for local accountability of State and local funds.

7. The administration of all Federal funds for all educational programs should be centered in the U.S. Office of Education at the Federal level, in the State education agency at the State level, and in the local education agency at the local level.

8. Federal controls of funds made available to education programs in the States, by the Congress, should be restricted to a determination of basic intended use by the State education agencies.

9. Guidelines developed by the U.S. Office of Education should be observed as guidelines, and such guidelines should not be viewed and administered as regulations.

Should the Federal Government observe these basic principles, and manifest a respect for the ability and sincerity of the administrators of State and local education agencies, we believe a more effective partnership can be developed for improving educational opportunities for all the children and youth of our States and communities.

Thank you very much.

Mrs. GREEN. Thank you very much, Mr. Bement.

Mr. Vittetow, could I ask you to summarize your statement, because of the time.

STATEMENT OF FRANK H. VITTETOW, ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT, STATE-FEDERAL RELATIONS, FOR DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY

Mr. VITTETOW. I am Frank Vittetow, Assistant Superintendent of Public Instruction, Commonwealth of Kentucky, in charge of Federal-State relations.

And I might express my appreciation on behalf of the Department of Education of Kentucky, Madam Chairman, for the privilege of appearing before the subcommittee, and also for the great concern

and appreciation given to the Congress of the United States for its intent in supporting this issue.

I would also like to state that this matter of redress of grievances is so basic to all of us in America that sometimes in looking at the operation of programs we forget the democratic process itself, and I say this because I have just recently returned from 8 years in the Far East, working for our foreign aid program. I just returned to the United States in June. And I see this being denied many people throughout the world, so I would like to throw this in first. And my appreciation is given to you because of this.

If I may, I would like to just list some of the overall recommendations that our Department of Education would like to give to the subcommittee for its consideration.

1. If Federal aid to education is to continue to come to the States, the amount of money and time factors should be predictable to all concerned.

2. All Federal funds for education should come to the States under a minimum foundation program type of an approach, based on an objective formula which would include consideration of the financial ability of a State to support education.

3. A congressional task force should be empowered to study the myriad of educational aid programs to the several States, offering suggestions for consolidation wherever necessary in order to avoid duplication, waste of effort, and possible inefficiency.

4. All Federal funds coming into a State for education should be routed through the State Department of Education, which is the legally constituted entity regulating all educational activities.

5. Basic planning by the U.S. Office of Education with State departments of education should be completed in the spring, so as to assure enough leadtime for budget review and implementation on the part of local school boards.

6. A conference should be held with State and Federal fiscal personnel to "clear the air" on basic requirements relating to accounting and audit procedures pertaining to Federal funds.

These in essence would be the gist of our recommendations coming from Kentucky at this time.

We appreciate it.

Mrs. GREEN. Thank you very much, Mr. Vittetow.

The complete statement will be made a part of the record.

(Statement referred to follows:)

STATEMENT OF FRANK H. VITTETOW, ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY

The Department of Education of the Commonwealth of Kentucky would like to express its appreciation to the Congress of the United States for its concern for and support of public education. The purposes and intent of the past and present educational legislation is clear to all of us—the improvement of the welfare of the individual in his environment which in turn will provide for the well-being of the United States.

The Kentucky school structure has always worked to its capacity in providing the best possible education for its approximately 672,000 children now in school.

A break down of Kentucky tax revenues shows that approximately 65% of each tax dollar goes into education. During the 1965-1966 school year Kentucky's Minimum Foundation Program sent \$128,114.139 into the local school districts. The local communities furnished an additional \$53,601,000¹ in sup-

¹ Required local effort.

port of schools. In the same year the federal government provided almost \$46,000,000 for services and/or materials for programs under Vocational Education, Rehabilitation Services, Titles I, II, III, V, National Defense Education Act, Adult Basic Education Act, Civil Defense, OASI, School Lunch and School Milk Act and Graduate Fellowships.

Some examples of the types of program improvement being made as a result of the local, state and federal relationship may be in order.

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT, TITLE I

The Federal Government working with the state and local governmental agencies as a partner in education, has for the first time, provided major financial assistance to bring added opportunities to America's disadvantaged youth. In Kentucky, 196,000 public and non-public disadvantaged students in 196 local school systems received these added opportunities during the first year of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Disadvantaged students provided these opportunities ranged from pre-schoolers to drop-outs. Opportunities encompassed special reading services, cultural activities, health programs, and classes for the mentally and physically handicapped. These were provided for during the regular school day, beyond the school day as well as during the summer months.

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT, TITLE II

The Title II Program has been well received by all groups concerned. It is felt that federal funds under this Title have assisted in strengthening the material programs in both public and non public schools. Moreover, teachers have had available more resources for the enrichment of the instructional program.

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT, TITLE III

The Commonwealth of Kentucky is divided into seven regions from which projects relating to innovations in education are developed. Fourteen projects were approved during the past school year. Typical regional projects representing cooperative educational efforts ranged from an educational diagnostic and treatment center to a multi-discipline educational center for the diffusion of emerging instructional techniques.

REHABILITATION SERVICES

The Bureau of Rehabilitation Services has experienced a cooperative and supporting effort from the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration.

The new Rehabilitation amendments have enabled the Kentucky Bureau of Rehabilitation Services to expand their services to 10,176 disabled Kentuckians who were returned to gainful employment. The achievement ranked Kentucky in the top 10 Rehabilitation Agencies in the Nation.

The Kentucky Rehabilitation Agency has utilized state appropriations as well as support from other state agencies to secure the available Vocational Rehabilitation funds allotted to Kentucky.

The Region III office of the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration has provided support, guidance, and technical consultation in the expansion of the growing Kentucky Rehabilitation Agency.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

The 1967 budget estimates reveal a federal expenditure of \$1.4 billion for programs of vocational education, work training and other adult or continuing education programs throughout the United States. Encompassed in this category are vocational programs administered by the Office of Education, the Manpower Development and Training Program, and training components of many activities financed by the Office of Economic Opportunity. Much progress has been made.

A sampling of major concerns pertaining to federally assisted programs throughout the Kentucky Department of Education indicated the following:

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT, TITLE I

Serious difficulties encountered during the first year of operation in this program centered around three major areas: 1) lack of funds for planning

projects; 2) late appropriation date by the Congress; 3) lack of adequate staff and facilities at all levels.

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT, TITLE II

Basic problem area of this Title revolved around Section 117.5(c) *Circulation of Loaned Materials*. This section concerns the requirement of a centralized depository for materials and the preparation of a materials list for each school. The following are some reactions to this section:

1. To provide a central depository for Title II resources is highly impractical for school libraries and such a plan is not consistent with the basic philosophy of a central library within the individual school.
2. Equally unrealistic is the suggested regulation requiring card catalogs or lists of Title II materials as well as their location. Preparation time of such lists is a prime factor.
3. At the present time, library staffs are involved to the point of having to spend more time in the administering of Title II program with less and less time being given to curriculum program development and service to children and their teachers.
4. The figure of 5% allotted to each state to administer the program is inadequate.

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT, TITLE III

Currently no funds are provided for administration cost for Title III. A minimum of 3% would be suggested as the minimum for such support factors.

NDEA—TITLE III

1. Uncertainty with respect to amounts of money and when such funds may be expected into the program is of major concern.
2. The categorical approach to the NDEA Title III program requires a tremendous amount of detail which, in view of the fact that almost all of the elementary and secondary school subjects are covered, seems unnecessary.

REHABILITATION SERVICES

One of the greatest problems presently being experienced in all growing rehabilitation agencies is lack of manpower and the training of key personnel.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

The coordination of educational activities throughout the ten cabinet departments and more than fifteen governmental agencies at the federal level seems to be the major problem to be revolved. Because of such a lack of coordination at the federal level a most perplexing problem presents itself to state and local education administrators.

SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS OFFERED FOR CONSIDERATION

Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title I

The following suggestions for improving the opportunities for disadvantaged students are: (1) The appropriation should be made by Congress in the spring, (2) Regulations should be liberalized to permit more construction under Title I funds, (3) The 15% cut made by the Congress during the current school term should be restored, (4) Additional Title I funds should be made available for the training of staff members.

Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title II

The provision requiring states to provide a centralized materials depository and preparation of material lists for all schools under Title II should be eliminated.

Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title III

Provisions should be made to allow State Departments of Education to develop state-wide projects on innovation in education. Current provisions provide only for local or regional development within a state.

NDEA—Title III

With the addition of more of the subject areas to the program, the categorical approach of aid should be dropped so that project applications could apply to the overall improvement of instruction.

Rehabilitation Services

There is a continuing need to serve more disabled Kentuckians and to help local communities with Rehabilitation facilities and workshops. Additional funds in the Rehabilitation Laird Amendments would assist states in the rehabilitation of additional handicapped persons.

OVERALL RECOMMENDATIONS OFFERED FOR CONSIDERATION

1. If Federal aid to education is to continue to come to the states, the amount of money and time factors should be predictable to all concerned.

2. All federal funds for education should come to the states under a Minimum Foundation Program type of an approach based on an objective formula which would include consideration of the financial ability of a state to support education.

3. A Congressional task force should be empowered to study the myriad of educational aid programs to the several states, offering suggestions for consolidation wherever necessary in order to avoid duplication, waste of effort and possible inefficiency.

4. All federal funds coming into a state for education should be routed through the State Department of Education which is the legally constituted entity regulating all educational activities.

5. Basic planning by the U.S. Office of Education with State Departments of Education should be completed in the Spring so as to assure enough lead time for budget review and implementation on the part of local school boards.

6. A conference should be held with state and federal fiscal personnel to "clear the air" on basic requirements relating to accounting and audit procedures pertaining to federal funds.

Mrs. GREEN. Mr. Entwistle.

STATEMENT OF JOHN ENTWHISTLE, PRESIDENT, NORTH CAROLINA STATE SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATION

Mr. ENTWHISTLE. I don't have a formal statement.

I would like to identify myself as John Entwistle, president of the North Carolina State School Boards Association, and on their behalf I would like to say to you and your committee that we appreciate your representation in Congress, and appreciate the time to come down and be better informed on educational matters.

In North Carolina, I don't think we have any specific complaints, and I don't think we have any specific praise for the Federal education program, either.

I think the thousand members of the North Carolina School Boards Association whom I represent are as fine a group of men and women as you will find anywhere. I think their deep concern for the children in North Carolina is evident.

And I think sometimes when a Federal program is handled down to a State level, it seems that it comes to the State and local level in a little bit of a spirit of criticism.

And my only comment would be that I wish it were possible that the Federal program could be implemented in North Carolina and other States in a spirit of cooperation, rather than in a spirit of criticism, because the school board members in North Carolina would not ever defy a Federal law, and they would not do anything to not carry out any law of the land, National or State, or on any level.

So I wish that the school board members in each and every State could be put into a spirit of this real partnership that we hear discussed with the Federal Government. I wish that we could work with them more closely toward carrying out the aims of education.

That is all.

Mrs. GREEN. Thank you very much.

And may I say that is one of the reasons for this subcommittee holding hearings, so that we can have the opportunity to work more closely with you.

May I ask: What is the average expenditure per child in elementary and secondary education in Tennessee?

Mr. BREWER. Last year I think it was approximatey \$340, something like that.

Mrs. GREEN. And in Kentucky?

Dr. VITTETOW. Just around \$350.

Mrs. GREEN. And in North Carolina?

Mr. ENTWHISTLE. I would guess just lightly below that, maybe \$330 or \$340.

Mrs. GREEN. And South Carolina?

Mr. ENTWHISTLE. Around \$320, I believe.

Mrs. GREEN. And Georgia?

Mr. ACREE. I believe ours was \$340. Not exact, but I believe that is approximately correct.

Mrs. GREEN. As representatives of State school boards, do you feel this is an adequate amount?

Dr. VITTETOW. Speaking for Kentucky, I would say it is not.

Mr. BREWER. We feel the same way in Tennessee.

Mrs. GREEN. Are school board members elected in Tennessee?

Mr. BREWER. Tennessee has various types of school boards, and has various methods for electing members. County school boards are either appointed or elected by the people. Some are in cities appointed by city councils, and some are elected by the people.

Mrs. GREEN. What can the school boards do to increase the amount of funds for education in your respective States so that the Federal Government will remain the junior partner in the educational community?

Mr. BREWER. We are doing two things on this. First, getting the permissive legislation to increase the support at that level, and No. 2, we are increasing our State support.

Mr. ACREE. We have done a very similar thing in Georgia, in that we are under local matching funds and State funds, and we have increased the local requirement by 5 percent, as of 3 years from now.

And our tax evaluation and other schemes having to do with our property on which the school taxes are levied. The school board members are in the forefront in bringing this to pass.

We are going into a program of equalization, statewide. On that basis, this will be reassessed.

In addition to that, we are trying to get legislation to work on the basis that some county that will not have an income—as long as they make an effort to come up to a certain amount, they will be given an equal share to bring them up with the richer counties.

