

The report to the President of November 25, 1966:

This report dealt primarily with the uses of Title I of ESEA during the summer of 1966. About 2½ million children, at a cost of about \$250 million, or about \$100 each, were enrolled in voluntary summer programs. The implicit freedom and the voluntary and unstructured atmosphere of the summer schedule both for teachers and pupils provided significant favorable influences for the work of Title I.

The six recommendations of the Council's November report appear on pages 2-4. The gist is as follows:

"The Council believes that future summer programs, besides being important in themselves, can have special beneficial effects on the year-round success of Title I programs which can be attained in no other way."

The very existence of many of the summer programs may have been fortuitous for reason of delayed funding, and the fact that substantial programs could not be launched during the conventional school year. Lest the summer programs be set aside in the future in favor of school year programs. "The Council recommends an early decision by appropriate officials to reserve a substantial percentage of Title I funds for summer programs."

Finally, our most recent report of January 31, 1967:

The report contained the expression of warm affirmation of Public Law 89-10. It again reflected the views not only of the Council members, but the consultants in the field. As the effect of Title I begins to be felt in the deprived neighborhoods of America, a number of generalizations emerge: There must be innovative and fresh approaches to teaching techniques and curriculum for the deprived; there must be a high order of selectivity in the assignment and training of teachers and principals in the schools serving the deprived; there must be a larger and more effective involvement of deprived parents in the school affairs of their children; there must be ingenious regulatory measures to insure that the desegregation of children in deprived neighborhoods does not remove them from the advantages of new Federally supported programs, and therefore retard the movement toward school integration.

In sum, we find the content and theory of Public Law 89-10 to be sound and wise. It is far too early to provide objective scientific testimony that the deprived children of America have prospered to this degree or that degree. The signs are good, as school systems and teachers come face to face with the monumental tasks of social justice through education.

But the installation of the evolutionary and innovative measures now emerging are extremely slow, and the fruit of these measures is still slower in ripening. We have really been engaged under Public Law 89-10 only about a year, with many years of continued heavy investment of treasure, commitment, and creativity yet to come.

No major changes are suggested at this time for the specific components of title I. With the exception of liberalizing the facilities-construction elements of the law, we urge its continued implementation in its present form.

Larger sums of money are needed to make a significant impact on the poor children of America. Much as the present appropriation level shows promise and hope, it still represents only a sum of roughly 5 percent of the costs of operating the elementary and secondary schools of the land. Given another year or two, major new dimensions in this law may be appropriate.

For the present, we recommend vigorous pursuit of the course of action now in motion, with full funding, and with the funds delivered on time to the places where the children of the poor desperately need them.