

to include instruction in dance, drama, painting, and "other arts." To ensure against any eyebrow raising, 50 percent of the campers came from other, less affluent sections of the state.

Deemed successful by the USOE, the "Arts Center" received federal money for the full 3-year limit. By 1969, the final year of federal funding, the program had become such a "recognized success" that some \$22,000 was donated by other organizations, including the Maryland Department of Education. Statewide recognition has ensured the continuation of the "Arts Center." Beginning with 1970, the state will take over its financing. Moreover, similar camps have been planned at Maryland's Frostburg State College and at other parts of the state. As the programs director says, "We believe the idea has taken root in Maryland."

Perhaps so, but whether it will have much of an impact on American public education is another question.

Ironically, the title of ESEA most specifically dedicated to innovation has lost its most innovative provision. The novel feature of Title III was that federal grants were made directly to local school districts and that no strings were attached by the state education departments. In 1967, Representative Edith Green (D-Ore.) introduced an amendment that Congress subsequently enacted and that put authority back in the hands of the state education establishments. The amendment transferred all authority over the administration and allocation of Title III funds from the U.S. Commissioner of Education to the state education departments; or, in the words of one of its outspoken critics, "... the Green amendment essentially wiped out Title III."

If indeed, the intent of Title III was to liberate the "innovative" genius of local communities from the restrictions imposed by overburdened SEA's, there may be some truth in the statement quoted above.

One effect of the amendment may be described as a virtual reversal of roles between the USOE and the SEA's. Before the amendment, the USOE approved and allocated money to local projects and the states would merely verify their legality. Since the amendment the states receive local proposals and approve and allocate money, so that now USOE merely verifies their status within the framework of federal law.

The impact of the amendment on the USOE may be emphasized by noting

that the Title III bureau staff has been reduced from 70 to a skeleton crew of 9. In 1969, the bureau staff was permitted to administer 25 percent of the total appropriation; beginning with the current fiscal year the total appropriation is to go directly to the states.

What the amendment will mean for ambitious LEA's seems fairly clear. In terms of local initiative, the LEA's are pretty much back to where they were before 1965 when they had no recourse but to beg money from state education departments, which as often as not were more concerned with expanding existing facilities than with testing computer assisted instruction, for example.

What makes this all the more true is an additional feature of the amendment that loosens up the language forbidding the "commingling" of Title III money with funds for other programs. Thus, the states get the same Title III money package to allocate to the LEA's, but there is less guarantee that the LEA's will get the types of innovative projects they may want.

As to the amendment's long-range consequences for the Title III program in general, it may be too early to tell. The U.S. Office of Education has neither the funds nor the legal mandate to evaluate individual Title III projects. They have tried to persuade the states, as one USOE official put it, "to make hard and honest" evaluations, but they are powerless to press the issue. The same official admitted, "We haven't even the vaguest idea how many state-run programs are being funded."

The National Education Association, which supported the amendment, hasn't taken much of a look either: "We are so busy with funding we haven't had time to evaluate Title III programs." Thus, Title III and its evaluation have become pretty much affairs of the states, and no one as yet seems to be interested in bothering about it.

What makes the short history of Title III such a curious phenomenon is that no member of the educational establishment found fault with the original program as such. As one old-time staffer of the House Labor and Education Committee states, "Prior to the amendment, Title III was no burning issue."

What did, in fact, disturb the educators was the way Title III was being administered. The sight of local school districts getting money and doing business without their advice and consent seems to have raised the ire of almost every organized group of educators. Leading the fight for the amendment

were the state education departments (CSSO) who saw in Title III what the same committee staffer called "a challenge to their paramount authority over state education." Behind the states stood the National Education Association and its affiliate the National School Boards Association.

Opposition to the amendment was comparatively slight. The Greater Cities Research Association, representing 27 large-city school systems, lobbied to defeat the measure. The big-city school systems, LEA's in name only, had been getting larger and larger portions of federal money and were not happy to give any of it up to the states. The individual local school districts across the country stood most to lose by the amendment, but they didn't put up much of a fight. The LEA's were in no position to openly oppose the wishes of their state authorities.

With the passage of the amendment another chapter in American education reform closed. In the old controversy of who will most influence the future of American education, the states, the localities, or the federal government, this latest battle has been won decisively by the states.—RICHARD KARP

*A free-lance writer, Richard Karp has reported on education affairs in New York City.*

## RECENT DEATHS

**G. William Holmes**, 47; chairman, department of geology, Beloit College, 7 January.

**Charles G. Johnson**, 55; geologist, U.S. Geological Survey, Denver; 1 December.

**Norman Osher**, 66; professor emeritus of medicine, Marquette University; 26 December.

**David Rittenberg**, 63; professor of biochemistry, Columbia University College of Physicians and Surgeons; 24 January.

**William E. Smith**, 78; former dean, Graduate School, Miami University; 12 December.

**Walter E. Spahr**, 78; former chairman, economics department, New York University; 19 January.

**Margaret Watkins**, 42; chairman, biology department, Western College, Ohio; 18 December.

**Philip F. Williams**, 85; former professor of obstetrics and gynecology, University of Pennsylvania; 13 January.