

University of Denver

Digital Commons @ DU

All Publications (Colorado Legislative Council)

Colorado Legislative Council Research
Publications

12-1964

0099 Administration of Vocational Education

Colorado Legislative Council

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.du.edu/colc_all

Recommended Citation


Colorado Legislative Council, "0099 Administration of Vocational Education" (1964). *All Publications (Colorado Legislative Council)*. 107.

https://digitalcommons.du.edu/colc_all/107

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Colorado Legislative Council Research Publications at Digital Commons @ DU. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Publications (Colorado Legislative Council) by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ DU. For more information, please contact jennifer.cox@du.edu, dig-commons@du.edu.

0099 Administration of Vocational Education





ADMINISTRATION OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

(Colorado - Legislative Council)
Report To The
Colorado General Assembly

OFFICERS

Rep. C. P. (Doc) Lamb
Chairman
Sen. Fay DeBerard
Vice Chairman

STAFF

Lyle C. Kyle
Director
Harry O. Lawson
Senior Analyst
Phillip E. Jones
Senior Analyst
David F. Morrissey
Research Assistant
Myran H. Schlechte
Research Assistant
Janet Wilson
Research Assistant

COLORADO GENERAL ASSEMBLY



LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

ROOM 341, STATE CAPITOL
DENVER 2, COLORADO
222-9911—EXTENSION 2285

November 24, 1964

MEMBERS

Lt. Gov. Robert L. Knous
Sen. William E. Bledsoe
Sen. Edward J. Byrne
Sen. Frank L. Gill
Sen. Floyd Oliver

Speaker John D. Vanderhoof
Rep. Joseph V. Calabrese
Rep. John L. Kane
Rep. William O. Lennox
Rep. John W. Nichols
Rep. Clarence H. Quinlan

To Members of the Forty-fifth Colorado General Assembly:

In accordance with the directives of House Joint Resolution No. 1030, 1964 regular session, the Legislative Council submits the accompanying report prepared by its Committee on Education concerning the feasibility of transferring the functions of the State Board for Vocational Education to the State Board of Education.

This report was reviewed by the Legislative Council at its meeting on November 23. At that time the report was accepted for transmission to the Forty-fifth General Assembly.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Representative C. P. (Doc) Lamb
Chairman

OFFICERS

Rep. C. P. (Doc) Lamb
Chairman
Sen. Fay DeBerard
Vice Chairman

STAFF

Lyle C. Kyle
Director
Harry O. Lawson
Senior Analyst
Phillip E. Jones
Senior Analyst
David F. Morrissey
Research Assistant
Myran H. Schlechte
Research Assistant
Janet Wilson
Research Assistant

COLORADO GENERAL ASSEMBLY



LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

ROOM 341, STATE CAPITOL
DENVER 2, COLORADO
222-9911—EXTENSION 2285

MEMBERS

Lt. Gov. Robert L. Knous
Sen. William E. Bledsoe
Sen. Edward J. Byrne
Sen. Frank L. Gill
Sen. Floyd Oliver

Speaker John D. Vanderhoof
Rep. Joseph V. Calabrese
Rep. John L. Kane
Rep. William O. Lennox
Rep. John W. Nichols
Rep. Clarence H. Quinlan

November 23, 1964

Representative C. P. (Doc) Lamb
Chairman
Colorado Legislative Council
Room 341, State Capitol
Denver, Colorado

Dear Mr. Chairman:

Your Committee on Education submits herewith its report on the feasibility of transferring the functions of the State Board for Vocational Education to the State Board of Education.

The committee does not recommend any changes in the administrative structure for vocational education at this time, but does suggest that attempts be made to improve cooperation between the two boards.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Representative Ruth B. Clark
Chairman, Committee on
Education

RBC/mp

FOREWORD

House Joint Resolution No. 1030, 1964 regular session, directed the Legislative Council to appoint a committee from the membership of the two standing education committees to study, among other things, the feasibility of transferring the functions of the State Board for Vocational Education to the State Board of Education.

The members of the committee making this study were: Representative Ruth B. Clark, chairman; Senator Fay DeBerard, vice chairman; Senators Richard F. Hobbs, Roy H. McVicker, and L. T. Skiffington; and Representatives Palmer L. Burch, Forrest G. Burns, John Kane, Kathleen P. Littler, John G. Mackie, John P. Orcutt, Clarence H. Quinlan, William F. Stevens, and C. P. (Doc) Lamb, chairman of the Legislative Council.

The State Board of Education and the State Board for Vocational Education were given an opportunity to present their respective points of view at a hearing held in the State Capitol on October 29. Approximately 100 persons attended. The committee found this to be a worthwhile and informative session.

The committee wishes to thank the State Board for Vocational Education and its Executive Director, Mr. A. R. Bungler, and his staff; the State Board of Education and the Commissioner, Dr. Byron Hansford, and his staff; and the many interested persons who attended the hearing and submitted written comments on the question before the committee.

