

exceptional children; teaching of foreign languages; junior colleges; linguistics and the uncommonly taught languages; reading; school personnel; science education; small schools and rural compensatory education; vocational and technical education; and adult and continuing education.

TITLE V—STRENGTHENING STATE EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES

State educational agencies have experienced rapid growth, but that growth has not been a balanced one. It has occurred largely where Federal concern for education has been expressed in Federal funds.

In 1950, out of the approximately 4,100 professionals working in State education agencies, about half were involved with federally subsidized programs. The imbalance continued: 10 years later, 57 percent of the professional staffs were so engaged. In a quarter of the States, 70 percent of the professionals in the State agencies were assigned to Federal programs.

It made a lopsided picture. Let us look, for example, at State supervisors for specific curriculum subjects, who were never very numerous. In mathematics, science, and foreign languages, there were 15 supervisors in all State agencies in 1958; there were 20 in English and social studies. In 1963, after 5 years' experience with Title III of NDEA, the 15 math, science, and foreign languages supervisors in State agencies had increased to 173, more than 1,100 percent. By contrast, in English and social studies, for which there was no Federal support, the increase was only 60 percent, to 32 supervisors. In all States, there were only three specialists in preschool education in 1958; there were still three in 1963.

Congress, through Title V, took steps to correct this imbalance. The provision of grants to strengthen State departments of education gave these agencies the means to reinforce weak places in their structure, places not directly related to Federal concerns. The response was dramatic. Based on a first-year appropriation of \$17 million, the States applied for funds to cover some 1,800 new positions, 1,000 of them professionals, to perform the following functions:

Study, planning, developing, and evaluating education programs and educational research—24.5 percent of the funds and 27 percent of the positions;

Extending instructional aid to local school authorities—23 percent of the money and 26.5 percent of the jobs;

General administration—17 percent of the funds and 16 percent of the positions;

Statistics and data processing—11.5 percent of the funds and 9.5 percent of the jobs;

Administrative aid to local educational agencies—6 percent of the funds and 7 percent of the positions.

Unfortunately, of the 1,800 jobs State agencies sought to fill, they succeeded in filling only 1,000. Scarcity of trained personnel proved the bottle-neck.

Amendments

Two amendments to Title V are proposed. The first would amend the allotment formula contained in Section 503 in order to provide for a more equitable distribution of funds. According to the present formula, 85 percent of the appropriated funds are available for allotment under Section 503. Of these funds, 98 percent are allotted to the States first on the basis of \$100,000 per State and the remainder on the basis of public school enrollment; the remaining 2 percent is allotted to the outlying areas.

Smaller and less populous States have suffered from this distribution formula. Funds allotted to them have not gone far in meeting the pressing needs of their State educational agencies. In order to concentrate more Federal assistance on these often-needy States, we are recommending a change in the allotment formula. Forty percent of the amount available for apportionment among the States under Section 503 would be allotted to the States in equal amounts; the remaining 60 percent would be allotted on the basis of public school-age population.

Our second proposal for amending Title V is designed to meet a vital need in the educational community and in our society—long-range educational planning. We are asking the Congress to authorize and appropriate \$15 million to begin this program.

Systematic, comprehensive, long-range educational planning at all levels is essential if our Nation's educational needs are to be met. If present programs are to be effectively coordinated and improved to fill the needs of each child, if new programs are to be developed to meet unmet needs, objective evaluation