

AN OVERVIEW OF FEDERAL POLICY IN SUPPORT OF EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES

John R Curley*
New York State Education Department

Federal involvement in and aid to education in the United States has always been limited. Nevertheless there have been very definite federal policy objectives throughout the history of the country which have given rise to a number of federal initiatives in relation to education. These various initiatives can be broadly grouped as meeting one or more of the federal education objectives of stimulating greater efficiency, promoting equal educational opportunity, and preserving diversity and choice. The history of federal activities in education is briefly traced and an overview is provided of the wide range of education programmes which are currently funded through a variety of federal departments and agencies.

Although the United States Constitution does not include education as a function of the federal government, reserving it as a responsibility of individual states, the federal level of government has nonetheless always had a concern for education because of its importance to the nation's social, political, and economic well being. This concern has been expressed in various ways, including the exercise of federal leadership relative to educational issues, through research and the compilation of educational statistics to identify the condition of education, and by direct and indirect aid to individuals and organizations to meet federal education objectives.

Federal support for education in the United States comes through many different channels. Public pronouncements by elected and appointed officials that favour education and public events such as the ill-fated attempt by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to put a teacher in space and appearances of the President in selected school

* Requests for off prints should be sent to John R Curley New York State Education Department, Albany, NY 12234 USA

classrooms help to focus attention on and generate interest in education. Material support for education and related activities can be found in many federal department and agency budgets and recent tax-reform legislation highlighted the effect some tax deductions have as indirect forms of federal aid to education.

The federal government has not, in general, been a major source of revenue for schools. On a national scale, the percentage of public-school district revenue from the federal level has never been above ten percent. Of course, there is considerable variation among the states and individual school districts in the federal share of total revenue. The State of Mississippi receives the highest percentage (17.5%) of school-district revenue from federal sources while Wyoming receives the lowest (3.1%) (14, p.81).

In spite of the variability, federal aid is vitally important even in those states receiving a lower percentage of total school revenue from this source. This is so because federal aid has stimulated innovations in education and has promoted equal opportunity for disadvantaged groups. Approximately 80 to 85% of most school-district budgets are in fixed costs, including salaries, and federal aid enables school districts to undertake activities that would probably not be possible in the absence of this aid. Federal aid, in the form of grants, fellowships, and loans, has also been crucially important to higher education in that it has enabled many students to meet the costs of a college education while federal funds granted to institutions of higher education support much of the research and specialized training activities of such institutions.

As the proper role of the federal government in education in the United States continues to be defined, it is important that the historical context be understood and that all areas of federal involvement and aid to education and related activities as reflected in the federal budget be considered and examined.

FEDERAL EDUCATION POLICIES

Garms, Guthrie and Pierce (5) identified the major underlying purposes of federal education policies as (a) the stimulation of greater efficiency, (b) the extension and promotion of equal educational opportunity, and (c) the preservation of diversity and choice. There are also federal payments 'in lieu of taxes' to compensate certain school districts for the

presence of non-taxable federal properties within their jurisdiction but these are not intended to meet federal education objectives

It is important to clarify what is meant by the terms efficiency, equal educational opportunity, and choice in the context of federal education policies. Efficiency relates to both the process of resource allocation and the use of those resources. It may be that to some extent the allocation of public funds for education as opposed to other public needs such as national defense, social services, highways and other purposes is not efficient in the economic sense of maximum utility. Currently what Michaelson (9) calls the bilateral monopoly characteristic of the public schools makes a sorting out of public preferences for education, both in relation to other public services and in the sense of choosing among educational options, problematic. Compulsory attendance laws, the guarantees of contingency budgets and tax support for public schools, as examples, limit the test of efficiency inherent in a competitive market place situation.

