

3. Paperwork, research and evaluation—red tape.
4. Identification of deprived youngsters under present Federal criteria.
5. Uncertainty about future aids once programs started.
6. Time factor—money allotted too late in school year.
7. Schools weren't staffed and ready to develop programs.
8. Poor communication and interpretation guidelines for local districts.
9. Equipment shortage and delivery delayed—inability or delay in getting instructional materials.
10. Lack of information—delay and Federal indecision.
11. The reports are too technical.

*II. What changes, revisions or new concepts would do the most to make Federal funds more useful for or more easily used by school districts?*

The suggestions mentioned most often by the discussion groups at the 14 WASB Regional Meetings were:

1. Simplify reporting requirements—less red tape
2. More local-state discretion as to how funds should be used—general aids preferred rather than categorical aids
3. Change basis of appropriations—1960 census statistics out-dated.
4. Continuing program—not year to year. Allocations and appropriations might be determined 2 years in advance so plans could be made. More time for planning needed.
5. Funds needed for school construction and property tax relief
6. Need more assurance that funds will be available on a continuing basis.
7. Provide schools with funds to improve some of the present educational programs which the local districts feel are needed—general aids. Less restrictions as to how the funds are to be used—especially for rural school districts.

*III. Which type of Federal school aids would be best—General aids or special program aids as are now being provided?*

Delegates at the regional meetings in rural areas favored, for the most part, general federal aids allowing for more discretion by the local school district as to how the funds will be used. Several references were made about the need for general federal aids to education, with local and state determination of the deficiencies in the local district and how the funds should be used.

Delegates at the regional meetings in urban area (Greenfield particularly) seemed to be more in favor of categorical special aids because:

1. general aids invite control
2. there are too many abuses in the application of general aids.
3. special program aids are more efficient and guarantee, in part, that certain expectations will be met.

At the regional meetings in urban areas there was more divided opinion as to whether special program aids or general aids would be better.

*IV. Should all high school level vocational education be operated and supervised by the public school system? Why?*

Practically all of the discussion groups expressed concern that there be proper coordination and administration of the vocational education programs at the secondary school level; and that this coordination would best be met if the vocational education programs were supervised by the public school system. Many of the discussion groups favored the establishment of area vocational school districts on public school district lines rather than county lines. The groups mentioned that the Department of Public Instruction was the state agency best equipped to supervise the vocational education programs at the secondary school level.

*V. What are the most important problems affecting public education which the legislature should consider in 1967?*

The problems which were most frequently mentioned at the 14 WASB Regional Meetings were:

1. Property tax relief for education costs (highest)
2. Professional Staff issues: Supply, contract breaking, opposition to job tenure, and employment negotiations on wages, hours and employment conditions.
3. Increases in state aids for local public education
4. Boundaries of area vocational school districts
5. School district reorganization problems