

1578 ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION AMENDMENTS

districts and doesn't affect very large districts, but it is hard on medium-sized districts (e.g., Levittown) whose innovative proposals are often overlooked in the insistence on a large, single, regional package.

8. Title III projects have not been carefully evaluated and their results disseminated.

Title IV—Regional laboratories

1. Regional labs have had little discernible effect on local districts but this is probably due to the fact that they have not had enough time to prove themselves.

2. Some geographic areas have been completely neglected by regional labs. For instance, Connecticut applied for its own regional lab but was forced to join the New England Regional Education Laboratory in Boston. (This outfit recently combined with a second lab at M.I.T.) All the activities of the New England Lab are centered in the Boston area. Connecticut feels slighted, and is becoming rebellious.

3. Programs for training researchers have been cut back. This is disastrous, since the shortage of competent researchers is holding back progress on the whole Act.

4. The Small Contract Program is underfinanced. Since this is where young researchers get the money to get started, lack of funds is serious here.

5. Basic research is being neglected and action-oriented programs are being funded. This is short-sighted.

Title V—Strengthening State departments of education

1. State departments of education undoubtedly are being strengthened as staff is increased and positions made.

2. Local districts have not yet felt the full impact of Title V, except that consultative assistance from state education departments is somewhat more available.

Recommendations

1. The largest overall weakness in the functioning of the Act is the lack of trained manpower. Even if all of the school districts in the country got all the money they thought they needed, it could not be spent wisely and well because the necessary pool of trained manpower does not exist.

Following are some suggested amendments to the Act:

(a) There should be a large amount of money designated for the training of necessary personnel: teachers, administrators, researchers, evaluation specialists, project designers, systems analysts, and the like. The teacher shortage is not severe if we use older notions of need but if we want to staff sufficiently to meet modern standards, the shortage is pronounced. The manpower shortage throughout education is very serious, and is the first priority item.

(b) Funds should be increased for in-service institutes to up-date teachers in all fields.

(c) Funds should be allocated to train sub-professionals for service in the schools.

(d) Money should be appropriated to develop new leaders for American education. This money should be spent for further research on characteristics of good leaders, so that they can be selected from the large number aspiring to administrative posts. There should be funds to support internships for administrators, so that no one will step into a leadership post without on-the-job training. In addition, there should be money for in-service workshops for administrators now on-the-job.

2. Now is the time to consider changing the basis for the distribution of funds to school districts from categorical aid to a national foundation program. I am in agreement with the attached document, *The Role of the Federal Government in the Years Ahead*, by Howard Jones, Dean, School of Education, University of Iowa.

3. Title IV should be greatly expanded. In my opinion Title IV is now the Achilles heel of the Act, since it should provide the knowledge base for education to move ahead and it is not doing it. The Small Contract Program should be at least doubled. The research training program should be rescued from extinction, and needs a vast increase in funding. The basic research program needs tremendous emphasis, and it is not now getting support from within the Office itself.