

I appreciate this opportunity, Mr. Chairman, to appear before your committee, on behalf of the National School Boards Association, to discuss the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1967. For the convenience of your committee, my remarks will be directed toward those major policy areas which are embraced by the two identical bills, H.R. 6230 by Congressman Perkins and H.R. 6236 by Congressman Brademas, that are officially before your committee for the purpose of these hearings.

The annals of history will record the April 11, 1965, enactment of Public Law 89-10, the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1965, as one of the most significant educational landmarks of our generation.

Webster defines landmark as "an event or development that marks a turning point." For local school boards, this "turning point" has resulted in the availability of a substantially higher level of Federal incentive funds and an activated public interest in both the total needs of public education and the special requirements of economically disadvantaged children.

A direct result of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 has been a significant shift in the pattern of financing our Nation's public schools. During the current fiscal year, for example, the \$28.3 billion in expenditures by our Nation's 21,684 operating public elementary and secondary school districts will come from the following sources: Federal, 8.1 percent—vis-a-vis 4.6 percent 3 years ago—State, 37.8 percent; and local, 54.1 percent.

The turbulent nature of rapid change, with all of its frustrating and exciting manifestations, has never been more clearly evident than within today's local school districts.

In an attempt to provide your committee with a current "grass-roots" appraisal of some of the major policy considerations implicit in the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1967, the National School Boards Association has recently distributed a six-point questionnaire to its key leadership. With the committee's permission, this analysis will be forwarded for inclusion in the hearing record as an integral part of our association's statement.

The National School Boards Association offers the following recommendations for further strengthening the purposes and objectives of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as proposed for amendment by H.R. 6230 and H.R. 6236:

FEDERAL APPROPRIATIONS TIMETABLE

A serious practical dilemma confronting local school districts is caused by the incompatibility of the school year with the Federal legislative calendar.

For example, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's appropriations bill was not approved last year until October 21, 1966, and the ESEA Amendments of 1966 (Public Law 89-750), which revised the distribution formula for title I, was not enacted into law until November 3, 1966.

As a result of these two factors, it was not until February 23, 1967, that the State Departments of Education were advised of their ESEA