As to the richer counties not being penalized, they are not being penalized, but they are helping the poorer counties to come up to the State level.

Mrs. GREEN. I must say that my daughter-in-law could not secure a babysitter for part of the year for what is being spent for a full year on the education of children in many States.

Do you all agree that Federal aid is just as essential? Is there any disagreement on that?

Mr. McLAURIN. As long as you leave it in the State, it is.

I think it should be left in the State to use for an educational program, rather than send it to Washington and get it back, because there is a lot lost between the time it leaves the State and the time it gets back.

Mrs. GREEN. What do you mean, "a lot lost"?

Mr. McLAURIN. All these kickbacks. There is a percentage on handling the money, so when it goes from the States to Washington—

Mrs. GREEN. I hope the National School Boards Association is doing some research on this. I have heard statements that out of every dollar 40 cents does not get back.

I think all of these studies and surveys show that the cost of the administration of these school programs is under 2 percent.

Mr. BREWER. I would think it is 40 percent, or somewhere near that. I would think that some of the programs in Washington are very good, and others are not, under the present setup.

Mr. ACREE. I am sure I speak for a great majority, if not all, of the school officials in the 196 systems of the State when I say that we do recognize the need for Federal funds that are properly allotted, and properly used, in keeping with what has been presented to you this morning.

Of course, ideally, with such a thing as Mr. McLaurin referred to—if the money did not have to go there and come back—we could possibly save some of that 2 percent, but to that point we would hope we could receive some of these State funds and that they would not be used as leverage or a whip.

Mrs. GREEN. Since you all are with members of school boards, may I say that I have welcomed what I seem to see in the National School Boards Association as a member of the committee, I look to the school boards across the country for much stronger leadership in educational matters at the Federal level than I think they have exercised in years past.

It seems to me that at least 10 or 12 years ago—I don't know, Jack, whether you agree or not—there was almost an emotional or an instantaneous reaction of the school boards against all Federal aid, regardless of what kind. There was not an objective analysis.

And I think this change in direction is something that we will look forward to. I am sure we will all benefit from it, because I agree with you that the school boards are closer to the people, and should be playing a very, very important role in planning legislation, evaluating it, and implementing it.

May I also say, Mr. Acree, that your brief will be studied with a great deal of interest.

Let me state very clearly my own position, and I may be in disagreement with some people in the room.

But after having said that, may I also say that I was a very strong supporter of the Fountain amendment in the last session of Congress.

I did think that the instances to which you refer in your brief, where individual employees went out and circulated memorandums, where the action was deferred on applications for new funds—went beyond the law.

I think the overwhelming vote in the House indicated that the House recognized the problem you have stated this morning.

And I assure you that as one member of the Education Committee, I intend to turn my attention to this in the next session.

Congressman Erlernborn.

Mr. ERLERNBORN. I think, in the consideration of time, I will waive any right to ask questions.

Mrs. GREEN. Congressman Flynt?

Mr. FLYNT. Thank you, Mrs. Green.

I am not going to usurp the prerogatives of you, as chairman, and Mr. Erlernborn as a member of this subcommittee.

I would like to say for the record, however, that I think that the conduct of these meetings by you has been most meaningful. I think that this is the most effective way that you could have obtained direct information, such as has been presented to you yesterday and today by dedicated people, people who are making every effort to make this Federal-State-local partnership a fruitful reality.

In this instance, to make all funds, from whatever source derived, that are allocated to education, improve educational standards, and thereby improve the education which we are offering to the young men and young women of the respective States and of our entire country.

If I may be permitted to do so, let me say this: Recognizing that on some particular piece of legislation, the gentlewoman from Oregon and myself occasionally find ourselves casting opposite votes, during the entire period of the service of the gentlewoman from Oregon, I have come to know her as a Member of Congress, possessing integrity and ability.

I think that in the field of legislation affecting public education at elementary, secondary, and higher education levels, our colleagues in the Congress recognize the gentlewoman from Oregon, the Honorable Edith Green, as a person who has done massive research, and has applied to that research an abundance of good judgment and common-sense.

So I think that I not only speak for my colleagues in the Congress when I say that we recognize her devotion and dedication to this subject of education, particularly as a legislative subject, but as a part of the State of Georgia and of the southeastern region of the United States, I think that I speak for certainly those with whom I have discussed this meeting, that we are indeed grateful to you and Congressman Erlernborn for coming and visiting with us and receiving the points of view which we have heard.

We are indeed grateful to you.

And I cannot let this opportunity pass without thanking my colleague from Illinois, Congressman Erlernborn, for joining Chairman Green in the conduct of these hearings.

Congressman Erlenborn is a relatively young Member of the House of Representatives. He is a man who, in a relatively short period of service, has demonstrated outstanding ability and capability.

As a rather junior Member of Congress, we often see him as the minority floor manager of important legislation. He is particularly interested in the subject of education legislation.

And I would like to publicly recognize him as a colleague in whom we have confidence, and whom we admire and respect.

I think that we in Georgia, where this meeting is being held, and that we in the Southeast, are indeed fortunate to have had Members of Congress of the character, integrity, and ability of these two members of this fine subcommittee who are here today.

Mrs. GREEN. Thank you very much, Congressman Flynt, for your very generous comments.

And all of you who are here can see that if they do not persuade us with arguments, at times, they always persuade us with their southern charm.

Mr. FLYNT. Madam Chairman, could I trespass on your time very briefly to point out one thing, which I know Mr. Acree had hoped to have a memorandum on at the time he made his presentation?

Without imposing on his prerogative to present this, I would like to call to your attention and to the attention of the subcommittee an incident which took place during a visit of a "compliance team" to the Griffin-Spaulding County School Board, which is not only within the district which I represent, but also my hometown.

I am not saying whether this statement that I am about to refer to was made during a recess of that meeting, or whether it was made after instructing the court reporter who was reporting the proceedings to go off the record, but when the question arose about mandatory assignments to create a racial balance in the faculties of different schools, the superintendent of schools of this Griffin-Spaulding County system told Mr. Rich and Mr. Pearlman and the other two members of the compliance team that if he followed their verbal instructions and directives, he would be confronted with either singular or mass resignations from members of the faculty, which was already understaffed, and he said that he could not, 2 weeks before school opened, take a position and issue transfer orders which would deplete an already understaffed faculty.

My recollection is that at that point Mr. Pearlman either asked—and he was a member of the compliance team—either asked to go off the record, or, during a recess, in an outer office from the one in which the meeting was being held, Mr. Pearlman seriously suggested using economic pressure by making investigations and inquiries to find out which members of the faculty of that school system were either in debt or so economically situated that they could not resist a transfer order, even though they would not like to comply with it.

Mr. Patrick and I were both shocked when we heard this suggestion, and Mr. Patrick asked him if he understood him properly, and if he did, would he elaborate on it.

He said:

Yes. What I mean is this: It is for you to find a schoolteacher, preferably a lady schoolteacher, who has an elderly or invalid parent dependent upon her for support, so that she cannot resign her job if she is transferred to a school that she does not want to teach in.

To me, that was one of the most inhuman and cruelest statements that I have ever heard uttered by any person in an official capacity with the U.S. Government.

I think that that particular statement, among many unbelievable statements, which were made during this 4-hour conference between the compliance team and the Griffin-Spaulding County School Board, has certainly caused me to take a more than casual interest in this overall subject, for the purpose of helping develop a record upon which the Congress can base a mature and intelligent judgment when we consider this legislation again next year, or the year after.

Because what we want to see done—and I think the members of the subcommittee agree with me on this—is that we are interested in seeing this legislation administered to improve education in the respective States, and throughout the United States.

We are not interested in seeing this entire Federal participation in education jeopardized by imprudent and irresponsible actions of officials in the Office of the Commissioner of Education, from Mr. Harold Howe on down to and including this man, Mr. Pearlman, who suggested the use of inhuman and cruel methods to obtain his objectives.

Mrs. GREEN. Thank you, Mr. Flynt.

My thanks to all of you gentlemen, who have come from various States. I am well aware of the demands that are made upon your time. It has been very helpful to me, and I think I speak for Mr. Erlernborn, to have you come to the committee this morning.

Other members of our subcommittee are listening to school board members in Minneapolis today. When we get back to Washington we will compare notes. We will tell them of the testimony which you gave, and they in turn will tell us of the testimony which they heard in Minneapolis.

My thanks.

We now have a panel of the persons who have to be on the firing line day after day, and to whom society has turned to cure all of the ills of society.

We welcome to the hearing Dr. Paul West, Mr. W. L. Robinson, Mrs. Nell Hallford, Mr. Samuel Wood, Mr. Jasper Griffin, and Dr. A. D. Clifton.

We also have with us representatives from Kentucky, and North Carolina, and Florida.

We are also glad to have Mr. Paddock from Houston in the audience today.

I think we will start out by calling upon Dr. Paul West, the superintendent of the Fulton County schools.

STATEMENT OF DR. PAUL WEST, SUPERINTENDENT, FULTON COUNTY SCHOOLS, STATE OF GEORGIA

Dr. WEST. Madam Chairman and members of the subcommittee, we understand we are under slight pressure of time. In view of the fact that the first part of this deals with the programs in which the Fulton County Board of Education is involved, and since there are other statements which have been made in this regard by other school systems, I think we may omit this.

The first part is a joint statement by W. L. Robinson, president of the Fulton County Board of Education, and myself, so I shall go beyond a discussion of the programs in which we have participated, and begin at this point.

Our school board commends the Federal Government for its interest in, provision for, and sustaining of these programs which strengthen American education, provided it does not attempt to exercise autocratic and unreasonable control over local schools.

Our major concern is with the implementation of the 1966 guidelines of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

We were greatly distressed by the confusion and chaos emanating from the Office of the Commissioner of Education when he presented the 1966 guidelines and their application to local school districts.

We were shocked by the severity of his statements, and his unbending manner when professional and articulate questions were asked by members of our professional group. His presentation was characterized by complete inflexibility and frigidity.

An example of this uncompromising manner was his reply to a school superintendent who asked him what a superintendent and board of education would do in the case of a white teacher who might be assigned to a previously all-Negro school, and who might refuse to accept the new assignment. His cryptic reply was, "You would fire her for insubordination."

May I say parenthetically that U.S. Education Commissioner Harold Howe said he was cognizant of individual school systems. He said there could not possibly be a consistency throughout the land, that each had its own personality, its own problems, and he did not feel it would ever be possible to arrive at any iron-clad policies or regulations which could be made applicable to every system in the country.

That, Madam Chairman, is my statement, and I think Mr. Robinson would like to supplement it.

Mrs. GREEN. Thank you, Dr. West.

We will call on Mr. Robinson next.

STATEMENT OF W. L. ROBINSON, PRESIDENT, FULTON COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION

Mr. ROBINSON. Thank you.

Madam Chairman and Congressman Erlenborn, I am W. L. Robinson, president of the Fulton County Board of Education, and immediate past president of the National School Boards Association once removed. I served as president during the year 1964-65.

I would like to supplement this joint statement prepared by Dr. West and myself by underscoring the fact that the people in this area, and, I might say, the people in 11 or 12 Southeastern States, and I speak with some authority on this matter, because we have had two meetings with representatives from 11 or 12 of the Southeastern States here in Atlanta, because of their concern about the inconsistencies, the ambiguities, and the contradictions that come out of the Office of Education, and as a matter of fact, the contradictions of the Commissioner of Education himself.

I did not know that Congressman Flynt would be here this morning. I have several exhibits that I would like to quote from briefly, just to get them in the record.

I am certain that you are familiar with the debate that took place on the floor of the House, at which time Congressman Flynt said that 13 of his school districts had been notified of the withholding or deferral of Federal funds, and Congressman Corman of California went over to the Office of Education to check this statement and was told that only one, Meriwether County, had funds withheld.

Congressman Flynt went back—and this is a direct quotation from Congressman Flynt—went back to Mr. Howe's office—

... and Mr. Howe has informed me there are presently outstanding at least 13 letters of disapproval, rejection, or deferral, and that he expects to recommend that all 13 school systems be held in non-compliance.

That is an illustration of the confusion that I referred to.

From the News and World Report, this week, one of the questions asked of Mr. Howe:

Your thinking has not yet reached the point where you would say to a school district that it must change its set-up in order to obtain a mixture of pupils?

Answer:

On, no. First of all, we haven't got that authority, and if we did have, we wouldn't use it. But we do think it is interesting for school districts to look at these findings and consider how they might react to them.

Yet you will have, in these documented papers given to you by Mr. Acree, that his men were given written memorandums to school districts in Georgia telling them to move entire grades from one school to another.

And one of the reasons that we have lost confidence is the fact that the Commissioner either does not know what his men are doing, which he should know, or else he is misstating the facts, when he says to the House Rules Committee, as quoted in one of the Atlanta papers on October 1:

U.S. Education Commissioner Harold Howe insisted before the House Rules Committee Friday that his office had not stepped outside the law in setting desegregation guidelines and getting local schools to comply. The Commissioner denied charges that the Office of Education's compliance officers had pressured school districts to achieve racial balance which is specifically prohibited by Title IV of the 1964 Act.

