

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION AMENDMENTS 1577

5. While it has been mandatory to build evaluation into proposals, the results have been token and of little value. Further, there has been no widespread dissemination of results so that District A can take advantage of District B's experiences.

6. There should be provisions for interstate and interdistrict transfer of funds to take full advantage of unexpended monies. Further, adjustments from "line to line" on individual budgets should be possible as experience yields wisdom. Poor judgments on early estimates have hampered many projects.

7. Guidelines should be more general rather than categorical, to meet local needs. The problems of the suburbs are not the same as those of the inner city. It should be possible to tailor proposals to deal with the particular problems of states, regions, or local communities.

8. The role of universities in 89-10 projects should be broadened and spelled out.

Title I—Special programs for the deprived

1. Many districts do not have resources for planning—skills lacking.

2. Aid is too categorical and guidelines too severe. This reduces flexibility and limits creativity. Proposals must satisfy not only guidelines but transitory notions of government personnel. Only certain lines of thinking are encouraged.

3. There has been some difficulty in identifying children to participate. Definitions of poverty and deprivation should be made more inclusive.

4. Adjustment of budget items should be possible as project is implemented.

5. Administrative expenses are not taken into account sufficiently. Every proposal requires some local investment, and those districts most in need of assistance are often least willing to make the necessary local commitment or take a risk.

6. There needs to be cognizance of the newest developments in providing for the deprived. For instance, some wealthy districts are accepting students bussed in from slum areas. Title I allocations need to take this into account.

Title II—Libraries and materials

1. General response to Title II is excellent.

2. There is some question about legality of providing materials for private sectarian schools. Some feel, however, that the fact that some public schools have acted as fiscal agents for securing materials for private schools has fostered closer relationships between the two.

3. There should be fewer categorical grants by subject area.

4. Sometimes local allocations for materials are cut back the year following Title II grant.

Title III—Supplementary centers and exemplary programs

1. Title II has fostered some innovation. It has been of tremendous help to New York City and other large cities, but of less help to smaller districts. It makes possible programs on a trial basis which would otherwise never be tried.

2. The phase in-phase out feature of Title III proposals is excellent, provided local districts are willing to take on full responsibility for successful proposals.

3. Encouragement of formal ties between schools and other local agencies is good—provides legitimate pressure for cooperation.

4. Delay in approval of projects and allocation of funds has hampered Title III projects more than others. There has been difficulty with last-minute staffing and coordination with other agencies. Long-range planning is especially important for Title III.

5. There have been difficulties in reallocation of line item funds as unforeseen needs arise and original estimates prove incorrect.

6. Districts which already have resources for planning make the best proposals, while others have the greatest needs. Districts must be provided with resources for planning.

7. While Title III proposals go directly to the federal government, they are usually approved by state departments of education. The states in this area have used this power to encourage regionalization or "clustering" of districts. A single district or agency (e.g., study council) is designated as applicant and administrator of the "package" proposal. While there have been some benefits from this (e.g., cooperation, reduction of overlap, more efficient programs), some creative ideas by individual districts have been lost. Local creativity is forced into the mold of the package. Regionalization or clustering is good for small