

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1967

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES NINETIETH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

H.R. 6230

A BILL TO STRENGTHEN AND IMPROVE PROGRAMS OF ASSISTANCE FOR ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION BY EXTENDING AUTHORITY FOR ALLOCATION OF FUNDS TO BE USED FOR EDUCATION OF INDIAN CHILDREN AND CHILDREN IN OVERSEAS DEPENDENT SCHOOLS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, BY EXTENDING AND AMENDING THE NATIONAL TEACHER CORPS PROGRAM, BY PROVIDING ASSISTANCE FOR COMPREHENSIVE EDUCATIONAL PLANNING, AND BY IMPROVING PROGRAMS OF EDUCATION FOR THE HANDICAPPED; TO IMPROVE PROGRAMS OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION; TO IMPROVE AUTHORITY FOR ASSISTANCE TO SCHOOLS IN FEDERALLY IMPACTED AREAS AND AREAS SUFFERING A MAJOR DISASTER; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

HEARINGS HELD IN WASHINGTON, D.C.,
MARCH 9, 10, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, AND 20, 1967

PART 2

Printed for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor

CARL D. PERKINS, *Chairman*



U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 1967

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

CARL D. PERKINS, Kentucky, *Chairman*

EDITH GREEN, Oregon
FRANK THOMPSON, JR., New Jersey
ELMER J. HOLLAND, Pennsylvania
JOHN H. DENT, Pennsylvania
ROMAN C. PUCINSKI, Illinois
DOMINICK V. DANIELS, New Jersey
JOHN BRADEMAS, Indiana
JAMES G. O'HARA, Michigan
HUGH L. CAREY, New York
AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California
SAM GIBBONS, Florida
WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan
WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY, Maine
PATSY T. MINK, Hawaii
JAMES H. SCHEUER, New York
LLOYD MEEDS, Washington
PHILLIP BURTON, California
CARL ALBERT, Oklahoma

WILLIAM H. AYRES, Ohio
ALBERT H. QUIE, Minnesota
CHARLES E. GOODELL, New York
JOHN M. ASHBROOK, Ohio
ALPHONZO BELL, California
OGDEN R. REID, New York
EDWARD J. GURNEY, Florida
JOHN N. ERLNBORN, Illinois
WILLIAM J. SCHERLE, Iowa
JOHN DELLENBACK, Oregon
MARVIN L. ESCH, Michigan
EDWIN D. ESHLEMAN, Pennsylvania
JAMES C. GARDNER, North Carolina
WILLIAM A. STEIGER, Wisconsin

CONTENTS

	Page
Hearings held in Washington, D.C.:	
March 9, 1967	833
March 10, 1967	901
March 13, 1967	951
March 14, 1967	1021
March 15, 1967	1089
March 16, 1967	1283
March 17, 1967	1339
March 18, 1967	1465
March 20, 1967	1581
Statement of—	
Ackerman, Joseph, president, National School Boards Association, accompanied by Hugh Calkins, Paul N. Carlin, and Harold W. Webb	1436
Adams, Hon. Brock, a Member of Congress from the State of Wash- ington	841
Baker, James E., superintendent of schools, Middlesboro, Ky.	983
Benjamin, Mrs. Marjorie, the Citizens Committee for Children	1563
Bergman, Mrs. Lewis J., Citizens Schools Committee of Chicago	1334
Biemiller, Andrew J., AFL-CIO, accompanied by Walter Davis, director, AFL-CIO Department of Education, and Jack Sessions, assistant director, AFL-CIO Department of Education and mem- ber of the School Board of the District of Columbia	1343
Bolling, Hon. Richard, a Member of Congress from the State of Missouri	833
Bowman, Dr. Garda W., program coordinator, special projects, Bank Street College of Education	1545
Breit, Fred, deputy superintendent, Seattle Public Schools, Seattle, Wash.	842
Buchanan, Dr. Paul, superintendent of schools, Jackson County, N.C.	1283
Burkhead, G. C., superintendent, Hardin County Schools, Elizabeth- town, Ky.	953
Byrne, Dr. J. A., director, Division of Education, College of St. Thomas, St. Paul, Minn.	1098
Clark, Charles, superintendent, Floyd County Schools, Freestonsburg, Ky.	977
Cline, Edward L., Sr., on behalf of the Omaha Tribe of Macy, Nebr.	1287
Dodson, Marvin, executive secretary, Kentucky Education Associa- tion, Louisville, Ky.	951
Donohue, Monsignor James C., director, Department of Education, U.S. Catholic Conference, accompanied by Monsignor William McManus, archdiocese superintendent of education, Chicago, and Mr. John Cicco	1154
Eater, John W., superintendent of schools, Rantoul, Ill.	1408
Edgar, J. E., commissioner of education, Austin, Tex., represented by J. Warren Hitt, deputy commissioner of education	905
Farrell, Sister Miriam J., supervisor, Archdiocesan Schools, Gilroy, Calif.	901
Goble, Russell, Martin County schools, Kentucky	1465
Hanks, J. M., superintendent, Ysleta School District, El Paso, Tex.	1420
Hazlett, Dr. James, superintendent of schools, Kansas City, Mo.	834
Holt, Charles, superintendent of schools, South Bend, Ind.	850
Hood, R. E., superintendent of schools, Brunswick, Ga.	1414
Johnson, Carroll, superintendent of schools, White Plains, N.Y.	865

Statement by—Continued

Keith, Everett, executive secretary, Missouri State Teachers Association; Warren Phillips, superintendent of schools; Harold Spears, superintendent of schools; Forest Conner, executive secretary, American Association of School Administrators.....	Page 1025
Levin, Mrs. Nathan W., chairman of the Educational Services Section of the Citizens Committee for Children.....	1553
Libassi, F. Peter, Special Assistant to the Secretary of HEW for Civil Rights, accompanied by Mrs. Ruby Martin, Special Assistant for Education; Mr. Derrick Bell, Deputy Special Assistant for Civil Rights; and Mr. Edward Yorman, General Counsel for Civil Rights.....	1498, 1581
Lumley, John M., director, Division of Federal Relations, NEA; Mrs. Mary C. Gereau and Mr. Stanley J. McFarland, members of the staff.....	1056
Lund, Kenneth W., senior vice president, Scott, Foresman & Co.; American Book Publishers Council and American Textbook Publishers Institute.....	1450
Marburger, Dr. Carl, Assistant Commissioner for Education, Bureau of Indian Affairs, U.S. Department of the Interior.....	1021
Martin, Mrs. Ruby, staff assistant, Office of the Secretary, HEW.....	1581
Mattheis, Dr. Duane, commissioner of education, State board of education, St. Paul, Minn.....	1090
McNeill, W. R., superintendent, Bowling Green Independent Schools, Bowling Green, Ky.....	997
Megel, Carl J., Washington representative, American Federation of Teachers.....	1348
Miller, Dr. Richard, director, program on educational change, University of Kentucky.....	908
Nagle, John F., chief, Washington office, National Federation of the Blind.....	1339
Niemeyer, John H., president, Bank Street College of Education, accompanied by Mrs. Verona Williams and Dr. Gordon Kopf.....	1124
Noe, Samuel V., superintendent, Louisville Independent Schools, Louisville, Ky.....	968
Osview, Leonard, assistant dean, College of Education, Temple University.....	1324
Panel of members of the National Teachers Corps: Dr. John W. Letson, Miss Rhoda Newman, Mrs. Babbara Goodwin, Miss Dorothy Hornsby, and Miss Thomasine Haskins, all of Georgia.....	1293
Pogue, Henry, Jr., chairman, State Board of Education, Commonwealth of Kentucky.....	981
Risner, Buford, superintendent of Bath County Schools, Owingsville, Ky.....	1540
Rose, Oscar, superintendent of schools, Oklahoma; R. E. Hood, Brunswick, Ga.; Richard Taylor, John W. Eater, Rantoul, Ill.; T. Olai Hageness, Clover Park Schools, Tacoma, Wash.; William Simmons, Detroit, Mich.; and J. K. Hanks, El Paso, Tex.....	1386
Ryan, Mrs. Edward T., chairman for legislation National Congress of Parents and Teachers.....	1456
Smith, Leon T., superintendent, McCracken County Schools, Paducah, Ky.....	999
Spaulding, Hugh C., superintendent of Marion County Schools, Lebanon, Ky.....	991
Stapleton, Ernest, assistant superintendent of schools, Albuquerque, N. Mex.....	852
Stimbert, E. C., superintendent, Memphis City Schools and member of the Executive Committee of the American Association of School Administrators.....	1026
Swanson, Austin D., associate professor of education, State University of New York at Buffalo.....	1142
Taylor, Richard, superintendent, Widefield School, Colorado Springs, Colo.....	1416
Torrence, Dr. Andrew P., dean of academic affairs, Tuskegee Institute, Tuskegee, Ala.....	903
VanHoose, Richard, superintendent, Jefferson County Public Schools, Ky.....	994

CONTENTS

V

Statement by—Continued

Vittetow, Frank, assistant superintendent, Bureau of State-Federal Relations Department of Education, Frankfort, Ky.....	Page 963
Watkins, Hon. Sam, member of the Legislature, State of Kentucky...	1002
Willenberg, Ernest P., president, Council for Exceptional Children, NEA, accompanied by William C. Geer, executive secretary, Council for Exceptional Children, NEA.....	1139
Wilson, Dr. Donald E., director, teacher education, School of Education, University of Southern California.....	1318
Statements, letters, supplemental material, etc.:	
Ackerman, Dr. Joseph, president, National School Boards Association, statement by.....	1442
American Parents Committee, Inc., statement of.....	1333
Biemiller, Andrew J., AFL-CIO:	
"Design for an Effective Schools Program in Urban Centers," publication entitled.....	1370
Statement by the AFL-CIO Executive Council on Education and the Federal Government, February 23, 1967, Bal Harbour, Fla.....	1367
Bottomly, Forbes, superintendent of schools, Seattle Public Schools, Seattle, Wash., letter to Chairman Perkins, dated March 30, 1967...	1717
Bowman, Garda W., program coordinator, special projects, Bank Street College of Education:	
Illustrations of the need for comprehensive, systematic, and continuing planning of education at all levels.....	1546
S. 721, text of bill.....	1550
Testimony by.....	1544
Brademas, Hon. John, a Representative in Congress from the State of Indiana, editorial in Life Magazine.....	1718
Breit, Fred, deputy superintendent, Seattle Public Schools, Seattle, Wash.:	
How can Public Law 89-10 be improved?.....	844
Seattle School District No. 1 as related to Public Law 89-10....	845
Buchanan, R. P., superintendent, Jackson County Schools, Sylva, N.C., statement by.....	1286
Carnegie Quarterly, article entitled, "The Rich Get Richer and the Poor Get Poorer—Schools".....	1574
Carr, Thomas W., National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children.....	1703
Chisholm, Dr. Robert L., superintendent, Albuquerque Public Schools, "Programs developed under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965," a report to.....	852
Exhibit A.—General evaluation.....	858
Exhibit B.—School counseling.....	858
Exhibit C.—Learning materials centers.....	859
Exhibit D.—1966 Headstart program.....	859
Exhibit E.—Federal funding, office of new programs, Albuquerque Public Schools.....	860
Consedine, William R., director, Legal Department, National Catholic Welfare Conference, "The Constitutionality of the Church-Related Schools in Federal Aid to Education," reprint from the Georgetown Law School Journal.....	1161
Darling, Dr. Richard L., director, Department of Instructional Materials, Montgomery County Public Schools, Maryland, and president, American Association of School Librarians, statement by.....	1704
Eater, John W., superintendent of schools, Rantoul, Ill.:	
Comparison of growth percentages in Rantoul (table).....	1411
Table I.—Percentage of Federal impact—current school year, 1965-66.....	1409
Table II.—Federal impact in Rantoul City Schools (elementary only).....	1409
Table III.—Growth comparison—Rantoul City Schools—19-year period.....	1409
Table IV.—12 heaviest federally impacted districts in Illinois....	1412
Table V.—Construction projects in Illinois filed prior to cutoff date of February 20, 1967.....	1413
Estes, Nolan, Associate Commissioner, HEW, letter to Congressman Brademas, dated March 15, 1967.....	1604

Statements, letters, supplemental material, etc.—Continued

Ford, Hon. William D., a Representative in Congress from the State of Michigan; table in International Municipal Statistical Bulletin showing State by State the total educational bonds asked for and passed in dollars for elementary and secondary education.....	Page 1044
Gilpin, Alfred W., chairman, Omaha Tribal Council, Macy, Nebr., letter to Chairman Perkins, enclosing a letter to Senator Hruska.....	1714
Griffiths, Daniel E., dean, School of Education, New York Education, statement by.....	1576
Hazlett, James A., superintendent of schools, Kansas City, Mo., testimony of.....	838
Hornsby, Dorothy Elizabeth, principal, Mary McLeod Bethune Elementary School, Atlanta Public Schools, Atlanta, Ga., testimony by.....	1300
Johnson, Albert C., superintendent, School District of the City of Benton Harbor, Mich., letter to Chairman Perkins, dated March 9, 1967.....	1709
Johnson, Carroll F., superintendent of schools, White Plains, N.Y., statement of.....	870
Knutzen, Owen A., acting superintendent of schools, Omaha Public Schools, Omaha, Nebr., letter to Chairman Perkins, dated February 23, 1967.....	1712
Letson, Dr. John W., superintendent, Atlanta Public Schools, Atlanta, Ga., testimony by.....	1304
Levin, Mrs. Nathan W., chairman, Educational Services Section of the Citizens Committee for Children, statement of.....	1553
Libassi, F. Peter, Special Assistant to the Secretary of HEW for Civil Rights:	
Clark, Hon. Ramsey, Attorney General, letter to Senator Russell B. Long, dated March 2, 1967.....	1515
Letter to Chairman Perkins, enclosing principal documents relating to the enforcement of title I with respect to school desegregation.....	1605
Administration sends to Congress tightened and strengthened Economic Opportunity Act of 1967, press release.....	1628
Estimated fall enrollment in fifth grade compared with high school graduates 8 years later: United States, 1948-56 to 1964-72 (table).....	1628
Estimated percentage of nonwhites (or Negroes) and whites (or others) enrolled in public schools, by kindergarten, elementary, and secondary level, in 21 large cities: 1960 and currently (table).....	1605
Information on the amount of funds available for the administration of title VI for school desegregation for each of the last 3 fiscal years (table).....	1623
List of complaints from September 1 through March 22, broken down by State.....	1616
Memorandum from Commissioner Howe to chief State school officers.....	1618
Memorandum from Louis J. McGuinness to Miss Carol Herzman.....	1623
"Success Stories," (brief summaries of districts that have moved effectively in the area of school desegregation).....	1609
Summary of the basis and general content of the economic opportunity amendments of 1967.....	1624
Material on school desegregation policies of HEW Office of Education under title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.....	1630
Authority for the 1966 school desegregation guidelines.....	1644
"Civil rights compliance in summer programs operated under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended," memorandum for chief school officers, February 8, 1967.....	1621
Commissioner Howe's letter to Austin R. Meadows, superintendent of education, State department of education, Montgomery, Ala., August 9, 1966.....	1669
Compliance with the Civil Rights Act with respect to the projects to be filed for fiscal year 1967 under title I.....	1618

Statements, letters, supplemental material, etc.—Continued

Libassi, F. Peter, Special Assistant to the Secretary of HEW—Con.

Material on school desegregation policies, etc.—Continued

"Distinguishing 'new' and 'continuing' activities for title I applicant's whose funds have been deferred pending compliance with civil rights guidelines," memorandum to State title coordinators, ESEA, August 17, 1966.....	Page 1670
Fulbright, Senator J. W., letter to Commissioner Howe, dated April 5, 1966, and reply, May 24, 1966.....	1660
Gardner, Hon. John W., Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, letter to Senator Carl Hayden, dated December 30, 1966.....	1673
Howe letter to Senator Stennis, enclosing February 24, 1967, memo, Mr. Yourman to Commissioner Howe.....	1676
Howe, Hon. Harold, II, Commissioner of Education, DHEW, statement of.....	1663
"Responsibilities of State education agencies in assuring compliance for State approved projects," memorandum from Harold Howe II, U.S. Commissioner of Education, to chief State school officers.....	1668
"Review of legal authority for the 1966 school desegregation guidelines," memorandum from Alanson W. Willcox, General Counsel, to the Secretary.....	1513
"School districts operating under free choice desegregating plans," memorandum for.....	1620
"Schools Get a Year's Grace," article in the Atlanta Constitution.....	1696
"Special civil rights compliance problems in summer programs under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act," memorandum from Commissioner Howe to chief State school officers, April 25, 1966.....	1667
Title VI—Civil Rights Act of 1964.....	1630
"Title VI—Civil Rights Act—revised statement of policies for desegregation plans—test of performance," memorandum from Alanson Willcox, General Counsel, to Harold Howe II, Commissioner of Education, dated March 7, 1966.....	1656
Title 45—Public Welfare (reprinted from the Federal Register, Friday, Dec. 4, 1964).....	1631
"Use of title I funds in local school district undergoing desegregation or in racially segregated attendance areas," memorandum to chief State school officers and State title I coordinators, February 27, 1967.....	1621
Memorandum by HEW General Counsel: "Legal basis for the policies of the revised guidelines".....	1670
Revised statement of policies for school desegregation plans under title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.....	1498
"Schools Get a Year's Grace," article in the Atlanta Constitution, March 10, 1967.....	1512
Statement of.....	1537
Statistical summary on title VI administrative enforcement actions by the department for the 1966-67 school year (under the revised guidelines).....	1511
Logan, William T., Jr., commissioner of education, State of Maine, statement by.....	1712
Lumley, John M., director, Division of Federal Relations, National Education Association:	
Letter to Chairman Perkins, dated May 3, 1966.....	1059
NEA questionnaire on Teacher Corps.....	1083
Testimony by.....	1056
Lund, Kenneth W., senior vice president, Scott, Foresman, & Co.; American Book Publishers Council and American Textbook Publishers Institute, statement by.....	1453
Marland, S. P., Jr., superintendent, Pittsburgh Public Schools, Pittsburgh, Pa.:	
Letter from, dated April 13, 1967.....	1697
Programs under title I, ESEA which are shared with nonpublic schools.....	1698
Tabulation of programs under ESEA title I.....	1697

Statements, letters, supplemental material, etc.—Continued

Mattheis, Dr. Duane J., commissioner of education, State of Minnesota, newspaper article entitled, "Teacher Loss Up in City Schools".	Page 1096
Moss, Hon. John E., a Representative in Congress from the State of California:	
Letter from Chairman Perkins, dated March 17, 1967.....	1573
Lohman, Joseph D., chairman, California Advisory Compensatory Education Commission, Sacramento, Calif., statement of.	1573
National Education Association, excerpts from NEA research report, 1966, October 1966.....	1470
Newman, Dr. Rhoda Spruce, assistant professor, and Director of the National Teacher Corps Center, University of Georgia, Athens, Ga., testimony by.....	1297
Niemeyer, John H., president, Bank Street College of Education:	
Testimony by.....	1129
A composite picture of 15 demonstration training programs for auxiliary school personnel conducted in 1966.....	1238
A profile of a project to train auxiliary school personnel (teacher aids) in conjunction with an NDEA institute for advanced study for teachers of disadvantaged children.....	1255
A project to train migrants for nonprofessional jobs (teacher aids).....	1266
"Auxiliary School Personnel: Their Roles, Training, and Institutionalization," study entitled.....	1131
Profile of a program for teacher education and parent-teacher aids in a culturally different community.....	1248
Profile of a project for training auxiliary school personnel as family aids.....	1270
Profile of orientation-training program for teachers and teacher aids working in the 1966 summer Headstart project.....	1260
Noe, Samuel V., superintendent of schools, Louisville, Ky., statement by.....	971
Exhibit A.—Federal expenditures 1965-66, 1966-67 (table).....	973
Exhibit B.—Evaluation of Federal programs.....	973
Exhibit C.—Learn more earn more adult education program.....	976
"Federal Team Checks School Program—Use of Funds for Disadvantaged Children Praised," article in the Courier-Journal.....	976
Polley, Ira, superintendent of public instruction, State of Michigan, letter to Chairman Perkins, dated March 31, 1967.....	1716
Roth, Herrick S., vice president, Legislative Committee, AFT Executive Council, president, Colorado Labor Council, AFL-CIO, testimony by.....	1366
Rose, Oscar, superintendent of schools, Midwest City, Okla.:	
Applicants and Federal funds requested (table).....	1392
Chart I.—Enrollment growth from 1950 to the present and estimated to 1970 and the corresponding degree of Federal impact.....	1397
Chart II.—Pupil turnover as related to proximity to Federal impact area.....	1398
Chart III.—Range of student mean performance of sixth grade classes Iowa tests of basic skills—Clover Park Schools.....	1399
Chart IV.—Clover Park per pupil valuation compared with other first-class districts, Washington State.....	1399
Tabulation I.—Maximum operating funds available from high to low without Public Law 874 funds.....	1388
Tabulation II.—Assessed valuation per pupil in each school district.....	1389
Tabulation III.—Total tax levied for educational purposes.....	1390
Schunk, Dr. Victoria, chairman, legislative program committee, and Dr. Lois Roth, area representative, education legislative program, American Association of University Women, letter to Chairman Perkins, dated March 21, 1967.....	1715
Scott, Mrs. Mary Jane, Ralph Waldo Emerson School, Newton Upper Falls, Mass.:	
An analysis made in Newton of our approaches with disadvantaged children.....	1707
Copy of letter to the Boston Herald replying to their articles, "Are the Rich Getting Richer?".....	1708
Letter to Chairman Perkins, dated March 9, 1967.....	1706

CONTENTS

IX

Statements, letters, supplemental material, etc.—Continued

Simmons, William, deputy superintendent, Detroit Public Schools, testimony of	Page 1402
Sizer, Theodore R., dean, Graduate School of Education, Harvard University, telegram to Chairman Perkins	1285
Swanson, Austin D., associate professor of education, State University of New York at Buffalo:	
Letter to August W. Steinhilber, dated December 7, 1966	1145
Steinhilber, August W., specialist for legislation, HEW, letter from, dated November 18, 1966	1144
Steinhilber, August W., specialist for legislation, HEW, letter from, dated December 22, 1966	1146
Taylor, Richard D., superintendent, Widefield-Security Schools, testimony of	1418
Tunney, Hon. John V., a Representative in Congress from the State of California, letter to Chairman Perkins, enclosing a statement by Bruce Miller, superintendent of schools, Riverside Unified School District	1710
Whitten, Hon. Jamie L., a Representative in Congress from the State of Mississippi, letter to Chairman Perkins, dated March 2, 1967	1713
Whittier, Dr. C. Taylor, superintendent of schools, the School District of Philadelphia:	
Federal funding needs, School District of Philadelphia, Pa.	1700
Poindexter, Robert L., deputy superintendent, letter to Chairman Perkins, dated April 10, 1967	1699
Willenberg, Ernest P., president, the Council for Exceptional Children, NEA, statement of	1137
Wilson, Dr. Donald E., director, Teacher Education, School of Education, Temple University, newspaper article entitled "Teacher Corps Makes Impact in Watts—They Hustle Education"	1318
Wright, Winnie, librarian, Flemingsburg Elementary School, Flemingsburg Elementary Library, Flemingsburg, Ky., letter to Chairman Perkins, dated March 8, 1967	1710
Younglund, Donald E., assistant director, Federal programs, Wichita Public Schools, Unified School District No. 259, Wichita, Kans., letter to Chairman Perkins, dated January 27, 1967	1706



ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1967

THURSDAY, MARCH 9, 1967

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR.

Washington, D.C.

The committee met at 9:30 a.m., pursuant to recess, in room 2175, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Carl D. Perkins (chairman of the committee) presiding.

Present: Representatives Perkins, Green, Dent, Brademas, Ford, Hathaway, Meeds, Quie, Bell, Reid, Erlenborn, Scherle, Dellenback, and Steiger.

Staff members present: Robert E. McCord, senior specialist, H. D. Reed, Jr., general counsel, William D. Gaul, associate general counsel, Benjamin F. Reeves, editor, and Louise M. Dargans, research assistant.

Chairman PERKINS. The committee will be in order. We are delighted to welcome this morning a fine Member of this Congress who has been one of our most prominent members in the Committee on Rules and who has done so much in seeing to it that educational legislation, reported by this committee, actually came to a vote on the floor of the House.

It is a great pleasure to welcome our distinguished colleague, the Honorable Richard Bolling, to introduce the Kansas City superintendent of schools.

STATEMENT OF HON. RICHARD BOLLING, A MEMBER OF CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MISSOURI

Mr. BOLLING. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am very pleased to have the privilege of being with the committee today. As you have said, the field of education has been one of my interests for many years. In fact, I am a teacher.

It is a particular pleasure, because it is my first opportunity to be here since your chairmanship and also because I have the privilege of introducing to the committee the man who is not only the superintendent of schools in Kansas City, but an old and good personal friend of mine.

He has had a remarkable career. He came up through the ranks the hard way. He has survived a great many difficulties in the Kansas City area and survived them with honor, skill, and ability.

It gives me great pleasure to present to the committee Mr. James A. Hazlett, Superintendent of Schools, Kansas City, Mo.

Thank you, sir.

STATEMENT OF DR. JAMES HAZLETT, SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS, KANSAS CITY, MO.

Mr. HAZLETT. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name, as Congressman Bolling has indicated, is James A. Hazlett, superintendent of schools, Kansas City, Mo.

I am pleased to have the opportunity to express to the committee our appreciation of the many opportunities which have been availed our district as a result of the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

The Kansas City School District has an enrollment of 75,000 pupils from kindergarten through the 12th grade. About one-third of the enrollment, or 25,000, can be described as culturally disadvantaged or economically deprived; 43 percent of the enrollment is Negro.

The availability of funds under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act was immediately recognized as an opportunity to expand and intensify a very modest locally financed program of compensatory education in the amount of \$150,000 which is still a part of our title I effort.

When we became the recipients of about \$1,800,000 in fiscal 1966 to launch a specialized program to meet the needs of the culturally disadvantaged, we created a division in our school system called urban education and placed an assistant superintendent in charge because we wanted to give an individual sufficient range and status that he could develop specially designed programs that would become an important part of our regular school offerings without any differentiation—being a second level program—or that its needs would be met after the regular program.

We proceeded to develop a title I program that would meet the needs of about 15,000 pupils in 21 schools, who could be described as the most seriously disadvantaged. The expenditure of funds was concentrated there.

We emphasized reading and the language arts as being the focal point for most of our efforts. We established workshops, reading specialists working with classroom teachers, reading centers, reading consultants and supervisors, teachers of speech and hearing, and then we set up a curriculum production center for producing learning materials that would be more appropriate to these particular young people.

All of these are receiving attention. We have endeavored to set up programs that would permit the individual teacher to exercise her strengths and to function without the responsibilities of all the jobs in the classroom. We are trying to departmentalize some teaching, use teacher aids, develop team teaching, and we have within the area a pilot program in one school where we are working in counselors, social workers, and psychological workers, while in another school we have a model resource or library center which we hope to extend into the other schools of the area.

Part of the design is to interpret to the area being served exactly what we are doing, to gain the support of parents in the community and to involve them in planning and hold classes for parents. Built in, of course, as required by law, are evaluations procedures to determine the efforts we are making are producing results.

It is going to take some little time, actually longer than the life of the act, probably, to determine if the special intensified efforts are really improving the achievements levels and the adjustment of the young people being served.

Chairman PERKINS. You are prepared to evaluate at this moment that the special programs offer considerable value, though, to your city?

Mr. HAZLETT. I don't think there is any question but what the recognition on the part of the people being served and the entire city that this attempt to uplift the community through education is considered to be positive and helpful.

Chairman PERKINS. In other words, you can already see present results?

Mr. HAZLET. Yes; in terms of attitudes and response.

We know that in the summer months there is an ordinary learning loss for students and we are attempting to enroll at least 75 percent of eligible students for half-day summer programs.

The success of any such program means that the staff must understand the added emphasis, the new techniques, the sociological problems, and so forth. Therefore, inservice education for principals, teachers, teacher aids, and supportive workers is receiving considerable attention in the first year.

An important consideration we feel is that if the title I effort is to be meaningful over a period of time that we ought to have some knowledge of funding that would permit us to plan in the years ahead, and that allocations should synchronize with our budget planning. We received \$1,800,000 in fiscal 1966 to spend now in 6 months; \$1,600,000 in 1967 to spend in 12 months.

If we knew for 1968, 1969, and 1970 approximately what the allocations would be and they would be available in time to hire a staff, I am sure we could have a better, more organized, and more efficient program. Within the same area of service and under the same assistant superintendent, we incorporated the Headstart program. We feel it would be better if it were placed under the U.S. Office of Education because it is essentially a preschool educational program, serving the same objectives as title I, and that we could administer it more economically and be more certain of the timing.

Title III has been helpful to us. We have been able, as a local educational agency, to act in behalf of all the schools of Jackson County in which our school system is located in setting up a pilot diagnostic and behavioral enhancement center, serving some 12 to 15 school districts as well as the parochial school system.

For the first time these other districts have had the availability of psychological psychiatric diagnosis services and a center where children—problem children can be taken and carry on their schooling away from the regular school which they ordinarily attend. We have a second grant providing opportunities to plan for the use of a computer in eighth-grade science and mathematics.

Mr. FORD. Might I ask a question at this point, Mr. Chairman? I might have to leave before all of the gentlemen have testified to attend an executive session of another committee.

Chairman PERKINS. Proceed.

Mr. FORD. I notice in your testimony you lay it right on the line that you believe Headstart not only should be transferred to HEW but should become a part of title I. This is the strongest recommendation that anyone has made in this regard.

This puts you out ahead of anyone else in talking about a transfer. Do you really mean you want it to become part of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act? I am not trying to trap you. I just point out to you do you really mean it when you stop to realize that the funds in title I can only go directly to a public school agency and therefore the non-public-school agencies operating under Headstart would not be included?

Is that what you mean?

Mr. HAZLETT. You raise a point I had not given full consideration to. I was thinking in terms of objectives of Headstart compared to title I rather than the availability of funds to nonpublic agencies.

However, it would seem to me that under a public educational agency the same students would be benefited regardless of who administers the money.

Mr. FORD. Are all the children in your city in the program of the public school system?

Mr. HAZLETT. In our school system the only Headstart program is operated in our city by the public school system; yes.

Mr. FORD. You don't have any parochial schools or private agencies operating?

Mr. HAZLETT. No. The contract from the community action agency is with the public schools system to set up the Headstart programs in the entire area.

Mr. FORD. I think I should tell you that approximately 30 percent of all the Headstart programs in the country and about 10 percent of all the children who are in Headstart are not in public school agencies. In the State of Mississippi no public school agency would handle Headstart. So we set up a community action program down there in a small college in northern Mississippi which administers Headstart on a statewide basis.

If we do what you are suggesting on page 4 of your testimony we would have to do one additional thing. We would have to convince the entire Congress that we ought to take the protective language out of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which was a condition to our getting this legislation passed, because the church-State issue is always just below the surface around here.

But for the very restrictive language that we put in the Elementary Secondary Education Act in 1935 we would not have passed it. So there is no chance of changing that language and having a bill. This means that if we follow the suggestion you are making, and as I pointed out you go further than anyone who has suggested this up until now, by specifying that it go into the education act, we will put Headstart out of business in Mississippi, we will put it out of business on the Indian reservations, we will put it out of business in those parts of the country where the only available resources have been nonpublic or church oriented, predominantly small programs.

Though it is 30 percent of the total number of programs, only 10 percent of the children are affected. But almost all of the Headstart

programs that are dealing with the American Indians, for example, and most of them that are available to migrant worker's children are operated by nonpublic agencies, or by agencies other than public school systems.

Some of them are, in fact, public agencies, but they are outside the school system. What I am really asking you, and I am sure that the other gentlemen will be asked about it later, are you really saying that you want to turn Headstart into a straight, no-nonsense education-type program administered by the public schools across the country and get everybody else out of it?

Mr. HAZLETT. I consider that the Headstart is a preschool, education-type program.

Mr. FORD. You qualified that. You said "preschool, education-type program." That is exactly what we think it is; an education program. But if you don't put the word "type" in there, you are not describing it as we have in the legislation. But again that is not what your testimony says.

Mr. HAZLETT. In terms of my experience in my community, I would like to see Headstart administered under title I, in terms of our own community. I am not sufficiently knowledgeable, and I do not know in other communities there have been some problems about the relationship between the local public school system and the community action groups, and that there are some complications of one kind or another that do not appear in our own situation.

Mr. FORD. You are aware that we have a couple of States that have constitutional prohibitions against the expenditure of public funds for the education of children below the age of 6?

Mr. HAZLETT. Yes.

Mr. FORD. We had some difficulty in those places in running the Headstart program through the schools. But the schools have been able to contract with local community action agencies, which is another category of people concerned with what you are suggesting here.

What I am trying to do is to ask you to reflect a little bit on whether you want to go this far. We are making a record here and somebody on the floor will say, "We had a group of school superintendents in and they are back home and know how the program works. They say it should be in title I."

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman PERKINS. Go ahead, Mr. Hazlett.

Mr. HAZLETT. I think I have already indicated that with respect to title I we feel we could use more money in developing programs for the disadvantaged, that the allocation should be made in such a way that we can build into our budget our personnel and plan more efficiently.

With respect to the current amendments before the House Committee on Education and Labor, I would like to commend the amendments to the Vocational Act and to the Teacher Corps. We have great difficulty, as do all city school systems, in working for disadvantaged youth in recruiting teaching personnel and others to work in those schools.

We believe that internships provided under the Teacher Corps, under the supervision of an experienced teacher, would provide us per-

sonnel that we could use during the internship program, and that ultimately they could be recruited as regular teachers in the school system.

We also would like to make the point that we feel that this type of internship program working with local universities might make a change in the training of teachers. We would hope ultimately that all teachers certified would have had sufficient background to be knowledgeable of the problems confronting educators in slum areas, of the large cities. We have in our region where we recruit teachers only one public college that is making any systematic attempt to train their young people to go into the urban community.

We worked out internship programs with them and we have about a 50 percent record in hiring those who do take their practice teaching in those areas. We also have a group of private colleges, small colleges, who agreed to band together some 14 of them, and under the regional laboratory work out a plan where students will take internship in Kansas City, Mo., and Kansas City, Kans.

So we think we see some values, not only practically but ultimately, in teacher training in the national Teacher Corps, and agree that it should be under title I because it is working with the kinds of students that are the objectives of the efforts of title I.

The expansion of the Vocational Act to do more planning and development in the field of vocational training is especially significant to us, I think, in the area of work study. We have one project involving the Rotary Club where some 47 dropouts this year on a part-time, part-time school basis have made complete changes in their attitudes toward school working with adults.

Some of them have gone to night school and some have actually reentered the regular school program. We need to experiment with guidance programs at earlier ages, vocational guidance programs at earlier ages, than presently we do and the availability of funds to work with young people in terms of vocational information would be very important, particularly with the disadvantaged.

There is one other comment I would like to make with respect to comprehensive planning at the State levels, this, in our judgment, would be very valuable to subsidize State departments of education. I am somewhat concerned that the wording, which implies possibly it could be some other State agency than the State department of education, is indicated.

In our judgment, the existing State departments should have the privilege of the overall planning. There are a number of matters which I have listed in my printed testimony which would be very appropriate for study in the State of Missouri.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that concludes my statement—any statement I care to make at this time.

(The document referred to follows:)

TESTIMONY OF JAMES A. HAZLETT, SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS, KANSAS CITY, MISSOURI

My name is James A. Hazlett, Superintendent of the School District of Kansas City, Missouri. The District occupies 80 square miles, most of which is in a Kansas City municipality comprising 320 square miles, but part of it is in the city of Independence. The enrollment is 75,000 pupils from kindergarten through

the 12th grade; certified employees number about 3,000 and the operating budget approximates \$40,000,000. About one-third of the enrollment can be described as culturally disadvantaged or economically deprived. Forty-three percent of the enrollment is Negro.

The availability of funds under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act was immediately recognized as an opportunity to expand and intensify a very modest locally financed program of compensatory education in the amount of \$150,000 which is still a part of our Title I effort. Organizationally, our approach was two-fold: (1) to interpret any programs financed under Title I as a part of our regular offering, not a second-level program, not one that would be provided personnel or services after the regular program needs were met; and (2) to give the person in charge sufficient rank to proceed to develop programs and make decisions with a minimum amount of delay. A division of Urban Education was created under the direction of an assistant superintendent charged with the responsibility of administering Title I programs, Headstart, and similar activities.

Program development proceeded under the following principles:

1. INTENSIFICATION AND SATURATION

Rather than spread funds over all schools having eligible students, a group of 21 schools (17 public and 4 parochial, enrolling over 15,000 pupils) with the most seriously disadvantaged pupils were selected and expenditure of funds was concentrated there. If and when funds are increased, we believe present experience will assist us in choosing the most promising activities to utilize in other schools to effect improvement.

2. EMPHASIS ON READING AND THE LANGUAGE ARTS

Recognizing reading as the basic tool for school success and essential for competent performance in adult life, reading becomes the focal point of curriculum effort. Workshops, reading specialists working with classroom teachers, reading centers, reading consultants and supervisors, teachers of speech and drama, a curriculum production center for producing learning materials—all these are receiving attention.

3. REORGANIZATION AND EXPANSION OF BUILDING FACILITIES TO PERMIT TEACHER STRENGTHS TO FUNCTION BETTER

The traditional self-contained classroom is being reorganized to permit team teaching, departmentalized teaching, use of teacher aides. Additional supportive services such as counselors, social workers, and psychological workers are serving in pilot situations in one elementary school to determine procedures for ultimate effectiveness before introduced in other schools.

A model resource center is a pilot project in a second school. Over 200 additional personnel at various levels have been added.

4. INTERPRETATION OF PROGRAMS TO PUBLIC

To develop parental and public support in the area served, an individual has been assigned under the District Public Information Director to develop a systematic series of stories and releases and to meet with local groups to assist in building positive, cooperative attitudes. Classes for parents are being developed and two schools are receiving extra money to develop total community service schools.

5. EVALUATION

As facets of the District Research and Development Department, four people spend their time testing, evaluating, and interpreting the various special features being developed in Title I schools. Not enough time has elapsed to produce meaningful evaluation results.

6. SUMMER SCHOOL

To compensate for ordinary learning loss and to maintain and increase standards in arithmetic and language arts, an attempt will be made to enroll at least 75% of eligible pupils in half-day summer programs for a minimum of 7 weeks.

7. INSERVICE EDUCATION

A staff that understands the philosophy of compensatory education, the sociological conditions and problems, their roles in a newly conceived situation, and the technical aspects of curricular, methodological, and organizational changes is essential to transformation. Workshops and inservice education opportunities to develop these understandings are prominent during the first year.

The Kansas City school system was allocated \$1,800,000 in fiscal 1966 to spend in six months and \$1,600,000 in fiscal 1967 to spend in twelve months. Recreational, enrichment, and feeding programs developed in 1966 were minimized in 1967 because of better designed efforts to work on basic skills and less money to be spent overall for a longer period of time. To broaden our program to serve more children and to add desirable supportive services, we believe additional funds are needed.

We consider Headstart a desirable supplement to Title I and I believe it could be more efficiently and more economically administered under Title I.

Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (PL 89-10) has provided us with funds to create upon our application a county-wide Diagnostic and Behavioral Enhancement Center as a pilot and a request for operational funds to maintain the Center is now being considered by the U.S. Office. A second grant is providing opportunities to plan for the use of a computer in eighth grade science and mathematics. One or two other activities of an innovative character are in the application development stage.

Our school system, in summary, has benefited from Titles I, II, III, IV, the NDEA Act, the Vocational Act, MDTA, the Higher Education Act, grants from NIMH, PL 874 for the first time last year, the Equal Opportunities Act, and the Civil Rights Act. These acts have enabled us either to seek new directions or to fortify important but costly programs.

Especially critical in our judgment is the determination of a method by which appropriations from Congress for certain programs, especially Title I of PL 89-10 can be synchronized with budgeting for a school year to allow time for hiring personnel, securing materials, sound programming, and minimal organizational changes within the school year.

With respect to the current amendments before the House Committee on Education and Labor, I would particularly commend the amendments to the Vocational Act and changes in the National Teacher Corps.

One of the values of the National Teacher Corps is that one of the long-range outcomes should be identification of the direction change in teacher-training programs should take. There is a need to assimilate practical information into present teacher-training programs that equip the new teacher with the distinctive insights, knowledges and attitudes that will improve instruction for disadvantaged pupils. Hopefully, the colleges and universities who train teachers will soon refuse to consider a graduate to be a fully qualified professional unless there is adequate development in this area.

It seems to be entirely appropriate and reasonable to include the proposed amendment relating to the National Teachers Corps in the Title I Program because of the following reasons:

1. Title I is the major effort attacking problems of the disadvantaged.
2. The provision of the practical part of the training, extremely important for adequate development of a teacher sensitive and responsive to the needs of the disadvantaged, will be facilitated.

The development of the intern program should provide needed staff for Title I areas.

Funds may be inadequate to support "planning, development and operation" particularly if vocational equipment is to be included. Amendment should facilitate:

1. Meaningful articulation and cooperation between schools and industry.
2. Systematic examination and evaluation of present programs of vocational education.
3. Collaboration across school district lines to provide adequate vocational programs for larger areas.
4. Orderly consideration of vocational programs for post high school youth.

We have operated two small work-study programs and are convinced that this type of activity is necessary for a large number of boys not suited for a standard high school program.

Finally, there are many issues which point to a need for comprehensive planning at the state levels. Among them:

1. New means of financing education
2. Programs to improve preparation of teachers
3. State-wide school district reorganization
4. Consideration of extension of the present school term
5. Finding ways to increase the proportion of financial support to education by the states, including state support for building construction
6. Liberalized voting limitations on tax and bond issues
7. State-wide assessment of the educational effort

In regard to the proposed amendment some concerns might be:

1. Rationale that requires 25% of funds to be granted to independent agencies is unclear. Any agency undertaking comprehensive educational planning on a state-wide basis cannot avoid involving state departments. It is almost certain that this will result in additional burdens being imposed upon the state by the activity of the independent agencies. The state departments are already over-burdened and under-staffed. The provision seems to be inconsistent with a statement in the *Background and Need*, i.e., "The best planning—that which will be most responsive to the needs of the persons to be served—must be carried out at the state and local levels.

2. The amendment, in addition to achieving its planning aims, ought to recognize the facilitate strengthening state departments of education. This would be consistent with present provisions of Title V.

Chairman PERKINS. Thank you very much.

Our next witness this morning will be Dr. Breit, who will be introduced by Congressman Adams from the Seventh District of Washington.

I might say before Congressman Adams proceeds that Congressman Adams has not only always tried to improve elementary and secondary education, but also all forms of education.

You may proceed.

STATEMENT OF HON. BROCK ADAMS, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

Mr. ADAMS. We are very pleased to have our colleague, Mr. Meeds, on this committee, Mr. Chairman. It has been very helpful to our overall educational problems in the Northwest to have his voice heard here.

I appreciate the chairman inviting me over this morning.

It is a great pleasure to introduce Mr. Breit this morning.

Particularly, I hope that during the course of the questioning you will have an opportunity to explore the title III projects with Mr. Breit. This was something that was a dream that many of us had when we first saw the Seattle Center facilities that were left after the Century 21 Exposition. These, through title III, we think are now providing what may be a model throughout the country where you can establish an excellent, centralized downtown facility that children from the entire area can come to for an excellence in education, and may begin to provide a breakthrough in the struggle to try to provide a meaningful education in our central cities.

I think the testimony this morning from Mr. Breit will demonstrate some of these things. Although the percentage may look small in our racial imbalance, for example, in the city of Seattle, it so happens that from my district in the central area we have high schools where the percentage of Caucasian children, for example, is below 50 percent. Some of our grammar schools are now at 90-10 percent.

So this is a very meaningful thing for them. We hope it will provide a breakthrough.

I am proud to have Superintendent Breit here this morning. It is a great pleasure to introduce him to the committee.

**STATEMENT OF FRED BREIT, DEPUTY SUPERINTENDENT, SEATTLE
PUBLIC SCHOOLS, SEATTLE, WASH.**

Mr. BREIT. Thank you, Chairman Perkins and members of the House Education and Labor Committee.

Our superintendent of schools, Dr. Forbes Bottomly, was scheduled to attend this hearing, but due to important bills pending at our current session of the State legislature, is unable to leave Seattle. He sends his sincere regrets.

It is indeed a pleasure and special privilege to have this opportunity to review the many benefits of Public Law 89-10 to students in the schools serving the city of Seattle and the Greater Seattle area. We have a thriving city that possesses the ingredients for a promising future.

Out of the diversity of our human talent and cultural resources, we have the potential for developing a dynamic educational program that could not exist in less populated areas of the State. A program of this nature would be highly attractive to parents and would tend to reduce migration of families to the suburbs.

With the financial assistance of Federal funds, we are now in a position to move into new and broader dimensions of educational planning that include nongraded programs, continuous progress concepts, team teaching, flexible scheduling, and the employment of computer-assisted instruction. In order to accomplish these objectives, mobility of students will be essential with transportation provided for those who need it. At the present time, we do not provide transportation and parents are required to carry the burden of this expense.

Even though we have an excellent school system in the city of Seattle with strong community support, we do not possess the funds needed to take giant strides toward truly imaginative programs. This is evidenced by the fact that during the past 14 months the Seattle School District has found it necessary to present five levy and bond issues to the voters in order to secure maintenance and capital outlay funds to meet the regular ongoing financial requirements of the school district.

Through the availability of title I funds, approximately \$1,500,000 for 1966-67, the Seattle School District has worked with citizen advisory groups and local Office of Economic Opportunity representa-

tives in developing additional educational services to meet the special needs of students who come from low-income families.

Students in this category have such limited cultural backgrounds and great deprivation that only through massive effort can educators hope to remedy some of these shortcomings. Federal funds have enabled the Seattle schools to accelerate their efforts in this direction.

We have reduced class size, provided teacher aids, counselors, nurses, and social workers, purchased special materials and equipment, developed new teaching materials, revitalized classroom procedures and arranged for intensive inservice training for teachers. Along with this, we have utilized the services of 1,700 community volunteers who provide special tutoring for our students.

A notable example of our special title I effort was the 1966 summer school program for 3,000 disadvantaged students. Title I funds provided improvement classes in mathematics and reading, enrichment classes, and outdoor education. We had a ratio of one adult to every five students and provided a wide range of field trip experiences.

In cooperation with three institutions of higher learning, teachers spent the afternoons developing new teaching materials and procedures for disadvantaged students. An important part of this entire procedure was the emergence of a better understanding of these pupils and their special needs by the entire teaching staff.

Through this summer program, students not only were given a vital educational experience but also were removed, in many cases, from an aimless summer of wandering the streets.

A number of our schools that meet the requirements for title I funds are overcrowded de facto schools in the central area of the city. To help alleviate this overcrowdedness and to provide a better educational environment, Federal funds are being used to transport many of these students to other schools in the district where space is available and facilities are now overcrowded.

Another outstanding example of the value of Federal funds is the title III program developed by the Seattle public schools in cooperation with school districts in four adjoining counties. The program known as the "Puget Sound Arts and Sciences Center Project" is located at the Seattle Center on the former World's Fair Century 21 grounds. This project housed in outstanding facilities provided by the city of Seattle could easily serve as a prototype for comparable programs across the Nation.

The basic objective of the project, as developed in cooperation with a citizens' advisory committee, is to use the Seattle Center as a focal point for mobilizing all available community talents in the arts and sciences that can supplement and give new directions to the existing educational programs in Seattle area schools. A conscientious effort is being made to include students from all socioeconomic groups and racial backgrounds.

Performances within individual school districts or in the unique facilities of the Seattle Center include professional repertory theater,

children's theater, symphony orchestra concerts, grand opera, chamber opera, small ensembles, music coaching, and in-class dramatic readings. These performances range from intimate groups to string trios and bass quartets playing for elementary pupils, to the challenge of opera presented in the superb setting of the opera house.

Approximately 200,000 students from 29 school districts enjoyed the various presentations of the performing arts program during the past year.

As a source of new ideas for curriculum revision and the improvement of instructional procedures, many workshops and demonstrations utilizing professional talent were arranged for 300 participating teachers.

The mathematics and science components of the title II program are designed to bring to students and teachers the newest materials, instructional procedures, and theories of learning that have been developed by distinguished national educators, including Jerome Bruner, Benjamin Bloom, David Riesman, Richard Suchman, and Jerrold Zacharias. Demonstration classrooms and model laboratories are available at the Pacific Science Center for use by teachers and students. During the past year approximately 40,000 students took part in the activities scheduled at the center.

Staff members of the Seattle public schools, other participating school districts, and nonpublic schools in the Seattle area are most grateful for the financial support provided by the Federal Government in meeting the exceptional needs of our young people.

Staff members have utilized these funds without Federal control and with a maximum opportunity to develop innovative programs to serve local needs.

In regard to the amendments that have been proposed, we are not as a school system actively involved in all of the amendment proposals. However, we have reviewed them and feel they are all good proposals and we endorse them.

(Mr. Breit's additional statement follows:)

HOW CAN PUBLIC LAW 89-10 BE IMPROVED?

Authorize funds so school districts can plan programs and secure personnel in ample time for the school year—September to June. In order to secure qualified personnel, school districts must hire teachers during the early spring months. This cannot take place if funds are not authorized until late summer or early fall.

Include the funding of the Head Start Program in P.L. 89-10 so the program can become an integral part of the school district operation and under school district direction.

Include funds for massive summer school programs in the large cities. It is essential that we provide a broad program of activities including improvement and enrichment classes, outdoor education, field trips, and physical education during the summer months for our young people.

Provide federal funds for school districts that are planning new and bold patterns of organization such as educational parks and continuous progress centers that hold promise for outstanding educational programs geared to student needs for the future. Centers of this nature would embody the best teaching methods, materials and equipment, and would provide an opportunity for students of all races to work together. There would be no de facto centers.

SUMMARY—SEATTLE SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 1 AS RELATED TO PUBLIC LAW 89-10

Profile of Seattle School District No. 1, King County, Wash.

A. Number of Public Schools in District-----	117
Public School Enrollment (K-12)-----	95,960
Non-Public School Enrollment-----	17,379
Total-----	113,339
City Population (latest estimate)-----	574,000
92%—Caucasian	
8%—Non Caucasian	
Total School District Personnel:	
Teachers-----	3,589
Teacher-Aides (including Title I & Head Start)-----	100
Other-----	2,656
Total-----	6,345
B. Federally-funded programs: 1966-67	
Title I (PL 89-10) (anticipated)-----	\$1,529,533
Title II (PL 89-10)-----	175,380
Title III (PL 89-10)-----	426,814
Handicapped Youth Training (PL 87-415)-----	122,664
Neighborhood Youth Corps (PL 88-452)-----	250,870
Public Law 81-874-----	610,000
Head Start (PL 88-452)-----	630,276
NDEA, Title III (PL 85-864)-----	330,000
NDEA, Title V-----	39,302
Federal Forest Funds (est.)-----	45,000
School Lunch Reimbursement-----	171,000
School Milk Reimbursement-----	133,000
Total-----	4,463,839
C. Total Budgeted Expenditure Chargeable to Fiscal Year-----	64,195,240
$\frac{B}{C}=6.96\%$	

TITLE I—ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965, PUBLIC LAW 89-10, 1966 FISCAL YEAR, JANUARY 4, 1966 TO AUGUST 20, 1966

ALLOCATION \$1,662,536

NUMBER OF CHILDREN SERVED

Disadvantaged Children, 11,513.

AIMS OR OBJECTIVES

To improve skills in reading, arithmetic and other academic areas. To provide experimental backgrounds that will motivate learning to provide educationally deprived children with heightened aspiration and motivation to realize their potential capabilities and to initiate self-improvement.

To help acquaint teachers with the background and problems of the educationally deprived children.

GENERAL STATEMENT OF SERVICES PROVIDED

The major emphasis of the educational services provided under Title I was in the elementary schools located in the areas of the city most highly characterized by low-income status and cultural deprivation. We sought to identify the special needs of the disadvantaged pupil and to correct them with priority fixed at the primary and intermediate grades.

Special services provided were:

Teaching and Tutoring	Transportation
Nutritional Services	Medical Services
Counseling and Guidance	Dental Services
Staff Training	Attendance Services
After-School Programs	Parent Involvement
Community Involvement	

SIGNIFICANT RESULTS

The development of remedial programs and basic skills.

The designing of programs using the services of para-professionals and volunteers.

The development of curriculum materials emphasizing the special needs of the culturally-deprived child.

The unique guidance and counseling plans.

The improvement of school-community relations and reorganization of the school day and school year.

The implementation of pre-service and in-service teacher training programs.

Planning for correcting racially-imbalanced schools.

The experience of learning how to work for the mentally retarded.

The provision for diagnostic and remedial and psychological services.

The identification and correction of health deficiencies among low-income children.

An opportunity and encouragement for recent dropouts to return to a pursuit of their formal education through a re-entry program.

A breakfast program (paid and/or free) for children not receiving a breakfast at home.

Field trips for cultural enrichment.

Coordination with other federally-funded projects (OEO, Titles II and III).

TEACHING STAFF

Teachers, 76:

Substitutes, 60:

Teacher Aides, 46.

Pupil-teacher ratio: Prior to Title I Project, 24-27; in the Title I Project, 20-24.

TITLE I—ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965, PUBLIC LAW 89-10. 1966 FISCAL YEAR, SUMMER PROGRAMS

AMOUNT OF ALLOCATION SPENT FOR SUMMER PROGRAMS, \$465,272

NUMBER OF CHILDREN SERVED

Disadvantaged Children, 2,050.

AIMS OR OBJECTIVES

To improve the academic achievement, attitude, and experience background of the participating students through an innovative instructional program.

To provide classroom teaching experience to teachers who will be assigned in the Fall of 1966 to teaching the educationally deprived.

To provide classroom teaching experience for undergraduate education students.

To provide an opportunity for skilled and experienced teachers to study, evaluate, recommend, and prepare curriculum materials suitable for teaching disadvantaged children.

GENERAL STATEMENT OF SERVICES PROVIDED

The services provided were those which would lend to the aims and objectives of the summer programs (see above). The services were:

Teaching
Field Trips
Outdoor Education Experiences
Teacher Training
Curriculum Study

SIGNIFICANT RESULTS

Effective remedial instruction because of small sizes of classes.
 An opportunity for the interns to work closer with the students.
 An opportunity to expose teachers to the culturally-deprived children.
 Teachers were afforded a better insight on handling the culturally-deprived child and his problems.

TITLE I—ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965, PUBLIC LAW 89-10, 1967 FISCAL YEAR, SEPTEMBER 6, 1966 TO JUNE 9, 1967

ALLOCATION, \$1,413,166

(This amount may be adjusted.)

NUMBER OF CHILDREN SERVED

Disadvantaged Children, 9,295.

AIMS OR OBJECTIVES

Design, develop and use curriculum materials and methods especially suited for the educationally disadvantaged child.

Design and use methods and materials suited for arrested language and perceptual development.

Reduce the rate and severity of disciplinary problems.

To increase the quality of instruction and the quality of learning so as to improve performance as measured by standard achievements tests and/or intelligence tests.

GENERAL STATEMENT OF SERVICES PROVIDED

Additional Counselors—Secondary.

Basic skills instruction provided to the potential "drop-out"—Secondary.

Reentry Program for suspended student-instruction in basic skills—Secondary.

Theme-Reader Program—teacher can increase the quantity and quality of student compositions by having someone else read and correct them—Secondary.

Breakfast Program—to reduce poor scholastic attainment traced to hunger—Secondary.

Teacher Aides—help for classroom teacher—Secondary, Elementary, Non-Public.

Field Trips to increase experiences—Secondary, Elementary.

Accenting basic skills learning, priority given to reading—Elementary.

Smaller classes, consequently more individual attention—Elementary.

Procedures developed to modify subcultural communication habits that inhibit learning—Elementary.

Diagnostic-Remediation services to children with learning disabilities, special program for each child—Elementary, Secondary.

Curriculum Development of new programs, materials and services especially suited for the disadvantaged child, emphasis placed upon programs and materials for improving self-image and developing basic language skills—Elementary, Secondary.

