

4. The basic U.S. Office of Education should be the agency to handle all funds to be allocated to the State departments of education and they in turn route funds to the local school districts. This should include programs such as Headstart that is now handled by the Office of Economic Opportunity. More consideration should be given to the timing of planning and implementation procedures on the part of local districts. Too much time is lost by the time the local school district is able to begin its program. Most of us are rushed for time and as a result do not do as good a job as we would like if we had more time.

5. Very serious consideration should be given to an aid to construction bill for public elementary and secondary schools. A formula based on need and ability to pay should be considered. In my own school system, many things that I would like to do under the present act is prohibitive because of lack of buildings or rooms with very little hope of being able to do anything about it unless we do receive Federal aid to construction.

6. The U.S. Office of Education should not be reorganized on the regionalization concept. Existing or proposed offices could better serve the cause of education in the area of planning and consultative services to the State departments of education. Much could be done to help strengthen State departments of education. Then they could more effectively carry out the program with the local districts in cooperation with the U.S. Office of Education.

7. Federal guidelines and regulations should be developed through more cooperative procedures with the States. There has been a tendency by the U.S. Office to establish the guidelines first and then involve State personnel. At this point the States are advised of basic intent, or clarifications, made of already existing guidelines.

Certainly in my opinion, Mr. Chairman, this is in reverse. We should be brought in before the act and not after the guidelines have been established.

I wish to express the concerns of many other educators that have appeared before this distinguished body in relation to H.R. 6230:

1. Guidelines under which present law is operating should provide more flexibility at the local level giving school authorities in the field greater choice in being able to meet the most pressing needs of the local school district.

2. The new low income factor of \$3,000 rather than the previous \$2,000—we certainly want to go on record as very strongly encouraging that this become a part of the new act or as it is amended—offers opportunities to more of Kentucky and the Nation's youth. It is our hope that title I could be fully financed to the October authorization level of the 89th Congress.

3. It is further hoped that much excessive paperwork relating to all the acts could be condensed. This could be realized if data requirements of the U.S. Office, State Department, and local districts could reach a commonality.

Many times we are duplicating much paperwork that is already contained in a previous report.

4. A tremendous additional workload has been forced upon State and local agencies by Public Law 89-10, making it impossible with limited budgets and personnel to ever evaluate the effectiveness of the