From the perspective of the larger society, efficiency also relates to how well the schools prepare students with skills and knowledge which they need and which are economically beneficial to society. There are, of course, still other returns to society from education, sometimes called externalities, which include keeping older students out of a job market that could not absorb them, the inculcation of certain social and civic values, and possibly a reduction in the need for health, welfare, and criminal institutions through the educating of students to be healthy and functional members of society.

Federal programmes that have been enacted to address the objective of efficiency are those for occupational training, those which stimulate school innovation and experimentation, and those such as School Nutrition and Health Education programmes which enhance the possibilities for students to more fully benefit from the time they spend in school and reduce the costs to society stemming from the social and medical problems of individuals.

Equal educational opportunity generally refers to the provision of compensatory education resources to pupils with special needs who, in the absence of the additional resources, would remain disadvantaged. There are federal aid programmes which extend and promote equal educational opportunity for several different groups of pupils including the

economically disadvantaged, those with handicapping conditions, native Americans, and those who speak English as a second language. Federal aid also makes it possible for disadvantaged students to attend college.

Many of the programmes to equalize educational opportunity have been enacted or greatly expanded since the passage of the Economic Opportunity Act in 1964 and the Elementary and Secondary Education and Higher Education Acts in 1965. Meranto attributed what he termed a new rationale for federal aid to education at that time to 'the "rediscovery" of poverty in the United States, the recognition of America as a metropolitan society and the Civil Rights movement' (8, p. 16).

Within education, there are degrees of freedom of choice. Governmental allocations of funds are constrained by voter preferences and the level of taxation that will be tolerated. Also, particular programmes may enjoy public support at one time and not another. School administrators have to meet state and federal mandates in the implementation of educational programmes and in the delivery of ancillary school services and have to contend with conditions imposed by negotiated teacher contracts.

Parents may have some freedom of choice in the selection of a school for their children but less so if they live in a sparsely populated area or have insufficient resources to afford an alternative to the public-school system. Students may have some choice in the selection of courses at the secondary-school level but only if the particular courses are offered in their school, if there are available openings in classes, and if the school allows such choice. Federal grants and loans at the higher-education level often do promote choice since students are enabled to attend a college of their own choosing.

HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE ON FEDERAL INVOLVEMENT IN EDUCATION

Initial Policy of General Aid

Milstein (10) has noted that recurring throughout the history of federal aid to education in the United States has been 'one constant theme: each federal contribution to the states' educational efforts has been granted to advance national objectives' (p. 7).

The original federal education policy was established under the Articles of Confederation in the Survey Ordinance of 1785 and the Northwest Ordinance of 1787 which, respectively, set aside land for schools and

declared that 'schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged' These Acts established the encouragement of public schools as a national policy and set a precedent for tangible federal aid and an enduring federal interest in education

Other programmes of general federal aid to education followed, including a series of National Land Grants beginning in 1802 as first Ohio and then additional territories were admitted to the Union These Grants were made by Congress through powers given to it 'to control and dispose of the national domain' in Article IV, Section 3, Paragraph 2 of the Constitution Also in 1802, the United States Military Academy, the first federally supported school of higher education, was established at West Point, New York

Programmes to Implement the Policy of Efficiency in Education

The Morrill Act of 1862 which provided land grants for colleges, which were to teach agriculture and mechanical arts, marked a change in federal policy in that grants under this Act were for specific activities rather than general aid grants and there was a formula for distribution of the aid (11)

Following the Morrill Act, federal aid to education programmes were almost always for specific programmes intended to provide for the training of necessary skills in an era of economic and territorial expansion The Hatch Act (1887) provided for investigation and experimentation in agriculture education, the State Marine School Act (1911) aided nautical education and required for the first time state matching funds, the Smith-Lever Act (1914) supported cooperative extension work in agriculture and home economics, the National Defense Act provided support for the training of military officers in non federal colleges and universities, the Smith Hughes (1917) and George-Reed (1929) Acts promoted vocational education, and the Smith Sears (1918) and Smith-Bankhead (1920) Acts authorized federal grants for the vocational rehabilitation of disabled persons