Work Experience Programs—a program of training and evaluation with compensation for the mentally retarded students, aims to discover the work potential of the mentally retarded student and develop this potential and provide actual work exposure in industry as a means to successful work experience.

Health Services—4 additional nurses and a one-half-time medical director give the additional time needed for discovering and following-up on health problems of disadvantaged children—Secondary, Elementary.

A workshop for 30 teachers to improve their ability to deal more effectively with intergroup education problems.

Speech Therapist and Reading Program—Non Public.

Community Liaison Coordinator and Volunteer Services Coordinator.

Planning and Research area to prepare statistical information for the project.

Social Work Services to follow-up and work with children who were former Head Start Enrollees—Elementary.

If enough money is available, the summer programs (Summer School, Summer Writing, Summer Reading and Summer Recreation) will be provided.

COST OF SERVICES PROVIDED

	<i>Percent</i>
Salaries—Teachers, counselors, substitute teachers, other educational-----	54
Salaries—Supervisory, technical, professional, medical-----	10
Salaries—Secretarial, staff and unskilled-----	9
Employee benefits and staff travel-----	5
Books, supplies, and materials-----	2
Telephone, alterations, repairs, and new equipment-----	1
Student wages and fringe benefits-----	1
Professional personal, and contractual services-----	4
Pupil transportation and field trips-----	7
Rental of buildings-----	3
Overhead costs-----	4
Total-----	100

TITLE II—ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965, PUBLIC LAW 89-10

ALLOCATION

Fiscal 1966, \$158,208.

Fiscal 1967, \$175,340 (to be adjusted).

NUMBER OF BOOKS PROVIDED

Fiscal 1966:

Special Reference Books, 2,900.

Library Books, 22,800.

Encyclopedias, 185 sets.

Audio Visual Materials.

Fiscal 1967: Data is not available at this time.

AIMS OR OBJECTIVES

Expand and improve the present book collections to meet state standards.

Increase the range and reading levels of materials to meet the non-graded programs.

Provide more listening materials to aid in vocabulary building and the improvement of listening skills at the elementary level.

The secondary level needs enrichment records and tapes in language arts, social studies and foreign language.

Provide a small professional periodical collection for teachers.

Continue to decentralize the record and filmstrip collection of the present audio-visual center so that these materials are more readily available in schools.

Provide periodicals on microfilm in secondary schools so that periodicals may be available over a longer period of time. Present storage is inadequate.

SIGNIFICANT RESULTS, FISCAL 1966

The secondary schools received an allocation of 80¢ per pupil. In the elementary schools, priority groups were established with: Priority I receiving \$2.50 per pupil; Priority II receiving \$1.50 per pupil; and Priority III receiving \$1.25 per pupil. The average per pupil expenditure was \$1.45.

It was hoped that the plan of allotment would help to minimize the differences between large and small elementary schools. It almost doubled the book budget for small- and medium-sized schools, and it also made possible the purchase of some expensive reference books in these schools. Differences have not been completely minimized.

TITLE III—ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965, PUBLIC LAW 89-10, 1967 FISCAL YEAR

ALLOCATION

Performing Arts, \$391,747.

Administration & Operation Expenses, \$50,000.

NUMBER OF CHILDREN TO BE SERVED

247,000 Children.

AIMS OR OBJECTIVES

The use of specially talented persons, including artists, musicians, and scientists, to supplement the basic educational process.

The educational use of the unique physical facilities available at the Seattle Center complex.

The development of new educational approaches to the humanities, emphasizing their relationship one to the other.

The provision of opportunities for children of all socio-economic and racial backgrounds to have significant contact with professionals in the arts and sciences and with one another.

The provision of exemplary educational programs and services to supplement the regular school program.

The continued development of in-service education programs for teachers, utilizing the special talents of professionals and the facilities of the Arts and Sciences Center.

GENERAL STATEMENT OF SERVICES PROVIDED

An opportunity for students to enjoy professional artistic performances in theatre, opera, symphony, and ensembles (music, drama, dance, etc.).

An opportunity to utilize individual professional talents (coaches in music and drama, guest artists, conductors, and consultants).

An opportunity for students to experience intimate personal contacts with performers and intimate looks into the inner-workings of a wide variety of highly professional artists.

An opportunity (through advance-preparation materials) for home involvement to help stimulate an interest in the performing arts before attending performances.

An opportunity to conduct workshops and demonstration programs for both students and teachers in arts and sciences.

An opportunity to develop instructional materials in the sciences especially.

SIGNIFICANT RESULTS

An awakening of the culturally-deprived children to the sciences, mathematics, and the performing arts.

Stimulation of interest in and appreciation of the performing arts on the parts of the students, the teachers, and the parents.

A definite effect not only on teaching ability and methods employed by teachers but a stimulate to the receptiveness of the students toward learning.

Marked improvements in students' technical ability.

Chairman PERKINS. Thank you very much for a very pointed statement. We certainly appreciate your appearance here today.

We will postpone any questioning until we have heard from all the witnesses.

Our next witness will be introduced by one of our senior Members in Congress, Congressman Brademas, from the State of Indiana, who has done, throughout the years, a marvelous job in the field of education at all levels.

Congressman Brademas.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I am very pleased to welcome to the committee today the superintendent of schools and the head of the Community School Corp. in South Bend, Ind., Dr. Charles Holt, who has been, for a number of months, our school superintendent in South Bend, and who has in his time there already shown himself to be a man of very great courage and of very great ability.

I think he is one of the best school superintendents in the country. However, I may be somewhat prejudiced.

I am very pleased to welcome you here today, Dr. Holt, as I know my colleagues are.

**STATEMENT OF CHARLES HOLT, SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS,
SOUTH BEND, IND.**

Mr. HOLT. Thank you, Mr. Brademas.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I should like to preface my statement by saying that first of all South Bend is a community that has recently returned from a very economically depressed condition. Our assessed valuation tax base is not growing. Therefore, we were in no position to proceed in any logical manner in helping our disadvantaged children, particularly.

Title I and title II have meant a great deal to our corporation, to the district. We have now 13 title I schools, for example, out of the 49 schools in the district. This has allowed us to bring in 13 instructional resource teachers to act as consultants and help the regular classroom teachers, 13 instructional aides. We brought in counselors, psychologists. We brought in testing specialists, nurses, fine arts teachers, four special education teachers, a speech therapist and a librarian.

We have at this point, we think, accomplished a great deal for these children. We are at this point on our own. We are sitting down and taking a long look at what we have done. We don't propose to proceed without some logical planning at this point and review, evaluate where we have been.

However, these are programs that would not otherwise have happened in South Bend. They have meant much in terms of materials. Our title II library construction materials has brought about a great strengthening of our programs. We still have 12 schools without libraries in the corporation. We are working on that.

It has meant, too, Mr. Chairman, very much in terms of a cooperative program with the private schools, of which there are many. I think we have learned much from them. I think we have been helpful to their programs.

These programs have done another thing: They have stimulated the community. One of the interesting things is even in the so-called areas of higher socioeconomic groups, they are now interested. They have asked a principal or two from the gold coast section, so-called, to go into these schools, and it is a different kind of experience. Without exception, they have been inspired in doing the job.

I think it has meant a great deal to the community's acceptance of a commitment to aid in disadvantaged children programs. I think this is one of the real benefits of the program, in addition to the financial nourishment, of course, that has come about.

I should like at this point to address my remarks to the amendments which we have studied.

The CHAIRMAN. You may proceed.

Mr. HOLT. First of all, we are committed in South Bend at this point with the National Teacher Corps. One of the most difficult things in these 13 schools of which I spoke is the recruitment of staff, as you have doubtless heard many times.

The experienced, competent teacher with seniority has said, by and large, "I don't want to go to these schools," which means there is a disproportionate number of inexperienced teachers. Even these teachers often leave after a year. I think this is changing now.

But I see the Teacher Corps as an opportunity to bring in people specifically trained to deal with these youngsters. Without this program, it means this to us: that we will have to bring in the summer, prior to the opening of school, a workshop program of one to two weeks at most to try our best to equip these teachers to know the problems of disadvantaged children.

With the interns, the use of experienced teachers in this program, it will assist us materially and will bring about perhaps more commitment on the part of the other teachers, as they see the young teachers, the interns, the experienced teachers work with these children.

What I am saying is, I think this is the way to provide the experienced teacher for disadvantaged children.

The problem of recruiting is a very discouraging thing. I notice that the Teacher Corps in the first year, their success, at the national level has been most encouraging. It has been most discouraging for us. I think this comes about perhaps because of a national commitment, a desire for public service that these people exhibit.

So we would be wholeheartedly in favor of the Teacher Corps. We would hope fervently that members of this Corps would come to South Bend to assist us with our programs.

Next, Mr. Chairman, in vocational education, I don't think up to this point we have done the best kind of job in the area of vocational education. I think we are still dealing in another era. I don't think we are up to the point in developing, what I would call immediately negotiable skills on the part of youngsters who go through the secondary school. I think we have to equip them for jobs immediately upon leaving our schools.

With the number of these youths who will come to the labor market, I think it is imperative that we begin to develop our programs in a better style. For example, our part-time work-study programs, I think, have been unrealistic. One of the reasons they have been unrealistic is the lack of communication in most districts with the business community and industry. Sure, we communicate, but not well enough. This amendment might bring about this kind of change in helping us communicate with them.

We certainly need to stimulate innovation because we are still, I am afraid, in a bird box building program in most of the schools. We need innovative programs. We need to go into data processing. We have recently taken a survey of our area and have found what skills are needed to equip these youngsters.

But this is a program under the auspices of the Vocational Technical College of the State of Indiana that is primarily for dropouts, for young adults. The program still must be, prior to this, in the secondary school. We still have that problem, which we must somehow stimulate.

We would wholeheartedly endorse this. It is an absolute essential in our community, which is an industrial community, that we have an improved vocational program.

One that is very dear to my heart is the program for handicapped children. Today we have sitting in the classrooms of the district of South Bend a minimum of 250 youngsters of the educable category who are sitting in classrooms because we can't supply teachers, we can't supply facilities, to house them in classes where they could be most effectively trained. We have them sitting in classrooms be-

ing frustrated, frustrating other children, frustrating a teacher ill equipped to do the kind of a job that ought to be done for them.

I would wholeheartedly endorse the recruitment aspect of this program for handicapped children. I would further endorse the idea that we have centers set up in the various parts of the country where there could be analysis of the needs made for these children and programs developed.

I would say, too, Mr. Chairman, that one of the real needs would be new programs. For example, we have deaf, mentally retarded children. We don't know a thing about how to deal with deaf mentally retarded children today. We don't even know where to approach it.

I think this program and these centers would allow us to have some high-quality research that would give us new approaches, new ways to train these children. So while there are few higher institutions, relatively speaking, that are working in this area there are some beginning.

For example, in our city, the College of St. Mary, I think, is making a remarkable start in the training of teachers for handicapped children. They have a basic commitment to this, and we are very happy with the progress they are making. I would like to see help furnished in this program, because we are far behind, in our district and, I think, other districts, where we ought to be at this point with these children. I think we will pay for it and pay for it dearly later.

Thank you, sir.

Chairman PERKINS. Thank you very much, Dr. Holt.

Our next witness is Dr. Stapleton, assistant superintendent of schools, Albuquerque, N. Mex.

STATEMENT OF ERNEST STAPLETON, ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS, ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX.

Mr. STAPLETON. Mr. Chairman and committee members, I am Ernest Stapleton, assistant superintendent of schools for instruction in the Albuquerque public schools.

I regret that Dr. Chisholm was unable to be here due to an emergency in Santa Fe at the State legislature and other matters pending in the city schools.

It is an honor for us to be here and we appreciate the opportunity to present part of what we are doing in the Albuquerque School District with regard to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

I would like to say that the report which you have, which has been presented to Dr. Chisholm, is a fine document and we would like to have it entered into the record.

Chairman PERKINS. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The report follows:)

PROGRAMS DEVELOPED UNDER THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965, ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX.

(A Report to Dr. Robert L. Chisholm, Superintendent, Albuquerque Public Schools from: Office of New Programs, Albuquerque Public Schools, March 1967)

PROJECTS DEVELOPED UNDER TITLE I, ESEA

INTRODUCTION

Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965 (E.S.E.A.) provides the Albuquerque Public Schools with the opportunity to meet some of the problems

attendant upon poverty in a city which has doubled in school population in the last decade. While the Albuquerque Public School System takes pride in its total educational program during this period of intense growth pressures, it recognizes in Title I the opportunity to effect a significant strengthening of programs which, in the words of the Act, "contribute particularly to meeting the special educational needs of educationally deprived children."

Recognizing the unique effects of educational deprivation, the Albuquerque Public Schools have planned and developed programs under Title I designed to meet the needs of children handicapped by such deprivation. In general, the programs are intended to broaden significantly the experimental base of disadvantaged youth, provide more intensive training in academic skills, widen perceptions of disadvantaged youth in their life-views and interpretations of society, and heighten aspirations toward productive economic and social functioning in society.

There has been wide participation of school personnel in planning programs and projects. Programs have been correlated with community action programs begun under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. The non-public schools serving significant numbers of deprived youth have been involved in the planning and implementation of projects. A continuing working relationship has been established with the parochial school community in the development of special educational services not normally provided the private school pupils.

In the development of plans to enhance the educational programs of the educationally deprived children of the community, it may be said that a common objective has been to facilitate access to the opportunities of our society. A theme present in the planning and development of projects and proposals may be found in the words of Ruth Benedict:

"In reality, society and the individual are not antagonists. His culture provides the raw material of which the individual makes his life. If it is meagre, the individual suffers; if it is rich, the individual has the chance to rise to his opportunity."

Planning

The day following the signing into law of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 by President Johnson on April 11, 1965, a project planning committee was appointed by the superintendent of the Albuquerque Public Schools. The committee was comprised of teachers, principals, and representatives of the various disciplines within the divisions of instruction and pupil personnel services. By early summer, the committee had developed a tentative structuring of projects to be recommended under Title I.

The Joint American Association of School Administrators-U.S. Office of Education meeting on E.S.E.A. in May 1965 provided valuable preliminary guidelines in the preparation of Title I programs. The New Mexico State Department of Education held regional workshops in the late spring and a state-wide workshop in July 1965, focusing upon interpretations of the various innovative features of E.S.E.A. and the designing of projects. These meetings and local planning sessions during the summer of 1965 helped to provide the capability of moving into funding and implementation of projects within a month following the receipt of final instructions from the State Department of Education in October 1965.

By January of 1966 many components of the Albuquerque Title I Program were in operation. Difficulties occurred, however, in the recruitment of personnel for the specialized educational and service areas that had been established or strengthened by the program. A change in emphasis was made, therefore, which provided for strengthening in-service programs for teachers (public and private), the establishing of curriculum study committees with emphasis upon the special needs of disadvantaged youth, and the development of summer programs.

During this period, a schedule of meetings was established which provides for continued joint planning with the Albuquerque Economic Opportunity Board established under P.L. 88-164. The most immediate educational areas requiring coordination were the Head Start, and Neighborhood Youth Corps projects. With the development of neighborhood service centers under the community action program, other areas of mutual concern have emerged, providing the opportunity for cooperative action between the Board of Education and the Economic Opportunity Board in the areas of family counseling, tutoring, and early childhood development programs.

Implementation, 1966-67

Full-scale implementation of the Title I Program was possible with the beginning of school in September 1966. The various components of the program are summarized in the following passages:

A. Counseling.—A team of eight specialists in guidance counseling has been assigned to strengthen guidance services at the public and private elementary schools in the project area. Emphasis has been placed upon consultation with principals and the development of faculty in-service programs aimed toward assisting school personnel and parents in relating effectively to pupils in need of counseling. An effort is made to acquaint faculties and parents with the various referral services available in the community. Professional school libraries have been supplemented by recent reference materials in the field of counseling and mental health. Thirty-four public and private schools in the project area are presently served by this project. The project is coordinated within the Albuquerque Public School Division of Pupil Personnel Services.

B. Librarians.—While there have been concerned efforts to provide elementary libraries in the Albuquerque schools, the accelerated growth pattern of the last two decades has militated against achieving the desired level of funding of library programs. Title I has provided the capability of strengthening libraries, which in turn strengthen the total reading programs, at twelve schools serving heavy concentrations of disadvantaged youth.

Library programs at four secondary schools have been strengthened by the assignment of additional librarians and the purchase of additional library books and reference materials.

Renovation made possible by Title I funding has provided library space at nine schools in the project area.

C. Junior High School Experience Enrichment.—In order to overcome the barriers erected by the limiting effects of poverty, the staff of a junior high school serving an extremely heavy concentration of disadvantaged youth has implemented a cultural enrichment program. The project involves the following basic features: (a) the centering of reading, writing, speaking and computational activities of the classroom around material gathered first hand from frequent educational field trips in the community; and, (b) the deliberate exposure of students to various cultural activities of the community such as concerts, dramas, and art exhibits.

As a corollary to the student activities, a teacher in-service program has been instituted, bringing leading local and regional scholars to the school and providing released time for teacher workshops in the field of teaching disadvantaged youth.

Since the implementation of this project, the concept of experience enrichment has been adapted to the projects of other schools. Title I funds are making possible a general increase of field trip activities for all schools in the project area.

D. Personalized Curriculum.—At a high school in the project area, a team of four teachers and a counselor work closely with approximately eighty disadvantaged students. A student is recommended for this program if he exhibits disorientation to the regular curriculum, or the symptoms which characterize the potential dropout. The personalized curriculum team concentrates on the need for increasing pupil motivation and self-direction, while working to improve pupil achievement in basic skills. Vocational and consumer education are integral features of the program.

E. Learning Materials Centers.—At two high schools, learning materials centers have been established. Audio visual equipment, accessories, and recently developed reading and computational materials are centered in the schools in locations easily accessible to teachers. At one of the schools, the center is operated in conjunction with the library. The room facilities which comprise the centers were made possible by renovation and construction funds provided under Title I.

At each center a teacher-coordinator is assigned to provide direction to the program and serve as a resource specialist in the field of visual aids and school-made learning materials. A corollary to the materials center program is the provision of additional field trips to provide pupils and teachers first-hand experiences upon which follow-up lessons using school-made reading and computational materials are based. Center activities also include special home economics classes involving the purchasing and renovating of clothing. Activities in consumer economics are also coordinated through the learning materials centers.

Many new items of audio-visual and reproducing equipment used in the development of teacher-made learning materials are circulated from the centers. The opportunity to tailor teaching materials to the needs of individual students has been enhanced greatly by the development of the learning centers. The learning centers coordinators have organized teacher in-service sessions ranging from the use of new educational equipment to the teaching of reading to bi-lingual children. The learning materials centers appear to have provided a valuable and immediate benefit to teachers and pupils.

F. Classroom Instruction Improvement Project in Cooperation with the University of New Mexico.—This project activity addresses itself to the matter of modifying classroom instruction to include the newest teaching methods and materials. The major objective of the project is the reduction of the normal lag between the development of promising innovations and the adaptation of those innovations to classroom practice. The project involves twenty teachers, each of whom is assigned a student teacher. With tuition funded under Title I, the teachers are enrolled in a university course designed to acquaint them with recent research relating to improvement of classroom instruction and the development of teaching methods correlated with the research. The student teachers take a course in general methods and student teaching. Consultants are used in the project to present recent methodology pertaining to teaching disadvantaged youth in the areas of reading, study skills, social studies, and communications skills.

G. Albuquerque Tutorial Project.—The Albuquerque Public School tutorial program was begun on a volunteer basis in the fall of 1964. At that time a small group of college students, working with the principals of several elementary schools serving disadvantaged youth, established a schedule wherein they furnished regular tutoring to school youth several times weekly. In the fall of 1965, application for funding to provide for expansion of the project was made through the Albuquerque Economic Opportunity Board by the public school system. A grant from the Office of Economic Opportunity financed the project from December 1965 to December 1966, at which time funding was brought under Title I. At the present time approximately four hundred pupils in five elementary and two junior high schools in the project area are provided regular tutoring in reading and arithmetic by some four hundred volunteer tutors. Tutors are drawn from the city high schools, the local colleges, and various adult groups sponsored by churches and service organizations. Title I funding provides for coordination of the project, remuneration of project aides recruited from the neighborhoods served, and transportation costs.

H. Special Services.—In the area of special services, Title I funding has made possible the following expansion:

(a) The assignment of eleven nurses to serve the public and private schools in the project area.

(b) The establishment of nine special education classes for educable retarded children and one class for trainable children in cooperation with the local community association for retarded children.

(c) The employment of four professional speech therapists to serve public and private schools in the project area.

(d) The funding of in-service programs utilizing local and national leaders in the fields of counseling and special services.

I. Reading Programs.—Recognizing that a firm foundation in reading skill is vital to education, a concerted effort has been made to strengthen reading programs in the project area.

Several reading teachers have been employed to serve schools exhibiting a high incidence of reading problems. These teachers provide assistance in reading programs to all the staff members of the schools to which they are assigned and work with individual students on a referral basis. Projects focusing upon the reading needs of bi-lingual and Indian Children have been implemented.

An elementary reading consultant employed through Title I funding serves the elementary public and private schools in the project area through teacher in-service programming, demonstration lessons, and consultation with individual teachers. Elementary specialists in art and music integrate their talents into the reading and language arts programs, serving public and private schools in the project area through in-service programs and consultantship.

The assignment of additional teachers to elementary classrooms has provided reduction of class sizes in the project area to allow for greater individual atten-

ion to pupil needs. The assignment of additional teachers at the secondary level has also achieved reduction in class sizes, with particular emphasis placed upon strengthening of pupil language and computational skills.

J. Head Start.—During the summer of 1965, the Albuquerque Public Schools sponsored a Head Start program funded from the Office of Economic Opportunity. The initial project provided an eight-week child development and pre-school program for 1200 children prior to their entry into first grade. The program offered the full range of educational, health, counseling, and parent education services recommended by the Office of Economic Opportunity.

An expanded Head Start project was implemented in the summer of 1966 accommodating approximately 2400 children for an eight-week period. Funding for the project was provided through both the Office of Economic Opportunity and Title I. Again, a comprehensive range of educational and supplemental family services in the areas of health and counseling was provided.

K. Program Evaluation.—In the summer of 1966 an office of program evaluation was established and a research psychologist employed to implement scientific research techniques in the evaluation of new programs. A variety of methodology, ranging from statistical techniques to the systematized eliciting of parental and teacher responses, is being employed in the assessment process. The most recent educational measurement devices and data processing facilities are being used to produce a valid and precise reading of the effects of the new programs upon students. The data required for a full-scale assessment of the past year's operation of the Title I program are not yet available. Such data will soon be available, however, due to the testing and measurements that have been implemented through the office of program evaluation.

Exhibits A through D of this report provide examples of the techniques being employed to evaluate the Title I program.

TITLE II—SCHOOL LIBRARY RESOURCES, TEXTBOOKS, AND OTHER INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS

Despite intensive growth pressures resulting in the need for many additional classrooms every year, the Albuquerque Public Schools have been able to make some progress in expansion of library programs. Title II, E.S.E.A., has provided a most needed opportunity to accelerate local expansion of school libraries, particular at the elementary level. As noted earlier, library programming is a significant component of Title I program. Title II has proved to be a most beneficial and logical corollary to Title I in the over-all E.S.E.A. Albuquerque program. Schools not included in the Title I program have also benefitted from Title II in the supplementing of school library programs. Experimental and innovative library programs have been accelerated by Title II funds. In three areas of the city, school libraries are serving as community resources by providing evening and summer library programs.¹

During the 1965-66 school year, a total of \$137,859.00 was allocated to Albuquerque under the New Mexico Title II State Plan. For the 1966-67 school year, a total of \$122,646.00 has been allocated, with an additional allocation expected in the spring.

TITLE III—SUPPLEMENTARY EDUCATIONAL CENTERS AND SERVICES

Albuquerque has received several grants under Title III of E.S.E.A. for the purpose of planning and operating projects new to the New Mexico educational and cultural scene. Planning of the projects has involved a wide range of local and state cultural and educational resources.

The various new programs made possible through Title III are summarized in the following passages:

A. OUTDOOR EDUCATION CENTER

In April 1966 work was begun under a Title III grant to plan an outdoor education center to be located at a 130 acre site owned by the Albuquerque Public Schools in the Sandia Mountain range, twenty miles from Albuquerque. In January 1967 the application for an operational grant to implement programing at the center was approved by the U.S. Office of Education.

¹ Sandoval Elementary School, northwest Albuquerque; Emerson Elementary School, southeast Albuquerque; Kit Carson-Ernie Pyle Joint Library, southwest Albuquerque (program to be initiated, spring, 1967).

In operation, the center is providing the opportunity to use outdoor situations and materials as vehicles for teaching natural sciences, arts and crafts, music, physical education and language arts.

The project is coordinated within the Albuquerque Public Schools Division of Instruction.

B. ALBUQUERQUE YOUTH SYMPHONY

The Youth Symphony Project, approved under Title III in September 1966, provides for the expansion of the existing Albuquerque Youth Symphony to accommodate more talented young people, the expansion of a tour program to reach more schools in Albuquerque plus several communities outside the city, and a summer music camp program.

The Youth Symphony involves some 250 student musicians from both public and private schools. The project is coordinated within the Albuquerque Public Schools Music Department.

C. ALBUQUERQUE CHILD GUIDANCE CENTER

Under a Title III grant, effective November 1966, the Albuquerque Child Guidance Center is being expanded by additional professional staffing. It is anticipated that some 200 additional public and private elementary school children and their families will receive benefits as a result of this expansion. The project program also provides for diagnostic conferences, workshops, seminars, and pupil progress conferences with school personnel.

The project is coordinated within the Albuquerque Public Schools Guidance Services Department.

D. A STUDY OF THE TYPE OF SCHOOL NEEDED FOR THE FUTURE

In January 1967 the application for a planning grant to study the type of school needed for the future was approved. A major objective of the project is the involvement of all segments of the community for purposes of consultation and communication in regard to educational goals and program. Tying in with the Albuquerque Title I program, the project will provide scientific research to determine the needs, desires, and basic motivations of the culturally deprived. The project will also make an examination of the variety of educational methods, curriculum patterns, and special services which may serve the needs of both culturally deprived and multi-cultural groups.

The project is being coordinated within the Albuquerque Public Schools Office of Research and Planning.

In addition to the projects in operation cited above, the Albuquerque Public School system has submitted the following project applications to be considered for funding under Title III:

(A) *The Planning and Implementation of a Developmental Education Center.*—This application proposes a program of centering and unifying the services of the following basic components of an educational program: (1) reading; (2) media and materials; (3) guidance and testing. It is proposed to enlist leading scholars in the planning of an educational program wherein the basic instructional activities and allied services are coalesced in a unified attack upon learning problems, with a particular emphasis upon reading.

(B) *Workshops to Prepare for the Teaching of Computer Courses in Secondary Schools.*—This application proposes the implementation of a series of workshops to prepare teachers in the field of computer mathematics, science, and business education. The project includes the development of curriculum content for the following high school courses: (1) Computer-Related Mathematics; (2) The Computer as a Business Tool.

(C) *The Planning of a Space-Science Center for the Schools of Central and Northern New Mexico.*—This application is submitted in cooperation with the Title III Educational Service Center, for which the Albuquerque Public School system serves as fiscal agent. The project provides for the planning of a science center of several components relating to space education. The final program of such a center would be tentatively comprised of the following basic features: (1) planetarium; (2) space science exhibits; (3) investigation center, or laboratory; (4) facilities for teacher workshops and in-service education.

CONCLUSION

The foregoing report provides a summation of the variety of new and supplemental activities and services funded under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. It should be noted that the following related programs have been made possible from other sources of federal funding: (1) the Neighborhood Youth Corps, serving to supplement the educations of one-hundred school youth, funded under the Economic Opportunity Act; and (2) the reduction of school lunch prices at three public and one private school serving heavy concentrations of economically deprived children, funded under the Child Nutrition Act.

E.S.E.A. and related legislation have opened new opportunities for the exploration of the learning process and the application of new approaches to the dynamics of community and human relations. The identification of need, the planning and implementation of programs, and the eventual evaluation of the effects of the programs upon the lives of children are demanding and complex responsibilities. We of the Albuquerque Public Schools recognize, however, that, as has been pointed out by Secretary John Gardner, great opportunities often appear upon the scene brilliantly disguised as problems.

EXHIBIT A

GENERAL EVALUATION

One of the basic ways in which an overall assessment of change in Title I eligible schools is being made is by wide-scale sweep testing. At the elementary level, testing is being conducted in an approximate 50 percent random sample of eligible schools. The schedule is designed to make use of and supplement the existing Albuquerque Public Schools testing program.

Grade	Pretest	Midyear	Posttest
1	Mental maturity readiness.....		Reading achievement.
2	Reading.....	Mental maturity.....	Reading.
3	Reading, arithmetic.....		Reading, arithmetic.
4		Reading, arithmetic, language arts, mental maturity.....	
5	Reading, arithmetic, language arts.....		Reading, arithmetic, language arts.
6	Full battery achievement.....	Mental maturity.....	Full battery achievement.

At the junior and senior high school levels, data from the regular Albuquerque Public Schools testing program are being used with some additional 7th, 10th, and 12th grade testing in selected subject matter areas in heavily funded schools.

The general test data are being used in the following ways:

1. To provide pre and post test gain score comparisons, to ascertain whether significant change has occurred with regard to comparison groups and/or prior years.
2. To provide information for studies of longitudinal change: a) tracing change at a given grade level from year to year with different populations; b) tracing change at different grade levels from year to year following the same population.
3. Using a data retrieval system, any test score data with regard to a given student or a given group of students can be abstracted for specific comparison purposes.
4. Factor analysis and item analysis provide longitudinal information with regard to changing areas of instructional need.

EXHIBIT B

SCHOOL COUNSELING

Present staffing provides approximately 1 day of counseling service per every 8 days for each public elementary school served, and $\frac{1}{2}$ day of service per week for each parochial school. A substantial portion of counseling services has to do with providing consultation and in-service training for classroom teachers and the development of on-going guidance programs.

This year, appraisal of the program is focusing upon:

(1) Changes in behavior and performance of the children referred to the counselor. At the time of referral to counseling and again at the termination of service, the referring teacher rates the child on *Behavior Rating Scale*. Changes in rating with regard to a) the desirable, i.e. "corrected" behavioral outcome and b) the kind of counseling service provided are being analyzed for "success" or "non-success." Pre and post test data in specific test areas are also being assessed. Comparisons of initial 7th grade adjustment of children participating in orientation programs and those not participating will be made in September 1967.

(2) Changes in demand for the service.

(3) Based upon a January 1967 survey of principals, the second highest priority in their request for expanded staffing was given to counseling and nursing services.

(4) Changes in attitude regarding counseling service. Responses of principals, teachers, and other staff members to the Guidance Services Opinionnaire are being analyzed with regard to changes in counseling services.

Projected plans include an estimate of changes in teacher attitudes as measured by pre and post administration of the *Professional Check List* and *Grading Practices Opinionnaire*. These will be administered to a sample of 1st, 3rd, and 6th grade teachers in 1) schools receiving maximal guidance programs, 2) schools receiving minimal guidance programs, 3) teachers participating in counselor-led discussion groups, and 4) schools having no counseling or guidance programs. Case studies and anecdotal material provide additional information.

EXHIBIT C

LEARNING MATERIALS CENTERS

Evaluation is concentrating upon a survey of:

1. The nature, quantity, and quality of the supplementary materials developed and disseminated;

2. The extent to which teachers are making use of materials;

3. The extent to which teachers indicate that their use of instructional techniques and materials has changed this year, as the result of the centers, as compared with last year;

4. Changes in reading competency and oral communication skills among the target population as measured by comparative achievement test scores, teacher ratings, and judgments of time sample tape recordings.

EXHIBIT D

SUMMER—1966 HEAD START PROGRAM

The basic areas of evaluation inquiry have involved:

(1) An assessment of the content of the program and its operation.

(2) An assessment of the progress of children during the 8 week Head Start program.

(3) Follow-up procedures including a comparison of the adjustment and attainment, in the regular school program, of children who have had the Head Start experience with children who did not participate in the program.

The evaluation has also focused upon four major areas: professional and staff reaction, pupil personal and social development: pupil scholastic readiness and attainment: and parental participation.

Instruments and procedures

(1) 80% of teachers, and 90% of all other professional staff members who participated in the Head Start program were systematically interviewed in small group sessions or individually. Their observations of the children's progress and their reactions to all of the phases of the Head Start operation comprise a part of the Albuquerque Public Schools Head Start evaluation report.

(2) Administered to a sample of Head Starters on a pre and post test basis during the 8 week program:

Lee-Clark Readiness Test:

Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test:

Reproduction of Geometric Designs Test (Developed by Albuquerque Public Schools).

With regard to the same sample, the teachers responded on a pre and post basis to the *Behavior/Skill Rating Scale* (Adapted by Albuquerque Public Schools from the *Head Start Check List and Vineland Social Maturity Scale*).

(3) Follow-up during the school year 1966-67:

September-October:

Lorge-Thorndike Mental Maturity Test: administered to Head Starters and non-Head Starters in randomly selected schools.

Survey of faculty members in Title I eligible schools asking them to compare, in a variety of behavioral, skill, and academic areas, 1st graders who participated in the Head Start program and 1st graders who did not.

December:

Standard Telephone Interview: an individually administered oral measure of communication skills and color knowledge, administered to a sample of high, medium, and low I.Q. 1st graders of Head Start and non-Head Start background.

January:

Survey of family organization patterns and socio-economic information regarding a sample of 600 first grade children, approximately half Head Starters, half non-Head Starters.

Item analysis of Peabody, Lee-Clark, Lorge-Thorndike, and Behavior/Skill Rating Scale across cultural and socio-economic lines.

March:

Survey of differential parent involvement, Head Starters and non-Head Starters.

Behavior Rating Scale: teacher estimate of a sample of Head Starters and non-Head Starters.

May:

Gates MacGinitie Reading Achievement Test, in randomly selected schools.

Comparative attendance and retention figures: Head Starters, non-Head Starters; this school year and prior years; records of Head Starters and older siblings when at same grade level.

EXHIBIT E

*Federal funding, office of new programs, Albuquerque public schools
(Figure to nearest thousand)*

I. Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965:		
A. Title I:		
1. 1965-66	-----	\$1,380,000.00
2. 1966-67	-----	1,235,000.00
(Additional allocation expected spring of 1967) -		328,000.00
B. Title II:		
1. 1965-66	-----	138,000.00
2. 1966-67	-----	123,000.00
(Additional allocation expected spring of 1967) -		15,000.00
C. Title III:		
1. Outdoor Education Center	-----	57,000.00
2. Albuquerque Youth Symphony	-----	22,000.00
3. Child Guidance Center	-----	92,000.00
4. Study of Schools for Future	-----	153,000.00
II. Economic Opportunity Act of 1964:		
A. Head Start:		
1. 1965	-----	104,000.00
2. 1966	-----	204,000.00
B. Neighborhood Youth Corps:		
1. 1965-66	-----	130,000.00
2. 1966-67	-----	136,000.00
C. Tutorial Centers, 1965-66		22,000.00
III. Child Nutrition Act of 1966:		
Spring 1967 (estimated)	-----	8,000.00
Total (including expected additional allocations) ----		4,147,000.00

Mr. STAPLETON. My remarks will be rather general in that Dr. Chisholm was unable to present a specific statement, but this report should cover most of the information regarding the Albuquerque district.

A little bit of background might suffice to set the stage. Most of us know the district has about a 300,000 population with 76,000 students in the public schools; 9,750 enrolled in the nonpublic schools. The number eligible under title I specifically is approximately 7,400. In the grade span of 1 through 12, there are 101 schools in Albuquerque, with 106 in 1967-68.

Again, something of a passing nature, there is the fact that Albuquerque has a tricultural, multilingual background, one foot in the past and one foot in the future, with its historical background in the Rio Grande Valley, and all of the scientific advancement that has occurred as a result of the Sandia Corporation, Los Alamos, and the other Federal programs in the area.

Public Law 89-10 has been a tremendous program for the Albuquerque district. I am sure that I speak for many of the programs in the States. I would like to suggest perhaps certain characteristics to change this about a little bit.

We have found these applicable to our program from the very beginning. First of all, there has been a continued involvement and cooperative relationship developed in the community with regard to title I and title III, title II being pretty much the public school program.

I would like to suggest that we have attempted to move on the basis of recognizing individual school projects and at the same time developing projects that are of a systems approach or systemwide approach.

I would like to suggest a third characteristic which is essentially that, as we have developed the program, we have attempted to look at a range of services. I would like to comment on this in just a few minutes.

Then, fourth, a characteristic that we hope is evident in the report, that there has been a reinforcement from one program to another. I am talking about title I, title II, title III, and even the National Defense Education Act.

And, finally, the fact that we have been for the last year searching for an evaluation design that we hope would get at some of the real merit of our title I, II, and III program.

Nicholas Bentley said learning history is easy, but learning the lessons of history is another matter.

We feel that the evaluation design or program that will come from our Federal projects will give us the opportunity to learn the lessons of history rather than just merely implementing programs.

I would like to indicate that the planning that started for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in Albuquerque began the day after the bill was signed by President Johnson, and that they—we began with a project planning committee and the appointment of a coordinator for Federal programs. Very soon after that, we entered into a series of meetings both on a regional and statewide basis that enabled the Albuquerque district, we feel, to sort of get a headstart on the planning phase of the program.

We feel also that the cooperative relationships that have developed with the program have been particularly strong. There was the shake-down period.

There obviously was the period of adjustment. But we would like to indicate very strongly that the leadership offered by the State de-

partment of education in our State has been very fine. It has been a partnership effort that we have appreciated in the Albuquerque district. We feel that many of the projects under title II and under title I have involved community leaders.

I would cite the report indicating under title III the outdoor education project involving 130 acres of recreational lands in the Albuquerque area, and the fact that the outdoor education project stemmed from long-expressed needs in the community and that for the first time under title III we were able to implement such a program. It involved community recreation leaders, businessmen, and professional men, of many walks of life.

Secondly, the youth symphony project under title III, which had been a longstanding interest, and which was finally expanded under title III. And many others of the same type can be cited from the report.

I would like to indicate just two for purposes of illustration regarding the matter of cooperative relationships that I think speak to a larger issue here. That is the Albuquerque pictorial project on page 4 of the report. This program was a volunteer program at the beginning. At that same time, a group of college students, working with principals of elementary schools serving disadvantaged youth established a schedule.

In the fall of 1965 application for funding to provide for expansion of the project was made to the Albuquerque Economic Opportunities Board by the public school system. Then a grant from the Office of Economic Opportunity financed the project from December 1965 to December 1966, at which time funding was brought under title I.

At the present time, approximately 400 pupils in five elementary and two junior high schools of the project area are provided regular tutoring reading and arithmetic by some 400 volunteer tutors.

Mr. Chairman, I attended a meeting last week in which this program is still growing, a joint meeting of the Economic Opportunity Board and the Albuquerque public schools. Four meetings a year are now held, formal meetings between the two boards, in which the projects are discussed. Last week we brought before the board a program which has been endorsed in full by the public schools for early childhood centers, which we hope will mesh with Albuquerque public schools and Headstart.

This will be for 4-year-olds and 3-year-olds. Here, again, there is a meshing, an interrelationship between the program. I cannot speak enough about the cooperative relationship that has developed between the EOB in Albuquerque in the past year and the Albuquerque public schools with the joint planning that has occurred.

Let me turn for just a minute to the question of individual school projects and system projects in the Albuquerque area. This was a decision by design early in the game. There are illustrations cited in the report of individual school projects. For example, the project of a personalized curriculum at one of the high schools in the Albuquerque area called the personalized curriculum.

At a high school in this project area, a team of four teachers and a counselor work closely together with approximately 80 disadvantaged students. A student is recommended for this program if he exhibits

disorientation to the regular curriculums or the symptoms which characterize the potential dropout.

The personalized curriculum team concentrates on the need for increasing pupil motivation and self-direction, while working to improve pupil achievement in basic skills. Vocational and consumer education are integral features of this program.

One of the interesting sidelights of this particular program has been that students from the personalized curriculum are now offering their services in the tutorial program. This is sort of a spin off which we have had from some of these programs.

I would merely note that under system projects we, of course, have done what others have reported here, have added librarians, counselors, clerks, nurses—many other specialized personnel to all of these projects.

May I turn for just a minute to the scope and balance of program and indicate here, again, something by design. We have attempted to keep a balance between elementary and secondary. We have attempted to look across the entire spectrum of the curriculum at music, at mathematics, at guidance, at reading. There are two curriculum study projects in the Albuquerque area which we feel are fledgling at the time but we believe they have real promise for the future.

They are a project from grades 0 through 12 on the social studies for disadvantaged. We have another project in general mathematics. We have had consultants from around the country visit the program. We have had them critique the program. We have had people from the U.S. Office of Education look at it.

Frankly, they found that it was so easy for us as a school district to begin to move around certain content areas without really getting at the problem. Their critique was that we had to develop methodology that would make a difference in the teaching in the classroom.

This is what we have been addressing ourselves to during this past year in developing these particular projects.

Let me just indicate with regard to the question of the reinforcing of one program to another which we have felt is important, and it has been alluded to here by Dr. Holt and others.

In title I and title II, the title II effort in our district has really reinforced the title I school programs, the elementary libraries, in which we have been able to fuse together projects aiding particular schools with audio-visual material and specialized material.

We feel even in the outdoor educational program we have a title III project and we are using title I field trips, transportation trips, and again some of title I projects are making use of the title II project funds.

We have taken National Defense Education money and are using this to develop support for title I and title II projects. One high school that is not in the disadvantaged area has been moving in the direction of modular scheduling. What we are hoping to do is to use title II funds to support this particular program.

I would call your attention to the final point regarding evaluation, which we feel is an important aspect of our program, and one we have provided a number of exhibits on the back pages of the report.

I would like to close by reading this statement on program evaluation. In the summer of 1966 an Office of Program Evaluation was established and a research psychologist employed to implement scientific research techniques in the evaluation of these programs.

A variety of methodology ranging from statistical techniques to the systematized eliciting of parental and teacher responses, is being employed in the assessment process. The most recent educational measurement devices and data processing facilities are being used to produce a valid and precise reading of the effects of the new programs upon students.

The data required for a full-scale assessment of the past year's operation of the title I program are not yet available. Such data will soon be available, however, due to the testing and measurements that have been implemented through the Office of Program Evaluation.

May I close by stating, by indicating something that Dr. Holt alluded to and which we feel strongly about? There was a recent article in an elementary school journal to the effect that Federal funds meant the exit of curriculum planning or the implementation of Federal funding meant the exit of curriculum planning. I suppose the intent was that the on-going program would suffer as a result of the new programs coming in at various times, and the kind of planning that would have to be done post haste in order to implement these. I would like to suggest just the opposite from this article.

I don't remember the exact journal that it appeared in. We have actually had a Hawthorne effect. I think Dr. Holt alluded to this. We have had a transference effect in that we feel, for example, under title II, if I can specify here, that as we looked at the new materials available to us under title II the district was forced to develop selection criteria regarding the kinds of materials that the rest of the school districts should be using.

So this sort of set in motion the idea that we had to be selective and we had to identify material from material. The transference effect was also evident in the fact that suddenly people in other areas of the city began to be concerned about their reading program and began to put a little bit of pressure regarding what can we do about getting a better reading program.

This year, as we have been looking at the evaluation designs, and we recognize we have to have multiple designs because of the tremendous variety or variability of programs, the entire district is suddenly concerned with proper evaluation design for on-going programs. One that I suppose is fairly obvious is the fact that a number of material centers have been available to us under title II, which have suddenly prompted other schools which have not really been too concerned to develop a need for material centers. So we would say, counter to this other argument, and I am sure others have presented it, that we feel that Public Law 89-10 has produced a kind of Hawthorne effect, a kind of transference effect which has been healthy for our school district.

We, obviously, have some concerns. Of course, the No. 1 concern that our superintendent asked me to convey in testifying to the committee concerns the matter of a timetable so that these could be fused in with the program. I will cite one practical example.

As we look at the fall term, as we look at the matter of implementing computerized mathematics courses, as we look at the matter of some of the reading programs we, obviously, are talking about spring planning, talking about schedules for high schools that involve data processing runs and this kind of thing.

So, very practically speaking, we are talking about our concern for an earlier timetable that would enable the school district to plan a little more effectively. Then one final one, and that is essentially that we feel throughout all of these programs, particularly as it regards the reduction of class size, there must be a strong inservice component throughout this program. If we are merely to reduce class size and the teaching does not change significantly in these classes, then we as a district will have failed to implement these Federal funds correctly.

We hope there would be built in something to have greater accessibility to the inservice training aspect in all of these programs.

Thank you very much.

Chairman PERKINS. Thank you very much.

Our next witness is Dr. Carroll Johnson, superintendent of schools, White Plains, N.Y.

STATEMENT OF CARROLL JOHNSON, SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS, WHITE PLAINS, N.Y.

Mr. JOHNSON. Chairman Perkins, Mrs. Green, distinguished members of this committee, I am Carroll F. Johnson, superintendent of schools in the city of White Plains, N.Y., a community of some 50,000 population and the county seat of Westchester County, and 8,800 students in the public schools.

Our 50,000 citizens constitute a cross section of America. We have poor and rich, we have well educated and 2,000 illiterates in our community. We are working on this problem of illiteracy through Federal and other funding.

We have beautiful homes and cold-water flats. Some of our children could ask for nothing in the way of encyclopedias, books, magazines, and newspapers, and others have to compete in cold-water flats perhaps for a place to sleep and the proper clothing when they go to school.

We have one of the largest of the urban renewal projects. I think we are trying in a significant measure to take advantage, to the extent that we may, of the funding which is being made possible through the Congress for both educational and economic programs which would improve the lots of the people with whom we are privileged to work.

It is indeed a challenge to be able to work in a community which has this cross section, which has the problems that we have, and to have this kind of funding available to aid our community.

It is indeed an honor to appear before this committee again, as I did last year, and it is a privilege to testify as to the value of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which has done so much to help the students and children of White Plains and others throughout our Nation.

Thanks to funds made available by the Congress under the Elementary and Secondary Education Acts of 1965 and 1966, under the Economic Opportunity Act and other Federal legislation, we have been able in White Plains to give a "headstart" to approximately 180 pre-kindergarten children in Headstart centers last summer and the summer before that.

We have undertaken a most effective remedial and enrichment reading program for pupils in the primary, intermediate, and secondary grades in our summer schools of 1965 and 1966. Using ESEA title I funds, we established last April a remedial reading clinic which gives intensive attention to some 90 public, private, and parochial school pupils with critical reading difficulties, and which provides remedial reading specialists to work with other, less critical reading problems among children in the elementary and secondary school buildings of our city.

We are taking care of youngsters who are 2 years or more retarded in reading. We are concentrating our funds in one area, rather than several, to try to improve the ability of our youngsters to compete on equal terms, educationally and economically. Ours is one of the communities which has been cited by the NEA and other organizations for their work in integration. It seems to me that as we are able to give these youngsters a headstart, whether we call it through this formal name, or a headstart in the upper elementary or other grades by teaching them to read, which is the fundamental tool of learning, as we are able to do this we are improving our opportunities and the acceptance of our program of integration, in which we believe.

Since the funding of title I got started a little bit late and we were not able to make commitments, we had funds left over which we were permitted to use for a summer program in the improvement and work in curriculum, in setting up curriculum guides for the culturally deprived and other youngsters.

In setting up curriculum guides for the culturally deprived and other youngsters, through title II, as my respective colleagues have testified, we have been able to improve our library opportunities, which, again, is the heart of the program.

We have established a microfilm library in our White Plains High School, which is available not only to the public schools but the private and parochial schools, and under restricted conditions to the adults of the community. It is the only one in the county, I believe, and this has been made available through the funds which our Congress has provided.

I would like to indicate, also, that we are very grateful for these funds. We have done our best to spend them as economically and effectively as we spend funds raised through our own local real property tax levee.

One of the keynotes that we decided upon when these funds become available was that any funds, Federal or State funds, should be spent as prudently and as wisely as funds which were carefully scrutinized when we again came to our local meetings to discuss the local funds.

I would like to endorse the Teacher Corps. The heart of improvement of any program, whether it is for the culturally deprived, for any handicapped child, is the teacher. Many of our teachers have worked in schools which have been predominantly for the privileged child, and are not fully aware of techniques and procedures for working with the deprived child, whether this deprived child be deprived through mental ability, through physical handicap, or through color. As our teachers develop a warmth in working with the handicapped child, our programs become more effective.

This is the key. In our own community, our teachers association is completely back of our program of integration and our program for deprived children. Indeed, they have established a committee to provide equal opportunities for all children.

Equal opportunities, of course, means for the deprived child and for the bright child. Our teachers are working in all of these angles. I believe that all funds should be directed through the State education department, that is, educational funds.

I would like to speak to the point that Mr. Ford made, because I would answer this that I believe that Headstart should be directed through the State education department. I acknowledge the fact, as Chairman Perkins requested me last year, that in some places there is not the availability of space under the direction of the public schools for the time, it seems to me, that the public schools should be directed and should have through the Office of Education and the State education department these funds channeled in that manner, and should be allocated in this manner if the public schools are able to accept the programs.

It was mentioned that in Mississippi this was not possible. It would seem to me that a proviso should be inserted, too, that no child would be denied this privilege, but that if the public schools were able to accept it, it should be through the public schools that they are administered.

I would acknowledge that in New York State we probably have one of the strongest of the State education departments. The leadership there is certainly unparalleled in the country. We have strong leadership and it is again leadership rather than a directorship. We are very grateful for that. In White Plains, the relationship between our public schools and the private and parochial schools, and the community action program, is absolutely harmonious.

We have been fortunate in this relationship. We have worked together happily and efficiently for the benefit of all the children of our community. But all communities have not been so fortunate.

Even in White Plains, the machinery for accomplishing such projects as prekindergarten programs and special summer remedial programs could be greatly simplified if applications for funds and administration of those funds were handled by the agency charged with carrying out the program; namely, the public schools.

Such a simplification of procedure would greatly expedite planning and would eliminate a great deal of time-consuming, expensive paperwork. I would indorse the proposal of Dr. Hazlett, that these funds be made available under title I.

Another, and then it seems to me, equally cogent argument for putting Headstart directly under public school administration through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is that such an arrangement would make possible continuous, systematic followthrough during the primary grades of those children who enrolled now in Headstart preschool classes.

As the committee is aware, the major national evaluation of Headstart, published in 1966, disclosed that Headstart youngsters in many communities began losing ground academically after entering regular kindergarten and first grade classes.

If Headstart were incorporated in the public school system as an integral unit of the elementary and secondary program, however, provision could more readily be made to monitor the social and academic progress of each pupil, remedial and enrichment programs could be planned as indicated, and evaluation would be facilitated.

One extremely important aspect of the Headstart program is the development of close working relationships between the schools and economically deprived families. The interests and involvement here of these parents would be easier to sustain when their children enter regular school, if Headstart were in all cases operated by the public schools.

It seems to me that as we have nurses working with these youngsters, and as we have doctors examining them, and as we work in small groups we are learning a great deal about both the child and his family. We are making anecdotal records and reports of these cases.

This becomes part of the record and part of the knowledge with which the public school undertakes the education of these youngsters.

It is, indeed, no mystery, it seems to me, that you have classes where the requirement is 15 for working with the Headstart youngsters, the maximum classes, and then you move them to double that. No wonder that there is a lowering of the efficiency with which these children are taught.

The key to the teachers is two things: One, the competition and dedication and warmth of the teacher, and, two, the classes and the opportunity to know each individual child and to know the family of the child, the roots from which this child comes, it makes all the difference in the world whether a child come from the home of one of this committee or come from a cold-water flat where four children were competing for a bed in one room.

Throughout the country you have that kind of situation. Some of it is in our affluent Westchester County. The Teacher Corps will help to insure the kind of teacher that we are looking for. It will give the teacher an opportunity to work in the kind of situation where that teacher will learn this dedication, will get to know the family of these youngsters and will become enriched through this kind of association.

I would urge also that in America we still have rural areas where teachers do not wish to go, unless there is an unusual dedication. I would urge that the proviso of the Teacher Corps be made available. The strength of America is not just in the large cities, although increasingly this is becoming the center of population, not alone in communities which have a heterogenous population in this suburban community, but also there are still many youngsters in rural America and the Teacher Corps should be made available there, also.

Another important point, one on which there has been a great deal of complaint, is that these funds be spent prudently, that we not rush into projects just because money is available, and so that we won't let it go by.

If we are to spend this money prudently we must have adequate time to employ the competent staff which is necessary. If we start a program in September, that program should be funded and we

should know and have certain knowledge and be authorized to begin to employ teachers in January.

We are involved in a recruitment program. We start school in September and immediately start looking for teachers for the next year. If we do not know by January and are not able to make wise and prudent use of this money, it is not as prudently spent as are those funds which are locally derived.

I don't like to use the word "complaint," but I suppose I will. There is the paperwork. We realize that local districts must be and should be accountable for Federal funds, and we acknowledge the right of the Congress to require meticulous accounting of disbursements and the manner in which disbursements are applied at the local level.

But let us work together somehow to simplify all reporting procedures so that the man-hours spent on reports and accounts will be kept to a minimum. It is becoming increasingly difficult for local school budgets to absorb the hidden administrative, clerical and accounting costs necessitated by many Federal assistance programs.

Might I say that the programs that are in the areas which need them most are handicapped by the nature of the proposals which are necessary in order to receive these funds. I am not speaking for White Plains, because we have developed a degree of sophistication—of sophistication—in applying for funds, but the places that need them most must either put out of the blood and sweat and tears of the administrative staff a proposal which may not be as polished as would be desirable in order to receive these funds, or they must go outside and pay a professional plan designer to draw up these plans.

I do not believe that it is the purpose of this committee or of the Congress to require school districts to employ outside consultants to design plans in order that they be approved.

I would hope that they might be simplified and that there might be some kind of supervision which would go in and look at a program and see what is being done rather than what a beautiful writing says is being done in our communities.

We don't suffer from this because we have good programs and we have good writers. This is a good combination. But the places that need the program most desperately are not always thus able to provide the polished report and request which is sometimes needed.

Another program which has been most helpful is the work study program, the program for vocational assistance for youngsters on the job.

I shall not dwell upon that. I will conclude by saying that I personally feel, and I know that my colleagues who are here would agree, that the continuing interests of the Congress, which the Congress has taken, in Federal aid to education during these past several years is indeed one of the most reassuring developments of the post-World War II era, directly and as a catalyst to State and local endeavor, the assistance provided in legislation sponsored by this committee has enabled the schools of America to move forward.

We have far to go, as my colleagues have testified, and we must make haste, but with continued Federal, State, and local collaboration, you have no doubt, sir, we shall succeed.

Thank you.

(The document referred to follows:)

STATEMENT OF CARROLL F. JOHNSON, SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS,
WHITE PLAINS, N.Y.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee, I am Carroll F. Johnson, Superintendent of Schools in the City of White Plains, New York, a community of some 50,000 population and the County Seat of Westchester County.

It is indeed an honor to appear again, as I did last year, before this distinguished Committee. And it is a privilege to testify to the efficacy of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which has done so much to help pupils in White Plains and throughout the nation.

Thanks to funds made available by the Congress, under the Elementary and Secondary Education Acts of 1965 and 1966, under the Economic Opportunity Act and other federal legislation, we have been able in White Plains to give a "Head Start" to approximately 180 pre-kindergarten children in Head Start centers last summer and the summer before that. We have undertaken a most effective remedial and enrichment reading program for pupils in the primary, intermediate and secondary grades in our Summer Schools of 1965 and 1966. Using USESA Title I funds, we established last April a Remedial Reading Clinic which gives intensive attention to some 90 public, private and parochial school pupils with critical reading difficulties, and which provides remedial reading specialists to work with other, less critical reading problems among children in the elementary, and secondary school buildings of our city.

With Title I ESEA funds, we also were able to assemble a faculty team last summer to review kindergarten through 12th grade curricula in the areas of English, science, social studies and mathematics. This team wrote new kindergarten through 12th grade curriculum guides for the use of our teachers and prepared special study guides and teacher material for culturally disadvantaged pupils.