"We are not engaged in anything of that sort," Howe said.

Many of the people in these Southeastern States have suspicions of the motives of the Office of Education and of the Commissioner of Education, and they are well founded.

If we are to believe quotes from his speech, I would like to read this quote: As recently as May 3, in a speech at Columbia University, Mr. Howe was heard to say that if he had his way, the American school would be built for the primary purpose of social and economic integration.

The Commissioner of Education, in short—this is an editorial comment, not a quotation, and incidentally, this is from the Charlotte News—

Mr. Entwistle just finished testifying before you, here, but this is an indication of the interest in other States besides Georgia. This comes from the Charlotte News of Charlotte, N.C., Tuesday, September 6.

The Commissioner of Education, in short, has never given the slightest shred of evidence that he sees or values the difference between vigorous racial con-

science and steam roller evangelism. Despite his repeated disclaimers, he often pursues his obsession with race to the detriment, if not the total exclusion, of education.

Now, we, as board members, Madam Chairman—and I have been a board member for 17 years—are interested in the education of the children, primarily. We intend to educate them within the confines of the law to the best of our ability, and we hope that we will be permitted to do this without pressure tactics, and without the Federal Government using the fact that they do furnish part of the money for an educational program without their using that as a whip over us to bring about certain philosophical social changes which you cannot legislate overnight, but which takes time to bring about.

Thank you very much.

Mrs. GREEN. Thank you, Mr. Robinson.

(Prepared joint statement by W. L. Robinson and Paul D. West follows:)

JOINT STATEMENT BY W. L. ROBINSON, PRESIDENT OF THE FULTON COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION, AND PAUL D. WEST, SUPERINTENDENT OF FULTON COUNTY SCHOOLS

This is a joint statement by W. L. Robinson, President of the Fulton County Board of Education and Paul D. West, Superintendent of Fulton County Schools. The Fulton County Schools are involved in the following Office of Education programs:

1. Public Law 874, affecting federally impacted areas—approximately \$210,000.00.

2. National Defense Education Act—Titles III and V.

Title III—Improvement of instruction in Mathematics, Science, Modern Foreign Languages, Social Studies, English and Reading.

Title V—Testing, Counseling and Guidance.

For both programs—\$65,000.00.

3. Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Title I—For the disadvantaged child only—\$400,000.00.

Title II—Textbook and Library Resources for all children—\$64,000.00.

Title III—Supplemental centers or innovative projects. Planning grant of \$22,535.00; Operational grant approximately \$200,000.00.

NDEA—Titles III and V are handled through the State Department of Education, although the funds are Federal.

ESEA—Title I is handled directly with the Federal government; Title II through the State Department of Education; and Title III directly with HEW in Washington.

Our system is also the beneficiary of certain funds combined with state funds for the operation of the Vocational Education Program (\$58,000) through the state.

Our school board commends the Federal government for its interest in, provision for, and sustaining of these programs which strengthen American education, provided it does not attempt to exercise autocratic and unreasonable control over local schools.

Our major concern is with the implementation of the 1966 Guidelines of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. We are greatly distressed by the confusion and chaos emanating from the Office of the Commissioner of Education with reference to this implementation at the local level. Incidentally, we should like to make it perfectly clear that the Fulton County Board of Education at no time has had any desire or intention to evade the laws of the United States. It has striven in a conscientious manner for many years to operate the schools so that all our children and youth might receive the best possible education. As evidence of the good faith of the Fulton County Board of Education, the Board President and the Superintendent accompanied a group of fellow Georgians to Washington March 30, 1966 following a visit to Atlanta by Mr. W. Stanley Kruger, Director Area II, Equal Educational Opportunities Program, of the Office of Education when he presented the 1966 Guidelines and their application to local school districts. We were shocked by the severity of his statements and his un-

bending manner when professional and articulate questions were asked by members of our professional group. His presentation was characterized by complete inflexibility and fridity. An example of this uncompromising manner was his reply to a school superintendent who asked him what a superintendent and board of education would do in the case of a white teacher who might be assigned to a previously all negro school and who might refuse to accept the new assignment. His cryptic reply was, "You would fire her for insubordination."

Commissioner Harold Howe, several of his associates, and members of the Georgia Congressional delegation participated in this Washington conference, March 30. The Commissioner appeared quite perturbed by statements made by the members of our Georgia delegation and requested a subsequent conference on April 5 with a small committee of school board members and superintendents from Georgia. Our committee was heartened in this conference with the Commissioner when he explained that he was aware of gross misunderstanding as between the Office of Education and the officials of local school systems insofar as the implementation of Guidelines was concerned. The Commissioner took great pains to state, first, that he was fully cognizant of the necessity of gradualism in the process of desegregation; secondly, that the Office of Education asked for nothing more than gradualism—progress year by year over the preceding year. We left this conference with the feeling that the Commissioner had concurred in our understanding of the purposes, intention, and interpretation of the 1966 Guidelines.

As a result of what we considered a highly satisfactory conference with the Commissioner, our Board of Education decided to take steps beyond its desegregation plans as previously approved by the Office of Education and to desegregate all twelve grades in 1966-67 rather than eight, as well as to keep open the period of Freedom of Choice for ninety days rather than the thirty days prescribed by the Federal government. The Board also proceeded promptly with faculty desegregation consistent with its understanding of the Commissioner's statement. Our Board of Education experienced a major shock when it received a letter from Mr. Stanley Kruger under date of July 14, 1966 in which he implied that the Fulton County Board of Education was not moving in good faith with its desegregation program. He went so far as to suggest that the Board might arrange meetings and conferences with parents and civic groups in order to limit opportunities for intimidation. Consistent with the desire of the Fulton County Board of Education to move professionally and properly, the Board President and the Superintendent were immediately authorized to seek an additional conference with Commissioner Howe. This took place August 4, 1966 and was attended by Commissioner Howe, Mr. Kruger and Mr. David Seely. When the Board President and Superintendent read excerpts from Mr. Kruger's letter of July 14, the Commissioner replied that he did not know the letter had been written and that he felt there was gross misunderstanding with regard to the intent of the letter. At this point, parts of the letter were re-read to him to give full evidence of a lack of communication, confusion, and chaos which apparently characterize the activities of the Commissioner's office. The Commissioner assured the group that no other letters of this nature would be forthcoming.

Our concern is heightened by direct quotations of the Commissioner in magazine and newspaper stories when his words are in direct conflict with the apparent policies and actions of his office.

Mrs. GREEN. Now may I call on Mrs. Hallford, superintendent of the Habersham County schools.

STATEMENT OF MRS. NELL HALLFORD, SUPERINTENDENT, HABERSHAM COUNTY SCHOOLS

Mrs. HALLFORD. Madam Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I, too, appreciate the opportunity to talk with you today.

I do not have any copies to submit to you, because my invitation did not come with instructions, so I am delinquent.

My system is rural, having an enrollment of around 4,800 students. There are seven elementary schools and three high schools. We have 172 classroom teachers. We do have in our community the services of a State trade and industrial school.

Our system has participated in numerous Federal programs, namely, title I, with an appropriation of \$126,000 the first year and \$92,000 the second year; and title II, with appropriations of approximately \$10,000; and title III of the Elementary and Secondary Act.

Then, in several areas of the National Defense Education Act, chiefly NDEA titles III and V. Under the Economic Opportunities Act we have participated in Youth Corps, adult education, Headstart.

And from each of these we have derived benefits.

Our system is completely desegregated. A desegregation program was begun in 1965-66, when 10 Negro students entered formerly white schools, under a freedom of choice plan. The system was completely desegregated this term, 1966 and 1967, when all Negro students entered formerly white schools.

This program was accomplished without difficulty to speak of, except in the case of faculty desegregation. And I could tell you a story about that, but I think it is the same story that has been told.

Some misunderstanding came up about that, but was resolved after many telephone calls and visits from the committee, from the Department of Education, the Office of Education.

We had followed with all our faculty exactly the same rules and regulations that we had done in all previous years, and just as fairly as we know how to do.

And at the present time, we have requested that we be allowed to sign a 441 form, and we have not heard from that, but we should hear from that any day.

We certainly appreciate the aid we have received, and commend Congress for making possible many things we have always wanted for our schools, but have not been able to afford financially.

I offer suggestions for improvement, because I believe we all realize that no law was ever passed, no rule or regulation was ever made, that was perfect, and not one of those was ever made of which all implications were realized before it was tried.

And I certainly feel that your purpose here, and our purpose here, is to see what difficulties can be made better, and I am speaking from a very personal standpoint. I am speaking from the things that I, on the level with the committee, have seen, that my staff and I have found out by ourselves. I was gratified to see how many things were parallel to the people who are in larger systems and are looking at it from a higher angle.

As far as titles I and III are concerned, we feel that the guidelines should be stabilized, and dates of allotments and approvals of projects made more timely.

The old cliché, "Haste makes waste," has been evidenced in many cases already. Personnel, for instance, must be employed, and preparations must be made prior to your actually starting the program, and in systems like mine, when those preparations have to be made, it fell upon the systems themselves to pay for things that had to be done before the approval date became known and legal.

So I think that is one of the most important things, and that has been brought out several times. We feel that insufficiency and inadequacy result from those things.

Second, we feel that limited Federal aid is practically a necessity in our educational programs, but local control is necessary in order

for the most good to be realized. We would request that you have some, or rather much, faith in the judgment and integrity of local school administrators, who should know better than anybody else what their needs are.

We would request that you allow more elasticity for meeting individual needs of each community, even to the point of approving construction of buildings, without which many problems are just impossible, particularly in systems like ours.

Then, that you allow continuation of some of the programs already in existence, and by that I mean the financing of programs that are already in existence.

It is my firm belief that administrators of school programs are cognizant of the needs of all types of children, the advantaged and the disadvantaged, and should have the privilege of determining how funds can best be spent for the total good.

We are aware of, and in agreement with, the fact that deadlines are necessary. However, we believe that it should be a two-way street. If school personnel meet their deadlines, why cannot the personnel in the Office of Education submit to deadlines, also? We have to wait a mighty long time for them, sometimes.

We sincerely request that an attitude of realism be applied to projects under title III.

Last week, I heard this statement concerning title III projects: "Unless the title III project is wierd, and way out, it has no chance of acceptance in the Washington office."

Programs I believe should first build a strong, basic foundation, and then become far out, if necessary.

Again we reiterate our appreciation and offer suggestions only in the hope that our money may be spent to the best advantage. We must all cultivate the attitude that we are working together toward the accomplishment of the same goal.

Thank you.

Mrs. GREEN. Thank you, Mrs. Hallford, for your very helpful suggestions.

It is my understanding that there are 197 superintendents of schools in Georgia, and 159 county school systems.

Mrs. HALLFORD. Yes.

Mrs. GREEN. Mrs. Hallford, could you tell me how many women are superintendents?

Mrs. HALLFORD. Six.

Mrs. GREEN. I hate to be accused of a bias, but it does seem to me there is rank discrimination.

Mr. FLYNT. Those six make up in quality, Mrs. Green, what they don't have in quantity.

Mrs. GREEN. Mr. Flynt, I have been told that is the way the South has been arguing for a hundred years. As a woman, I will not accept this.

I was just wondering if we could work in Congress to bring about some kind of a balance, here. Would we have the cooperation of your colleagues?

Mrs. HALLFORD. Definitely.

Mrs. GREEN. Thank you very much.

Dr. Samuel Wood, superintendent of the Clarke County schools.

**STATEMENT OF SAM W. WOOD, SUPERINTENDENT, CLARKE
COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT**

Mr. Wood. I hold the position of superintendent in the Clarke County School District.

The Clarke County District is a countywide district of, generally, urban and suburban nature. The community has a population of about 50,000, and a school enrollment of about 10,500 pupils.

The University of Georgia is located in Athens, and the general level of education in the community may be somewhat higher than that in districts of comparable size in the State, although there is a wide socioeconomic range, and there has been considerable recent industrial development in the county.

The school system includes two senior high schools, three junior high schools, and 13 elementary schools, with a professional staff of approximately 475, in addition to a vocational-technical school with about 600 students. Exclusive of the vocational-technical school, the average annual expenditure per pupil is in excess of \$400, not including debt service.

The Clarke County School District is involved in programs under titles I, II, and III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and various titles under the National Defense Education Act. And, of course, others that are not involved in the Office of Education.

The Clarke County School District began desegregation in the fall of 1963, before the Civil Rights Act was enacted, under policies established by the Clarke County Board of Education in 1959, pursuant to the Supreme Court decision of 1954, but without court order.

At that time, the first applications were received from Negroes seeking admission to previously all white schools, and five of the seven applicants were accepted. The initial desegregation was carried out smoothly and without incident. The following year the number of approved Negro applications for formerly all white schools was more than doubled.

