

Mr. ERLÉNBOEN. I will be glad to yield. I think you will say that the States do comment.

Mr. SCHEUER. Yes. I had the first supplementary center on the eastern seaboard. We sent our application to the State. The title III consultant took hold of it, came down here and had lunch with me, and said, "I think we can improve this radically if you let me assign a couple of my people to work with Bernard Donovan in New York."

I said, "By all means. Be my guest."

They went to work with Donovan and completely redid the title III proposal. I think it will be one of the most outstanding centers in the country. There couldn't have been a more cooperative effort between the Albany office and the New York City school system where it just went to Albany for a comment, and here came back this beautiful thrust, and we are going to have such a perfect center as a result of it.

Mr. ERLÉNBOEN. Perhaps you could comment as to what rationale there is to this.

Dr. MARLAND. I would say what Mr. Scheuer has said, that this has worked reasonably well in what might be called a voluntary association with the State authorities. I would say, however, that if it evolves over time, if Congress sees it wise to have all programs flow through the State, I would see no objection to this. I think as our States become more skillful through the processes of title V in managing and stimulating programs, there might be a real gain here.

Mr. ERLÉNBOEN. Would it be desirable to coordinate title III and title I projects through the device of having them both flow through the same process?

Dr. MARLAND. I would say this is quite reasonable. Substantially that is what is happening now.

Mr. ERLÉNBOEN. One last question, Dr. Marland. You mentioned the lack of facilities in title I. Do you think the schools now fully utilize the facilities they now have? I have reference to the proposals for a 12-month school year, proposals I know you are familiar with.

Dr. MARLAND. I understand the question. One could easily say that schools are not very productive or efficient instruments in terms of the time, the hours and months that they are used.

Many experiments have been undertaken without success to develop a year-round school system. There are many reasons for this. It is not the fault of the schools. Mostly it is rejected by society. However, there are other forces at work which are important. Many of our schools can easily be and are used year round, particularly with a viable and supportive summer school program.

Virtually half of the schools in Pittsburgh, if we had the money we hoped for under ESEA, would be operated this summer, and into the evening. The extended school day was a program thrown out. And Saturday classes. It is largely a matter of staffing money. It is not a matter of the will or lack of will on the part of local authorities. It is money to maintain and operate these programs.

So the schools are there. It is a matter of budgeting for staff to make them more productive.