Mr. FORD. How do you break down the percentage?

Chairman PERKINS. I think we spelled it out last year.

Mr. FORD. Last year, I though we made it clear we intended it to be divided equitably between the State and local units. What formula do you have for dividing it? Do you have a percentage, or how do you do it?

Mr. VITTETOW. I apologize for not having the detailed information on the percentage, but we do pass to the local districts that portion which is given to us, sir.

Mr. FORD. Is there anybody in the panel that later will tell us what is being passed on from the State to the local?

Mr. DODSON. We have one here.

Mr. FORD. All right. I will withhold my question until later.

Chairman PERKINS. Go ahead.

Mr. VITTETOW. Title III, NDEA: The department of education strongly recommends that restoration of the proposed cut in NDEA, title III, funds which are earmarked for title V, ESEA. It is further hoped that the fiscal year 1968 appropriation bill be no less than the fiscal year 1967 funding level of $79 million. The proposed extension of the National Defense Education Act is fully supported.

Title V, ESEA: There is an understandable need for continuous planning and evaluation at all levels of education. Such planning, of necessity, must come from within the school structure with the assistance of advisory groups from all levels of society.

The new proposal, part B of title V, relating to "Grants for comprehensive educational planning and evaluation" does not meet the avowed needs of State departments of education. The proposal is foreign to basic precepts which relate to close planning and operational relationships. Part A of the same title has a built-in planning and evaluative process.

As an aside to the issue, the $15 million request is exorbitant if contemplated just for planning purposes. This proposed financing would probably have more far-reaching effect in developing better educational programs in departments of education if it were added to part A, same title, with a requirement that a portion be utilized specifically for additional planning and evaluative elements.

There are also concerns relating to part A of title V. It is understood that a support figure of $29,750,000 is proposed. This budgetary support figure and the general 40/60 percent distribution formula will benefit Kentucky's Department of Education.

Under the above distribution formula some consideration should be given to an equalization concept which would take into account the relative wealth of the States.

The "borrowing" from established NDEA titles to produce the $29,750,000 proposed for title V, ESEA is our fundamental concern. It is understood the funding compilation is as follows:

Basic appropriation request, title V	$22,000,000
Deduct from NDEA, III	5,500,000
Deduct from NDEA, X	2,250,000

From the above, 15 percent is withheld for "special projects" by the Commissioner of Education. This, coupled with the proposed 25 percent "special grants" withholding element of the proposed part B,