In 1965, the Clarke County Board of Education continued to follow its policy concerning desegregation, resulting in the acceptance of approximately 40 Negro pupils in formerly all white schools.

It was at this point that the Office of Education required the submission of a desegregation plan and form 441. The form was submitted, with a delineation of past performance and an explanation of the plan.

After an unduly long period of time, notification was received that what had been done was not acceptable.

Two trips to Washington were required in order to determine what would be necessary to placate the Office of Education.

It was at that time that it became apparent that past performance, sincerity of purpose, and forthrightness of approach were of no value to the Office of Education officials. In fact, I was told by an attorney in the Office of Education that statements about what we had done was merely "preamble," and was of no interest, and not worth reading.

The result of the trips to Washington was that the Clarke County Board of Education was required to reopen the "freedom of choice" period. This created considerable confusion, but resulted in some increase in the number of Negroes in formerly all white schools.

I must add that, in response to a letter of complaint, a representative of the Office of Education appeared in my office. Having a copy of the letter of complaint, I quickly proved that it was baseless by displaying a copy of the local newspapers in which the desegregation plan had been published.

Without going into minute details, which would be too time consuming at this hearing, the situation in 1966 was even worse.

The Clarke County Board of Education submitted form 441B with a statement that it would comply with only such modifications that would be in keeping with truth, fact, and feasibility in this community.

On this basis, the procedures were carried out, resulting in 17 percent, more than 500 of Negro pupils being accepted in formerly all-white schools.

This created crowded conditions in some schools, and left empty rooms in others.

As to staff desegregation, the school district has 13 teachers assigned and functioning well in desegregated situations. In addition to these, seven employees in supervisory and consultative positions serve on a desegregated basis.

On July 18, 1966, a letter was received stating that the school district was on a "deferral" list, and that no funds would be approved for any new programs involving Federal money. The letter pointed out that the "deferral" was based upon:

- (1) Notices to parents were not sent by first-class mail.
- (2) A slight change was made in the text of a letter which required the signature of the superintendent.
- (3) It was required that parents or guardians exercise the "freedom of choice."

The position of the Clarke County Board of Education was that:

- (1) The first-class-mail requirement was ridiculous on its face. The responsibility of the board was to send notices, explanations, and "freedom of choice" forms, and to receive the "freedom of choice" forms from parents.

This responsibility was carried out.

- (2) The text of the letter which required the signature of the superintendent stated:

Our community has adopted a school desegregation plan.

This was, in point of fact, untrue. A change was made so that the letter read:

Our Clarke County Board of Education has adopted a school desegregation plan, as required by the U.S. Office of Education.

- (3) To accept choice of schools made by 15-year-old children would tend to abrogate the responsibility of parents for their minor children.

No issue arose as a result of dealing with parents or guardians.

On August 9, 1966, three individuals who identified themselves as Mr. Corrigan, Mr. Prager, and Mr. Nelson, and who stated that they were representatives of the Office of Education, conferred with me in the presence of the attorney for the board of education.

This conference was recorded on tape. After a review of all points, they stated that they were satisfied that everything was in good order, and that they would so report to their supervisors.

Without reference to numerous telephone calls, in which suggestions were made as to what the school district should do, it is significant that at the late date of September 19, 1966, a copy of the following telegram was sent to me by State Superintendent of Schools Jack P. Nix:

We are reviewing the situation regarding Clarke County in view of the information you have furnished. In the meantime they should not be included on the deferral list. New activities can be funded at this time. We will continue to discuss with county officials their desegregation plan for this year and next.

DAVID SEELEY,
Director, Office of Equal Educational Opportunity,
U.S. Office of Education.

Nothing further has been heard from the Office of Education, but I must admit that I cannot anticipate 1967 relationships with the Office of Education with any degree of enthusiasm. I should like to feel that the Clarke County School District may be allowed—without harassment—to continue its progress, including compliance with the purposes of title VI of the Civil Rights Act.

It should be true that the all-important item is “results,” and not adherence to minor technicalities and relatively insignificant requirements that are largely academic in nature.

The Clarke County School District has produced amply acceptable results. I state to you emphatically that no school system in the State of Georgia has accomplished more under title VI of the Civil Rights Act than has the Clarke County School District.

As to the “guidelines”: Why are they not of general applicability throughout the Nation, as provided by section 602 of the Civil Rights Act?

Where, in the law, is there a provision for deferral of Federal funds? Is it not in violation of section 604 to make requirements concerning teacher transfers and assignments? Is it not impractical to require the sending of notices by first class, or any other class of mail? Is it not an assumption of authority to determine whether or not a plan is acceptable solely on the basis of the percentage of children choosing transfers?

Why was it ever even suggested that 15-year-old children be allowed to choose their schools, when this is clearly the responsibility of parents?

These and other such questions may well be appropriate to ask.

Thank you.

Mrs. GREEN. Thank you, Mr. Wood.

Mr. Griffin.

STATEMENT OF JASPER M. GRIFFIN, SUPERINTENDENT, COBB COUNTY SCHOOLS

Mr. GRIFFIN. Madam Chairman, Congressman Erlenborn, Congressman Flynt, my name is Jasper M. Griffin, superintendent of the Cobb County Schools (student average daily attendance 35,511), Marietta, Ga.

The Cobb County school system participates heavily in numerous Federal programs administered by HEW as outlined below.

I had intended, Madam Chairman, if I may be permitted to digress here just a moment, to press very strong personal appreciation to the chairman of this committee for her very strong interest in the educational welfare of the youth of this Nation, and her strong and continuing acknowledgment of the fact that the Congress of this country has a responsibility there, also.

The average daily attendance of Cobb County schoolchildren increased from 9,904 in the school year 1952-53 to 35,511 in 1966-67. This abnormally large increase is the result of Lockheed Aircraft Corp., Air Force plant No. 6; Dobbins Air Force Base; U.S. Naval Air Station—all of which are located in Cobb County.

The Federal Government has removed from the tax rolls of Cobb County 10,000 acres of land. The total bonding capacity was completely exhausted in 1961, with many schoolchildren not properly housed. The Cobb County school system is heavily dependent upon Federal funds for maintenance and operation as well as housing.

Madam Chairman, the Federal program in the next eight or 10 pages is set forth, and if I may go to the following page, I will conclude.

(Pages referred to follow:)

FEDERAL PROGRAMS

Public Law 874

The following funds were received by the Cobb County School System under Public Law 874 for maintenance and operation:

1960-61	\$486,330.53
1961-62	444,081.00
1962-63	613,983.00
1963-64	743,222.00
1964-65	772,284.00
1965-66	1,036,674.00
Total	4,096,574.53
Estimated total, 1966-67	1,250,000.00
Estimated grand total	5,346,574.53

Public Law 815

The following funds were received by the Cobb County School System under Public Law 815 for buildings:

1959-60	None
1960-61	None
1961-62	None
1962-63	None
1963-64	\$152,709.00
1964-65	830,964.00
1965-66	434,300.00
1966-67	1,797,173.00
Total	1,435,944.00
Estimated additional funds for 1966-67	536,000.00
Estimated grand total	1,971,944.00

Elementary and Secondary Education Act Title I

In 1965-66 the Cobb County School System received the following funds under Title I:

Summer Reading Program	\$152,000.00
Library Books (approximately)	150,000.00
Head Start Program	45,000.00

Application for \$57,000.00 for a Head Start Program in the summer of 1966-67 has been filed.

Elementary and Secondary Education Act Title II

In 1966-67 the Cobb County School System received a grant of \$64,821.00 for library materials.

Elementary and Secondary Education Act Title III

In 1966-67 the Cobb County School System received a grant of \$31,800.00 for a Pupil Personnel Center.

National Defense Education Act (NDEA) Title III

In 1965-66 the Cobb County School System received \$11,740 for strengthening elementary and secondary instruction.

National Defense Education Act (NDEA) Title V

In 1965-66 the Cobb County School System received \$30,796.57 for strengthening the county-wide counseling programs.

Economic Opportunity Act Title II, Section B, Basic Education

In 1965-66 the Cobb County School System received \$14,312.89 for an adult education program.

OTHER FEDERAL PROJECTS

A. In 1965-66 the Cobb County School System received \$213,227.23 for lunch-room operations.

B. In 1966-67 a commitment of \$121,355.37 was made to the Cobb County School System to finance a vocational program for Juniors and Seniors with saleable skills in various vocations.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Funds received from Public Law 874 and Public Law 815 have benefited the Cobb County school system more than all of the other Federal programs. Because of the present increase of 3,000 students each year, it would be impossible to offer comparable services without these funds.

The programs are efficiently administered. The service is prompt and courteous.

The other Federal programs administered by HEW, in which the Cobb County school system participated, appear to be well organized. Most of these new programs will require additional time for objective evaluation.

There is a very strong feeling that the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as it applies to school systems, has been operated in a very inefficient and inconsistent manner. Information has been most difficult to obtain. Some information received from different HEW officials has been contradictory.

The guidelines were not received in time to comply in an efficient and orderly manner with them.

Although the Cobb County school system seems to be considered in compliance, notification has not been received to date.

The superintendent and a school board member recently visited the Washington HEW office for the express purpose of determining whether or not the system is in compliance. After a conference with three or four courteous HEW officials, a letter was promised, but has not been received.

It is strongly recommended that clear-cut, understandable guidelines be provided well in advance of their expected implementation, thereby avoiding the chaos that we have literally had in this State this past year.

It is recommended that experienced and able elementary and secondary school men and women be placed in positions of authority along with the lawyers and college students.

Appreciation is expressed for the opportunity of presenting the material herein to Members of the Congress.

Thank you.

Mrs. GREEN. Thank you very much.

Mr. Clifton.

**STATEMENT OF A. D. CLIFTON, SUPERINTENDENT, CANDLER
COUNTY SCHOOLS, METTER, GA.**

Mr. CLIFTON. I am A. D. Clifton, superintendent of Candler County schools, Metter, Ga.

Our system is a small system with 1,716 students and 84 teachers; 1,094 of the students are transported. Eighteen of the 84 teachers are paid in part or in full from Federal funds administered from the U.S. Office through the State department of education.

We have only three schools, and all of them qualify for title I funds under Public Law 89-10. Our allotment is a little more than \$130,000, and we have what we think is an excellent program.

Five of our teachers are vocational teachers, and part of the funds for these programs come from Federal funds administered from the U.S. Office of Education through the State department of education.

I feel that this arrangement, whereby the U.S. Office of Education works out agreements with the State department of education, and local systems work with the State departments, is a good arrangement.

I feel that the U.S. Office of Education is making the right approach when it assists with finances and encourages local systems to develop their own programs. Through this approach there will be many innovative programs that will help students to greater achievement than there would be if the U.S. Office of Education prescribed the programs for the schools that participate. This is assistance without local control. This, I think, is the business of the Office of Education.

However, I think the progress of education has been hindered when educational programs, such as Headstart, have been permitted to be operated by agencies other than the schools.

When the Federal Government decided to use the schools as the medium through which the civil rights laws would be enforced, they imposed problems upon the schools that have made it very difficult to make the progress that needs to be made in education.

When the U.S. Office of Education exercises the control over the use of Federal funds, and cuts off these funds when school systems cannot or will not comply with certain guidelines, in many cases the students that have the greatest need of education are the ones that are deprived the most from lack of these programs financed with Federal funds.

In my opinion, this is too much Federal control.

The U.S. Office of Education has had a serious lack of communication with the local school boards and local people. This has been brought about by:

1. Consultants from the U.S. Office of Education, in many cases, have not been educators, and they have little knowledge of the problems that exist in trying to operate a good school program.

2. These consultants have not taken into consideration the problems that local school boards have in dealing with local people.

3. They have refused to talk to boards of education in the presence of representatives of the press.

I feel that these programs under the National Defense Education Act, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and other acts administered by the Office of Education are excellent programs, and do much to raise the level of education of all students who participate.

There is a need, however, for adjustments in the law—and I am referring to title I—that will enable more schools and more students to participate. I feel that these programs contribute much toward equal educational opportunities for all students, regardless of where they live or what their social backgrounds may be.

I do feel very strongly, however, that control of these programs should be with local people, rather than with the Office of Education.

Mrs. GREEN. Thank you very much.

Let me turn to you, Congressman Erlenborn. Do you have questions?

Mr. ERLENBORN. I would take it from the statements each of the members of the panel have made that you are pretty well agreed that the receipt of Federal funds is necessary for the operation of your school districts.

My question is: Is this merely a monetary need? Do you feel that the reason you appreciate the receipt of the Federal funds is that you just need more money, and this is one place that you can receive it when it is difficult or impossible to raise these funds locally or statewide?

And I am going to make a pretty long question, here, but I hope it can be answered.

I think that I can put the question in this way: Do you believe in categorical aid? Do you believe in these programs, like title I or title III? Or would you be just as well satisfied or possibly better satisfied if you just got the money without the direction of the Office of Education or the Congress as to how you would spend these funds in specific programs?

