

Wisconsin school districts spent approximately \$460.00 per public elementary and secondary school pupil during 1965-66. Of this figure approximately \$196.00 is state support and \$264.00 is local support. To maintain this level of per-pupil expenditure, the local school district must rely on local property taxes for 60-70% of its revenue. Educational improvement and expansion at the local level must be supported by state and federal sources of income, for only in this way can the local district obtain the necessary capital without establishing oppressive levels of property taxation. This year the state of Wisconsin will approach the 30% level of financial support for the operation of local district educational programs. \$303,354,000 is being requested by the Department in its 1967-69 biennial budget for state aids to Wisconsin school districts.

In the long run, significant improvement in education cannot be effected without financial assistance from the federal government. Redistribution of a part of the national wealth to each state is essential for long-range educational well-being. Thus, the issue for us is not whether we should or should not have federal aid; rather the critical issue, in our opinion, is what type of categorical aid, prescriptive control, and administrative processes should accompany federal legislation. We are concerned that the 89th Congress, though providing increased amounts of federal support to education, bound that support by greater specificity, increased administrative control, and many more requests for information and statistics. This increased specificity taxes the local school district and the state agency and necessitates the development locally of greater administrative capacity in order to prepare applications, operate programs, gather data, and comply with reporting requirements. We understand that such specificity, in many cases, stems from the natural concern of Congress about legislative programs and the needs of the U.S. Office of Education in reporting to Congress about programs it administers.

We hope that the Congress will, to a great extent, look to each state and its educational agency or agencies for assurance that the intent of Congress is being fulfilled. We believe it desirable that each state educational agency be designated as the agency responsible for administering federal aid programs in the state according to the appropriate legal structure and administrative procedures of the programs.

Each state has its problems in administering federal education programs. Federal definitions for categorical aids often differ from those used by the state (for example, the term equipment as versus that of supplies). The development of a regional depository plan for Title II library resources runs counter to the Wisconsin philosophy of developing strong libraries in each school.

The direct federal-to-local district relationship provided for in Title III is detrimental to the development of a purpose and direction in supplementary centers and services funded by federal and state programs. Incompatibility as manifested in the above examples makes it difficult for federal and state programs to be mutually supportive and complementary. A major consequence of this incompatibility is the increasing tendency of local school districts to set aside or ignore state goals, objectives, and administrative procedures in order to qualify for federal aid.

I recognize that the committee is pressed for time. Rather than give a detailed report at the present, I invite you to request any information from the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction that will prove useful to the committee. With your consent I would like to conclude my presentation by discussing several concerns of the agency I represent.

1. The Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction would prefer that a general distribution of federal funds earmarked for education be made to the state for priorities determined by the state. If general aid is not expedient or feasible in the near future, then we emphatically endorse federal programs utilizing the state-plan method of operation, such as the National Defense Education Act, the Vocational Act of 1963, and Title VI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, rather than programs requiring detailed state applications and federal guidelines, as in Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. We believe that we can effectively assure fulfillment of the intent of Congress for Title I by means of the state plan procedure which has been the pattern of the National Defense Education Act and the Vocational Act of 1963.

2. We hope that, rather than proliferate individual programs of federal aid, the Congress will consider the utilization of general categorical plans, each of