During the years of the Depression and World War II (1933 1945), the federal government further expanded the scope of its programmes of aid and its involvement in public education matters Aid and educational services were provided under several different agencies including the Public Works Administration, Civil Work Administration, Federal Emergency Relief Administration, Civil Conservation Corporation and National Youth Administration The programmes included loans for school

construction, repairs to school buildings, school-feeding programmes, and the employment of teachers in the areas of rural education, English, guidance, adult education, and in nursery schools. These programmes were primarily intended to serve the federal objectives of economic relief and recovery during this period, but the school-feeding programmes were continued and expanded under a number of successive Acts.

At the higher education level, substantial federal assistance was first provided to veterans of military service through The Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (GI Bill). The GI Bill was intended to cushion the economy from a sudden wave of job-seekers as well as to reward the veterans for their service.

In 1954, the Cooperative Research Act was passed which enabled the federal Office of Education to arrange for educational research and training and in 1956 the Library Services Act was enacted to strengthen library services.

Following the launch of the satellite Sputnik by the Soviet Union, the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) of 1958 was designed to help close a perceived technology gap. This Act contained ten titles, each of which designated a particular area of federal support and included assistance to schools to strengthen instruction in mathematics, the sciences, foreign languages, and other critical subject areas. It also provided grants, fellowships, and loans for higher education institutions and students. Students who entered teaching, a critical-need profession, did not have to repay their loans if they taught the requisite number of years.

In 1962, the Manpower Development and Training Act was passed to provide training in new skills for the unemployed and underemployed. This programme was later succeeded by the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973.

In 1963, the Higher Education Facilities Act provided construction funds for colleges and universities. Also in 1963 the Vocational Education Act to train youth in vocations was enacted. This Act has since been amended several times and is now known as the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act.

Aid in Lieu of Taxes

The enactment of the Impact Aid Programme in 1950 was reportedly

(3, p 102) an attempt by the Congress to establish a single programme in place of previous authorizations administered by a dozen federal agencies. These agencies had been established to compensate local education authorities which had been affected by the federal acquisition of taxable property for military, research and other uses and by a school enrollment increases due to the presence of federal personnel and their dependents. Federal agencies previously providing such assistance included the branches of the military, the Departments of Agriculture and the Interior, the Federal Works Agency, the Panama Canal Company, and the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The Impact Aid Programme, unlike other federal education programmes, is not a means of implementing federal education policy. Rather, Impact Aid payments made to local education authorities are treated simply as revenue. There are no restrictions or controls on how the funds are to be expended except that additional funds received by authorities for federally connected pupils who have handicapping conditions must be used to meet the special educational needs of those pupils.

A Shift in Policy to Emphasize Equal Educational Opportunity

The crisis atmosphere caused by Sputnik is credited by Colella and Beam (2) with overcoming 'a long standing religious and racial stalemate over federal aid to education' (p 155). These two problems had been identified by many others as having divided the potential supporters of federal aid to education. Even after the NDEA programmes had been enacted to close the knowledge gap, the religious and racial issues remained as impediments to expanded federal aid to education. Burkhead reported (1) that in the context of the times, 'the official position of the Catholic hierarchy has been one of acceptance of federal aid if, and only if, some aid to religious schools is incorporated' (p 255). Such aid was opposed by others on the grounds that it would provide benefits to secular schools and would be in violation of the Constitutional principle of separation of church and state.

Guthrie (6) has noted that the racial issue stemmed from the fact that 'northern and liberal members of Congress were reluctant to vote for large scale federal aid bills unless funds were to be denied to or used as incentives to desegregate southern dual school systems' (p 6). Passage of the Civil Rights Act in 1964, which prohibited federal funding for activities in which there was discrimination against persons because of race, colour or national origin, finally overcame this major historical impediment to

more substantial federal aid to education.