Dr. WEST. May I reply?

I always like to think of the statements of the late and very distinguished Senator Robert Taft, who in my judgment shed a light that was characterized by equanimity, and I think this was quite evident in his attitude about Federal aid to education.

It was Senator Taft who said that there must be in America a partnership as among the local, the State, and the National level, insofar as education is concerned. We can never educate our people, otherwise.

As you remember, Senator Taft felt that some Federal control was necessary, but he said the country would make a great mistake if it ever come to the time that the Federal authorities would try to dictate the educational policies of the Nation.

I do not think, Congressman, that we would be true to the ideals of our profession if we thought purely in terms of the monetary.

We might add parenthetically that we cannot get along without the cash, and we are not going to try to do it. But I think that our philosophy goes far beyond that. You may know that the highest professional associations and organizations in this country stood for general Federal aid.

It was not the thinking of these groups that this money should come without any control, without any suggestions, and, we might say, without mild guidelines.

But we realized that in the first place there was going to be a tremendous amount of extravagance, and waste, with these airtight programs that we have. And I would like to give you an illustration.

In our system, we have had a title I program, Headstart, for only a summer session, because our facilities did not make it possible to go beyond that, but if this program had been projected for a year, with all the restrictions, with all the ramifications, with all the provisos set forth by the Federal Government, it would have cost us \$1,605 per pupil, whereas we provide what we think is an excellent program of education for our pupils in the school district at about \$435 per year.

So I feel that there is a half-way point, somewhere. I think what we are all going to have to do is to develop a common understanding of what we are trying to do for all the children in this land.

I think the present program goes entirely too far, insofar as its restrictive elements are concerned. I think we are boxed in. I think it is forcing upon us extravagance and waste, which I think the Congress of the United States strongly disapproves.

I do not advocate simply giving the money to the State and saying, "Spend it as you wish," but I believe if we are going to have this three-way partnership, each group must recognize the integrity of the ability and the philosophy and the point of view of the others; that it must not get out of line to the extent that we have bureaucratic control of education, to which we are opposed.

Mr. ERLBORN. I think that is a fine statement. Does anybody have anything to add to that?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I would like to make a long statement on this, but I would like to show a little more courtesy than to make a very long statement.

First, I would like to say that I believe very strongly that this Federal Government of ours has a responsibility to every citizen in its land. I think we need to recognize the fact that in various sections of this country there are varying degrees of economic ability.

I think we need to recognize the fact that if the Federal Government does not join hands and participate in the education of the youth of this country, we are going to have certain sections of our country where we will have ignorance and poverty from then on out, until there is an industrial development moving into that area.

I think these are factors that we cannot overlook.

And I would like to say that I believe that the Armed Forces will also bear out the fact that our country cannot be strong when large sections of it are weak.

Therefore, I think very strongly that this Federal Government of ours does have—and I think, and I want to say to my former classmate and good friend Carl Flynt, that I wish he would move a little closer to our chairman, over here, on this—that the Congress does have a

responsibility to help finance the education of the youth of this Nation, wherever they are.

Secondly, I would want to point out this: Yes, I want the money. I am interested in the money. I don't hide that at all. I have heard all my life, though, that when you get money from the Federal Government, they are going to take over control. I have lived several years, as you can note. These public laws to which I have just referred—this money comes to the Cobb County Board of Education. It goes into the same account that our tax money goes into. The Federal Government has no control over it whatsoever. And we have numerous bills in our county, handled exclusively, 100 percent, by this, with no control.

For many, many years, we have had Federal funds coming in, and for some reason or other we still hear that we are going to have Federal control.

I do not want Federal control. I do not want our schools run by the Federal Government.

But I do get a little bit tired of hearing, over and over again, people who say that the Federal Government is going to move in and tell us how to teach history and how to teach English, and what to do.

I do recognize, unfortunately, that in recent times, in the implementation of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, certain elements have entered in there that have given impetus to this sort of thing, and that I regret very much.

But I am strongly, unalterably, and wholeheartedly interested in the Federal Government participating in the education of the youth of this Nation.

Thank you.

Mr. WOOD. May I add one short sentence, reaffirming what Mr. West has said, and Mr. Griffin?

I just want to add that there is also a new disease among many superintendents around about the country, known as innovative indigestion.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mrs. Green, you are interested in equality among the sexes, so perhaps you would be interested in equality of equal opportunity among board members and superintendents.

You have heard from three superintendents. As a board member, may I say that I think board members throughout the country, and particularly in the South, to answer your question, Congressman, would much prefer general Federal aid than categorical aid.

The reasons for that are evident, and have been expressed, here, that you have more controls, you are boxed in more, and it costs more, and the needs of different sections of the country, even in a State, are different.

And what a group of people in Washington would set up for a program in one State, or even in north Georgia, would not be the type of thing that would fit as well in south Georgia, and therefore general Federal aid in my estimation would be much preferred.

Mrs. HALLFORD. I feel the same way about the State that I feel about the Federal Government. We have to have their money. But we do not want too much of their control, either.

And when I say that: An individual school system is just as individual as an individual is. And to do everything in my county that

another county does may be total waste. I may already have that sort of thing. So I want to say that we don't mind accounting for money. I think accounting for it, and taking suggestions, are well. But tied so tightly that we cannot move, when with the same amount of money we could have really much more adequacy if we had leeway to go with it—that is all I mean when I say I don't want Federal aid, or State aid, legislation, either, to interfere with who teaches history, or what history is taught, or when it is taught, or where.

I don't think that ought to be in it.

Mr. CLIFTON. I might make one complaint about this Public Law 89-10. I referred to it in my statement.

This does not apply to my little county so much, but in so many counties you may have a third of your children who are just as culturally deprived, in schools that do not participate or cannot participate, as you do in the two-thirds or maybe almost half that do participate.

And it seems to me that this is an unfair situation, when part of your children participate, and your other part cannot, who are just as culturally deprived as the ones who participate.

We talk about discrimination. We are discriminating in a law that is trying to alleviate discrimination.

Mr. ERLNBORN. May I ask just one other question?

Outside of the field of the enforcement of the Civil Rights Act, how is your relationship with the Office of Education?

Mr. WOOD. May I say to you that under the title I projects, the relationships have been, in my experience, very good.

Like Mr. Beemon, who testified before you earlier, I can say that has worked out very nicely.

I think the only criticism that I would make would be the fact that in just a little over a year, the basic guides for title I have had complete major revisions six different times, and only during the past week, just that recently, we have received amendments revising some part of it, No. 19.

It is an almost impossible task to keep abreast of the various changes they are making.

Dr. WEST. May I just make this brief comment?

I think our relationships are very cordial in this regard. Of course, we are tremendously concerned about what we call excessive redtape, about all these changes.

It takes an enormously expanded staff to carry out all the directions that are given.

Someone said the other day that one of our troubles at the present time—and I think this statement is applicable now—is that we have too much paralysis of the analysis and too much friction of the diction.

I would hope they might be reduced. I would think it might save us time and money.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Congressman, I believe that many people have been quite unhappy over some of the recent Commissioners of Education that we have had, and some of their philosophies, perhaps; but if we can get away from the fact that the Federal Government is going to step in and demand, and control, and take over, I think our relationship in the past years has been good.

For example, Mr. Lilywhite, Mr. McEwen, Mr. Cherry—those are three gentlemen that administer 815 and 874, and we have found them to be extremely courteous, extremely polite, and very, very efficient.

So Public Law 89-10—I cannot say too much for that. As I said here, I think we need more time to evaluate part of it.

But general Federal aid, as Mr. Robinson, here, has mentioned, I think would be the answer.

We get criticized for receiving this impact money, when some other systems do not receive it.

So I do think that a general Federal aid program, with a minimum of Federal control, is the thing. That would be my philosophy.

Mrs. GREEN. In conclusion, may I make a couple of comments.

Mr. West, you referred to Senator Taft. I recall in 1949 that he was “one of those awful Socialists,” and some referred to him as left of the Socialists, because he would be so bold as to suggest that there should be Federal aid for education.

I wish to heaven that we had followed his good advice in 1949, for in 1969 we might not have the problem we will if we had done it.

And I think of Luther Burbank, who said, a long time ago, that if we paid no more attention to our plants than we do to our children, we would be living in a world of weeds.

This is why we have our problems today, because we have been unwilling to finance education properly, and we have placed burdens upon school superintendents without giving them the authority and the means of doing the job.

And then in regard to your comments, Mr. Griffin, I was delighted to hear them. As one who has strongly supported Federal aid for education through the years, and who has seen the necessity for it in my own part of the country, and when I review the rate of rejections in the military, I cannot help but be convinced that we have done an inadequate job in education.

And I must say that I have never seen, until the last couple of years, any indication of any Federal control in any educational program.

For the first time, in the last year, perhaps, and I think it is the enforcement of the civil rights, I have seen a bit of a problem that does bother me, and I think that we need to be alert to it in the Congress, and we need to be alert to it in the educational community. And if we are alert to it, and we provide the kind of leadership that we should, I see no reason why major problems should develop. I, too, want this control and direction of education at the local and the State level.

If we do not see some of you again, may I express my deep gratitude, on behalf of the committee, for your willingness to come here and give up time that I know is precious.

We are grateful for the comments and the recommendations you have made.

We are very grateful to those people who made it possible for us to use this very charming, very delightful room, where my colleague tells me he tried many cases. Coming from the part of the State that has timber—lumber—as a No. 1 industry, and the finest lumber in the world, I appreciate the wood paneling.

And I am exceedingly grateful to Dr. Martin and the regional office for all of the arrangements that he has made, and the many courtesies, the many kindnesses, that have been extended to us in our brief visit here. It has been most helpful.

And to Congressman Flynt, and to his colleagues, with whom we have had a very close working relationship over the years, Phil Landrum, who served on the Education and Labor Committee for about 10 years, to Mr. Landrum, Mr. Flynt, and John Davis, and our very dear friends Charlie Weltner and Mr. Mackey, I want to express our appreciation for their cooperation and their help in making this visit possible.

Our colleagues from Georgia are most effective legislators, and we on the Education and Labor Committee have benefited by their views and by their interest in the legislation before the committee.

We hope also that we may have a closer working relationship in the Congress on the Education Committee with you people who are on the firing line, as I suggested, and who have the responsibilities that we sometimes wisely, and perhaps sometimes unwisely, place upon your shoulders.

Thank you again.

(Whereupon, at 12:55 p.m., the subcommittee recessed, to reconvene at 2:15 p.m. the same day.)

AFTERNOON SESSION

Mrs. GREEN. This was not originally included in our on-the-record hearings, but it seemed to me that it might be advantageous to have it.

I hope this afternoon we can make this very informal and discuss the problems as you see them.

Mr. Green, we are glad that you could rearrange your schedule to be here at this time, and we appreciate your willingness to discuss the problems as you see them.

STATEMENT OF J. GREEN, DE KALB HUMAN RELATIONS ASSOCIATION

Mr. GREEN. I might say we appreciate very much the opportunity to be heard, and we regret that on such short notice I was the only one who could manage to flip his schedule around so as to make it here. However, everybody else wished me good luck over the phone, and hoped I would say the things others could say better than I.

What we have to tell is sort of a story of our efforts in human relations, concerned with improving human relations, and promoting racial understanding and racial integration in our home district, and our efforts to try to in particular bring about desegregation of the De Kalb County schools, in line with the Civil Rights Act, and our attempts to get the U.S. Office of Education to perform in the manner we felt the law required them to perform in, and cooperate with citizens in a manner that we would feel was reasonable.

For a variety of reasons that are not open to our knowledge, in many instances, we ended our letter to you asking to be heard, saying:

Our efforts as citizens to concern ourselves with the problems we face here in De Kalb County in education have been totally defeated by the action of

the Office of Education. We are totally frustrated by the failure of that office to enforce its own guidelines. We have appealed in writing to Commissioner Kemis, Commissioner Howe, Mr. Howe, Mr. Johnson, and others, but no investigation has ever been made of our complaints.

If you could stand it, I would like to give you a much abbreviated chronological version of some of the things that happened, and why we feel so strongly that it was the operation of the U.S. Office of Education that has in fact prevented the ending of the dual school system in De Kalb County. We think it could have been ended at any time.

I might, just for clarity—I am not sure how much you know about De Kalb County, but I think it contributes a great deal if you realize it is a largely white bedroom county with a school population of around 70,000 pupils, of which only about 3,000 are Negro, living in small pockets scattered around the county.

At the present time, we have achieved some integration of schools and faculty. However, some schoolhouses which were integrated last year are segregated this year. Negro children are still bussed out of their attendance districts to Negro schools. In fact, some of them are bussed past several white schools in order to get to the Negro schools.

We still have in existence two very small Negro high schools, with limited course offerings. One of them has only something like 120 pupils in the whole school. There are many over-a-thousand pupil schools within a couple of miles, or 5 or 10 miles, in any case, of this school.

