

program. Adequate funds are needed for this important function but those should, by all means, be channeled through the State departments of education.

5. Again I wish to express concern over the conflict between school people, who as trained professionals have done an excellent job operating Headstart, and the Office of Economic Opportunity which seems to fail to understand that readiness is truly a school function.

This program should be operated by the U.S. Office of Education through the various State departments of education, where there is always some degree of understanding of the problems, in even the most remote sections of the State.

I think this is true even in remote sections of the State. Many school boards are so disturbed by lack of understanding on the part of OEO that some local boards of education and superintendents are ready to give up the Headstart program.

This could only hurt the children who so desperately need this experience.

As an additional point here, I would like to state that even my own local board of education is expressing great concern at this point as to the continuation of the Headstart under the Office of Economic Opportunity. I could go on and elaborate a little further on this but I think what I have is sufficient at this point.

6. Much concern is being expressed by education over the proposed cut in NDEA, title III, funds which are earmarked for title V, ESEA. It is further hoped that the fiscal year 1968 appropriation bill will be no less than the fiscal year 1967 funding level.

We feel title III of ESEA has been a very important part of our school programs.

7. Much concern is being expressed by education over the new proposal, part B of title V, relating to "Grants for Comprehensive Education Planning and Evaluation" in that it does not meet the avowed needs of State departments of education.

As an aside to the issue, the \$15 million request is exorbitant if contemplated just for planning purposes. This proposed financing would probably have more far-reaching effect in developing better educational programs in departments of education if it were added to part A, same title, with a requirement that a portion be utilized specifically for additional planning and evaluative elements.

I would like to add at this point, if we continue to plan and never implement the things that we plan in our programs, then I can't see much value in planning if it ends at that point. Truly this is where much of it is ending.

It is my sincere belief that if we are to implement new programs in education that are desperately needed that additional classrooms are going to be needed.

We must face this fact, I think, from the Federal, State, and local standpoint. You cannot innovate or improve educational programs if you don't have someplace to house them.

Most districts in our area have bonded to their limit and yet in many cases we cannot take full advantage of the provision of ESEA of 1965 because of our lack of rooms. It is my wish that a partnership attack on the construction needs by local, State and Federal that these needs could be met.