

I would be the first to admit and indicate that all State departments of education are not staffed to do as good a job in educational leadership as they desire. They are all working diligently, within the environment of problems associated with State government and local school districts on one hand and rapidly expanding Federal education legislation on the other. A significant amount of assistance is being provided by the best and most easily implemented title of ESEA 1965, title V, and I will address myself to it in more detail later.

It has been said that State departments do not have the quality of staff to make proper judgment where new ideas and educational innovations are concerned.

From what I have experienced, all ideas and innovations relating to education—good ones, that is, don't originate in the U.S. Office of education and they never will. State departments of education need a chance to exert educational leadership.

Title III, under the responsibility of the State, would be a wonderful and unique opportunity for the State department of education to flex its muscle and exert initiative in meeting the exciting possibilities of the title. On the other hand, the present administrative arrangement could thwart and curtail actually much leadership development opportunity.

It is not difficult for me to envision, in view of the present freedom and flexibility of the title and the rapid increase of funds now in the title for, over a short period of years, a federally operated system of educational institutions to be operating in each State with little, if any, control or direction of it from the State department of education or any other State agency.

Some have said that inasmuch as State departments are not of the desired stature, whatever that is, to handle the responsibilities of this exciting title, that the U.S. Office of Education could best operate it as is for a few years and then consider turning over part or all of the responsibility to the State departments of education.

It is inconceivable that on the one hand our department of education is sufficiently wise to make decisions for the expenditure of \$20 million for exciting and innovative educational programs for the educationally disadvantaged under title I and then not be of the quality and stature to make decisions regarding \$1.6 million under title III. I cannot envision any better way to encourage educational chaos in the States than to postpone action on this matter beyond the first session of the 90th Congress.

The States are ready and sufficiently able to administer this title now. A State plan arrangement would provide for sufficient control and direction by the U.S. Office of Education.

No one is saying that State departments will implement this title to perfection. I don't believe the U.S. Office of Education has or will either. By having the opportunity to exercise authority State departments could grow and improve.

Two of the finest methods of learning are by trial and error and to be given responsibility. Departments of education can grow to become more responsible State agencies by being assigned more responsible tasks. It would be far better for 50 State departments of education to in various ways and degrees work through trial and error of title