

a bill to amend title III and title XI of the National Defense Education Act. Such actions will help encourage health and physical education just as the National Defense Education Act has stimulated academic progress. We support the extension and expansion of NDEA to include school, health, education, and physical education.

Earlier in my statement, I attempted to make a case in support of an orderly transition from categorical aid to general aid. One condition, and there are several others, I believe, that this committee, the Congress and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will require to be met, prior to the adoption of a general aid to education philosophy and policy, is that all State Departments of Education achieve a level of competency which would assure that programs funded with Federal funds were properly planned and administered.

One functional capability which I believe all State departments of education would like to see strengthened is that of planning. State departments and the school systems in large metropolitan areas are faced with a multitude of complex problems that deserve the attention of highly qualified planning staffs. As Dr. Bernard Donovan, in his testimony before this committee on March 8, 1967, so aptly stated:

The cities of this Nation have been and are now the melting pots of America. They have drawn to them those who seek social improvement, economic opportunity, cultural uplift and social acceptance. This constant shift of population and the attendant delicate, complicated problems which it brings to the city reflect directly on the educational program of these school districts.

To identify, isolate, and help solve some of the critical problems which we are confronted, we recommend that substantial earmarked funds be provided through title V of the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965 or some other appropriate channel to the State educational agencies for comprehensive planning for the provision of quality education in metropolitan areas including cities of 100,000 or more.

Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is perhaps the most exciting title in the act for the simple reason that it is noncategorical in application. Under this title, school administrators, teachers, patrons of the system, civic groups, cultural and professional organizations, and many others are brought together in an atmosphere of unrestricted challenge and brainstorming to produce innovative, creative, imaginative educational programs for schoolchildren. This condition is a plus for local communities for reasons which are obvious.

The structure of the law and the provisions of the regulations and guidelines pertaining to title III, however, contravene traditional relationships between State departments of education and school districts by centering project approval authority and responsibility for administration of project grants in the Office of the U.S. Commissioner of Education. State commissioners of education are, by law, placed in the difficult, if not delicate position of being: (1) Responsible for reviewing, commenting upon, and forwarding a copy of a school district's application, within 30 days, to the U.S. Commissioner of Education, and (2) assuring that title III funds are equitably distributed among the various school districts within the State.

State departments of education are vitally interested in title III projects and the results obtained through their operation; however,