Our superintendent of schools boasts that he received \$5 million of Federal aid to education in the last year. We have repeatedly suggested to Mr. Seeley's office that just the suggestion of the withholding of Federal aid would bring De Kalb into immediate compliance.

Now, this all started, as far as we are concerned, back in 1965, but I won't go through what happened during the year 1965, but pick it up in the spring of 1966.

We reported by letter to Mr. Seeley, in the U.S. Office of Education, in February of this year some of the particular points concerning the events in De Kalb County that we felt needed correction, such as that there was no faculty integration, and there was no individual notification concerning the possibilities of transfer of schools. The burden of proof at that time was entirely upon the Negro, and we had very clearly and obviously gerrymandered school districts. We asked the Office to intervene. We got no response to that letter.

We then wrote to Mr. Peter LeBasi, a month later, asking for help in getting the Office of Education to pay attention to our complaints. We also sent a copy of this letter to Mr. Howe.

We received no response to the letter to Mr. Howe.

On March 21, however, we did receive a reply from Mr. LeBasi, apologizing for the Office of Education not responding to our complaints, and stating that Mr. Kruger would follow through.

In the meantime, on March 11, we had written again to Mr. Seeley, right after the new guidelines were prepared, noting not only that their Office had not answered our letters, but we thought the new guidelines were just great.

We still think that the guidelines themselves were a very fine document, and a very intelligent one, that was produced by someone who

understood what the problems of getting some kind of compliance would be.

We suggested in this letter that Federal pressure would be needed to make De Kalb County comply. Our reasons for this were our own personal experience, plus published statements by the superintendent of schools, boasting of his success as a segregationist.

For example, in an Atlanta Constitution article back in 1965, Mr. Cherry was quoted as saying:

I suppose I am the most successful segregationist in the country.

I am just taking this in order.

We didn't know about this, but on April 14, Mr. Harper, the assistant superintendent of schools in De Kalb County, who is more or less in charge of dealing with the U.S. Office of Education with respect to segregation, silenced by Mr. Cherry, superintendent of schools, went to Washington, and we were told later in a letter from Mr. Seeley that Mr. Harper was told at that time that the county was operating under a geographical zone attendance plan.

I am sure you are not basically concerned with the features of this as such. I hope you understand there is a difference between a geographic-zone plan and a freedom-of-choice plan, because around this distinction a good deal of our difficulties in dealing with the U.S. Office developed.

De Kalb County, then, according to Mr. Seeley, did not have a freedom-of-choice plan, had an attendance-zone plan, and Mr. Seeley claims that not only had De Kalb County chosen to do this a year before, but in his conference with Mr. Harper on April 14, this had been reiterated and made explicit.

In the meantime, we began to read in the newspaper, and hear discussions, and get notices and comments from the school people, that seemed to indicate to us that the county was now operating under a freedom-of-choice plan.

This was not our notion of the greatest idea in the world, but any plan was better than no plan.

We read the guidelines, and the guidelines laid out certain requirements to be followed by school systems, following a freedom-of-choice plan.

They were not being followed completely, just in part, at that time.

We wrote Mr. Seeley and asked that he explain what was going on.

On April 22, we got a reply from Mr. Seeley, saying that De Kalb had until April 30 to mail parents, giving name and location of the school to which the student had been assigned by the school leader, and information about bus service, and that they were supposed to publish map attendance zones, and so forth.

We received notices from the school system on May 2.

Now, these notices were freedom-of-choice notices. They were exactly the notices that the guidelines said should be sent under a freedom-of-choice plan.

We pointed this out to everybody we could, and in the meantime we made some complaints to various and sundry people, that the freedom-of-choice procedures were not being followed.

For example, the freedom-of-choice plan covered what choices were not offered at all high schools. This was never done, for obvious reasons.

In any case, Mr. Kruger at this point took a hand, and while I don't know the details of what he did, at all, and I do not claim that what I have here is an accurate report of what he did, it is what we understand happened.

We understand that on May 3, Mr. Cherry received a telegram from Kruger, Mr. Kruger at the Office of Education, saying that letters should have been sent prior to April 30, assigning students to school, and then a transfer permitted, also that the system should have submitted a map by April 13, and asked for immediate publication of a geographical request zone plan, and a requested explanation.

The next day, Mr. Harper stated to the Constitution that he knew of no deadlines for mailing letters.

We understand that Mr. Cherry was incensed by this telegram from Mr. Kruger, and said he would have no further dealings with him, that he would only talk with Mr. Howe.

On May 6, the De Kalb Council met with Mr. Corrigan, of the U.S. Office of Education. He reiterated that the procedures for a geographic plan would be enforced. He also stated that all faculties would be integrated. And he stated that preparation of pupils, teachers, and staff for desegregation was an important consideration in the Office's considerations of compliance.

On May 9, we wrote a letter to Mr. Corrigan, pointing out the variety of courses currently offered in De Kalb schools, and asked when we would receive new notices.

We got no answer to this letter.

It was on May 11 that Mr. Cherry was quoted in the paper as saying he would not deal with Kruger, because of statements made.

We had community support, then, for insisting that there be compliance. I can point to articles in the Atlanta Constitution pointing out there should be no reason why there should have been any difficulty, under the guidelines.

On May 16, Mr. Cherry saw Mr. Howe, and came out of the meeting with a letter in hand in which Mr. Cherry was absolved completely. And Mr. Howe said Mr. Cherry was doing just great, that he did not have to have any notices of attendance zones, because "each child understands that he is initially assigned to an attendance area."

In the meantime, in fact following this for a number of weeks, our committee in the schools were being told that they must sign these freedom-of-choice forms.

My own job people, for example, told a third grade student that he would not be able to go to school next year unless his parents completed the freedom-of-choice forms.

However, some did not complete those forms, and we did want to see if we would ever get a notice of our attendance zone.

On June 8, assignments by attendance zone were made for those who had not completed the choice form. This was after school closed.

In the meantime, we wrote to Mr. Howe, on May 26, citing what we considered to be 10 violations of the guidelines, and asking him to answer this letter.

We never did get a reply to this, although we wrote him a month later asking if he could not reply, and since we could not get any information from that point, De Kalb County paid no further attention to us.

In fact, they did not have to. Mr. Howe's letter resolved the condition of the guidelines.

And while they answered our letters in due course, they were evasive letters, and just said, "I am sure if you take any particular child to a school, the questions will be answered for that child."

I might note that although the assignments were given at the end of June, that was not universally true. The principal of one Negro school said he did not assign seventh grade students to the school.

In De Kalb County, grade eight is the beginning of high school, so that apparently none of the children in that school were told which high school zone they lived in.

On June 10, we wrote a letter to Mr. Corrigan, asking for some specifics about what aspects of the guidelines still applied to De Kalb County, if any, such as the unlimited transfer permissible for bus service to Negro children, and asking who was in charge of compliance in De Kalb County now.

We got no answer to that letter. In fact, we never, nearly, until a few days ago, got anything further out of the U.S. Office of Education, and we made a number of attempts, but we never really did get any.

We became totally ineffective. What newspaper support we had for the notion that De Kalb could comply vanished immediately, was all a misunderstanding, and Mr. Cherry and Mr. Howe agreed that the thing that De Kalb County was doing was great.

As we note in our letter to you, Congresswoman Green, late last year, you had been told by Mr. Howe, we understand, that he would see to it that De Kalb County was investigated. As far as we know, that is not true, and has never happened.

In fact, in August, representatives of the Office of Equal Opportunity were in Atlanta doing a field investigation in Georgia, and at that time we were told that Mr. Seeley had refused to give permission for any investigation in De Kalb County.

I will call your attention to only one other thing.

On June 22, of this year, the Atlanta Constitution front page headlines had an article referring to Mr. William Page's memorandum to Secretary Gardner, in the local office, which said in part:

The ineptitude in handling the De Kalb County matter is unequaled in our experience. Local people in this Regional Office have attempted for a year to get this problem handled constructively by the Office of Education. If any of the 2,000 school superintendents can negotiate his case with Commissioner Howe, why should 10,000 hospital administrators not have access to the Surgeon General?—

and so on.

We feel rather strongly that this is a case of a bureaucracy tripping over itself; in its efforts to accomplish one thing, it is accomplishing something else.

I don't think any of us doubt the individual personal sincerity of the people in the Office of Education. We nevertheless feel that we personally have been treated shabbily, but above all, a number of children in De Kalb County could have been in some semblance of adequate schools, or still remain in the segregated schools unnecessarily, and we really had come to a dead end when we had the opportunity to be heard by you.

Mrs. GREEN. How many schools are there in the county, and to what extent are they integrated?

Mr. GREEN. Number of schools—we are a rapidly growing suburban county, and I am not sure of the exact number of schools at the moment. There may be something like 60-odd schools, or more.

Mrs. GREEN. Elementary?

Mr. GREEN. Around 55 elementary schools, maybe 10 to a dozen high schools, something on this order.

Mrs. GREEN. And your high school is from the eighth grade through the 12th?

Mr. GREEN. Eighth through 12th.

There are around, as I say—enrollment figures, 70,000, and Negro enrollment figures are in the neighborhood of 3,000.

There is no large concentration of Negroes in De Kalb County. They live in scattered pockets, scattered around the county. That is, all those that are eligible for the De Kalb County schools. The city of Atlanta extends into De Kalb County, but that is a different question.

Mrs. GREEN. I don't understand. Are you saying you have a completely dual system in De Kalb County? There is no—

Mr. GREEN. No. I am sorry.

You asked about integration.

As of October, according to my best information—this is not official information—we did discover later on that there was an official report available—

Mrs. GREEN. As of what date?

Mr. GREEN. As of October of this year.

Our attempts to find these official reports—we finally came across them, but it takes a lot of getting anything out of the school office these days, for us. We are not very welcome there, and when they can evade our questions, they do.

Our information is that there are about 25 Negro teachers or staff in previously all white schools, and about five white teachers or staff in otherwise Negro schools.

The number of Negro pupils in integrated schools in the county at this time—

I seem to have a blank. Let me give you a figure off the cuff that I think is approximately correct: 400.

Mrs. GREEN. 400 Negroes in all 55 schools?

Mr. GREEN. They are not in all of them. There are approximately 17 or 18 schools that have such a situation, as far as students are concerned. The remaining schools are either all Negro or all white. Both of my children attend schools that are all white.

We really think there is no reason for this, at all, in this county. It is a well to do, wealthy county.

I don't mean that the people who live there are all in favor of integration. Don't misunderstand me, at all. We think that if it became a matter of obeying the law, they would obey the law, without any question.

Mrs. GREEN. Are they operating under freedom of choice?

Mr. GREEN. No. We have a school attendance plan.

There are many difficulties with this plan, as we see it. There are difficulties with the districts. There is difficulty with the application of the plan.

Operating with an attendance zone plan followed by freedom of choice—now, what exactly this means is one of the things we have been unable to discover, but this is the description of the system.

Mr. Howe's letter to Mr. Cherry on May 16, 1966, this is the description of it as given, that we have attempted to find out what this really means, but we are told that basically it is a geographic plan, with attendance zones, and children assigned by zone.

Mrs. GREEN. Do you know of any instance in De Kalb County where a student presented himself at any school and said, "I would like to enroll in this school," and he was denied the opportunity to attend?

Mr. GREEN. Not in direct fashion; no. We know of some instances in which there were some discouraging steps taken, but, no, I would have to say that any child who made a direct, clear, cleancut request to be assigned to that school—we could not say anybody had been rejected for race in that school.

Mrs. GREEN. What do you think the Office of Education ought to have done that they did not do?

Mr. GREEN. We think they ought to have asked that De Kalb County toe the line on guidelines.

Mrs. GREEN. What, specifically? What guidelines? And what do you mean by "toeing the line"?

Mr. GREEN. Using the 1966 guidelines, we believe that perhaps the most important thing that should happen, that has not happened, is that every single parent and child in the county receive notice of his zone, of the attendance zone in which he lives.

There are still many children, particularly Negro children and parents, in De Kalb County, who don't really know. They know their children go to that Negro school, a number of miles away. They don't know whether they live in that zone, or they live in that white school zone, or that Negro school zone.

Now, I don't deny that those who care about it strongly enough to take the initiative, to go down and visit each school in turn, can, by looking at the map on the wall, find out whether they live in the zone at that school, and after making the rounds at several schools, they can probably find out in just which attendance zone they live.

Then they could, presumably, next year apply to transfer to that school, and my guess is that that request would be granted. There would not be any basic difficulty.

But we think that the burden of this kind of thing should not be put upon the transferring of Negro children.

Mrs. GREEN. Then you say, one, you think that the Office of Education should see that a notice is given to everyone in the county?

Mr. GREEN. That is correct.

Mrs. GREEN. Now, what about the Human Research Council? Have they taken leadership, sent out notices, done an educational job in the county?

