WICHITA PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 259,
Wichita, Kans., January 27, 1967.

Hon. CARL D. PERKINS,
Chairman, Education and Labor Committee, U.S. House of Representatives, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

THE HONORABLE MR. PERKINS: I have read that your committee will soon begin hearings on "Follow-Through"—a program to extend the educational momentum of Head Start Projects through the primary grades.

In my present position I am directing a $1 million project for disadvantaged youth in the Wichita Public Schools under Title I, P.L. 89–10. I also directed Project Head Start here last summer for 1070 five years olds. We are planning two new Head Start programs—one a summer project for 800 children and the other a twelve month project for 180 four years olds from the most severely deprived families.

In your Committee's deliberations, may I recommend that you give strong consideration to these points:

1. Inasmuch as the large majority of Head Start programs are administered by local school systems, monies designated for Head Start should be added to Title I, P.L. 89–10 amendments and allocations. This change would streamline accounting, auditing and budgeting procedures. Furthermore, it would be possible to develop a more closely integrated program if we had to deal with only one funding agency—U.S. Office of Education.

2. Congress must assume responsibility for funding educational program in advance of the academic year in which these endeavors are to be initiated. Upgrading society through educational innovations is an awesome task in itself without the millstone of belated appropriations that cripple local implementation.

Here are two examples:

(a) Title I monies were appropriated for 1967 far too late. With the adjustments required by the 1966 amendments, the U.S. Office of Education had to obtain new foundation figures from each state. Although Congress passed a continuing resolution, firm figures were not obtainable. As of this date, our school system still does not have final word on the 1967 appropriation figure and the first semester is *history*. Meanwhile, we have a stock of new Title I projects ready to submit when monies become available. Such delays jeopardize new programs and prohibit effective educational planning.

Fiscal 1968 appropriations should be made in time for State Departments of Public Instruction to allocate the monies available by June 1 at the latest.

(b) Head Start Programs have been approved only *days* prior to the initiation schedule. Last summer we had eight working days to "tool up" for the project—a task of impossible dimensions. Our regional OEO office has promised approval by February 28. This is a great improvement—if it actually happens.

Concerning the "Follow-Through" legislation soon to be debated, these factors must be considered:

1. The schools need space—classrooms—to permit smaller classes during the crucial period of grade 1 through 3. Some program improvements can be implemented with additional monies for additional teachers, aides, etc., but severe limitations are prevalent in many urban areas due to already over-crowded schools. Construction money is needed.

2. Title I programs, with increased flexibility, can be one of the answers to follow-through projects but only if the limitations discussed above can be overcome. The NEA backed legislative program provides an avenue toward the solution of the disadvantaged pupil problem. I urge you to become acquainted with it and to push for its enactment.

Sincerely,

DONALD E. YOUNGLUND,
Assistant Director, Federal Programs.

RALPH WALDO EMERSON SCHOOL,
Newton Upper Falls, Mass., March 9, 1967.

Hon. CARL PERKINS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PERKINS: I am teaching the primary grades in the Title I program of the Newton Public School. I am also coordinating the team work of three