

title III of ESEA this year except in two minor details. The Council of Chief State School Officers differs strongly on this point.

Although we do not propose to consume a great deal of the time of the committee here today, we hope there will be amendments to title III of ESEA at this session of Congress.

In the annual business meeting of the council in New Orleans on November 18, 1966, the following resolution was passed unanimously by the membership:

The Council approves of the purposes of Title III. It provides for the development of supplementary centers and services to improve the quality and quantity of education, to increase the use of results of educational experimentation, resulting in creativeness in teaching and learning, and to stimulate broad, local State and Federal cooperation in providing exceptional educational opportunities for all children and youth.

An analysis of the first year's Title III results shows that States in which the State Department of Education has assumed responsibility for organization and direction of Title III projects on a statewide basis has produced projects (1) of higher quality, (2) more exemplary and innovative in content and services, (3) more in accord with the educational needs of the states, and (4) involving wiser use of Federal funds.

I quote from a report of the U.S. Office of Education administrators in that paragraph, gentlemen. It was given to us on November 9, 1966, without restrictions on its use. It was the basis for this resolution.

In view of this experience, the Council urges that Title III be amended to authorize the use of State plans for its future administration. Such plans should be developed according to criteria established by the U.S. Office of Education in cooperation with the State Departments of Education. Within the requirements of these criteria, the State education agencies should be authorized to evaluate and approve Title III projects proposed by local educational agencies.

It is imperative that all State educational agencies actively coordinate the administration of Title III with reference to their potential or existing local and regional educational service units. With such coordination exercised in full cooperation with the vast reservoir of leadership in local educational agencies, many conditions that now restrict general educational improvement can be removed.

That is the end of the resolution.

Mr. Chairman, we have been encouraged to believe that the U.S. Office of Education would cooperate with the council in transferring more involvement in its administration to State departments of education.

In this connection, and I have already mentioned the Office of Education memorandum from which the resolution was drawn last November, on January 5, 1967, we inquired of all chief State school officers what their opinion was on title III amendments for congressional action in 1967. There were replies from 42 States and territories, all of which favored State plans, making local project applications and proposals for supplementary centers subject to approval by State departments of education.

A large minority would be willing to set aside 15 percent of the funds for special projects to be approved by the U.S. Commissioner of Education, and a very few would support up to a 25-percent set-aside.

At meetings of the board of directors and the general meeting of the 23 States in Atlantic City last month, there was strong sentiment that an amendment to authorize State plans and State project approval should be enacted as soon as possible, with the percentage of