In an era of concern for an attention to the issues of poverty and equal opportunity, President Lyndon Johnson launched his 'Great Society' and 'War on Poverty' programmes. The first programmes for education were authorized under the Economic Opportunity Act (EOA) of 1964 and were intended to alleviate the effects of poverty. They included Headstart and the Job Corps. At the higher education level, EOA established the College Work Study programme through which needy students could earn funds for college expenses. The Adult Education and Volunteers in Service to America (VISTA) programmes were also authorized under the EOA.

The Johnson administration was also able to 'fashion a compromise between the National Education Association and the National Catholic Welfare Conference' (6, p. 31) concerning the participation of private school children in services provided under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965. The basic premise of the compromise was that the federal funds received under the various Titles of ESEA for educational services and materials would benefit the child and not the nonpublic school. Under ESEA and subsequent federal aid to education programmes in which there has been an involvement of non-public-school children, the appropriate public-school district has administered and controlled the funds, retained title to all materials and equipment purchased, provided for necessary instructional sites, and directly employed programme personnel. Non-public schools cannot themselves be applicants for programme funds. A number of subsequent amendments to ESEA added to or revised the many Titles to the Act, each directing aid to different school populations including those with handicapping conditions, the disadvantaged, migrants, and the bilingual.

At the higher education level, the Higher Education Act (HEA), which was also enacted in 1965, provided for grants to colleges for libraries, training programmes and equipment, graduate fellowships for teachers, grants for needy students (Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants), and federally guaranteed loans for students.

In 1972, the Basic Education Opportunity Grant (BEOG) programme was established to provide tuition grants (now known as Pell Grants) to low-income students. This grant programme differs from Supplemental Education Opportunity Grants (SEOG) in that it is a direct, government to student, grant programme while SEOGs are determined by the colleges

themselves. The BEOG, SEOG, and guaranteed-loan programmes unquestionably did much to ensure equal educational opportunity for students from disadvantaged backgrounds.

Promoting Diversity and Choice

Although there are some aspects of standardization in American education, the fact that education is a state responsibility, coupled with a prevailing belief in local control of schools, does allow considerable room for diversity to flourish. School districts are able to offer courses beyond the core curriculum which are pertinent to the needs and interests of their particular communities and to experiment with different instructional methods or techniques. The education block grant programme created under Chapter 2 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981, which eliminated 29 separate education aid programmes and reduced the attendant administrative paperwork for school administrators, was deliberately designed to encourage experimentation and innovation in programming by the schools by allowing a broad range of programme options and minimal accountability requirements.

Federal-aid programmes which include non-public-school children help to further the diversity and choice offered by non public school alternatives even though public support for these schools is small by comparison to other countries, some of which fully support denominational schools with public funds.

Various voucher and tuition tax-credit proposals have been introduced by the Reagan Administration, purportedly to increase parental choice in schools, but these have not been generally well supported, either historically or in recent years (4).

Federal promotion of diversity and choice has been most successful at the higher education level. The GI Bill and subsequent education assistance programmes for veterans, College Work Study, grant and loan programmes for students from low income families, and assistance under other programmes, including that provided under the Social Security Act, have done much to make a college education a reality for students who would otherwise not have found it possible to afford such an education.

Further, the Middle Income Student Assistance Act of 1978 expanded the eligibility for Pell Grants and federally guaranteed student loans to reach students from middle-class families. At the time, there was a

concern that inflation was pricing the middle class out of many of the private colleges which charge higher tuitions than do public colleges.

The private colleges themselves are aided not only by the federal aid provided to students who attend those colleges, but also by tax exemptions for gifts, bequests and, in some cases, bonds issued for construction of new facilities.

Recent Developments

Up until the mid-1960s, federal education policy in the United States was chiefly focused on efficiency objectives, on meeting national needs for persons trained in particular occupational skills, on national security purposes, and to stimulate or stabilize the economy. Equal educational opportunity became the paramount theme of federal education policy with the advent of the EOA, ESEA, and HEA programmes. The promotion of diversity and choice has occurred primarily at the higher education level through various student financial aids, although many of the federal-aid programmes operated by the public schools do have provisions for the inclusion of non-public-school children.