November 24, 1964

Lyle C. Kyle
Director

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
LETTERS OF TRANSMITTAL	iii
FOREWORD	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	ix
ADMINISTRATION OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION	1
APPENDICES	
A -- Duties and Responsibilities of State Board for Vocational Education, by A. R. Bunger	3
B -- Summary of Vocational Education Act of 1963	7
C -- Statistical Information on Vocational Education in Colorado	11
D -- Minutes of Hearing on Vocational Education, October 29 and 30, 1964	24

Administration of Vocational Education

The specific charge to the Education Committee concerning vocational education was "to study the feasibility of transferring the functions of the Board for Vocational Education to the State Board of Education." In the course of completing this assignment the committee has heard testimony from representatives of the State Board of Education, the State Board for Vocational Education, the Commissioner of Education, the Director of Vocational Education, and educational, business, labor, technical, vocational, and professional groups.

The proposal to abolish the State Board for Vocational Education and place the supervision of vocational education with the State Board of Education is not new in Colorado. It has been at issue in the General Assembly for the past decade. Persons on both sides feel strongly about their respective points of view. Unfortunately, however, their willingness to express their opinions has not always been accompanied by supporting evidence. As can be noted from the minutes of the October 29 hearing (Appendix D), the committee's effort this year has done little to remedy the situation.

The committee seeks to provide the administrative structure which will do the most to strengthen vocational education in Colorado. No convincing evidence has been presented that a better program of vocational education would be offered the people of Colorado by placing the vocational supervisory function under the State Board of Education. Furthermore, plans for junior college organization in the state -- intimately connected with programs for vocational-technical training -- have not been completed. Consequently the committee recommends no change in the administrative structure for vocational education until such time as the final decisions are made regarding junior colleges.

However, as a result of its study the committee does wish to make the following observations:

1. Despite vehement statements to the contrary by both general educators and vocational educators, vocational education in the public elementary and secondary schools is currently handled as a "stepchild" of general education. A careful study of the minutes of the October 29 meeting seems to reveal this thinking on the part of the proponents of consolidation, i.e., the general educators. Also, school administrators have a tendency to think in terms of public school education and may pass rather lightly over the role of vocational education outside the public schools and junior colleges. The vocational educators, acutely aware of these attitudes, generally oppose consolidation because of them. This fosters the air of distrust with which each side views the other. The committee regrets the existence of such a situation in so vital an area.

2. People in vocational education often criticize general educators, particularly administrators, as being unsympathetic to vocational education and yet they sometimes fail to include administrators in statewide and regional conferences now primarily conducted for vocational teachers.

3. The State Board of Education has consistently pressed for the consolidation of the two boards and the committee is convinced that such action is based upon honest conviction. However, the committee feels that more than conviction is necessary. The Board should back up its conviction with specific proposals and programs for improvement which would be followed should the consolidation be effected.

4. Finally, it seems to the committee that the State Board of Education and the State Board for Vocational Education should take the lead in getting together to resolve their differences, thereby setting an example for state and local administrators and teaching personnel throughout the state, so that we can all proceed with the job of providing an educational opportunity for all youngsters in Colorado.

APPENDIX A

JOHN A. LOVE
GOVERNOR



STATE OF COLORADO
THE STATE BOARD FOR VOCATIONAL
EDUCATION
ROOM 510 STATE OFFICE BUILDING
DENVER 80203

May 7, 1964

Mr. Lyle C. Kyle, Director
Legislative Council
341 State Capitol
Denver, Colorado

Dear Mr. Kyle:

Attached is a statement which outlines in part the fundamental duties and responsibilities of the State Board for Vocational Education. This statement is provided you in compliance with your request for this information. I shall be pleased to discuss any part of it in further detail if this should be necessary.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "A. R. Bungler".

A. R. Bungler
Executive Director

ARB:ir
Enclosure

The functions of vocational education are greatly varied and in some respects assume unusual characteristics in relationship to conventional kinds of education. Since vocational education is essentially justified for its contribution to the employment needs of people, it frequently changes and is materially affected by changing economic situations, especially by technological influences and other scientific developments. Unlike general or basic education which relates quite directly and consistently to an established pattern of human behavior, vocational education must be as flexible and as adaptable as the changing conditions in the business and industrial climate in which over 80 million Americans are employed.

