

1
2 MISS CLARK: In preparing our narrative history
3 of the Office of Education, we are interviewing Dr. Nolan
4 Estes, Associate Commissioner for Elementary and Secondary
5 Education, who has been with the Office since 1965 when
6 he joined us as a Washington intern in education.

7 DR. ESTES: Let me talk first about the Element-
8 ary and Secondary Education Act and the way we have at-
9 tempted to visualize this as an operating program.

10 Although it may not be clear in the legislation
11 or in the documents that have been developed as a result
12 thereof, we have tried to see this legislation as a means
13 of funding all of the steps that are essential in bringing
14 about significant change and improvement in American edu-
15 cation.

16 There are four steps, as we see it, as being
17 essential:

18 One, basic research which has the responsibility
19 for funding new knowledge in education;

20 The second step, that of development which in-
21 volves, in using new knowledge, to invent, develop and
22 design new packages, new solutions to problems;

23 The third step is that of demonstration, inform-
24 ing and disseminating information about new inventions
25 that have been tried out, have been tested and found to be

1 successful; and ... the key ... and ...
2 Fourth, the adaptation or adoption of these new
3 practices as an ongoing part of the regular school program.
4 Our view of the Elementary and Secondary Act has
5 been that this, indeed, is a catalyst for a change, an in-
6 strument or a mechanism to be used to influence the total
7 expenditure at local, state and federal levels of educa-
8 tion.
9 Although the amount appropriated for the Ele-
10 mentary and Secondary Act represents approximately eight
11 percent of the total investment in elementary and second-
12 ary education, this eight percent, when viewed in terms of
13 a catalyst or a change agent, is much more important than
14 the eight percent would indicate.
15 Title IV of the Act, as we see it, as we attemp-
16 ted to implement it, focussed in on the research step and
17 the development step.
18 Title III, as we visualized it, had the respon-
19 sibility for focussing and concentrating on development
20 and demonstration;
21 Titles I and II of the Act, concentrating in the
22 areas of adoption or adaptation.
23 During the initial phases of implementing Title
24 III, it was very difficult to get across the concept --
25 not only "get across" but "have accepted" the concept of

1 development and demonstration as the key role and key re-
2 sponsibility of Title III -- difficult to gain acceptance
3 on the part of the Staff in the Office of Education, as
4 well as the National Advisory Committee and lay people at
5 large.

6 During the initial testimony, the development
7 and demonstration aspects of Title III were not emphasized.
8 The law itself indicates that any activity which improves
9 or provides a service not available in adequate amounts is
10 an appropriate funding activity for Title III.

11 In implementing Title III, the scope of the Act
12 was significantly altered and more sharply focussed on ac-
13 tivities or services which indeed were inventive or which
14 demonstrated a program that had the possibilities of hav-
15 ing a significant impact on improving or changing American
16 education.

17 MISS CLARK: How was this emphasis arrived at?
18 Who influenced this focussing of the title?

19 DR. ESTES: The person who had the biggest --
20 the greatest influence in this was the Commissioner of Ed-
21 ucation at that time, Francis Keppel, who, through informal
22 chats with the Associate Commissioner and a few other key
23 individuals, insisted that the focus be on innovation, on
24 invention and demonstration.

25 It was through these people, then, that the

1 National Advisory Committee and later the Staff began to
2 see the unique role and the unique mission of Title III
3 as indeed, invention and demonstration.

4 MISS CLARK: There were some external influences
5 in the way of consultants, particularly with the adoption
6 of the change-continuum philosophy and that sort of thing
7 which appears in the Title III guidelines, specifically in
8 Chapter I.

9 DR. ESTES: We had a number of consultants in
10 the beginning or in the implementation stages of Title III.
11 We had a group of ten-or-so "innovating innovators", as we
12 called them, in to talk with us about the direction that
13 Title III ought to go. Among them was Egan Gouba and an
14 other person by the name of Clark, Dave Clark. At that
15 time these gentlemen were associated with Ohio State Uni-
16 versity and now are at the University of Indiana.

17 It was their thinking and their research in the
18 area of change strategy that influenced the model that was
19 finally developed by the Office of Education in implement-
20 ing Title III of the Act.

21 MISS CLARK: I have understood, too, that Secre-
22 tary Gardner was quite interested in Title III. Was he
23 influential in the direction of the program from the begin-
24 ning?

25 DR. ESTES: I am not sure that Secretary Gardner

1 was influential in the beginning. He did have a great
2 concern for Title III.

3 As Chairman of the Task Force on Education and
4 Chairman of the White House Conference on Education, he
5 and the framers of the report to the President from the
6 White House task force envisioned a title such as this that
7 would be used much in the same way as we attempted to im-
8 plement it. So in that respect, he was very interested
9 and followed the developments of Title III very carefully.

