

. . . This position generally should be filled by someone from outside the state department, and he should personify the PACE spirit of innovativeness and creativity. This qualification is conspicuously absent among many state Title III coordinators who are more interested in staff and line relationships within the department than in a dynamic thrust for their Title III program.

Then you note that some headway has been made among State departments of education and that, to quote you, "The overall quality of State department effort on PACE has definitely improved."

The following conclusion of your report is, I fear, quite revealing in describing the attitude of so many of the State departments of education toward their role of leadership in respect of Title III programs:

. . . The fact that there are only ten full-time Title III coordinators indicates that a substantial number of the states have not taken Title III seriously enough to assign full-time status to the position.

I hope you see now why I am not persuaded by the arguments of those who want to give to the States mandatory veto power over the Title III applications of local school districts, as distinguished from the present power of the States to review and make recommendations with respect to Title III applications from local school districts. I would ask you to comment on this issue in the light of your survey.

Mr. MILLER. I am happy to comment.

I wonder if I might take just a second for background information. Would this be permissible, Mr. Chairman?

In order to set this in perspective, let me outline just a second the State department situation as I see it. The State departments in American education have increased tremendously in power in the last 5 years, I would say, and I think this is generally considered to be a very good thing.

We have some people who have mixed feelings, but basically this is a plus. Many of us who worked as consultants to State departments certainly have worked to this end. However, the State departments have a variety of roles as the States vary a great deal.

On the other hand, the basic roles of most State departments are regulatory, are supervisory, are doing the types of things that need to be done in order to get minimum foundations, in effect, or to get financing.

These are vitally important. There are very few States that are really taking a lead in innovation. I am not saying that because their Mr. Hitt is here, but I have had the privilege of visiting his State. I know of Roger Barton's work.

Certainly, you can name Texas, California, and New York. I have named New York and California in my book as States which have really taken real leadership roles in terms of the innovative aspects.

We are talking, however, about 50 States and talking about tremendous diversity within the country as a whole. Therefore, any discussion of title III, I think, needs to be framed in this general background of the importance of State departments, of their very pressing day-to-day, week-to-week, and year-to-year jobs which are there and which will be there regardless of the Federal Government.

Having said that, we did look very closely at the State departments. We visited a total of 16. I visited 12 myself. Generally speaking, we found very few States tooled up for title III. As a matter of fact, you can say the same about title I.