Mr. GREEN. Yes, and no. In fact, in many respects this is one of the things that had us so very angry, at first. In 1965 we did just exactly that. We spent our time in notifying parents.

In 1965, first and eighth graders only were allowed to transfer. We spent a great deal of time and effort finding families that had rising eighth graders and entering first graders, and notifying them of the

possibilities of getting their children in this school or that school, and finding out what could be done about transportation, which has been a very difficult problem.

Part of our difficulty the following year was that we believed the U.S. Office of Education's statements that they meant to enforce their rules, and as we read the rules, I still believe that if the rules they had laid down had been observed carefully, there would have been no difficulty.

Mrs. GREEN. How much success did you have in 1965 with the first and eighth graders? Did you send everyone a notice that had children in the first and eighth grades?

Mr. GREEN. No. In most cases this meant a door-by-door attempt, attending church meetings, going from door to door, in this little Negro community, trying to find out who had such children. We did not have any master list from which we could work.

In 1966, we simply did not do this. We thought all we would do was watch the national Office of Education enforce the guidelines.

This was a terrible mistake, which we regretted very much.

However, in the fall of 1965, nearly 250 pupils transferred. It only went up to 400, or thereabouts—I don't claim I know the exact figure—in the following year, when all grades went up. I am sure that we could have done much better.

Mrs. GREEN. You have said one thing. What else do you think the Office of Education ought to do?

Mr. GREEN. They have a paragraph in their guidelines saying they will not tolerate the existence of small, isolated, inadequate schools. There is at least one school of roughly 120 pupils in De Kalb County, an all-Negro high school. That is five grades, now, we are talking about. That is being maintained, which we think is in direct contradiction to the provisions of the guidelines.

Yet it is a good provision, and we don't believe that that high school should be maintained.

There is also an elementary school on the spot, and we are not suggesting that that spot should be eliminated.

We believe that in the immediate action, the U.S. Office of Education should investigate at the very least the actions of the school system with regard to its bus transportation.

Some buses that were desegregated last year are segregated again this year.

Unfortunately, I could not get some people of the council here who know in precise detail about this particular point, but there is one story of the Negro community in Tucker, which is a small community or city or town in De Kalb County. It is a very small Negro community, and four buses go around through that little Negro community.

Many of the children go to a nearby white elementary school. As I understand it, and this is hearsay on my part, now; I have not investigated this personally—the bus to that school, to that white elementary school, with the Tucker Negro children, used to go down the street, where they lived. It was an integrated bus.

They discovered that a bridge over which that bus had to go was defective, and the white children on that bus were taken off the bus and put on other buses, and the Negro children continued to ride that particular bus, which now is segregated going to school.

There are other cases where segregated buses take children to schools, and particularly the high school children, the Negro high school children, I understand, resent this very much.

Mrs. GREEN. These instances that you cited—can you document this?

Mr. GREEN. I can get people to testify of their own personal knowledge of these circumstances.

I am sorry, very sorry, we are not here in force, so that I could turn and say that so-and-so knows about that experience.

Mrs. GREEN. What else would you ask of the Office of Education?

Mr. GREEN. Specifically with respect to promoting understanding—how shall I rephrase that—we do not feel that De Kalb County has taken any really constructive steps to help, officially to help, the people of the county understand about desegregation.

We think the U.S. Office of Education could have helped the county and assisted, as they say in their guidelines that they demand positive action by the school system to instruct people about this, to promote understanding and acceptance of the guidelines.

We do not think the Office of Education has urged this, even.

Mrs. GREEN. Do you think this is really the responsibility of the Office of Education?

Mr. GREEN. I had better speak personally on this. I don't know about the people in the country generally.

We do think that if an agency of the U.S. Government announces it is going to follow a policy, it ought to follow it, or admit publicly it is not, and retract.

Mrs. GREEN. In this case, of what policy?

Mr. GREEN. In this case, enforcing the act.

Mrs. GREEN. But let's take the point of bringing about better understanding.

Mr. GREEN. Should they have undertaken the responsibility? Should they have the responsibility of trying to bring about desegregation? Is this what you are asking?

Mrs. GREEN. No. On your last point, I asked: What else would you have the Office of Education do?

Mr. ERLNBORN. I think you were saying that there is a guideline that requires this.

Mr. GREEN. Yes.

Mr. ERLNBORN. And I think here the point is not whether you feel they should do it; but if it is in the guidelines, they should do it; or if they should not do it, it should not be in the guidelines.

Is that a fair way to put it?

Mr. GREEN. Yes, it is.

Mrs. GREEN. Is that in the guidelines, that the Office of Education shall come out with proposals?

Mr. GREEN. No; it is in the guidelines that the school systems will come out and do the same, and this is one of the criteria.

Mrs. GREEN. The school systems will come out and do what?

Mr. GREEN. Will take action to obtain acceptance of desegregation.

This is one of the official provisions of the guidelines, that this Office of Education said it would use as a judge of whether or not the school system is in compliance, if they in fact take steps to win public acceptance.

I don't believe that the U.S. Office pays any attention to this, at all. Certainly there is no evidence of this for De Kalb County.

Mrs. GREEN. How would you have them do it, specifically? What would you have the Office of Education do?

Mr. GREEN. In this particular case, I would have them say to De Kalb County, "This is something you have not done. For heaven's sake do something."

They have not done anything. They could have programs explaining this. They could promote a positive attitude among school employees, and ask for it.

I think there are many things they could do to promote better human relations, generally speaking, within the county.

The school system has grudgingly complied, rather than being forced to comply.

How much of this sort of thing there is, and how effective it is, I don't know. I belong to an organization that dedicates itself to trying. We don't claim that we know the answers on human relations, either. We just try.

Mr. ERLNBORN. You made reference to a letter from, I believe, the regional director of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to the Washington office. Is that right? During this last year, have you been in fairly frequent contact with the regional director?

Mr. GREEN. Off and on, people in our council have been in contact with the regional office.

We have always found that they understood. I think we have always found they understood the nature of our problems quite well. For the most part, they have been unable to help us.

Mr. ERLNBORN. Let me put the question to you this way: Do you think you would have a better job done if the job of civil rights enforcement were decentralized, and the regional director had the authority?

Mr. GREEN. Yes, I think so. I think most of us at this moment believe that would be the case.

Mr. ERLNBORN. I will just make two quick observations.

I think your experience in De Kalb County is probably just about the complete antithesis or contrary experience of other counties that we have heard about; but interestingly enough, your conclusion is about the same as the conclusion of the people on the other side of the fence, that local enforcement would be better.

I think this is rather interesting.

Mr. GREEN. And one of the reasons we wanted to be heard was that we were fairly sure that this was the circumstance, that is, that we were on one side, and almost everybody else was on the other.

We do agree with the conclusion, anyhow. We may be wrong. Until it is tried, I am not sure. But I really think that there are just so many layers to the bureaucracy, here. This has been our major problem.

I don't think anybody has intended to undercut anybody else. I suspect this is true on the other side of the coin, too.

No, I don't see any reason why there could not be some local authority on this matter. At least it ought to be given a trial.

Mrs. GREEN. You don't have any other specific recommendations for the Office of Education?

Mr. GREEN. No, I don't.

Mrs. GREEN. Thank you very much, Mr. Green.

Mr. GREEN. Thank you for the opportunity of presenting the council's views.

Mrs. GREEN. Next we have representatives here from the American Friends Committee.

This seems to be an afternoon of the Greens. Miss Winifred Green, and Mr. Green of the public relations council, and myself are no relation, to my knowledge. We just happen to all have the same name.

Would you introduce the people who have come with you, too?

STATEMENT OF MISS WINIFRED GREEN, ALABAMA COMMUNITY RELATIONS PROGRAM, AMERICAN FRIENDS SERVICE COMMITTEE; MEMBER, AFSC-LEGAL DEFENSE FUND SCHOOL DESEGREGATION TASK FORCE

Miss GREEN. I certainly would.

My name is Winifred Green. I am a member of the Alabama Community Relations staff of the American Friends Service Committee.

Sitting to my immediate right is Miss Teretha Lemmon, a 10th grade student at St. George High School, in South Carolina.

Next to her is Mr. Hayes Mizell, a member of the South Carolina Community Relations staff of the American Friends Committee; Mrs. Frieda Mitchell, a program associate of the school desegregation task force, and chairman of the Beaufort County Education Committee; Mr. Henry Aronson, a legal attorney with the NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund; Mrs. Annie Mae Williams, a program associate of the task force from Wetumpka, Ala.

To my left, Miss Constance Curry, of the desegregation task force, and southern representative for the American Friends Service Committee.

Mr. ERLNBORN. Might I suggest before we get started that we might explain our time limitations, so that the presentation could be tailored to fit our plane schedule.

We do have to catch a plane this evening, to go to Kansas City, and from what we understand about the traffic, and the time between here and the airport, we will have to leave here at about quarter to 5, so that gives us about half an hour.

I thought you should be advised of this, so that you could tailor your presentation to fit what is a rather stringent time limitation, I realize, but if we are going to get to Kansas City, that is the way it is.

Mrs. GREEN. If you could, summarize your statement, and then the entire statement will be made a matter of the printed record, not only for us to refer to and read, but also for our colleagues.

Miss GREEN. I planned to read sections of this, and summarize, but I think, in view of the time schedule, if it is all right, I will only read the five recommendations that we have to make, and then have the people, many of whom come from a long way, make their presentations in regard to this.

I wonder if we could let them make their statements, and leave the remainder of the time for questions when finished.

I will just say, to start out, that the American Friends Committee is speaking out of 15 years of community programs.

Mrs. GREEN. We are very familiar with the American Friends Service Committee. I have great respect for it.

Miss GREEN. We have recommendations in five areas.

Our first recommendation is that the guidelines should be strengthened, and you will notice on page 2 of our report their comments about that.

Our second recommendation, on page 4 of the statement, is that the Office of Education should develop an informational and educational program to interpret the goal of abolishing the dual school structure, to inform Negro citizens of their rights, and to win a broad base of support for securing equality of educational opportunity.

On page 5 is the third recommendation.

At this critical juncture, the Office of Education must launch an affirmative compliance program, with adequate machinery and staff, and with a strengthened technical assistance component.

Our fourth recommendation is that the Office of Education should develop a well coordinated approach to compliance, so that Federal programs are working toward the same goal.

Our fifth recommendation is that the Office of Education should build into its compliance program a process of systematic factfinding and evaluation, so that it can make an accurate assessment of progress, identify areas of weakness in the guidelines, and strengthen its compliance machinery on the basis of documented experience.

I think that the exhibits indicated in the statement are clear, except Exhibit E is not marked. That is a letter received this morning.

Mrs. GREEN. Are your recommendations particularly pertinent to Georgia, or to all of the South?

Miss GREEN. They are pertinent to the nine Southern States where the desegregation task force has operated.

I would like next to let Mrs. Williams from Wetumpka, Ala., speak about her experience in desegregation in Elmore County, Ala.

STATEMENT OF MRS. ANNIE MAE WILLIAMS, PROGRAM ASSOCIATE, SCHOOL DESEGREGATION TASK FORCE, WETUMPKA, ALA.

Mrs. WILLIAMS. I am a parent of four children in the desegregated schools in Wetumpka.

Last year 19 Negroes were enrolled in the white school at Wetumpka. Forty signed up, but lost their nerve for one reason or another.

One reason some of the children did not attend is because the attendance supervisor went around in the Negro community encouraging parents not to send the children to the white school.

In October of last year, the home of Mrs. Cara Teavey was burned to the ground. The fire department let this house burn all night, and all the whites stood around all night. Her car was broken into by a group of white boys. The fire department let the house burn, and never came back.

This happened after Mrs. Chew integrated the schools.

Deborah Gracie, a Negro girl in the 11th grade at the desegregated school, was shot by rubberbands by the white students from the very beginning, and no one did anything to defend her.

After taking all she could, she had to defend herself. When she hit back, she was expelled from school, put in jail, and kept there overnight, without bail. She was kept out of school almost 4 months.

The day before Deborah was to return to school, her parents' home was destroyed by firebombs. It was a total loss. Nothing has been done to replace the home, or punish anyone for the crime.

My son Victor's arm was broken in physical education class. The white kids laughed and said, "Oh, goody, 'Nigger' got his arm broke. It should have been his neck."

The lunchroom workers treated the Negro children very cruelly. They just treated them different from all the others. The teachers made jokes about "niggers" and helped the students laugh at the Negro children.

The harder the Negro children were working to make good grades, the lower the grades would be.

Three Negro girls were refused admittance to Wetumpka High by white students because they were told their transfer blanks had gotten lost. This loss of transfer blanks did not prevent them from returning to the Negro school.

During the past summer, we worked very hard, trying to encourage parents to send more children to the white school. The things that happened to Teaveys and Deborah made others afraid to send their children. Others were afraid of losing their jobs, or being cut off welfare.

I had gone to work before then as practical nurse and assistant teacher, but after enrolling my children in the white school, I am no longer called to do any work.