Table 1 shows the amounts of federal aid revenue for public elementary and secondary schools for selected years since 1919-1920. From this Table, it can be seen that federal aid to elementary and secondary schools more than doubled from 1963-64 to 1965-66 with the funding of ESEA, and that it continued to grow until 1981-82, the first year the Reagan Administration had its budget proposals enacted. The philosophy of the Reagan Administration is that education is not a federal function and it has repeatedly attempted to eliminate federal education programmes and/or reduce the funding for those programmes. President Reagan has been termed an 'education president' (7), not because he has advocated increased federal support of education but because he has contributed to the development of the educational reform movement of the 1980s in the US and has sparked renewed debate over the proper role of the federal government in education.

The National Commission on Excellence in Education, which Reagan appointed, issued its report *A national at risk* (13) in 1983. This report was followed by a series of others from dozens of other commissions and task forces concerning the condition of education in the US; each made recommendations for change. These reports did much to change the focus of educational efforts in the US toward meeting the dual objectives of

TABLE 1

FEDERAL AID REVENUE FOR PUBLIC ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS 1919 20 TO 1982 83

School Year	Federal Aid in Thousands of Dollars	Percentage of Total School Revenues
1919 20	2 475	0 3
1929 30	7,334	0 4
1939-40	39 810	1 8
1949 50	155 848	2 9
1959 60	651 639	4 4
1961-62	760,975	4 3
1963-64	896,956	4 4
1965-66	1 996,954	7 9
1967-68	2,806,469	8 8
1969-70	3 219 557	8 0
1971 72	4,467,969	8 9
1973 74	4,930,351	8 5
1975 76	6 318 345	8 9
1977 78	7 694,194	9 4
1979 80	9,503,537	9 8
1980-81	9 768 262	9 2
1981 82	8 186,466	7 4
1982 83	8,338,804	7 1

Source US Department of Education Center for Statistics (14) p 80

promoting equal educational opportunity and achieving greater efficiency in education. One result of this refocusing was the Education for Economic Security Act of 1984 which, as was the case with NDEA, was triggered by fear that the country was losing out to international technological competition. It established programmes to improve the quality of mathematics, science, and foreign language instruction.

Despite this revival of interest in efficiency and the fact that many of the original ESEA programmes have been subsumed under subsequent Acts, the basic structure of federal aid to education programmes has not radically changed in the past twenty years. Most of the programmes continue to be for categorical purposes and, with the exception of Impact Aid, are intended to accomplish the federal objectives of efficiency, equalization of opportunity, and/or diversity and choice.

Although few of the plethora of national educational commission and task-force reports that were issued in the early 1980s concerning the need for educational reform specifically called for greater federal support of education, the reform movement they engendered has made the financing of education in the United States a higher priority at all levels of government. Also, the National Commission on Excellence in Education (13) itself did declare that the federal government 'has the primary responsibility to identify the national interest in education' (p. 33) and that it 'should also help fund and support efforts to protect and promote that interest' (p. 33).

It must be noted that following initial successes in consolidating the 29 separate federal education programmes into an education-block grant and in reducing overall funding for education at the federal level, the Reagan Administration has subsequently been forced by Congress to accept annual increases in funding for education in more recent years.

THE SCOPE OF CURRENT FEDERAL EDUCATION ACTIVITIES

For Fiscal Year (FY) 1986, the Department of Education, with a budget of \$17.8 billion (14) is, as it should be, the federal agency administering the largest share of federal funds appropriated for educational purposes. Included in the Educational budget are funds for several specific student populations including the disadvantaged, students with handicapping conditions, bilingual students, and post-secondary students. Funds in this budget are also directed to certain programmes concerned with vocational education, adult education, libraries, federally impacted schools, the education block grant, mathematics and science education, and higher education. However, many other parts of the federal government also engage in education-related activities and allocate significant amounts of funds to them.

