

STATE OF OREGON,
STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Salem, Oreg., March 21, 1967.

Hon. EDITH GREEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

It is my understanding that the U.S. Office of Education is not requesting the extension of Title X of NDEA beyond June 30, 1968. In my judgment, the Title X program for gathering, processing, analyzing, and disseminating pertinent information relating to school staff, pupils, property, program, and finance is a most successful and worthwhile activity. For the first time in the history of educational data, states are submitting comparable and reasonably adequate information to the U.S. Office of Education.

I like the matching feature of Title X requiring the state to match federal funds dollar for dollar. This is a desirable partnership arrangement which places equal responsibility for the Title X program on the states. I was recently informed that the U.S. Office of Education is recommending that Title X (NDEA) funds be included in Title V of ESEA. Should this happen, state matching funds will no longer be required, which will probably reduce many states' participation to a minimum. There is need to strengthen this program if states are to continue to feed vital educational data to the U.S. Office of Education. Instead of reducing the amount of funds for this program, and this is actually what the U.S. Office of Education's recommendation does, a larger federal appropriation is needed. Matching federal grants to states of \$100,000 to \$150,000 would be nearer in line to adequately build an educational information system needed by State Departments of Education and the U.S. Office of Education.

May I ask your help in retaining Title X of the National Defense Education Act in its present form? It has become an effective and efficient program, and I have every reason to believe that, through adequate funding, you can expect even better performance.

LEON P. MINEAR,
Superintendent, Public Instruction.

STATEMENT OF HUGH CALKINS, MEMBER, CLEVELAND BOARD OF EDUCATION

Section 623 of the Amendments proposes to amend Subsection 303(a) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 by inserting a paragraph requiring that the State plan set forth any requirements imposed upon an applicant for financial participation "including any provision for taking into account, in such requirements, the resources available to any applicant for such participation relative to the resources for participation available to all other applicants."

The purpose of this statement is to suggest that, either by amendment to the proposed legislation or by explicit reference in the legislative history, the intent of Congress be made clear that the fiscal problem known as "municipal overburden" be included among the factors to be taken into account by a State in determining resources available to applicant school districts.

One of the most important problems in school finance within the States arises from the fact that in certain school districts, principally the larger and older cities, the portion of local taxes (normally property taxes) required for municipal services (police, fire and the like) is much higher than in the average community in the State. This differential is not reflected in the traditional formula by which State money is allocated among school districts.

The result is that the big cities are treated as "wealthy" school districts upon the ground that their total property tax base per pupil is higher than the average in the State. This is only a half truth since in fact a smaller portion of the property tax base in the cities is available for the costs of education.

The situation in Ohio is illustrated by the enclosed chart. It shows that in Ohio the true measure of the size of the tax base per pupil in the larger cities is 51/68ths of the figure which is in fact used by Ohio in allocating State money among school districts.

The same problem appears in reverse when tax effort is used in State formulas. The effort of Ohio's big cities, measured by school taxes alone, is about average in the State. However, their effort for Government services as a whole, and their total local tax rate, is about 175% of the State average.