

1576 ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION AMENDMENTS

several cities, with particular emphasis on Atlanta, Boston, Chicago, New York, and San Francisco. In the cities studied—and though there may be some striking exceptions, the rule appears to hold for most cities—the boards of education have proved to be more tax-conscious than expenditure-conscious. They have tended to tailor demands to what they calculated the tax traffic would bear rather than to hammer home the needs of the schools and the expenditure levels that would be necessary to meet them.

Since taxpayers' groups have many spokesmen and school children, especially poor ones, have few, one might have expected the boards of education to have attempted more in the way of cajoling, pleading, and demanding. This line of reasoning, however, ignores the composition of most school boards. At any rate, though boards of education might have accomplished much more if they had tried harder in the days when the cities were affluent, the question is now almost academic. Most of the big cities are strapped financially, and although some could raise more locally if they would, it is clear that the kind of money that is needed simply cannot be raised by the cities from local sources alone. Much of it will have to come from increased state and federal aid.

Here the passive role of the school boards is much less easy to understand. If they despair of the possibility of getting adequate tax money at home, it is hard to fathom why they have not been leading the fight for external aid, but they have not. So far, the Campbell group concludes, the boards of education have played a relatively minor role, and "there is no evidence in the studies we have undertaken to indicate that this role is going to undergo any drastic change."

Even if it did, it is obvious that strong and active school boards alone could not bring sufficient pressure to bear on behalf of increased aid to the cities. But a coalition of school board members plus local business leaders, various civic groups, school administrators, and teachers' organizations might be able to.

"No such coalition now exists," Campbell says, though there are signs in some cities that business leaders are becoming increasingly concerned about the quality of education. As their concern grows, perhaps they will serve as rallying points for strong coalitions to speak for the cities' schools.

(The following statement by Dean Daniel E. Griffiths was submitted for the record:)

STATEMENT BY DANIEL E. GRIFFITHS, DEAN, SCHOOL OF EDUCATION,
NEW YORK UNIVERSITY, MARCH 21, 1967

EVALUATION OF THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT (P.L. 89-10)

General

1. The Act has provided stimulus for educational change and development.

2. The most frequently voiced criticism is that proposals are acted upon and allocations made too late for effective implementation of plans. Early commitment by local districts is essential. Decisions come so late that providing for complementary funds in local budgets and for staffing is extremely difficult. Budgets need to be drawn and approved before precise project allocations are made. Further, late decisions make it necessary for local districts to gamble on projects being approved and funded, and those that need the help the most are often least able or willing to "gamble" or "invest" local funds. Uncertainty about allocations has had a debilitating effect.

3. Districts need the help of design and evaluation specialists and other resource persons in the preparation of proposals.

4. Wealthy districts have an advantage over poor ones in securing grants for several reasons:

(a) They are able and willing to gamble local funds prior to the actual grant.

(b) Their staffs are better able to prepare polished proposals—greater educational sophistication and savvy.

(c) They are willing and able to hire consultants to help prepare proposals.

(d) Some estimate that it costs about \$10,000 to prepare an outstanding proposal with a proper professional tone.