

Mr. STEIGER. If I may, Mr. Chairman, would you clarify for the record when you are talking about March 9 and 10, is this 1967?

Mrs. LEVIN. Yes, sir; I am talking about 1967, the current year.

I should like to quote a paragraph from the March 14 letter of the New York City Council Against Poverty to Mr. Garrison, president of the board of education.

Although the education committee and the Council devoted considerable time to these project reviews and have examined individual projects in the past, they are of the opinion that the piecemeal approach to the use of Title I funds which now total \$75 million to \$80 million is not realistic or tenable. It is impossible for the Council to view the true impact or lack of impact of the Title I program when its only contact is through a many times hasty project by project review. What in the Council's view is needed for sound planning is a broader look at stated goals, objectives, and priorities.

Chairman PERKINS. Thank you very much for a good statement. May we hear from the next witness?

Mrs. BENJAMIN. Mrs. Levin has some more important points she would like to add.

Mrs. LEVIN. No. 3: We ask that you make possible the combination of titles, particularly titles I and III. The number of proposals submitted make it innovative and necessary to discard many which are worthy of exploration, but for which funds are insufficient under title III.

The funds are more ample in title I. If it were possible to develop a partnership of community personnel with educators in the sharing of ideas and the sharing of funds, we think that this would open up many new avenues for innovative experimentation.

No. 4, we ask for amendments to render the required evaluations of title I projects meaningful. The act states that evaluations must be made but not that they be utilized in future planning. Evaluations that cost half a million dollars were submitted last September after programs had already been recycled.

It seems essential that the goals of programs should be clearly defined at the outset and that evaluations should include a summary of findings with recommendations that have some meaning for followup.

This is a very expensive exercise and it should provide service to local school boards which have the responsibility for making policy based on the experience of the program.

No. 5: We ask that you mandate 15 percent of funds for innovative projects to be set aside for the retraining of teachers. We have several leading teacher educators on the membership of the Citizens Committee for Children and there was a consensus among them that the teacher training institutions are not graduating teachers who are equipped to do the kind of job that is necessary in urban schools.

This year the Nation is spending \$100 million of title I funds for in-service courses, which seem to be perpetuating the system's errors in a closed loop. We should like to recommend an internship outside of the system (perhaps on the order of VISTA's training program) so that an insight and understanding of the problems of this special group can be developed in the teachers who will then be better prepared to go into the classroom.

Finally, No. 6: We should like to underscore and endorse what Dr. Bowman has said. We, too, ask that you reinforce other new