

2. That the U.S. Congress and the U.S. Office of Education be urged to consult with local and State boards and their administrators in adopting guidelines for implementation of existing legislation.

3. That categorical aid programs are a threat to the control of education at the State and local level.

Categorical aid programs are fragmented and piecemeal in nature. Most categorical programs do not reflect priorities determined at the local and State level: That it would be desirable to reexamine the present types of categorical grants and work toward changing Federal policy to provide a general type of aid to be distributed through the State departments of education in accordance with a State foundation plan developed by local boards, administrators, and State departments and approved by the U.S. Office of Education.

4. That Federal funds should flow from the U.S. Office of Education to State departments to local education agencies.

5. That leadership be provided for the encouragement of further study of the proper roles of the local, State, and Federal Government in public education.

6. That at least equal weight be given to educational excellence, as well as the promotion of socioeconomic goals and ideals.

7. That it would be desirable to know that various guidelines prepared by Federal agencies are in keeping with the intent of the Congress.

8. That provisions be included to provide for judicial review of legislation.

These concerns were also expressed by consensus statements developed in table discussions in a series of nine conferences held jointly by the Tennessee Education Association, the Congress of Parents and Teachers, and the Tennessee School Boards Association.

The debate and discussion on the control of education has stimulated considerable evaluation of local and State efforts in meeting responsibilities for education. Most are willing to admit that we have not measured up to our educational responsibilities in many areas, for various reasons, such as lack of finances, lack of understanding, unwillingness to deal with issues, and other reasons. This, no doubt, is a worthwhile outcome of the debate.

Most educators in Tennessee now accept the fact that Federal involvement in education, at all levels, is here to stay, and that it is likely to increase; if so, other questions quickly follow.

What will be the nature of the involvement, and how is it to be managed?

Is there anyone to speak for the States as a whole?

Does the Federal Government speak with one voice?

In general, how is the partnership to be implemented?

Partners are supposed to have intimate and constant communication, and each is to have influence upon the other. It appears to many that where previous programs were organized to provide fiscal support for programs determined in the States, we are now engaged in programs written in Washington and determined to be good for the States.

The Headstart program is an example of this. The point is not whether the program is good or bad, but that it was not determined or recommended by the States.