

Mr. CAREY. I don't agree with my colleague but I would point out those school systems which are truly interested now in educating the disadvantaged child, these districts have every opportunity that they can now possibly desire in terms of instituting integrated preschool programs under title L of ESEA.

The only answer to application of the programs in areas where the school district does not intend to provide this kind of quality of integrated education from the first day a child has learning experience, the only answer to that presently would be OEO Headstart programs which is the option outside the public school district program.

I hope we would not shut off that avenue of option. That is the importance of our discussion.

Chairman PERKINS. This concludes the hearings. The record will remain open through next week for the insertion of any pertinent data requested in the record.

(Whereupon, at 11:40 a.m., the committee adjourned subject to call of the Chair.)

(USO memo appears on p. 456.)

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
OFFICE OF EDUCATION,
Washington, D.C., March 15, 1967.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAs,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BRADEMAs: The November 9, 1966 memorandum was written at the request of Dr. Edgar Fuller just prior to a meeting of Chief State School Officers to encourage State departments of education to take an active supervisory role in stimulating the development of imaginative Title III project applications. This development role by State departments of education has been advocated by the Office of Education since the inception of Title III as a major area for State contribution in the operation of the program as a Federal-State-local partnership.

State departments of education have reacted in a number of ways to Title III of ESEA during the first year of operation. Some have accepted leadership responsibility and have used ESEA Title V funds and State funds for employing one or more full-time coordinators for Title III. Over two-thirds of the States, however, have assigned a person to work only part-time with Title III, and have not exercised much of a leadership role.

In general, better proposals are submitted from districts within States where the State departments of education have played an active role in the development of project applications. This has led the Office of Education to encourage all States to take an active role in developing imaginative project applications designed to solve the major education problems of areas within the State. The importance of developing projects to meet local and area needs in terms of National concerns cannot be overstressed. The memorandum of November 9 merely suggested several alternatives for State strategies as vital to a more effective National effort, but did not infer that all State agencies independently would be able to fulfill the National aims of ESEA Title III without direct Federal administrative participation.

The State and Federal educational agencies each have unique but interdependent roles in the successful implementation of Title III. Strengthening the capabilities of one agency should not imply the elimination of the other. Office of Education administration, State department of education development, and local district operation of ESEA Title III projects involve new working relationships. At present, these relationships appear to be viable and hold promise for building upon the strengths of each of the components of this unique partnership.

Sincerely yours,

NOLAN ESTES,
Associate Commissioner for Elementary and Secondary Education.