

APPENDIX G

O.E.O. Personnel present at August 23 meeting :
Office of Operations, Community Action Programs :
William Bozman, Deputy Assistant Director.
David Grossman, Director, Program Management Division, and others.

APPENDIX H

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
OFFICE OF EDUCATION,
Washington, D.C., November 12, 1965.

Mr. JULE SUGARMAN,
Office of Economic Opportunity,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JULE: I wonder if you have had time to look over the first draft of the Guidelines for Title I, ESEA yet? This would be a particularly crucial time to get your suggestions for improvement because we are in the process of re-writing the Guidelines for re-issue.

As you may remember, I sent you a copy on October 13, airmail, from Atlanta. It was the second copy I could get my hands on—the first copy I received the day before. I used it to prepare for our "road show" which started in Atlanta on the 13th. These draft Guidelines were (and still are) scarce around here.

It was our desire to get you a copy of the draft as soon as possible. The tremendous pressure for an early release of the Guidelines made necessary the writing of them in a half dozen different places in the Division. The parts were brought together and rushed to the printer the same day. Three days later I saw the whole document printed, in the draft form I sent you. The same day your copy was sent, Bill Rioux, of our joint unit, got a copy.

We hope that we can hear from you soon so that the pressure of time on this second, and we hope final, draft will not preclude careful consideration of your comments and suggestions for improvement. I know how busy you are and I would be happy to meet you at your office, whenever you suggest, in order to receive your comments.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. MAUCH,
Acting Director, Programs Branch.

APPENDIX I

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY,
Washington, D.C., November 26, 1965.

Memorandum:

To: Dr. James E. Mauch, Chief, Programs Branch, Division of Program Operations, U.S. Office of Education.

From: Jule M. Sugarman, Acting Associate Director, Community Action Program.

Subject: Guidelines for Administration of Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

I am impressed with the substantive content of the guidelines. The tone and the objectives set forth are generally good. There is one major policy with which I do disagree (I understand, informally, that Commissioner Keppel may also have raised the same objection). This is the notion that the funds should be distributed evenly among all the poor children in the community. The statement first appears in Part A, Chapter I(b), but is repeated at numerous points throughout the guidelines. This policy, I think, would greatly dilute the value of the program, and is not at all consistent with what I understand to be OE's emphasis on quality.

Following is a list of other points which I think worth noting:

1. In Part B, Chapter I(c) there is a discussion of project approval by state agencies. I regret that there is no way in which a local community can appeal an arbitrary decision by the State Board of Education. If it is not possible to do so formally because of legal strictures, I would hope that the Office of Educa-