

It is my belief, Mr. Chairman, that the combined experience of the 50 States provides the most valid source of evidence at the present time for evaluating the efficiency and effectiveness of the new Federal programs in elementary and secondary education.

Today, State school systems, working cooperatively through the Council and interstate programs, are increasingly better informed, better staffed, and better organized to provide insightful leadership in education. In addition, title V funds have contributed materially to the expansion and improvement of the planning and evaluating functions of most State departments of education. Particularly, I feel this is true in the States with limited resources and many high priority needs at the local level.

My first general observation of most new legislation is that the timing of authorizations, appropriations, and finally allocations are "out of joint." In addition to the need for advanced notice of funding of projects, the State and local school districts are concerned with the necessary personnel and facilities to operate the programs—with both in short supply.

My second observation is that even intermediate-range planning is discouraged; and the ultimate success or failure of new programs rests heavily on State and local school systems. To insure reasonable stability, it is recommended that legislation carry a minimum extension of 4 years and that general safeguards be established to insure funding of projects prior to the beginning of each academic year.

Even with what must be labeled "emergency planning," the several titles of Public Law 89-10 have progressed extremely well in Kentucky. In my testimony before the subcommittee on March 10, 1966, I dealt at some length with the planning and organizing phases of programs and the early problems encountered.

Today, in this second report to the committee, I shall review briefly (1) the 1966 amendments incorporated in Public Law 89-750; (2) react to the proposed amendments in H.R. 6230; and (3) provide for the record, if I may, a progress report on the basic titles of the original legislation.

By the way, I shall not go into this detailed analysis of the achievements, but they are attached to my statement for the record.

THE 1966 AMENDMENTS TO PUBLIC LAW 89-10—TITLE VI—PUBLIC LAW 89-750

The Congress is to be commended highly for correcting a "blind spot" in the original legislation with the addition of title VI and its incorporation in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1966. This title provides a vehicle for States to improve the quality and quantity of educational programs for handicapped children. It is a highly desirable expansion of the basic law.

It is estimated that Kentucky is only meeting the educational needs of approximately 20 percent of its handicapped children and youth. From the authorization of \$50 million, Kentucky was reported to be eligible for an estimated \$905,442. From the final appropriation of \$2.5 million, Kentucky may receive an estimated allocation of \$45,270, or approximately 1 percent of the State's current budget for special education.