

Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. All States should now plan these centers and coordinate them with similar State and local regional service arrangements.

Both experience and policy considerations support State plans for title III. After all, approximately 15 States voluntarily coordinated the local projects on a statewide basis during the first 2 years of title III operation, and earned high praise from the U.S. Office of Education. In a memorandum of November 9, 1966, USOE made the following evaluation:

"II. STATE LEADERSHIP

"An analysis of the first year of operation of PACE reveals some very important facts. States in which the departments of education have taken the responsibility to organize for and give direction to title III at the State level have submitted projects which (1) are of higher quality, (2) more exemplary and innovative in content and service, (3) significantly relate the State's assessment of educational needs of problems at the local level to solutions in the National, State, and local interest, and (4) have apparently made full and wise use of funds available to that State."

With this encouragement, the Council of Chief State School Officers passed a resolution on November 18, 1966 including the following:

"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 education 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 education agencies, many conditions that now restrict general educational improvement can be removed."

This position was approved on January 18, 1967, by a Legislative Conference of the American Association of School Administrators, the Council of Chief State School Officers, the National Association of State Boards of Education, the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, the National Education Association, and the National School Boards Association. There were no objections to State plans. There were some objections to a Federal "set aside" of approximately 15 percent for special projects to be approved by the U.S. Commissioner of Education without reference to State plans. Expressions generally favored postponing for a year or two if necessary the date the State plans would become effective.

These positions have been communicated to the administration. Thus far, it has not recommended that title III be amended to authorize such State responsibility under State plans, or even that title III be extended so States and local agencies may have time to plan their programs for another year.

Without these changes, Federal administration of title III supplementary centers may deny great benefits to 35 or more States without State plans. In these States there would be growth of systems of supplementary centers but no real State responsibility for their number and location. Such denial of State responsibility would be far more serious than it has been for purely local annual projects.

As the U.S. Commissioner of Education makes the decisions on a local basis, these 35 disadvantaged States will lack the administrative, psychological, and public reinforcement they need. They will be weakened in full view of their constituencies of citizens and their State and local governments. The Federal Government refuses, in substance, to use educational methods in education. It helps the strong, but in title III it denies to the weak the things that would enable the weak to become strong. It is as though a classroom teacher overemphasized demonstrations by brilliant pupils while the disadvantaged pupils looked on without being given practice in and responsibility for improving themselves.

On the basis of Federal, State, and local policy considerations, title III should not be allowed to develop a federally financed system of supplementary service