

We have recently completed a study of the first year's operation—a study drawn from the reports submitted to the Office of Education by State educational agencies. These reports reveal both the scope and the promise of the program. Of nearly 27,000 local educational agencies in the country and outlying territories, almost 25,000 were eligible to receive Title I funds; 17,481 participated during the school year, conducting some 22,173 projects. The projects ranged from comprehensive preschool programs to courses in mathematics and job skills for high school dropouts.

Almost two-thirds of the projects were for language arts and remedial reading. Instructional services account for 51.6 percent of the funds expended in Fiscal Year 1966 and 57.6 percent in Fiscal Year 1967.

Children who had never visited a doctor or dentist were given medical care. In both Fiscal Years 1966 and 1967, more than 2 percent of the funds expended went for health services.

Food service programs, accounting for more than 2 percent of the local educational agency expenditures for each fiscal year, provided hot breakfasts and lunches to children formerly too hungry to learn.

Children from pre-kindergarten through the sixth grade accounted for nearly 70 percent of the total number of participants, an indication of the schools' attempts to eradicate early the crippling effects of poverty.

Appendix A shows a breakdown of all the major categories of expenditure for Fiscal Years 1966 and 1967.

Many school districts were extremely creative in their use of Title I funds. Let me give you a few examples, gleaned from the State evaluation reports:

In a Washington farm community, two nurses' aides (one of whom spoke Spanish) brought health care to the impoverished Spanish-speaking children of migrant farm workers.

New York City assembled teams of specialists—reading experts, counselors, and psychiatrists—for intensive work with preschoolers.

A Tennessee project developed wireless auditory training units for deaf children.

A Louisiana school taught English as a foreign language to children of Cuban refugees and resident aliens from South America.

An Iowa school provided evening classes for high school dropouts.

But the most encouraging aspects of our evaluation are the changes in attitudes—on the part of both students and teachers—that have been reported. Children taking part in a Title I project in Ohio, for example, who previously had exhibited great hostility to anything connected with school, openly admitted enjoying the program.

The National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children, in its January 31 report to the President and the Congress, stated: "The attitudes of teachers are crucial in improving the education of disadvantaged children." It cited summer schools aided by Title I last summer, "the atmosphere of experimentation," and "fresh feelings of success with children" as instrumental in changing traditional teacher attitudes. The State evaluation reports reflect such change. Teachers in a Chicago project were amazed at the rate of improvement in reading ability of a class of "educationally deprived" children once individualized remedial reading services were provided for the class. They and local school administrators learned that under-achievers, poor learners, or whatever they had been called in the past, could be aided by the proper educational program.

One of the potential problems with a program of this size is that of communication with the teachers and administrators at the State and local levels. We have tried to meet this need through constant contact with State administrators and through a series of meetings with State and local educators concerned about compensatory education. Early in the first year of the Act, we began a series of meetings with State department of education people who were to administer the Title I program. These meetings provided an initial contact which helped get the program off to a good start and established a relationship that has continued into the second year.

Representatives from the 21 largest cities, with their State department associates, met with Office of Education staff at three meetings in October 1966 to discuss Title I programs. The Federal-State-local dialogue set up by these meetings was clearly useful in helping us to serve the States better, and State and local representatives were unanimous in their desire for a continuation of the