10 The Congress amended Title III to limit eligible
11 applicants to public elementary and secondary schools.
12 John Gardner had wanted the money to be available to any
13 organization, institution or agency that had an interest
14 in improving education. He would have, if he had had his
15 way, made grants available to industrial firms, to private
16 parochial schools, to colleges and universities, to private
17 profit and not-for-profit groups who might have had an in-
18 terest in it.

19 The Congress in its wisdom decided that that was
20 much too broad and limited Title III grants to public ele-
21 mentary and secondary schools.

22 MISS CLARK: I know you were involved in talking
23 to state and local people when Title III was being imple-
24 mented. How did they react to this focussing of the title
25 or did they see it in broader aspects perhaps than the

1 Office of Education?

2 DR. ESTES: Several of the states were able to
3 grasp the concept immediately and, in fact, supported the
4 Office.

5 A large number of states, for various reasons,
6 were not able to understand the limits that were placed
7 on Title III in the beginning. They had a service-oriented
8 concept of Title III, rather than an innovative concept,
9 largely because of the testimony that was provided to the
10 Congress in defense of the Elementary and Secondary Act
11 and because of the great need for improvement in the quan-
12 tity of services that needed to be provided.

13 In talking with Commissioner Keppel about the
14 rationale for justifying Title III to the Congress on the
15 basis of a service-oriented program, he indicated that
16 this was done in order to gain substantial support for the
17 title and was not necessarily meant or designed as a plat-
18 form to stand on once the title was passed and ready to be
19 implemented.

20 MISS CLARK: How would you assess the resistance
21 of the ~~east~~ ^{States} to a program that would go right from the fed-
22 eral government to the local level, in effect, bypassing
23 them, though there were efforts made to involve them in
24 decisions?

25 DR. ESTES: This was typical behavior, I think,

1 on anybody's part, for a program of this nature, given our
2 non-system of public education in these United States.

3 Any program that attempted to alter the tradi-
4 tional pattern that had existed since 1635 would naturally
5 and normally be expected to accrue unto itself some resist-
6 ance and of course this did follow: The states were very,
7 very upset. But it is interesting to note that the weakest
8 states were the ones that were most threatened by the fed-
9 eral directory to local arrangement.

10 Those states which were providing the greatest
11 and strongest leadership to their local school districts
12 were least offended by this arrangement.

13 MISS CLARK: As the states in the following two
14 years saw the pains the Office was taking or the way the
15 Office was administering the program, do you think this
16 feeling was increased or --

17 DR. ESTES: I think the feeling was decreased
18 because the forces that were brought to bear upon the
19 Office caused the operation to become more state-depart-
20 ment oriented than it was originally.

21 In the beginning, the approval or disapproval
22 of a state department of education was not considered ser-
23 iously. But later on, as the pressure increased, as ESEA
24 came up for renewal and/or amendment, our staff was very
25 careful to build in very appropriate participation on the

part of the state.

MISS CLARK: ^{State} ~~States~~ were encouraged from the beginning to develop a state-wide pattern for the Title III projects, or not?

DR. ESTES: Yes. They were.

We had hoped that states would be in the very middle of planning, developing, implementing and evaluating Title III projects, either on an individual or a state-wide basis. But two things hindered this kind of an operation.

One was that the Title provided no money for state administration, no money to hire people to do this kind of activity at the state level.

Secondly, the other titles in the Elementary and Secondary Act were so demanding and required so much time on the part of local and state agencies that many of them simply put Title III on the shelf and did not consider it seriously until the other programs had become operational, programs for which they had direct responsibilities. So it was natural that they or many of them didn't become interested or involved until the second and some even until the third year.

There are two or three problems associated with implementing Title III which might deserve special mention at this point:

1 One was the uniqueness of the program, the new-
2 ne of a grant-type program for the Bureau of Elementary
3 and Secondary Education. We had not had any practice at
4 operating a program of making grants directly to local
5 school districts. Consequently, everything was new. De-
6 cisions were difficult to reach. There actually had been
7 no guidelines laid down prior to this."

8 The second problem related to human and financial
9 resources for implementation of the program. The Office
10 actually made available less than one percent of the total
11 amount appropriated for the program for the purposes of
12 administration. As a result of this, very few new people
13 were brought into the Office to develop, implement and
14 evaluate the program.

15 Personnel were bootlegged from other ongoing,
16 operating programs. The program that had had the most peo-
17 ple assigned to it in the Bureau was the National Defense
18 Education Programs, specifically Title 3, NDEA, and Title 5,
19 NDEA. These programs were reduced in staff size. These
20 staff members were reassigned to implement Title III. Both
21 in terms of quantity and quality, the program was somewhat
22 limited.