Headstart, a preschool programme for the disadvantaged, and the Refugee and Entrant Assistant Programme are two education grant programmes which are administered by the Department of Health and Human Services, a Department created when Education was broken off as a separate Department from the then Department of Health, Education and Welfare in 1979. These programmes have an appropriation of \$1,087 million and \$16.6 million, respectively.* A separate \$4.8 million grant

* All the appropriation values in these pages are for the Fiscal Year 1986. They are contained in the appendix to US Office of Management and Budget (16).

programme for child-care services in elementary and secondary schools has also been recently initiated by Health and Human Services

It is fairly well known that the Department of Agriculture administers a number of Child Nutrition programmes and these are important because of the relationships between nutrition, school attendance, learning, and ultimately the need for medical care. Most of the \$3,873 million appropriated for these programmes is allocated directly to school district operated feeding programmes. It is less well known that through the Cooperative State Research Service Programme, the Department of Agriculture is authorized to make payments of about \$185 million to land grant colleges for general operations, for research, and to strengthen instruction, or that it administers a competitive research grant programme of \$44 million. Research grants to colleges and universities help in the general support of these institutions through the inclusion of general purpose, indirect cost, and administrative funds in the grant budgets. The Agriculture budget also includes funding support for the Cooperative Extension Service which provides out-of school applied education to communities across the country.

The Energy Department supports research concerned with energy conservation, the Department of the Interior funds institutes at 31 colleges and universities for minerals research, the Department of State contracts with institutions of higher education for research on the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, the National Science Foundation funds science and engineering research and studies in science and mathematics education, and other agencies as diverse as the Tennessee Valley Authority and Smithsonian Institution also award research grants.

Energy Conservation Grants are available to schools through the Energy Department, \$50 million has been appropriated to the Environmental Protection Agency for the purposes of the Asbestos School Hazard Abatement Act of 1984, and the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, which produces educational programming for public television and radio, has a federal appropriation of \$159.5 million.

Although the Department of Education administers some funds for the education of migrant and Indian children, there are, in addition, Department of Labor programmes for the occupational training of the youth in each of these two groups. The Department of the Interior, with an appropriation of \$269.8 million, as well as the Department of Labor, operates

schools for Indian children and supports tribal-operated schools. The appropriations for the Labor Department training programmes are \$60.2 million for migrant and seasonal farmworkers and \$62.8 million for Indians and other native Americans. There is also a special training programme for veterans funded at \$9.7 million but the largest Department of Labor job-training programmes and their appropriation amounts are: summer youth training, \$724.5 million; dislocated workers, \$128.8 million; and the Job Corps, \$624.3 million. The Job Corps supports residential and non-residential vocational training sites for youth.

Internationally, there are a number of Development Banks and international aid programmes through which loans and technical assistance are provided to development projects which, in most instances, include educational and training activities. The Agency for International Development more directly supports education programmes in underdeveloped countries and the US Information Agency sponsors educational and cultural exchanges with 140 other countries.

Many grants are awarded to individuals. The Smithsonian Institution operates the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars and awards Woodrow Wilson Fellowships. The National Science Foundation and Department of Health and Human Services each award graduate fellowships. The US Information Agency administers two Fellowship Programmes, the Humphrey and Eisenhower Programmes, and also the Congress-Bundestag Scholarship Programme. The National Endowment for the Humanities awards various study grants and supports programmes to improve quality in the teaching of the humanities. There is a Foundation for Harry S. Truman Scholarships and the Japan-United States Friendship Commission is authorized to grant both fellowships and scholarships.

