The program has been well received by all groups concerned. It is felt that Title II funds have strengthened materially the library program in both public and non-public schools. Moreover, teachers have had made available to them more resources for the enrichment of the instructional program.

TITLE III: SUPPLEMENTARY EDUCATION CENTERS AND SERVICES

In the fall of 1966, A Study Conference on Federally Supported Educational Projects in Kentucky was sponsored by the Central Midwestern Regional Educational Laboratory and held at Murray State University.

Certain findings of this select committee in the nature of recommendations are as follows:

We recommend to the U.S. Office of Education that funds not be restricted from the adaptive step of innovation. If "innovation" is equated with "change", then the implantation and implementation of an innovative practice locally is essential in bringing about educational change. "Demonstration" is not alone the display of an innovation in a pilot situation, but should be pursued through a variety of procedures with high priority given to providing active support for the school or district seeking to implant the innovation. Unless this task is taken, we shall continue to know more about innovations but only chance and rare initiative will overcome the familiar educational "lag."

We also recommend to all Kentucky educational leaders that the development of future Title III projects should be carefully designed to include a broader base of participation in the formative stages of proposal development. In part, many of our communications problems are due to the fact that we have rushed to get a proposal developed and have by-passed too many people who might have made considerable difference in the quality of our projects and now must somehow be brought up-to-date concerning the project.

We further recommend that the "regional concept" be retained as the principal design for the development of future proposals. Though some realignment of regions may be desirable from time to time, we stand to gain more in the long run from concerted action. Piecemeal, single district proposals, while in some instances desirable, nevertheless, should have elements for the dissemination and diffusion of outcomes.

Through February 9, 1967, the U.S. Office of Education had approved six planning and ten operational grants. Through the above date, all eight regional groups with the exception of one have participated in the Title III program. The region not included has a planning grant under consideration by the U.S. Office of Education at the present time.

The listing of projects approved, by region, title, type, and funds allocated are as follows:

Listing of projects approved, by region, title, type, and funds allocated

Region	Project	Туре	Funds	
			Allocated	Through—
<u>I</u>	Development and implementation of innovative curriculum programs,	P O	8, 968 509, 585	May 9, 1966 Sept. 30, 1967
II	Physical fitness project. General survey. Area natural science mobile projects. Student dramatic enrichment program	0 P 0 0	222, 030 32, 804 17, 592 65, 822 66, 525 227, 985	Aug. 31, 1967 Do. July 31, 1966 June 30, 1967 May 31, 1967 June 30, 1967
IV-BIV-BVIVI	Supplementary educational services. Implementation of nongraded elementary schools. Supplementary educational center. General survey.	P O O P P P	18, 056 30, 000 44, 207 20, 372 36, 488 50, 924	¹ Nov. 1,1966 June 30,1967 Aug. 24,1966
vii	Regional supplementary educational center	0 0	180, 679 (2)	Dec. 31, 1967

¹ Extended from Feb. 1, 1967, to Feb. 1, 1968. Amount of grant has not been received from U.S. Office of Education.

² Contracts being negotiated.