Under the Vocational Educational Act of 1963, we were able to arrange part-time employment for 44 students who are taking vocational training at the high school. This combination of work and study has enabled most of these pupils to remain in high school and complete their vocational courses. It had the additional benefit of making that vocational training more meaningful and more useful to the students involved.

We have been able to purchase library books and badly needed instructional equipment with federal funds under Titles I and II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. And we are even now installing at White Plains High School a microfilm center which will serve the public, private and parochial schools of our city. This microfilm facility will make available to our students the back issues of 28 major periodicals, dating back to the mid-19th century in some cases. Unique in Westchester County, the microfilm center will be an invaluable adjunct to our school library and classroom facilities and will serve, as well, adults who wish to do serious periodicals research.

Federal aid from all sources for our elementary and secondary programs, including the National School Lunch Act and the National Defense Education Act totals approximately \$413,000 in the White Plains School Budget for the current year, 1966-67.

We appreciate this assistance very much. We have done our best to spend these funds as economically and effectively as we spend funds raised through our own local real property tax levy.

We have been invited today to submit comments regarding the proposed Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1967, specifically, amendments relating to the National Teacher Corps, to Comprehensive Educational Planning, to Innovation in Vocational Education, to Expanded Educational Opportunities for Handicapped Children and to Miscellaneous amendments including the Federally Impacted Areas Program.

The proposed amendments take account of many pressing needs of our society and our schools. The amendments are worthwhile and farsighted, and I believe that they should all be enacted into law.

In certain particulars, however, I believe it would be possible to strengthen the proposed legislation so that federal funds allocated under these amendments would go farther and do a more effective job.

The first revision I would suggest, if I may, is one which has bearing not only upon the particular amendment in question, the National Teacher Corps, but also upon the underlying philosophy of federal aid to education.

We have previously stated in testimony before this Committee, and elsewhere, our conviction that the most effective, most economical and most equitable manner of apportioning federal funds for education is through the state education departments of the several states.

This conviction, I believe, is one shared by perhaps a majority of my colleagues in public education and in educational administration.

The inescapable fact is that the state education departments are in the best position to assess local needs, establish and uphold high educational standards, monitor the care with which federal funds are utilized locally, and keep federal monies from being dissipated in a proliferation of overlapping programs which duplicate effort and diminish the impact of federal assistance.

In White Plains we have been very fortunate indeed, as I told this Committee last March, in the harmonious relationship between the schools and the local Community Action Program. We have worked together happily and efficiently for the benefit of all the children of White Plains. Similarly, the working relationship among the public, private and parochial schools in our city has been exemplary.

But other communities have not always been so fortunate. And even in White Plains, the machinery for accomplishing such projects as pre-kindergarten programs and special summer remedial programs could be greatly simplified if applications for funds and administration of those funds were handled by the agency charged with carrying out the program—namely, the public schools. Such a simplification of procedure, would greatly expedite planning and would eliminate a great deal of time consuming, expensive paper work.

Head Start, for instance, could well be placed under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, since it is, in the final analysis, a school program. The time now spent in clearing Head Start plans and applications through two agencies, the schools and the community action board, could better be devoted to developing closer coordination among the schools and other community agencies on a wider front. In White Plains, for example, there is developing a very fruitful cooperation between the schools and the neighborhood centers operated by the Community Action Program. It would seem more productive to concentrate on inter-agency collaboration in this area, leaving the schools to deal directly with such school-oriented programs as Head Start and the Elementary Summer School.

Another cogent argument for putting Head Start directly under public school administration through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is that such an arrangement would make possible continuous, systematic followthrough during the primary grades of those children who enrolled in Head Start pre-school classes. As the Committee is aware, the major national evaluation of Head Start published in 1966 disclosed that Head Start youngsters in many communities began losing ground academically after entering regular kindergarten and first grade classes. If Head Start were incorporated in the public school system as an integral unit of the elementary and secondary program, however, provision could more readily be made to monitor the social and academic progress of each pupil, remedial and enrichment programs could be planned as indicated and evaluation would be facilitated.

One extremely important aspect of the Head Start program is the development of close working relationships between the schools and economically deprived families. The interest and involvement of these parents would be easier to sustain when their children enter regular school, if Head Start were in all cases operated directly by the public schools.

In the proposed 1967 amendment dealing with the Teacher Corps, provision is very wisely made for the State Education Departments to develop programs at the request of a local school system, and in collaboration with a local university. This would appear to be a sound arrangement, especially since it is the State Education Departments which set and maintain teaching standards and certification requirements for the several states. We think it extremely farsighted to place the National Teacher Corps under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and to provide funds for a Teacher Corps program which would be extended for three years, through fiscal year 1970, plus authority enabling a teacher-intern who begin training in 1970 to continue that training for one additional year beyond 1970.

However, we see the pitfalls of ambiguous and overlapping authority as being inherent in the proposed provision for Teacher Corps members to be assigned to groups "not in a regular school, groups taught by a public or other non-profit agency."

I believe there is grave peril implicit in the assignment of Teacher Corps teams to groups of children "not in a regular school," groups which do not answer directly to the public education regulatory authorities of the states in which they operate.

Generally, speaking, children who most need an inspired and competent Teacher Corps are the very children whose entire educational and cultural background is so far below par that a monumental effort will be required just to lift them to the norm; just to enable them to compete on anything like an equal footing with their more economically privileged peers.

This effort will demand the concerted, coordinated efforts of all arms of public education, an effort which would bring to bear in the most efficient manner all the professional resources the states and the federal government, together, can muster. The available funds should not be diffused among many, unrelated agencies.

On the other hand, there is the problem of the migrant worker's child, and of the minority group child in rural areas where the state's own public education system, for whatever reason, is not functioning adequately, is not meeting the educational needs of children.

The amendment as it now stands no doubt reflects the Committee's entirely justifiable concern about this very problem.

But I do not think volunteer schools, or schools operated by various other private non-profit agencies are the answer.

The Committee has already moved toward solving the problem by the requirement, embodied in the National Teacher Corps legislation, that local educational agencies must receive approval from the state educational agency before receiving Teacher Corps services.

However, regulatory authority over quasi-public or private non-profit educational institutions varies widely from state to state, and the educational standards and practices of such independent educational agencies are varied. Moreover, many state education departments are not adequately staffed to provide valid evaluation of these institutions.

To strengthen duly constituted systems of public education within the several states and to assure maximum benefit from Teacher Corps services, it would appear advisable to incorporate in the legislation an explicit requirement that Teacher Corps members be assigned only to public schools and to such special federal educational institutions as the schools operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

It might also be wise to construct the 1967 amendments so as to give state education departments some powerful incentive to assign Teacher Corps teams for schools in deprived *rural* as well as deprived urban areas. The Committee might also consider further incentives designed to encourage state education departments to establish permanent or mobile schools for the children of migrant workers, in areas where such schools are needed and do not exist. Matching funds or special grants, keyed to eligibility for receiving Teacher Corps teams, could be devised to provide this incentive.

Such an approach should have a dual effect: It should improve public education in deprived local areas while, at the same time, improving the public education program at the state level. Such an approach might also have *lasting* impact on both state and local education. Schools, once constructed, mobile units once purchased and put into operation as traveling classrooms, will create a self-sustaining demand for the education they bring to disadvantaged children in out-of-the-way places. This approach, I believe, would strengthen the already existing public education structure of the states, consolidate efforts to help underprivileged youngsters, and avoid possible fragmentation of the federal assistance program among a multitude of private and quasi-public volunteer educational organizations. The important objective is to get Teacher Corps teams not only into the blighted areas of our large cities, and to areas where there are temporary concentrations of migrant workers, but also to get these teams into chronically depressed and educationally neglected rural farm areas. Using the Teacher Corps thus to strengthen public schools in depressed rural areas would affect not only the immediate education of children in those areas. It would

also have a long range effect upon the total economy of such areas by helping to create a skilled, literate local labor force which would facilitate diversification of agriculture and attract new industries. The evident long range possibilities for economic improvement would undoubtedly help secure the acceptance and active cooperation of State Houses as well as State Education Departments.

On the proposed comprehensive Educational Planning amendment, we heartily concur in the Committee's judgment that local education expenditures of the magnitude of \$27 billion demand a program of systematic statewide planning and evaluation. I believe the proposed five-year program of planning grants for the States will be of invaluable assistance.

I note that \$15 million would be authorized for comprehensive planning for fiscal year 1968. This is a commendable federal contribution toward a most important need, but at the risk of seeming ungrateful, I would like to emphasize that, *especially in the case of funding on a year-to-year basis*, it is imperative—and I use the word advisedly IMPERATIVE—to enact fund authorization NO LATER THAN JANUARY for any program which is to be operative in schools or in educational planning divisions by the following September. Many school systems and state education departments operate on a July 1 to June 30 fiscal year. They must recruit professional personnel in January, February and very early March if they are to secure competent teachers and specialists. Without a firm, early spring commitment on funding, personnel simply cannot be secured in time, and there are grave delays in ordering supplies and equipment, as well.

Belated funding severely impairs any program and is the most common, most deeply felt criticism of the entire program of federal assistance. The next most common complaint is, as you have heard, *paperwork*. We realize that the local district must be accountable for federal funds, and we acknowledge the right of federal departments and the Congress to require meticulous accounting of disbursements and the manner in which disbursements are applied at the local level.

But let us work together, somehow, to simplify all reporting procedures so that the man hours spent on reports and accounts will be kept to a minimum. It is becoming increasingly difficult for local school budgets to absorb the hidden administrative, clerical, and accounting costs necessitated by many federal assistance programs.

The proposed amendment to the Vocational Education Act of 1963 establishing a five-year program of grants for vocational education is another highly commendable undertaking. On the basis of our experience in White Plains, I would urge that a large proportion of the funds for this program be earmarked for helping public high schools develop comprehensive, well-planned work-study programs, and also for incentives which would encourage business and industry to become and remain fully participating partners in such work-study endeavors.

Another highly desirable application of vocational assistance funds is in the area of guidance and counseling for vocational students from the junior high years through the senior year of high school. Any funds which will strengthen high school job placement services and enhance continuing cooperation between industry and the high schools will be funds wisely invested.

The Committee is understandably concerned that funds allocated to the states on the basis of population age 15 to 19 be limited to programs which will not displace already employed workers or impair existing contracts for services. The Bill would also stipulate that these funds should not be used to pay any part of the compensation of a student working for employers other than public or private non-profit agencies.

It should be recognized, however, that properly supervised student internships in business and industry provide valuable training in many skills and technologies which are not found in public institutions or private non-profit organizations. In White Plains, for instance, we have secured the cooperation of some local merchants in a small-scale local work-study program. One of the unique opportunities which comes immediately to mind is that afforded our students who work with a White Plains furrier, learning the highly specialized techniques of cutting and matching skins for fur garments.

Any work-study program involving private industry must, of course, have built-in safeguards to prevent displacement of workers or substitution of student employees for adult workers who would otherwise be hired. If funds are available for continuous teacher supervision of work-study pupils, however, business firms and industrial concerns might be more receptive toward work-study ar-

rangements which would enable groups of students to spend several weeks each year in on-the-job training situations. Students might combine such non-paying industrial training periods with regular part-time work in public and non-profit agencies, for which work they could be compensated from Vocational Education Act funds.

Furthermore, many businessmen simply cannot afford to participate in student training programs because of the time involved in directing and supervising trainees. If each small group of trainees were accompanied by a full-time teacher supervisor, who would remain with the student group on the job, merchants and small local industries would be more interested in making their premises available for student trainee groups. Full-time teacher supervision is, of course, expensive. Certainly, it would entail adding vocational teachers to most high school faculties involved in such programs. The best we can do in White Plains at this time, for example, is to provide general supervision by vocational counselors who regularly visit firms where work-study pupils are on the job. Federal assistance in the area of student trainee supervision, on-the-job, would be very helpful.

Additionally, nominal monetary grants might be given to participating businesses and industries. This would compensate the employer for the time he and his employees must spend working with student trainees. Regulations governing the conduct, length and conditions of such trainee programs could be written into the legislation to insure that student work-study programs would not jeopardize the employment of adult workers. On the contrary, such grants could stimulate considerable interest in the student trainee program, among employers and owners and among adult workers and union representatives. Two-part grants, including a sum for the employer and a sum for the adult employee in charge of trainees on plant premises, might well be considered.

Again, in the case of vocational assistance, we would urge the Committee to allocate all funds through state vocational boards and state education departments. We would also urge that federal assistance be limited explicitly to public local and regional high schools and vocational schools which are under the authority of state vocational boards and state education departments. Conditions could be established whereby students who regularly attend independent and parochial schools could enroll in the federally assisted vocational programs conducted by the public schools.

Finally, I would ask the Committee to consider, in funding all existing and future programs, the very considerable overhead, administrative and planning costs incurred by state education departments and local school systems participating in federally aided projects. Staff time and consultant services required in the planning and application stages, clerical, accounting and administrative costs incurred as the program moves into the operative stage—all these add up. Allowance should be made for these costs when funding. Moreover, a significant proportion of the total federal grant should be available immediately upon approval of each local project, so that monies will be at hand to meet financial obligations. In New York and some other states, federal funds cannot be commingled with other local budget funds, nor can the local school district borrow money required to meet immediate obligations, since no part of federal grants may be used to pay interest. Therefore, the importance of substantial, immediate funding of local projects is obvious.

I am gratified that the Committee has recognized the need for research and innovation in its proposed amendments. This is one area of very great potential, but an area for which these are seldom sufficient local money.

Systematic research and development in new materials, methodology and programs must be undertaken, coordinated and sustained at federal, state and local levels if education is to meet the challenge of a rapidly changing world. Funds to help state education departments and local school systems train personnel in these new techniques and new fields should also be considered in planning future federal allocations. The knowledge is available; but we must have men and women who know *where* to find it and how to apply it.

In short, we need any assistance that will enhance and enrich the kindergarten through 12th grade program for all children, any help that will enable us to take closer account of each child's unique needs and talents, any support which will help educators keep abreast of new developments, evaluate them wisely, and apply them to the benefit of all the boys and girls in our schools.

I personally feel—and I know that most of my colleagues would agree—that the continuing interest the Congress has taken in federal aid to education dur-

ing these past several years is, indeed, one of the most reassuring developments of the Post-World II era.

Directly and as a catalyst to state and local endeavor, the assistance provided in legislation sponsored by this Committee has enabled the schools of America to move forward. We have far to go, and we must make haste, but with continued federal, state and local collaboration I have no doubt that we shall succeed.

Chairman PERKINS. Thank you very much.

Mrs. Green.

Mrs. GREEN. I would like to make one brief statement which I direct primarily to Dr. Hazlett, if I may. If it affects work-study programs in other parts of the country, so be it.

We had a superintendent yesterday who referred to the fact that they had work-study programs for the boys. I know on page 7 of your statement that you have work-study programs for a large number of boys. If the girls are not included in work-study or if there is any discrimination in terms of opportunity, in my judgment, it is a violation of title VII of the Civil Rights Act.

I have contacted the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and have asked for a ruling on this. Since it is just employment on a part-time basis, with the schools, that it would not be any different than any other kind of employment.

I expect to have a ruling from the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission shortly.

I think if they rule it is a violation, then the funds ought to be held up or ought to be recovered.

I would like to direct questions, if I may, to the vocational phases of education in 5 minutes.

Chairman PERKINS. Mrs. Green, you have raised an important point and I think the gentleman ought to respond to the first portion of your question. If there is discrimination against the ladies in the work study, I think we ought to have an explanation of it.

Mr. HAZLETT. I appreciate the opportunity to respond briefly.

We have two small work-study programs. One is sponsored by private funds, from a foundation. It is about 5 years old. It is a real piece of experimentation based upon the theory that about 15 percent of the boys will not fit into a regular high school program.

I think, as we all know, for some reason or other boys seem to have greater difficulty in going through the regular school program in grades 1 through 12 than do girls, with various reasons given all the time for this.

The other program, in conjunction with the Rotary Club, does work with both boys and girls. Industrial leaders in the community are working with the schools in placing people of both sexes.

The first program is about to conclude as a research experiment. It is being written up. We do see the desirability of having programs for girls as well as boys.

Mrs. GREEN. Thank you very much, Dr. Hazlett. I have a very high regard for your professional competence.

If I may, I would like to make a couple of other comments.

I think the Civil Rights Act does not differentiate between private and public employment. Whether Federal funds are used in work study or exclusively private funds, it makes no difference.

In regard to boys not finishing the 12 grades of school the statistics show that there are as many as a couple of years ago. Fifty-one percent of the dropouts in high school were girls, and 49 percent were boys. I think the statistics today are very similar. The highest unemployment rate in the Nation is among nonwhite girls between 16 and 21.

I do not want to argue today whether or not women should or should not be working. But the facts are that one out of every three employed in the country is a woman. Therefore, in 1967, I can't quite buy the defense that the boys need the program more than the girls.

May I turn to the vocational education recommendations by the Office of Education? I consider this probably the most important part of the 1967 amendments. I would like to first direct the question to the superintendent from Albuquerque, if I may, and then ask others to comment.

I am well aware of the controversy and newspaper articles in the Albuquerque press over the Job Corps center for girls in Albuquerque. The question, that I would like to address to you revolves around an allegation that has been made. That the girls in Albuquerque center have had 2 or 3 hours, in some cases 4 hours, of work during the entire day and not necessarily 5 days a week, but sometimes 2 days a week or 3 days a week; and further the allegation that they are not in any way being trained for remunerative employment while in the center.

The specific questions to any school superintendent are: What do you think you could do if we, as an alternative procedure, said to a large city school superintendent, or said to the State department of education, would you explore this? What kind of a program could you put together that would include on-the-job training, taking advantage of work-study, combining it with MDTA, with the residential center? You would have a residential environment for those youngsters who need a change of environment and you could concentrate effort on the youngsters who would stay at home but come there during the day-time.

What kind of a program could you design for your city for \$8,000 per student?

MR. STAPLETON. As you know, we have the Technical Vocational Institute, which was developed several years ago and recently was strongly endorsed by a number of community leaders.

MRS. GREEN. Is that a residential school?

MR. STAPLETON. No, it isn't. There have been some plans identified. They certainly have not been formalized. But they indicate that this could be the direction to go, in terms of a residential area.

The Technical Vocational Institute has been received with such enthusiasm, the nature of the program has been in such a short time made so comprehensive, as we see it, with a broad spectrum of courses involving some of the traditional basic courses and then some of the new courses, such as data processing, that we feel that if funds could be channeled in this direction, the district could expand much faster.

As it is now, it is a holding action, hoping that the program will get continued endorsement. There was a recent effort to receive some funding from the State legislature.

Our feeling is that in the Albuquerque district we certainly feel that through the Technical Vocational Institute, which we feel has had reasonable success during a short time, we could expand the program, we could make programs more comprehensive. We certainly could reach out and touch a larger population and we could explore the whole question of the residency which someone in the area has already indicated they would like to explore.

Mr. JOHNSON. I don't think I am the appropriate person, but when you speak of \$8,000, I am very interested, and I am stimulated. I indicated to you earlier that we had handicapped children. I would want to start a residential center. I would improve our supervision. I would improve the recruitment of jobs.

I would have our supervisory staff working with this on-the-job training program, and have them move out into the businesses and industries to keep close tab on these youngsters.

I would do all of this within the scope of the comprehensive high school. I think there is an unfortunate move in this country away from the comprehensive high school in the direction of vocational education which segregates and moves aside youngsters of different abilities and different interests, and so on. I think they have common interests which are greater than the different interests. I would like very much to see that.

If we had an on-the-job program for both boys and girls, clerical work, auto mechanics, in anything where we could get an employer to work with them, I would like to see it.

But our supervision is not as adequate as I would like it to be, because we have to do that with one man and one woman working with these people. The one man works with boys and girls and the woman works primarily with the girls in clerical and in sales work. But I would like very much to see it.

I would like to see some of us have the opportunity to develop such a program for the child who should be taken away from his family. The family is one of the reasons in many instances for the cultural deprivation of the youngster. When he comes to a good school and goes home, he goes to a very unfortunate circumstance, and unfortunate surrounding, which works in conflict fewer times than we would like to say, but sometimes.

Chairman PERKINS. Do you wish to comment, Dr. Holt?

First, let me call on Mr. Quie at this time.

Mr. QUIE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Johnson, you have an excellent statement.

I like especially what you say about the need of administering education programs through State departments of education and how Headstart administered by local public schools would actually improve and strengthen it.

I am glad you mentioned the family-school relationship. This is one of the criticisms which has been leveled against the traditional education concept. I am glad you recognize it so well.

Rather than going over the parts of your statement that I agree so much with, I would like to inquire about your comments on the Teachers Corps. You seem quite enthused with the Teachers Corps and encourage that it be spread out to the rural areas and to migrant work-

ers more than just the urban centers. There is a tendency to limit it to the urban centers since that is where the institutions of higher learning are located. You have to bring them to the institutions for their learning sessions.

You seem to have the concept, however, that the Teacher Corps is not only to bring people who previously had no interest in education, but developed one later, into the teaching profession, and also to bring them special training in the culturally and socially deprived children. Also you mention the help that they give to the children in the district.

Since this is the case, and I find people tend to look at a Teachers Corps the way the blind man looks at the elephant, would you be willing to fund a portion of the stipend or the salary of these teacher interns to the extent of the benefit you receive in your school from their services?

MR. JOHNSON. I personally would be willing to fund a part of it through the local funds. But one of the points that this committee and Congress has recognized is that there is a need to provide these programs over and beyond what is now being done.

If we were required to match the funds, which in essence is what the question you are asking is about, I might say yes, I would be willing to, but whether we would be able to is something else. In Westchester County, three of our larger cities are right up against the tax limitation, and what we can do and what we would like to do are sometimes different.

We would not, in my opinion, be able to go into such a program next year, or perhaps the year following that: Philosophically, I agree with you, sir, but matching funds sometimes if categorically applied drains away the general support of education.

If you were asking would I support this in legislation, no, sir, I would not.

MR. QUIE. Then with the glowing remarks you made about the Teachers Corps, they are really not sufficient, however, to cause you to put some local funds into this program because it would even be superior and more necessary than some of the education activities you are already engaged in with local funds.

MR. JOHNSON. You see, this is comparable to the situation of when I go to my desk and take on the pressing jobs, but many times the less important jobs. I do the things which have to be done that day and not the long-range, important things.

That same thing would apply here. It seems to me it is an obligation of the State, more than of the local area, to provide this kind of educational program. It is the obligation of the country, since these people will be working in all kinds of areas, it is the obligation of the Congress and of the local State to provide this training in education of teachers, and not that of the local district which is concerned vitally with the day-to-day providing of reading, writing and arithmetic and those other things regarded as important by the local community.

MR. QUIE. So the assistance provided by the teacher interns is not sufficient to lessen the load or improve the education of the young people in your schools where you would be willing to transfer some funds from another purpose to this one?

Mr. JOHNSON. I seem to be evasive on that and I don't intend to be. It is sufficient to provide that. But so are many of the other kinds of things that we can do, but we just don't have funds to provide. When it comes to a matter of providing funds for this supplementary program which we can do without, and providing the salaries, the necessary funds for the teachers, we might just not be permitted locally to provide this training program for the country at large, or for the State at large.

It is this that I am referring to. It is not that I would question the validity or value locally, but it is just that we in so many instances do not have this kind of funding available locally.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Dent?

Mr. DENT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I notice throughout the hearings there is a tendency to arrive at a conclusion that the Headstart program ought to be transferred from the act under which it is now, and put into the public school system throughout the State departments of education.

Have any of you superintendents looked up your State laws to find out whether or not you could absorb the present type of a Headstart law without running contrary to your State provisions of law?

In the last decade, we have had many reforms in education in our State and others where we have set up pretty strict rules on teacher qualifications, classroom compositions, and other restrictions that are not inherent in the Federal participation in that program, and also the Teacher Corps program, and others.

If we suddenly dumped Headstart onto the State departments of education all over the country, how many States would have to have enabling acts immediately for them to absorb this program? I know that we would have to have it in my State. We could not absorb this program as it is now constituted.

First of all, we do not interfere with State regulatory bodies in the application of the State laws. I don't think you can absorb the Headstart program as it is now operating into your State systems entirely without Federal participation in the program, and with the overriding Federal hand on it. I don't think so.

Maybe you can answer that, Mr. Johnson. You were the first one who made the positive statement that Headstart should be transferred directly and bodily over to the State departments of education.

Mr. JOHNSON. Sir, I hedged a bit and said if those departments could take it, the proviso be made if they couldn't either through the Constitution or through legislation, that it could go somewhere else. Of course, we do speak from knowledge of our own State.

In spite of the desirability that we would like to know the laws of the other States, in many instances we don't. In our own State, for example, we could, legally and otherwise, accept this proviso.

I would feel unless there is provision against it, as was indicated when Mississippi was mentioned, I would make the proviso that I would want this program available since it is extremely valuable and some loophole might be made if the States and local districts were unable or unwilling to accept the program.

Mr. DENT. Of course, that would make it sort of a hydra-headed monster. We would be running a program in one State and across

the border the State department of education would be running it. It would be a peculiar thing. The State departments operate in the same fashion, you might think, as we operate in the Federal Government.

But you cannot run your schools without doing exactly what the State tells you to, as to classroom sizes, teacher qualifications, and so on, because the State pays a certain amount of the expense of the local school district, and we are paying a certain amount.

If you have participating programs we would have to have some say as to which tune the children were going to dance to. Is that right or wrong?

Mr. JOHNSON. You are getting into a philosophical statement.

Mr. DENT. No, I am getting into the practical political situation of getting legislation through the Congress with the great sums of money attached. Mr. Quie indicated that there seems to be a tendency to move not only Headstart over to public education in the various States, but soon the Teacher Corps.

The reason we went into these programs on the Federal basis was because we had failed at the State level to take cognizance of the great problems facing our people, and we are, therefore, pumping Federal moneys into the local boards where it is needed. It is difficult for local school districts and State governments to provide necessary funds for the essentials in education, let alone these other needs.

You talk about vocational school training and a comprehensive high school. We have failed miserably in vocational training in the various States. There isn't a greater shortage in the United States than a shortage of vocational graduates to take their place in industry, in the construction trades.

We have completely gotten away from carpentry and cabinetmaking in our high school classes of manual arts. I know we don't have them in our schools. We have over 600 trade schools in Pennsylvania which have kept us pretty well abreast of the needs in that State, but some States have no schools whatsoever.

A comprehensive high school would be a responsibility of the local community. How many of your high schools have training courses in vocational classes that would graduate a kid from high school—at the time he finished high school—able and ready to step into a vocational training job?

Mr. BREIT. We have in business education, but not in the trades.

Mr. DENT. That is because it is a soft-skirt job. You don't have the hard blue-collar jobs in any of your schools any more.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Bell?

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. Quie.

Mr. QUIE. I would like to ask the gentleman from New Mexico about the title III program. I understood title III was to fund supplemental centers, supplemental programs which would strengthen and improve education throughout an area, and it would be widely beneficial to elementary and secondary education. I notice that you are talking of a space science center and one of the basic features is a planetarium.

Mr. Breit, do you think that secondary schools of the country really need a planetarium as much as they need a host of other improvements in order that the young people might have an adequate education?

I hope you don't think I join necessarily with the gentleman from Pennsylvania that we ought to have more cabinetmakers, but I don't know if we need as far out a program as planetariums in the secondary schools.

Mr. STAPLETON. **Mr. Quie**, this program, of course, again is one that we have applied as a district. We are fiscal agent for the educational service center, which is located at the University of New Mexico. We have for some years in the Albuquerque area had a number of people who have been pressing for a planetarium, a moon-watch team that has received a great deal of publicity and support in the local area in the State of New Mexico.

So part of the background for this has been the request that has come for the planetarium. The key element for us, at least in the Albuquerque area, is that we would hope to see the space scientists program developed that would give us an opportunity on a central basis to service communities in the local area, 10, 15, 20, and 30 miles from Albuquerque, that are all part of this educational service center.

We would hope that this would be the real heart of that program if it gets approved. It will give us an opportunity to bring youngsters in from not only our school district but some of the others.

As to the relative merits of a planetarium, personally I feel that the space science program with its related areas is probably more important, and the opportunities for the inservice education that we might give the teachers, the workshops, and so forth.

The planetarium, again, as I say, is a special interest and one which has been pressed for because they felt this was not available anywhere in the New Mexico area.

Carlsbad, N. Mex., put in a planetarium a number of years ago and they have testified to the fact that they have enriched their science program in the Carlsbad area and the surrounding environs for quite awhile. They speak highly of the motivational factor, the fact that youngsters are taken on field trips and this type of thing.

So this is part of the rationale for this being included here.

Mr. QUIE. It really is a problem for me when I visit Hines School in the District of Columbia and see the terrible conditions there and some other schools here, where the Federal Government has the responsibility, and then to see that we are financing planetariums.

I sometimes think we lost sight of what are our most important needs.

Mr. STAPLETON. I would speak to the fact that, of course, this is just one element. Our feeling has been, under title III, that we would attempt to develop any number of programs. The first one listed there on page 9 of the Albuquerque project speaks of a developmental education center, which is in essence a reading clinic, which we would hope would be the balancing factor, and that we would have areas such as B, speaking to the computer courses in secretory schools, science being just the third component.

We hope that we are moving along on several fronts as we look at all of these projects.

Mr. QUIE. Let me ask one question on the NYC in-school program. You have all indicated you would like education programs funded through the State department of education. We have two Neighbor-

hood Youth Corps programs being talked about, one in school and one out of school.

I recognize the out-of-school program would not be your responsibility. But do you think this program, too, could function better if it was administered by the schools, and, therefore, was transferred from OEO to the Office of Education?

Mr. HAZLETT. We operate a Neighborhood Youth Corps group of some 400 people. We have had no problem in working out relationships with the Department of Labor. I think the concern of many of us with respect to utilizing the State educational agency is that it seems it would be more efficient if educational programs could be synchronized together and that more efficiency would result.

I cannot criticize, however, our own experience with respect to the NYC program.

Mr. QUIE. In other words, you have more problems with OEO than you do with the Department of Labor, I gather?

Mr. HAZLETT. That is what I said.

Mr. BREIT. I would like to add to that. We have a Neighborhood Youth Corps program that was worked very well. We have had no problems there at all. But in relationship to the Headstart program we have strong feelings that it would be better under the U.S. Office of Education direction and as a part of the local school program operations. Our program in Seattle is on a contract basis and we handle it.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Brademas.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I will direct this question to Dr. Holt. First of all, Dr. Holt, I wonder if you could make any general comment on the impact of the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965 on the school system of South Bend, Ind?

Mr. HOLT. Yes, Mr. Brademas. I indicated the city of South Bend was recovering and is now recovering from being an economically depressed area. We have simply enriched a program in 13 of 50 schools that brought materials that we would not otherwise have had in terms of instruction materials, books and so on. As I said, the important by product of this, too, is the inspiration furnished the entire community.

We have an enrollment of about 38,000 students, and we have, as in White Plains, some of the upper socioeconomic groups, the most advantaged, to the most disadvantaged.

I think it has infected the whole community with a commitment to help these people, to help these children.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Let me ask you this question: Mr. Quie touched on title III. I know that South Bend has submitted a title III application. Under present law, the State departments of education are to review and recommend on local applications.

Suggestions have been made that a statutory veto should be authorized for the State departments of education. Do you have any comment on that?

Mr. HOLT. Yes: I would like not to see them shortstopped at the State level. I would like to see us be able to present these and have them go through. I am not sure that I like the veto at all in the State. I would rather they not have this.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Would you make any comment on suggestions that have been made, and some of which have been discussed, about the possibility of developing teacher aides to enable you to make more effective use of scarce professionally trained teachers?

Mr. HOLT. Yes. We are bogged down now. We have a shortage of teachers now because of budget limitations.

We have introduced teacher aides in 10 schools. We added three last week. We propose to add as quickly as possible teacher aides. We need help. We can't go 50 schools, but we are relieving teachers of nonteaching duties.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Would you be sympathetic to Federal support to help you enable some of these teacher aides?

Mr. HOLT. I would. It would help us do it much faster.

Mr. BRADEMAs. You were about to make a comment on vocational education a little earlier. I don't know what you were going to say, but you might say what you had in mind at this point.

Mr. HOLT. Mrs. Green's concern, one of our problems seems to me, in answer to Mr. Dent, is that I think we have made too many cabinets, more than we need, perhaps, and one of the things we have not known is what are those things, because we have not studied them well enough, pure and simple, and it is our fault.

We have not studied well enough to know what are the negotiable skills needed. Now how would I have known in my district that there was a need for television production people, which the vocational technical institute is going into now?

I see a lot of beauty shops. How would I know that we need a great many more beauticians if the girls could be trained?

We had not studied. We need to make a study and then get the programs, instead of what we have been doing.

Mr. BRADEMAs. One other question and one observation. My observation simply is that I have been struck by the fact that you leaders of middle-size American cities and school districts, most of you, have indicated strong support for the Teacher Corps, while yesterday the leaders of the great urban schools took the same position.

The day before that, the State superintendents of public instruction were in and also indicated their sympathy with this program.

Dr. Holt, have you any comment to make on a very thorny problem for all of us, especially in the North, of de facto segregation in schools?

That is a huge one to throw at you, but have you any observation? It has not been touched upon in our hearings this morning.

Mr. HOLT. Yes; this is, of course, a problem of great concern and one that we spend as much time on at present as any other single problem.

In regard to these schools that the teachers go to, I would say that the most frustrating single problem I have today is to staff the schools where we have disadvantaged children.

I simply have not been able to do it because, as I have indicated, the experienced teacher has said, those with seniority, "I don't want to go to that school." The young ones are not equipped to deal with the problem. Part and parcel of any problem we face is the matter of de facto: in South Bend, for example, is a study of how the effects, what will be the effects, of any action we may take.

Mr. BRADEMAs. I don't know how much time I have left, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman PERKINS. It has expired.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Thank you.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Reid.

Mrs. GREEN. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. REID. I would be happy to yield.

Mrs. GREEN. The superintendents testifying yesterday were asked if they supported the Teacher Corps and they said "Yes." I would like to direct the same question to you. Not if you support a Federal Teacher Corps versus nothing. But, rather, if you had a choice between receiving the same amount of funds to train your local teachers, or would you prefer to have a National Teacher Corps that recruits and trains and helps to place teachers? What I am asking is would you like to do it yourself.

Do you think you would have better quality of education and better teachers under one system than the other?

Mr. HOLT. I would like to discuss that. I would rather have, I think, in view of the success of your recruiting program, the National Teacher Corps, for this reason: We still do not inspire, apparently, at the local level, the young people who feel a commitment to public service, as the Federal Teacher Corps has been able to do.

I think it is astounding, the number of applicants you have had. We get nothing like that.

Mrs. GREEN. How large would you like to have the National Teacher Corps?

Mr. HOLT. I tend to think in terms of South Bend, I suppose, Mrs. Green, at the moment. I would be willing to put local funds insofar as possible into this program.

We are going to do it anyway. We have no choice. But I would like to have a supplement. How large it should be, I just don't know at the moment.

Mrs. GREEN. Would you have 5,000 members of the National Teacher Corps, 10,000 or 100,000?

Mr. HOLT. I don't know. Perhaps 10,000 to do the job.

Mrs. GREEN. I don't want to take Congressman Reid's time, but do any of the rest of you wish to comment?

Mr. HAZLETT. Mrs. Green, I think one of the virtues of the National Teacher Corps idea is that it would tend to make a mammoth impact upon the attitudes of teacher training institutions who don't respond at the—when we at the local levels endeavor to join with us in some kind of program.

I mentioned earlier that we have only one public college in the area that has ever endeavored to make any systematic attempt to train teachers to go into our inner city.

We would, to answer a question raised earlier, subsidize interns from local money and consider them at the time of internship as being sub-professionals. Also, if we did that, we would like to find some way to permit them to become teachers upon certification in our area.

I don't know any value out of the National Teacher Corps concept other than the fact that the entire country's attention would be focused on a need that has not been able to be overcome otherwise.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Reid.

Mr. REID. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

First I would like to warmly welcome Dr. Hazlett, Dr. Breit, Dr. Johnson, and Mr. Stapleton, particularly Dr. Johnson of White Plains, who, I believe, is doing an outstanding and creative job as superintendent of schools in White Plains in administering a number of these programs.

Dr. Johnson, I certainly want to thank you for your detailed and thoughtful comments. I have a few specific questions I would like to direct to you, if I may. On page 13 of your testimony you refer to the very considerable overhead in administrative planning costs incurred by State educational departments and local school systems participating in federally aided projects.

One suggestion that has been made is not only to increase the amount of administrative funding for title II from 3 to 5 percent, but equally perhaps to have a sliding scale percentage available to the local school district too, so that, for example, on a large grant, 5 percent would be adequate for local administrative costs, whereas on a smaller grant, it might be necessary to have 10 percent.

Would you favor some sliding scale, too, of that kind to meet this problem?

Mr. JOHNSON. Yes, I would.

Mr. REID. Second, with regard to the vocational education act amendments, the act provides for original construction and initial equipment. Buildings suitable for vocational education are available in some places but cannot be purchased.

Would purchase of such buildings be desirable? In other words, not necessarily having to rely on original construction, but the use of other buildings that could be rehabilitated for vocational education purposes, would that be of assistance in White Plains?

Mr. JOHNSON. Yes, it would be, Mr. Reid.

Chairman PERKINS. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. GREEN. Could I ask unanimous consent to proceed a little longer?

Chairman PERKINS. The gentleman—the gentletlady from Oregon asks unanimous consent that Mr. Reid be permitted to proceed for an additional 3 minutes. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Oregon is indeed generous.

Dr. Johnson, I would also like to ask you now a broader question with regard to title I funding in general. With such specifics as you could supply with regard to White Plains—being an excellent illustration of the immediate city problems—as you know the Congress has authorized \$2.4 billion for fiscal 1968 in funding for title I programs. The President's budget, however, only requests \$1.2 billion.

The question has been raised here in colloquy both with the Commissioner of Education, Dr. Howe, and the Secretary of HEW, John Gardner, whether or not there should not be full funding for title I.

Dr. Gardner has indicated in his judgment that, as an educator, he would favor that, were it not for budgetary problems.

He also stated his belief that local school districts in a number of States, and I believe implicit in that is New York, could take full

advantage of full funding under title I where we have some of our most serious problems of the educationally deprived.

In the case of White Plains or in Westchester or New York, generally, would you care to comment about the desirability of full funding as per the authorization under title I?

MR. JOHNSON. Chairman Perkins, may I put in an aside, before I answer that, to say how much we appreciate the fact that Congressman Reid has firsthand knowledge of these programs.

I personally visited the programs with him, and it is this kind of knowledge which I think is most helpful to the Congress in realizing the value even more than what we say. As you see these programs, and I am sure it is true of all of you, and talk with parents, as Congressman Reid does, as you are in close contact with the programs, I think you can indeed see the value of them.

I would favor, since there are many youngsters in title I that are being aided under title I, many others who need to be aided under title I who are not now being aided.

We have arbitrarily set 2 years of retardation. I am sure that in other places in the country they have had to set—if it is exclusively a reading program—a greater level of retardation. I would favor full financing to the extent of the amount that you mentioned, and feel that even that might not be adequate to do the job that ought to be done in picking up deficiencies in our educational programs.

MR. REID. In the case of White Plains, just to be specific, compared with what you now get under title I, could you roughly double that?

MR. JOHNSON. We could prudently use twice as much, Mr. Reid.

MR. REID. Thank you.

Chairman PERKINS. The comment from you is very impressive insofar as I am concerned because it has been alleged consistently from the time we started with that categorical approach that Westchester County was a wealthy county and did not need assistance in that area.

I am impressed with your statement that you really could well utilize twice the amount of funds that you are receiving at the present time in Westchester County.

If you did not receive the funding that you are receiving under the bill at the present time, would it be possible to put into operation these enrichment programs, special programs that you have referred to here today?

MR. JOHNSON. From local funds?

Chairman PERKINS. Yes.

MR. JOHNSON. Under the present tax limitations it would not, sir. I pointed to the fact that in White Plains we have 2,000 illiterates with which we are working under the NDT programs. About 20 percent of our population is, by definition, at the poverty level.

Chairman PERKINS. About 20 percent?

MR. JOHNSON. Yes; that is in my community.

Chairman PERKINS. And you consider then it is proper to recognize poverty whenever it exists, regardless of the income level of Westchester County.

Am I correct in that assumption? You feel that the formula we have adopted, putting the funds wherever they have these spots of poverty over and above a certain number is proper, is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSON. My understanding is completely consistent with the objectives of the Congress: That you educate the youngster where he is, that you provide it whether he is in an affluent community or whether he is in other places. I think it is particularly wise also that you have permitted us, who have completely desegregated our schools, and have a quota, that this program may go into each one of our schools and not be restricted to simply geographic area where poverty does exist.

Chairman PERKINS. I want to say that Ogden Reid is always using this approach. He is one of our dedicated Members who has contributed much in the improvement of the legislation.

Mr. QUIE. Would the gentleman yield on that point?

You know, New York is one of the wealthiest States in the Union. How does Westchester County rank with the other counties in New York?

Mr. JOHNSON. It would be in the upper two or three.

Mr. QUIE. Probably in the upper one, too, wouldn't it, at times?

Well, New York has been getting three times as much money per child as Mississippi. I happen to be one of those with the opinion that if it is the top two or three in New York and New York is the richest State in the Union, there ought to be sufficient revenue there. We must be getting our money from Westchester County to send back up to Westchester County again.

Mr. JOHNSON. We don't give very much of it back, however.

Mr. BRADEMAs. In defense of our other colleagues, I would observe we have 10 minutes left. There are three members who have been here since 9:30 and I would ask unanimous consent that each of them be permitted to question the witnesses for 3 minutes each.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Hathaway.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

There is one question I would like all of you to comment on. That is on categorical versus general aid to education. I would be interested in having your observations on it.

Mr. STAPLETON. I will make this general observation, that we have discussed this question and our feeling is somewhat that the categorical has given us some target areas to focus on and that some of the programs we have developed, reading programs, what have you, all of the programs that again have been indicated here today, have been brought about to a certain extent by categorical aid.

I recognize that many people would not agree with this, but this is, as I say, something we discussed and felt was a plus for categorical aid.

We would want to show that as a point.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Thank you very much.

Mr. HAZLETT. I believe in both the categorical and general aid. Categorical aid has the advantage of stimulating, I think, school systems on a national basis in terms of meeting certain national goals which might not otherwise be crystallized as being in the apparent need that they are.

But I think also the school systems across the country need a general uplift of meeting the ordinary demands of financing public schools. There is great need every where, I think, for restructuring the entire tax system that supports schools, traditionally on local real estate to a large extent.

I would subscribe to both.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Do you think title I as it stands now is sufficiently general in that respect?

Mr. HAZLETT. Title I as categorical aid, limited to certain kinds of objectives and cannot be used to supplement the general operations of the school system.

Mr. HOLT. I tend to agree with Mr. Hazlett in that I might support in certain areas both. I certainly think in the case of title I it is sufficiently general to deal with a problem that we must deal with at this moment.

Perhaps there are some areas generally that are not covered that I would like to see covered. But the Teacher Corps, again, the vocational, particularly the handicapped, those things that we want to do, I very much favor.

Mr. BREIT. I think in the long run general aid is the preferable direction to go. However, in the use of categorical funds you are in a position to emphasize particular problems in the district that are critical and in need of massive kinds of support.

To that extent, certainly, this has been a wonderful help to us. But I would not like to see it as a plan for the future, that this is the way we meet our educational problems.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Don't you think continued innovations are going to be necessary?

Mr. BREIT. Yes, I think so, and I think the funds that have been issued in title III provide us a general overall application that is a little better as far as the local district is concerned than the title I.

Title I is specifically geared to a specific kind of individual.

Mr. JOHNSON. I would tend to agree in general.

In the first place, over a period of time our schools have been inadequately financially supported and we have great needs. Secondly, I would hope that over a long period of time the aid would become general. There have been instances in categorical aid in the past where there has been concentration and matching funds required which has drained the money away from the more general area of the humanities, general science, for example, as contrasted to the humanities.

I would subscribe to what I feel to be your point, that innovation might continue to be categorical aid, that over a period of time proposals might come in in the area of innovation which would continue to be financed. But otherwise, general aid would have my support.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Do you think we should still maintain title III?

Mr. JOHNSON. In the area of innovation, yes, I think this should be well done.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Gentlemen, thank you.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Erlenborn.

Mr. ERLBORN. Let me welcome all of you and thank you for your statements.

Dr. Hazlett, it is particularly good to see you again after our meeting last December in Kansas City.

On page 4 of your statement you mention that the Kansas City school system was allocated \$1,800,000 in fiscal 1966. Could you tell me, if you recall, how much of that was actually spent?

Mr. HAZLETT. We, as I recall, spent practically the bulk of it.

Mr. ERLNBORN. When did your program begin? As I recall, fiscal 1966 was the first year of ESEA and it was not authorized nor were the allocations made until—well, the authorization was late fall of 1965 and allocations I don't believe were made until early 1966.

Mr. HAZLETT. We began our programing in March 1966.

Mr. ERLNBORN. In March of 1966?

Mr. HAZLETT. And continued through August 1966.

Mr. ERLNBORN. And in that period of time you spent approximately \$1,800,000, is that correct?

Mr. HAZLETT. Yes, part of that was due to the authorization of an addition to the school that was crowded to reduce class size.

Mr. ERLNBORN. Can you tell me approximately what percentage of that was spent on either construction or the acquisition of physical matter, teaching aids and so forth?

Mr. HAZLETT. The construction was approximately one-third. I don't have any figures with respect to the purchase of equipment, but there was a substantial amount. There was a mammoth summer school activity. Then through March, April, and May we incorporated within our designated schools and started the programs which we continued on then in fiscal 1967.

Mr. ERLNBORN. Do you feel beginning the program in March and carrying it through August you were able to really use these funds in an economical manner, or was there across the country, not just pointing the finger at Kansas City, a good deal of waste as a result of the fact that this arrived so late in the year?

Mr. HAZLETT. I think there is bound to be waste and inefficient utilization of funds unless they can be available early enough to incorporate in a plan starting at the beginning of the school year.

Mr. ERLNBORN. Many other areas, my own State of Illinois, for instance, felt that they could not spend these funds in an economical manner, that they could not get value from them. They did not spend the full authorization or allocation the first year. In the second year we then found that the appropriations had a proviso that no State would be allocated below the level at which they spent the first year.

I think you are familiar with this. I understand that that same proviso will be in the appropriations bill this year.

Do you think it is fair to those States that felt they were doing a job of weeding out profitable programs, which had no real opportunity to spend funds successfully and, therefore, save the taxpayers' money in the first year, to be hampered and penalized as a result?

Mr. HAZLETT. Very definitely that—I think that is true.

Mr. ERLNBORN. It is just not fair, is it?

Mr. HAZLETT. No, it is not fair, because in the exercise of prudence and good judgment they are being penalized.

Mr. ERLNBORN. Dr. Johnson, you mentioned, and I think this touches on the same point, that we should not just spend money because it is available, and must be spent before the authorization expires. Would you agree with some of the observations that Dr. Hazlett made or maybe that I have led him into making?

Mr. JOHNSON. Yes, I would agree. My statement was that if you were to spend money in September, prudently, wisely, and to the best

of advantage, you should have authorization so you can go out and employ teachers and buy supplies and materials, to plan for alterations of rooms in many instances.

This cannot be done on short notice. If you insist on spending the money prudently, you must have authorization well in advance of the time you begin to pay the money out.

Mr. ERLBORN. Let me address this to all of you. I think you realize the present authorization carries us through fiscal 1968 and the Office of Education presently has no plans this year to ask for additional authorization in fiscal 1969.

Do you feel that we are headed down the road again of late funding, and does this worry you?

Mr. JOHNSON. We are heading down the road, sir, of late funding, and it worries me.

Mr. HOLT. I have recently come from Arizona and I was concerned as to what would happen to the Indians. I am happy to see that they are extended to 1968 now.

Chairman PERKINS. It would give you more assurance if we put in at least a 2-year duration to the authorization with the hope that the Committee on Appropriations would appropriate early, several months before the beginning of the fiscal year?

Mr. BREIT. Yes, this is a matter of real concern to us, particularly in securing the adequate personnel. You simply must do this in the early spring of the year.

Chairman PERKINS. We hope that you can help us make that point this year before the House Committee on Appropriations. I hope this committee, in extending this program, can cure the criticism. You must have an idea of your budgets early. You may impress the House Committee on Appropriations.

It is my understanding that they have hearings this year running into April. If some of you want to come down and put in an appearance before the House Committee on Appropriations, I would think it would be helpful for them to see the picture we are getting here.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Ford.

Mr. FORD. Gentlemen, last year when we were reviewing the first year of operations of the bill we had some principal State school officers who had stated that they had difficulty in title I with an overloading of equipment requests.

In other words, in their opinion in their particular State the people making up the title I applications had used a much larger percentage of their money for hardware.

But in general the prediction was made that this would change, that in the initial years there would be heavy hardware expenditures and as time went by this would represent a sharply decreasing percentage of the expenditure of title I funds.

In the past couple of days it has become apparent that there is within the Congress and within this committee some feeling that perhaps too much of title I money is being used for equipment and that you are really not doing much more than that.

Is the prediction that was made a year ago that this would drop off sharply coming through or not?

What do you see as the trend in this respect with respect to title I funds?

Chairman PERKINS. I think it would be fine to let them all comment on that question.

Mr. STAPLETON. I will make a brief comment that at least in our meetings in New Mexico, and in recent meetings earlier this year, we have had some guidance and some trend setting that would indicate we were to look at programs, to look at personnel, and even to look at curriculum study, and not hardware facility.

I would indicate, as I look at our totals here and our breakout that there has been, obviously, some equipment, but there has been an emphasis and a reemphasis on moving toward program development with regard to personnel, curriculum, and study, and this type of thing.

Mr. HAZLETT. I don't have with me the specific figures, but I am positive that the second year of expenditures has been spent on personnel, on program development, and that there has been a minimum amount of equipment purchased.

It is true in the first year, partly because personnel were not available at the time funding was made, we recognized much of the equipment could be carryover for subsequent years.

I would be glad to supply the exact figures, but I know the trend is less on equipment by a great percentage.

Mr. JOHNSON. Our experience is the same. We spent heavily on equipment, supplies, and materials of this kind in the first year because we received the allocation well after the year had started, because we did not have the staff to put into our remedial and clinical reading program.

In the current year, very little is being spent on equipment or so-called hardware. It is being spent almost exclusively for program in our community.

Mr. HOLT. I think it should be said that we are much more sophisticated consumers of hardware than we were the first year. We now know what it will do and consequently we are buying less.

Mr. BREIT. The first year, for all the reasons mentioned, we had substantial expenditures in equipment, I think around \$300,000 out of \$1,600,000 and our budget for this year does not include any budget for equipment.

Mr. FORD. I want to thank you for that unanimous opinion because it will go far to dispel the effect of simply quoting percentages during the first and second year for hardware, and to try to draw from that the conclusion that title I has not stimulated you people very much in terms of special programs and special personnel for the problem we are trying to reach.

I have one brief question and you can all comment, if you will. We have had suggestions here as an alternative, although there is no legislation pending that suggests the alternative, that rather than have a Teacher Corps as it is conceived in this legislation, we might better just take the same amount of money and divide it out among the school districts across the country and leave you to your own devices in terms of teacher training of some sort.

Some of us are very eager to draw again on the very good experience of VISTA and the Peace Corps, in a program where people under-

take special training with a precommitment to the ultimate goal of working with a specific type of student under specific circumstances, as contrasted with the teacher who enters the school system waiting until he can get enough seniority to get into the nicer school in the nicer neighborhood.

Do you think if we were to spread this money out thinner, by going to all of the school districts with some form of just general teacher training funds, that we would be likely to be able to put together the same kind of group of people with its prededication to go into the specific tough areas that we are trying to reach with the Teacher Corps?

Do you think the kinds of pressures you normally have from your teacher organizations, your parent organizations, your school boards and others, would allow you to use teacher money that was not targeted towards this particular project for the very limited kind of person that we are after, not limited in their resources but limited in terms of where we might send them?

Mr. HOLT. As I indicated in my statement, I am really impressed with your recruitment up to this point.

I think the commitment in the Federal Corps for the people of this type is much greater than we could hope to get. I would say at this time I would rather see the National Teacher Corps than have the money to recruit our own. I think you are more successful to get people for this particular purpose.

Mr. HAZLETT. Mr. Ford, I believe we need the National Teacher Corps because we need the large image built up in the country which additional concepts like this would assist the local districts with.

I have tried for several years to get our teacher training institutions to work with us in training people particularly for the inner city, and have found the response not forthcoming. To describe what might be kind of a parallel, if you went into the extended teacher fellowship program under the Higher Education Act, I don't believe any of the colleges and universities have shown the initiative in developing particular programs to aid in the teaching in substantive areas, the training of counselors and that sort of thing.

So I think the push that comes from the National Teacher Corps would be of great value in 4 or 5 years. After that it might be obsolescent.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Dellenback.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman PERKINS. Would you yield for one short moment?

Mr. DELLENBACK. Certainly.

Chairman PERKINS. It would be most difficult for me to visualize, following the first couple of questions Mr. Ford asked, why any responsible people charged with the administration of schools would purchase equipment or hardware that could not be well utilized by the schools in the district.

Do you know of any answer as to why they would do that? I have not heard of any criticism of that type coming before the Committee. I know in the first year many of the school people invested heavily in hardware because they did not have time to make other plans.

But the evidence reported thus far disposes of that. It was, for example, types of audio-visual equipment and other equipment that could well be utilized in the local school system.

Is that the way you have viewed the situation?

Mr. STAPLETON. Mr. Chairman, our experience on the equipment purchased, the decisions to purchase certain kinds of equipment, for the laboratories or whatever the case may be, were still sound decisions. We had a gap and the gap was in service education and working with teachers.

But this was just a matter of time. We continue to work on this constantly.

Chairman PERKINS. I know that gap existed in eastern Kentucky, where they were not able to fully utilize these items at times because of a lack of competent personnel.

Mr. Dellenback.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Let me ask this question, if I may, and it follows down again on this point of Teacher Corps versus training teachers yourself.

As a background to this, let me say when a question was put this way to your colleagues from the larger cities who testified yesterday, the majority of them spoke in terms of preferring to train their own teachers if the choice were between self-training and Teacher Corps.

So recognizing there is not time for depth in discussion, putting the question this way, if the funds were to be made available to you to train your own teachers as an alternative to using Teacher Corps as a training system, which would you prefer—the gentleman from New Mexico first—would you prefer to use those funds for training your own teachers or would you prefer to have those funds used for a Teacher Corps?

Mr. STAPLETON. I guess I can speak on both sides of this question.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Unfortunately there is not time.

Mr. STAPLETON. I will just indicate that because of the same reasons given earlier by my colleagues in order to dramatize the need and the special programs required for the massive infusion of personnel for these programs, at least my feeling would be that I would see the need for the Teacher Corps.

Mr. DELLENBACK. And Dr. Hazlett, you have spoken to that question.

You prefer the Teacher Corps?

Mr. HAZLETT. I would prefer it. We could not train our teachers without the cooperation of universities.

Mr. DELLENBACK. We are not plowing here the ground that was plowed yesterday. I read most of your answer as saying because of what happened before and you were not able to get this cooperation, you therefore would prefer it.

But that has been plowed. Now in light of the situation, you would still prefer the Teacher Corps to self-trained?

Mr. HAZLETT. As I envision the training; yes.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Johnson?

Mr. JOHNSON. Locally, for myself and my district, I would prefer the funds. On a national basis, I think the national interest would be better served by the National Teacher Corps.

Mr. DELLENBACK. My question is for you and your district, that you know best.

Mr. JOHNSON. For my own situation, for my community, I would prefer to have the funds and to set up a program of teacher training in collaboration with one of the colleges and universities.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Dr. Holt, you have spoken in favor of the Teacher Corps, I believe.

Mr. HOLT. Yes. And, again, from my district and speaking for us I would prefer the Teacher Corps.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Even for your district?

Mr. HOLT. Yes.

Mr. DELLENBACK. And Seattle?

Mr. BREIT. In Seattle, we would prefer to handle it ourselves.

Mr. DELLENBACK. You then divide with three of you preferring the Teacher Corps and two of you joining the majority of your colleagues yesterday in preferring self-education.