Education and training funds for veterans, in addition to the small amount mentioned previously in the Department of Labor budget, as well as for their eligible dependents, are in the budget of the Veterans Administration. There are separate aid programmes based on the period of time in which the veterans served. For those who served at least in part between February, 1955 and December 31, 1976 there is an appropriation of \$718.7 million for education and training purposes. Those who entered service after December 31, 1976 have a separate Veterans Educational Assistance Programme with a matching contribution feature of two federal dollars for each dollar contributed by the individual. The All Volunteer Force Education Programme has been established as a separate

educational assistance programme for those veterans who enter active duty during the period July 1, 1985 to June 30, 1988 and for certain Reservists

There are also education benefit programmes in the various Department budgets to reimburse federal employees for the costs of external education and training programmes they may enroll in at institutions of higher education and which are job related. Special Health Education Assistance Loans are available to students through the Department of Health and Human Services

Not easily overlooked in any examination of the United States budget are Department of Defense appropriations. This Department conducts an extensive amount of internal education and training of its personnel, operates a number of overseas schools for military dependents, and maintains and operates schools for 29,000 dependents at seventeen military sites in the US alone (15). The Defense Department schools are funded at over \$700 million and collectively would rank as one of the largest US public-school districts in terms of both student population and total expenditures. The Defense Department also owns, but does not operate, many other schools for military dependents in the US and is responsible for any necessary repairs to these facilities. These schools are operated by local school districts

There are many schools of higher education funded and operated by the federal government, again at a total annual cost of about \$700 million, including the national military academies at West Point, New York, Annapolis, Maryland, and Boulder, Colorado, the Coast Guard Academy, the Merchant Marine Academy, the US Naval Post graduate School, the Air Force Institute of Technology, the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences, and the US Army Command and General Staff College. The Department of Transportation, through whose budget the Coast Guard and Merchant Marine Academies are funded, also has \$13 million for state marine schools

There are, in addition, several federal academies to train students in specialized areas. These include the Department of Justice National Corrections Academy, the Department of Labor National Academy for Mine Safety and Health, and the Department of Treasury Federal Law Enforcement Training Center

The Department of the Interior has a modest appropriation for the Educational expenses of the children of Yellowstone National Park employees and there are Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC) programmes funded at both the high-school and college levels. The direct financial benefits offered to ROTC enrollees enables many of them to continue their education.

Libraries are funded in several places in the federal budget. The Library of Congress with an appropriation of \$133.7 million houses the Congressional Research Service, is open to the public for research purposes, and administers the \$3.7 million National Library Service for the Blind and Physically Handicapped. The Department of Agriculture operates a National Agricultural Library, the US Information agency supports US sponsored libraries in other countries, and the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science coordinates federal, state, and local activities to meet library user needs nationally.

There are many federal programmes which affect education in more peripheral, yet important ways. One form of peripheral aid is the assistance provided to educational institutions in the establishment of learning and support activities for children through the federally supported Volunteers in Service to America (VISTA), Foster Grandparent and Retired Senior Volunteer Programmes.

Schools may apply through local governmental agencies for federal Community Block Grant funds on a dollar-for-dollar matching basis for projects. Several federal agencies, such as the National Aeronautics Space Agency, the National Science Foundation, the Smithsonian Institution, and the National Endowment for the Arts, conduct formal and informal educational programmes in schools or in cooperation with out-of-school organizations, develop educational exhibits, and produce materials which are used for instructional purposes in schools.

The Defense Department engages in considerable research and development activities, some of which relate to education. Language laboratories, the ubiquitous overhead projector, and interactive learning technologies are some of the products of military research which have wide application in educational programmes.

The US Postal Service has a preferred library rate for the mailing of books, journals, films, and other educational materials by libraries,

schools, institutions of higher education, and other educational organizations. This preferred rate makes possible economical and effective systems of distribution and circulation of much educational material from educational providers to education consumers.

