

1444 ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION AMENDMENTS

administrative, statistical and curriculum supervision functions. *Second*, State and Federal funds, to assist in meeting the financial costs associated with hiring or providing personnel to work on a local long-range planning project, are presently available only under very limited circumstances. By way of comparison, there are more than 80 Federal planning grant programs available to other local and State governmental entities.

Thoughtful school board members are also becoming increasingly apprehensive that unless local school districts implement systematic and comprehensive long-range planning programs, then this planning and evaluation "vacuum" will be filled by non-educational and/or non-local sources.

The National School Boards Association feels that the proposed comprehensive educational planning amendment to Title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 offers a far-reaching "opportunity" for strengthening and enhancing the ability of local school districts to determine their own futures, provided that these grants are administered through the state educational agencies. We feel that such a modification would further strengthen the leadership and service role which must increasingly be assumed by the State departments.

We recommend that the leadership resources of the state educational agencies be further enhanced by amending the proposed 5-year program of grants to State and local education agencies by providing that these Comprehensive Educational Planning and Evaluation grants be administered through the state educational agency.

NATIONAL TEACHER CORPS

The National School Board Association endorses the major revisions in the National Teacher Corps program, as provided for in H.R. 6230 and H.R. 6236.

We are especially pleased with the amendment of the existing program to reinforce the concept of local control by further clarifying the local school board's absolute right to decide what Corps members are assigned to its schools.

The reduction of the teacher-intern compensation rate to \$75 per week plus \$15 per dependent or the lowest rate for full-time teaching in the school system, whichever is less, will remove an existing pay disparity with fully qualified teachers already in the school system by conforming the compensation rate for these teacher-interns with the prevailing rate for graduate students or the local community's salary scale.

In addition, we fully support the requirement that all proposals be approved by the state educational agency, including those training programs which are to be offered by the participating institution or University.

A further amendment to provide authority for contracts with local school districts and Universities over a two-year period of service would allow participating school districts to more effectively plan for utilizing the services of their "trained" teacher-interns during the Corpsman's second year.

We recommend that the National Teacher Corps program be further amended to provide authority for contracts with local school districts and Universities for a two-year period of service, and that this pilot program be continued as modified by the provisions of H.R. 6230 and H.R. 6236.

FULL FUNDING OF TITLE I—SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

The estimated ESEA Title I authorization for fiscal year 1968 was \$2.4 billion vis-a-vis the actual budgetary request of the Administration for only one-half (\$1.2 billion) of that amount. Though this budget figure estimate represents a 13 percent increase, a 100 percent gap still remains.

In addition, the National School Boards Association has noted that while the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (PL 89-10), the ESEA Amendments of 1966 (PL 89-750), and the Committee reports on these bills clearly enunciated the Congressional intent that Title I funds be utilized, among other purposes, for "the construction of school facilities and plans made or to be made for such programs, projects, and facilities," the official policy position of the U.S. Office of Education is that Title I is not a construction-type of a program.

For this reason, only \$97 million (9.95 percent) of the estimated expenditures under this program were authorized for school construction projects in fiscal year 1966. During the current fiscal year (1967), the amount allowed for public school construction was decreased to \$81 million (7.95 percent).