23 We started off the program with fifteen profes-
24 sionals -- a program calling for an expenditure of \$75
25 million with fifteen professionals to begin operating the

1 program.

2 In terms of quality, these people had largely
3 been responsible for a state-grant-type program in the
4 field of guidance or in the field of instructional equip-
5 ment and were not necessarily acquainted with the proced-
6 ures, the techniques, the processes whereby you bring about
7 substantial change in the educational enterprise.

8 The problem of resources, both human and finan-
9 cial, have plagued the operation of Title III since its
10 inception.

11 Three years hence, we have only thirty-two peo-
12 ple, professionals, assigned to operate, implement, eval-
13 uate the Title III program. The allocation or the appro-
14 priation now has increased to \$189 million for the current
15 fiscal year with approximately \$515 million authorized.

16 MISS CLARK: I know when we received our first
17 round of project applications, they far exceeded in number
18 our expectations. To what do you attribute this, since we
19 really had such a short time to let people know the pro-
20 gram existed?

21 Also, do you think the quality of the project
22 applications improved?

23 DR. ESTES: We received at the first initial
24 period -- we were asked --

25 The appropriations for the Elementary and Second-

1 ary Act was signed on September 25, 1965. The President
2 had asked us to implement the program and have something
3 to show the Congress when they returned in January. Be-
4 cause of this, we did not take the normal two year's time
5 to tune up for a program of this magnitude, as is frequent-
6 ly the case in the National Institute of Health operation
7 and the National Institute of Mental Health operation.

8 The first proposals for funding were received in
9 November? We received what? 700? 700-plus proposals.
10 Of those, we funded about 200, I guess, 250, in January
11 of that year. We received a number of proposals because
12 there had been much publicity about the Elementary and
13 Secondary Act in the educational community.

14 The proposals that we received during the first
15 go-around were, for our purposes, not of high quality.
16 Most of the projects were requesting funds to provide ser-
17 vices that were not available in sufficient quantity or
18 quality, that is, projects that proposed to do more of the
19 same: Add an additional teacher, add a guidance teacher,
20 purchase additional equipment, establish a materiel center,
21 projects that dealt with maintaining or attempting to im-
22 prove the status quo rather than take a look at the system
23 and come up with creative and inventive new solutions of
24 the overall educational process.

25 Over the three-year period, the proposals have

1 improved significantly for two ^{reasons:} ~~years~~

2 One, our guidelines have been distributed quite
3 widely so that our clients know now what we expect and the
4 kinds of projects that we are funding;

5 Secondly, because we have moved from a posture
6 of being passive recipients of unsolicited proposals to a
7 posture of going out and actively stimulating the develop-
8 ment of projects in areas of priority, as identified by
9 the Office of Education.

10 MISS CLARK: How have those priorities been
11 identified?

12 DR. ESTES: These priorities that we have estab-
13 lished as being problems whose solutions are in the nation-
14 al interest have been identified through a number of sour-
15 ces:

16 One, picking up emphases appearing in legisla-
17 tive language or legislative history, such as the big-city
18 problem. Running throughout the House and Senate Educa-
19 tion Committee Reports is the mention of the problem of
20 inner-city education.

21 Also, in discussions with state departments of
22 education and with members of the profession and the cus-
23 tomers or those who receive the product of the profession,
24 all of these have served to assist us in identifying what
25 we consider to be credible problems, significant problems

1 whose solutions are in the national interest, whose prob-
2 lems are common to many or most of the fifty states.

3 MISS CLARK: And have these priorities been gen-
4 erally well-received by the states and that they see them
5 as their priorities, also?

6 DR. ESTES: These priorities have had mixed
7 reactions.

8 In New York State, as we listed the priorities
9 for a National Advisory Committee on Title V, New York
10 State and Colorado indicated that they were substantially
11 the same priorities as those outlined for the states, the
12 states mentioned.

13 In other areas, in other states, the priorities
14 were not consistent with those conceived of by the state
15 and, as a result, were less well received.

16 MISS CLARK: Have they also had to cope with
17 much political pressure in approving local grants?

18 DR. ESTES: There have been a number of Congress-
19 men who have been very interested in the grant-making
20 process in Title III, if that is what you mean by "poli-
21 tical pressure".

22 There has been great interest because Congress
23 is generally more interested now in education. My percep-
24 tion is that they see education as one of the central ways
25 or one of the central problems of our times. Secondly,

1 Because Title III had the potential for making the differ-
2 ence for bringing about significant change in their own
3 Congressional Districts and, because of those two areas,
4 they have been much more concerned about this program.

