

more fully, title II should, we feel, be funded at the full level authorized by Congress.

We also strongly urge that a portion of title III funds—at least 50 percent—be subject to State determination to insure continuity in the development of the program designated and operated by the States.

The remaining 50 percent allocated by the U.S. Commissioner of Education would be available to develop the innovative programs needed on a nationwide basis.

In these remarks I have pointed out the extent to which title V funds have been utilized in the development of an educational planning capability within the Texas Education Agency. Coupled with the available title III funds, these funds can establish the basis for a strong educational planning program in the State.

An additional fact should be noted. The Governor of Texas has established the planning agency council for Texas, with one division of this for coordination of the educational planning efforts of all groups charged with educational planning—the local public schools; the Texas Education Agency; the coordinating board, Texas college and university system.

It also provides the framework for coordinating the educational activities of other departments of State government such as the department of welfare and the department of health.

Based on this approach, and with the results obtained from this type organization and these activities, it is our belief that title V of ESEA should not be amended to establish a separate program for educational planning with separate funding but rather that the funding level of title V as it is now written should be increased to provide the States with the resources needed to carry out a comprehensive program of educational planning—State, regional, and local. The basis of State educational planning has to be local planning, and the State educational agencies are in the strategic position to assist in local and regional planning.

In closing I would like to bring one other item before the committee. Title I of the act is presently extended through fiscal 1968, I believe. In order to work the formulas of this act and to give the States their allocations on a timely basis requires from 6 to 8 months on the part of the staff of the U.S. Office to gather the necessary data.

Therefore, we strongly urge that you consider extending the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, title I, through 1969 during this session of Congress, because if we wait until 1968 to make this extension we will be faced in 1969 with a substantial delay that we experienced this year.

Thank you very much.

Chairman PERKINS. And thank you very much.

The next witness is Dr. Richard Miller, director, program on educational change. University of Kentucky.

STATEMENT OF DR. RICHARD MILLER, DIRECTOR, PROGRAM ON EDUCATIONAL CHANGE, UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

Chairman PERKINS. I understand you have made an extensive study of title III. That will be printed as a separate document. I understand the study was completed about the first of February.