Dr. JOHNSON, you were asked by my colleague from Oregon, Mrs. Green, a question about if you had something like \$8,000 per person what would you do as an alternative to the Job Corps.

As a preliminary, let me ask you this: Do you know how many young people from your district are in the Job Corps at the present time, people taken out of your area and put into Job Corps camps?

Mr. JOHNSON. Do you mean going out from our schools?

Mr. DELLENBACK. Out of your area and put in Job Corps camps somewhere.

Mr. JOHNSON. I don't believe very many, if any, have left our schools. We do have it on the job training in collaboration with local industry.

Mr. DELLENBACK. The question, as put, is not a particularly fair question because there would not be many \$8,000 per person made available to you to train the people who are being helped by Job Corps camps at the present time.

Mr. JOHNSON. On the contrary, I might cite a local institution called The Cage and this is the youngsters who are on the borderline of society who have been alleged to be dope addicts, who are well known by police, who are out of school.

We have a project now going to the State education department for funding to try to work with these youngsters. They are not in high school. They are of high school age. We are going to, if we get this funded, go into the cage, which is their habitat, and provide education for them.

Ultimately we hope to lead them back to school. There are many of the youngsters of this type who are out of school who we could use and house in a program of the kind Mrs. Green envisions.

Mr. DELLENBACK. What you are saying as I read you, Dr. Johnson, is that if funds in any quantity were to be made available to you you could use them well in reaching a group that seriously needs help.

Mr. JOHNSON. We believe so; yes, sir.

Mr. DELLENBACK. But those would not be the same young people who at the present time are being reached by the Job Corps?

Mr. JOHNSON. I have to distinguish and, in a measure, equivocate. We have youngsters in the Job Corps working in contract with local agencies, the Urban League, for instance, and we are taking these youngsters and employing them but they are not in school and we are not providing them with education.

Many of them are out of school. It is this kind of youngster that we would like to have this \$8,000 to use on.

Mr. DELLENBACK. I suppose there is not any of the five districts here involved that would not like massive infusions of Federal funds if this were to be in addition to everything that is now given to you.

May I ask again, please, a simple question, trying to make it "yes" or "no" around the horn. Do you, speaking for your district, favor title V, the strengthening of State departments, in your specific States?

Mr. STAPLETON. Yes.

Mr. HAZLETT. Without any question; yes.

Mr. JOHNSON. Yes.

Mr. HOLT. Yes, sir.

Mr. BREIT. Yes, a strong endorsement.

Mr. DELLENBACK. All five of you are unanimous in feeling that State departments should be strengthened.

Again, and oversimplifying, all of us working under the gun of time and oversimplification, do you feel that future emphasis in this field of Federal-State-local should be primarily on an improvement in Federal-State relationship, or do you feel that the primary emphasis should be on improvement and increase of Federal-local-district relationship? May I again ask around the horn? This is an either/or that is somewhat false because the answer could be that they should both be. To the degree we choose one at the expense of the other, does your vote come down in favor of primary emphasis on improving Federal-State or primary emphasis on improving Federal-local?

Mr. STAPLETON. I wish we had time to speak to a three-way partnership, but in the context of your question, State-local.

Mr. DELLENBACK. You mean Federal-local. I put the question on the relationship of Federal to building the Federal-State relationships so that then the State deals with the local, versus the Federal dealing directly with the local and bypassing the State.

Mr. STAPLETON. I would favor building the relationship between the Federal and the State.

Mr. HAZLETT. In view of your last remarks, I would say "yes."

Mr. JOHNSON. To be consistent with my previous answer I would have to say Federal-State.

Mr. HOLT. Federal-State.

Mr. BREIT. I would say Federal-State, with the exception of title III, which I would like to see continued as Federal-State-district relationship.

Mr. DELLENBACK. We could all dwell at some length on the ramifications of this question, but in the stripped-down analysis I tried to break it into a simple question.

I appreciate your answers.

Speaking for those who have been here and have left, we do appreciate you gentlemen coming, some of you coming from a particularly long distance. This type of testimony is very helpful to us as we seek to do what we ought to be doing on our side of the desk.

Chairman PERKINS. I regret that the other minority members were not present to hear the questions put to the witnesses by Mr. Dellenback.

Mr. DELLENBACK. I am interested in the fact that the membership ebbs and flows. In the back of my mind I am making a mental note

as to how many sit on this side of the aisle and listen to these questions and to the profound answers.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Ford?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I was very happy to hear my colleague's questions about the Job Corps. He put his finger on a very sensitive point that this committee will go into, not with this particular piece of legislation but with another one that is coming along.

I am on the subcommittee that wrote this legislation in the past couple of years, with the chairman. A fight has been developed over there over the concept of the Job Corps which seeks to remove a particular type of fellow from his home environment. I could give you a profile.

We may or may not have a large number of them. I don't have very many of these people in the district I represent, although I have some very poor people.

The surroundings that the poor people live in, in my district, are far superior to most of the areas that the Job Corps recruits come from. I don't suggest it is better to be poor in good surroundings than in bad, but a lot of the pressures that these kinds have on them before they come to the Job Corps don't exist in a suburban type area like I represent.

I don't mean to confuse this with the Neighborhood Youth Corps, which is a program for the in-school and out-of-school youth. I thought that is what the gentleman from White Plains was describing as the program he was cooperating with now, the out-of-school Neighborhood Youth Corps. One of the concepts under fire in the Congress is the concept of putting boys in a camp type of arrangement which some of the members of Congress characterize as being semimilitary, though it is a long way from that.

We find a very marked difference in our success with these kids. Quite frankly, as a defender of the Corps I have to admit we have a lot of problems. We find marked difference in our success between the conservation centers, where the boys are closer to the CCC type operation than with some of the urban centers where we have more diversity in the kinds of things we try to teach them.

But the defenders of the Job Corps say that one of the great gains we make even with a boy who drops out is that for a short time he is in a new environment where there is a new set of personal disciplines made available to him. Eating regularly, getting along with a group, and doing all of these things are not possible when he leaves the training area. Do you think that the boy out of the big cities' slums or out of the extreme rural poverty of some of the sections of Appalachia would be reached by a program that was operated in the local school district the same as when it reaches him in the Job Corps?

Mr. BREIT. I had the occasion to visit a Job Corps center in Idaho, which is a conservation type, and I thought the program there was very effective. As a matter of fact, we have six teachers currently working with the Job Corps there. I would think the overall picture would be that it would probably be a better program, such as the conservation program I visited there, if that were continued, although in conjunction with that we are planning to set up in our school system next year a Job Corps center for our own youngsters, not from other communities or other cities.

Mr. FORD. Will this be residential?

Mr. BREIT. They will all live in the town.

Mr. FORD. They will still live in whatever home they have?

Mr. BREIT. Yes; eventually we could develop, and we have this in the future as a possibility, a residential type, but it would only be for our own students. We think there is a lot of potential in that.

Mr. JOHNSON. To be effective in the long range there has to be an educational foundation and the collaborative efforts which have taken place, where there is an educational foundation. In the efforts to even get these youngsters back in school, it is the most prudent expenditure of Federal funds.

The end is not to keep the youngsters out, but to take him and induce him to come back to school. Then to ultimately give him enough education whatever environment you may find him in, so that having had a taste of education he will be willing to come back to school and see the need of it.

Mr. HAZLETT. I have two opinions and they are just opinions. One is if it is desirable that there be a new and structured type of environment for these youngsters to permit some observance of their habits, that could be achieved locally in a residential-type setup.

Secondly, it would seem to me that one of the objectives would be to gradually cause these individuals to assume a place in a normal kind of setting in terms of jobs and living with their neighbors.

It might be better effective if it could be done in the area where they live. If you could come and combine both of these in a residential setting and a gradual moving into the community, it would be wiser.

Chairman PERKINS. I want to thank all of you gentlemen for your appearance this morning. A quorum has sounded. If agreeable, as many of you as can please return for further questioning. You are being most helpful to the committee. Your testimony certainly enlightens the committee in preparing this legislation.

I hope I am not imposing on you too much. If I am, and if any of you have to leave this afternoon and cannot conveniently be present, of course you have that right, too.

The committee will be in recess until 2 p.m.

(Whereupon, at 12:30 p.m. the committee recessed, to reconvene at 2 p.m. the same day.)

AFTER RECESS

(The committee reconvened at 1:57 p.m., Hon. Carl D. Perkins, chairman of the committee, presiding.)

Chairman PERKINS. The committee will come to order.

I feel that all the members, perhaps, have had the opportunity to interrogate the witnesses, so I have only a few questions, and then I will excuse you, if someone does not walk in within the next 5 or 6 minutes.

I would like to ask Dr. Breit, and have the comment of you other two gentlemen, whether you feel that if you had a general Federal aid program, as a complete substitute for the categorical approach, that we now have under title I, involving the same amount of money, do you feel that the disadvantaged would reap the benefits to the extent they are now receiving benefits under title I of ESEA?

Mr. BREIT. Well, I suppose this would depend on the handling of the funds by the local schools.

Chairman PERKINS. I mean, if we just turned it over to the States to handle.

Mr. BREIT. Yes. I think my own reaction would be no, that under categorical aid, where it is specified for specific uses, then you do apply it to those critical areas and you use it there. If the same amount of money that is now going into title I came as general aid, I doubt that you would get the same degree of concentration.

It probably would be spread over a wider area.

Chairman PERKINS. Let me have your comment on it.

Mr. HAZLETT. Yes, I would agree that there would not be the emphasis on educating the disadvantaged, under a general Federal aid program. It is a radical concept that is causing many of us to re-examine some of our basic philosophies, really, with respect to the possibilities of education.

Mr. STAPLETON. I would agree with my colleagues here. We obviously would still face, under general aid, the decision of priorities, and I have a feeling that there might be a different ranking of priorities, a diffusion of participation of them, which I think the majority—

Chairman PERKINS. Do you feel that if we had this same amount of money going into the States from the Federal level, as complete substitute, that the State authorities would not reach the disadvantaged children to the extent they are now being reached under ESEA, and that they would spend their funds for teachers' salaries, and other State obligations and they would not emphasize the disadvantaged as they are now being emphasized under ESEA?

Mr. HAZLETT. I believe that we would not get the same kind of emphasis on the disadvantaged. There would be some diffusion.

Chairman PERKINS. Now a couple of other questions. Do you feel that we are placing this money under title I of ESEA to the greatest possible advantage at the present time, considering the needs at the elementary-secondary level?

Mr. BREIT. Yes. I think the direction of this categorical aid to the low-income-family youngsters, those of limited cultural backgrounds, is well placed. I think it is money well spent.

Mr. HAZLETT. Well, under the objective of the elimination of poverty, and providing education for these disadvantaged, I think it is being placed correctly.

Mr. STAPLETON. I believe that it is being placed correctly. I am made mindful of the fact that perhaps our district, other districts, perhaps, should view the research available today, and do a little more in terms of saturating at the earlier grades.

We have heard comments to the effect that we have had patchwork, remedial work, at later stages, in secondary, and while I believe that these programs are necessary, and that we need to continue them, and have good programs at other levels, I believe there needs to be a concern for saturation of services for the disadvantaged, under this program, at the earlier grades.

Chairman PERKINS. Is it your experience that we only have enough money for programing purposes under title I available at the present time, do not have funds available adequate for school construction?

Mr. BREIT. Well, under the present title I program, we have used no money for school construction. It has all been for mostly personnel, and we could use twice the amount that we are getting.

Chairman PERKINS. If you had another billion dollars, in addition to the funds now available under title I of ESEA, how would you recommend to the Congress that the extra million dollars from the Federal level be expended?

Mr. BREIT. Well, I think the first emphasis and concentration should be on program, and then insofar as you need facilities to—

Chairman PERKINS. I did not get the first part of the answer.

Mr. BREIT. I would say the emphasis on the use of funds should be on the program for the children, and then if you need facilities to augment that program, to implement it, there should be this privilege and opportunity to use some of the money in that direction, but I think the focal points should be on programs and services to children, as your first use of the funds.

Chairman PERKINS. Go ahead.

Mr. HAZLETT. Well, most of our schools for the disadvantaged are also among our more crowded schools. It would be desirable if we could have funds to be replace outworn buildings, and also provide more classrooms to reduce the class size in the area being served.

However, I would consider that secondary to program development.

Chairman PERKINS. Yes.

Go ahead.

Mr. STAPLETON. My reaction to this would be that program development obviously comes first. However, I am made mindful of the fact that we cannot separate a quality program or qualitative program from the various components that make up a quality program, which would be personnel.

Chairman PERKINS. I am sorry. Restate that.

Mr. STAPLETON. I was just stating that I personally feel that obviously one would make program the priority, but I find it hard to distinguish between program development or a quality program and the various components or ingredients that go into making that program, starting with, of course, quality teaching or quality personnel, quality material support, quality conditions of work, quality facilities.

I am made aware of the fact, also, however, that there is a subtle area, and as a curriculum and instructions person charged with that specific job, I feel that we need program money which would get at methodology, and this type of thing, as opposed to buildings, but I would not make it an either/or situation.

Chairman PERKINS. I think I will recess. I know some of you want to leave pretty soon, and the other members, it would appear, have had the opportunity, and we have an important bill on the floor this afternoon, and perhaps they will not be back, but let me thank all of you for coming here today, and helping the committee.

Your testimony has been most helpful. And certainly, it has gone a long ways, in my judgment, to pointing up the need for the Teacher Corps. And the city superintendents, by and large, have endorsed the Teacher Corps. This did not occur 2 years ago. Of course, there are some amendments to it, in the proposal this year.

It makes me feel that our hearings have been very constructive. Not only that, but the operation of the Elementary-Secondary Act in general. You people, you educators, have come before us with illustrations, and have evaluated the different titles, which to my way of thinking will go a long ways relieving the Congress of much criticism, because many programs have been criticized that evidence shows are operating very effectively in the country today.

I want to thank you all for coming. Thank you very much.

Mr. BREIT. Thank you.

Chairman PERKINS. I hope that it will not be the last time. I know some of you have been before the committee before, and I hope you will continue to help us in the future.

Mr. JOHNSON. Thank you.

(Whereupon, at 2:10 p.m., the committee adjourned, subject to call of the Chair.)

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1967

FRIDAY, MARCH 10, 1967

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,
Washington, D.C.

The committee met at 9:30 a.m., pursuant to recess, in room 2175, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Carl D. Perkins (chairman of the committee) presiding.

Present: Representatives Perkins, Green, Dent, Brademas, Erlernborn, Scherle, Dellenback, Esch, and Steiger.

Staff members present: Robert E. McCord, senior specialist; H. D. Reed, Jr., general counsel; William D. Gaul, associate general counsel; Benjamin F. Reeves, editor; and Louise M. Dargans, research assistant.

Chairman PERKINS. The committee will be in order.

A quorum is present. This morning I will ask the members to refrain from questions until all the witnesses have made their statements.

First I will call on Sister Miriam J. Farrell, supervisor, archdiocesan schools, Gilroy, Calif.

STATEMENT OF SISTER MIRIAM J. FARRELL, SUPERVISOR, ARCHDIOCESAN SCHOOLS, GILROY, CALIF.

Chairman PERKINS. You may proceed with your statement at this time, Sister.

Sister FARRELL. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, let me identify myself. I am Sister Miriam Joseph Farrell, a member of the Sisters of the Presentation of the Blessed Virgin Mary, whose headquarters are in San Francisco, Calif. I have been supervisor of elementary schools in the archdiocese of San Francisco, Calif. Currently I am supervisor principal in Gilroy, Calif., and member of a commission, set up by my religious community for the study of our role in education.

I have been involved with ESEA—Public Law 89-10—as a member of the Advisory Committee on Supplementary Educational Centers and Service—title III—established pursuant to section 306 of Public Law 89-10 and I have participated with my public school counterparts in Gilroy, Calif.—a rural area south of San Francisco—in implementing both title I and title II.

As a member of the title III advisory committee, may I take this opportunity to present the following observations:

Because of staff and budget limitations, the division of plans and supplementary centers has not been able to achieve a satisfactory response to the request of the advisory committee relative to site visitations to determine reliability and validity of project requests, and postapproval visits to determine the effectiveness of the project.

That the State role in title III continue to be that of advisory to the U.S. Commissioner of Education.

The need for support and development of education centers, each serving its own region and forming one link in a nationwide network of centers.

It is a distinct pleasure for me to appear before you this morning to discuss and support the administration's legislative proposals as embodied in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act Amendments of 1967, H.R. 6230.

Before I enter into that discussion and express that support, however, I should like to commend this committee for its very positive contribution to the entire spectrum of American education as evidenced in the historic Public Law 89-10.

Further, I want to assure you that from my experience what you envisioned is being fulfilled—not perfectly, but in significant strides.

It was to be expected that legislation as revolutionary and of such magnitude as ESEA would meet with problems. However, if the spirit that initiated it prevails, it cannot but be an effective vehicle in improving all of American education.

One factor in the successful implementation of ESEA is the staff of the U.S. Office of Education. The people I have had the privilege to work with in that Office have been both highly competent and genuinely professional.

Permit me, Mr. Chairman, to address myself to H.R. 6230, a bill to strengthen and improve programs of assistance for elementary and secondary education.

In general, on the basis of experience, the proposals it embodies reflect a necessary evolution of Public Law 89-10 in the pursuance of both quality education and educational opportunities.

I would strongly support the extension and expansion of the National Teacher Corps program for the following reasons:

The unprecedented shortage of teachers, especially in urban slums and depressed rural areas, is a matter of record.

We need trained, creative, committed teachers to work with the disadvantaged.

The concept of teacher-intern is realistic.

Our present culture is such that this type of dedication can be made attractive to young people who impound a vast reservoir of talent and willingness to serve.

My current experience in a migratory area applauds your extension of this program to migrant groups. This would not only benefit the children of migratory workers. It would enable the local school system—in this instance, the Gilroy Unified District—to improve its stability and its effectiveness in the education of the children of the permanent community. I would likewise support the amending of title V (ESEA) to include statewide educational planning. Quality education and the needs of children necessitate rational and complete planning.

The coordination this implies would, hopefully, improve present programs and develop new ones. Planning is one aspect of education that is best carried out within a State-local relationship. The Federal Government is hereby fulfilling its role by assisting all educational agencies in developing comprehensive systems of both planning and evaluation.

I have highlighted specifically the National Teacher Corps and comprehensive planning. I would like to, generally, support H.R. 6230's proposals regarding innovation in vocational education and expanded educational opportunities for handicapped children.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I have kept this testimony relatively concise and to points within my competence. I stand ready to attempt to answer any questions you might want to put to me.

Let me assure you of my vital and compelling interest in our Nation's education needs, and of my awareness that congressional action is needed to keep American education moving forward.

Thank you, gentlemen, for this opportunity.

Chairman PERKINS. Thank you very much, Sister Farrell, for an excellent statement. We will refrain from asking questions until we hear from all the witnesses in order to conserve time.

Our next witness is Dr. Andrew P. Torrence, dean of academic affairs, Tuskegee Institute, Tuskegee, Ala.

STATEMENT OF DR. ANDREW P. TORRENCE, DEAN OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS, TUSKEGEE INSTITUTE, TUSKEGEE, ALA.

MR. TORRENCE. Mr. Chairman, members of the House Education and Labor Committee, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, whose underlying purpose is to strengthen and improve the Nation's schools at the precollege level, is one of the most significant pieces of education legislation ever passed by the Congress of the United States.

The need for this legislation is patently obvious, and the best efforts of all Americans are required if its necessary and wide-ranging programs are to succeed.

Most important to supplying the adequately trained manpower which our Nation needs for an ever-changing and complex society is the further strengthening of the foundation of education at the elementary and secondary levels.

In a 4-year study of some 10,000 high school graduates, Leland Medsker and James Trent of the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education found that nearly 40 percent of the students clearly possessing college ability—upper two-fifths of their high school graduating classes—did not enter college.

Their study raises this point: While we continue to expand the opportunities for higher education, what can we do to devote further attention to an exploration of the question of the motivation of young people who might now go to college but who chose, for a variety of reasons, not to?

Obviously, one of the answers lies in better teaching and counseling and of students in the precollege years and the provision of the breadth

and quality of programs which will instill in our young people the love for learning—and to do this in an atmosphere which is conducive to learning. ESEA is sharply focused to achieve these goals.

Each title under the act is important and necessary; however, I shall direct my remarks specifically to Title III: Supplementary Educational Centers and Services. I have an especial interest in this title because (1) I serve as a member of its advisory committee and (2) and perhaps of much more consequence, I believe this title holds unusual promise for improving the quality of education in our elementary and secondary schools.

The present legislation serves three basic functions: (1) to stimulate and assist in the development and establishment of exemplary elementary and secondary school educational programs to serve as models for regular school programs; (2) to improve education by enabling a community to provide educational and cultural services not now available to the children and adults who live there; and (3) to raise the quality of educational services offered.

It permits, even encourages, the schools to experiment with innovative practices and to question the appropriateness of present curriculum—its organization, sequence, quality and quantity. This is, perhaps, the first attempt at wide ranging efforts to bring creativity and innovation into programs at this level of the American educational enterprise.

The February 1967 issue of American Education sums up the accomplishments of programs under title III during the past year:

By encouraging the efforts of schoolmen to translate the results of educational research into classroom practice, Title III has enabled schools across the country to offer their students everything from teach teaching and mobile art galleries to special programs for the emotionally disturbed.

And while Congress authorized \$100 million for the title in 1966, only \$75 million was actually appropriated.

The amendments to this act will broaden title III at several points: The provision of additional funds for the territories, for Indian school of the Department of the Interior, and for Department of Defense schools overseas. In his message, President Johnson requested "seed money for planning innovative school construction to deal with overcrowding, obsolescence, and segregation."

He proposed that beginning in fiscal 1968 the school districts would be able to apply title III funds toward such critical educational needs as preschool education and replacing inadequate facilities.

From studies which point up the weaknesses of our elementary and secondary schools and the many evidences of low motivation of high school graduates in pursuing college careers, the need for the continuation and expansion of this title is quite clear.

Likewise many statistics, reports, and studies show the importance of this legislation's being adequately financed, administered, and directed at the Federal level. Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 states:

No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subject to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance.

There has been blatant opposition to compliance with this and with the guidelines of the U.S. Office of Education in many States, especially those in the southern region. The skillful tactics of some officials, over the years since the 1954 Court decision to desegregate the public schools, point up clearly a need for Federal control of administration of funds for these programs.

Examples of these tactics include the mushrooming of private schools whose pupils receive grants for tuition from the States in some cases and the general attitude of many persons that what has been traditionally in education—the dual system—is a “way of life” and each person must be given the freedom of choice about the school he will attend.

In other words, unless there is Federal control of these programs there is, in the largest measure, the possibility that a large segment of our Nation's population—specifically, the Negro—will not be able to share proportionately in these programs which are so necessary to alleviate their present status as disadvantaged citizens.

The late Adlai Stevenson summed up the importance of education in this way:

The American dream begins in the classroom . . .

The question that looms large today is: How do we give all Americans an opportunity to share in the dream that begins with education?

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman PERKINS. That is a fine statement, Dr. Torrence, and I appreciate your putting in an appearance this morning.

Our next witness is Mr. J. W. Edgar, commissioner of education, Austin, Tex. It is my understanding that he is not here, but he is represented by Dr. J. Warren Hitt, deputy commissioner. You may proceed, Dr. Hitt.

**STATEMENT OF J. W. EDGAR, COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION,
AUSTIN, TEX., REPRESENTED BY J. WARREN HITT, DEPUTY
COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION**

Mr. HITT. We are sorry that Dr. Edgar was unable to be here. He was previously committed to an educational planning meeting in Denver.

I am Warren Hitt, of Austin, Tex., deputy commissioner of education for Texas, here to discuss titles III and V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as these programs operate in Texas.

I am including title V, because these two programs as they operate in our State are closely interwoven.

In preparing for the implementation of title III, the Texas Education Agency utilized the resources available to it under title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to establish the office of planning to administer the State's responsibility for title III.

Approximately one-third of the Texas allocation under title V was devoted to this effort. The office of planning under the direction of the associate commissioner also has the responsibility for coordinating the planning activities of all agency programs related to instruction—academic, vocational, compensatory, special, and adult.

Intra-agency instructional planning includes coordination of educational research, program evaluation, and communication.

Agency staff members in all divisions and departments are assigned to various long- and short-range planning activities under the guidance of the office of planning.

Aware of the potential too in the projects funded under title III for affecting educational change in Texas, this planning office assists local schools in planning, developing, operating, and evaluating the projects.

In keeping with the intent of the title III program, the staff has encouraged schools to take a new look at their educational needs and to develop programs which illustrate innovative ideas. Projects demonstrating these programs are helping to create in Texas an awareness of successful innovations. In this way, title III may well become the key to educational change.

In the fall of 1965, as an initial step in developing a State plan for title III in Texas, a State panel identified the most pressing needs in Texas elementary and secondary education. During the first year of operation of title III in Texas, the State plan adopted by the State board of education served as a guide to local school districts in planning projects and to the Texas Education Agency in reviewing and recommending projects for funding.

In December 1966, the State plan was revised in light of changing educational needs and goals.

A review of the 16 months of operation of title III, ESEA, in Texas, shows that 50 projects have been funded to date. Thirteen projects offer multiservices such as consultations and mobile units, material centers, testing, and enrichment programs.

Two planning projects were designed for special groups of children: one for mentally and physically handicapped children, another for the gifted and talented.

Five projects emphasize staff development through such techniques as in service instruction by television, instruction in the use of media, or language development programs for teachers.

Thirteen projects are concerned with model subject-matter programs. The other projects provide for such services and activities as a model library-learning center, media centers, educational television services, a neighborhood learning center, and an experimental junior high school.

These 50 projects involve an estimated 800 school districts, employ an estimated 450 full-time personnel; and most important, are designed to benefit approximately 1,900,000 of the 2½ million schoolchildren in Texas.

Innovative projects, offering new solutions to old educational problems, are being planned, implemented and operated in Texas under title III.

As one component of its responsibility for effective utilization of title III, the staff of the Texas Education Agency has made an in-depth study of the concept of regional educational services and the relationship of such services to the title III program in Texas, the State department of education, institutions of higher learning and the new educational institutions being funded under title IV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

On the basis of this study, the agency has identified "providing educational services within a region"—particularly an educational planning capability—as a priority need which should be met through the Texas title III program.

A number of other activities have also contributed to recognition of the need for regional educational planning. By September 1967, Texas must be ready to implement regional media centers which were authorized by the 59th Texas Legislature in 1965.

The intent of the media legislation is to provide State money to regional centers to match local expenditures up to \$1 per pupil to purchase instructional media such as films, filmstrips, and visuals for use with overhead projectors.

Valuable as these aids are in modern teaching, to establish regional media centers outside the context of other regional educational needs would even be to shortchange education in Texas.

Therefore, the Texas Education Agency has planned for the implementation of the regional media center in such a way that other needed educational services may eventually be provided. Coordination between State resources for the media center and Federal resources available under title III would strengthen services available to all schools.

In addition, such coordination would provide the machinery—the education service center—for involving all school districts—large and small—in educational planning for the region.

To assist in the development of this needed regional planning capability and to implement the media legislation, the state board of education has adopted policies and designated 20 regions in Texas, each to be served by an education service center.

Resources available under title III will make it possible to establish in each center a capable staff to assist in designing innovational approaches to educational problems.

As the centers develop, other educational services which regional schools, large and small, need and want, will become available. And, at every step of development, evaluation will be a necessary component of program design. Careful educational planning needs the kind of feedback only evaluation may provide feedback to indicate change of pace and direction, feedback to point out alteration of design and techniques.

Regional educational planning provides an opportunity to tailor education to the unique environment of the region, to the specific needs of the pupils, and to the strengths of the professional educators within the region.

This objective is beyond the reach of the majority of Texas school districts functioning alone. But through utilization of resources available under State media legislation and Federal legislation, in-depth educational planning can become a reality in the education service center.

In reviewing title III project proposals, the Texas Education Agency has made broad use of advisory committees in the State. We have worked cooperatively with the U.S. Office of Education in screening projects to insure that the projects approved for Texas fit into the overall plan for title III in Texas.

Activities developed under policies of the State board of education have given direction to the title III program. To get the full benefit from these efforts, to insure that the purposes of title III are met

more fully, title II should, we feel, be funded at the full level authorized by Congress.

We also strongly urge that a portion of title III funds—at least 50 percent—be subject to State determination to insure continuity in the development of the program designated and operated by the States.

The remaining 50 percent allocated by the U.S. Commissioner of Education would be available to develop the innovative programs needed on a nationwide basis.

In these remarks I have pointed out the extent to which title V funds have been utilized in the development of an educational planning capability within the Texas Education Agency. Coupled with the available title III funds, these funds can establish the basis for a strong educational planning program in the State.

An additional fact should be noted. The Governor of Texas has established the planning agency council for Texas, with one division of this for coordination of the educational planning efforts of all groups charged with educational planning—the local public schools; the Texas Education Agency; the coordinating board, Texas college and university system.

It also provides the framework for coordinating the educational activities of other departments of State government such as the department of welfare and the department of health.

Based on this approach, and with the results obtained from this type organization and these activities, it is our belief that title V of ESEA should not be amended to establish a separate program for educational planning with separate funding but rather that the funding level of title V as it is now written should be increased to provide the States with the resources needed to carry out a comprehensive program of educational planning—State, regional, and local. The basis of State educational planning has to be local planning, and the State educational agencies are in the strategic position to assist in local and regional planning.

In closing I would like to bring one other item before the committee. Title I of the act is presently extended through fiscal 1968, I believe. In order to work the formulas of this act and to give the States their allocations on a timely basis requires from 6 to 8 months on the part of the staff of the U.S. Office to gather the necessary data.

Therefore, we strongly urge that you consider extending the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, title I, through 1969 during this session of Congress, because if we wait until 1968 to make this extension we will be faced in 1969 with a substantial delay that we experienced this year.

Thank you very much.

Chairman PERKINS. And thank you very much.

The next witness is Dr. Richard Miller, director, program on educational change, University of Kentucky.

STATEMENT OF DR. RICHARD MILLER, DIRECTOR, PROGRAM ON EDUCATIONAL CHANGE, UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

Chairman PERKINS. I understand you have made an extensive study of title III. That will be printed as a separate document. I understand the study was completed about the first of February.

I understand further you are here today to summarize this study, briefly, for us.

We shall be delighted to hear you at this time.

Mr. MILLER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I might add that it was not only an exhaustive but an exhausting study that we undertook for 6 months.

Indeed, it is a privilege to testify an ESEA, title III, before this distinguished committee, and I would like to pay my respects to the fine leadership that is being given by a fellow Kentuckian.

Last May I was asked by the USOE to organize and direct a major study of ESEA title III. I accepted this challenge, but was not aware of how difficult and challenging it would be.

The study has been completed and within 2 or 3 weeks it should be available through the Government Printing Office as a committee print of the Senate committee that is the counterpart of yours. The structure of the study is given in some detail in appendix A, but I will outline it here briefly:

The independent study has five basic purposes: to analyze and appraise the proposals approved during the first year; to look for "gaps" between where selected areas seem to be going and where the approved projects are pointed; to study overall directions and developments of PACE; to view title III in the broader context of trends in American education; and to study interrelationships of PACE to the various ESEA titles and other programs. Emphasis is placed upon the first three purposes.

Twenty special consultants were asked to focus on 17 areas that have been dominant during the first three funding periods. The consultants obtained data from analysis of proposals in their areas of competence, field visits to PACE sites, two Washington meetings, and other related materials.

Several special reports were solicited by the director and these are listed in appendix A.

The subsequent sections follow closely what is contained in the final chapter of the overview section of the title III study. For a summary of the 25 recommendations in the overview volume see appendix 3.

The future shape of PACE will be determined substantially by what then has happened during the first year. What overall verdict can be given at this time about title III, based upon this study?

Considering everything, weaknesses and strengths, blunders, and triumphs, politics and purity, title III has thus far achieved outstanding success, probably more so than any other ESEA title. Success is due to its stimulating and fresh nature which catches the imagination and zeal of the most dynamic and creative individuals in the public schools and its appeal directly to public school people provides them with a unique opportunity.

In essence PACE is betting on the vitality and vigor of American education at the local level, and the bet is paying off contrary to some predictions that localism in education personifies status quo conservatism.

Its success is due in so small measure to the Office of Education title III leadership, that offered by some States, and certainly to leadership offered at the project level.

The optimism of the latter group is indicated by their responses to the question, "Do you believe title III is serving as a catalyst for change?" Seventy-six percent answered yes; 2 percent answered no; 9 percent did not express an opinion; and 13 percent were classified as maybe.

I might add that as of the time consultants traveled around the country and visited some 75 site centers, we discovered a hidden resource in American education. We did not know it was there.

This was the project directors in the field. There are now roughly 1,500 project directors, and it grew to 2,000, which is quite a dynamic group of individuals. This was an independent view all of us reached. We have an independent resource here that we ought to use.

Arthur Hitchcock has suggested that title III might be considered as B in an A B C sequence where A is the contemporary educational scene and C is a more innovative and creative educational scene, which hopefully can be realized in a relatively few years.

Nolan Estes, Associate U.S. Commissioner for Elementary and Secondary Education, said in mid-1966 that the hope of title III is still only a dream—a symbol of change and not yet a dynamic force.

Title III then should be considered as an intermediate stage—something between the present and the future that can have ripple effects upon education far beyond its modest size.

Some individuals expected more of PACE than it has delivered and this impatience is healthy so long as it is based upon realistic understanding of the time element involved in the process of change. Change in attitudes and ways of doing things is a slow process and it is unfair to expect PACE to have instant success in doing what professional educators have not done too well.

Writing about change in 1597, Francis Bacon observed:

It is true, that what is settled by custom, though it be not good, at least it is fit. And those things which have long gone together are as it were confederate within themselves: whereas new things piece not so well; but though they help by their utility, yet they trouble by their inconformity. Besides they are like strangers, more admired and less favored.

The future success of PACE is by no means assured; in fact the honeymoon period is about over and the obstacles and problems may become more vexing in the period immediately ahead. A very real problem—one that may afflict all new thrusts—was succinctly expressed by John W. Gardner when he wrote "Great ventures start with a vision and end with a power structure."

The age-old organizational problem of function and structure—also an age-old problem in architectural design—will be faced continuously as tendencies to routinize the program become more evident. These pressures must be resisted by bringing various renewal mechanisms into play.

Inservice staff conferences is a promising procedure that is being employed; a 1967 Hawaiian summer conference of PACE project directors is another; and this study represents still another. Additional innovations might include summer appointments of university professors as well as public school personnel, and exchange positions where OE title III staff members would serve in the field for a short period of time.

Evaluation will continue to be one of the most difficult problems for title III as well as for the other ESEA titles. This overview has taken a strong position favoring more and better evaluation but it has also cautioned against looking to evaluation as the mecca that it itself will solve problems.

We could become evaluation happy, viewing this diagnostic and remedial tool as the program itself, or we could tend to ignore those programs that do not lend themselves to present methods of evaluation.

Paul Brandwein one of the 20 special consultants, noted that the 3-C's of most large science projects are confusion, comprehension, and clarity—and the confusion stage may last quite awhile.

Title III needs to stay as clear as possible of political entanglements and this will not be easy. The future growth of PACE should rest upon what it does to improve the quality of education. Increasing pressures will be applied on OE title III officials to develop priorities that advance this or that cause many of which have strong political overtones. Some political problems of course cannot be escaped, and these will need to be confronted, but many others can and should be avoided by keeping the focus on the basic purposes and intentions of PACE.

The matter of priorities has been touched upon several times thus far, and it is a major problem that OE policymakers must wrestle with, within the framework of congressional legislation.

For example, have too many arts and humanities projects been approved and too few in ways of achieving organizational flexibility? The overview section has taken this position. Also too few projects creatively and courageously attack urban and metropolitan problems—particularly those relating to racial problems.

Any time priorities are attempted, flak can be expected. Those groups recommended for deceleration have been given unfair treatment and those recommended for acceleration have received due consideration. OE officials may minimize criticism if criteria are developed for determining priorities and if these are determined in connection and in cooperation with its National Advisory Board.

The project directors themselves have some views on future developments of PACE, as given in their responses to this question: What idea and suggestions would you offer for future developments of title III?

The need for more money and for greater dissemination are future needs mentioned most often by project directors, with construction funds and consultant help following. Taken together, more funding in general—and for construction in particular—account for over 16 percent of the responses.

Creative use of PACE project directors as consultants and advisors can be a strong plus to American education. This reservoir of talent needs to be applied toward other types of projects and programs. In the next few years several thousand educators will have had PACE experience. More thought needs to be given to how this resource might best serve education.

Based upon carefully conducted interviews with 1,634 parents, the Gallup study concluded that educators have not appreciated the extent

to which the public is ready to accept change. It could well be that the public, in response to education, is as far ahead of educators as it is ahead of its legislative leaders in the field of government.

All PACE projects are required to list community participation in their proposal, so recommendation No. XXV should be redundant. But that is not the case. The fact that community involvement is required during formative stages of project development has meant that the more fundamental community involvement in education over a period of time and use of title III as a symbol of broader change needed on the local scene has not come about as yet.

Representative Charles Goodell has stated:

Unless we see an educational ferment at the local level . . . all the Federal efforts will be for naught.

And in his 1967 state of the Union address, President Lyndon B. Johnson spoke about relationships in these terms:

Federal energy is essential. But it is not enough. Only a total working partnership among federal, state and local governments can succeed. The test of that partnership will be the concern of each public organization, each private institution and each responsible citizen.

Those are some of the points. In conclusion, I might mention that title III is really an institution of great expectations, based upon what has already been accomplished. Its ability to do good for the future of education is limited only by the vision, courage, and persistence of those in policymaking roles, such as yourselves.

Local schools are ready to go further and faster, and whether they do so will depend upon congressional supports and upon OES leadership. I emphasize the point. All systems are go at the local level. They are ready to go. How fast you go is really, in a sense, up to you.

Thank you very much.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Brademas.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thanks very much to all of the people who have testified. I have several questions. Let me begin, Dr. Miller, by asking you a couple of questions. I have in my hand the document to which you have been referring, "Catalyst for Change."

I raise an issue which has been discussed on title III programs by a number of our colleagues. That is the issue of whether or not the State departments of education should, in addition to the present statutory requirement to engage in review and recommendations of title III projects, have a mandatory statutory veto power over local school district applications under title III.

I notice on page A-150 of this document, in which you discuss the issue of Federal versus State department of education control, you note:

. . . Prophets of doom who predicted dire consequences would flow from what they alleged would be the Commissioner's control of local school systems revealed their fundamental misunderstanding of patterns of power in public education. Their forebodings have not been realized at all, based upon the findings of this study.

Then on page A-156 you say, speaking of the position of a State Title III coordinator:

... This position generally should be filled by someone from outside the state department, and he should personify the PACE spirit of innovativeness and creativity. This qualification is conspicuously absent among many state Title III coordinators who are more interested in staff and line relationships within the department than in a dynamic thrust for their Title III program.

Then you note that some headway has been made among State departments of education and that, to quote you, "The overall quality of State department effort on PACE has definitely improved."

The following conclusion of your report is, I fear, quite revealing in describing the attitude of so many of the State departments of education toward their role of leadership in respect of Title III programs:

... The fact that there are only ten full-time Title III coordinators indicates that a substantial number of the states have not taken Title III seriously enough to assign full-time status to the position.

I hope you see now why I am not persuaded by the arguments of those who want to give to the States mandatory veto power over the Title III applications of local school districts, as distinguished from the present power of the States to review and make recommendations with respect to Title III applications from local school districts. I would ask you to comment on this issue in the light of your survey.

Mr. MILLER. I am happy to comment.

I wonder if I might take just a second for background information. Would this be permissible, Mr. Chairman?

In order to set this in perspective, let me outline just a second the State department situation as I see it. The State departments in American education have increased tremendously in power in the last 5 years, I would say, and I think this is generally considered to be a very good thing.

We have some people who have mixed feelings, but basically this is a plus. Many of us who worked as consultants to State departments certainly have worked to this end. However, the State departments have a variety of roles as the States vary a great deal.

On the other hand, the basic roles of most State departments are regulatory, are supervisory, are doing the types of things that need to be done in order to get minimum foundations, in effect, or to get financing.

These are vitally important. There are very few States that are really taking a lead in innovation. I am not saying that because their Mr. Hitt is here, but I have had the privilege of visiting his State. I know of Roger Barton's work.

Certainly, you can name Texas, California, and New York. I have named New York and California in my book as States which have really taken real leadership roles in terms of the innovative aspects.

We are talking, however, about 50 States and talking about tremendous diversity within the country as a whole. Therefore, any discussion of title III, I think, needs to be framed in this general background of the importance of State departments, of their very pressing day-to-day, week-to-week, and year-to-year jobs which are there and which will be there regardless of the Federal Government.

Having said that, we did look very closely at the State departments. We visited a total of 16. I visited 12 myself. Generally speaking, we found very few States tooled up for title III. As a matter of fact, you can say the same about title I.

We did a survey of all the States to find out just how many States really had full-time title III coordinators. As of October 1966 we found eight. Since then there was one that we found, making it nine, and probably one more. So we have 10 out of 50 that have full-time State coordinators. In terms of really seriously considering title III, we suggest an average State should have at least two full-time coordinators, and adequate secretarial help.

In the document there is a position taken in terms of one of the major recommendations, I would like to read it because it does weigh very directly on the point. It is toward the area of strengthening department—State department roles in the area of title III.

It reads as follows:

State departments of education should receive a four percent allocation of the overall Title III appropriations, for, one, development, stimulation and dissemination, and two, administration for administration of the Title.

In other words, it is recommended here that 4 percent be allocated to help take care of the real problems some states have had.

There is the following recommendation, however, which takes quite a definite position in terms of the authority, recommendations 22. It states:

Responsibility for direction and administration of Title III should remain in the OE.

I might add also then in reference to that point one of the 20 consultants was Norm Curlin who is director of the Center for Innovation in New York State. Norm Curlin did quite an exhaustive study of title III and basically in his reports he substantiates this basic position of keeping title III in the OE as administrator, but also closer Federal-State relationships which we concur in fully.

I am sorry to take so long, but this is a complicated issue. I will stop there.

Mr. BRADEMAS. At the local level, the act requires that in the planning and operation of title III programs there must be participation of representatives of the cultural and educational resources of the area to be served.

Mr. HITT, do you now, in terms of whatever coordinating efforts you exercise at the state level in respect of title III projects, provide for the participation of persons outside the State department of public education?

Chairman PERKINS. Does the gentleman ask unanimous consent to proceed?

Mr. BRADEMAS. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman PERKINS. Is there objection?

There being none, you may proceed.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Is my question clear?

Mr. HITT. Let me make one point clear.

When we suggest that possibly 50 percent of these funds should be under State determination, we do not intend in any way to imply that we haven't had very good working relationships with the U.S. Office. In fact, I spent yesterday with Mr. Barton, who is our associate commissioner for planning, with representatives of the U.S. Office of Education staff going through all of the projects which have been funded

up to this time, and all of the projects that were recommended for funding in the January review period.

We came out of the day's work of looking at the entire title III program in Texas in very close agreement.

Mr. BRADEMAs. My question was not clear. I wasn't concerned about the relationship in this question with the Office of Education, but I was concerned about whether or not if the States play an important role in title III work, do you in the State of Texas, in your State education department, work with people outside the State department of education? That is to say, the universities and other educational resources?

Mr. HITT. Practically every project that has been funded in Texas does have associated with the project a university, and in some instances the city symphony orchestra.

Mr. BRADEMAs. No. My question is not clear yet.

The point is at the local level the law presently requires that when a local school district puts together a title III application, that it not be engaged solely in a dialog with itself, but that the local public school officials talk to other educational and cultural people in the area, of all kinds.

My question is, Do you, in undertaking your planning and coordination work in respect to title III programs at the State level, do you in your office talk to people outside your own department?

Mr. HITT. Yes.

Mr. BRADEMAs. That is all I am asking.

Mr. HITT. Yes. We have always. In our regular operations, not even considering title III, as a pattern of operation, we always have constantly used advisory groups drawn from the schools and from the lay public, and from other organizations and institutions.

Mr. BRADEMAs. You do this in title III as well?

Mr. HITT. Yes. It occurs at the local and State level, both.

Mr. BRADEMAs. I have just one other question and then I will yield back, Mr. Chairman.

I notice, Mr. Hitt, you have about 16 Teacher Corps programs in your State involving, at least the last time I looked at them, about four institutions of higher learning. Can you give us any general comment on the problems you may have had or how it is going?

Mr. HITT. I am not in a position to make much comment on the Teacher Corps because this program has a relationship directly from the U.S. Office of Education and the institutions involved. The State department of education has not been involved in it.

I would say that the proposed amendments to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act that do put some approval responsibility in the State is very important if this program is to succeed.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Do you support that amendment?

Mr. HITT. I would.

Mr. BRADEMAs. I yield back, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Erlenborn.

Mr. ERLNBORN. I pass, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman PERKINS. Mrs. Green.

Mrs. GREEN. I would like to reserve my time.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Scherle.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to reserve my time for later.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Dellenback.

Mr. DELLENBACK. May I ask you a question about one of the statistics you cited, Mr. Miller?

You indicated, as I read you, that some 10 States are at present tooled up for title III. Did you mean that to be 10 out of 50 or 10 out of the 16 which you indicated your group had covered when you said you covered 12 personally?

Mr. MILLER. I meant 10 out of the 50.

Also, when you break that down further, the statistic even becomes more significant. I broke it down by dates.

Then, also, if you are not a full-time title III coordinate, what allocation of your time do you give to title III activities? Of that, nine give only 10 percent of the time to title III; three give 70 percent; three give 60 percent; and 50 percent of the time is given by eight.

So, we also broke down for those who gave part time what estimate of time they give, also what job did you come from to your present job. So, we have a breakdown on what they came from into the title III job.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Let me be sure I understand.

I didn't total in my mind those statistics that you just stated.

How many States are not fully geared up for operation under title III or at least partially geared up?

Mr. MILLER. If you take the assumption that every State with a title III program should have at least one full-time State coordinator, and I would think that is a reasonable assumption, in terms of having visited some of the smaller as well as the larger States, then only 10 States as of within a month have full-time title III coordinates, nine or 10. There is one in there I can't really classify. It is nine or 10.

If you take the other 41 or 40, then I have asked what percent of your time do you give to title III, and I also have have that breakdown, which I will not go into now.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Then out of those 40, how many are doing nothing whatsoever with title III? Can you give me an answer on that? How many of them are doing something but have less than one full-time person?

Mr. MILLER. On the percent of the total time given to title III, the lowest we have is 5 percent of the time. There are 40 part-time title III coordinators. One is giving 5 percent or less. Nine are giving 10 percent or less, and one is giving 20 percent. I could go on.

Mr. DELLENBACK. So, about 10 of them are giving substantially no time, 10 percent or less?

Mr. MILLER. That is a good generalization; yes.

Mr. DELLENBACK. So, 20 percent on one end have a full-time person, and 20 percent on the other end are doing practically nothing, and the intermediate 60 percent are doing something between 10 and 100 percent?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir; that would follow very closely what we found in the study.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Can you say anything, in pursuance of Mr. Hitt's suggestion about 50 percent of the funds being made available

to the State departments in those States which are truly doing a good job, the State with your 20-percent statistic? How can we best take advantage under this program of the State departments which are tooled up to do an effective job without ignoring the fact that evidently a number of them are doing almost nothing?

Mr. MILLER. That is a very difficult one. I think we are talking about individual situations here, in terms of an average class, and yet in terms of States we treat them all alike. This, I contend, is unfair. On the other hand, if you gave the same ruling to all the States in this respect, I would say it would be unfair to the States that are not tooled up and some States that are not basically interested in innovation and creativity.

There are some States, and we have to be honest about this, which I think is an important aspect. Half of the States still have appointed State superintendents and half have elected State superintendents.

I think the point is, as I mentioned in the volume, we may well experiment, trying two or three States, trying to turn title III funds over to them. I think it would be a fair position. That would be for a couple of years. Test it and do an experiment to see if it works. You can start with New York and California. I think as you look at title III these are States that are tooled up. Texas, I would say, would be very close in this lead. They have taken it seriously. They have gotten the professors involved, the local school people involved, people from the arts involved.

So, we are talking about that type of State and we are talking about other States, also, which have done almost nothing. If you take the money and go right into title I type of projects, that would be the best way to kill title III in those States. It is a tough problem because you have these two aspects of it, as I see it.

Mr. DELLENBACK. To assist me, I perhaps ought to ask you this privately rather than publicly, but since we are having a dialog in public here, I will ask it this way: Do you have any comment on Oregon and what it has or hasn't done well? Was that one of your 16 States?

Mr. MILLER. I know Oregon and the superintendent of education there. I have worked very closely with the superintendent in Portland. He is a personal friend of mine. I think Oregon would be certainly very high on this list.

I haven't done the ranking, and I would be foolish to try it. I will give you some of the good States but I will not mention some of the others.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Under this same general coverage, may I bring, you, Dr. Torrence, into this subject?

I was concerned by what I read in your testimony, to the effect that unless we keep the Federal Government deeply involved in this you are afraid that the job will not be done in the State or States with which you are most familiar.

Would you generalize and go beyond your own particular State in this? Would you be talking about more than Alabama? Are you talking about all of the South?

Can you give us any additional comments on this?

Mr. TORRENCE. Yes, sir. I would certainly think it would go beyond Alabama and would cover most of the South.

MR. DELLENBACK. You feel it imperative, then, that the Federal Government continue in these areas to deal directly with the local districts rather than leaning very heavily on the State departments?

MR. TORRENCE. I think that there is room for cooperation between the Federal and the State, but the direction should be in OE at the Federal level.

MR. DELLENBACK. Do you have any suggestions you can make to us relative to what further than is already being done under title V could be done to beef up the State departments?

Part of the basic question which faces us at the Federal level, and particularly those of us who come from States which, by and large, are doing a good job on a State level and on a local district level in education, is how to reach a common denominator that extends across 50 States which are diverse.

Some of us are deeply concerned that our State departments ought to be given a great deal of responsibility, and that we would rather have our State departments deeply involved than we would have the Federal Government deeply involved. We are met with the answer that you can't do this in States A, B, and C because their State departments just wouldn't do the job and, therefore, we must go to the lowest common denominator on the Federal level that we don't feel necessarily benefits education in our particular States as best it could be benefited.

Texas may be one of these States and Oregon may be one of the States; maybe New York and maybe certain other States.

Do you have anything in this area that you can say to us. How can we handle both of these problems at the same time?

DR. MILLER has made one suggestion. Perhaps you can pick out two, three or four States and give them control. But this is very difficult to do.

MR. TORRENCE. It is a very difficult problem, sir. I don't know beyond what Dr. Miller has said, really, at this point, what ought to be done or what might be tested or tried.

MR. DELLENBACK. May I ask one additional question, Mr. Chairman, if I may?

Let me be pointed. Would you feel that education in Alabama would suffer if we were to go to a situation which placed increased responsibility effectively on the State's department at the expense of the Federal Government dealing directly with local school districts?

MR. TORRENCE. I think that it would suffer and that there would be tremendous inequities in those who do profit from the programs.

MR. DELLENBACK. At least in this one State, the State department would not measure up to what it ought to be doing?

MR. TORRENCE. Not in my judgment.

MR. DELLENBACK. Would you expand this over any neighboring States to Alabama?

MR. TORRENCE. Yes; this would hold true in most of the neighboring States, I think.

MR. DELLENBACK. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN PERKINS. MR. ESCH.

MR. ESCH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I have one or two questions to direct to Mr. Miller, if I might.

You suggest, I think, that we are in the A-B-C complex, which is a nice categorization of predicament.

I would like to question you in terms of the availability of competent staff to continue the transition from A B to C. You predict or suggest a large increase in terms of the money authorized under this program within the next 4 years.

What about availability of individuals, professionals, and the number of people competent to carry on in the field? Would you see a problem here?

MR. MILLER. Sir, the point you raise is the point that the project directors are most concerned about. If you ask the project directors to answer that are your three most difficult problems, the first is people, the people problem.

It is a very simple answer. It comes through loud and clear. The percentage is a dominant one. Not only that, but the people problem in terms of the regional labs, in terms of R. & D. developments, too. That is the one problem.

MR. ESCH. In effect, there is competition within the programs, themselves, now for qualified people; is that right?

MR. MILLER. Yes, and I would also suggest that the profession has not yet realized the reservoir of talents in the title III directors. In another year they will be siphoned off.

When you take schoolchildren, give them quite different experiences, take the restive, the ambitious, the slightly abrasive, the type of youngster who often will go outside the profession because it is not exciting enough or challenging enough, this is a person that, generally speaking, we found to be filling the title III jobs. This is the type of person who will be siphoned off into other types of operations, I am afraid.

MR. ESCH. Doctor, would you want to make some suggestion as to the solution to this problem? Do you see what direction we might take professionally or nationally?

MR. MILLER. I think there is the aspect of several possible alternatives. One is to look upon their uses in other types of Federal programs at the local level. In other words, if they only have three years, maybe this is all you can expect.

Also, there maybe an interchange of project directors.

Another suggestion we have had is that the Teacher Corps be brought in to help the problem. In other words, there is a real relationship for the Teacher Corps bringing people from other countries. Why not bring 1,000 educators from other countries into the projects?

There are a lot of ways you can look at the problem, in addition to utilizing the personnel you have already gained at the local level. I can go on, but those are some suggestions.

MR. ESCH. Let's turn, if we might, to another point.

You quoted Mr. Gardner on his idea that great ventures start with a vision and end with a power structure.

You seem to be concerned with the relationship between the power structure that will be developed eventually within this Elementary and Secondary School Act, and its relationship to creativity. I think these are the two areas.

You are suggesting, I assume, that we don't have a great deal of creativity prior to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act

within the present structure? The premise is based on the fact that prior to this time we didn't have as much creativity as we need?

Mr. MILLER. Is this in American education as a whole?

Mr. ESCH. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. Definitely I would state we have not been known for creativity in American education.

Mr. ESCH. The second premise is based on the point that we will be in a short time a "routinized," situation in regard to the Elementary and Secondary School Act and will be in a similar problem in the near future.

Mr. MILLER. As a former political scientist, I am concerned about structure and function, as I think many educators are today. I think the problem is how can you maintain flexibility and yet make the rules increasingly sophisticated?

For example, the new guidelines in title III include the bit about evaluation. Well, we think there should be something on evaluation. But you keep adding this and things and things that are important, to be sure, but this in a sense is sort of an approaching torrent which inundates a local school administrator. He has an increasing flood of paper he has to work with. I am very sympathetic to his point of view.

So, the problem is, how can you keep the fluids in terms of requirements and yet keep it regularized enough so that it can be systemized?

When you are dealing with 1,000 proposals, you have to have a real system. It is a real problem. I think, myself, the total OE staff members of title III—I have been privileged to work almost as a staff member, with nothing being withheld from me—I think they are doing a good job with the problem.

I think we need to be aware of the problem. I would say intensively aware of it in another 3 or 4 months, looking at it in terms of the next year's program. There may be ways we can innovate here. Maybe we don't need all the information we are getting. You see, it is interesting.

The OE staff feels they need statistics to verify its program. I am not sure it needs all these statistics and they are not sure, either, but they have to include everything, including the kitchen sink, to make sure they have touched all bases, in case Congress or some other person wants the fact and figures. It is a dilemma they are caught in.

I am also sympathetic to the local level where they have to react to these things.

You probably have reaction at the State level, too, I suppose.

Mr. HITT. I sure do.

Mr. ESCH. This brings out the relationship that exists with regard to the Federal program, and the need for us to maintain a simple and direct relationship between the State and the Federal programs as much as possible.

Mr. MILLER. Very much so.

Mr. ESCH. The other factor is that it does suggest that to the degree to which the Elementary and Secondary Education Act was, in effect, a stimulus to education in the United States, and that perhaps that is its major contributing factor.

Mr. MILLER. I think this is where it seems to be on title III.

I have looked at title IV intensively in terms of the regional labs, and also a little on I. I would say particularly in III it is this way. In I, I think it is much more massive, much more difficult. The lab is another story. This is where I see it. It may be serving as a ground-work from which you have a takeoff, maybe in another year or two. Where I look at it, I may not be correct. It is very hard to get a handle on this.

