

We have in the membership at the table Mrs. Elizabeth Koontz, a member of the Council and a teacher.

We have Mr. Thomas Carr, who is executive officer of the Council, and his associate, Mr. Michael Kirst.

I will proceed, Mr. Chairman. My statement has been distributed and I will go through it quickly and be pleased to respond to questions.

I understand that my appearance before you is in the capacity of a member of the National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children, as named by the President pursuant to Public Law 89-10. Accordingly, except that the members of the committee may wish me to depart from the role of reporter for the Council, my testimony will be confined to what I know to be the position of the Council.

The Advisory Council, as chaired by Dr. O. Meredith Wilson, consists of a broad cross-section of citizens, most of whom are distinguished non-public-school observers as contrasted with my own role and Mrs. Koontz role as members of school staffs. However, our judgments as reported here are a clear consensus of all members.

During 1967 we have retained the part-time services of 27 consultants, expert in the field of elementary and secondary education, to examine "in the field" the impact of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Further, the members of the Council themselves have traveled about the country personally to visit the communities and classrooms where the message and money of Public Law 89-10 were being applied.

These systematic visits and observations have reached approximately one-third of those school systems offering title I programs in terms of the \$1.05 billion appropriated for title I during fiscal 1966.

Based upon our observations, we have as a Council submitted three reports to the President and Congress over the past year. I will offer one or two highlights from each of these reports to express the gist of our recommendations. These reports, I believe, have been furnished to the members of the committee.

The report of March 31, 1966, about a year ago :

Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act has, for the first time, made available major resources to bring opportunity to those who until now have lacked even hope. It has directed the attention of educators toward the plight of the disadvantaged. It has provided to local boards of education the funds necessary to develop programs through which children can overcome the handicapping limitations of poverty-ridden environments. The record of response is already good.

This was as of about a year ago.

Further, I invite your attention to page 28 of our March 31, 1966 report noting 10 recommendations. Broadly, these recommendations strongly endorse the intent of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, urging a continuation of massive educational assistance, focused on the special problems of the disadvantaged children of our country. A year ago we strongly urged the reconciliation of the timing of appropriations for Public Law 89-10 to be consistent with the school year. I will mention this subject again later.

Not the least of our 1966 recommendations was our message concerning the liberalization of Title I to permit the construction of facilities, especially in our big cities, to accommodate the newly created programs. This condition remains today a vital need, especially in our inner cities.