

projects in your own State, or from your vantage point. I think you are a member of the Title III Advisory Committee.

Mr. SPARKS. Yes.

(The questionnaire referred to follows:)

INTRODUCTORY NOTE ON SENTIGRAM No. 145 OF JANUARY 5, 1967

Sentigram No. 145 of January 5, 1967, was formulated to follow up on some of the details of State administration approved by the New Orleans resolution on title III of ESEA. The "State plan" policy was not involved in the sentigram questions. It had been approved unanimously by the membership in the annual meeting at New Orleans. It is worth noting that it was again approved by the board of directors and by the representatives of 23 States in the Atlantic City meetings of February 10-11, 1967. There is no question about the position of the chief State school officers in regard to a State plan.

The sentigram involved the following questions:

1. Should there be a Federal set-aside of 15 percent for projects to be approved by the U.S. Commissioner of Education outside the State plans? There was room for individual comments or suggestions on a larger or smaller Federal set-aside.

2. Should the State plan be authorized by the Congress in 1967 to take effect July 1, 1969? There was room for alternative suggestions on timing and the 100 percent State approval of local projects assumed in this question.

The returns were accurately summarized in the testimony before the House Committee on Education and Labor on Monday, March 6, 1967.

CCSSO SENTIGRAM No. 145

JANUARY 5, 1967.

POSITION ON TITLE III AMENDMENTS FOR CONGRESSIONAL ACTION IN 1967

Amendments to title III to give the State educational agencies more authority and influence in its future administration are among the most important legislative items affecting education that Congress will consider this year. Such amendments are likely to pass in one form or another. I have been working closely with the Office of Education on major details falling within the principles expressed in the USOE memorandum to this office dated November 9, 1966, and the resolution passed by the council in New Orleans after full consideration of this memorandum on November 18, 1966. (Both these statements are in your copy of the record of the annual meeting in New Orleans, on pp. 2-4 and 15-16, respectively.)

The purpose of this sentigram is to check with you on major questions involved in the talks with USOE and in forthcoming contacts during a workshop with representatives of AASA, NEA, NSBA, the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, and the National Association of State Boards of Education. The united support of all these and the USOE for title III amendments generally favorable to the council's position may depend on the resolution of only a few points.

A State plan for title III has to be coordinated with its current status. USOE has about 1,000 local projects under title III which it is under a moral (but not legal) obligation to carry on for from 1 to 3 years. USOE needs some funds set-aside and a period before a State plan would take effect to make its adjustments. Some sort of Federal set-aside (comparable to the 15 percent in sec. 505 of title V) may also be necessary to maintain a little of the original title III rationale. We know it was authorized as a program that would escape the allegedly dead hand of regular State and local school systems and thus to stimulate innovations. Whether we like this or not, some congressional and Federal administrative sentiment of this kind persists.

A second element is to postpone the date the first State plans would become effective long enough to permit thorough State-local coordination in planning the supplementary centers to be covered in the State plans. It would also give State departments time to coordinate emerging patterns of regional or intermediate State and local service centers with the State patterns of title III centers.