Mr. ESCH. Dr. Torrence, I think you suggest that we do need continuing Federal control within certain States in order to maintain and develop those children which may not otherwise have the benefits of a proper education.

Would you go so far as to suggest that we need a Federal system of education on a broad base to accomplish this purpose?

Mr. TORRENCE. No; I wouldn't go that far.

Mr. ESCH. You think that there are advantages to a State-based system?

Mr. TORRENCE. Yes, sir; definitely.

Mr. ESCH. I would still like to hear you address yourself sometime today as to how we might break through utilizing statewide systems in certain areas, utilizing them fully, to make sure that the impoverished children are taken care of.

What you are saying is that we really need statewide systems but we are willing to bypass statewide systems for certain groups?

Mr. TORRENCE. For certain programs, certain kinds of activities, not only because of the racial problem, but I expect that in areas other than the south for a program of this kind if directed fully by the State, certain areas of the State perhaps would not benefit as well as other areas that have certain kinds of influences with the State departments. I am particularly concerned about rural areas.

Mr. ESCH. The power structure within the State is such that more attention is given to some areas rather than others?

Mr. TORRENCE. That is true.

Mr. ESCH. I think all of us are concerned with this, that is: the relationship of maintaining a well-structured program and yet meeting the needs of a given area.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman PERKINS. Mrs. Green.

Mrs. GREEN. Mr. Hitt, I notice that you did not approve of the amendment which would set up another program for educational planning, but it was your hope that the State departments of education would do this, if I understand your statement.

Mr. HITT. It wasn't my intent to leave the implication that I was taking the position that the State department of education was the only one that could do it. I was trying to make this position, that there is existing authority in the present title V act to carry out educational planning in a State.

I illustrated that in our State the Governor has established a planning council involving all of the departments that are involved in educational planning. So we do achieve coordination.

I am not concerned about the fact that the Governor has to approve an application, because in our State I feel sure it would be assigned to the Texas Education Agency for the elementary-secondary educa-

tion planning and to the higher education board for the higher phase of it.

Mrs. GREEN. Do you have a copy of the bill?

Mr. HITT. Yes.

Mrs. GREEN. On page 30 there is the provision that sets aside \$15 million, and authorizes the Commissioner to make grants to public or private nonprofit agencies, institutions or organizations or to make contracts with public or private agencies, institutions, or organizations for special projects related to the purposes of this part to be conducted on an interstate, regional, or metropolitan basis.

What is your reaction to the Commissioner being given the authority to contract for comprehensive planning with the private agencies?

Mr. HITT. I see no objection to this.

Mrs. GREEN. Does it do anything to the State departments of education?

Mr. HITT. I don't think so. There is no reason why some of this planning can't be going forward through other devices and other institutions at the same time it is going through the State department.

But I am a firm believer that if we are going to move the title III program, if we are going to move public education in general, there must be a heavy involvement of the State department of education.

The U.S. Office cannot move directly from Washington into the school districts without involving the State department of education and doing an effective job. This is the position I take. It is a partnership operation, I say, involving the Office of Education and the State department of education, and the local organization.

Mrs. GREEN. Let me turn to something else, if I may.

Under the provisions for the handicapped children, again this bill would give the Commissioner of Education the authority to make grants to nonprofit agencies, and also to enter into contracts with private profitmaking organizations and agencies for research or demonstration projects.

Do you think that this is a good trend in terms of sound educational planning?

Mr. HITT. I can only react to this from how I think it should operate in our State of Texas.

I think that as we establish in Texas these 20 regional service centers which will have as their core educational planning, and each governed by a lay board—we will have a professional educator as the director, who will serve on the Texas Commission of Education Planning Council—this is the way we can get an unidentified planning job done.

If we plan without this planning, leading directly to implementation of a sound program of education, then we have wasted our time planning. It becomes an academic vacuum, so to speak.

So, I think it has to be built into the framework with safeguards so that you do get innovative practice and bring it to bear on the problems of education.

When you ask a question about how this language would work, it would depend on how the U.S. Commissioner would administer this language.

Mrs. GREEN. The point I am trying to get your views on is: that in three places in this bill, funds could be used by the Commissioner to

make grants to other educational agencies or enter into contracts with public or private agencies, organizations, or institutions. Is it a good trend to say to the Commissioner of Education's Office, that in the education of the handicapped, in vocational education, and if we do it then in other areas, too, you can bypass the State department of education, you can bypass the city superintendent of schools, and you can enter into a contract with a private agency to carry out these same programs?

At the same time I would point out, and I would like Mr. Miller's reaction to this because I think I came in at the point he was suggesting that 4 percent be given for administrative costs. The trend, as I see it, and I don't have a complete report on this, is that when we enter into contracts with private agencies we do it on a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis. We are doing this in Job Corps; we are doing it in research. We pay the private profitmaking institution, whether it be Philco, Packard-Bell, or any other one, we pay all of their costs, and then a fixed fee which may amount to 7 or 8 percent.

We apparently are not willing to give the State departments of education 4 percent for the administrative costs.

What is the direction in which we are headed if we continue this? Is this good?

Mr. HITT. Mrs. Green, I believe that the U.S. Commissioner should have some resources with which independent research and surveys and planning can be pursued. But I think it is a matter of degree. I think the mainstem for educational planning must involve the States; at the same time, we should have some capability for the U.S. Commissioner to pursue a line of inquiry. So, I would say it is a matter of degree.

Mrs. GREEN. Would you put any percentage on it?

Mr. HITT. No; I don't believe I would be in a position to put a percentage on it. But if it goes into States in practically every instance when we are administering programs of this kind in our State we do involve private institutions and we do make contacts to carry out some of these efforts.

Mrs. GREEN. With the profitmaking institutions?

Mr. HITT. Yes.

Mrs. GREEN. What kinds of financial arrangements do you make?

Mr. HITT. We are preparing to enter into a contract now with a national accounting firm to assist in the design of a statewide data system, the application of computers to public school operation, trying to develop a statewide system so there will be compatibility throughout the State. This contract will be made with an accounting firm under the same rules that any private business would make this contract.

It will be strictly on their standard fee with a not-to-exceed figure in the face of the contract. There will be no cost-plus to it. It would be just like any other private business would enter into such contract.

Mrs. GREEN. Mr. Miller, would you comment?

Mr. MILLER. I certainly fully concur with what Commissioner Hitt has said.

I might add that the problem, I think, basically is. How can you get the job done best? That is really the first question.

We have a job to be done. You ask how can you get the job done best. It may be that you can get resources from within a State. It

may be that you are dealing with a regional problem, such as the study that I was conducting on title III, which is really a national problem. That is, in that respect.

Therefore, this wouldn't be of equal concern to all the States.

I would say that is the real question, on the resources.

When you come up to resources in education, we are pretty feeble in terms of providing the types of assistances that are needed for certain types of studies. For example, I know the situation in Vermont where Commissioner Gibony wanted this, so he looked for educational help and he went to ADL, Arthur Little, as California did. They didn't do it by just turning to ADL, but they did it on the basis of looking around for resources to do the job.

It is partly a weakness that we have in education. We have not developed this. We are developing by leaps and bounds but we are still behind. It doesn't really concern me much as long as it is taken on the basis of who can do the job that needs to be done.

Incidentally, on the planning, I think the Commissioner does need funds to do planning and to do research. This has been a real problem in terms of title I, for example, and title III. There are many other types of research that need to be done on title III. The one that we did really just scratched the surface. Yet there are few funds available.

For this type of research, whether done by a university or an industrial firm, in my opinion is not the real point. The real point is who can best do the job that needs to be done. This is my view on it.

Mrs. GREEN. Did I understand you to say that staffing was the No. 1 problem, as you see it?

Mr. MILLER. It is the No. 1 problem in terms of the 723 project directors who responded to an anonymous questionnaire on their total operation. I asked them to list the three most difficult problems they faced in title III. No. 1 was personnel, by all means.

Mrs. GREEN. Do you think that that can be said of all educational programs and problems that we have today, getting adequate staff?

Mr. MILLER. I am afraid so. It is just all across, in research developments, educational technology.

Mrs. GREEN. Then may I go back to the trend of entering into contracts with private agencies on a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis.

Such groups are not limited by the voters in a district, in tax levies or bond issues. The profitmaking institution can pay any salary necessary to do the job and make a profit on what they do. It seems reasonable to assume that they would siphon off people in the public school systems or in universities because they can offer a much higher salary.

I am not arguing about what the salary should be. I think all salaries should be higher than what we are paying in education. But I am wondering what we are doing to the total educational program if we do this. I can cite R. & D. labs as one. Here we have in every State but California, I believe, the R. & D. lab and it is not subject to any tax limits of a State. It is not subject to any vote or any approval by the State legislature, or the approval of Congress or anybody else. It is a law unto itself, completely autonomous.

They offer in every area that I know of higher salaries than State superintendents receive, higher salaries than the Commissioner of

Education, higher salaries than could be attained in almost any educational program within the State.

I am not directing your attention to what the salaries should or should not be, but what does it do to the total educational program and structure?

Mr. MILLER. Mrs. Green, you have touched on several difficult problems, and if I have missed your question, would you bring me back to it?

First, the regional lab is a difficult problem, in my opinion. The regional labs set up high salaries to attract the very best people, but the fact is the jobs they have had to offer have not been exciting enough or challenging enough to attract the best people.

In other words, it has been my experience, studying the personnel of the labs, and you have, of course, made a very extensive study of this also, is that the salaries have been the major attraction and not the job, whereas we really intended it to be the other way.

They intended to give the man enough salary to get the people they wanted.

I am not so much concerned about the regional lab siphoning off from the university, because there are lots of benefits and a lot of commitments you can get from being with children, from teaching and doing research that the labs do not offer.

Mrs. GREEN. Could I interrupt there for just a moment?

The State department of education in each State should offer a salary to attract the best possible individual that they could get for the State superintendent's job. Isn't this equally as important as to set up a regional educational lab that is entirely independent and autonomous, and say "You can offer as high a salary as you want to"?

Mr. MILLER. I would say that every State superintendent in the country should receive at least the equivalent as the best paid college president in the State. That is just an opener, a flat statement. I think it is a very important and a very key job.

The salaries are nothing short of disgraceful in some States. This is a fact and it certainly has been said by many people. I think it needs to be restated.

Having said that, I don't think it is totally a salary job, though, in terms of the State department's role. Some people simply are not attracted, regardless of the salary, to the types of work that would be involved in the State departments as they now exist.

This is not saying it is bad. It is simply saying that different types of people like different types of work. I think this is a healthy situation.

So, salary would help immeasurably, but I don't think it could be equated synonymously with quality, as such. It would help a lot. This is how I see it.

Mrs. GREEN. Didn't you in your statement say in many of the States we don't have the leadership we should have?

Mr. MILLER. Yes; in the area of innovation and in the area of creativity. In other areas, in terms of certification, supervision, other types of leadership, I would have to consider each type of leadership. To me, leadership is a many splendored thing, and you have to almost take it by overall leadership.

Mrs. GREEN. How would we attract the leadership in the State if we set up other agencies within the States with higher salaries and more attractive working conditions?

Mr. MILLER. I concur, and I think, as I mentioned earlier it is disgraceful, the salaries we do have. Also, there is the fact that half of the States have elected State superintendents. This makes the job very political, as many of you know. This is a real problem.

Mrs. GREEN. Then your position is still the same, that one, we are justified, as a Federal Government, setting up and giving funds to private institutions and organizations and two, it doesn't have any effect on the leadership or the staffing of the traditional educational groups?

Mr. MILLER. I would say if it happened often enough, it would be one thing. I don't think it happens too often, to begin with.

Secondly, I look at the first criterion of how can you best do the job. If you can get resources in education to do it, fine; I would say do this. But if you cannot get resources, then don't do a poorer job than can be done by getting outside resources. That, to me, is the criterion.

We don't have resources in some States to do these types of surveys and studies, and then I would say to go and get the people who can do the job.

Mrs. GREEN (Presiding). Mr. Quie, the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Miller, you said something in answer to Mr. Dellenback, as I understood it, that unless there were Federal direction to title III, as we have now, that title III projects would just go on the same as title I projects do now.

Do I understand you correctly?

Mr. MILLER. I said in some States.

Mr. QUIE. It is my understanding that quite a large number of title III projects are really that type of a project anyway, rather than what we had envisioned, such as experimental centers or model school systems. What some schools are doing are just demonstrations.

Isn't it true that a large number of them that are funded are of this nature?

Mr. MILLER. If you have a chance to read the volumes, you will see that we are quite critical.

Mr. QUIE. Yes, but it is a little thick to read right now.

Mr. MILLER. I know. And you have my sympathy.

We are quite critical of what we found in the reports. As a matter of fact, I would say we took our job to find what was wrong with title III. We found many things wrong with it.

But, when you take the total package, looking at it, we think it comes off very well. I don't think there is contradiction there.

Getting specifically to your point, it is pretty hard to expect people to think creatively. I think people basically go into three different categories. They go into either people-people, things-people, or ideas-people. There are some All-American triple threats, but most people will fall into three general categories, in my opinion.

Therefore, you ask people to think creatively, to think innovatively, and this is pretty hard to do. I think we have done pretty well in terms of problems in this area. Some of the projects are pretty bad. They come in, and there has to be study on the projects.

You are right in a sense, but when you look at the exciting projects that have come in, the 1,000 projects, of those 100 or 200 are startling in their creativity, scope and organization, so it seems to me we have enough good out of this whole kettle to say that the pot is somewhat beginning to simmer. It is not boiling yet and I think it would be too early to ask it to boil after just one year.

Mr. QUIE. What do you envision in the future? You talk about fiscal year 1972 as \$2.2 billion. That is a substantial increase over present funds. I imagine you envision something much greater, even more varied than we have right now.

Should we expand further than is being contemplated?

Mr. MILLER. The two basic projects, supplementary centers and the projects, both have to be expanded, I think, considerably. Actually, the funding has been a problem in terms of just the number of projects to be approved. I think they should be expanded dramatically. It is succeeding, in our opinion, in terms of the people who have studied it, and certainly it is adding something, an element in most schools that has not been there.

I think if you go out into many of the States and talk to the title III people, you will see what we found. These are interesting projects.

The important thing is the people involved. I think when you really get down to it, we capture some people by the excitement of the idea.

Therefore, if III goes into the area of needs without being innovative, we are really moving in a troublesome direction, in my opinion. We need to keep creativity and innovation, and the process of change pretty foremost in these projects.

But they are far from perfect. In no way would we want to say that there haven't been some bad projects, there haven't been some political aspects there. But when you take the whole kettle, I think it is pretty good.

If you focus on one aspect in terms of the bad projects, you are going to get one picture. We tried to look at the total as best we could.

Mr. QUIE. You put a great deal of emphasis on creativity of the individual on the local school district, and if we are actually to do a job we have to harness them. I share your feelings in that.

But I also get the impression, and perhaps you could tell me if I get the right impression, that you don't feel the same way about the State departments of education, or the possibilities. A number of colleagues seem to share that view, that there isn't much possibility of creativity in the State departments of education to accomplish this so you need the Federal relationship directly with the local school district and there the creativity of the individual with the whole system can be seen.

Mr. MILLER. The suggestion that 4 percent be allocated to State departments is in recognition of the importance of strengthening State departments. There is quite a lengthy section in this State-Federal relationship. I think the important thing is that the partnership be strengthened considerably.

So, in a sense, 4 percent would allow them to do some things in terms of personnel, some of their own research, studies, conferences, things

they wanted to do in order to stimulate title III. This would help considerably.

But I go back again in terms of the job definition, a man assumes in a job pretty much determining what he can do. Most State departments have not geared themselves up to do the exciting, innovative, creative types of work that are better done in universities at the local level.

I think it is a frank recognition of the role of the State departments, as I said before; it is a vital role. It should be increased. We need to up the salaries. I have been very strong in my feelings toward the role of the State departments.

But my point is innovation and creativity, with the exception of some, is an area which they have not gotten into. They will have to retool a bit to do it. As I say, there have been exceptions. I think Texas has done a fine job. They have set up an associate commissioner for planning and development. How many State departments have done this?

Mr. BRADEMAS. Will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. QUIE. Yes.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Isn't it possible that the problem we are all concerned with here; namely, how do you get the best job done in meeting the purposes of title III, is really not so much ideological as it is chronological, that is to say that Mr. Quie, who wants to see a larger role for the States in title III and I, who have been skeptical about the mandatory veto, might not really be at odds at all with respect to what you are talking about, or what Mr. Hitt is talking about.

We all want to see the State departments of education greatly strengthened. I certainly do.

What you are saying, I take it, Dr. Miller, is that you are not opposing strengthening the State departments of education; you say you want to see them stronger; and I think Dr. Hitt takes the same position. I certainly can see that.

All I am concerned about is that we not at this particular point put that much power in them. If they get much stronger, let's say, in 3, 4, or 5 years, with additional title V funds, then it might well be that the State departments of education ought to have precisely the kind of role that Mr. Quie is suggesting.

I don't think Mr. Quie and I are at odds on a strong State department of education in this, if that is a fair observation.

Mr. QUIE. I would also say that I am not arguing for a Governor's veto or a State department of education veto. I think this is a system of last resort that we utilized in the poverty program, and it is a very valid one.

What I am talking about is the State department of education assuming responsibility. I think where the difference comes is that my colleague from Indiana would like to see the State department strengthened so they could assume the responsibility. I say, let's give them some responsibility and the tools with which to do it, and then they are going to learn how to handle it.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I would sign my name to the statement that Mr. Quie just made.

Mr. QUIE. I would like to see every State required to devise a State plan which they would submit to the Commissioner for approval to accomplish what I would observe California has accomplished.

I understand Texas has done well with title III, as well, though I am not familiar with it. I am familiar somewhat with the 19 experimental centers in California.

Just the idea of doing some State planning, it seems to me, will make this program much more effective. The helter-skelter way it has operated so far is that it has brought in some programs zeroed in on the purposes of title III, but there are too many which are not.

It seems to me what you said would happen has happened, making it too much like title I. If you had this Federal-local relationship and it has not been perfect, I say let's take a try at strengthening what we believe should be the optimum of a strong State department of education.

Could I ask one other question, and that is to get an understanding of what you meant by title III and title II should be closely related both at the local and Federal levels. I don't believe you elaborated.

Mr. MILLER. I said I and IV, I believe. Did I say II?

Mr. QUIE. Here it says title III and title II should be closely related both at the local and Federal levels.

Mr. MILLER. Where did I say that?

Mr. QUIE. On page 16 of your statement. You have two pages of recommendations, or a summary of the recommendations of the overview section. And then No. 16 on page 16.

Mr. MILLER. That is very interesting. I think it is a misprint. I think it should be IV. In fact, I am sure it should be IV.

Mr. QUIE. I can understand that a little better.

Mr. MILLER. I would certainly concur that III and II should be, however. It is just that I didn't look into II. But IV I was concerned with, about regional labs, and I. Also, there is a study of the relationship of I and III in the volume.

We went into the relationship of how well these are being related at the local level. So, I have been personally concerned about this in the study.

Mr. QUIE. I have some questions of Sister Farrell and I feel it is too bad she has not been questioned more.

My colleagues should have their time first.

Mr. STEIGER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Quie.

May I ask, Dr. Miller, what Wisconsin's standing is insofar as title III?

Mr. MILLER. Sir, Wisconsin stands very high in everything. My wife happens to be from northern Wisconsin, so I have no choice in the matter. I really cannot say. I visited the center at Manitowoc. I know of the work in Milwaukee. What I have seen has been good. I am not avoiding the question, but I simply do not know.

Mr. STEIGER. Do we have a full-time title III administrator?

Mr. MILLER. Without going back to my figures, I could not say. My recollection is yes, but don't hold me on that. I am not certain. I could check it quickly, but I don't have the figures with me.

Mr. STEIGER. The discussion between my colleagues from Indiana and Minnesota on what is the relationship and the role of the State

department, let me read a statement that was made by the superintendent of public instruction in Wisconsin and his chief deputy, and get your comments, and those of Dr. Hitt. He said:

We support the conversion of Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to a state plan operation which will permit each state to administer its plan of supplementary services and centers.

Specifically, is this what you think we ought not to do under the present circumstances, based on your study?

Mr. MILLER. Yes. I do not think we are ready for this yet. I think it would be a real mistake at this point to turn over title III to the State departments. I would state from my experience that it would, in a sense, probably destroy the spirit of title III at the present time, to turn it over to all the State departments, en masse. This is different from what I said earlier, turning over selectively on an experimental basis to those that we recognize.

I know the political problems of recognition here, but it seems to me that treating all the States alike, if you had to do it all or none, then I would say none. But I much prefer saying let's try it on the basis of a few, and perhaps chronologically, as they develop, which certainly I support very fully. They should develop much greater strength. Then maybe it can be moved a little more in that direction.

Mr. STEIGER. Do you have any comments, Dr. Hitt?

Mr. HITT. Yes.

There has been quite a bit of talk about the weakness of State departments. I would like to point out one thing, that in the past 3 years there has been a very substantial strengthening of State departments of education. If we are going to follow through with strengthening, organizations or people strengthen as they get responsibility.

This is the reason I proposed that 50 percent—I wouldn't quibble about the percentage—or some have the responsibility, some portion of title III, should be moved into the State departments to give them that responsibility, because it is through the exercise of responsibility that they continue to strengthen and grow.

As we operate with the Office of Education, it is not going to bother Texas one way or the other, because we have a working relationship worked out and we work with our people constantly in planning their title III projects so that we are involved in the grassroots planning of these projects and in their implementation.

On the point of how much resource they put in it, in our State we feel like title III is an integral part of our overall planning effort for education in the State. We not only have a full-time person working with it, but when we come to the review period we may involve 30 or 40 of our other staff people in the operation.

We will assign staff personnel to monitor these projects as they operate so that we know what is going on in the projects. I think this is the way a State department should work. It should be a full partner in the operation. Unless we move in that direction, if you wait 5 years you will be in the same position you are in now, possibly. The involvement of people and organizations is what I think strengthens it.

Mr. STEIGER. Dr. Torrence, in your statement you said that we must devote further attention to exploration of the question of motivation of young people who might not now go to college.

I was interested in your stressing the college-bound student without really, perhaps because of time, devoting much time to the non-college-bound student.

Do you have any comments or do you wish to make any comments about what we can do to provide the motivation in our society for the noncollege bound, on what our programs are that we have undertaken, or whether we should expand in this area?

I am concerned that we have been so college-bound motivated that we have tended to downplay the importance of a vast segment of our society that does not choose to go to college or perhaps would not be as suited to go to college.

What is your concern here and what are your ideas?

Mr. TORRENCE. This is a great concern of mine, also, the way we seem to be moving into society.

It simply almost requires now, or it will soon, some college education for a person to have a successful, a pleasant, and a wholesome life. I think to some extent this is regrettable. I think to a large extent requirements for employment out of phase are not in harmony with what is required to do certain jobs.

But in order to even be considered for certain jobs, anything less than high school is out of the question, and in many cases college training is required. I don't think in many of these jobs college training is required in terms of proficiency of the person to do the work.

Though this may never happen, so long as college training is required for so many of the jobs of today, then it becomes a concern of mine that more and more people have the opportunity and are motivated to accept this opportunity to go to college.

I think that the high schools, the elementary schools and high schools, have not been successful in helping to get students motivated, those who are capable of going to college, and who could receive the necessary financing to go to college. They are not motivated for one reason or another to take advantage of it.

Mr. STEIGER. When you discuss college, are you talking here about the liberal arts type of college, or can we provide some leadership and shifting of emphasis to the junior college-technical institute type of training which may give them an associate degree, for example, which can lead to some wholesome employment (your words), in our society? Is this what you are talking about?

Mr. TORRENCE. I am talking about both. I think the junior college or the community college, the technical institute type of college education, is quite appropriate for some people, and needs certainly are tremendous and great, and the opportunities are great. A large number of youths are not taking advantage, however, of these opportunities.

Mr. STEIGER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Scherle.

Mr. SCHERLE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Dr. Torrence, I believe I would like to pursue this matter a little further, if I may, with regard to college training, college instruction, and college graduates.

I feel, to a certain extent, also, that this has probably been pushed and emphasized a little too much. I believe that there are three reasons, perhaps, why people do not attend college.

One would be, perhaps, that they are not academically inclined; their financial status may not allow them to attend; and, then, perhaps, they may have no desire to attend.

Someone asked me the other day, particularly in this field of education, why do you go to college, and he said, "Well, to better myself so that I can make \$500 or \$600 a month."

I asked, "Have you hired an electrician or plumber lately?"

The field is initially not white collar, but it is certainly blue collar. I think that we must, in the field of vocational education, clear up a void that has existed for many, many years from high school to college, and provide those who do not attend college the opportunity to become blue-collar workers if they have no desire to become white-collar workers.

I noticed also in your remarks this other point, about which I would like to ask you a question. You stated in your remarks:

There has been blatant opposition to compliance with this under the guidelines of the U.S. Office of Education by many states.

Do you feel that the handling of the educational system in your State has been a blatant violation in regard to the law as we recognize it on the books today?

Mr. TORRENCE. In the State of Alabama, sir?

Mr. SCHERLE. Yes.

Mr. TORRENCE. Yes, sir.

Mr. SCHERLE. And this money is federally controlled and administered? That is, to your State?

Mr. TORRENCE. My response to you was not with regard to title III funds. I do not think this is true with regard to title III funds, with regard to the programs funded under title III in Alabama.

Mr. SCHERLE. But you do feel that in some regard in the educational facilities you have been shortchanged in Alabama?

Mr. TORRENCE. Yes, sir.

Mr. SCHERLE. And because of this assumption, you feel that you will be given more consideration if the controls and guidelines were established and held by the Federal Government rather than the State department of public instruction?

Mr. TORRENCE. Yes, sir.

Mr. SCHERLE. Do you recall, I believe last year or 2 years ago, where in the State of Illinois \$30 million was withheld for a period of time because of so-called segregation in schools existed?

Mr. TORRENCE. I recall reading about this.

Mr. SCHERLE. This money is being sent down in a certain percentage to all States. If this is a clear violation of the law, why wouldn't this also have been done in Alabama?

Mr. TORRENCE. Sir, I don't know the answer to that.

Mr. SCHERLE. If I may move from questioning you to Sister Miriam, I have one question.

I notice in your testimony, Sister, that you feel you would like to see title V expanded to include statewide educational planning.

I also notice in your remarks, particularly to stay compatible with my previous questions:

My current experience in a migratory area applauds your extension of this program to migrant groups. This would not only benefit the children of migratory workers. It would enable the local school system in this instance to improve its stability and its effectiveness in this education of children of the permanent community.

By this, I gather that you also have problems in the field of education in regard to transients that come and go in the area where you live?

Sister FARRELL. Yes, Mr. Scherle; we do, simply because they are migratory. They are accepted into the school system readily on a tentative basis. I observe that the teaching leaves a great deal to be desired because they are there only a short time.

In the particular area in which I am currently working, the Lower Santa Clara Valley, they leave in the fall, after the prunes. Certain classes are dismantled and there are few children left. The school, I gather, has to be reorganized and reset up.

Mr. SCHERLE. Do you feel that even though these are migratory workers that they are considered for the full extent of education as possible in budgetary and fiscal appropriations?

Sister FARRELL. Are you speaking of title III, Mr. Congressman?

Mr. SCHERLE. Either one of the two.

Sister FARRELL. First of all, title III hasn't seeped down to our particular area even though the State has a very splendid plan. Head-start, under the OEO, is beginning to be quite effective in this particular area.

I gather that the California Education Department is quite competent. But also it has a tremendously large job to handle, particularly in these areas where there are transients. These people are moving up through the two valleys, of course, I don't observe any effective approach currently to the solution of this problem of the migratory workers.

Mr. SCHERLE. You don't feel in your own mind, then, that because of the situation as it exists and is known to the State Board of Public Instruction, that there is any discrimination at all in regard to the education that they should be entitled to?

Sister FARRELL. No; validly, there is no discrimination.

However, I don't see any approach to the problem. The problem exists. These children are handled as they go up the valley. But I feel that this is not the answer.

I speak from the viewpoint of a schoolteacher. I think we all know when children come in they are in the classroom for 6 weeks and then move over and have another teacher for 6 weeks. This is the situation in which they are existing for most of their elementary education, at least.

Mr. SCHERLE. To pursue this a little further, then, knowing this, the possibility of many of them becoming college entrants is remote?

Sister FARRELL. Very remote.

Mr. SCHERLE. Then how is your vocational program in California?

Sister FARRELL. I am not prepared to give you an overall picture of the vocational program. I know something is being done. But

if we were speaking of the migratory workers, I would say this is very remote. I don't think they are in areas where vocational centers are accessible to them.

I would think if the suggestion in the recent amendments to ESEA would become law, this would present a tremendous potential resource for this type of thing.

Mr. SCHERLE. Thank you very much, Sister.

Commissioner Hitt, I would like to approach one subject in your testimony to clarify a situation in my own mind. You also make the statement that it is our belief that title V of ESEA should not be amended to establish a separate program for educational planning with separate funding.

Do you have reference to some of the infiltration or cohesiveness or compatibility of working with the OEO along with your educational system?

Mr. HITT. No. This was not involved in my remarks at all. My statement in this regard was based on one thing, that in as much as we do have a Federal law that has full authorization—I believe authorization up to almost twice as much as was appropriated—that does provide for educational planning, that the need does not exist for a separate statute to provide for this function.

The provision is already made in the Federal statute.

Mr. SCHERLE. Let me ask you this question, then, concerning Headstart. Do you have that?

Mr. HITT. Yes.

Mr. SCHERLE. You would like to see this moved or changed from its existing department to the educational field, would you?

Mr. HITT. I think it would work more smoothly as it really relates to the public schools. I think if I polled our superintendents throughout the State, the administrators in the State, they would rather be dealing with the State agency in their direct relationship.

Mr. SCHERLE. Here is a situation where the money is funded directly, isn't it?

Mr. HITT. That is right.

Mr. SCHERLE. And not through the State department of public instruction?

Mr. HITT. That is right.

Mr. SCHERLE. What is your analysis or appraisal of this type of education being funded directly, bypassing the Governors, the State legislatures, all the way down to the local level?

Mr. HITT. It does not, in effect, bypass the Governors. In our State we have established a division of OEO in the Governor's office. Every application for an OEO grant dealing with education is referred to our Office for review and comment and referred back to the Governor. So we do have information in our files and in the hands of our staff so that they can be involved with the operation of this Headstart program throughout the State.

We think this is important, that our staff be informed and involved in the developments of these programs. We accomplish this through this cooperative relationship with the Governors.

Mr. SCHERLE. In the sense of the word, then, you do have control because of affiliation with the executive branch in your State?

Mr. HITT. We don't have control. We do have a voice in the projects.

Mr. SCHERLE. We don't unfortunately, but I am sure we will.

I have one question for Dr. Miller. How is Iowa doing under title III?

Mr. MILLER. You are guilty by association. I am from Nebraska, so I can talk a little bit about Iowa. I think they have established a law, interesting system of districts, intermediate districts, in Iowa, and they are going to hook this in. So I think it is better to talk about Iowa in terms of what they are planning to do. Actually, this would be somewhat like they are doing in Texas.

I think this has great promise. It is something like what they did in Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCHERLE. Thank you very much. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Chairman PERKINS. Mrs. Green.

Mrs. GREEN. Sister Miriam, you are a supervisor of schools. How large a geographical area in California?

Sister FARRELL. At that time we handled 14 counties and in the last year—the last 3 years it has been broken up into four dioceses.

Mrs. GREEN. That was in the northern California area, the 14 counties?

Sister FARRELL. That is right.

Mrs. GREEN. How long has it been since you have been supervisor?

Sister FARRELL. Six years, I have been acting as consultant, however, in the office subsequent to that time.

Mrs. GREEN. I would like now to turn to Mr. Hitt, since my question is over legislation adopted in the last 2 or 3 years.

Where is the regional education office that serves Texas?

Mr. HITT. Dallas.

Mrs. GREEN. Do you have a regional education lab?

Mr. HITT. Yes.

Mrs. GREEN. Where?

Mr. HITT. It covers Texas and Louisiana. It is located in Austin.

Mrs. GREEN. Do you have an R. & D. lab?

Mr. HITT. Yes, on the campus of the University of Texas.

Mrs. GREEN. Do you have supplementary centers in Texas?

Mr. HITT. I believe you came in after I had given my testimony. We are establishing 20. Last Monday the State board of education adopted policies that established 20 regions, each of which will be served by a center, a service center.

Mrs. GREEN. Then in Texas you have the State department of education, one R. & D. lab as a result of this Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and you have one regional education lab?

Mr. HITT. That is correct.

Mrs. GREEN. Also, you have plans for 20 supplementary centers?

Mr. HITT. That is right.

Mrs. GREEN. What is the relationship now between all of these?

Mr. HITT. Let's take the regional lab. When we started cooperative planning for a lab in this region, the University of Texas—

Mrs. GREEN. This is the R. & D. lab?

Mr. HITT. No, this is the regional education lab.

The University of Texas dean of education made one of his staff people available. We made office space at the university and A. & M. university sent one of their people over to assist.

The university at Baton Rouge, La., sent a person to work with us. Cooperatively we developed a plan for a laboratory to cover these two States. During the review period we then created a nonprofit corporation under the Texas law.

Mrs. GREEN. How did you happen to establish a private, nonprofit organization? How did you happen to use this format?

Mr. HITT. We felt this was the most feasible and workable way to operate this kind of an institution in the States.

Mrs. GREEN. Was it suggested by anybody? Was there direction on this?

Mr. HITT. No, this evolved out of our planning there in the Texas Education Agency with the university groups.

On this board for the lab, in this private corporation, we have the commissioner of education from Texas, the commissioner from Louisiana, the chancellor of the University of Louisiana, the chancellor of the University of Texas, representation from A. & M. College.

We have outstanding lay citizens on this lab board. So they have a 23-man board, with a representative of labor, of industry, of education, trying to get a complete cross section of the educational community and the lay community of the two States.

The lab is operating in very close cooperation with our department.

Mrs. GREEN. What is it doing, specifically?

Mr. HITT. Its focus was on the needs of the inner cultural groups in the society of these two States. It will tune in to work on problems relating to the migrant, the Latin American culture as it exists in Texas, for instance; the French groups that influence the Louisiana society; the Negro as a part of the society of both States; of moving into the area of teaching education or teacher education; moving into the area of retraining of teachers.

Mrs. GREEN. Do they actually train teachers?

Mr. HITT. You see, our lab was one of the last ones established.

Mrs. GREEN. When was it established?

Mr. HITT. About 10 months ago, when they were in the planning grants. They were recently approved for a 22-month operational grant.

Mrs. GREEN. Let me ask you specifically. Is there anything that the regional education lab is doing that the State department of education in Texas could not do if they had the same funds

Mr. HITT. The answer to that question is "No."

Mrs. GREEN. Then why do we set up another agency?

Mr. HITT. But there are areas in which they can move that would be more difficult for the department to move in.

Mrs. GREEN. What area, specifically, and why would it be more difficult?

Mr. HITT. I suppose tradition would be part of it.

Mrs. GREEN. Specifically, what area can they move in that the State department could not, if they had the funds, if they had the same money?

Mr. HITT. Mrs. Green, I can't answer that. I don't believe that there is any area that they are working in at the moment that our de-

partment could not work in. We have a rather broad-based legal base under our department.

Mrs. GREEN. If we say we want to strengthen the State department of education and then by action we set up a competing organization charged with the same responsibility but with a heck of a lot more money and with no limitation on how they can siphon off personnel from other agencies, what are we doing? Are we doing what we say we want to do?

Mr. HITT. It will be in pilot program development, of additional involvement. We are operating more or less as partners in attacking these problems. The reason we wanted the lab is that it gave us more resources that could be brought to bear on these problems more quickly.

Mrs. GREEN. It is largely examination, isn't it, and not much research?

Mr. HITT. It will be in pilot program development, of additional instruction materials, suited to the needs of these particular cultural groups.

Mrs. GREEN. Have you not been doing this in the State department?

Mr. HITT. Yes, we have, but by having then both forces at work we can get them done more quickly. In other words, we were trying to multiply our resources when we conceived the idea of moving into a laboratory.

Mrs. GREEN. You said that you strengthen the State departments of education with the exercise of responsibility?

Mr. HITT. We have not withdrawn from the field, but we are not duplicating each other. They are working in one field and we are working in another.

Mrs. GREEN. But I thought you said you had been doing exactly the same thing as the regional lab?

Mr. HITT. We are working in the same general areas. Under our legal authority, we have legal authority to do anything that they are doing now but we do not have the resources to do all that are underway at this time.

Mrs. GREEN. And if we give you the same resources?

Mr. HITT. We could do them.

Mrs. GREEN. Why would it not be better to have one set of books, one administrative procedure and give the State department the resources that we give to the R. & D. lab?

Mr. HITT. This is not the R. & D. lab. This is the regional laboratory.

Mrs. GREEN. I am sorry. The regional education lab?

Mr. HITT. This would work either way.

Mrs. GREEN. Which way would it work better, if you want to strengthen the State departments?

Mr. HITT. I think we should do both.

Mrs. GREEN. You do?

Mr. HITT. Yes.

Mrs. GREEN. You want a competing agency?

Mr. HITT. It is not competing.

Mrs. GREEN. I won't say competing. But you want another agency with more funds that is doing exactly what you could do?

Mr. HITT. Let me try to phrase it this way. There is room in the area of education in the Southwest for the laboratory and for the State

departments of education to operate in accordance with an overall plan for the improvement of education.

They can be working on some phases of this while we are working on other phases. All of this will come together into a total plan and operation. We are staying very close to the laboratory in all of its planning activities to be sure that our planning and their planning are paralleling and that we are coming out with something that will have an impact on the needs of that region.

The R. & D. center at the University of Texas is concentrating its efforts in the area of teacher education, carrying on experimental work in a number of the school systems to prove up some of these new practices in education. They are working in the field of engineering at these practices so that they can be transmitted throughout the State.

Our regional service centers are going to serve a very important role as the disseminating agent of helping to transplant these new practices out of the school system in which they have been proven up over into the other parts of the State so that we get a widespread implementation of these new ideas and new practices.

So there is room with the number of youngsters we have and the size of the territory to cover for all three to play a very vital role in the development of new practices in education for the improvement of education, and bring about the changes we all feel needs to be made.

So it is not an either or in my thinking. If any lab is operating in competition with a State department, then I think we are in trouble. We have done everything we can to make sure this does not happen. It is all one operation one effort.

Mrs. GREEN. I agree there is enough work to keep a lot of people busy. But if I follow your logic, then let's set up a lot of different agencies so we would have a better chance of getting them done.

If there is enough work for three agencies to do, I think there would be argument that there would be enough work for 10 agencies to do. Why not set up 10 in Texas?

Mr. HITT. We could use them.

Mrs. GREEN. And you would again favor that?

Mr. HITT. No, I did not say I would favor it. I think we have all we need at the moment.

Mrs. GREEN. Thank you.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Brademas.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Hitt, following some of the questions that Mrs. Green has asked which I think are quite relevant to the whole new look we are seeing, is it fair to say that there are many programs that have been passed in the field of education in the last several years of our country that authorize support for elementary and secondary, for preschool education and higher education, that legally could have been undertaken by States a long time ago?

Mr. HITT. That is correct.

Mr. BRADEMAS. But they were not. We are all familiar with some of the reasons that they were not.

I think it that you are not advocating that we should not have had the NDEA of 1958 and the several programs that it authorized to help support our elementary and secondary schools, or our colleges

and universities, although States could very well have undertaken such programs, could they not?

Mr. HITT. That is correct.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I am against the waste and duplication of unnecessary effort, which I guess is like being against sin. But I am very much concerned, as Dr. Miller phrased it, that we get the job done.

I am sure you have a lot of oil in Texas and you could raise a few taxes on that oil to do some of these jobs. But I am not unaware of the political difficulties in State legislatures. We could even lower the depletion allowance on oil right here in the Congress, but I am not going to hold my breath until that is done.

Let me ask a question, Sister, of you, and also of Dr. Miller. What about the relationship between public school systems and private, in particular church related, organizations in title III programs?

Have you any comment on that?

Sister FARRELL. I would say that ESEA certainly has worked out as it was intended to, that we have participated, and I think that in the overall picture of the projects, of course, they have not been awarded unless there has been some indication of this participation.

I might inject here that I think we should define our terms. I think State planning is consistent with the law as it is now in California.

Because of the State plan it has not seeped down to the area we are, but we are currently working on a project. I would say it looks very good.

I would caution this, however, that I think that even this morning's discussion being subject that we bypass the real spirit and intent of this law, which was to the child. Sometimes we get bogged down in all of this of who is doing what.

But what is happening to the child? We are trying to do something for the American child. We are trying to set up a service. I hope we will never lose this vision. I suspect, too, with the constant rewriting of guidelines we are in danger of losing this perspective.

We turned over the spotlight to the child in ESEA with some of the rewriting of the guidelines it tends to suggest that we are getting back to this institutional approach which I hope will never happen.

Getting back to your basic question, there has been participation. I might add that this ESEA has given us who are involved in the other parts of the American scene, the educational scene, in a pluralistic society, an opportunity to exhibit the real philosophy that we have always tried to exhibit.

In other words, we try to be a service and a resource to the community we serve. This is our philosophy. ESEA has given us an opportunity to exhibit this much more readily than was possible, let's say, in 1949 when this was a real touchy delicacy.

Thank you.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Dr. Miller.

Mr. MILLER. I concur fully with what Sister Miriam Joseph has said about the private-public relationship. They are growing. They are uncertain. This is a new area. But we have some good examples of where this is being worked out.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Dr. Miller, what about the relationship between title III and title IV programs as your survey developed? From what

I can judge, you have done about the only systematic survey of the way title III programs have in fact been working out over the country.

Have you any general findings on the relationships between the two titles, or recommendations?

Mr. MILLER. Yes. I might also add that I think I have done a rather systematic study of the title IV, one of the few that has been done. I have looked at this title even before title III. I think the relationship there is very interesting. I was interested in the discussion about the situation in Austin in particular.

In the overview volume, there are two case studies of the inter-relationship of ESEA titles, one in Boston, a title I and a title III. The other one is in Austin, Tex.

I looked around for positive examples of what is being done. In Austin there is a very interesting example where a triple AAAS science inquiry project, directed by a young fellow, Dave Butts, in Austin, has caught fire.

This was an example of a non-Federal program which went over very well. Then in order to get it out wider a title III project was brought in to demonstrate it. Meanwhile, the R. & D. lab at the University of Texas was doing the research on it. They were bringing teachers in to orient them, bringing teachers back to retool them, and then the regional lab was taking the results and putting them out over a wider area.

This relationship is good. But the interesting thing in the Texas agency was one of the coordinating the whole operation which to me is a very legitimate function.

No other agency could have performed the coordinating role here.

I see this as a relationship of where each aspect certainly had a role, which is not unique to it, but, in a sense, by working together, this developed a rather exciting study. It is what we should be getting much more of in terms of various relationships.

Mr. BRADENAS. I take it from what you just said, Dr. Miller, and what Dr. Hitt said a few moments ago, in response to Mrs. Green's question, that a fair characterization of your general posture in this entire area would be that we need a diversity of sources of support, thereby enhancing the prospects of creativity and higher quality, while at the same time we need to maintain the maximum degree of coordination so that we make the wisest possible use of scarce resources—money, people, facilities—and that we would lose, perhaps, some of those benefits if we tried to insist on a more monolithic structure for both obtaining financial support and administering programs.

There have been several rhetorical questions asked here today, and now mine is among them.

Have I misrepresented your attitudes? I would be glad to have any of you comment on that observation.

Mr. HITT. I would agree fully with what you have said. Really, the Texas State Department of Education plays a very heavy role in this thing of coordination.

Some of the ideas are generated by our shop. Some by some of the other shops. But sooner or later we see to it that all those that have something to bring to bear on this, and some resources, do get involved

in the act. This is the basis of, really one of the basic reasons I am suggesting that the State departments be involved directly in title III operations.

If they are not strong enough to run, let's let them start crawling some, by giving them some responsibility. You can't coordinate this.

If we did not have perfect coordination with the U.S. Office of Education we would have trouble getting these things coordinated so that they tie together.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Mr. Miller?

Mr. MILLER. I concur fully with those comments. I think it certainly expresses what the consultants in the title III study felt and what my own observation would lead me to believe would be much more apparent in the future.

We do have some other forces, however, such as universities, such as private businesses in some areas, that are doing inroads, and the new extent of the military as a new force in education, and certainly the new force of business.

So when you analyze the whole ball of wax you have an interesting interplay of forces of which only four or five are related to Federal moneys. But others shift in and out.

Mr. BRADEMAs. What we are really developing, then, it seems to me, in the sphere of education, is something of the same kind of pattern we have in American economic life where we have an impact on the part of private resources as well as State and local, and Federal-public resources.

It is part the genius of our mixed economy that we have been so enormously productive, economically. One might hope that that same combination of forces would cause the same high quality and productivity in education.

Mr. HITT. Your industrial groups are moving into education very rapidly.

Sister FARRELL. I think very frequently we miss the spirit of title III on this point. We certainly are all committed to diversity, everyone in this room. There is no question here about the fact that the State has a very definite role to play in education.

But so has the Federal Government a role. I think it is precisely this sort of thing that the Federal Government will be able to play its role and add this diversity. This is a title that requires an imaginative mind to understand. It is not just as technical as some people here this morning might suggest it is.

We don't question the State's ability, but we do know, from our study of this title and its intent, that it needs national perspective, a national balance, a national network of centers, if we are going to realize its genius.

Mr. BRADEMAs. I want to thank all of you for a most useful discussion.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Quie.

Mr. QUIE. Dr. Hitt, when you went through this line of organizations with Mrs. Green, the R. & D. centers, the regional laboratories and the supplemental centers, nothing was mentioned of the clearing-house.

When the Commissioner of Education testified before us, I believe he said there would be 10 clearinghouses around the country, in addition to the 20 regional labs and the R. & D. centers.

Do you have any of those clearinghouses? I assume they might be connected with ERIC.

Mr. HITT. We have been very active in the ERIC project. I assume he was referring to a network for dissemination purposes. Our planning staff is constantly developing brief descriptions of activities or special projects that are being carried on and sending them into the U.S. Office for inclusion in ERIC.

The regional lab, in our case, has taken this thing of dissemination as one of their primary responsibilities. They have organized so that they are staffing to assist in the implementation of this clearinghouse operation, of moving information out.

To find a good answer is no good unless we get it into the works.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Which subject will your clearinghouse specialize in?

Mr. HITT. I don't know whether they have been designated. I am not familiar with this idea of 20 clearinghouses.

Mr. BRADEMAS. As he told me, they would have all of these clearinghouses, and each one would have a different subject, just as each R. & D. center has a different subject.

I understand the regional labs are trying to coordinate everything?

Mr. MILLER. That is the basic approach. There is one, for example, in the small schools in New Mexico. There is one under the vocational education at Ohio State. There are a number of them which have been designated as clearinghouses, depositories of fugitive materials that can be then put on cards and developed in some way that can be useful.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Then we really have three channels, don't we, through which information is coming by an organization to the local school district?

One is the State department of education which transmits a substantial amount of information, innovative ideas and education, and then running from the R. & D. centers through the regional laboratories to the supplemental centers and down to the local school, and the third way would be from the R. & D. centers to the specialized clearinghouses and then to the local schools.

Mr. MILLER. I would say all of these would be involved. I would emphasize the point that Commissioner Hitt made, that this information is of no value unless it gets to people who can use it and will use it.

Both can and will are important. Just giving a flow of information is not enough. The information needs to be packaged. This is quite an art in itself, packaging information so that it can be used, so that systems will pick it up. It is not just a flow that we are concerned about. It is the type, the nature of the flow, and what is said to whom and how.

I would suggest we are still infants in the area of dissemination. We have packaged reams of materials and millions of words, just sort of hoping by the shotgun blast somehow we would get there. I think the centers being developed in Texas are very conscious of the dissemination problem and the implementation problem.

So it is getting information out to be sure, but I would say that is just half of it. The other half is the right information at the right time, so it can be used by the right people.

Mr. BRADEMAS. With all these ventures going on at the present time which I just explained, is there then the necessity of comprehensive planning grants, for a State agency to then be set up to make sense of all of this which is being made available?

Mr. HITT. I can't answer that directly, but if you recognize this it is one reason why we committed so much of our title V ESEA money to this area of planning, because if we did not gear ourselves as a department, through the use of title V money, to establish a planning capability, we would not have been in a position to coordinate these many activities that are emerging.

This is one thing that led us to establishing these 20 regional supplemental centers as a State-oriented group, with State, local, and Federal financing flowing into them. So we will have a voice working closely with these school districts.

Mr. QUIE. Will these new, comprehensive planning grants, if the program is enacted by Congress, enable you to do what you have already decided to do with title V money?

Mr. HITT. It will enable us to expand our planning capabilities and to shift some of the money now committed for this purpose into some other areas of needs, to broaden our leadership role as a State department of education.

Mr. QUIE. Is there anything in the comprehensive planning grant proposal that you are not already doing? I am not saying other States are doing, but I am just referring to Texas.

Mr. HITT. No, the language of that act is written in broad terms and we are operating in those broad areas in each of those.

Mr. QUIE. So this fits Texas the way you have been operating?

Mr. HITT. Very well.

Mr. QUIE. And perhaps it could be said that it will then provide some money for other States to do what Texas has done.

Mr. HITT. Remember, I said I did not think we ought to splinter title V. We ought to leave it as one act and not set a section up for planning. It can be done the other way.

Mr. QUIE. Sister Miriam, I would like to talk to you about the National Teacher Corps, if I may. This tends to be my pet subject.

Sister FARRELL. Are you for or against it?

Mr. QUIE. I voted against it the last time. Let me say this, in explanation that I believe it is wise for the Federal Government to make some expenditures in bringing people into the teaching profession who later in life indicate an interest in it. I think it is necessary for us to give special training and assistance from the Federal level to reach the culturally deprived children.

I have no quarrel with that. I also think it is a great idea to involve the internship as a part of teaching. I am familiar with the work of St. Thomas College in St. Paul, Minn., with this same type of a training, utilizing the internship method.

They only use 1 year, however, instead of 2 years. The teachers receive a master's degree at the end of 1 year of internship. I understand an explanation will be presented from St. Thomas next week so we will get some firsthand information on it.

There are other parts of the Teachers Corps that worry me. First, what has your involvement been with the National Teachers Corps?

Sister FARRELL. None. I just envision it as an answer to some of our problems.

Mr. QUIE. I just wanted to know if I were talking to a person who was running a program?

Sister FARRELL. No, it just looks very good at this point.

Mr. QUIE. You say, then, in your strong support of the Teachers Corps, "that our present culture is such that this type of dedication can be made attractive to young people who constitute a vast reservoir of talents and willingness to serve."

Sister FARRELL. I got carried away in prose there, I suppose. What I meant was that we have had experience with the VISTA workers in Santa Clara County. Most of these people come from eastern colleges, I guess just to get to California.

I observed tremendous potential dedication there. I was thinking this summer, as they worked with the migratory workers, if these people were in the field of education what a potential power they would carry for setting up temporary schools for the children of migrant workers.

When you say this in the proposed amendments, I immediately made the connection. I do think that there are young people who, if they were so motivated, would be willing to give a year or two in this area.

Mr. QUIE. The reason I wanted to ask you this question, Sister Miriam, is that you are involved in an installation that has as its purpose the development of this dedication of people's lives. I was educated in a Lutheran college and part of this whole thing was the teaching of dedication.

What has bothered me is that it is necessary evidently, in order to develop the kind of education we want to put a Federal label on a person, calling him a Peace Corps, VISTA, or a Teachers Corps man. Why can't we do this, at least in the institution such as you are connected with, in developing that dedication?

As I put it to many of the clergymen in my church, why can't people dedicated to the work of Jesus Christ be willing to do it without putting the U.S. Federal label on it, or in this case wear a tie clasp with an apple on it, or a pin for the women with an apple on it?

Sister FARRELL. I can't help but agree with you, but I also have to be very realistic, that this is an ideal. We have not achieved it, have we?

Mr. QUIE. I don't agree with you. I think that there are so many people dedicated in this country than we will ever see in the Teachers Corps. They are talking about 1,200,000 and 5,500,000 is what they are aiming for. This is a drop in the bucket.

If we are to reach the socially and culturally deprived children by this method, we will never make it. We will make it by your institutions and by public schools, who have this dedication. That is where we have to do it. I am worried about us having one program and putting a Federal label on it. I would rather see us do a much bigger job and provide Federal assistance to help young people go into this type of profession.

Why do we have to pin the label on them?

Sister FARRELL. I don't see the distinction. How do you propose to do it?

Mr. QUIE. I would say it ought to be connected with the other teacher training programs, as we are going to consolidate them all in one section, I understand, and have the money available for an institution of higher learning which wants to go into the training of teachers to reach the socially and culturally deprived, and also as a part of the working out of the internship.

But they would be no different from any other. For instance, we have a Federal program for the training of guidance counselors. I don't think we ought to have a guidance counselor corps in the country to get the dedication.

The people I have met are pretty dedicated individuals.

Sister FARRELL. I agree that this can be proliferated beyond all sense but I was thinking more in terms of the work to be done. The work has to be done. It is not being done. There is a shortage of teachers. Sometimes I think we can't wait for the ideal. We have to be realistic. I have no feelings for instance for or against the National Teacher Corps as such, but I know that the work has to be done and has to be done soon.

Mr. QUIE. I am sorry I get worked up about this. It is not your fault at all. I thought by doing it I might get you angry enough to chop my head off. I guess we are both following the same line anyway.

Sister FARRELL. I think we are, I might mention, apropos of what you said, that this is the type of dedication which we try to teach.

Today we are suffering, actually, because of that teaching. As I am sure you know, if you read the papers, there are now fewer knocking at our door because we try to get over to the students we teach they have a real obligation to their country, to their community, to be of service, what are they doing? They are going into VISTA and the Peace Corps, and they are not knocking at our doors. So we are suffering from the very thing we are teaching.

Mr. QUIE. I also realize one problem in the Teacher Corps was that this was the most lucrative program of receiving a master's degree that anybody could find. That kind of removes a little bit of the feeling of dedication.

I know that many of them, however, are dedicated individuals. Since all of you are connected with higher education, do you think it is necessary to have a national recruitment of such individuals, or do you think if you had the programs available in the State between an institution of higher learning and the local schools the people would find there their way to it as they presently are finding their way to a number of the other programs of education beyond the baccalaureate degree?

Mr. HITT. I am not really well acquainted with how the Teacher Corps operates, but I have never been able, in my own mind, to see the need for this kind of organization to do the job of getting teachers into the teaching profession.

I think we could do the job better if the institutions were involved in it, and if the public schools were involved in it, and the private

school group as well. We have not done too bad a job over the years in developing these personnel.

Chairman PERKINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUITE. I will yield to the chairman.

Chairman PERKINS. As a school administrator, Mr. Hitt, isn't it true that national feeling of teachers for the Teacher Corps is nothing, more or less, than a categorical approach or a zeroing in on the disadvantaged areas of the country? We know it is not the sole answer to the great shortage of teachers, but it is more or less a zeroing in on the worst disadvantaged areas of the country.

There is nothing wrong with this type of approach because the local educational agencies have all the autonomy that they have in any other instances. Whether or not they want the interns or whether or not they want the teachers, is up to them.

Do you approve of this approach?

Mr. HITT. I can't completely disagree with the approach, but I think the point I am trying to make is that it could have been accomplished through existing channels just as effectively through using the church-related colleges and the public colleges, the public schools and private schools to move into it, had they been given the resources and the categorical requirements that are embodied in this.

Mr. QUITE. I would say you are talking about something that does not exist, Mr. Chairman, the recruitment of these people from areas where there is a high incidence of educational deprivation. These people can come and apply for the Teacher Corps from any place. They could come from Westchester County.

Chairman PERKINS. Let's take the case of New York. The city school superintendent, Dr. Donovan, testified a couple of days ago that the Teacher Corps was operating in 16 of the elementary and junior high schools that serve the disadvantaged areas in the city of New York, and that they had about 75 interns, and 25 or 20 team teachers in those schools, also, that the interns spent most of their weekends and extra hours in community service mainly mixing with the students and assisting the students in many ways, that the program was very effective, furthermore, that they added stimuli in the disadvantaged areas.