We worked very hard, and got almost 300 promises for the present school year, but many were afraid, and did not keep the promise.

We were happy to get 150 children enrolled throughout the county. This year we were so proud we had some larger boys attending the formerly white school.

Some of the boys went out for sports, but soon had to stop, because the whites treated them so cruel. Two of the boys were hurt during football practice, and they were never protected by the white players.

The spectators started going to watch the practice, and encouraged the white boys to spank the Negroes. Two of the boys were hurt and taken to the school doctor. The doctor always treated the Negroes very cruel.

When time for basketball came this year, the Negro boys thought they would have a better chance. They were allowed to practice, but they couldn't play on the team. They were told they couldn't play the first year they transferred, even though the guidelines clearly say they can.

The whites buses are not transporting the Negro children to the white school. Only one bus is bringing children to the white school, and this driver sat back and watched while the whites sprayed deodorant in the faces of the Negro kids.

One girl was hit in the face with a baseball bat.

Most of the children had to ride the bus to the Negro school and then walk to the white school, rain or shine, and some of the time they are punished for being tired.

The home economics teacher makes the Negro girls sit on a sewing machine, while the whites were at tables. She always told the Negro girls to clean the bathroom and wash inside the toilets. The whites are never told to do this.

The worst thing that happened to those of us who work so hard is that the children in the integrated school have an easy chance of going back, and many children have changed their minds and gone back, because of the grades, and the treatments they received. And all they have to do is to ask for a little yellow slip and say they want to go back, and it is easily done.

The few Negro children who attend the white schools are outnumbered, so they are left out on all activities, such as homecoming.

Small, inadequate schools, with outdoor toilets, are still being used. They are heated by old potbelly stoves. According to the guidelines these schools should be closed.

Dobey High School, the Negro school, is so crowded they have classes in the halls, and some teachers have as many as 50 or 60 children at one time.

Everything that has been going on has been reported to the Office of Education, but we are still waiting for some action.

Mrs. GREEN. Thank you, Mrs. Williams.

Mr. Hayes Mizell.

STATEMENT OF HAYES MIZELL, SOUTH CAROLINA COMMUNITY RELATIONS PROGRAM, AMERICAN FRIENDS SERVICE COMMITTEE, MEMBER, SCHOOL DESEGREGATION TASK FORCE

Mr. MIZELL. The findings I have made in South Carolina during the last 8 months are contained primarily in exhibit C, and I will just refer you to that for my primary criticisms, observations, et cetera.

Now I would like to introduce Miss Teretha Lemmon, who is a 10th grade student at St. George High School, a desegregated high school in St. George, S.C.

STATEMENT OF TERETHA LEMMON, 10TH GRADE STUDENT, ST. GEORGE HIGH SCHOOL, ST. GEORGE, S.C.

Miss LEMMON. I am at St. George High School. From the day we have walked in that school, we have been treated like little dogs—like a person who goes in a place and you are not wanted.

And our principal is very nasty.

Even though Negro students, we try to be as nice as we can, and if someone do something to you, well, we ignore them for a while, until they push us too far, and then, if we hit back, we are sent to the principal.

He doesn't wait for us to give our side of anything. He always listens to what the whites have to say, and whenever a Negro's statement doesn't count, we get the punishment, whereas some of us maybe are put out of school, and the rest of them remain in school.

And in our classes, we sit in the back of the classroom, and the whites are ahead of us, or either we sit on one side, and they sit on the other side, whereas the teacher stands in front of the white kids and displays things to them.

And if we have questions, and we ask our questions, she seems to ignore us, as though she doesn't even hear us, as though we are not a part of the class. And if we hold up our hands and answer a question, she looks over our hands and calls on some of the white kids.

All right, then. The bus seating: We sit on one side of our bus, and the whites sit on the other side. And we do this because the principal came on the bus one day and told us where we had to sit, and we are not allowed to sit on the other side.

The door on the bus has a hole in it, and the wind comes in, and quite naturally we wanted to sit on the side where the heater is, too, but we aren't allowed to sit on that side. We sit on the opposite side all the time.

In the class, we sit there because the teachers tell us to sit there.

We aren't allowed to participate in any activities. And the reason for that—they don't give us a reason for that.

And in the gym, we sit on one side of the gym, and they sit on the other side of the gym.

And we pass the students in the hall. They call us "niggers" and all kinds of things, names, throw paper on us, and we report this to the principal and the teacher, and they don't say anything.

And I say that a whole lot of students around there are tired of it, and a whole lot of our students have transferred back to the Negro schools. And we asked one—Miss Jennie Patricia asked to transfer some students over there. He said they couldn't take the school time to transfer students over there, but they would take time to transfer Negro students back to a Negro school. And the Negro students have Negro teachers and the others is all white teachers teaching Negro students.

Mr. MIZELL. Madam Chairman, we had planned to hear from Mrs. Mitchell, of Beaufort County, but the statement is similar, and I think we will go on to Mr. Aronson, and come back.

STATEMENT OF HENRY ARONSON, ATTORNEY, NAACP LEGAL DEFENSE AND EDUCATIONAL FUND

Mr. ARONSON. For 12 years, the law of the land regarding segregated schools has been unequivocal. They are illegal. Every school district which does that is acting in violation of the Constitution.

The fact is that southern school districts, with few exceptions, continue to be operated in whole or in part on a segregated basis.

Recognition of the fact that the Supreme Court decisions require action only of the party or named parties to the decision is basic to understanding the current segregated status of southern schools.

While the principle that segregated schools are unconstitutional, as enunciated in *Brown*, applies to 2,000-plus southern school districts, the decree requires desegregation only, and required desegregation only of five school districts, namely, those school districts that were parties to the *Brown* litigation.

The limited reach in terms of mandatory action of a court decree explains the essential failure of litigation as a technique to effect widespread desegregation.

Too few attorneys are available to conduct litigation against the hundreds of segregated school systems in existence at this time.

And in particular deference to Congresswoman Green—and I know your very real concern for local autonomy in local school districts doing their job—I think it is relevant to note that school districts have not been willing, anywhere in the Deep South, to voluntarily desegregate.

The law of the land—and we are told that we are a nation of laws, and not men—was that segregated schools were unconstitutional and illegal. Yet, in 1964, there was not one desegregated school system in the State of Mississippi.

It is ironic to tell schoolchildren that this is a nation of laws; yet those school systems don't feel bound by those laws.

Administrative remedies, such as title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, assume monumental importance here. It is nothing less than a tragedy that the conceptual scheme and enforcement procedures adopted by the Office of Education have been ineffective to effect the results required by the 14th amendment to the Constitution.

Statistics published by the Office of Education are deceptive. We are told that a number of Negro children are attending school with white children, usually a geometric percentage increase over the previous year.

Our natural inclination is to marvel at such astronomical improvement.

A closer examination of the unstated facts should dampen our response and discredit the numbers gained.

Examples of the unstated facts would include, one, that nowhere in Mississippi, in one district in Alabama, in one district in South Carolina, and in only a handful of districts in the remainder of the Deep South, do white children attend schools formerly maintained by Negroes.

The Negro schools continue to exist. And I am aware of no action or plans on the part of the Office of Education to abolish this segregated institution.

There has been no progress worthy of note in faculty desegregation in the Deep South.

To my knowledge, there are no Negroes teaching as regular teachers in formerly white schools in all of Mississippi. There are two in the whole State of Alabama.

Similarly, to my knowledge, there are no white teachers in Negro schools in Alabama and Mississippi, and the pattern is the same, with few exceptions, throughout the Deep South.

Not one Negro team has played a team from a formerly white school anywhere in the Deep South.

Segregated transportation systems are maintained throughout the Deep South to this day. Little or no effort has been made to consolidate routes serving both white and Negro students, even where these children attend the same schools.

As of this time, new schools are constructed to accommodate children of one race. In Alabama, prior to a new school being constructed, the State department of education takes a census of only those children of the race for whom the school is built. The Alabama State Board of Education has been found by the Office of Education to be in compliance with title VI.

And I might add that these racial censuses were testified to last week in Alabama, in the case of *Lee v. Mason County, Alabama*.

The existence of all Negro schools, segregated facilities, segregated athletics, segregated transportation, continued building of schools for children of one race, suggests that the Office of Education's stand-

ards of practice, the number of Negroes in white schools, are of little or no value, and even where these statistics are considered, they are pretty unimpressive 12 years after *Brown v. The Board of Education*.

The continued existence of pervasive segregation within school systems can be traced in large part to the use of freedom-of-choice as a means of accomplishing desegregation.

Southern school superintendents readily admit that white children will not choose Negro schools. Extraordinary pressures exist in many communities which inhibit Negro children from choosing white schools.

The ugly events of this past September in Grenada, events which I personally witnessed, carry a message to Negro homes throughout the South.

Aside from violence, there is the omnipresent threat of loss of jobs, of homes, to countless Negro families, who choose to do no more than exercise their constitutional rights.

The failure of the white, coupled with the fear of the Negro, will undoubtedly insure the continued existence of the Negro school so long as freedom-of-choice is relied on by the Office of Education as the primary technique for accomplishing desegregation.

The Negro community cannot in good conscience be expected to assume the burden of desegregating schools. The burden must be shifted to school authorities. They alone created segregated schools. They must assume the responsibility of desegregating their schools.

If we accept the thesis of title VI, that Federal moneys cannot be used to support segregated institutions, a thesis that I feel is compelled by the Constitution, the Office of Education is subject to criticism for doing too little, rather than too much.

The criticism we have heard from Southern whites is simply not supportable in fact.

Nine Mississippi school districts which at this time are considered to be in compliance with title VI have not one Negro in a formerly white school, not one white in a Negro school, and no faculty desegregation.

For the record, they include Bay Saint Louis, Franklin County, Jones County, Lowndes County, Monroe County, Pawnatuck, Union County, Wayne County, and Union Special Municipal School District.

In fact, most, if not all, school districts found to be in compliance with title VI would be required to do more, if they were brought into court.

I find it ironic that the Office of Education has not been defended by the Southern States, for the Office of Education has added respectability and credibility to the continued existence of segregated practices in countless southern school communities.

The Congress has an obligation, and I sincerely hope that the work of this subcommittee will lead the way, to enact further legislation which will provide funds and a mandate to the Office of Education and all other Federal agencies to insure that Federal moneys are in fact not used discriminatorially.

Title VI, like *Brown versus the Board of Education*, set down a principle. Hopefully, further legislation will provide for the realization of this principle.

Thank you.

Mrs. GREEN. Let me interrupt here to clarify my own position.

One, you made reference to my belief in autonomy at the local level. My statements on this have been with regard to leadership. I have at no time said that I thought the enforcement of the Civil Rights Act should be left to the local level.

We have raised questions whether the enforcement should be taken out of the Office of Education and put either in the Justice Department or in a new office in HEW, but my concern is that there should be local leadership, and that this should remain at the State and the local level.

Mr. ARONSON. I am sorry. I did not mean to misstate your position.

I say as far as I am concerned, I would like to see local leadership. I think it is a sin and a crime that we have to sue school district after school district, and use countless energies to effect only that which the court said must be effected 12 years ago.

Miss GREEN. Mrs. Mitchell, is there any point that you would like to add?

Mrs. MITCHELL. No, unless there are questions.

What I was going to say is very much similar to what has been said.

Miss GREEN. We certainly appreciate this opportunity to be here.

Mrs. GREEN. Do either of you wish to speak?

Miss GREEN. I would like to use the remaining time for questions.

Mr. ERLNBORN. I don't want to be quarrelsome on your figures, but one thing you said caught my attention, because I had heard something just to the contrary in the last day or two.

In some of your figures, as to the lack of desegregation, you stated that there were no football games played between Negro and white schools. Is that correct? Was that one of your statements?

Mr. ARONSON. Mr. Congressman, I referred to the Deep South, and most particularly to my intimate experience with Alabama and Mississippi. I have been informed by people from South Carolina that the same thing is true there.

Mr. ERLNBORN. I just had related to me that here in Atlanta they have had—

Mr. ARONSON. I believe that is true, but I think that is an exception.

Mr. ERLNBORN. That may be, in your definition of the Deep South.

Mr. ARONSON. Certainly not Atlanta and the general area, no, sir.

Mr. ERLNBORN. Do you feel that the Office of Education is the proper instrument for the enforcement of the 1964 Civil Rights Act?

Mr. ARONSON. With respect to schools and education?

Mr. ERLNBORN. With respect to schools, right.

Mr. ARONSON. I think their work should be more closely dovetailed with the Department of Justice, and I think that the failure of the 1966 Civil Rights Act, which would have given the Department of Justice authority to bring suit on its own initiative, as opposed to having the necessary complaint under title IV of the 1964 act, would have increased the Federal abilities a great deal.

I think the Office of Education is as proper an agency as any other agency, if they are willing to follow their own rules, and secondly, if they are willing to set down rules which will accomplish the task that needs to be accomplished.