Finally, deductions for state and local taxes and contributions or gifts to non-profit educational agencies on individual and corporate federal tax returns, the exemption of non-public school property from property taxation and tax-exempt status of bonds for the construction of college facilities are all forms of indirect federal aid to education. The amount of federal revenue which is foregone because of state and local tax deductions is almost equivalent to the entire Department of Education budget (12).

Fellowships and scholarships are not regarded as income as long as they are granted for tuition and fees. They need not be reported for income tax purposes and are not taxed. Tuition and fees, which are not reimbursed, for courses taken or for professional conferences attended by an individual may also be deducted on federal income-tax returns.

CONCLUSION

The essential importance of education, training, and educational research to society is evident by the existence of many and varied types of federal assistance for programmes in education and for educational institutions. Much of this assistance is in the form of categorical aid programmes funded through a number of federal departments and agencies, including but by no means limited to the Department of Education. Other aid comes in the form of materials, reduced rates for services, and the findings of research and development activities. Finally, there are indirect kinds of aid in federal tax policy through tax deductability and tax exemptions. In view of these various kinds of support, it is clear that education benefits from federal budget expenditures to a far greater extent than is generally acknowledged. It should also be noted that total educational funding is also reduced by federal budget reductions or economies in ways that are often not appreciated. Some recent reductions such as those in the Library of Congress appropriation which have led to reduced public hours in the Library and the funding cuts for the schools for military dependents were well publicized, but others have not been

In this paper I have attempted to describe the purposes, history, and extent of existing federal involvement in and assistance to education in

the United States. The United States government is involved in education through a wide array of agencies and programmes. Those who make public policy should take account of all identifiable sources of educational support in assessing the cogency of national policy in education and how the objectives of that policy are being met by existing programmes. Whether there could or should be somewhat greater coordination of federal programmes in education or a more efficient system for delivery of federally funded services to education is, however, another matter.

REFERENCES

1. BURKHEAD, J. *Public school finance, economics and politics*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1964.
2. COLELLA, C.C., & BEAM, R. The political dynamics of inter-governmental policymaking. In J.J. Hanus (Ed.), *The nationalization of state government*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books, 1981.
3. COMMISSION ON THE REVIEW OF THE FEDERAL IMPACT AID PROGRAM. *A report on the administration and operation of Title I of Public Law 874, Eighty-First Congress*. Washington, DC: US Department of Education, 1981.
4. CURLEY, J.R. The federal education voucher proposal and educational choice. *National Forum of Educational Administration and Supervision Journal*, 1986, 3, 349-357.
5. GARMS, W.I., GUTHRIE, J.W., & PIERCE, L.C. *School finance. The economics and politics of public education*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1978.
6. GUTHRIE, J.W. (Ed.), *School finance policies and practices*. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger, 1980.
7. KAPLAN, G.R. Hail to a chief or two: The indifferent presidential record in education. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 1984, 64, 7-12.
8. MERANTO, P. *The politics of federal aid to education*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1967.
9. MICHAELSON, J.B. Efficiency, equity and the need for a new educational policy. In J.W. Guthrie (Ed.), *School finance policies and practices*. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger, 1980.
10. MILSTEIN, M.M. *Impact and response. Federal aid and the state education agencies*. New York: Teachers College Press, 1976.
11. MULLER, H.M. *Federal aid for the equalization of educational opportunity*. New York: H.W. Wilson, 1934.
12. PHARES, D. Elimination of state-local tax deductibility and education: The issues and its impact by state. *Journal of Education Finance*, 1986, 11, 297-314.
13. NATIONAL COMMISSION ON EXCELLENCE IN EDUCATION. *A nation at risk*. Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office, 1983.
14. UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION. CENTER FOR STATISTICS. *Digest of education statistics, 1985-86*. Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office, 1986.
15. UNITED STATES GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE. *DOD schools. Funding and operating alternatives for education of dependents*. Washington, DC:

US Government Printing Office, 1986

16 UNITED STATES OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET *Budget of
the United States government, fiscal year 1987* Washington, DC US Government
Printing Office 1986