In the course of the program, for the training of the interns, for the training of the teachers, I believe it is particularly suitable or fitted for the disadvantaged areas. Do you approve of that approach?

Mr. HITT. I see nothing wrong with the approach. The point I was making was that it could have been done through one of two ways, either through the Corps or through the existing institutions had the money been put in their hands.

Chairman PERKINS. And the proposal here leads up to local boards of education or the local education agency as to whether they want to have the services of the interns or a team teacher, or a member of the Teacher Corps to come into the school system.

Mr. HITT. That is correct.

Mr. QUITE. You are really not addressing yourself, Mr. Chairman, to the main difference between the Teacher Corps and a similar program run by an institution of higher learning in cooperation with the local school district.

There are only two real differences. One is that the Teacher Corps man has the Federal label with the tie clasp and second, there is national recruitment. Everybody who wants to apply is then put into a machine and supposedly they can be selected out of that machine or they can go where they feel like. There is really no selection of these individuals from the worst areas.

And already the Teacher Corps has found out that this was a mistake for the experienced teachers. The way they will operate in future years, they say, is that the school district, wherever possible, will select the experienced teacher for their own system because then it works better that way. It is only in the school system where they have nobody interested in it that they will try to select them.

We have already found out that here they are wrong for the experienced teacher. My question is, Why continue this one system of national recruiting for the rest?

Mr. MILLER. Actually, the Teacher Corps should not be needed in American education. Had the system been going well we would have had plenty to go into the most difficult, the most deprived, and the schools of greatest need. We do not have teachers to go into these schools, this is an unfortunate fact. Secondly, the Teacher Corps will not appreciably change the tremendous quantitative need.

There is no question about it being a drop in the bucket. Thirdly, the teachers colleges themselves will not, as they are presently going, adapt themselves quickly enough to meet the needs here.

In my opinion, the most conservative segment in American education is in the teacher training institutions. We have not moved with the times. We have not moved as fast as the elementary and secondary education. Therefore, there is a critical need in the deprived slum areas, in every major city or moderate size city of America, for people to go in with some background or understanding of it.

The Teacher Corps does represent a drop in the bucket but it is a forward step. One of the things that I actually see it doing in one city, and I will not name the city, is that it is serving as a spur for the colleges to examine their own programs.

They have not been training teachers to go into these areas and they know it. But they have not done anything about it. This is having this interesting side effect. I would, in a sense, agree to expand the program considerably, if it is going to be done.

But with the mistakes, and there are mistakes though they are correcting the program, I think it does serve a useful purpose on the teacher training institutions, as well as an immediate effect in terms of some of the places where it is actually in operation.

Mr. QUÉE. Do you think you need additional recruitment to get these people?

Mr. MILLER. I have very mixed emotions about this. I would much prefer doing it quietly. I just do not know.

Personally, I don't think that style. This is my own personal view. Whether or not this is the right thing to do in terms of the program is another whole question. But it may well have some advantages that are not apparent.

The idea of recruiting people who have some experience in general area may not be a bad idea. The compensatory education program

in San Francisco, one of the most successful ones in the country, recruits teachers from the area who are outstanding teachers. They are put right back in the area after special training. This program has been working out.

It is acknowledged as the best in the country. So the national recruitment may have some disadvantages. I am speculating on that aspect of it. I don't know.

Chairman PERKINS. The gentleman from Minnesota and I well know, since we have been on this committee for several years, that national recruitment is not the answer for this by any means. But I view the National Teacher Corps recruitment as more or less a pilot program, zeroing in on some of the most disadvantaged areas in the country.

For instance, there is the Watts area in California, where they have institutions in the community to give these teachers special training. I am looking for the day when we can go far beyond any national recruitment and get away from that approach completely.

Mr. QUIE. I share the view of the chairman on this point.

Chairman PERKINS. At the moment, with this limited program, I think there is much to be gained from this approach, at the moment.

Mr. QUIE. If this program works out well and is expanded, I just would be disturbed if we ended up using a system of national recruitment to get a job done. I would like to see that dropped. Also I would be disturbed if we needed to put a Federal label on people to get dedication. In that case, we better get to producing a lot more pins so we can put them on everybody who requires one.

Chairman PERKINS. Let me say to my distinguished colleague that I likewise would be disturbed if we would not broaden our educational facilities, and do something about keeping our good teachers that leave the disadvantaged areas. Right now I know that the metropolitan areas will be the greatest beneficiaries of this program, and that the rural areas such as I represent certainly will receive very little benefit from the National Teacher Corps.

But I am not disturbed about this so called label for the fact that the local school districts have complete autonomy. They make all the decisions. For that reason, I don't think my distinguished colleague from Minnesota has anything to fear. The local school districts will make a determination as to whether or not they should have the interns or the teachers.

Mr. QUIE. My relationship of local systems of government is anytime they get something absolutely free, it looks pretty good to them. We have to also remember they don't pay one red cent for the use of these teachers.

Chairman PERKINS. That is because we provide here, if they don't have the resources. I think it is well that we have this experiment. I think this experiment will bring about, sooner or later, a broadening, much broadening, of the program from the Federal viewpoint to where we can provide funds and leave it to the States to do something about the disadvantaged.

Mr. QUIE. St. Paul, Minn., already pays for the salaries of these interns on a similar program, whether or not in the Teacher Corps. To me this is greater proof of this program.

Chairman PERKINS. That is true.

Now the gentleman is getting into an area where they have the resources to do that.

Mr. QUIE. They are a center city. You have heard what the center city people have said about their resources. They just think it is important to reach the culturally and socially deprived kids. What I am getting at is we don't have all the sensitivity on the Federal level. I was impressed with what Dr. Miller said in his statement about the parent school board support.

There is just a tremendous reservoir of creativity and support here. I like to keep saying this is where the job is going to be done.

Chairman PERKINS. I think your statement is sound. I don't think we have the community, citizenry and so forth involved enough. They can make a much greater contribution than they are making at the present time.

Mr. QUIE. Those are all the questions I have. Thank you very much.

Chairman PERKINS. Let me thank you all for your appearance today. We do appreciate your coming.

Dr. Miller, we do appreciate copies of your study.

Thank you one and all for coming.

The committee will recess until 9:30 a.m., Monday morning, gentlemen.

(Whereupon, at 12:45 p.m., the committee recessed, to reconvene at 9:30 a.m., Monday, March 13, 1967.)

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1967

MONDAY, MARCH 13, 1967

**HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,
*Washington, D.C.***

The committee met at 9:15 a.m., pursuant to recess, in room 2175, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Carl D. Perkins (chairman of the committee) presiding.

Present: Representatives Perkins, Pucinski, Hawkins, Ford, Bell, Scherle, and Esch.

Staff members present: Robert E. McCord, senior specialist; H. D. Reed, Jr., general counsel; William D. Gaul, associate general counsel; Benjamin F. Reeves, editor; Louise M. Dargans, research assistant, and Michael J. Bernstein, minority counsel for education and labor.

Chairman PERKINS. The committee will come to order.

We have with us this morning several distinguished Kentuckians. Mr. Marvin Dodson, executive secretary of the Kentucky Education Association in Louisville, Ky., will you come forward; and all the county school superintendents that have been invited by Mr. Dodson, or anyone else, please congregate around the table there the best you can. We will try to get started this morning. Proceed.

STATEMENT OF MARVIN DODSON, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, KENTUCKY EDUCATION ASSOCIATION, LOUISVILLE, KY.

Mr. DODSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I want to express my appreciation to your distinguished chairman and other members of the committee for this opportunity to testify very briefly on H.R. 6230.

Before getting into that, I want to say how pleased we are that you have a distinguished Kentuckian as chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee. Like the ad we have all seen on TV, Carl Perkins stands "10 feet tall" among school people in Kentucky. We are extremely proud of him and believe he will make a real contribution to the schools of the Nation in the position he now holds. I know that this is not the purpose of this appearance, but I could spend the time allotted to me in describing the very fine qualities which Congressman Perkins has.

By way of introduction, I am J. Marvin Dodson, executive secretary of the Kentucky Education Association. KEA is an organization of certificated personnel in Kentucky and has approximately 31,000 members. This is about 97 or 98 percent of the potential of the qualified personnel in Kentucky.

Since we in KEA are in no way responsible for the administration of the funds distributed under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, nor is it the recipient of any, my testimony, naturally, will have to deal with some of my own observations and reactions which I have received from those who are more closely identified with the administration of the funds.

I would like to express appreciation to the committee for what the Elementary and Secondary Education Act has meant to our schools in Kentucky. Even though KEA is on record, and has been for a long time, favoring general Federal aid with the State being allowed to develop programs within the framework of its particular needs, we believe that the Elementary and Secondary Education Act has certainly brought improvements to our schools. Through the years, serious attempts have been made in the Congress to get general aid for public education but, as you know, it has met with defeat time after time. It is possible that this act is the only way that public education can be improved at this time. On the other hand, this does not minimize our conviction in the belief that the best possible way in which the Federal Government can assist public education is through some sort of general aid with an equalization factor in the distribution formula.

Most States have developed foundation programs for the distribution of State funds and, in my judgment, the bulk of Federal aid for education should come to the States under some approach similar to the foundation program laws which operate in most of the States throughout the Nation. This could be an objective formula which considers financial ability of a State with relation to its participation in Federal funds. Federal aid to education will never quite get the job done until this principle of distribution is recognized by the Congress.

It is our belief that all aid for elementary and secondary education under this act should be channeled through the U.S. Office of Education and the State departments of education to the local school districts within the State law. As I understand it, there are presently some programs which are not channeled through these particular agencies. For example, the Headstart program, which is currently administered by OEO, and the National Teachers Corps which is directly administered from the U.S. Office of Education to the local school districts are not handled in this manner.

I am sure you will hear a great deal about this during the period of hearings, but there seems to be a need for improved timing of authorization, appropriations, guidelines, and allocations. In my judgment, this will facilitate more effective planning insofar as programs are concerned.

In our State, there is still a tremendous need for school buildings and facilities. In our State, according to a recent survey, the need for classroom construction and related facilities is in the neighborhood of \$143 million. The Kentucky Legislature, in trying to meet the increased demands for teacher salaries to keep them anywhere near the level they should be, has been unable to make any appropriation at the State level for buildings since 1960. The lack of appropriations by the legislature for school buildings has not only limited

the school boards in their abilities to build buildings out of current revenues, but it also has limited their capacities for the amortization of school bonds. The amount of bonds to be amortized by each district is determined by the resources which the district has for this purpose. This usually is determined by the revenue from special building taxes and capital outlay funds from the foundation program. Naturally, when the capital outlay fund remains constant over a period of years, the ability of a board of education to amortize school bonds is seriously crippled. Because of the factors which I have mentioned, there has been an accumulation of needs over the past 7 or 8 years which seriously impedes our education progress in Kentucky. Boards of education are limited by a statutory tax rate limitation that prohibits them from raising the necessary additional revenue at the local level.

Let me again express my appreciation for this opportunity to express my views on H.R. 6230 and also express my gratefulness to the members of this committee for what it is doing toward improvement of public education in this country.

Chairman PERKINS. Let me say, Dr. Dodson, that I appreciate your coming. You and I have marched up and down a lot of mountains frequently in the direction of Federal aid to education, commencing back in 1949 and 1950.

Mr. DODSON. Right.

Chairman PERKINS. I am delighted that you are making some progress. We have not been able to branch out in the direction discussed in your statement, but I feel that sooner or later we are headed in that direction.

Mr. DODSON. That is good.

Chairman PERKINS. Thank you for an outstanding statement. Are you going to preside over the panel?

Mr. DODSON. I will, if you would like me to.

Chairman PERKINS. Yes.

Mr. DODSON. The next one, Mr. Chairman, will be Mr. G. C. Burkhead, superintendent of Hardin public schools down in Elizabethtown.

STATEMENT OF G. C. BURKHEAD, SUPERINTENDENT OF HARDIN COUNTY SCHOOLS, ELIZABETHTOWN, KY.

Mr. BURKHEAD. Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of the Education Committee:

I am G. C. Burkhead, superintendent of schools in Hardin County, Elizabethtown, Ky. May I express my appreciation for the opportunity to present certain facts and viewpoints on the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and amendments of 1967. I would also like to request the privilege of commenting on the operation and results of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

Kentucky is a State where 24 percent of its youth are from families with incomes less than \$2,000. Financing schools, even with heavy support from the State under the minimum foundation program, has fallen far short of providing the bare essentials of an adequate school program. The act has greatly aided in providing needed equipment,

materials, books, personnel, planning, enrichment of curriculums, and, in some instances, construction. On the whole, the act has been very helpful in spite of its many weaknesses.

I suggest that the law would become more effective and efficient if the following points could be given some needed study and, in my opinion, urgent attention and action.

1. The guidelines under which the present law is operating should be less stringent, giving school authorities greater choice in spending the money where it is most needed and will do the most good.

2. Much better planning and use of funds could be made if school authorities were given assurance of funds several months in advance instead of a few days. Crash programs are poorly planned and are, as a result, inefficient.

3. Excessive paperwork under title I applications should be reduced. For example, more paperwork has been required in the 2 years of title I operation than has been necessary in the 15 years of operation under Public Law 874.

4. The law, as it now stands, is discriminating, particularly so in large school districts. In my county of Hardin, for example, there are 13 schools; 9 of these qualify under the act, and 4 do not. School A, which is Upton, has 160 children with a qualifying percentage of 25; school B, Radcliffe, has 1,000 children with a nonqualifying percentage of 12. In school A there are 40 economically deprived children; in school B, there are 120 children who are economically deprived, and these 120 children are denied any benefit under title I of the act. Thus the greater number of children in school B are denied, while the smaller number in school A are favored.

This is not true in a district which has only one school, for in such a district no one is denied. This discrimination is as unjust as the "Colonial Saw" which provided a fine for the rich man and lashes for the poor man for the same offense. This should be corrected so that every underprivileged child has the same opportunity regardless of where he resides. It is recognized that we could have elected to choose the schools which have the greatest numbers rather than using the percentage method in choosing. This would have denied the smaller, poorer school of the aid which it so desperately needed. In a sense, therefore, there was no choice.

5. The OEO Community Action Committee requirements should be changed in reference to selecting personnel. Presently, this is in conflict with Kentucky State law which provides that the superintendent of schools must recommend all personnel. The program should be administered by a single agency if it is to be most effective.

Chairman PERKINS. Before you leave No. 4, what method do you use in locating the educationally deprived in your hometown under the guidelines?

Mr. BURKHEAD. The principals and teachers select the children. They know the children well enough to know whether they are economically deprived.

Chairman PERKINS. Do you have a census as to the income of the families, or something like that?

Mr. BURKHEAD. Mainly through the welfare agency in the county we are able to determine how many.

Chairman PERKINS. Do you mean to tell me that the guidelines have prevented you from giving assistance to one of your communities where you have two school systems with 120 educationally deprived children?

Mr. BURKHEAD. That is right, Congressman. You either have to take the percentage method or the numbers method. That is the guideline. We made a desperate effort to get Radcliffe qualified, because 75 percent of those children at the Radcliffe School are federally connected. The children there are deprived educationally because they have been in schools all over the world, but we failed.

I am not sure that that is the guideline from the Federal level or the State level.

Chairman PERKINS. How is the income in general of the school where you have the 120 that were denied participation, compared with the income level of the other school districts that do participate?

Mr. BURKHEAD. The income is much higher in the area of Fort Knox, because the Upton School is in the southern part of the county and largely agricultural.

Chairman PERKINS. The reason that the school did not qualify is that it is in the Fort Knox area?

Mr. BURKHEAD. But the 120 children there are just as poor as the 40 children down in Upton.

Chairman PERKINS. Go ahead.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question about five before he goes on?

Chairman PERKINS. Yes.

Mr. FORD. You said in the second sentence of the fifth recommendation that community action requirements conflict with the Kentucky State law which provides the superintendent of schools must recommend all personnel. Are you talking about Headstart there?

Mr. BURKHEAD. Yes, sir; Headstart. And under the OEO program, it is the same.

Mr. FORD. If we made Headstart an educational program as distinguished from the community action program, would the Kentucky law require that all the personnel approved by the public school agency could be employed in the program?

Mr. BURKHEAD. That is right.

Mr. FORD. Would that, then, under Kentucky law, prohibit a parochial school teacher from teaching in Headstart?

Mr. BURKHEAD. I believe it would, but I am not sure. I think it would; yes.

Chairman PERKINS. Go ahead.

Mr. BURKHEAD. No. 6. In my school district, and in Kentucky as a whole, there is a serious shortage of classrooms. The money received cannot be spent as wisely—I am talking about money received under title I—or as effectively, since there is no space in which to house the children for special classes. In some instances, makeshift rooms or substandard rooms are being used; however, there are very, very few of these available. The lack of classrooms is probably the greatest handicap for school officials in carrying out an effective program under ESEA. Construction money should either be made available under the act or a new construction act passed.

This lack of space has prevented school systems from making the most efficient use of funds and has led in some instances to the spending of money for programs which do the least good. The pressure to spend the money has led to impractical and unnecessary programs in some instances. Such money could have been spent wisely had there been available space in which to set up special classes for the mentally handicapped, special remedial programs, and enrichment programs. For instance, we have one class for educable children (IQ's 50 to 80) in our system; with space available, there could have been 10 or 12 of these very much needed units.

7. Local school districts should be allowed funds for administering title II of the act.

8. It is my understanding that title V of ESEA may be amended to include a section B which would permit the Governors of the States to set up a special agency to plan for education. Far too much politics already exists in school management and planning; this will invite and encourage even more. This type of planning could best be done through the already existing Department of Education, where machinery and trained personnel are available for that purpose. It would appear that the suggested \$15 million annually for 5 years is an exorbitant amount for this program.

9. Headstart is the best program in all of the categorical aid programs. It should not be tampered with by community action committees who are neither trained nor qualified to recommend employees to superintendents of schools. To demand or require the superintendent to choose employees from their recommendations is inviting weakness and discord in the program.

10. It is the belief of school administrators in Kentucky that the U.S. Office of Education should be the sole agency for the administration of education legislation. At the annual midwinter meeting of the Kentucky Association of School Administrators, the following was one of the resolutions passed by the group.

Federal Aid to Education—This association recognizes and supports the growing National interest in education as exemplified by the Congress of the United States in its passage of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, the Vocational Education Act of 1963, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, and many other laws which provide for national support of education. We are concerned, however, with the wide proliferation of responsibility for administration of these laws among so many different agencies of the Federal Government.

The United States Office of Education should be designated by the Congress as the sole agency for the administration and implementation of all laws affecting education. All such laws should clearly state that the U.S. Office of Education shall administer such programs, below college and university level, through the various state departments of education in accordance with State Plans which clearly provide that the intent of Congress shall be completely fulfilled. The Congress of the United States should not tolerate guide lines for State Plans which promulgate the bias and theories of individuals or agencies which go beyond the laws enacted.

11. The suggested plan to use one-half of the national average of per pupil expenditures for education as a new base for distributing funds under title I is sound. This would enable the purpose of the act to be carried out in the education of the disadvantaged child rather than merely dividing the funds.

The observations and criticisms presented above do not mean that the law has failed to accomplish at least a part of its intended purposes. Certainly, the aid received has had a tremendous effect for good in our local educational program and, I am sure, this same good has been effected throughout our State and Nation. I believe that these criticisms represent the general thinking of many superintendents over the State and Nation. It is hoped that careful consideration will be given to these suggestions and that, with changes in the law, even greater achievements could be made in our school programs for the disadvantaged and economically deprived children.

PUBLIC LAWS 874 AND 815 (TITLE I OF THE 1965 ESEA ACT)

I would now like to discuss Public Laws 874 and 815 as they now relate to Kentucky.

Since the beginning of World War II, children of both military and civilian personnel from the Fort Knox Military Reservation have each succeeding year placed a greater burden on the schools of Hardin County and other adjacent districts. This is also true in the Fort Campbell area. Approximately 110,000 acres of land have been removed from the tax rolls in order to increase the acreage of the Fort Knox Reservation.

Hardin County is for the most part a rural county. In more than half of the counties of Kentucky, there has been a loss in population since World War II. In Hardin County, the school population has doubled. With this pupil increase, there has not been a corresponding increase in economic growth. There has been less than a 10-percent growth in financial support of schools at the local level (1965 Statistical Report, State Department of Education).

There are now enrolled in the Hardin County schools a total of 7,220 students. Of this number, 2,755 are impact students. The previous year, there were 2,450 impact students. This is an increase of 305 impact students this year. With the present increase in activities on Fort Knox, a helicopter school, and a \$16 million building program, the number of impact students will probably increase to 1,000 additional over last year before the end of the fiscal year. Our school financing, even with the increased aid from Public Laws 874 and 815, has caused tight budgeting, budgeting so tight as to be dangerous. Financial difficulties increase month by month.

School districts in the area of Fort Knox and Fort Campbell are facing financial disaster and in some cases bankruptcy because of the crippling amendment slipped into the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

Mr. FORD. What amendment do you have reference to there?

Mr. BURKHEAD. I am referring to the amendment that in any Federal installation where the State does not contribute to education of the children in the dependent schools that property will no longer be considered eligible for funds under Public Law 874.

Mr. FORD. Is that an amendment—

Chairman PERKINS. You will note it is on page 7 of the statement.

Mr. BURKHEAD. The following new provisions were added by the amendment to section 10 of Public Law 815 and by section 229 of Public Law 89-750.

If no tax revenues of a State or of any political subdivision of the State may be expended for the free public education of children who reside on any Federal property within the State, or if no tax revenues of a State are allocated for the free public education of such children, then the property on which such children reside shall not be considered Federal property for the purposes of Section 5 of this Act.

Section 204 added the following new provision to section 6 of title I, Public Law 874:

(f) If no tax revenues of a State or of any political subdivision of the State may be expended for the free public education of children who reside on any Federal property within the State, or if no tax revenues of a State are allocated for the free public education of such children, then the property on which such children reside shall not be considered Federal property for the purposes of sections 3 and 4 of this act. If a local educational agency refuses for any other reason to provide in any fiscal year free public education for children who reside on Federal property which is within the school district of that agency or which, in the determination of the Commissioner, would be within that school district if it were not Federal property, there shall be deducted from any amount to which the local educational agency is otherwise entitled for that year under section 3 or 4 an amount equal to (1) the amount (if any) by which the cost to the Commissioner of providing free public education for that year for each such child exceeds the local contribution rate of that agency for that year, multiplied by (2) the number of such children.

Boards of education and school districts affected in Kentucky are helpless within themselves in complying with these amendments. Attorneys general in Kentucky have ruled repeatedly that Kentucky law forbids the State and local school districts from spending tax dollars in the operation of schools on Federal property since the property is not considered a part of the State of Kentucky. During the past 16 years, numerous appeals have been made to the attorneys general of Kentucky for a reversal of this ruling. The present attorney general is studying the problem. The chance, however, for a favorable ruling on the matter is very slim.

Without a favorable ruling from the attorney general's office, we in Kentucky have but one alternative. The State legislature will meet a few months before the amendments go into effect. An effort must be made to get legislation passed which would allow school districts to operate schools on Federal property. This legislation, which would save only a few districts from financial ruin, would be extremely difficult to pass.

Here is the problem in getting enabling State legislation. Kentucky is a pauper State. Greater demands for additional school funds are made each succeeding meeting of the legislature. The legislature in the past 10 years has been rather generous with the schools despite limited State resources. A sales tax was passed; additional enabling legislation was passed in order to allow districts to increase funds at the local level. With all of this, Kentucky still ranks 44th in the Nation with its schools.

To ask the State legislature to appropriate \$2 million in extra school funds to provide for 10,000 children thrust on them suddenly by Federal legislation seems unfair and unjust. There are a great many arguments against such legislation and very few to support it. For example, this \$2 million cost to the State would give each teacher in the Commonwealth an \$80 raise in salary, and Kentucky ranks 44th

in this category in the Nation. There is just no good argument for getting such legislation passed.

What will happen to my school district of Hardin County with its 7,220 schoolchildren if this amendment remains a part of the impacted area legislation and if the attorney general of Kentucky fails to give a favorable ruling and the State legislature fails to pass enabling legislation?

There are at present 2,755 children eligible to receive aid from Public Law 874. Under the Armed Forces interpretation, in Hardin County, 1,147 of these children would qualify under the new law. This would mean that we would have to deduct \$184,920 from the 1968 school budget. This would amount to a cut in salary of more than \$600 for each of our 300 teachers. Such a reduction in salary would not be allowed under the law, which sets a minimum salary which must be paid. Even though the law allowed this, our teachers would not stay in the system and it would be impossible to hire others. Without staff, our schools would be ruined, and 7,220 children would suffer the consequences.

We have no alternatives. We are at the mercy of three forces: the attorney general of the State, the State legislature, and the Congress of the United States. One of these agencies must act or our school system will be wrecked. What is true in Hardin County will also be true of others in the poor Southland.

Chairman PERKINS. Have you discussed this particular amendment with your impacted people throughout the country? Is this the only hardship that exists in Kentucky? As I recall, the people pretty well supported this amendment last year throughout the county, I could be wrong.

Mr. BURKHEAD. It was in there, Mr. Perkins. Of course, there were about eight States affected, and they are the Southern States.

Chairman PERKINS. Let me say to my good friend that this was discussed openly. We all knew the true import of it when we put it in here, except we felt like you would get a favorable ruling without difficulty. We could see no reason why the way the other States had applied. But be that as it may, we will try to render all justice here that is possible.

Go ahead.

Mr. BURKHEAD. I would like to explain further the helplessness of my district in absorbing this loss in revenue. For the past 15 years, we have levied the maximum tax rate allowed under Kentucky laws. Our bonding capacity has been continually exhausted from building 224 new classrooms and in making other capital outlay investments. This fiscal year we were permitted a 10-percent increase in the tax rate; we were also allowed to levy a 3-percent tax on utility bills. This, the board did; they also agreed to levy an additional 10 percent for the next school year, which was also permitted by law.

In spite of our having levied the maximum taxes under State law and in spite of our having issued all the bonds for construction permitted under the law, we were forced to have 600 children on double sessions this past fall. The future becomes a calamity if this amendment, subsection 204 of section 6 of title I, goes into effect on June 30, 1968.

To save a great many school districts in this county from great injury, or in some cases bankruptcy, I suggest that this committee give its careful consideration to one of the following alternatives:

1. Delete the amendment from the 874 legislation.
2. To avoid great numbers of children from Federal properties thrust upon already overburdened States, exempt all Federal properties with 2,000 or more children in their dependent schools.
3. Allow a longer period for adjustment—20 years, for example—deleting 5 percent each year until all the children can be absorbed by the local district.

I want to express my appreciation to the members of the committee for having given me the opportunity to present these observations, problems, and facts covering the operation of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and the present Federal aid to education legislation now before this committee.

Chairman PERKINS. Let me say, Mr. Burkhead, as to the problem you pointed out in connection with Federal aid. Your State board of education operating your school system, if I recall, this has been pretty uniform procedure through the years, where we had so many Federal installations operating schools at the time, and there are very few of them today throughout the country. My memory may be dulled, but our committee will see that you obtain justice. If it is necessary to make a change, I know that the committee will want to do the right thing. It will direct the staff to go into this problem and see if there are any other Federal installations in the country, other than Fort Knox, where the States cannot, under the laws, presently operate their school system—

Mr. BURKHEAD. My board of education would be happy to merge the districts if it were possible under the law, but we are helpless. We can't control the State legislature or the Attorney General. The State has the argument that to provide \$2 million in extra State revenues to educate the children on Campbell and Knox, and a few districts get only \$800,000, that is not very good trade. That is not horse trading in Kentucky. Yet some school districts will be ruined. Elizabethtown, Meade County; Hardin County, West Point, Christian County; Montgomery County of Tennessee.

Chairman PERKINS. We will see that no school district is destroyed by this amendment.

Mr. BURKHEAD. That makes me very happy.

Chairman PERKINS. Let me say this. We will certainly do the best job we can, but we have done so much in the impact areas and so little in the general Federal-aid area. I came to your community one time in 1949 when you were teaching in an old NYA building. You have made so much progress under the impact area and I want you to continue to make the same type of progress.

Mr. BURKHEAD. You have kept us from being the poorest district in Kentucky from the Federal impact money.

Chairman PERKINS. You have done a great job down there. I want to compliment you for it. This amendment more or less puzzles me. When we were trying to work out a uniform procedure last year, it did not dawn on me that we were contravening State law. We have it all around us in all neighboring States that have taken a diametri-

cally opposite approach. I thought that Oscar Rose endorsed this approach. I may be wrong.

Mr. BURKHEAD. I called Oscar. He had not even heard of it.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, you will recall in the hearings on the west coast and Hawaii there were places where school districts were almost totally dependent on the Federal impact funds. In the State of Hawaii, if we pulled out Public Law 874 they would have to shut their schools. They don't want 874 pulled out, because one of the principal ways to support schools out there is with the sales tax and sales tax collection bears a direct relation to the number of dependents that we station out there who spend money one way or another.

But there is another problem that comes up. As I recall, we have 16 or 19 States that take the Federal impact money and, by one device or another, actually merge it with general State aid so that the school district that has the Federal impact children does not really gain much advantage. In the State of Washington, for example, if you receive a hundred thousand dollars under Public Law 815 when they divide up your State aid the following year they deduct the \$100,000 from the money you would otherwise get from the State. The result is that that is \$100,000 in the general pocket distributed around the country.

There was some agitation in Congress, and there has been some history of an attempt to earmark the impact funds so that they would be spent, if not on the individual dependent child, at least only in the school that he attended in proportion to his portion of the student body. This would have worked a hardship on a large number of districts. And I think Mr. Rose and his people, with this amendment, were concerned in trying to find a way to keep the money with the school district that had the kid.

When we put a military installation in Kentucky, in other words, we should attempt to keep the money in an area that is absorbing the impact.

Mr. BURKHEAD. This is not ruining Kentucky. It is not deducted from our entitlement under the foundation program.

Mr. FORD. But you say that the Kentucky law says you can't use public funds to operate schools on Federal property?

Mr. BURKHEAD. That is right.

Mr. FORD. Does that extend to a child who lives on Federal property but attends a public school adjacent to Federal property?

Mr. BURKHEAD. The children living on the Federal property don't attend public schools off the base. The schools are all on the bases. No child living off the base is permitted to go to school on the base.

Mr. FORD. I can't get the picture of what we are talking about here. Are you talking about only those schools operated by the public school system, even though they are in the Military Establishment?

Mr. BURKHEAD. No, sir: it is a dependent school operated by the U.S. Office of Education.

Chairman PERKINS. It is one of the few operated by the Office of Education on Fort Knox property?

Mr. BURKHEAD. That is right.

Mr. FORD. How do these children who are attending that school place a burden on your school district?

Mr. BURKHEAD. We have 5,723 children living off base that are Federal connected. Those are the children I am talking about.

Mr. FORD. They live off base and go to school on base?

Mr. BURKHEAD. No, sir. They go to the public schools off base.

Mr. FORD. This amendment prevents you from receiving aid for those children?

Mr. BURKHEAD. Except for the Armed Forces children; under the interpretation of the law at present, they say we can receive 874 funds for children of soldiers, but not for other personnel working on base.

Mr. FORD. We liberalized that in 1966.

Mr. BURKHEAD. Yes, that is the liberalization. But we would be happy to operate the schools on the post, but we can't. All we need is an Attorney General's opinion, and it does not look like we are going to get it.

Mr. FORD. But you are receiving the 874 funds for the children who are living off the base and attending public schools?

Mr. BURKHEAD. Yes, sir. Our entitlement this year is \$317,000 out of a \$2 million budget.

Mr. FORD. What portion of the total support for your schools comes from the State and local resources? What is the percentage?

Mr. BURKHEAD. About 25 percent.

Mr. FORD. Local or State?

Mr. BURKHEAD. Local.

Mr. FORD. You get 75 percent of support from your State?

Mr. BURKHEAD. State and Federal.

Mr. FORD. You said in your statement earlier that in 1960 you have not receive any construction money from the State?

Mr. BURKHEAD. Any additional construction money from the State; that is right.

Mr. FORD. But does the 75 percent aid you have include construction money as well?

Mr. BURKHEAD. Yes, sir.

Mr. FORD. Where does the State get the money?

Mr. BURKHEAD. Sales tax and general fund.

Mr. FORD. Does it earmark?

Mr. BURKHEAD. No, sir; it is not earmarked. We get about 1 percent of the 3 percent sales tax for school purposes.

Mr. FORD. One percent of the sales tax revenue, or one-third of the sales tax revenue?

Mr. BURKHEAD. About one-third.

Mr. FORD. When they put a \$16 million building program into just one military installation in Kentucky it has to kick a lot of dollars around in the sales tax collection. Don't they see that down in your State capital?

Mr. BURKHEAD. No sales tax applies on the reservation.

Mr. FORD. But there are a lot of people drawing paychecks?

Mr. BURKHEAD. We can't tax those checks. If we could, we would be the richest county in the area. We have the largest per capita income in the State of any county, according to the 1960 census.

Mr. FORD. You have the highest per capita income and the poorest school district?

Mr. BURKHEAD. I didn't say we had the poorest. I said we would have had the poorest system if it had not been for 874.

Mr. FORD. I meant poorest district in terms of income.

Chairman PERKINS. Is Congressman Stubblefield here? He was sitting here a moment ago.

Go ahead, Marvin.

Mr. DODSON. The next witness, Mr. Chairman, is Mr. Frank Vittetow, of the department of education in Kentucky.

**STATEMENT OF FRANK VITTETOW, ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT,
BUREAU OF STATE FEDERAL RELATIONS, DEPARTMENT OF EDU-
CATION, FRANKFORT, KY.**

Mr. VITTETOW. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am Frank H. Vittetow, assistant superintendent of Public Instruction for State and Federal Relations, Department of Education, Commonwealth of Kentucky.

On behalf of Dr. Harry Sparks, superintendent of public instruction and the department of education, may I express my appreciation to the members of the Committee on Education and Labor for the privilege of appearing before you. Too, may I thank this distinguished body for the courtesies that have been extended to the department of education and to the public school districts of the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

Much of the present strength of the United States has come from a diversified and free public school system. The desires on the part of the local school district to dare to be different: to follow the dictates of its own educational insights, as well as to perpetuate the mores of the community of which it is a part—is bedrock to the democratic tradition.

The dedication of local school administrators and teachers and staffs to provide an adequate system of education for the Nation's children cannot be measured in dollars or formal measuring devices. The measure of such dedication at all levels of the school structure in the future will continue to be determined by such factors as morale, freedom of choice, and participation in decisions that are rightfully theirs by tradition and proven service to the Nation.

It has been stated on numerous occasions that America may be in a period of transition. If this be true, we should pause, reflect, and examine very carefully the process of transition. It is sometimes recognized that a process, in itself, is often more important than the end result which is being sought. It is in this context that the speaker would like to respectfully review some of the concerns of Federal aid to education and offer some recommendations on behalf of the department of education relative to the proposed H.R. 6230.

The process of administering, and the evolving philosophy on the part of the U.S. Office of Education, seems to be developing a general tendency to draw more and more attention away from the desired end result of providing well qualified teachers in a well built and adequately equipped classroom for 25 to 30 well nourished and highly motivated children in an increasingly complicated society.

To assist in the elimination of some of the basic frustration and general concern of school officials in Kentucky relative to certain aspects of Federal aid to education, the following types of general recommendations are respectfully offered:

1. The timing of Federal authorizations, appropriations, regulations, and allocations is not conducive to encouraging logical and methodical planning on the part of local and State school officials. The effectiveness of Federal aid to education could become more pronounced if congressional authorization patterns and school years could become more compatible.

Chairman PERKINS. Let me state at this point that I am most hopeful that after the debate on this bill this year and the debate on the education appropriation bill which may come in mid-April that we can eliminate this problem once and for all, so that you can plan in a timely and orderly manner.

I know you are frustrated by the way we have been coming along with slow authorizations and then slow appropriations, and everybody hardly knows in which direction to turn. It just does not provide such action on their part, good administration at the local level. We are going to do our best to eliminate that.

Mr. VITTELOW. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

2. The bulk of Federal funds for education should come to the States under a minimum foundation type of an approach that is based on an objective formula which would consider the financial ability of a State to support education.

3. All of the Federal funds coming into a State for preschool, elementary, and secondary education should be routed through the departments of education. There should be no exception to this approach.

4. The basic planning by the U.S. Office of Education should be done with departments of education early enough in a fiscal year so as to assure enough leadtime for budget reviews and implementation procedures on the part of local school districts.

5. Serious consideration should be given to the development of an aid-to-construction bill for public elementary and secondary schools. A formula, including provisions for need versus local school districts' building bonding potential and usage, should be considered.

6. General opposition is given to the regionalization concept of the U.S. Office of Education. It is felt that such an approach simply constitutes another layer of regulatory control over the educational structure of the States. Existing or proposed offices could better serve the cause of education in the realms of planning and consultative services to State departments of education in a region.

7. Federal guidelines and regulations relating to education should be developed through more cooperative procedures with the States. Currently, there is a general tendency for State personnel to be brought into the process after basic guideline direction has been established by the U.S. Office of Education. At this point the States are advised of basic intent, or clarifications made of already written guidelines and/or regulations.

Specific concerns, support, and/or recommendations relating to H.R. 6230 may be grouped in the following manner:

Title I, ESEA.—Full support and appreciation is given to two amendments which are extremely beneficial to the Commonwealth of Kentucky:

1. The revised "Federal percentage" factor which will be used to determine maximum grants during fiscal year 1968 based on the aver-

age per pupil expenditures in a State or the United States will help to correct the inequity for distribution of title I funds that was contained in the original legislation.

2. The new low-income factor of \$3,000 rather than the previous \$2,000 offers opportunities to more of Kentucky and the Nation's youth.

It would be further hoped that title I could be fully financed to the October 1966 authorization level of the 89th Congress.

Excessive paperwork requirements.—One matter of concern relates to the excessive "paperwork" requirements relating to title I, as well as other titles of all acts. It would seem that there should be some commonality in and between the data required by the U.S. Office of Education from State departments of education and local school districts. Baseline data from one title application to another could possibly be referred to in applications, or reports, as they are offered to the U.S. Office of Education for consideration.

Title II, ESEA.—Because of this support we are grateful, and at this time we have no basic recommendations to offer to the committee.

Title III, ESEA.—Amendments need to be made in title III, ESEA, which will provide that local project applications and proposals for supplementary centers shall be initially routed through, and be subject to final approval by, the State departments of education under provisions of State plans. Probably 10 to 15 percent of Federal funds available should be set aside for projects to be approved by the U.S. Office of Education.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman.

Chairman PERKINS. Yes.

Let me ask you, though, have you ever had any trouble with the Office of Education, any difficulty in their going contrary to the wishes of the State department in Frankfort in approving a local project supplemental education center over and beyond your recommendations, or have they followed your suggestions and cooperated with you?

Mr. VITTEROW. On one or two occasions, sir. We have a record of that, yes.

Chairman PERKINS. Where have they approved projects down there not recommended by the State department?

Mr. VITTEROW. They have not overridden us, but those that we have recommended that they would not recommend.

Mr. FORD. I notice that you passed over title II with a very short sentence saying "We love it." But the man just ahead of you pointed out that they have a problem at the local level of administering title II because they are not getting any of the administrative set-aside that was put into this title. We have heard this from other States as well.

Is it true that in Kentucky the percentage allowance for administration of title II is held at the State level and they do not pass any of this along to the local districts administering the program?

Mr. VITTEROW. We pass some: yes, sir. We were trying to compare this in concert with the other types of problems that we were having. We do not feel, sir, that this was a major concern. Naturally, we would like to have more moneys for administration of all of our funds, but to me we did not feel that it was a major concern.

Mr. FORD. How do you break down the percentage?

Chairman PERKINS. I think we spelled it out last year.

Mr. FORD. Last year, I thought we made it clear we intended it to be divided equitably between the State and local units. What formula do you have for dividing it? Do you have a percentage, or how do you do it?

Mr. VITTELOW. I apologize for not having the detailed information on the percentage, but we do pass to the local districts that portion which is given to us, sir.

Mr. FORD. Is there anybody in the panel that later will tell us what is being passed on from the State to the local?

Mr. DONSON. We have one here.

Mr. FORD. All right. I will withhold my question until later.

Chairman PERKINS. Go ahead.

Mr. VITTELOW. Title III. NDEA: The department of education strongly recommends that restoration of the proposed cut in NDEA, title III, funds which are earmarked for title V, ESEA. It is further hoped that the fiscal year 1968 appropriation bill be no less than the fiscal year 1967 funding level of \$79 million. The proposed extension of the National Defense Education Act is fully supported.

Title V, ESEA: There is an understandable need for continuous planning and evaluation at all levels of education. Such planning, of necessity, must come from within the school structure with the assistance of advisory groups from all levels of society.

The new proposal, part B of title V, relating to "Grants for comprehensive educational planning and evaluation" does not meet the avowed needs of State departments of education. The proposal is foreign to basic precepts which relate to close planning and operational relationships. Part A of the same title has a built-in planning and evaluative process.

As an aside to the issue, the \$15 million request is exorbitant if contemplated just for planning purposes. This proposed financing would probably have more far-reaching effect in developing better educational programs in departments of education if it were added to part A, same title, with a requirement that a portion be utilized specifically for additional planning and evaluative elements.

There are also concerns relating to part A of title V. It is understood that a support figure of \$29,750,000 is proposed. This budgetary support figure and the general 40/60 percent distribution formula will benefit Kentucky's Department of Education.

Under the above distribution formula some consideration should be given to an equalization concept which would take into account the relative wealth of the States.

The "borrowing" from established NDEA titles to produce the \$29,750,000 proposed for title V, ESEA is our fundamental concern. It is understood the funding compilation is as follows:

Basic appropriation request, title V	\$22,000,000
Deduct from NDEA, III	5,500,000
Deduct from NDEA, X	2,250,000

From the above, 15 percent is withheld for "special projects" by the Commissioner of Education. This, coupled with the proposed 25 percent "special grants" withholding element of the proposed part B,

title V, would seem to continue to defeat the basic tenets of good planning in the State departments of education. This would mean that nearly 20 percent of the proposed \$44,750,000 under parts A and B of title V could be utilized by the U.S. Office of Education for direct planning and evaluative projects relating to departments of education.

The Kentucky Department of Education is opposed to such concepts as are offered. Restoration of funds to titles III and X, NDEA are strongly urged.

Title V-A, NDEA.—It is recommended that NDEA, title V-A be fully financed to the authorized appropriation level of \$30 million beginning fiscal year 1968. It would be further hoped that an increasing appropriation, during the next 5 years, would be in evidence providing for the development of pupil personnel services.

Title VI, ESEA.—It is urged that full support be given to all amendments proposed in this title which relate to education of the handicapped child. The regional resource centers concept can serve the needs of Kentucky and the Nation to a great advantage.

It is hoped that title VI can be fully financed at the \$50 million (fiscal year 1967) and \$150 million (fiscal year 1968) levels as authorized by the 89th Congress.

National Teacher Corps.—It is recommended that the National Teacher Corps Act be continued as a pilot program for a period of 3 years. Funds allocated for such a program as well as the approval pattern for Corps members should come through departments of education.

The "local control" section should be amended so that no Teacher Corps member could be assigned to a local educational agency unless the local agency finds the teachers to be acceptable.

Support is given to the idea of transfer of Teacher Corps from Higher Education Act to title I, ESEA.

Other Concerns of a General Nature:

1. The Headstart program should be transferred from the Office of Economic Opportunity to the U.S. Office of Education. All basic elements of the program, featuring parent education and participation, should be retained.

2. Support is sought for the passage of Senate bill 3, of 1967 which provides effective enforcement procedures of the free-exercise clauses of the first amendment of the Constitution.

3. The Child Nutrition Act should be fully funded. Portions of the allocation should be reserved for the purposes of State administration of the act.

4. That portion of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 as amended to cover public schools should be repealed. There are indications that subsidized programs such as the school lunch services, now more or less on a breakeven basis will have to raise lunch prices to meet requirements of the act, secure additional foodstuff and/or secure additional appropriations to meet financial requirements of the act.

5. The Adult Education Act of 1966 should have a supplemental appropriation in order to provide the maximum level authorized for fiscal year 1967 and fiscal year 1968. The minimum age of eligibility should be 16 years. The term "adult basic education" should be consistently defined at all places in the act.

Again, may I express my most sincere appreciation for the honor of having appeared before this distinguished body.

Chairman PERKINS. Thank you very much for your statement this morning.

Go ahead, Dr. Dodson.

Mr. DODSON. The next witness, Mr. Chairman, will be Sam V. Noe, superintendent of the Louisville City Schools.

Chairman PERKINS. Come around, Dr. Noe. We are glad to have you here again.

STATEMENT OF SAMUEL V. NOE, SUPERINTENDENT, LOUISVILLE INDEPENDENT SCHOOLS, LOUISVILLE, KY.

Mr. NOE. Mr. Chairman, distinguished members of this committee, I, too, am very grateful for this opportunity to appear before you and to offer testimony in behalf of the amendments to H.R. 6230 which are before you. Let me say, also, that we in the metropolitan area also have this same fine appreciation for the leadership of your chairman that Mr. Dodson expressed on behalf of Kentuckians and all sections of the state. When Carl Perkins Day was held up in eastern Kentucky we were very happy to have a delegation from Louisville to join with our friends in eastern Kentucky in honoring the person whom we have come to love as a very distinguished Kentuckian.

So, on behalf of 53,000 public school children and 4,500 employees in the Louisville school system, I want to express our very great appreciation to you and through you to the Congress for all the Federal assistance that we have been receiving. Because of this, we have been able to expand and initiate programs which would not have been possible otherwise. Through Federal grants, this year amounting to \$4,337,-614, we feel that we have accepted a great responsibility for its proper use. To the best of our knowledge, all our programs are good, all have been helpful in giving added educational opportunities to thousands of handicapped youth.

We were exceedingly pleased, and we offer as an exhibit to you the paper which we have submitted to you that in our Courier Journal on Friday there is this headline "Federal Team Checks School Program. Use of Funds for Disadvantaged Children Praised." This came from a three-man team from the National Advisory Council for Education of Disadvantaged Children, who spent 2 days in our city looking at our programs.

I think you would expect me to say that as a result of our experience that none of these programs should be discontinued. The financial cuts which we received this year, we think, should be restored, and, also, I think you would expect a city superintendent to say that we need more.

We would add the endorsement to the statement that was made, and we were delighted to hear, Mr. Chairman, your statement about this, that appropriations should match authorizations and that they should be made with as much consideration as possible to the schools' fiscal year.

Now, in regard to my comments about the National Teacher Corps, I would say that our system, like I am sure many urban systems, has

been affected by this major problem which the National Teacher Corps has been designed to solve. That is, the recruiting and holding of well-qualified and adequately trained teachers for inner city schools. During the school year, two National Teacher Corps teams are working with us. The team leaders and the internes have already demonstrated their value to the schools. It is obvious that the competence of the internes will continue to develop so that at the end of their training they will be excellent teachers dedicated to working in impoverished areas.

We believe that the National Teacher Corps is meeting a longfelt need and we, of course, would like to see the program continued with increased emphasis. Apparently the proposed amendment which you people are considering by making the NTC a part of title I does have hope of improving the budgetary arrangement, and we feel that it is an amendment which should be favorably considered.

Under the comprehensive educational planning, it is our belief that title V amended as a 5-year program, I suggest, will be highly beneficial. In our judgment, a strong State department of education will help individual schools through additional and more effective services. Long-range planning, research projects, and evaluation procedures at the State and local levels will benefit all school systems.

For example, ways of examining and evaluating textbooks, preparing curriculum guides, selecting audiovisual materials, and improving ways of pupil accounting might be studied and the results made available statewide.

I might say in passing it does not seem to me in this electronic age that we have 30,000 schoolteachers in Kentucky and every schoolteacher every morning and every afternoon is a bookkeeper, and one who spends much time at the end of each month in pupil accounting, when it could be done in a much simpler fashion.

In order to avoid further involvement with the various existing agencies and with a possible additional State agency, I would recommend that all projects to be authorized under this proposed amendment be channeled through the State department of education. This would not mean that we would not want the involvement of citizens groups with the Government. We feel that all of these relationships would be fine. But in the final analysis we feel that such proposals going through the State department of education, with whom we work, would be to our advantage.

Then, when we look at the Vocational Act of 1963, we are very grateful to a concerned Congress which has done so much to help and to improve the image of vocational education. The proposed amendment as we understand it would make possible more extensive and intensive programs to meet manpower needs. Exploratory, work experience, and counseling programs will assist students in pursuing their objective. This shift in the structure of the labor market will place youths with lesser abilities at a greater disadvantage. Since many youths become dropouts because of academic requirements, more programs in which students can acquire skills in basic tool operations and processes are needed.

Continuing financial help supporting the occupational, informational and skill programs must be forthcoming, if both the quantity

and quality of the manpower needs are to be met. Curriculum changes and updating are needed. Expensive equipment in electricity and electronics should be made available for training purposes. Then we have a real problem in additional training and in-service sessions for instructors of vocational programs. Then, when we look at your proposal on expanded educational opportunities for handicapped children we say that educational opportunities for handicapped children in our school district have been provided since 1911.

Proposals contained in H.R. 6230 to strengthen title VI by adding regional resource centers would provide testing and evaluation services to determine the special education needs of handicapped children and to develop educational programs to meet these needs.

I am also submitting—and I shall not read it—as an exhibit, just a report on a diagnostic center which we have established under title III funds. That is, we and Mr. Vanhoose in Jefferson County and the superintendents in Fullerton and Oldham Counties, in which we have established a center for diagnostic purposes for atypical children. It just started this year. We foresee real promise for it. We think that the results to date are exceedingly fine. This type of thing, this type of program which is proposed here for handicapped children we feel could be exceptionally useful to us and to all the school people throughout the country.

Now if I might go back to the question which the Honorable Mr. Ford asked a moment ago about title II. To my knowledge, we do not receive any money for the administration of the title II program. Now if we have a quarrel with our State department of education, then we will look at that when we get home. But we do receive some money, to my knowledge, for processing books and those things. But for the administration of the program as it pertains to our friends in the parochial school, I don't think we are getting any administrative money for that. I think that is out of our own local budget.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman.

Chairman PERKINS. Go ahead, Mr. Ford.

Mr. FORD. I would like to call your attention to the House Report No. 1814 of the 89th Congress on H.R. 13161 which became the 1966 Amendments to the Elementary and Secondary Educational Act. On page 18 we say under title of "Administration:"

In the original Act we authorized not to exceed 5 per cent of the amount paid to the state under Title II be used in administering the state plan. The percentage was to be reduced to 3 per cent in subsequent years of the program.

That was the administration recommendation last year, that we go back to 3 percent. This committee—and I will paraphrase the balance of it because we used a whole page to explain exactly what we had in mind—determined to leave the amount at 5 percent and not reduce it to 3 percent as was suggested. Then we said:

Accordingly amendments have been adopted to require that state plans for carrying out the provisions of this title will provide for making available appropriate portions of the 5 per cent administrative funds to the local public agencies actually distributing and exercising control and supervision over the use of the books and materials furnished.

I thought that they are supposed to share that pay with you.

Mr. NOE. My colleague here from Kentucky, Mr. Ford, has another opinion about this.

Chairman PERKINS. There is no doubt in my judgment that the regulations will provide that you are entitled to receive that.

Mr. NOE. Then there was a question, again raised by Mr. Ford, about the final authority for employment, and were we running into any particular problem there.

There was a guideline which our local OEO Office had which indicated that we were limited in our employment to people who were to be approved by the local committee of OEO. We pointed out to them in another action that was being done by a superintendent of public instruction what was said earlier, under Kentucky law the board of education does have final authority for all employment. I think this has been resolved satisfactorily by correspondence which said that you have to listen to recommendations from these local committees but are not bound by those recommendations, and that the final authority did remain with the board of education. In Kentucky, the superintendent makes the nominations for all employment. So, we feel that this has been worked out satisfactorily for us. We were happy to listen to recommendations and commendations from individuals and committees, but we do not feel that our hands have been tied by this.

One other question, Who can teach in a Headstart program? Were we limited to people? Again, I do not think so. We see nothing in Kentucky law or in the Federal guidelines that would keep us from employment of a nun or a brother or a priest in a program in the OEO or Headstart program. As a matter of fact, in Louisville at the present time the coordinator of the Headstart program, working through the local office and working with all of us in the public school system, is a sister from one of the orders. To us this, again, is not a limiting factor.

Thank you so much for this opportunity to speak to you.

(Mr. Noe's complete formal statement follows:)

STATEMENT BY SAMUEL V. NOE, SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS, LOUISVILLE, KY.

I am Samuel V. Noe, Superintendent of Schools in Louisville, Kentucky, and on behalf of some 53,000 public school children and 4,500 employees, I want to express through you to the Congress our deep appreciation for all of the Federal assistance we have been receiving. Because of this, we have been able to expand and initiate programs which would not have been possible otherwise. Through Federal grants amounting to \$4,337,614.00 for expenditure on programs this school year, we have accepted a great responsibility for its proper use. To the best of our knowledge all are good, and all have been helpful in giving added educational opportunities to thousands of handicapped youth. None should be discontinued; the financial cuts of this year should be restored, and you would expect a city school administrator to add that we need more.

I would also add our endorsement to the requests you have received that appropriations should match authorization and that they be made with as much consideration as possible to the schools' fiscal year in order that better planning and staffing can be made.

Concerning the proposed amendments to H.R. 6230: I should like to comment as follows:

NATIONAL TEACHER CORPS

The Louisville Public School system for several years has been affected by the major problem that the National Teacher Corps has been designed to help solve; that is, the recruiting and holding of well-qualified and adequately trained teachers for inner-city schools.

During this school year, 1966-1967, two NTC teams are working in two Louisville elementary schools. The two team leaders and the nine interns have already demonstrated their value to the schools. It is obvious that the compe-

tence of the interns will continue to develop so that at the end of their training they will be excellent teachers dedicated to working in impoverished areas. We believe that the NTC is meeting a long-felt need, and we would like to continue the program with increased participation.

Apparently the proposed amendment would ease the local educational agency's administrative problems by making the NTC a part of Title I and by improving the budgetary arrangement.

COMPREHENSIVE EDUCATIONAL PLANNING

It is our belief that Title V, amended as a five-year program, will be highly beneficial. A strong State Department of Education will help individual schools through additional and more effective services. Long range planning research projects and evaluation procedures at the state and local levels will benefit all school systems. For example, ways of examining and evaluating textbooks, preparing curriculum guides, selecting audio-visual materials, and improving ways of pupil accounting might be studied and the results made available statewide.

In order to avoid further involvement with the various existing agencies and with a possible additional state agency, I would recommend that all projects to be authorized under Section B, Title V, of the proposed amendments be channeled through the State Department of Education.

Federal assistance has already made an impact on services from the State Department. Extension of these services as proposed in this amendment will further strengthen education throughout Kentucky.

INNOVATION IN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Modern equipment obtained through the Vocational Education Act of 1963 has enabled the Louisville Public Schools to improve, expand, and innovate programs in all areas of vocational education. A concerned Congress has done much to improve the image of vocational education.

The proposed amendment would make possible more extensive and intensive programs to meet manpower needs. Exploratory, work experience, and counseling programs will assist students in pursuing their objective.

The shift in the structure of the labor market will place youth with lesser abilities at a greater disadvantage unless programs can be provided to meet their needs. Since many youths become dropouts because of academic requirements, more programs in which students can acquire skills in basic tool operations and processes are needed.

Continuing financial help supporting the occupational information and skills programs must be forthcoming if both the quantity and the quality of manpower needs are met. Curriculum changes and up-dating are needed. Expensive equipment in electricity and electronics should be made available to students for training purposes. Additional training and in-service sessions for instructors of vocational programs are necessary.

EXPANDED EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

Educational opportunities for some of the handicapped children in the Louisville Public School District have been provided since 1911. Although the state began providing additional support approximately thirty-five years later, many of the needs continue to be unmet.