5 Perhaps a third one: They have more control.
6 The federal, executive and legislative branch has much
7 more control over this program than they did over the
8 state-grant programs.

9 Most of our money, 85 percent of it, goes to
10 the state department of education who, in turn, then dis-
11 tributes it to local school districts and, in effect, the
12 state department of education has control, within appro-
13 priate guidelines, of these funds.

14 Title III was a direct federal-local-school-dis-
15 trict grant and, as such, was more amenable to influence
16 and the concern of the Congress. So it quite natural that
17 we would have many more contacts with this program than
18 other programs.

19 MISS CLARK: How were these contacts or conflicts
20 generally resolved?

21 DR. ESTES: These were generally resolved by ap-
22 proving the projects through a process not necessarily of
23 influence but through a process of improving the quality
24 of the project to the point that it was approvable, as
25 judged by outside evaluators and personnel within the

1 Office of Education.

2 MISS CLARK: In the amendment which has since
3 given Title III to the states, of course the Office was
4 in opposition to this change in the program.

5 Was there some indication that some states pre-
6 ferred the Office to continue its administration?

7 DR. ESTES: Probably for the historical record,
8 we ought to indicate that the Office was not opposed to
9 this change. In fact, the Office had proposed this change.
10 It was one individual in the Bureau of the Budget that was
11 opposed to this change and probably the entire shift, the
12 massive significant shift of Title III to the states in
13 the manner in which it was provided can be attributed to
14 that person.

15 This particular person in the Bureau of the Bud-
16 get would not yield to any compromise position with regard
17 to Title III. It was quite evident after the first year
18 of Title III that some adjustment would have to be made in
19 order to accommodate the reservations that state depart-
20 ments of education had about the operation of the programs.
21 The Office of Education was quite willing to make some ac-
22 commodations. Given the size of the program, the implica-
23 tions of this program for improving education, the Office
24 was willing to make some sort of an appropriate compromise
25 giving the states control over part of the funds, with the

(W.M. CANION)

1 Office of Education retaining control over the remaining
2 portion of the funds.

3 However, the Bureau of the Budget, as represented
4 by their Assistant Director for these matters, would not
5 suggest, would not agree to any kind of compromise. Con-
6 sequently, the Office appeared before the Congress in an
7 all-or-nothing posture and came out of it with nothing.

8 MISS CLARK: How many states' plans have come
9 in that you may have looked at, do you see the states
10 carrying the program forward with the same focus on demon-
11 stration and innovation?

12 DR. ESTES: Given the guidelines that we devel-
13 oped and the charge that has been made by the Congress, I
14 think the states will do as well as, if not better than,
15 in many instances, the Office of Education has done.

16 In the first place, there is 7.5 percent pro-
17 vided for administration of this program, as opposed to
18 the one percent the Office has used for administration.
19 This should give states ample opportunity to employ the
20 kind and the quality of people necessary to implement a
21 program of this type.

22 Secondly, they have had three years of experience
23 under the program. From observing a program of this type,
24 they have, through Title V and other areas, been in a pos-
25 ture of moving toward a comprehensive planning capability

1 in which they assess needs, assign priorities and then
2 develop program strategies accordingly.

3 This should provide states with an opportunity
4 to do as well or better than we have done in the past with
5 this program.

6 MISS CLARK: If we can move from Title III now
7 to all of your programs, from your vantage point as Asso-
8 ciate Commissioner, are there a few comments you would like
9 to make on the Bureau in general? For instance, the ad-
10 ministrative effectiveness of the Bureau.

11 Or is it possible to administer this Bureau?
12 Maybe that is a good one.

13 DR. ESTES: The Bureau is largely a grant-making
14 operation, pretty much distributing money on a formula
15 basis to the several states. The impact of the Office of
16 Education on these programs is minimal. We simply do not
17 have the staff, nor the time, to do the kind of job that
18 is necessary to implement significantly the major portion
19 of our funds.

20 We have time and again attempted to establish
21 criteria in Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Act
22 that would provide a more significant return on our in-
23 vestment and each time we have attempted to do this, there
24 have been pressures, there have been forces brought to
25 bear which substantially ^{substantially} ~~substantially~~ the impact or the influence

1 t we have had in this area.

2 Likewise in Title V. I know of no instance where
3 we have successfully disapproved a Title V project that
4 has come in from a state department of education.

5 Most of our impact is through influence and per-
6 suasion, as opposed to administrative edict or legislative
7 mandate.

8 MISS CLARK: Along those lines, the Title I staff
9 I know is thinking right now in terms of concentrating
10 funds and recently in the Washington papers, there has
11 been quite a discussion of the proposal
12 here to try to concentrate Title I funds, instead of let-
13 ting them go to all of the children that are entitled to
14 them.

