

The first revision I would suggest, if I may, is one which has bearing not only upon the particular amendment in question, the National Teacher Corps, but also upon the underlying philosophy of federal aid to education.

We have previously stated in testimony before this Committee, and elsewhere, our conviction that the most effective, most economical and most equitable manner of apportioning federal funds for education is through the state education departments of the several states.

This conviction, I believe, is one shared by perhaps a majority of my colleagues in public education and in educational administration.

The inescapable fact is that the state education departments are in the best position to assess local needs, establish and uphold high educational standards, monitor the care with which federal funds are utilized locally, and keep federal monies from being dissipated in a proliferation of overlapping programs which duplicate effort and diminish the impact of federal assistance.

In White Plains we have been very fortunate indeed, as I told this Committee last March, in the harmonious relationship between the schools and the local Community Action Program. We have worked together happily and efficiently for the benefit of all the children of White Plains. Similarly, the working relationship among the public, private and parochial schools in our city has been exemplary.

But other communities have not always been so fortunate. And even in White Plains, the machinery for accomplishing such projects as pre-kindergarten programs and special summer remedial programs could be greatly simplified if applications for funds and administration of those funds were handled by the agency charged with carrying out the program—namely, the public schools. Such a simplification of procedure, would greatly expedite planning and would eliminate a great deal of time consuming, expensive paper work.

Head Start, for instance, could well be placed under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, since it is, in the final analysis, a school program. The time now spent in clearing Head Start plans and applications through two agencies, the schools and the community action board, could better be devoted to developing closer coordination among the schools and other community agencies on a wider front. In White Plains, for example, there is developing a very fruitful cooperation between the schools and the neighborhood centers operated by the Community Action Program. It would seem more productive to concentrate on inter-agency collaboration in this area, leaving the schools to deal directly with such school-oriented programs as Head Start and the Elementary Summer School.

Another cogent argument for putting Head Start directly under public school administration through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is that such an arrangement would make possible continuous, systematic followthrough during the primary grades of those children who enrolled in Head Start pre-school classes. As the Committee is aware, the major national evaluation of Head Start published in 1966 disclosed that Head Start youngsters in many communities began losing ground academically after entering regular kindergarten and first grade classes. If Head Start were incorporated in the public school system as an integral unit of the elementary and secondary program, however, provision could more readily be made to monitor the social and academic progress of each pupil, remedial and enrichment programs could be planned as indicated and evaluation would be facilitated.

One extremely important aspect of the Head Start program is the development of close working relationships between the schools and economically deprived families. The interest and involvement of these parents would be easier to sustain when their children enter regular school, if Head Start were in all cases operated directly by the public schools.

In the proposed 1967 amendment dealing with the Teacher Corps, provision is very wisely made for the State Education Departments to develop programs at the request of a local school system, and in collaboration with a local university. This would appear to be a sound arrangement, especially since it is the State Education Departments which set and maintain teaching standards and certification requirements for the several states. We think it extremely farsighted to place the National Teacher Corps under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and to provide funds for a Teacher Corps program which would be extended for three years, through fiscal year 1970, plus authority enabling a teacher-intern who begin training in 1970 to continue that training for one additional year beyond 1970.