The proposals contained in H.R. 6230 to strengthen Title VI by adding Regional Resource Centers would provide testing and evaluation services to determine the special education needs of handicapped children and to develop educational programs to meet these needs by assisting schools and other agencies; the proposal for Recruitment of Personnel would expand and encourage intensive nationwide recruitment programs; the proposal of Dissemination of Information on Education of the Handicapped would encourage students to enter the profession and give a new kind of support to the professional worker now in the field of handicapped children; the proposal for Expansion of Instructional Media Programs to Include All Handicapped Children would insure that all handicapped children would receive benefits of instructional media materials as now being enjoyed by the deaf children through the Captioned Films Program. These additions to Title VI will give overall strength to the authorized programs and will undergird existing programs.

EXHIBIT A.—FEDERAL EXPENDITURES 1965-66, 1966-67

Estimated amount of Federal funds received in 1965-66 and to be received by Louisville Board of Education:

	1965-66	1966-67
Elementary and Secondary Education Act:		
Title I.....	\$1,419,000	\$1,307,000
Title II.....	103,849	104,838
Title III:		
Student dramatic enrichment.....	25,798	40,727
Education diagnostic-treatment center.....		227,985
Total.....	1,548,647	1,680,550
Economic Opportunity Act:		
Community-School program (including preschool and adult education).....	1,979,271	1,486,435
Headstart—Summer.....	152,000	144,000
Neighborhood Youth Corps.....	214,400	273,000
Total.....	2,163,671	1,903,435
Public Law 874: Federal impacted areas.....		204,994
National Defense Education Act:		
Title III (instruction).....	198,241	86,886
Title V-A (guidance).....	16,888	19,779
Total.....	215,129	106,665
Vocational Education Act, 1963.....	69,013	62,851
Lunch program:		
Plate lunches.....	150,781	150,781
Surplus foods.....	115,674	100,000
Milk subsidy.....	128,338	128,338
Total.....	394,793	379,119
Grand total.....	4,391,253	4,337,614

EXHIBIT B.—EVALUATION OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS

Statements by principals, supervisors, and teachers

Field trips rated superior with the teachers as they had found that the trips provided a background for the better understanding of concepts needed in learning to read in all subject matter areas. Trips also provided experiences that promoted interest in language, (letter writing, stories, etc.) social studies, and mathematics.

All of the teachers gave high praise to the value of the teacher assistants. They felt the pupils gained assurance in their improved self-image and in their ability to tackle academic tasks. The teachers expressed a fervent hope for the employment of additional teacher assistants for the upper grade teachers.

The new teachers spoke very highly of the help they received from the resource teachers, who held conferences, gave demonstrations, assisted with planning units, aided with room arrangement and classroom management, guided problem pupils, and furnished appropriate materials for use in the classroom. Teachers were also generous in their praise of the equipment which had been delivered.

Numerous teachers commented, "At last I have the materials necessary to really teach effectively."

All teachers reported a great lift in their morale and a greater pupil interest in class work as a result of purchases from Title I funds. Title I funds made it possible for teachers to buy groceries and use government surplus commodities in more appealing ways. Some principals had been so pinched for money that they had been unable to allot any money for groceries. All teachers are enthusiastic about the program, the additional equipment, supplies, and materials which will enable them to motivate and reach many of the culturally deprived children who would have otherwise continued to be culturally deprived and eventually become dropouts.

Junior high librarians reported that the assignment of clerical aids has released the librarian from these time-consuming non-professional jobs. All junior high librarian reported that the librarian now has more time for careful selection of materials.

The addition of personnel to the elementary library resulted in increased interest and enthusiasm on the part of the pupils.

One major objective: to test the hearing of all children of the target area and identify children who should be recommended to an ear specialist. This objective was accomplished as follows: There were a total of 13,524 given an initial screening test. Two thousand five hundred and forty-eight did not meet the standards of passing so they were given another test a week or two later. Of those tested the second time, many received a third test, and 466 were recommended to visit an ear specialist.

Another objective was to administer vision screening tests and make recommendations to the parents of the children who did not meet the passing standards to take their child to an eye specialist. The resource teachers tested 1,284 pupils and recommendations were made for 147 of the pupils to visit an eye specialist.

Another objective was to improve the dental health of as many children as possible.

The Materials Center of the Board of Education is extremely helpful in preparing the Curriculum Guide for the Special Education EMR pupils on the senior high level. It is now possible to secure useful materials on all grade levels and from so many different sources, namely; books, workbooks, pictures, posters, motion pictures, filmstrips, and many others.

I am sure that everyone attending the workshop, "Curriculum for the Educationally Deprived" can honestly say that we benefitted from this opportunity. We appreciated the opportunity to attend a most interesting and well-planned workshop. The speakers were excellent. Upward Bound students were delightful.

TITLE II—E.S.E.A.

Thanks to Title II—E.S.E.A., which has furnished us \$104,838.00 worth of school library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials for use of children and teachers in 126 public and non-public schools of the district. The acquisition of these resources, together with library services provided by funds from Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, has improved and has enriched learning experiences in the classroom.

Replies to the question: "Name the most significant aspect of Title I project in your school, and tell as specifically as possible how it helped to pupils:" Field trips. Many children had never been out of their immediate neighborhoods. These trips widened their experiences and increased their vocabularies.

The new counselor. This allowed an adult more time to work with children who had problems.

The services provided by the addition of a guidance counselor supplies a long needed service to our overall school programs.

The Reading Improvement teacher was most effective at Henry Clay School. Pupils made progress, got a different image of themselves and returned to show the teacher the change accomplished in their reading grade. Many students were happy.

Teacher assistants to work with slow-learning pupils and free the teacher for instructional procedures. Resource teachers helped those teachers who are less progressive.

The addition of a librarian and a clerk enabled the school to set up a central library and classes to make use of the library on a scheduled basis. The principal and clerk were relieved of these duties.

The opportunity of getting enough supplies and materials helped encourage the teacher. The children were overcome by such pretty pictures, books, games, etc.

The additional equipment and supplies have been most stimulating to teachers and pupils in a school where we have had so little to work with. The resource teachers who helped the new teachers were most helpful. The teachers are already aware of the help children are receiving in the program for the perceptually handicapped.

The classes of twenty have given better learning experiences to underachievers and allowed us to improve our pupil-teacher ratio. The offset press allowed us to have a school paper.

Replies to the question: "If you add additional personnel, services, equipment, and/or supplies to your school with Title I funds, what would you want?" I

would like to have a Title I clerk, three Educable Mentally Retarded classes and one class of twenty. Wall screens for every classroom and kindergarten storage cabinets for lower grade classrooms would add so much to the effectiveness of the program. Expand the allotments for field trips to include tickets for admissions to educational functions.

The addition of clerical personnel, remedial reading teachers and assistants, a part-time coordinator of audio-visual, a helping teacher in music and art, and physical education personnel would help this program immensely. We could use more physical education equipment and more library books and periodicals.

I would fill the position of reading specialist. We need the addition of sets of supplementary books, metal cabinets, and first aid cabinets in each classroom. I would add more space for mobile units.

Our greatest need is the addition of more clerical personnel and a replacement of old clerical machines. For our lunchroom we need the services of monitors.

Our greatest need is for guidance personnel and clerks to help in making this added program more effective. I would buy with additional fund equipment and supplies for Art, Home Economics, and Industrial Arts. With extra funds I would make available the items suggested by teachers and make further alterations to building to accommodate classes of twenty.

We could use a continuing supply of materials for the Industrial Arts Department. I would purchase 30-60 sets of books to be loaned to ninth graders and 80-100 physical education suits. Additional funds would supply money for free lunches, more field trips and admission expense, and an additional clerk.

TITLE III—DIAGNOSTIC TREATMENT CENTER

As a result of the Title III project in the Louisville area, a Diagnostic Treatment Center for the purpose of diagnosing and treating the learning problems of school children has been established. This Center, composed of psychologists, social workers, and educational specialists, very effectively complements and assists the school staffs in their endeavors to minimize the individual child's learning problems.

The Center is providing an essential service to many pupils in our schools. The diagnosis and treatment of disturbed, handicapped, and retarded children have assisted us in meeting the needs of more pupils than this community has been able to serve in the past. As an innovation—that is, an operation by one school system with services available to public and non-public school children in five school systems—the Center has been successful and unique because of the lack of administrative problems often associated with such a coordinated undertaking.

THE NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS

The Neighborhood Youth Corps is making a significant contribution to the Louisville Public School System. The current program has 400 enrollees who, while developing job skills, responsibility, and competencies in a variety of job opportunities, are making a positive contribution to the school system.

The income, counseling, and job experiences in school are the primary reasons for the success of keeping these young people in school and in helping them complete their high school education. We have less than a three percent dropout rate in the program.

STUDENT DRAMATIC ENRICHMENT PROGRAM

Through attendance at the performances and study in the classroom, many students who never before had attended live performances of well-known plays have achieved a wholesome interest in live drama in the Student Dramatic Enrichment Program funded through Title III E.S.E.A.

The Louisville Board of Education, in cooperation with Actors Theatre of Louisville and public and non-public schools in Jefferson, Bullitt, and Oldham Counties, has been administering this program with a \$66,525.00 two-year grant. Thousands of high school students are able to attend performances of live drama at the Actors Theatre of Louisville, a local non-profit theatrical organization. Study Guides for the plays are furnished to teachers and students for classroom use before attendance at the performances.

Transportation is furnished to those students who live outside the Louisville district.

EXHIBIT C.—LEARN MORE EARN MORE ADULT EDUCATION PROGRAM

Seven terms of the Learn More Earn More Adult Education Program will have been conducted by the Louisville Board of Education between April 1965 and May 1967 with \$198,730.00 in Federal grants under provisions of the Economic Opportunity Act. Enrollments for these evening classes, conducted in schools participating in the Community School Program, total 7,716. The pilot program, conducted in one elementary school in the summer of 1964, enrolled 416 adults. The enrollment for the current term, February–May 1967, is 1,558, classes being conducted in seven elementary and junior high schools two nights per week. Enrollment by courses is as follows: Basic Education, 221; High School Equivalency, 627; Business Education, 371; Home Management, 309; and Shop, 30. The great expansion of the pilot program was made possible by Federal funding. The program is planned and operated for adults 21 years of age or older and for young people who are 18 years of age and have been out of school for at least one year. It is organized for persons in these five major categories: (1) persons who want to gain skills in the fundamentals of education; (2) persons who want to prepare themselves to pass the General Education Development test; (3) persons who want to gain skills in business practices and office procedures to enable them to find better employment; (4) persons who want to manage their homes more efficiently; and (5) persons who want to learn how to use simple hand tools and machinery.

The staff for the centers includes certificated principals, counselors, visiting teachers, and teachers regularly employed by the Louisville Public Schools. Through cooperation of the State Employment Office, job counselors and employment officers regularly service the various centers.

Many students have been upgraded on their jobs, many have realized increase in pay, and some have qualified for and found better paying jobs. Many success stories testify to the effectiveness of the program.

[From the Courier-Journal, Friday, Mar. 10, 1967]

USE OF FUNDS FOR DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN PRAISED

FEDERAL TEAM CHECKS SCHOOL PROGRAM

(By Gayle Griffith)

The Louisville school system got a good grade yesterday on its over-all use of federal funds for disadvantaged children, along with some suggestions for improvement.

Issuing the report card was a three-man team from the National Advisory Council for Education of Disadvantaged Children in Washington. The team, headed by Dr. Joseph Page, visited city schools to determine whether the \$2.7 million authorized for Louisville thus far under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is being used effectively.

"Not without exception, but close to without exception," it is, the team concluded in an oral report to city school administrators after visiting classes yesterday.

The city school system received its first grant of \$1.4 million last spring and spent the bulk of it on equipment. Of the \$1.3 million authorized this fiscal year, \$1.1 is being spent for remedial reading teachers, counselors, and teacher assistants now at work in 31 elementary schools and 13 junior and senior high schools. Of this year's grant, \$100,000 is going for reading improvement programs and equipment for disadvantaged children in city parochial schools.

The team listed these "exceptions"—or areas where Louisville schools can improve:

Parent involvement. There is "very substantial evidence" that parent involvement is as important as student involvement in many programs for the culturally disadvantaged child, the team said, and parents are not involved in Louisville to the extent that they are in Cincinnati, Detroit, Chicago, Cleveland and other big cities.

In-service training for teachers and teachers' aides. Though highly impressed with the quality of the teaching observed yesterday, the team felt that teachers should meet together, and with supervisors, more frequently to exchange ideas and encourage innovation.

City school supervisors commended the University of Louisville for its help in this direction. Asked about the University of Kentucky, City Supt. Samuel V. Noe said that U.K. and other state universities have not had the concept of the inner city schools' problems in the past and have geared their teacher training programs more to the rural and suburban schoolteacher.

"This is one problem that we'll have to work on with the state's teacher training institutions," Noe said.

Parochial school participation. Only one parochial classroom under the project was visited yesterday, but the consultant who saw it called it "distressing," and in "sharp contrast" to the spirit and response in public school classrooms he saw.

Though unwilling to generalize on the basis of one class visit, the consultants indicated that if this situation were typical, closer supervision should be exercised over parochial school participation to insure that the best available teachers and methods were being used.

Among aspects of Louisville's program singled out for commendation yesterday were the over-all quality of teachers and teachers assistants, ability and interest grouping among elementary students in the program, and effective use of special equipment.

Chairman PERKINS. Thank you, Dr. Noe. I think the committee from reading your statement will appreciate what an efficient school system you are operating in the city of Louisville. We certainly appreciate the way and the fine method you have taken advantage of the ESEA funds.

Mr. Noe. Thank you.

Mr. Dodson. Mr. Chairman, we now move from the metropolitan area back to the mountains. We have one of your constituents, Mr. Charles Clark, superintendent of the Floyd County schools.

Chairman PERKINS. Go ahead, Mr. Clark. I am glad to welcome you here.

STATEMENT OF CHARLES CLARK, SUPERINTENDENT, FLOYD COUNTY SCHOOLS, PRESTONBURG, KY.

Mr. Clark. Mr. Chairman and members of the House Education and Labor Committee, you must have noticed that our statements are somewhat repetitious, but that is understandable when you consider that we made no effort to correlate in making arrangements for this presentation. However, you have noticed that these statements all agree in important philosophical educational ideas.

It is a great source of satisfaction to a county school superintendent to have an opportunity to express the views of the people in his area to the national leaders who enact Federal educational legislation. So often, as professional educators, we fear that educational and/or social legislation is tailored to urban needs, and that such legislation does not meet the needs of rural areas. You do well to hear school people from all geographical sections of the country and endeavor to make legislation flexible enough to meet all needs. You, who make up this very important committee, have made history and are in a position to lead in a great surge forward in public education.

We, in the local school districts in the several States, are happy that the Federal Government is a full partner in the important job of elementary and secondary education. You may look, even to Appalachia, for great leadership in this healthy partnership. We, the school superintendents from the east Kentucky counties located in the Seventh Congressional District, could reasonably feel that we

have already made a great contribution to the cause of education, since we have had the good sense to continue to elect Carl D. Perkins as our Congressman. Since Congressman Perkins is a product of an area where educational deprivation was and still is the rule rather than the exception, he perhaps understands the need of aid to the educationally deprived better than most Congressmen. We, the school people in the Seventh District, could reasonably feel that we have done our part for the cause of education in reelecting Carl D. Perkins. If that were our only gift to the cause, then we would have made a significant contribution. If you have admired his devotion to public education as the second ranking member of your committee, then I warn you that you have as your chairman now, an American who lives, eats, and sleeps with the idea that democracy will survive only through its willingness to face up to its educational responsibility. He will, by his tireless efforts for the cause, spur you to greater efforts than any of you thought possible. If you keep up with your chairman, then this shall be the most productive session in the history of Congress.

The enactment of the aid to elementary and secondary schools of 1965 was an answer to lifelong prayers for an overwhelming number of dedicated school people. It is no secret that we would have preferred general, rather than categorical aid, but we are practical people and are doing our utmost to implement the legislation as it was written. We, in Floyd County, Ky., in order to qualify for participation under Public Law 89-10, dread to take a county survey in order to identify our educationally deprived children. Our efforts led us to the conclusion that almost 50 percent of our young people were deprived and as a result, we are very much aware of the problems of educational deprivation. This awareness haunted us and compelled us to strive for answers. We sought answers with groups composed of parents, teachers, welfare workers, college instructors, administrators and others. With the aid of the groups mentioned above, we identified our needs and even agreed on a priority arrangement for attacking the problems.

We are making progress in Floyd County by spending title I funds on remedial reading, in-service teacher experiences, instructional materials, classes for exceptional children: by adding special instructional units for physical education, libraries, guidance, counselors, supervisors, and social workers as well as purchasing glasses for school-age indigents and making minor alterations to physical facilities where needed.

Implementing Public Law 89-10 has led us to the realization that the education of the 1950's is no longer adequate for the 1960's and 1970's. Indeed Public Law 89-10, as enacted in 1965, no longer fills the needs. Since our National, State, and local education partnership was founded in 1965 with the enactment of the elementary and secondary school bill, we have discovered that there is much uncertainty in dealing with Washington. We never seem to know when the funds in our entitlement will be available until after the start of our school year, and this condition makes constructive planning extremely difficult. Competent personnel is seldom available after the start of the school year. If this shortcoming could be overcome on your part, adequate planning will result in more effective use of funds.

The uncertainty of Teacher Corps funding has resulted in a reluctance on the part of school superintendents to make applications for the use of these people, who may add materially to our educational programs. We urge you to act favorably on this portion of Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1967.

To insure adequate comprehensive educational planning on a State, regional, or local level, adequate funds should be made available to the States. A tremendous additional workload has been forced upon State and local agencies by Public Law 89-10, making it impossible with limited budgets and personnel to even evaluate the effectiveness of the program. Adequate funds are needed for this important function, but those funds should, by all means, be channeled through State departments of education.

We would strongly urge your favorable consideration of the amendments dealing with innovation in vocational education and expanded educational opportunities for handicapped children. Both of the amendments would mean much to all school systems in the country. Again, these funds should go through State departments of education in the several States.

Gentlemen, I would call your attention to one other educational situation which calls for your immediate action. School boards all over the United States are alarmed about an inevitable conflict between school people who, as trained professionals, have done a good job operating Headstart and the Office of Economic Opportunity which seems to fail to understand that readiness is truly a school function. We take issue with recent OEO guidelines for Headstart requiring community action committee's recommendation for employees for Headstart programs before local boards or education may employ. And, Sam, we did not have the same experience with the Headstart office that you did. They told us that the guidelines meant exactly what they said, nothing more, nothing less.

We are alarmed too by the OEO guidelines regarding so-called neoptism in employment of Headstart personnel. In many counties in Appalachia where qualified, certified personnel is limited and where most people in the area are remotely related, there is a good possibility that this rule may make operation of Headstart impossible. We maintain that Headstart can be most effectively and efficiently operated by the U.S. Office of Education and through the various State departments of education, where there is always some degree of understanding of problems, in even the most remote section of each State. School boards are so disturbed by a lack of understanding on the part of OEO that some local boards of education and superintendents may wash their hands of the whole Headstart program. Such action could only hurt children, who do not deserve such a fate.

Again, we welcome you to a full partnership in this important job of educating all our youth. This partnership is a great challenge to public educators all over the 50 States, as it must be to each of you as parents, lawyers, business people, and American citizens. We have no doubt about all members of the partnership accepting the challenge so that the great progressive movement in education shall proceed with dispatch.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman and committee members.

Chairman PERKINS. Thank you very much, Mr. Clark.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Chairman.

Chairman PERKINS. Yes, Mr. Hawkins.

Mr. HAWKINS. I see that all the witnesses have apparently agreed that Headstart should be transferred over to the Office of Education to be operated, I assume, by the school people locally. I do not know what the situation is in Kentucky.

Chairman PERKINS. It is quite different from your area, the Watts area.

Mr. HAWKINS. I assume that they are relating this recommendation to the situation as it prevails in Kentucky, because in other States the programs operate very successfully by groups in the community, including fraternities, sororities, and churches, and so forth.

I am wondering whether or not they are making a distinction in this recommendation based on what prevails in Kentucky. Because certainly in some areas of the country we would not want this. We believe that parents and many of the personnel contribute their services rather than being paid. I don't know whether I should ask this particular witness or some of the others if the program is to be operated by the school people, in what way will you conduct the program so as to involve the parents, involve the personnel that at the present time are not being paid but are offering their services as part of the local contribution? What would you do about facilities that are now being offered by private industry?

Many of the programs are being operated in places that are not requiring compensation. How would you approach these practical problems if the school people are to operate the programs exclusively.

Mr. CLARK. Should I answer the question, Mr. Chairman? I will be glad to.

We have largely followed the suggestions of involvement of a great many people in developing our Headstart programs. As far as we are concerned, in Kentucky that suggestion is followed implicitly, as it was in trying to decide in Floyd County what our needs were under title I. However, we believe that final authority for employment in the State of Kentucky should be with the board of education, with the superintendent's recommendation.

Now that has not, up to this time, posed a serious problem but we did not get the revised guidelines until very recently from OEO. It seems to make the case very strong and, as I have said, in Floyd County in telephone calls to the Headstart headquarters in Washington they said the guidelines mean exactly what they say.

Mr. HAWKINS. May I interrupt to ask whether or not this would also be the situation if the Headstart program is operated by a non-school group? Would you still insist that you should have a right to say who should be employed and who should not be employed?

Mr. CLARK. No, we would not. It so happens in the schools in Kentucky, Headstart programs are operated exclusively by school people. They have the only facilities available for Headstart.

Mr. HAWKINS. You have none that are being operated by groups other than school people?

Mr. CLARK. No.

Mr. HAWKINS. May I ask you this. Do you have any representation on the old community action agencies of school people? Are they not represented on the OEO community action committees?

Mr. CLARK. Yes, we do have those representatives. We do give reports of educational progress regularly to the community action group.

Mr. HAWKINS. Then are not the schools therefore represented in community action agencies and therefore do have a voice in what goes on in Headstart programs?

Mr. CLARK. Yes. But, again, we are back to the problem of the Kentucky law which says, and since board of education operate Headstart in eastern Kentucky, we are right back to the point which says that Kentucky law states very clearly that employment can be made only upon the recommendation of the school superintendent.

I recognize that problem would not exist if we did not operate Headstart. But since if we did not operate Headstart we would not have Headstart, that is a problem to us.

Mr. HAWKINS. I want to thank the witness for being frank in his answer. I merely wanted to suggest that differences sometimes do lie between one State and another, but we would certainly not want this recommendation carried out in our particular State. Insofar as my experience has proved this program would not operate successfully unless we did have the involvement of many groups, the school people certainly, but many other groups also.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Bell.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Clark, I want to say that I completely concur with what you are saying relative to Headstart. One problem was revealed in the Wolf Report which indicated that youngsters that were in the Headstart program for 3 or 4 months and then went into their regular school system, were found going back to their previous low level. Very poor conditions, poor teachers, inadequate teaching system. So their Headstart was really lost to them. They lost ground, so to speak, when they went in the regular system as before.

I think a coordinated effort like this through the regular school system, from Headstart up through the primary grades so you don't do one without a followthrough in the primary grades. It is an educational program. Let us keep it an educational program.

Chairman PERKINS. Go ahead, Mr. Dodson.

Mr. DODSON. Mr. Chairman, the next witness is a member of the Kentucky State Board of Education, Mr. Henry Pogue.

Chairman PERKINS. You may proceed, Mr. Pogue.

STATEMENT OF HENRY POGUE, JR., CHAIRMAN, STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION, COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY

Mr. POGUE. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am Henry Pogue, Jr., chairman, State board of education, Commonwealth of Kentucky.

On behalf of the members of the State board of education, may I express my appreciation to the Committee on Education and Labor for the privilege of appearing before you. Also, may I take this opportunity to thank this distinguished group for the deep concern you have shown for the cause of public education in our great country, and more especially for the schools of the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

I am here today to voice some continuing concerns relating to a few basic concepts and operational controls that are being advocated under

Federal legislation with respect to public education. More specifically I would like to call your attention to some aspects of proposed H.R. 6230 which is currently being reviewed.

Kentucky Revised Statute 156.035 gives to the State board of education the legal authority for the management and control of the public schools of the Commonwealth of Kentucky. The State board of education, through necessity, needs and desires to understand fully the scope and impact of programs of an educational nature that are either fully or partially supported from Federal funds.

Based on the preceding factors, funds designated as aid to pre-school, elementary, and secondary education should be channeled through the U.S. Office of Education and in turn to the State departments of education and the local school districts in accordance with State laws.

The State board of education has for many years supported all attempts of the Kentucky Department of Education in providing opportunities for better and coordinated planning on short- and long-term bases. Just recently a "survey of surveys" of the department of education was completed under the direction of Dr. Finis Engleman. This survey pointed up the need for educational planning to continue in the legally constituted agencies of State government. Management consultants advocate close relationships between planning and operation.

The State board of education would like to go on record as supporting the idea of the need for better and more coordinated planning at the State level, but would oppose the basic concepts as proposed in part B of title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act under which much of the planning authority of the department of education would possibly be eliminated.

Currently, about 15 percent of the support for public education in Kentucky comes from Federal funds. I might add that 33 percent is local support and 52 percent is State support. This is a small portion of Kentucky's total school financing, but a category of money that requires an extraordinary amount of time in accountability and general control. Some of the difficulty arises from the categorical aid approach.

We believe Federal aid to the States for education should be based on a foundation-program principle which would be distributed to the State departments of education based on need and ability.

Many of the local school districts advise us that great difficulties are being experienced in areas of fiscal management, and especially in areas of planning for utilization of Federal funds. This has been especially true for title I. ESEA, funds. Final allotment figures were not known to the Commonwealth of Kentucky until late February, thereby creating much confusion in local school districts relative to budgetary matters.

It is recommended that the authorizations and appropriations for Federal aid to education programs be made early enough in the fiscal year preceding the school year they are to be made operative. This approach would seem to greatly assist school officials at the local and State levels.

Mr. Chairman, your prior remarks were very encouraging in that regard.

Title III, ESEA, has offered to Kentucky education unusual opportunities for cooperative planning on the part of the local school districts. Innovative practices, with ultimate long-term gains to our schoolchildren will be the end result of such efforts. Continuous efforts should probably be made to update and support the concepts developed in such a worthwhile educational program. The educational "feedback" to the local and State officials will also have far reaching effect on educational progress in Kentucky.

The State board of education recommends that all title III, ESEA, proposals be initially routed through and receive final approval by the State departments of education. All Federal funds in support of programs in title III should be routed through the State departments of education.

The program of vocational education in Kentucky needs to be greatly expanded. Additional funds are needed for the construction of area vocational school facilities to house needed programs. Additional personnel must be trained to staff vocational programs. The work-study program needs to be expanded in order to care for more persons needing financial assistance to take full advantage of these types of programs.

The State board of education recommends that the maximum authorization of \$225 million in the 1963 Vocational Act be raised and that additional appropriations be made for the training of personnel needed in vocational education. Support of the expansion of work-study programs is offered.

The following recommendations are offered concerning the Adult Education Act of 1966:

A supplemental appropriation to provide financing at the maximum level authorized for the current fiscal year.

An appropriation at the maximum level authorized for adult basic education in fiscal 1968, and such funds in fiscal years thereafter as Congress may authorize.

Establish a consistent definition of "adult basic education" to be used throughout the act and fix the minimum age of eligibility at 16 years.

As a final recommendation the Kentucky State Board of Education generally opposes the regionalization concept as has been developed by the U.S. Office of Education. It is felt that this type of an approach simply constitutes another layer of regulatory control over the educational structure of the States.

Again, please accept my most sincere appreciation for the honor of having appeared before this distinguished body.

Chairman PERKINS. Thank you very much, Mr. Pogue.

Mr. Dodson.

Mr. DODSON. The next witness, Mr. Chairman, is Mr. James Baker, superintendent of schools at Middlesboro, Ky.

Chairman PERKINS. Go ahead, Mr. Baker.

STATEMENT OF JAMES E. BAKER, SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS, MIDDLESBORO, KY.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is James E. Baker, superintendent of the Middlesboro Independent Schools of Middlesboro, Ky. Middlesboro is located in Bell County

in southeastern Kentucky. It adjoins the States of Tennessee and Virginia at what is known as Cumberland Gap.

I want to thank the committee for the opportunity of appearing here today. I commend each of you for your interest in the education of the children of this Nation. Recognizing that education is the key to raising the standards of living and the wage-earning power of the poverty-stricken and unemployed citizens of this country.

I believe that education is the major means by which most people are going to be able to prepare themselves to shake the shackles of poverty, to make themselves employable, and to take their rightful place in society. In fact, I know of no one in Bell County, Ky., who has an education and wants a job that is not employed.

In my opinion, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 was one of the finest pieces of legislation that has ever been enacted. As a personal evaluation of this act, I wish to illustrate what it has meant to the Middlesboro Independent School District. We have 2,933 students in our district. Of this number we have had 1,350 students who have participated in programs under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. This is approximately 48 percent of the total enrollment. Seventy-three of this number are enrolled in a parochial school. Title I programs of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act were implemented for the first time in our school district on March 1, 1966, and have now been in operation 12 full months. With the help of this program for the first time the Middlesboro school system now has (and for the information of the others I have added an exhibit of some pictures of the title I program that have been in operation in the Middlesboro school system, which I have passed on to the chairman. I only have one copy and they are at his disposal) :

1. Libraries with certified librarians in every school. This includes books, library shelving, audiovisual materials, and so forth, and these libraries are open 12 months of the year. Not one of our elementary schools or the junior high school had a librarian or library services before. There is a daily average of 495 participating students who use these libraries throughout the system. These same libraries are being utilized by the teaching staff through the use of filmstrips, films, and audiovisual equipment.

2. For the first time full-time physical fitness programs are in operation for all students, grades 1-12. This includes equipment and materials as recommended by the President's Council on Physical Fitness and is established on the same principles and criteria. Again, none of the elementary or the junior high schools offered these programs before.

Physical participation improvements

	Mar. 1, 1966	Mar. 1, 1967
Rope climbing.....	4 out of 25.....	10 out of 25.
Pull-ups (chinning).....	9 out of 50.....	20 out of 39.
Standing broad jumps.....	4 feet 3 inches.....	4 feet 6 inches.
Sit-ups.....	30.....	46.

These comparisons were made on the same students within a given class. That is indicative of the average throughout the school sys-

tem. The program in physical fitness is received with avid participation with the desire on the behalf of the students to go to school.

3. Three programs on remedial reading with trained teachers are now equipped and in operation supplying the needs of those who are reading below grade level. Before we had only one teacher to serve the whole school district. The following illustration is the average improvement by students participating in this program under remedial reading who were reading below grade level.

Grade :	<i>Reading vocabulary increase</i>
3d.....	2 years
4th.....	1.3 years.
5th.....	6 months.

There were 1,092 students involved in the remedial reading program.

4. This program has provided guidance counselors for all elementary students. All guidance counselors are fully certified. There were no guidance counselors at the elementary level before.

5. We now have the services of a full-time social worker who works with the deprived children, with their parents, and with other agencies such as social, welfare, and governmental agencies to provide everything available for the full help of these students. This service was not provided before. Overall attendance increased during this period of time 1.35 percent. Many children now receive help from other coordinating agencies.

6. A summer school program (1966) for students that were at low grade level in grades 7, 8, and 9. Total enrollment was 196. Of this number, 180 completed summer school. Of this number, 176 students were able to advance to the next grade level. Without the summer school program, the majority of those 176 students would have been retained in the same grade. It has never been possible for this school district to offer a summer school program at this grade level before.

7. Health services are provided through the employment of a full-time registered nurse. This person coordinating the health factors with the local and State health departments.

(a) Most of the students are now using tooth brushes and having followup visits to the dentist.

(b) Many students have obtained eye glasses, had tonsillectomies, dental treatment, and consequently are now able to do normal work.

(c) Proper treatment of minor injuries has curtailed infections and has prevented absenteeism.

(d) The nurse has helped tear down, by her acceptance, the hereditary superstitions involving inoculations, medical services, and fear of doctors.

(e) The maintaining of thorough and accurate personal health records.

8. Two hundred children per day have been provided a full class-A lunch plus adequate milk needs. In most situations this is the best meal these students have.

I believe that one of the reasons for the success of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act through the State department of education to the local participating district; that the local district has been able to make evaluations of its needs and designed programs to

meet these needs; to utilize the creative imagination of the local professional people and other supporting agencies and supplementing the major needs of that particular district. I know this has been true in our district as all of our professionally trained people, plus civic groups, health departments, news media, and many other agencies were involved in evaluating and setting forth our most pressing needs.

By this act being administered through our State department of education, we have been able to utilize the work of trained professional people, to coordinate programs under this act with the programs already in existence and to make these new innovations in education an incorporate part of the total education program and not something that would stand alone. By this, we have utilized in title I programs, established certification standards of teaching personnel, standards of accreditation, health standards, and all other requirements which are basic to strong education programs.

The three big objections that I have to the programs that we have been directly involved with under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is the excessive amount of paperwork connected with title I applications and followup information.

1. I believe that forms for reporting finance, the objectives, the dissemination of the statistics, and knowledge gained from project evaluations, should be standardized and be put on time periods to the degree that they would be influential in support of projects and be appropriate for proper review and evaluation. I sincerely believe that budgets should be prepared, accurate accounting be followed, and information and evaluation be supplied in support of the program. But this should be in line with that which is reality and will be effective.

2. Each school should be allocated sufficient funds for the proper administration of title I projects. The present allotment for administration is 8 percent of the total allocation. You cannot provide efficient supervision, accounting, and the overall cost of administration and stay within this amount, unless you have an extremely large grant. By cost of administration, I refer to—

- (a) Cost of an administrator or supervisor;
- (b) Bookkeeping or accounting services;
- (c) Publications such as advertisement of bids on materials and equipment, the annual financial reports and evaluation of projects;
- (d) Postage;
- (e) Telephone; and
- (f) Travel—some limited travel controlled by State or National levels, calling meetings, or something of that sort.

3. The third, but probably the one thing that needs an immediate revision, is the time of year when local districts are notified and given their final appropriations and allocations. This is most important as school districts operate on a fiscal-year basis beginning July 1 of each year and running through June 30 of the following year. If information could be supplied within a time limit which would, along with the necessary guidelines and other criteria, for school districts to plan Elementary and Secondary Education Act programs that will coincide with the basic education programs that are in operation. Without this and not knowing when projects will be approved or the amount of the school districts grant, the respective school districts cannot:

(a) Employ trained, certified, and qualified people in the respective needed areas. These teachers are really the critical teachers who are in demand throughout the Nation. They can gain employment any place, and will unless they can obtain valid contracted employment giving them security. It is vital that districts with a high concentration of low-income families and educationally deprived children have the services of these specialists if the intent of this program is met.

(b) School calendars and programs of activities involving projects under this program must be set and planned for to meet and utilize all available factors.

(c) Programs requiring classroom space, transportation, health services, and all of the supported services require detailed planning that will give full benefit to each child.

(d) In many situations where trained personnel are not available, the colleges and universities will plan a summer school program as a part of their offerings to provide training for these individuals who in turn can put these programs into effect. This can only be done when you know ahead of time and all of these efforts can be coordinated and utilized.

Amendments—Title V Elementary and Secondary Education Act: It has been proposed that an amendment be added to title V which would provide grants for comprehensive educational planning and evaluation. Comprehensive and continued planning for a high quality of education should be provided for; that the authority for this planning and the involvement of different agencies to aid in the planning should be administered and supervised by the State departments of education. Here again I emphasize the need for having educational programs coordinated by trained professional people. Programs for education should not be independent, but should be coordinated with the continuing and existing programs. New programs will be activated and should be to meet the continued educational demands. It is reasonable to assume that new programs will require classrooms, transportation, lunchrooms, playgrounds, and so forth. Then, these same facilities will be needed to serve both the new and the present programs.

Certainly, the thoughts and ideals of other people and agencies, as well as the professional teacher's, should be utilized in planning new ways to meet the educational needs of all children.

I subscribe to the belief that local and State governments should continue to increase and improve their financial obligations to education. But, this can only be done when this planning is carried out and supported through an informed public as to the educational needs of the respective communities.

Amendments—Title VI Elementary and Secondary Education Act: Education for the handicapped children of this country has been secondary and needs full implementation. By this, I mean that the educational needs of every child, regardless of his handicap, should be provided for. No child who is handicapped should ever be deprived of an education. The argument that there is not enough in his classification to provide an adequate program or that he lives too far from a program designed to meet his needs is not valid. The proposed regional resource centers which would be authorized by

amendment to title VI is a good start. But I believe that it should go further than that: that training centers for children should be in each district or at least by combining a small number of districts within a given geographical area which would put the centers where the children are and within a reasonable driving distance which would make it available to every child.

I suggest and recommend that:

1. It be a requirement that every school building constructed in the United States provide classrooms for the handicapped on the first floor level with ramps leading to the outside and with the bathrooms designed to accommodate these children.

2. A program for the recruitment and training of personnel to work with the handicapped be intensive and become a major project of all educational agencies. This program can be strengthened by more colleges and universities offering training programs in the field of education of the handicapped children.

I recommend that these programs be continuous and established for at least 5-year periods in advance.

Amendments—The Vocational Act of 1963: Vocational education is as important as any other phase of education. The Vocational Act of 1963 is a strong and sound piece of legislation. The amendments that have been proposed to this act are vital and should have the support of every educator in the country.

I doubt if any person really knows or can visualize how great the need for education in the vocations really is. As vocational education is really put into effect throughout this country and the public becomes aware of its importance, the demand will be greater from the employer as well as the employee.

In Middlesboro, Ky., as well as Bell County and the adjoining areas you simply cannot find trained plumbers, electricians, printers, commercial cooks, bakers, auto mechanics, bricklayers, sheetmetal workers, carpenters, painters, and most all of the other trades. Common labor is plentiful, but not the skilled or trained workers. When any form of construction is carried out in our area, the workers in most of these trades have to be imported and the native people go unemployed or go to the metropolitan areas to seek employment. This is true even though a large amount of construction is in force most of the time.

Not only is the construction area not able to gain the trained worker in this area, but the small business or service companies cannot obtain qualified personnel to meet the needs for the domestic services.

Guidance and counseling of students at the elementary, secondary, and levels above these are most important and needs full support under this act. To explore and cultivate the interest and ability of our youth into careers is a must. If there is one element left out in helping a student to find himself and to put his ability to work, then all of us are wrong. Let all of us help all the youth of today to take his place in a meaningful society.

Distribution of Title I—Elementary and Secondary Education Act Funds: I wish to express my deepest appreciation and full support to the plan to use one-half of the national average per pupil expenditure for education as the new base for the distribution of title I funds under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. This act was

conceived, enacted, and is concerned with the education of the disadvantaged child. Then it is right that the needs of each child should be considered to be equal.

The materials and equipment used in supporting the education of each disadvantaged child in this country will be manufactured and supplied from practically every State. The trained professional teacher personnel will not all be native born but will be supplied from all areas of this Nation. As Kentucky colleges will train thousands of teachers each year, of which a high percentage will go to other States, then so will many teachers from other States find employment and happiness in Kentucky. In fact, during the past 12 months since title I has been in effect, the Middlesboro school system has obtained the services of teachers from New Jersey, New York, Florida, Washington, Ohio, Tennessee, and Virginia. Without the help of these fine teachers some of the strong title I programs now in operation in our district could not and would not have been fully implemented.

U.S. Office of Education should administer all Federal education legislation: I strongly recommend that legislation enacted by Congress for the purpose of education be administered by the U.S. Office of Education. Programs in education administered by other agencies can be in conflict with one phase or another of the existing educational programs including some phases of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. By conflict, I mean that it's involving children from the same households, the need of classrooms, transportation, food, health, and medical services. I am not opposed to the basis or guidelines of these programs. In no sense do I mean this; I simply believe that programs for education with the aim of uplifting the educational level of all people should be and will have to be in support of each other and be coordinated for full effect. In my opinion, the programs administered from the U.S. Office of Education through the State departments of education to the local school districts have been operated more efficiently and with the greater return for each dollar spent.

One of the programs I strongly recommend to be administered by the U.S. Office of Education is the Headstart program now funded through the Office of Economic Opportunity. My reasons are:

1. Headstart is the beginning of the formal education of these designated children. Their education is and will be continuous through their life. Headstart should be operated in school classrooms provided with adequate lunchroom, bathroom, and many other services that are needed for the operation of this program.

2. Personal and health records of these children should begin with Headstart and should be permanent and cumulative throughout their school life.

3. I can see no reason why educational equipment such as audio-visual equipment could not be utilized in Headstart as well as title I or vocational programs, et cetera.

4. Permanent employees of local boards of education such as social workers, school nurses, supervisors, and many others could be utilized to a more efficient operation.

5. Local boards of education in long-range planning of classrooms and facilities could provide for this program of education.

6. When this program is operated under another agency, and the personnel are employed without any form of qualification or knowl-

edge of educational processes, and local school districts are told that they take these people or it will be operated by other agencies; then it will not and cannot work to the full benefit of the child.

Please place the administration of the Headstart program in the U.S. Office of Education.

Proposed adult education program: I recommend a program of adult education at the high school level, for the thousands of people in this country who quit high school before they completed the requirements for graduation. The requirements here could possibly be the same as for the high school age child now enrolled. Most of these people who quit high school realize that they made a mistake and now have a strong desire to go back and finish high school. Due to obligations to families and employment, these people cannot attend a regular school program. Then, too, many would be embarrassed to go to school with their children and have to compete with a young energetic mind.

The same school facilities and equipment could be utilized to operate such a program. This would mean that public schools could be used more hours in a day and longer periods in the year. Why should they sit idle?

Think of what this would do to improve the capabilities and the wage earning power of the people of this country, and what it would do to improve the overall thought as to our responsibility to education of all. Consequently, the financing of a total educational program will be better received with higher values and everyone will be the recipients one way or the other.

School construction: A shortage of classrooms for the general education of children is now at the critical stage. But, it will be more critical before funds are available and classrooms can be constructed. Most of the school districts in Kentucky have extended their bonding ability to its capacity. Yet, the needs have not been met. I am sure this exists in most, if not all, other States.

The new programs of education are going to require additional classrooms. Where are they to come from? We need the aid of the Federal Government toward financial aid for the construction of classrooms and other educational facilities.

I do not believe nor propose that this be carried out by the Federal Government alone; that it should be a combined effort of the local, State, and Federal Governments. That if Congress would enact legislation for school construction, with matching funds to come from the local and State governments, then this classroom shortage could be met in a very few years.

Thank you for giving me the opportunity of presenting my statements on behalf of education. I am very humble and honored that you have granted me the time.

The Middlesboro Board of Education asked me to extend their appreciation to each of you for your untiring efforts to the education of the children of Middlesboro and the Nation. In behalf of the Middlesboro Board of Education, I would like to extend an invitation to any or all of you to visit Middlesboro and to see the real values that have come from your programs.

Thank you again.

Chairman PERKINS. Thank you very much, Mr. Barker. I have heard of your outstanding school system over these many years. I appreciate your coming here today. You made mention of the outside school teachers coming into your area. Did you acquire most of your remedial reading teachers or social workers and school nurses and supervisors and guidance counselors from the outside, or did you recruit those at the local level?

Mr. BAKER. Most of them come from the local level. I used the term "influence these programs" because some of these people were presently employed in other positions or as basic classroom teachers. They made a replacement for the people who were assigned to title I projects or programs. In certain phases, for example, special education in the area of mental retardation, this person came to us from another State, trained in another State and came to us to work in the Middlesboro school system. By far most of these people who are involved are and have been within the faculty of the school system.

Chairman PERKINS. Dr. Dodson.

Mr. DODSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Our next speaker is Mr. Hugh Spaulding, superintendent of Marion County Schools.

Chairman PERKINS. Go ahead, Mr. Spaulding.

STATEMENT OF HUGH C. SPAULDING, SUPERINTENDENT OF MARION COUNTY SCHOOLS, LEBANON, KY.

Mr. SPAULDING. Mr. Chairman, distinguished members of the Education and Labor Committee, I am Hugh C. Spaulding, superintendent of school in Marion County, Lebanon, Ky. I represent a largely rural school system in central Kentucky with a total population of approximately 18,000 people and a school census of approximately 5,000 children. Twelve hundred seventy-one of our children, or 23 percent are classified as children from low-income families.

I am very glad to have this opportunity to appear before you to participate in the orderly processes of representative government, and to present this statement giving my views regarding certain aspects of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 added about 15 percent to our annual budget for the operation of our school system. It has enabled us to provide many of the things that we have known we needed for many years, but for which funds were not available.

Some of the principal additions made in the staff, facilities, and services of our school system are as follows:

1. Nine special remedial reading teachers, serving 753 pupils in 10 schools.
2. Six special physical education teachers, serving 1,792 pupils in 10 schools.
3. One special teacher for slow-learning children, serving 16 pupils in one school.
4. Much valuable audiovisual education equipment, materials and supplies for these new special teachers of remedial reading.
5. Twelve teachers' aids to assist these new special teachers in the respective instructional areas.
6. Free lunches for 84 children from low-income families in 10 schools.

7. Several thousand new library books to improve school library services.

As an example of the benefits derived from the Federal aid to education program, I wish to quote from a report on a preliminary evaluation conducted in our school system on the effectiveness of our remedial reading program :

81 percent of the pupils checked out more books to read, the parents stated that 73 percent of the pupils were reading more at home, and that 76 percent had a better attitude towards school.

Much good has been accomplished with the assistance of Federal funds, but there is much that still needs to be done. We have not yet reached our goal of excellence in education. As long as hundreds of people in our county, thousands of people in our State, and millions of people in our Nation go through life partially blindfolded by preventable ignorance, we still have a long way to go.

I request that you give the following suggestions serious consideration as you study ways to improve the present law :

1. School authorities should be given definite information regarding the available Federal funds several months in advance of the beginning of a school year. This is very important if the most effective use is to be made of these funds in the employment of additional personnel and in the arrangement of facilities and services.

2. Any special planning agency for education on the State level should be under the general supervision of State departments of education instead of the Governors' offices for the following reasons:

- (1) Personnel, organization, and experience are more readily available.

- (2) An educational center, such as a State department of education, is more appropriate for an educational planning series than a direct political center such as a Governor's office.

3. One-half of the national average per-pupil expenditure for education should be used as the base for the distribution of title I funds. Using one-half of the average per-pupil expenditure for education in each State as the basis for distribution in each individual State penalizes the poorer States. It helps to perpetuate a system whereby the rich get richer and the poor get children. We are one nation, and Federal policy should be directed toward the goal of achieving the same high standard of living in all States.

4. The authority of community action committees to recommend the staff to be employed in the Headstart program should be eliminated. The community action committees are organized under the auspices of the Office of Economic Opportunity. Many are doing excellent work, but school authorities are generally better trained and prepared to select and organize the Headstart programs, which are essentially educational in nature.

5. Paperwork should be reduced and guidelines restricted as much as possible. For example, we suggest the elimination or at least the modification of the calculations now required in each school center to determine that a certain specific number or a certain specific percentage of economically underprivileged children are in that school center before the benefits of the present law can be made available to any of the children in that school center. We doubt that it is necessary or

desirable to carry such calculations below the level of the local school system.

6. The U.S. Office of Education should administer national educational funds and programs. The splintering of national educational efforts is almost certain to be less efficient and effective than would a policy of continuity and consistency which is more likely to develop under a united educational organization. With all due respect to the House Education and Labor Committee, I venture to suggest that some day even this committee may well be separated into two committees, one in the field of labor and another in the field of education.

7. The definition of a low-income family used as an important factor in the distribution of title I funds should be changed. A definition of a low income, or economically deprived family with an annual income of \$1,999 and denies Federal assistance for 10 children in a family with an annual income of \$2,001, in my opinion is wrong. Such a definition of a low-income family almost seems to be a device designed to discriminate against the disadvantaged: however, I am sure that such was not the case. The use of this definition of a low-income family may, in a long span of years, be effective in some small way as a family size limitation measure, but it can never be justified as a fair means to use to provide help for needy, economically deprived, underprivileged, and living children.

8. Funds should be provided for schoolhouse construction on the elementary and secondary level. Schoolhouses, in a very vital way, are the real fortifications of a democracy. Any effort to produce a strong and effective educational program for our Nation as a whole, without insuring first of all a strong and effective elementary and secondary program, is almost certainly doomed to failure because of the simple engineering truth that you cannot build a solid structure on a weak foundation.

In conclusion, I wish to express the gratitude of the people I represent to those of you who helped to make the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 the law of the land. Federal aid to elementary and secondary education has been one of the dreams of educational leaders for many years.

A combination of factors, all diminishing in force, have united in the past to defer this dream. The modern American poet Langston Hughes, once asked this question in one of his poems, "What happens to a dream deferred? Does it dry up like a raisin in the sun?" He was writing about the kind of dream which comes from the searching heart of humanity as it seeks the golden day of peace and prosperity for all people.

His answer was that such a dream does not dry up like a raisin in the sun, that it cannot be locked up in a jail, that it cannot even be permanently deferred. The dreams of education are of such dreams as the poet wrote about. Federal aid to education was once a dream, and it was the kind of dream that kept coming back until it became a reality. It will, I am sure, be improved in many ways in the years ahead in order to give our young people the educational and intellectual assistance they need to help them to solve the many problems of our society.

Chairman PERKINS. Thank you, Mr. Spaulding.

Mr. Dodson?

Mr. DODSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I would like to present to this group a Kentucky legislator from Hardin County who came along to keep Mr. Burkhead straight—Sam Watkins. Sam is a very good friend of our down in the Kentucky Legislature. He is here today to hear our testimony.

Chairman PERKINS. I am glad you are up here.

Mr. WATKINS. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DODSON. The next witness is Dr. Richard VanHoose, superintendent of not only the largest school system in Kentucky but the fastest growing system in Kentucky.

STATEMENT OF RICHARD VAN HOOSE, SUPERINTENDENT, JEFFERSON COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS, KENTUCKY

Mr. VANHOOSE. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am Richard VanHoose, superintendent of the Jefferson County schools, a system employing over 5,000 personnel to serve 75,000 children enrolled in the public schools of a suburban, metropolitan area of Kentucky. Fifteen years ago our pupil membership was less than 20,000. Since that time, we have grown at the rate of 3,000 to 6,000 pupils a year. Next year we expect to enroll 82,000 or more, so you can see that we are blessed with the advantages and disadvantages of phenomenal growth.

We appreciate the contribution the Federal Government has made through the legislative programs you are now considering, and we are aware of your desire to strengthen these programs. You are acting wisely when you invite an interchange of thought from those who have had the responsibility of using the funds that Congress intended to help the schoolchildren of this land. We believe they have been helped. We believe, as you do, that this legislation can be improved in the light of our experience of our past few years, and we are most grateful for the opportunity to offer suggestions as you consider amendments to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

In setting up programs funded by Public Law 89-10, our biggest headache has been the delay in receiving guidelines, authorization, and final allocations, as well as some confusion caused by conflicting directives. Poverty qualifications are defined one way by the Office of Economic Opportunity, and another by Public Law 89-10. Paperwork in connection with these programs is extremely heavy, and is further complicated in some cases by requests for information not included in the original guidelines.

We realize that legislation alone cannot break this logjam of paperwork. We are sympathetic to the need for good planning and for an evaluation that will show how well the project did what it set out to do. We believe consideration might be given to placing the administration of all educational legislation under the U.S. Office of Education.

It would eliminate some of the present confusion about communicating with Washington. Hopefully, it would also eliminate some of the

duplication and conflicting directives which now exist. We want to cooperate in every way possible in setting up, operating, and evaluating programs under Public Law 89-10, but our ability to plan and staff these programs adequately is reduced when delay and confusion interfere. The children do not receive full benefit. Earlier annual appropriations for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act would permit better planning and staffing.

In my opening remarks, I referred to the rapid growth that has been experienced by our school system. We believe that any school system so affected is under conditions of unusual stress, and that the Federal Government rightly could permit the use of Federal funds to supplement local effort in housing schoolchildren. You will find a housing crisis in almost every community experiencing rapid growth on a large scale, and this results in crowded classrooms, double sessions, and all the other problems created when the school population expands faster than the tax base which supports it.

Because of our housing shortage, we have not always been able to house title I programs where they were most needed. Some of our title I counselors operate out of the school bookstore. Remedial reading teachers are holding classes with small groups in dressing rooms off the stage of the school auditorium. Since we are so desperate for housing for the average child, we have been able to provide very little in the way of special facilities for children with special needs. Funds applicable to construction would alleviate these problems.

In amending the Fair Labor Standards Act to include schools, Congress has shown concern for those who were getting less for the going rate for the work they do, and this is a good thing. At the same time, it has worked a hardship on schools attempting to provide equitable distribution of the limited funds available to them. The time and a half provision has created immediate problems, as the minimum wage is increased to \$1.60 an hour over the next 5 years, years, these problems will increase. Can the Federal Government give some support to help the financially pressed public schools meet these wage requirements?

In support of Superintendents Burkhead and Stone, let me say that the recent amendment of Public Law 874 will mean a loss in revenue to the Jefferson County schools of about \$145,546. If it is not possible to remove this amendment, we would strongly urge the exemption of installations with more than 2,000 children. In Kentucky, the local school system's hands are tied by State law, and we are helpless to correct this situation. Our foundation program is based on local taxes, and since Federal property is not taxable for local purposes, Public Law 874 money is not counted as local effort when foundation calculations are made.

Chairman PERKINS. Let me interrupt you to make the observation that I am sure the gentleman realizes it was the policy all through the years to get the Federal Government out of the business of operating schools and let the local boards of education shoulder the responsibility. I am of the opinion that that is what prompted the amendment last year. If I recall correctly throughout the country the school people in general wanted this approach at the State level.

They wanted to participate in financing the cost of education on the theory that it was an economic benefit to the State by virtue of the military installation.

If that was true at Fort Knox, I mean if the State participated on that theory I would not see that we would have any problem down there at all. But be that as it may, we have a problem presently and I will certainly do everything in my power to see that we cure the problem if the State does not make the proper interpretation. I personally feel that this policy that we have been processing under has been sound over the years. It has been more or less our policy to try to get the Government away from operating schools on the theory that it is an economic benefit to the State, these military installations.

But be that as it may, this committee will try to find an equitable solution and we will take another look at this amendment that was put in here last year. But what strikes me at the present time, Mr. VanHoose, no other school in the Nation has raised the question on this amendment and last year I went against administration's wishes in rewriting the impact legislation and the committee sustained my views. We all worked together to make sure that we did not tear down the impacted area program legislation, a program which I feel has worked so well.

Now, this is one particular instance in Kentucky where we do not, as I see it, have the interpretation of the law that most other States have. Maybe we are right down there and the other States are wrong, I just don't know. But we will take another look at it.

Mr. VANHOOSE. Thank you, Mr. Perkins.

Mr. PERCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, apropos of the colloquy, I was wondering whether Mr. VanHoose would care to comment on the suggestion that has been made here by others that we include children living in public housing units in impacted areas for Federal aid. Would that help your county? You said you were losing \$145,000. If they were to count, in lieu of taxes, the Federal contribution on the basis that we now employ for impacted aid youngsters, federally financed housing, would that help your county to any degree?

Mr. VANHOOSE. No, sir; not in my particular county. We do not have, to my knowledge, any Federal aid supported housing projects.

Chairman PERKINS. Go ahead, Mr. VanHoose.

Mr. VANHOOSE. Comprehensive planning for education is indeed a worthy objective. This type of planning goes on in Kentucky at both the local and State level. Title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act has resulted in improved resources at the Kentucky State Department of Education. The people in this department have shown in the past that they realize the value of planning, and with the assistance of title V funds, have improved their resources that can be applied to this need.

To set up a special agency to deal with problems of educational planning when State departments of education are already staffed and involved in this very activity makes for duplication of effort.

It is possible that the purpose of this proposal could actually be defeated by its implementation as proposed in the amendment. Most States have departments of education with resources and personnel necessary for comprehensive planning, and can provide more value

per dollar spent than a group newly assembled for this specific purpose. In fact, with the present shortage of professionals in this field, I would question in any State that would compare favorably with resources already to be found in that State's department of education.

It has been a privilege to appear before this committee. The school system I represent appreciates the opportunity to express to you our thoughts on the subject you are considering.

Thank you for your kind attention.

Chairman PERKINS. Thank you very much.

Mr. DODSON. Our next witness is Dr. W. R. McNeill.

STATEMENT OF W. R. McNEILL, SUPERINTENDENT, BOWLING GREEN INDEPENDENT SCHOOLS, BOWLING GREEN, KY.