15 Can you respond to this?

16 DR. ESTES: Yes.

17 This is just one attempt on our part to coor-
18 dinate and to package, to concentrate our programs in or-
19 der to get a bigger bang for our buck.

20 Given the limited resources that we have, we
21 feel that if we are going to be effective and efficient
22 in administering our programs, we have to focus our pro-
23 grams on our most critical problems, on priority problems
24 and concentrate funding in these areas.

25 The attempt to concentrate Title I on a fewer

1 number of children -- that is, spend more money on fewer
2 children, rather than a little bit of money on a lot of
3 children -- is just but one of a series of efforts to do
4 this.

5 However, as you well know, the Senate report is-
6 sued this last week and admonishes the Office for:

- 7 (1) Attempting to establish priorities;
8 (2) Attempting to consolidate or package funds
9 in this fashion.

10 Therefore, it simply reinforces the point that
11 I made previously: That 95 percent of the operation of the
12 Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education is a grant-
13 making operation, a grant-management operation. Probably
14 five percent of our activity could be labeled "leadership"
15 or "efforts to provide new approaches to stimulate the de-
16 velopment of new solutions to American Education".

17 MISS CLARK: Do you think our point of view in
18 concentrating funds and using funds from all the sources
19 that a school can get them from to do something that will
20 really have an impact, do you think that feature hasn't
21 been presented to the Senate or do you think they see us
22 as trying to exert too much influence?

23 DR. ESTES: I think it is a struggle between the
24 legislative and executive branches in the government. When
25 the legislative branch adopted the educational offspring

1 as an important member of the cultural family three years
2 ago, it did not foresee or visualize the offspring grow-
3 ing as rapidly as it has and now it is having problems.
4 The offspring is beginning to toddle around and get into
5 all sorts of problems.

6 The legislative branch would like to maintain
7 very strict and tight control over the total operation.
8 However, this is not feasible, nor possible. New arrange-
9 ments are going to have to be developed, new arrangements
10 both for the legislative, as well as the executive branch.
11 These are simply growing pains that we are going through
12 right now, sort of a give and take and, of course, I am
13 sure accommodations will be developed as we move along.
14 But it is going to take a great deal of patience on the
15 part of anyone concerned.

16 MISS CLARK: How would you assess our packaging
17 efforts in North Dakota and Texas or is it too soon to
18 tell?

19 DR. ESTES: I am not at liberty at this point to
20 talk about Texas, inasmuch as I have disqualified myself.
21 I really don't know a lot about that one.

22 I think the project for North Dakota is a good
23 model. It is one of many models that probably will pro-
24 vide significant information on how a state goes about
25 concentrating its federal funds in order to bring about

1 significant changes in the state.

2 Of significant interest in this area, I think,
3 is the combination of funds in higher education and ele-
4 mentary and secondary education; the bringing about of
5 change not only in elementary and secondary education but
6 at the college level as well and, indeed, institutions of
7 higher learning are the ones that are going to have to
8 make significant changes soon, if any lasting improvement
9 is to come about in elementary and secondary education.

10 MISS CLARK: It would seem that the Bureau of
11 Elementary and Secondary Education has sort of led the way
12 in this packaging concept.

13 What has been the reaction from other bureaus?

14 DR. ESTES: Guarded cautiousness.

15 The attempt to package, the attempt to coordin-
16 ate, in many instances, is threatening to other bureaus.
17 It is easy to see why:

18 When programs are coordinated, when there is a
19 sharing of responsibility and there is a sharing of author-
20 ity, it means that someone's control has to be reduced
21 and it is not always easy for people to share authority or
22 share control over, or share the identity of a project with
23 someone else.

24 MISS CLARK: In the administration of the Bureau,
25 I know in recent months we have been working to develop

1 per is a program planning budgeting system or a modifica-
2 tion thereof.

3 Could you describe our efforts along this line
4 and what we are gaining from this, if anything?

5 DR. ESTES: I think the attempt to join account-
6 ability in public education is one of the most significant
7 moves that has been made in the Office of Education in the
8 past three years.

9 The central question that we have got to answer
10 and which we are poorly equipped to answer at this point
11 is proof of results, proof of performance, what we actually
12 receive as a result of all of our inputs.

13 We now have all sorts of measures relating to
14 the inputs in education. We know class size. We know
15 cost of construction. We know per-pupil expenditure.
16 We can quote these kinds of per-pupil-expenditure input
17 measures until the sun goes down. What we do not have,
18 however, is any measures on the output. We do not know
19 what the results are and people, our citizens, our clients
20 quite appropriately expect us to be able to measure more
21 efficiently and effectively our product than we are doing
22 at the present time.

