

political situation of Michigan fairly well. If you want to have a total plan of some sort in the State whether there is some interaction between the political body and the school system in the State then in some fashion, they have to be brought to bear upon each other.

What happens now, if I recall the situation, is, generally speaking, a fight within the appropriations committee of the legislature. That is really where the relationships are worked out.

To an extent that is our situation in Florida where we have an independent board of regents who are concerned with higher education. Yet the junior colleges are under the county school systems.

So, I am in a position of being on a local school board which operates the largest institution of higher education in the State of Florida because we have some 20,000 students in a community college.

Out in Colorado we have a situation where there is not only a board of higher education and elementary and secondary education, but the vocational education has a separate board. I am sure that is true in other States.

So in some way, we have to bring these things that relate to each other. I assume whoever you toss the ball to in the State is going to be involved in a heck of an argument.

I would see no objection to the requirement that the chief State school officer prepare a plan that not only takes into account his specific responsibilities but parcels out in some fashion a way for the other agencies to interact.

Somebody has to coordinate this. We have this situation, for example, in many States where State education agencies are involved in curriculum support. They have supervisors who are working in mathematics in a number of school districts but they have no particular relationship with the State universities that are training the new teachers of mathematics.

You have very little feedback between what is actually happening in schools, what is happening in colleges of education and what is happening in the inservice training of existing teachers.

This is a highly inefficient way to get curriculum change unless you are forcing them to get together. In many States there is no opportunity to do that. It seems to me in some fashion as we move along in education, we are going to have to bring these factors to bear on each other without necessarily saying who is in control.

Let us see that everybody knows what everybody else is doing. That is very much in favor of focusing on some type of comprehensive long-range plan for education through the States.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Chairman, I have just one question, if I may. I will ask the question of Mr. Fuller. If some language could be devised to take care of this problem which would make it primarily the object or the duty of the State educational agency, then would you suggest that that same agency be required to give approval or disapproval in the exercising of the veto power which you are suggesting under title III?

Mr. FULLER. I don't quite understand as applying to title V.

Mr. MEEDS. This morning your objection to title III was that the State ought to be able to say whether a program was going to be instituted and it should come under a State plan rather than the action between the Federal Government and the locality.