Mr. McNEILL. Honorable Chairman and distinguished members of the House Education and Labor Committee, I wish to thank you sincerely for this opportunity of appearing before you in behalf of children in the Commonwealth of Kentucky and particularly in the city of Bowling Green, who have profited immensely from the fine effort on your part through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. I have with me some exhibit material that I would like to present, material on our reading center, and material from our guidance division which is part of this act, and also a dropout study that is being carried on.

May I at this time quote from comments the reading material center presented as they embarked upon their work, showing the deep sincerity of our appreciation.

This marks the beginning of a new era in education. For all teachers this is an exciting and dreamed-of experience in our teaching career. Title I funds are providing new horizons for our economically, culturally, and educationally deprived students. The reading centers are one facet of this Federal program in which our staff members are seeking to provide equal opportunity to students through differential treatment without regard to race, creed, or national origin. Our purpose in this remedial reading project is to establish a program geared to the needs of the aforementioned students.

May I say that we have as a result of these opportunities you have provided us been able to do things that we have wanted to do for so long, to probe the very depth, as you will find as we discuss the surveys we have made through the guidance division where we would talk with parents, we would bring parents in and talk with them about our problems, as we worked with the underprivileged children they would sit in our midst, they would talk with us and we would then develop programs that would meet the needs. We are approaching the very zenith of our desire to work toward the one to one ratio of individualized instruction.

May I hasten to add that other areas beside title I are particularly beneficial because we have been benefactors from an area of title III where we have an individualized instruction program going in one of our schools that serves some 40 counties and about 50 school districts in our area, where these people through the funds you have provided us, are visiting communities throughout the Nation and are bringing innovations that we are using to provide our children the opportunity to obtain this instruction on an individualized basis.

We use team teaching to bring much in the way of an impact on the individual student through the various areas of specialists working with the children in areas of, say, a specialist in math, science, language, arts, social studies, so that they can receive that individualized attention.

I would like to support strongly points that my colleagues have listed here today such as the timing of the information and particularly the appropriation in order that we may go about our planning more orderly and not have the crash programs that we sometimes experience.

You asked the question, Mr. Chairman, of another person testifying here about securing the personnel. Sometimes, we do get some outside people but most often we feel that we use our people from our own staff. We have fine people working with us, dedicated people who are intensely interested in children and in their educational opportunities. We develop them. We are going to strive at every moment not to deprive the other children in our community by depriving them of our resource here in Bowling Green because we have the Western Kentucky University. Of course we feel we are fortunate to have that fine institution to provide us with well-trained personnel who come in and work with us. Moving on, we do need funds for construction. As was pointed out by Dr. VanHoose, you find that it is difficult to keep up with the population explosion, providing classrooms for this very fine program that we feel is being instituted, all over this land of ours. So, take a good look at the possibilities of providing some funds whereby we may bring in needed fiscal facilities in order to assist us in this program. We heartily endorse the Headstart program.

We appreciated the President's message to Congress where he emphasized that Headstart was a basic approach and we feel that it is quite true, we feel that it should be, as has been brought out here, perhaps a bit more school oriented. We want the community. While we use the community at all times, if we are not using the community we are losing a very vital resource. We are going to involve the community every way we can but as those youngsters come into school after getting a good start through Headstart then let us have it more school oriented so that that child will get more of the same from Headstart instead of more of the same of the deprived conditions that we had, the deprivations that we have had in the past.

I might also add another item, the restoration of funds under NDEA title III. We think this is of extreme importance to assist us in our regular program where we used the matching money to provide audiovisuals that are so important for our regular program as well as for title I program, title III program and of course we are very appreciative of the program in title II. I am of the opinion that perhaps we have not been receiving the percentage on the administration, but I mentioned to a colleague, I suspect that could very well have been totaled in with our total funds and then divided equitably between us. I am just putting that in as a plug for that.

Yes, your guidance for the use of the national average for per pupil expenditures we feel will benefit us in Bowling Green and throughout the State of Kentucky, and the use of the \$3,000 income as the guide-

line for the increase will also give us greater opportunities to provide our children with these wonderful opportunities.

I might add a footnote that I would like to know more about the distribution that you have had about the use of children in federally supported housing. I believe there is another member of our group that will be interested in this that might benefit from it.

May I thank you for this opportunity of appearing before you on behalf of the children, the staff, the school board and the community of Bowling Green, Ky., for presenting my views before you at this time.

Chairman PERKINS. Thank you very much, Mr. McNeill.

Mr. DODSON. Mr. Chairman, we have one other superintendent remaining to testify and then Mr. Watkins wants to make a brief statement. Our last superintendent is Leon Smith, superintendent of McCracken County schools down in Paducah.

STATEMENT OF LEON T. SMITH, SUPERINTENDENT, McCRACKEN COUNTY SCHOOLS, PADUCAH, KY.

Mr. SMITH. Congressman Perkins, members of the committee, it is certainly a privilege for me to come and appear before this committee. I am Leon T. Smith, superintendent of schools in McCracken County, a county in the extreme western part of Kentucky. You have heard primarily from central and eastern Kentucky this morning. We are located in the heart of the Purcuse right near Kentucky and Barkeley Lakes. McCracken County had previously been an agricultural county until recent years. We are fast becoming urbanized and industrialized. We have some 6,000 children enrolled in 12 different educational centers in McCracken County. All of our schools have benefited greatly from the legislation that has been enacted at the national level. We have tried to take advantage of all the measures that are applicable to our particular county.

We are especially appreciative of title I because we feel that education has been greatly improved in McCracken County as a result of this measure. Some of the things that we have achieved as a result of this act are as follows: We have in McCracken County a complete physical education program for all children in grades 1 through 12. This program is administered by properly certified and well-trained physical education teachers. We are now in the process of completing plans for the initiation of a remedial reading program primarily designed to teach remedial reading mathematics. This too, of course, would be under the direction of properly trained and well-certified people. We have a complete library program in all elementary and secondary schools and as a result of title I we have an expanded guidance program at the junior high and high school levels. Also, under title III of the Elementary and Secondary Act we in western Kentucky, some 17 counties and 28 districts, have one of the most successful, I believe, programs for inservice training of teachers that is in existence in Kentucky and possibly in the Nation.

In McCracken County we have organized curriculum study and research committees which are designed to study and improve our instructional program at all levels. We are studying different fields and have individuals at work in all of these particular fields.

I would like to refer to some of the other acts of legislation that are beneficial to us in McCracken County. The National Defense Educational Act which came early in our experience has been responsible for helping provide much needed teachers aids and materials, and audiovisual aids and things of that nature. We feel that this has greatly improved the instructional program in McCracken County. We have endeavored in all instances to use all of our entitlement under this particular program. The Vocational Administration Act of 1963 has been of invaluable service to McCracken County. I have only one recommendation to make to this group: Several of my predecessors have mentioned several recommendations. We in McCracken County were faced with the apparent loss of our vocational education departments in our three county schools. We were faced with that loss primarily because very few of our people were farm connected and our whole vocational educational program required that all of our students be farm connected. Some 31½ years ago, McCracken County participated in a pilot program in agricultural occupations and for 18 months we conducted that program with an idea of training agricultural youth to do something other than farming. Since the 18 months pilot program has been in existence we have been designated as demonstration center in agricultural occupations.

The purpose of this particular program is threefold: First, it is to prepare boys for effective job entry and advance. In agricultural businesses which sell agricultural supplies and services to farmers and others. Second, it does help many boys discover an interest in a particular phase of the business of agriculture to move on to a specialized or technical training area vocational school or community college. Third, it does cause boys to develop a desire to go to college and to prepare themselves for professional careers in agriculture.

I think we in McCracken County and Kentucky are doing a better job of educating our college-bound students, than we are those who are forced to leave school and take a job in order to earn a livelihood. For that reason my recommendation is that this committee and my fellow educators should place more emphasis on the training of individuals to earn a living. I am talking about those individuals who must begin to earn a living before they enter college or without college. The first year of the demonstration center in McCracken County, and, incidentally, this was located at Reidland High School, which was in the eastern part of McCracken County, are as follows: the Department of Vocational Agriculture at Reidland has successfully completed 2 years as a demonstration center demonstrating a program which trains senior students of vocational agriculture in agricultural occupations. During these 2 years some 300 principals, board members, educators, superintendents, supervisors, and advisory committee members from 20 States in the Nation have visited this center or this demonstration center.

The program at the center has recently been evaluated by out-of-State and in-State committees. It was evaluated first on the program and second on how well the program was being demonstrated to visitors. The center received commendable recommendations from both evaluating committees. The in-State committee was composed of superintendents, principals, and agricultural businessmen. The out-of-

State committee was composed of teachers and supervisors and teachers of agriculture. Prior to becoming a demonstration center the department an 18-month pilot program which leads to employment in agricultural occupations. The present program at Reidland prepares senior students of vocational agriculture for employment in agricultural businesses that sell services and equipment or feeds and seeds and fertilizers, agricultural chemicals and supplies.

There is a systematic program of instruction, classwork is followed by supervised practices related to classroom instruction. The program runs through an entire school year and includes the following units:

Opportunities in agricultural occupations; orientation to the training program; organization of distributive businesses; agricultural mathematics; human relations; personality traits; salesmanship and selling; merchandizing in the fields of feed, seeds and fertilizers and agricultural chemicals.

The class instruction includes problem solving, demonstration, constructing displays, role playing, rehearsing, and use of resource people. Each boy is placed in an agricultural supply business for a minimum of 200 hours of supervised practice during the school year. Reidland High School has a three-teacher department of vocational agriculture. There is a 4-year program of instruction at the high school level and an out-of-school program for young and adult farmers.

Freshmen agriculturists composed of crops, horticulture, soils in relation to crops. The sophomores study farm animals, including selecting, feeding, and breeding. The juniors study soils, including land use, physical properties, chemical properties, using soil-building materials, landscaping, and horticulture. The seniors have farm management, agricultural occupations, and so forth. In each of the regular 4 years of vocational agriculture, have had agricultural mechanics and supervising farming as a part of the instructional part of the program. The out-of-school programing for the young adult farmers varies from year to year based on the needs of the group. The department has a small greenhouse which is used in connection with classwork with freshmen and juniors in crops and horticulture. Two teachers handle the first 3 years of agriculture. One teacher directs the program of agricultural occupations at Reidland and coordinates the placement of students for supervised practices in agricultural businesses in the city and the county. In addition to the agricultural occupational class at Reidland, two other high schools in McCracken County have programs in agricultural occupations. One is in vocational horticulture. The other is in agricultural mechanics. The director of this program is Mr. Clayton Reilly, who serves as coordinator of all programs in the county. We believe that we have revolutionized the teaching of vocational agriculture not only in Kentucky but in the United States and will enable boys to learn to serve in different capacities that they otherwise would not have had the opportunity to serve in. Since we live as close to Kentucky and Barkeley Lake as we do—

Chairman PERKINS. In order to expedite, let me suggest that the rest of that statement be inserted in the record, Mr. Smith. We are going to have to recess here in 15 minutes for a quorum. If you would care to summarize—

Mr. SMITH. I have just one more minute and then I will be through.

Since we live as close to Kentucky and Barkeley Lake as we do, it is a serious matter if your lawnmower or your cultivator won't start, but if your motorboat won't start, it is a calamity.

Thank you, sir. I have appreciated the opportunity of appearing before you.

Chairman PERKINS. We appreciate your coming.

Mr. DODSON. Mr. Sam Watkins, whom I introduced a while ago, is a representative from Kentucky. He is on the education committee and several other committees which I won't take the time to mention, but he wants about 2 minutes.

Chairman PERKINS. Please come around.

STATEMENT OF HON. SAM WATKINS, MEMBER OF THE LEGISLATURE, STATE OF KENTUCKY

Mr. WATKINS. Honorable Chairman, honorable members of the committee, I want to thank you for giving me just a minute to make just a brief statement regarding some of the hearings that have been brought out today, especially in regard to the Kentucky Department of Education taking over the school system at Fort Knox.

The attorney general of Kentucky has ruled that it would be unlawful for the department to take over these schools under the present statutes and it is necessary to charge them. Of course I can't speak for the Kentucky House of Representatives or the Kentucky Legislature as to what they will do but being a battle-scarred member of that honorable body, I think I can point out that it would be impossible to get such a law changed inasmuch as there are only about five members of the house that would be affected in this area around Fort Knox and Fort Campbell.

Chairman PERKINS. Let me ask you at that point: Assuming that the law was changed, you had favorable ruling from the attorney general, how much money would Hardin County then lose to the area as a result of the change, if any?

Mr. WATKINS. In the two forts there are approximately 10,000 children involved. It is estimated about \$2 million would have to be brought from some other source or would have to be deducted from our general fund.

Chairman PERKINS. Here is the point: I think you have missed the point. Public Laws 815 and 874 cited by Mr. Burkhead was added in order to encourage the education of federally connected children in local community schools rather than in federally operated home base schools. This, as you recall, was the basic philosophy behind Public Laws 815 and 874 originally, get the Army in particularly and the Government in general out of the business of running schools. That is what we were trying to do last year, trying to get the Government and the Army out of the business of running schools. Now if Frankfort agreed to participate in financing of education of these youngsters on the theory that there is economic benefit to the State by virtue of Fort Knox, I am of the opinion that the problem would be resolved. However, none of us is infallible and I have already directed the staff to check with the Office of Education and if Frankfort did participate,

assuming that they did, to find out whether there would still be any loss. It can be done, in my judgment, under a ruling of the attorney general.

I don't want to take issue with my friend on the history of 815 and 874. I am just as anxious as you are to see that the States, the State of Kentucky especially, does not suffer any loss, especially in the Fort Knox area, by reason of this amendment. I don't know of any reason why we cannot remove the amendment. I think the committee will go along. But the basic purpose which I say you missed was to get the schools, was to get the Army and the Government in general out of the business of running the schools. That is what we have tried to do all through the years.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Chairman, that is welcome news, that the U.S. Office of Education, would like to get out of the business of operating schools. I might say, sir, that that would be welcome news from other departments of Government, also, getting out of the business of being in business.

To answer your question, sir, I am told that the money that is allocated to these posts under title VI of Public Law 874 would adequately take care of the problem but as far as raising the money locally, on a local level, which I am sure would be desirable, I would like to point out, sir, that we get approximately \$45 million from 1 percent of our 3 percent retail sales tax and that could not be collected at the PX.

Chairman PERKINS. We well understand that. We have gone over that hundreds and hundreds of times.

Mr. WATKINS. Where would we get our money? May I direct a question to the Chair?

The department of education in Kentucky without Federal help in operating the schools would find it impossible.

Chairman PERKINS. No one in the impacted area legislation area has supported it more strongly than I have. I helped write the legislation. I think we protected the legislation when it was under all kinds of attacks throughout the years. We intend to do it this time. I don't think we have any argument here. I think you are trying to argue over nothing.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Chairman, you feel that the Attorney General has authority to say—that is something I don't have anything to do with, or know anything about. If we knew what money is available to us I would know what kind of bill of goods I would have to sell to my colleagues in the house of representatives.

Chairman PERKINS. I am sure your particular area does not benefit very much from the impacted area legislation. The great impact has been around the Fort Knox area. I can appreciate the loss of revenue. This committee certainly, even though it is one district in the country, I don't think would stand for a tremendous burden on any one school district if our State laws did not conform. I think we can iron out this problem without any difficulty.

Mr. BURKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, may I make a brief statement?

Chairman PERKINS. Yes.

Mr. BURKHEAD. We are agreed with the principle that the Federal Government should not operate the schools but we do not want to be caught with the school system not having sufficient funds to operate when there is no source to get it from. That is our problem.

Chairman PERKINS. I understand your problem. Now assuming that you had a favorable ruling from the Attorney General, I don't have the figures before me, how much money would you lose, if any?

Mr. BURKHEAD. We would not lose any. We would be happy to operate the schools on the base.

Chairman PERKINS. That is what I am trying to get.

Mr. BURKHEAD. That is what I have been working on with the attorney general. He has called the attorney general down in Georgia to find out what kind of ruling he made to take care of Georgia. He did that last week.

Chairman PERKINS. That took place last week?

Mr. BURKHEAD. Yes.

Chairman PERKINS. You know that as good as we have been all through the years with these education agencies we do not intend to let any school district suffer.

Mr. BURKHEAD. We don't want to be the forgotten district.

Chairman PERKINS. I don't think you are. You see, the theory that we operated under here was trying to get the Government out of business.

Mr. BURKHEAD. I can agree with that.

Chairman PERKINS. That has been the principle throughout the years.

Mr. BURKHEAD. But come June 30, 1968—

Chairman PERKINS. I am very confident that your school district will not suffer too much. I think you ought to go ahead and press for this ruling anyway since this is the only one in the whole country that we have this demand on since we are heading in the direction of getting the Federal Government and particularly the Department of the Army out of the business of running the schools.

Mr. BURKHEAD. There are the States, the Carolinas and Tennessee and Georgia at present, who think they have their problem solved. Maybe one or two others.

Chairman PERKINS. Yes. Let me compliment you, Mr. Burkhead. All through the years you have come up here and helped us write the impacted legislation. We appreciate your interest. We know just what it means to that area. When I get around the Fort Knox area, especially in your county, and see those nice school buildings, I like to think that I have had a part in it, especially when I visited that area in 1949 when we first wrote these laws.

Why don't we recess and come back here at 2 o'clock.

Mr. DODSON. Mr. Chairman, we are all finished with our Kentucky delegation.

Chairman PERKINS. I know, but there may be some questions. Try to come back.

(Whereupon, at 12:45 p.m., the hearing was recessed, to reconvene at 2 p.m. the same day.)

AFTERNOON SESSION

(The committee reconvened at 2 p.m., Hon. Carl D. Perkins, chairman, presiding.)

Chairman PERKINS. Gentlemen, I am impressed with the word that you superintendents have brought to the Congress from all sec-

tions of Kentucky. Of course I am more familiar with eastern Kentucky. I never anticipated that the hearings today would produce a general report throughout Kentucky from all sections. I certainly wish to compliment Dr. Dodson for inviting to Washington all of you distinguished educators. I think we have a long ways to go yet. We are making some progress. If I were to project into the future, I feel that we will sooner or later expand in another direction from the categorical approach, general Federal aid will actually become a reality.

I do not mean to imply that the categorical approach has not been effective. In fact, I feel it has been most effective because we are zeroing in on the areas where we have the so-called educationally deprived child, and it is in those areas that you need the assistance greater than any other area. We cannot overlook this fact. It is going to take us some time to come up with the ways and means and the type of programs that will best serve these disadvantaged areas.

To my way of thinking today, I feel that the funds we now have, from the evidence that I have heard, the funding is not sufficient for our programing purposes and at the same time our school construction program which is just as much a need perhaps as the programing for the disadvantaged sections of the country.

I would like to ask you a question. I know very little funds have been expended for school construction. I would like to ask you gentlemen, considering the way that the program is being funded at the present time, the present level of funding, do you know of any better way to spend the money and make use of it to see that the needy areas of the country receive the greatest benefits than the way you are expending funds for it at the present time? That is my question. I would like to hear your comment.

Mr. BURKHEAD. I brought out in my testimony this morning that large school districts were disadvantaged in that they had to select the schools either on a numbers basis or on a percentage basis. That cuts out a great percentage of our economically handicapped children. What can be done about that I don't know.

Chairman PERKINS. That is an administrative point.

Mr. BURKHEAD. According to the guidelines we have no choice about it.

Chairman PERKINS. Go ahead, Doctor.

Mr. McNEILL. I feel very strongly about the need for assistance in constructing new classrooms in order to house these programs. I might give an example in my own instance and maybe Mr. Dodson can give some examples from the statewide need.

We feel strongly about the Headstart program. It is fine. They did a fine job for our youngsters. But our schools are so crowded. By the way, we have a campaign right now to help ourselves by building a new high school in Bowling. I think the people of Bowling are going to do that. But we have not had the Headstart program throughout the year for the reason we have no place to put it. Our classrooms are filled, and we had no place to put the Headstart program. So we are having a full-blown program during the summer. Then we are losing that during the remainder of the year.

I would like to give that example as the need for classroom construction.

Chairman PERKINS. I agree with that statement. You know, before we came forth with the categorical approach, we were doing very little toward assisting the disadvantaged child in the country. Do you feel that we have zeroed in in the right areas with the funds that we are expending?

Mr. McNEILL. We are doing things now that we have wanted to do for years and felt that we could not deprive one part of the community at the expense of the other. We feel that by zeroing in, as you have just said, that you have given us this opportunity to—well, the Headstart is such a good example.

Take the youngster in his formative years and emphasize some experiences, and we would like to, and others are doing it, they are able to carry it through the years and we would like to follow it on through, when they are second graders and third graders, see to it that they have the experience that other children get normally but they don't.

Chairman PERKINS. That is why I emphasize the categorical approach.

Mr. NOE. Mr. Chairman, you were asking about categorical aid against general aid, and all that has been said certainly is correct, that we have been able to do lots of things that we couldn't have done otherwise.

Chairman PERKINS. The reason of course, Mr. Noe, we did not come forth with the general bill is that I advocated the general aid approach for 20 years but we just could not get to first base. Finally we came along with the categorical approach.

I am wondering if we are reaching those areas of greatest need and serving those youngsters that are in greatest need under this categorical approach. That is my question.

Mr. NOE. You are reaching a lot. At the same time it does handicap us when trying to operate a total school system. For instance, you do nothing for teachers' salaries. Staffing is a great problem for many of us. Staffing in these areas is even a greater problem.

Chairman PERKINS. Yes. In your cities you manage to pay teachers salaries for the special education programs.

Mr. NOE. Yes; we do some of that. You see, if we are not careful, the areas that in the past have been the so-called privileged areas could become the underprivileged areas.

Chairman PERKINS. I agree with you wholeheartedly.

Mr. NOE. Take this as one example. Because we had to operate an austerity program for the past decade, we cut out kindergarten. Louisville was one of the first cities in the country to pioneer kindergarten education, but we had to abandon it. When we got the aid, we said we would reestablish kindergartens in the area of greatest need. Because of that, then we took care of kindergartens for about half of our children, but the other half we couldn't get.

We got some money, and we said, well, because we are getting Federal aid, half of it, we can find the money to operate the other half. But then OEO immediately came along, the local group, and said, "Oh, no, if you are going to operate a kindergarten program up here in your so-called affluent neighborhood and pay for it, then you pay for it down here." So we lost our kindergarten program.

We compromised with them one year, but the next year we had to pick up the whole program. So it can be a handicap. We can have library services.

Chairman PERKINS. I appreciate this splendid report which shows so much progress in your city, that you have made especially under title I.

Are there any other comments?

Mr. VanHoose, do you care to comment on the question?

Mr. VANHOOSE. Mr. Perkins I have only one point in response to your question: Is there any way or is there some suggestion regarding a better way to aid from this Federal standpoint?

In regard to the larger school areas like Louisville and Jefferson County, we are often confronted with the fact that because of the bigness of our area and the good hospitals and good medical facilities and other things that go along in a community of this size and are possible because of the size of the community, this in itself attracts certain people to our community for certain services.

In attracting people to our community, we naturally then develop certain problems because of their coming, and there is a little bit of an imbalance as far as children are concerned. Special education, for example, would be an example.

We have probably a much higher percentage of children who need special education than would a normal community, we will say. When I use the word "normal," you understand what I mean. For this reason I am wondering if the Congress could not give some consideration to Federal programing that would look into a particular area from the standpoint of special need based upon conditions that would not fit into a normal category that the Congress would develop.

Chairman PERKINS. Do you feel that you do not have the flexibility to do just what you are talking about under this act at the present time?

Mr. VANHOOSE. Yes, I think this would be applicable under special needs so far as physical deficiencies, mental deficiencies of children. We have in our community a number of children who have come to town or their parents have come to town because of some help for those who are perceptionally handicapped. We are operating eight perceptionally handicapped classes. There are not more than a half dozen scattered around the State.

This has attracted a few people in our community who have children who have perceptual handicaps, feeling that they can get service in our community. We do not have any particular way to receive additional help on these children.

It is recommended that you only have four per teacher or eight as a maximum. So you can see this puts a tremendous load on the school system that tries to branch off and serve these children that are in very great need.

Another instance might be the present programing provides for reading of readiness help for those who are in the poverty category. Well, there are great numbers of children who are not in the poverty category who need this same help and assistance.

Maybe this illustrates the kind of thing I believe you might consider in expanding the Federal aid program.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Scherle?

Mr. SCHERLE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would first of all like to tell you gentlemen that I have spent many fine times in your great State of Kentucky both in Louisville and also in Paducah. In fact, I treasure your countryside and particularly your fast horses.

This morning I had a very unique opportunity to be invited to the White House with other members of this committee and to witness a new motion picture called "Pancho," which is based primarily on the Headstart program. Now there has been consideration that the Headstart program should probably be changed from the OEO to the educational part. Would you gentlemen like to comment on that?

Chairman PERKINS. Before you start, I think I ought to apologize for many members of the committee this morning, the minority and the majority. All of us were invited to the White House, but I felt that I should not go because of you gentlemen. I noticed about everybody else went.

Mr. SCHERLE. We missed you, Mr. Chairman, but we knew also that your duties were here.

But I am very much interested in the remarks from you as educators as to whether you think the Headstart program should be allowed to stay in the OEO or do you think because of educational fundamentals it should be transferred to the educational field—perhaps the State board of public instruction?

Mr. BURKHEAD. At a recent meeting of all the administrators in Kentucky, back in December, we passed a resolution to the effect that we felt that all programs relative to education should be administered through the U.S. Office of Education.

Mr. NOE. I would say that, Mr. Scherle, too. Basically, it is an educational program. You have a board of education in a community concerned with the problems of education. This doesn't mean that you are not interested in all the resource personnel that is in the community to work with you and to help you.

Also, as far as we are concerned, it is not saying that we are not working very harmoniously and effectively with our local community action group. There was one conflict earlier that we talked about this morning. There was a directive that our community action committee had said that we must take the recommendations of these community groups.

We pointed out that there was a conflict there with our State law. Apparently that one has been resolved. So, there is no real clash that we have in this. We just think it is good school administration to keep all of your school programs channeled through official educational administration channels and procedures.

Mr. SCHERLE. Do you think, also, that if this is changed that along with the educational facilities for the youngsters you will also be in a position financially to look after their medical needs as youngsters just commencing their educational process?

Mr. NOE. I don't know what is the practice in the other communities throughout the country, but with us the Louisville and Jefferson County Medical Department is responsible for the health of youngsters. So, we work with them. We do not have our own doctors and

nurses as such in our school system. So we have always had that arrangement and that understanding and there has been no conflict of interest there. They work in the schools, through the schools, and with us.

Mr. SCHERLE. Perhaps I did not phrase my question correctly. First of all, do you have kindergarten in Kentucky?

Mr. NOE. In some places, yes; we do, in Louisville. I would say in the majority of the school districts in Kentucky they do not.

Mr. SCHERLE. Your starting age for kindergarten is what?

Mr. NOE. Five.

Mr. SCHERLE. At what age would you recommend that Headstart commence?

Mr. NOE. If we didn't have kindergarten, we would recommend 5, and that is what has happened in Kentucky. Primarily the Headstart programs have been for 5-year-olds. We have to get the kindergarten programs going before we can get back to the nursery school. So if you are asking, then I would move it back a year.

Mr. SCHERLE. This is a good question because I understand from some of the conversation I overheard this morning they are recommending age 3.

Mr. NOE. Yes. I think there have been some studies. The University of Chicago a number of years ago pointed out that if they could get children 3 years old and had a controlled group, that they showed there was a distinct advantage.

Mr. SCHERLE. What would be their capacity of absorbing the knowledge necessary at that young, tender age for, say, exposure to summer classes of 6 weeks in regard to letting them become a little bit more mature, we will say, at age 5 in regard to going out and having more of a continuity in their educational process?

Mr. NOE. You are not talking to an authority on early childhood education, but my answer would be that we think it is all to the good, that there should be followup and there should be continuity just as we see if you are moving into a headstart program for the 4- or 5-year-olds, you suddenly can't cut it off at the first grade.

Mr. SCHERLE. But if you start at 3, this is only a summer course; is it not, Headstart, more or less?

Mr. NOE. Yes, we are starting at 4.

Mr. SCHERLE. Let us say it is recommended at 3, would the tender age of 3 still make them mature enough that it would be advantageous to continue this program and then have them that much farther advanced at 5 or would you gain just as much starting them at the year of 5 in kindergarten? This is my question.

Mr. NOE. As I told you earlier, I can't answer as an expert in early childhood education. My best judgment would be that it would be advantageous.

Mr. SCHERLE. Not just as professional babysitters.

Mr. NOE. That is correct.

Mr. SCHERLE. This is the thing I would like to stay away from.

Mr. NOE. I would, too, and I think all people in education would not want that. If we didn't think there were values in working with 3-, 4-, and 5-year-olds, I don't think that we would be particularly interested in promoting a program.

Mr. McNEILL. Particularly in this type of child. They get experiences—I don't know about the 3 and 4—I would want to think that through, and I think others will, too. I think that is what makes Headstart so advantageous. Those youngsters get experience they don't get at home. We maintain that running the Headstart program for the 4-year-old if it is a summer program, they will still get experiences on field trips, contact, living together that you won't get at home, because they don't have that supervision.

As far as just professional babysitting, I think we would all object to that.

Mr. VANHOOSE. When I mentioned a moment ago the need for those children who may have special difficulties, if you went back to the age of 3, this would, I think, be even better for those youngsters because the sooner you can get at resolving some deficiency that a child has, the quicker you can get him back into the flow of normal schooling. If we could have children at the age of 3 receiving special instruction, or these neurologically impaired youngsters receiving the kind of special training that is necessary in order to overcome this mental block that they have, this would be an extremely important thing for us and would be even in the beginning outside of the realm of professional babysitting.

Mr. SCHERLE. Do you have Teachers Corps?

Mr. NOE. Yes.

Mr. SCHERLE. Do you find the results pretty highly beneficial?

Mr. NOE. I made mention in my prepared statement about it, Mr. Chairman. We have two units that we established this year. We think it is all to the good. We are well pleased with the progress that these interns are making. We think that it is a source of gaining some additional teachers. Staffing in the inner-city has been a particularly hard problem for us.

Mr. SCHERLE. You do not find any conflict then between your normal teachers and those who are receiving additional help and benefits to teach in the underprivileged areas?

Mr. NOE. We have not yet. This is a new program for us. These are considered intern people. In the main I suppose they are taking positions that otherwise would have been filled by substitute teachers or people who were not qualified. When you have these supervisors working as closely with them as you do under this program, we think it has been a source of great help to us.

Mr. SCHERLE. In the field of OEO and that part of poverty that is connected with education is there any conflict between what they are doing, any duplication or overlapping in regard to the jurisdiction held by a State department of public instruction?

Mr. NOE. We have a State department man here, but as far as one school system is concerned, no. We have representation on our local community action group which I am referring to as the OEO group. We work with them. We started early with the community action program. The only regret we have is that we lost some funds and we had to cut out some programs this year.

Mr. SCHERLE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, gentlemen.

Chairman PERKINS. Especially in the inner-city areas where you have so many disadvantaged youngsters, to what extent do you need

school construction to serve the most disadvantaged areas and to what extent are you unable to furnish those buildings with your total State resources?

Mr. NOE. Mr. Chairman, Louisville has been rather fortunate in that it has never lost a tax campaign for capital construction. We haven't won one for current operation for some time. We have been in one position.

Mr. VanHoose in Jefferson County has been in another position. You see, the growth in our area has been outside of the school district because our boundaries are frozen and the county has caught the tremendous impact on pupil explosion.

So, while we have had modest increases right along, our building needs have been to replace older buildings. In the past 6 years we have been able to spend about \$45 million for school construction. We still have a lot to do. As we move into kindergarten programs and as we move into nursery school programs, we will need additional facilities and we are now scraping the bottom of the barrel, and we still have unmet needs.

So, money for capital outlay purposes certainly could be of tremendous assistance to us. We have had to let maintenance go, for instance, that should have been taken care of because we just didn't have the money and operating budget to do it. So this has been a real problem for us. There is still much for us to do.

Chairman PERKINS. In your planning stage, what will be your unmet needs 5 years from now?

Mr. NOE. At the rate we are going our unmet needs will be for a program, No. 1; additional facilities, No. 2.

Chairman PERKINS. How about your situation, Richard? I was impressed with the county. You have multiplied there 300 percent since you have come to Washington in 10 or 12 years.

Mr. VANHOOSE. Yes. Mr. Perkins, in the next 5 years, if the present trend continues, our population will pass a hundred thousand pupils. Our building needs will be nearly \$40 million. We dedicated six new buildings this year in an effort to stay ahead of this and are down now to only 8,000 children on double sessions from 21,000.

Chairman PERKINS. How many children on double sessions now in Jefferson County?

Mr. VANHOOSE. About 8,000.

Chairman PERKINS. About 8,000?

Mr. VANHOOSE. Yes. It was 21,000, but we have been able to pull this number down in the last couple of years. Hopefully next year we can reduce this number considerably more. We now have under construction six or seven more buildings that we hope to dedicate or have ready for dedication for the opening of school in the fall of 1967.

We are currently experiencing an unusual growth pattern in our community. The Catholic schools are discontinuing first grades. So we are picking up about 2,500 additional first-graders next year for the first time. The city is picking up around 1,500. This, together with our normal growth, means that we will have about 11,000 in our first grades this next year.

We will need an additional 100 first-grade teachers just to take care of this transfer of first grades from the Catholic school system to our

public school system. We are working on this. We have had a number of conferences with the Catholic school board and their representatives and have made some progress. However, the problem of employing 100 or thereabouts new teachers in our system is going to be a very formidable task.

Our normal growth requires about 200 teachers additional each year. Then with our turnover we are looking for between 500 and 800 teachers next fall. You can see our building needs are reflected also in our teacher need. I think our biggest problem, being somewhat different from Mr. Noe's, is that of growth and development. In addition to these special building needs, we need buildings just to keep up with the rapid explosion of population.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. McNeill, in the Bowling Green area, what is your building situation? Are you lagging?

Mr. McNEILL. We are lagging on school construction. As I say, we are going for a capital outlay program which we hope will be supported. I am somewhat in the position of Mr. Noe in that we are in an independent district which has this perimeter, outside of which, the suburban areas, is where the greatest growth will come, in Warren County.

I understand that they have a building program underway. Again they will have the need for classrooms just the same as everyone else.

Chairman PERKINS. What about your extreme west? Mr. Smith, are you able to fulfill your building needs, or are you lagging behind?

Mr. SMITH. We are gradually lagging behind. We made quite an effort to expand our physical facilities and have done so. In the last 10 years we have spent in excess of \$7 million in capital construction. We are not nearly as large as Mr. Vanhooose, of Jefferson County. However, we are experiencing a 6- to 8-percent growth. Each year which requires an additional half million or a million dollars every 3 to 5 years. We have about exhausted our borrowing power. We have spent all the \$15 money and what-not that we could get, so we are beginning to have growing pains as far as building is concerned.

Chairman PERKINS. Let me ask this question of you and Mr. Dodson. I am wondering just how much further you can go under your present resources at the State and local level toward fulfilling the program needs at the elementary and secondary level in Kentucky?

Mr. DODSON. Well, we can't go a lot further, Mr. Chairman. We are asking the legislature this time for an appropriation, but this will in no way meet the needs that are current. For example, I gave I think in my testimony, and this is the result of a recent survey of buildings and related facilities, there is a need presently of about \$143 million.

Of course, we can't start to touch that on our present setup in Kentucky. We haven't had any increased appropriation from the State level since 1960. We are asking for one this time, but this will not do the things these people are talking about all over the State. This building need, as I get it, is pretty general everywhere, especially in the areas where they are growing. Many of the boards of education are up to their bonding capacity. They are hemmed in by statutory tax limitation which keeps them from raising any more revenue locally and it is getting to be a serious problem everywhere.

Chairman PERKINS. Assuming we were able to enact a construction bill before we ever got to the point that we were able to get a general aid fund through the Congress, in that event, would you feel that you should make the needs applicable to the disadvantaged areas just like we zeroed in on the disadvantaged areas for our programing purposes?

Mr. DODSON. You mean make them applicable to the disadvantaged areas only?

Chairman PERKINS. Yes; if we only could make a start on the school construction bill.

Mr. DODSON. I think it might be a start; yes. This might be a way of getting your foot in the door.

Chairman PERKINS. Do you feel that would be the best approach to a start?

Mr. DODSON. Yes.

Chairman PERKINS. How about you, Mr. Noe?

Mr. NOE. Yes; I think that is correct. It could be very helpful. Always, as you know, with a rapid growth on the periphery that you have children there and you have no housing and by necessity you have to go there with your housing first and that leaves the older buildings that you have in the central city, you see, just staying there for that much longer time. They are the ones really where you ought to have your best programs and often your facilities are such that you can't have as good a program as you can where you have modern facilities.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Scherle?

Mr. SCHERLE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I have one or two questions. It has always been a question in my mind in regard to audiovisual aids. How many of you now have ETV in your schools?

Mr. NOE. We have.

Mr. VANHOOSE. We have.

Mr. SCHERLE. About half or a third?

Mr. DODSON. Mr. Vanhooose has done as much with ETV as anybody else in the State.

Mr. SCHERLE. This field intrigues me particularly since it is so current. Can you compare for me audio visual aids in regard to ETV in your classrooms? Do you prefer one over the other, or what are the benefits of one over the other?

Mr. McNEILL. I think you need them to supplement each other.

Mr. SCHERLE. They complement one another?

Mr. McNEILL. Yes.

Mr. SCHERLE. I noticed in going through here that many of you recommend audiovisual, but in no sense of the word have I seen any ETV.

Mr. NOE. I think Mr. VanHooose might tell you what our plans are in Kentucky which may account for that.

Mr. VANHOOSE. Kentucky has an educational television authority now and we are in the process of implementing an educational television program that will be free to each child and each school in our State. We will have eventually 12 transmitters about our State. These 12 transmitters presumably will blanket our entire pupil population, our entire State. Hopefully our programing will be designed to provide for the kind of instruction that will do the most good

throughout the State. I am not in a position to say what instruction that will be. That very definitely belongs to our department of education and has not as yet been established, the exact program that we will view.

We do believe that educational television is another tool just like the motion picture is a tool or the overhead projector is a tool. Anything that the teacher may utilize to help her become more effective is a tool.

We would place television perhaps as one of the better tools because of the opportunity here to concentrate on quality of programing that might come out from the studio, not meaning that this master teacher would be the teacher, but this master teacher, so to speak, would become the great aid and assistant to an equally strong and masterful teacher in the classroom, this teacher on camera presumably having the time to great research and go into programing in great depth, maybe do things that a teacher with 25 or 30 youngsters continually with him could not do.

In this way the teacher not only would have the opportunity of a good lesson for the youngster, but also an opportunity to see good teaching and to have the opportunity to grow from what they would learn from this very outstanding on-camera teacher.

I think in addition to this you get immediacy that the television can bring to your classroom that the film does not make possible. I suppose we could go on and on.

There is redeployment of teachers made possible through television by virtue of the fact that sometimes television can go to a large group of youngsters at one time, bringing uniformity of instruction where this would help the programing and then diversification can come later.

I think this is a great tool. I do feel that educators are tremendously interested in seeing this developed so that it may be the best tool of all that we have ever had in our classrooms.

Mr. SCHERLE. Thank you very much.

In our family we have two teachers, so this has been quite an important thing as far as I am concerned.

Mr. VANHOOSE. We have certainly passed the day when we are worrying about this displacing the teacher.

Mr. SCHERLE. I realize that ETV would be a poor substitute for a teacher, but from what I am told they definitely serve a real purpose in diversity and also, as you say, a redeployment. I think this is fine.

Mr. VANHOOSE. And immediacy.

Mr. SCHERLE. And immediacy.

I have one more question. In your State of Kentucky, you have parochial schools, I know this. Do you bus your children? Do you furnish the transportation for the children of parochial schools?

Mr. VANHOOSE. Yes, sir, we do. Our State law provides that a school board may transport a youngster, a Catholic school youngster, providing the fiscal court pays for it. So far as I know, every fiscal court in our State does pay for the service. We are transporting all the parochial youngsters in our district who request it. And the fiscal court pays for this.

Mr. SCHERLE. Do you also afford opportunity for those in parochial as well as public schools to exchange specific courses?

Mr. VANHOOSE. In our particular school system we have never been requested to do this. No. 2, it would be very difficult in our particular case because of this rapidly expanding situation that we have. We have on just one or two occasions an interchange on driver education courses.

Mr. SCHERLE. But this is all? No specific educational courses?

Mr. VANHOOSE. No.

Mr. NOE. The only thing that I could add to that would be that in the city of Louisville we share all athletic facilities with the parochial schools, exactly on the same basis as they are used by our own schools. In other words, there is a charge to our own school for just out-of-pocket expenses, and the parochial schools use the football stadium and the gymnasium exactly on the same basis.

Mr. SCHERLE. Do you share your winning coaches, too?

Mr. NOE. Winning coaches? No, sir, but in discussing this interchange you were talking about on a half and half basis, we were willing and we were prepared to do this about a year ago when the parochial school officials found that it could not work for them. We were going to let them go to our trade school a half a day. We said if we are going to share on half and half, who is going to get the star halfback?

Mr. SCHERLE. In our particular school system we do have some shared time instruction in special areas. We have instrumental music and the parochial children do come to the public schools to get instrumental music instruction. We also have parochial children coming to our high school to get physics and art. There are special classes which we have not been able in the past to provide, and they do come to our schools to get that type of instruction. We think it is legal.

Mr. BAKER. In our schools everything is on an open basis, it is share alike for those for whom the invitation is there. In the event of any utilization of facilities, materials, audiovisuals, whatever, the parochial schools are the same recipients and same users as the other.

The parochial school in our school district is small, there is only one, they share our library facilities. They do not have any. The elementary and junior high grades, they come in for remedial reading classes or physical education if they are involved in intramural or junior high athletics, complete utilization without any form of question or restriction or what-have-you involved.

Mr. SCHERLE. I would like to ask another question. I believe this gentleman here mentioned the fact that the parochial schools dropped the first grade, is that right?

Mr. VANHOOSE. That is correct.

Mr. SCHERLE. There is one question that intrigues me. Perhaps you gentlemen would like to dwell on it. Was this primarily because of finances?

Mr. VANHOOSE. I believe that is correct.

Monsignor Pitt told me that the Catholic order that provided the teachers had to withdraw the teachers. I presume this was partly because of their inability to finance properly, and I think possibly, partly because of the great need that might be developing elsewhere. I am not sure that I am answering that correctly.

Mr. SCHERLE. My question is this: What do you gentlemen as educators contemplate to be the future of the parochial school that is now

financed privately with the cost of education soaring to such phenomenal heights?

Mr. NOE. I think that you had a report from the national Catholic organization, Father Hesburgh from Notre Dame, and that group, in which, if I understand correctly, they are thinking in terms of a policy of retrenchment, that they would eliminate some of their colleges and part of their elementary school program to give greater concentration and to work for quality education at the secondary level, which, I think, if I understand correctly, is a change from the previous position when they wanted to stay with the elementary schools.

As I understand it, it is a matter of cost with them as it was in Cincinnati, that over half of their teachers were lay teachers and the competition salarywise is such that it was making it exceedingly hard for the parishes.

Mr. SCHERLE. Don't you feel in the future that you will see fewer and fewer parochial schools because of the fantastic cost involved in operating these on a private basis and almost complete abolition of your elementary grades as time goes on?

Mr. NOE. I am not prepared to answer that one. We have been trying to find out if they are going to drop the second grade and the third grade, you see, but they say not, that they think by doing this that they can hold the line. For how long I don't know. But if they are going to do this, this just makes the question that your chairman asked us a little while ago about facilities more important.

Even next year we are going to have to use some of their facilities to take care of the first grade. So, we will be renting some parochial facilities to house some public school first graders.

Mr. VANHOOSE. Mr. Scherle, we have a new Catholic school board in our community which has just been organized. It is a Catholic lay school board. They are currently attempting to collate several thousand questionnaires that came in from Catholic parents to determine just how the Catholic parents there are thinking along the lines of your question.

The few Catholic parents that I have talked to seem to indicate that they are going to be forced to back away from education at the lower grade level and possibly at the college level so they might concentrate on their programming maybe at the junior and senior high school level. However, this is pure conjecture on the part of a few parents that I have talked to.

Mr. SCHERLE. From what little knowledge I have, from what I have heard and read, this appears to be the trend because of the enormous cost involved of education today, that they just cannot make it. So there will be a slow but sure abolition of elementary school classes.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman PERKINS. Thank you, Mr. Scherle.

Mr. Bell?

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I just have a couple of questions. One of them is for Mr. Pogue.

Mr. DODSON. I don't believe Mr. Pogue is back.

Mr. BELL. Perhaps one of you other gentlemen would like to comment on this. I note in his statement, Mr. Pogue referred to the Adult Education Act of 1966, some of the things he felt we should do. I was

wondering how the adult education program is working down in Kentucky. Is it beginning to show signs of life? Or has it been kind of stymied under the direction of OEO as it used to be?

Mr. NOE. I will be glad to answer as far as we are concerned. As appendix to the statement—my name is Noe, Sam Noe, not Pogue, Noe from Louisville—I had a statement in there about an adult education program which we call “The learn more, earn more” program, which we established. In this we have both the basic education for the adult illiterates and then for those who are trying to get a high school equivalency certificate. It has worked now for us for 2 years. We think it is an excellent program. We have much community support for it. From all that we know about it and all evaluation we can give it, we think it is quite fine.

Mr. BELL. In one of last year’s amendments in the Elementary and Secondary Act and the Poverty Act the adult education part of the Poverty Act was taken out of the direction of the OEO and placed under the direction of the Office of Education in much the same fashion as you gentlemen were discussing for Headstart to be changed and taken away from Poverty Act and put under the Office of Education Department. Did you know that?

Mr. NOE. You mean the literacy part?

Mr. BELL. The adult education was taken away from the poverty program.

Mr. NOE. All adult education. Earlier the adult literacy was under one program.

Mr. BELL. There is some part, the literacy still is in under the OEO but essentially the major part of the adult education—

Mr. NOE. It is one of the points, sir, we were making. When you are dealing with different agencies, this is a good example, we were dealing with Frankfort, which was operating under the State department of education for the basic literacy program. Then we were working with our local community action commission for the rest of it. One had money at the time when the other didn’t. So, these were complicating factors. These are the things we were saying, if we could get them channeled in more direct line, it could help us administratively.

Mr. BELL. As you know, the amendments last year were very late. The adult education was taken out very late so the Appropriations Committee did not change over and appropriate adequately for it.

Mr. VANHOOSE. Mr. Bell, my name is VanHoose. I think there is a feeling, Congressman Perkins and others have indicated this morning that Congress is interested in getting appropriations made far in advance so that there can be better planning at the local level. This would greatly facilitate our effort to make the adult program even better than it is.

A couple of times already we have had cutoffs before we were complete with our program. Not only was this disrupting, but this was embarrassing and very discouraging in many instances to those who were participating when, at a strategic moment, we had to curtail the program. I would like to compliment the Congress and the thinking that is going into this particular aspect and encourage you to move in this direction because it would greatly aid us.

Mr. BELL. Yes. As I say, this was done late. It was unfortunate that we did not catch up. That was the first move taken last year,

by amendment, to take basic adult education away from the Poverty Act. I think this would be a good move for many other aspects that you gentlemen have spoken of.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Bell, in relation to your question about progress, in eastern Kentucky this has been a tremendous influence on a great many people, beginning with the adult, no formal education, who dropped out of school at the first, second, third, or fourth grade.

Today we are witnessing, not only, I guess it is all education in a form, but there is a social factor involved, and there is a personal factor involved including personal hygiene. It does your heart good in these adult education classes to see men who in the past have not taken a great deal of personal pride in their personal appearance or the way they are dressed, to go back like you and I—I won't say you, but I—when for the first time we recognized there was another sex and we started combing our hair and coming to school with a clean shirt. This is what has happened, and with the great deal of pride they get in the instruction, especially the instruction at the elementary level and those who have completed an equivalent of a secondary education program and have received a high school equivalency certificate, this is one of the proudest possessions they have today.

We are putting the personal pride back into them. It is coming out. These same people are going forth and they are utilizing this, they are presenting this. This is a means of gaining employment or looking for better means of employment or advancement in the area in which they are now working. It has its merit and it has its value and it has been—well, I just wished everyone that needs it could have it. If we could utilize our public school facilities more hours a day, more days per year and get these people back and use the basic high school course of instruction and offer it to those people who dropped out of high school and get them their high school diploma, which is an ambition, and they do not know how to approach it, they have no way to approach getting it, it has merit.

Mr. BELL. Aside from the literacy part, this was the intent of my amendment, to get those people you are talking about.

Mr. BAKER. I will say this, those people in this area, some of them if they have an axe to grind, it might be one of us who maybe used the wrong approach and caused this person to drop out of school or as parents we forced him to because we didn't have the finance to support him to go on to school when he had to go to work or maybe like so many of us in eastern Kentucky that were bound by the limitations relationship to high schools, back in the days when some of us went or had the opportunity—well, we say we didn't have the opportunity and you say, "Well, that is not true," but it is true because in the days past when they were in school the schools were not there and the transportation could not be provided and some of those in the mountains could not be reached in a given period of time for the formal high school education at high school level.

Mr. BELL. I note on page 7 of your statement, Mr. Baker, you say that the U.S. Office of Education should administer all Federal education legislation. Then you go on to discuss Headstart. What do you mean by all? Are you talking about other education facilities?

Mr. BAKER. Yes, sir; I define education as that which involves the complete education of the human being.

Mr. BELL. Of course you are not going so far as to get into the military aspects?

Mr. BAKER. No, sir. I am talking from the standpoint of that which has the involvement of the public school, that which we have direct interest in. I believe Headstart is a formal proceeding toward education and it should have a formal beginning and process.

Mr. BELL. I am fully in accord with you there, with everything you have said. I certainly think Headstart should go the same direction as adult education. I think it should get away from OEO and made to be a part of Education. So I concur.

I think that is about the essence of my questions, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman PERKINS. Let me thank all you gentlemen again.

My colleague from California was talking about the adult education program. We started that program years ago, but we never could get it enacted. We could get it as far as the House Committee on Rules and there it would fall by the wayside. When we were conducting the poverty hearings in 1964 we had the bill over before the Rules Committee at that time. We went through the hearings and in the markup of the poverty bill I had an idea at that time that we could get the bill enacted if we put it in as part of a package. That is the way we threw it in, as part of the package during the markup. But all during the history of the poverty hearings it was contemplated that adult basic education perhaps would be the major aspect of the training under the community action program, that is title II. The real purpose of the adult basic education program was to create the incentive on the part of the States to initiate an adult basic education program and we earmarked so much funds for every State. But it was well understood that as much community action funds as the local community action agencies wanted to expend could be expended for adult basic education purposes.

We are making some progress, and you Kentuckians have made your part of the contribution.

Again I am delighted to welcome you here. I hope to visit with as many of you as possible, especially you superintendents in eastern Kentucky. My eastern Kentucky superintendent is absent now. There is only one from my district, my friend from Bell County.

Do you want to make some comment?

Mr. BAKER. I didn't have an opportunity on the school construction. I think I would be badly out of line if I did not ask for permission to comment concerning the area of construction in eastern Kentucky.

Chairman PERKINS. Of course that is one of the greatest areas of need in the whole country.

Mr. BAKER. Because the one-room schoolhouse still exists, the lack of health and all the other facilities are there. We may be more fortunate in Middlesboro to have the facilities to take care of the present. The future we don't know what it holds. All the other district that adjoin us in eastern Kentucky have the needs, will have them and will continue to have them unless we can get some support and help for them.

Chairman PERKINS. I want to say for the benefit not only of you gentlemen, but my minority friends over here well understand, and the majority, that later on this fall when I get some of the most press-

ing legislation out of the way, I certainly intend to hold school construction hearings and education hearings in general, trying to come up with some other improvement in the general area of elementary and secondary education.

I don't think we can for a much longer period of time push under the rug school construction.

Is there anything else, Mr. Bell?

Mr. BELL. Nothing further.

Mr. DODSON. Mr. Perkins, I would like to express the appreciation of the delegation for this meeting and to tell you in your new position as chairman of this committee, if there is any way that any of us from Kentucky can help this cause, we will be glad to come back.

Chairman PERKINS. You come back anytime. We will be glad to see you.

(The committee recessed at 3:20 p.m. until 9:30 a.m., Tuesday, March 14, 1967.)

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1967

TUESDAY, MARCH 14, 1967

**HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,
*Washington, D.C.***

The committee met at 9:30 a.m., pursuant to recess, in room 2175, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Carl D. Perkins (chairman of the committee) presiding.

Present: Representatives Perkins, Green, Pucinski, Daniels, Gibbons, Ford, Hathaway, Scheuer, Meeds, Ayres, Quie, Bell, Erlenborn, Scherle, Dellenback, Esch, Eshleman, Gardner, and Steiger.

Staff members present: Robert E. McCord, senior specialist; H. D. Reed, Jr., general counsel; William D. Gaul, associate general counsel; Benjamin F. Reeves, editor; and Louise M. Dargans, research assistant.

Chairman PERKINS. The committee will come to order. Our first witness this morning is Carl L. Marburger, Assistant Commissioner for Education, Bureau of Indian Affairs.

We are glad you are here this morning. The provision that we added last year concerning the Indians which you know expires this year, we would like you to review this and then proceed with your statement.

STATEMENT OF DR. CARL MARBURGER, ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER FOR EDUCATION, BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. MARBURGER. The Department of Interior supports and endorses an extension of the Indian provision in the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1966, as proposed in H.R. 6230.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 did not include provisions for Indian students in Federal schools. Based on such factors as family income, isolation, English fluency, and cultural deprivation; American Indian children constitute one of the most severely disadvantaged segments of American society. In an attempt to remedy this omission, we cooperated with the Office of Education in drafting an Indian amendment which was included in the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1966.

The Committee on Education and Labor is to be highly commended for its support of the Indian amendment, for without this support, ESEA programs for Indian children in Federal schools could not have been implemented.

It is also to the credit of our school staffs that so much progress has been made under the 1966 Indian amendment in enriching our educational program. The 62 title I projects approved to date include the following components:

- 38 percent of the projects relate to reading programs;
- 48 percent of the projects relate to guidance, counseling, attendance, social work;
- 19 percent of the projects relate to parental service, home-school counseling;
- 56 percent of the projects relate to English as a second language, English language arts;
- 6 percent of the projects relate to speech therapy;
- 40 percent of the projects relate to physical education and recreational activities;
- 51 percent of the projects relate to cultural enrichment; for example, art, music, field trips;
- 45 percent of the projects relate to reduction of class size and development of remedial learning centers;
- 32 percent of the projects relate to inservice and preservice training;
- 32 percent of the projects relate to teacher aids.

At present, there are a total 42,650 Indian children being served by title I projects totaling \$4,746,548.

Chairman PERKINS. Before we get away from title I, where you have 42,650 Indian children being served, with a total of \$4,746,548, what is the per capita expenditure? How much does that average?

Mr. MARBURGER. About \$100 a child. It will range between roughly \$35 and \$100.

Chairman PERKINS. I thought it would range more than that.

Mr. MARBURGER. Because of the funding time and a half-year program beginning about January 4 when the money was transferred to the Department of Interior, with only a 6-month program, we actually received much less than the normal school system would.

Chairman PERKINS. If you had been on an all-year-round basis with the added formula we put in the bill last year what would the allocation be?

Mr. MARBURGER. It would have been closer to \$8 million to \$10 million.

Chairman PERKINS. A little over \$200 per child?

Mr. MARBURGER. That is right.

Chairman PERKINS. That is what puzzled me. Go ahead.

Mr. MARBURGER. \$127,000 was made available under title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act for students attending Federal schools. A formula based on enrollment and need has been devised and approved for expending these funds. The average per pupil allotment will be \$2.62.

Under title III of ESEA, the Bureau of Indian Affairs was advised of an allocation of \$204,000. Twenty-two title III projects have been submitted, totaling \$782,979.

The educational programs offered under the authorization of the 1966 amendments has expanded our ability to provide both quality and quantity of enrichment, whereas our regular appropriation has been limited to a traditional operating base for our schools.