23 To the extent that PP and BS represent this
24 attempt or is designed to move us closer to develop a pro-
25 gram-oriented budget and move us in the direction of adjoin-

1 in accountability and public education, quality control
2 and public education. And it has been very, very helpful,
3 as a matter of fact, and it is a very significant move.

4 It is limited, however, in its usefulness in the
5 Office of Education by the number of intangibles that we
6 have to deal with in a social institution such as the
7 school and also limited because of the lack of coordina-
8 tion between the legislative, the program, the budget and
9 the operational units and functions of the Office of Edu-
10 cation.

11 To be quite truthful, there is little relation-
12 ship between the program-planning calls, the legislative-
13 planning calls, the budget-planning calls and the operat-
14 ing-planning calls that emanate from each level of the
15 Office.

16 Ideally, once a long-range program plan has been
17 developed, all other calls for plans would grow out of
18 this. Thus far, it has been non-existent in the Office.

19 MISS CLARK: But you see us moving in that direc-
20 tion?

21 DR. ESTES: Hopefully, as we gain more experience
22 with and have more confidence in the program-planning bud-
23 geting system, we will move in that direction.

24 MISS CLARK: Perhaps you would talk for just a
25 minute about the internal organizational problems with the

1 Bur of the scope that elementary and secondary educa-
2 tion is.

3 I know, when you first became Associate Commis-
4 sioner, I believe Mario Fantini, among other people, was
5 in to talk about the possibility of reorganizing the Bu-
6 reau and we are still talking about reorganizing the Bu-
7 reau.

8 DR. ESTES: The Bureau, of course, administers
9 twenty-seven programs over \$2 billion.

10 The Bureau ought to represent elementary and
11 secondary education for the Office of Education. It ought
12 to be the Bureau for elementary and secondary education
13 for the Office. Thus far, it has not been possible to
14 bring about this kind of an operation because of the in-
15 ternal operation and organization of the Bureau and because
16 of the pressures on the Office to establish additional Bu-
17 reaus which have fragmented a cohesive, coordinated, coher-
18 ent operation for elementary and secondary education.

19 We are convinced that this Bureau ought to develop
20 a program for elementary and secondary education and then
21 use the existing programs to implement, develop, stimulate
22 the development of that program insofar as is possible.

23 During the last three years, the Bureau for the
24 education of handicapped children was mandated, established
25 by the Congress which fragmented the elementary and

1 secondary operation and now, more recently, the Bureau for
2 Education Personnel Development has been created by the
3 Office of Education which takes an important training com-
4 ponent out of the Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Edu-
5 cation, further fragmenting. And more recently, the Insti-
6 tute for International Education has been established,
7 again further fragmenting the operation.

8 Within the Bureau, there have been real difficul-
9 ties in developing a bureau staff that could mount the
10 kind of program that would make it possible to move toward
11 a coordinated, cohesive program. There have been few gains
12 in coordinating the various programs within the Bureau to-
13 ward a common goal or a common effort.

14 With recent moves toward breaking down proprietary
15 interests, breaking down the established units designed to
16 administer particular pieces of legislation within the Bu-
17 reau, much more progress will be made in the next twelve
18 months than has been made in the last two or three years
19 in this area.

20 MISS CLARK: Is it true that there has been pres-
21 sure from outside groups to keep certain programs visible
22 within the Bureau?

23 I guess there are some areas within the whole
24 Office that we could point to like that, but do you find
25 this problem within the Bureau, itself?

1 DR. ESTES: There are always professional groups
2 interested in maintaining a specific unit or a section or
3 a division within the Office that deals specifically with
4 their particular area. This is true of our Bureau. Par-
5 ticularly the guidance professional has been very interest-
6 ed in maintaining, within the Office, a unit that would be
7 identified as a "leadership unit for guidance and counsel-
8 ling".

9 The same has been true with the program that was
10 designed to provide leadership for library programs, for
11 instruction equipment and other areas as well.

12 MISS CLARK: Why was the Mexican-American unit
13 placed in the Bureau, as opposed to some other spot in the
14 Office?

15 DR. ESTES: I guess the Mexican-American unit
16 logically should have gone in the Assistant Commissioner's
17 Office for Disadvantaged or reported directly to the Com-
18 missioner.

19 We recommended that this be done. Our recommend-
20 ation was not approved for a number of reasons, perhaps
21 the most important at this point is our Bureau has adminis-
22 tration of the largest piece of the Office of Education
23 budget, dealing directly with problems of Mexican-Americans.
24 We have \$2 billion. A significant portion of that is ex-
25 tended in areas that have high concentrations of Mexican-

1 American people. So it was indeed appropriate that that
2 unit be placed as close as possible to the operating pro-
3 grams that have the greatest impact on the Mexican-American
4 people.

