

age per pupil expenditures in a State or the United States will help to correct the inequity for distribution of title I funds that was contained in the original legislation.

2. The new low-income factor of \$3,000 rather than the previous \$2,000 offers opportunities to more of Kentucky and the Nation's youth.

It would be further hoped that title I could be fully financed to the October 1966 authorization level of the 89th Congress.

Excessive paperwork requirements.—One matter of concern relates to the excessive "paperwork" requirements relating to title I, as well as other titles of all acts. It would seem that there should be some commonality in and between the data required by the U.S. Office of Education from State departments of education and local school districts. Baseline data from one title application to another could possibly be referred to in applications, or reports, as they are offered to the U.S. Office of Education for consideration.

Title II, ESEA.—Because of this support we are grateful, and at this time we have no basic recommendations to offer to the committee.

Title III, ESEA.—Amendments need to be made in title III, ESEA, which will provide that local project applications and proposals for supplementary centers shall be initially routed through, and be subject to final approval by, the State departments of education under provisions of State plans. Probably 10 to 15 percent of Federal funds available should be set aside for projects to be approved by the U.S. Office of Education.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman.

Chairman PERKINS. Yes.

Let me ask you, though, have you ever had any trouble with the Office of Education, any difficulty in their going contrary to the wishes of the State department in Frankfort in approving a local project supplemental education center over and beyond your recommendations, or have they followed your suggestions and cooperated with you?

Mr. VITTEROW. On one or two occasions, sir. We have a record of that, yes.

Chairman PERKINS. Where have they approved projects down there not recommended by the State department?

Mr. VITTEROW. They have not overridden us, but those that we have recommended that they would not recommend.

Mr. FORD. I notice that you passed over title II with a very short sentence saying "We love it." But the man just ahead of you pointed out that they have a problem at the local level of administering title II because they are not getting any of the administrative set-aside that was put into this title. We have heard this from other States as well.

Is it true that in Kentucky the percentage allowance for administration of title II is held at the State level and they do not pass any of this along to the local districts administering the program?

Mr. VITTEROW. We pass some: yes, sir. We were trying to compare this in concert with the other types of problems that we were having. We do not feel, sir, that this was a major concern. Naturally, we would like to have more moneys for administration of all of our funds, but to me we did not feel that it was a major concern.