

will come from the following sources: Federal—8.1 percent (vis-a-vis 4.6 percent three 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 (P.L. 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 Title I maximum basic grants for fiscal year 1967. Numerous school districts still have not been apprised of their fiscal year 1967 allocations, even though less than three and a half months remain in the 1966-67 school year.

The financial "pinch" came with the annual ratable adjustment provision (Sec. 208 of PL 89-10, as amended by Sec. 114 of PL 89-750), which this year reduced the national maximum amount authorized by nearly one-fourth. The \$1.312 billion maximum amount authorized was reduced to \$1.053 billion.

After a further deduction for the outlying territories and state-operated programs, the amount left for local educational agencies was less than \$1 billion (\$989,935,591).

While the Administration has recommended a five-year extension of three major education programs a year before they are scheduled to expire, it was regrettable that a recommendation was not also made at this time to extend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 beyond its June 30, 1968 expiration date. A Congressional extension of the ESEA program, during the 1967 calendar year would allow local school boards to plan ahead in an orderly manner for assimilating any modifications in its program objectives or authorization levels.

Since the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (PL 89-10) is presently scheduled to expire on June 30, 1968:

We recommend that P.L. 89-10 be extended, during the current calendar year, for a period of five years in order to encourage long-range local planning and and orderly implementation of any modification in its program objectives or authorization levels.

To ease the very real dilemma caused by the conflict between implementing most educational programs during the school year and the timing of Federal appropriations for these purposes:

We recommend that Congress modify its existing appropriation procedures, insofar as it relates to the funding of programs for State and local educational purposes, so that eligible participants can be apprised during the early spring of each year, of the specific amounts that they will receive during the coming school year.

STATE AND LOCAL SCHOOL BOARD PLANNING GRANTS

While local school boards have long recognized the critical need for implementing systematic and comprehensive long-range planning programs, other priorities have often prevailed in the competition for severely limited educational dollars.

Those forward-looking school boards which are making a real effort to implement local planning programs find themselves doubly thwarted. *First*, when State educational agencies are called upon for technical planning assistance, it is seldom available because most of their personnel specialize in