5 MISS CLARK: How would you characterize the Bu-
6 reau's relationship with the regional offices and the work
7 of the regional offices in the past couple of years?

8 DR. ESTES: As of yesterday, we have completed
9 regionalizing all nine of our offices, nine of our regional
10 offices.

11 We have delegated authority, operational decision-
12 making to each of the nine regional offices in all of our
13 state-grant-state-plan programs. For the Office of Educa-
14 tion, this is an historic moment because, for the first
15 time now in elementary and secondary education, we have
16 established in each of our regional offices a decentralized
17 operation which attempts to provide better service, attempts
18 to humanize our operation, attempts to provide the quantity
19 and the quality of service that is necessary, I think, for
20 us to make necessary and needed improvements in education.

21 We have, in the last two years, moved toward com-
22 pletely decentralizing the decision-making process. It has,
23 in spite of the problems we have had with personnel ceilings,
24 personnel shortages, it has far exceeded our expectations
25 in terms of gaining the support of key state school officers

1 in the several states.

2 MISS CLARK: Do you see our five-percent influence
3 being increased because of regionalization?

4 DR. ESTES: Over the next two or three years,
5 the influence will not increase significantly. In the
6 next decade, however, the influence of the Office of Edu-
7 cation will grow significantly as we begin to realize that
8 local control is really a myth. Local school districts do
9 not control much of anything, except the amount of money
10 that they can raise from local taxes.

11 As we move from that myth to a more realistic con-
12 cept of public education that is basically one that is state
13 controlled and state operated, the federal government, as
14 it increases its contribution, will move more and more in-
15 to a significant partnership in which there is an appropri-
16 ate give-and-take, as opposed to the way we are operating
17 now.

18 MISS CLARK: But you see the regional offices as
19 the operating base for the Office.

20 DR. ESTES: More and more, there will be no choice
21 but to regionalize our operation.

22 It is difficult now for us to operate a program
23 amounting to \$2 billion on the banks of the Potomac. As
24 we move toward \$10 billion in elementary and secondary edu-
25 cation at the federal level, it will be essential, if not 28

1 disastereous, if we don't. It is essential that we move
2 more and more to decentralization.

3 MISS CLARK: How do you see the role of special-
4 ists in the Office?

5 I know, during the ^{Keppel} ~~Capital~~ reorganization in 1965,
6 it seems that the role of the specialist was of primary
7 concern there. Perhaps there will be less and less empha-
8 sis during the coming years on the specialist's role. Have
9 you found that to be true?

10 DR. ESTES: There will be less and less emphasis
11 on the role of a subject-matter specialist but more and
12 more emphasis on the role of the specialist in the area of
13 urban planning, urban problems; specialists in the area of
14 economics, anthropology; in the areas of specialization,
15 in management, in decision-making, comprehensive planning,
16 will increase. Whereas, the area of specialization for
17 subject matter, subject-oriented people, such as social
18 studies, science, math, will decrease.

19 MISS CLARK: Speaking of urban problems, since
20 you are going to an urban district, how responsive do you
21 think the Office is to the problems of the inner-city?

22 DR. ESTES: Virtually non-responsive. No visible,
23 no perceptive response whatsoever.

24 MISS CLARK: What can be done to change this or
25 do you think --

1 DR. ESTES: Well, if we have got 3,000 employees
2 in the Office of Education and if 70 percent of our popu-
3 ation lives in the 212 standard metropolitan areas and if
4 urban education is the No. 1 priority for the nation, then
5 the Office of Education ought to have more than one person
6 assigned to take a look at these problems and that is what
7 we have right now. We have one person or individual,
8 Chuck Smith, who has this responsibility.

9 I would see 1500 people in the Office of Educa-
10 tion focussing in on helping to identify and solve some of
11 the problems of the big cities.

12 MISS CLARK: One possibility for getting more
13 impact out of our funds has been working with other organi-
14 zations, with foundations and outside agencies and so
15 forth.

16 Would you care to talk about some of the activi-
17 ties along that line?

18 DR. ESTES: We have worked with a number of
19 foundations, among them, of course, Ford Foundation, Dan-
20 North Foundation and there was that small foundation. I
21 forget what the name of it was. I believe it was the
22 Lettering Foundation that work with us.

23 I would see more and more a partnership arrange-
24 ment with foundations. For instance, our latest coopera-
25 tive activity has been a \$4 million one with the Carnegie

1 Foundation and the Ford Foundation in developing a new
2 series, a twenty-six-week series, for kindergarten educa-
3 tion, a televised program in which the two foundations
4 will put in at least half of the money, I guess, and the
5 Office of Education perhaps matching or not quite matching
6 the amount; a cooperative endeavor that I think will pay
7 off very richly in the months ahead. I would say this is
8 probably just the beginning of this kind of relationship.

