

tion came from this expenditure of this money. Some of the value is still felt. However, the program was hampered in a number of ways:

1. Time of year when programs were approved—January. With a critical teacher shortage this is a poor time to hire additional personnel and especially specialists in reading, mathematics, etc.

2. Voluminous application—appears to be statistic gathering only, and have no real bearing on the program to be approved. Paper work falls upon administrators who have little additional time for this.

3. Aid to education is not for everyone but only to selected schools and designed for only a selected group within that school. The philosophy of the local school board has been to provide equal opportunity for all. This type of aid makes opportunity unequal.

4. Local school boards are in a better position of deciding where monies need to be spent and for what than any other group.

5. Evaluation of the program had to be made before the program was fully in effect.

6. Timing for 1966-67 is as untimely as it was in 1965-66. We do not yet know our full allotment for the current year.

7. This aid cannot be counted on to build quality programs. There can be no long range planning because there is no guarantee that monies will be forthcoming to support programs once established. Quality teachers want nothing to do with these programs because of the insecurity of their continuance.

Title II—Library Services

This program has been instituted into the local school program rather easily. It has had less red tape, less control and more freedom of choice than any other program. Local school systems have been able to use their own judgment and have implemented this in such a way as to supplement existing materials to the benefit of all pupils.

Title III—"PACE"—Projects To Advance Creativity in Education

Quoting from a manual by the U.S. Office of Education:

"This title is designed to encourage school districts to develop imaginative solutions to educational problems; to more effectively utilize research findings; and to create, design and make intelligent use of supplementary centers and services. Primary objectives are to translate the latest knowledge about teaching and learning into widespread educational practice and to create an awareness of new programs and services of high quality that can be incorporated in school programs. Therefore, PACE seeks to (1) encourage the development of innovations, (2) demonstrate worthwhile innovations in educational practice through exemplary programs, (3) supplement existing programs and facilities. The heart of the PACE program is in these provisions for bringing a creative force to the improvement of schools and for demonstrating that better practices can be applied.

"Since the innovative and exemplary programs supported by PACE are intended to contribute substantially to educational improvement, priority in funding is given to those projects which offer the greatest promise of advancing education and solving *persistent* problems."

Our District applied for two planning grants under this title and has been awarded funds to conduct both studies. One planning grant for the Study of Slow Learners has now been completed. It was a logical assumption that if a planning grant was successfully carried out that this would lead to a construction grant—if no building facilities were available to house an innovative program. This fact was clearly stated in our original application. Our planning project has been completed as previously stated, the report has been submitted to the U.S. Office of Education and classed by them as a project of "high quality". In preparation of an application for a construction grant, the U.S. Office was further consulted and advised me that no money was available for construction now or in the foreseeable future. I feel that this is not right nor does it follow the intent of the law as passed by Congress when this section was included.

It would appear that monies spent on planning grants have been partially wasted and the work and aspirations of many people cast aside if this is so.

Slow Learners is a *persistent* problem of every school system. Our study shows that 20 to 25% of the pupil population in every school falls into this classification. We feel that we came up with some solution for this group in our study which could set the example for many school systems throughout the nation if only