9 As with any new beginning, there are going to be
10 some painful moments. There are going to be some abra-
11 sions. But you have to anticipate this.

12 MISS CLARK: Would you care to comment on our re-
13 lations with the Kittering Foundation?

14 I know that is on the record in other places.

15 DR. ESTES: I think the relationship, as a whole,
16 is, has been and will continue to be very wholesome.

17 The fact that specifically, as we think about
18 the Hawaii Conference -- that is probably what you are
19 talking about -- to think that we could take a thousand
20 educators, expose them to forty of the innovating innovat-
21 ers, the leading people in the profession, for an entire
22 week in a highly stimulative, creative atmosphere, for a
23 cost of less than \$235 to the local state and national tax-
24 payer is almost unbelievable and certainly has not been
25 matched in my lifetime. It certainly probably will be the

1 outstanding educational conference of this decade.

2 This was made possible only through the assis-
3 tance of a foundation such as Kittering who was willing to
4 pick up a substantial portion of the cost in order to make
5 it possible.

6 MISS CLARK: Has any evaluation been done, now
7 that the conference is a year in the past, to see whether
8 people actually adopted any of the ideas they may have con-
9 tributed there?

10 DR. ESTES: A follow-up, that has been done. We
11 are just now getting the report of that conference off the
12 presses.

13 MISS CLARK: Has this Bureau taken any position
14 on national assessment and, if so --

15 DR. ESTES: This Bureau favors national assess-
16 ment for the purposes we mentioned earlier. We must, if
17 we are going to maintain our professional status, join ac-
18 countability and public education. There is just no way
19 of maintaining the professional status that we should have;
20 by that, the status that distinguishes our decisions and
21 our opinions from that of the average citizen. There is
22 no way to maintain that professional status unless we can
23 assess our end product adequately, fairly, and then pre-
24 scribe viable solutions in order to improve that.

25 MISS CLARK: At a recent Chief State School

1 Officers Meeting, you described a proposal for a consoli-
2 dation-legislation-education package. Could you describe
3 the reaction of the Chiefs to this proposal and also the
4 internal reaction here in the Office?

5 DR. ESTES: The reaction within the Bureau was
6 fine. The reaction within the Office of Education was
7 cautious.

8 The reaction of the Chief State School Officers
9 was, I would say, overly cautious. While they agreed in
10 concept, they questioned the ability of the educational
11 enterprise to (1) consolidate or (2) once programs have
12 been consolidated, maintain the funding level specifically
13 for state departments of education, once the total amount
14 has been pulled out and identified as "assistance for
15 state departments of education".

16 Through our various programs in this Bureau, we
17 provide about \$62 million or \$63 million for state depart-
18 ments of education. This is hidden away in each piece of
19 our program. Once this is pulled out and is consolidated,
20 coordinated and identified, Chief State School Officers
21 are worried about it being very susceptible to the red pen-
22 cil used by Congress in reducing budgets.

23 The question of whether or not we are in a posi-
24 tion now, as a profession, to sustain these kinds of line-
25 item accounts is indeed questionable.

1 So I would say at this point that it may not be
2 appropriate for us to move toward the consolidation of pro-
3 grams. Given the specific interest of the members of the
4 Congress in various pieces of legislation, that interest,
5 in turn, provides a great deal of support for increases in
6 funding, support for important amendments which improve
7 the program, et cetera.

8 MISS CLARK: Okay.

9 Have you observed any changes in the way policy
10 is developed in the Office in the last couple of years and
11 how much influence do the Associate Commissioners or the
12 executive group have on what becomes the official policy
13 of the Office?

14 DR. ESTES: The Office is moving now toward a
15 posture of corporate management in which all Associate
16 Commissioners will participate in the decision-making pro-
17 cess. This has been evolving over the last twelve months
18 and I think will improve significantly the quality of our
19 decisions that are made and our attempts to coordinate our
20 various programs.

21 MISS CLARK: Does this carry through to individ-
22 ual bureaus where --

23 DR. ESTES: Hopefully, if this can be done at the
24 Commissioners' level, it will then carry through to the bu-
25 reaus and divisions and will have opportunities to provide

1 significant input into the decision-making process.

2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

LR 66-1
(Tape)

66-1

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE

-----+
:
Interview of: :
:
DR. NOLAN ESTES :
Associate Commissioner for :
Elementary and Secondary Education :
:
-----+

Room 2189
Office of Education
400 Maryland Avenue
Washington, D. C.

Tuesday, 23 July 1968

The interview referred to above commenced at
4:00 p.m., being conducted by Miss Monna Clark of the
Office of Education.