The concept of vocational education was well defined in the Smith-Hughes Act which was passed by Congress in 1917. Then as now, the kinds of needs for which vocational education was conceived included not only those of youths in school who might choose to prepare themselves to enter the world of work upon completion of their secondary school career, but it envisioned programs for out-of-school youths---graduates and dropouts---in need of training for entry into employment, and for older persons in need of training or retraining that they might achieve stability in their employment and effectively move from one type of employment situation to another when such movement became necessary. Unfortunately, public education has been reluctant to assume the kinds of responsibility necessary to fully achieve any of these purposes and particularly reluctant to do much about needs of people "after high school." As our society has changed and the youths of work age have found it more and more difficult to become employed, we have had an increasing number of out-of-school youth who are in real need of specific training to equip them with skills, knowledge and understanding of a kind which the potential employers are willing to accept. In this field of need public schools too generally have failed to provide the necessary training opportunities, and as a result there have been periodically initiated federal programs designed to meet these needs on an emergency type of basis. Many of these emergency programs have been assigned to the State Boards for Vocational Education for administration at the state and local levels.

Since the enactment of the Smith-Hughes law in 1917, there have been many additional vocational Acts, each of which grew out of a recognized need of a vocational or occupational nature which obviously was not being fulfilled through other public educational means. Among these was the George-Ellzey Act, the George-Reed Act, the George-Dean Act, all of the 30's, and subsequently replaced by the George-Barden Act of 1946. Each of these Acts extended the vocational training opportunities to additional groups of people and each authorized additional appropriations of funds for use as grants-in-aid by State Boards for Vocational Education to implement such programs for their people.

In 1956, Congress passed Public Law 911, providing for the training of practical nurses and charged the State Boards for Vocational Education with the responsibility for this program. This became Title II of the George-Barden Act.

With the passage of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, a third title was added to the George-Barden Act, a title which provided that highly skilled technical training would be provided for persons working in areas related to the national defense and adding further to the responsibilities of the State Board for Vocational Education.

In 1961, the Area Redevelopment Act was passed by Congress and signed into law by the President on May 1 of that year. The need for this program grew out of the ever increasing number of hard core unemployment communities. (Five such areas have been designated in Colorado.) Again, we see in this situation and in this action on the part of Congress, the results of a shifting economy and of the impact of technology on industry. These hard core unemployment areas contain thousands of families whose heads have to be retrained for new kinds of employment. If these people are to be removed from the relief roles and put back into the role of a productive worker, programs of retraining are inevitable. The responsibilities for these programs are given to the State Boards for Vocational Education.

On March 15, 1962, less than one year after the effective date of the Area Redevelopment Act, the President signed into law the Manpower Development and Training Act. Here was a program with tremendously broad implications for not only the unemployed heads of families, but underemployed persons including workers in the agricultural industry with net incomes of less than \$1200 per year. Initially, only 5 per cent of the funds made available for this program were authorized for pre-employment training of youths aged 19 to 22 and out-of-school. Subsequently, however, the amount authorized for this purpose has been increased to 15 per cent. None of the funds are permitted for use with in-school students.

The MDTA program is a cooperative program administered jointly by the Secretaries of Labor, and Health, Education and Welfare, through the State offices of Employment Security and State Boards for Vocational Education. The responsibilities of the Employment Office are to identify qualified trainees and to match these persons with employment opportunities after they have been trained for these new employment situations through programs initiated, developed and administered by the State Boards for Vocational Education. The law authorizes the Board to utilize both public and nonpublic facilities for accomplishing the training objective.

In the early 60's as the economic complexities began to compound, the President of the United States constituted a national panel to make a thorough study of the vocational-technical training needs of the people of this nation, and to assess those needs in terms of the ongoing programs of vocational and technical education. The panel was further instructed to recommend such changes in the overall program of vocational and technical education as seemed necessary to more effectively meet the occupational needs of the current and projected work force of this nation. As a result, Congress enacted the Vocational Education Act of 1963, which became law on December 18, when it was signed by the President. This Act authorizes federal appropriations to be allotted to the states for use by State Boards for Vocational Education to implement a greatly expanded program of vocational education in order that "persons of all ages in all communities of the State---those in high school, those who have completed or discontinued their formal education and are preparing to enter the labor market, those who have already entered the labor market but need to upgrade their skills or learn new ones, and those with special educational handicaps---will have ready access to vocational training or retraining which is of high quality, which is realistic in the light of actual or anticipated opportunities for gainful employment, and which is suited to their needs, interests and ability to benefit from such training."

It is interesting to observe that only one of four categories of persons defined in Section 4 of this Public Law 88-210 is a group normally associated with public secondary schools. The other three categories are made up of persons whose training needs are not generally recognized as being a responsibility of local public schools in the use of their funds, facilities, or personnel. Yet, their numbers far exceed the number of high school persons involved and the economic consequences of this unfortunate situation is extremely far reaching.

It is apparent that the work of the State Board for Vocational Education has a definite economic orientation and transcends the normally recognized and accepted responsibilities of local public educational agencies. There is a definite federal relationship in every program for which the State Board for Vocational Education has a responsibility. The cooperative requirements for implementing the programs under the authority of each federal Act gives a unique identity to the Board. The comprehensive nature of the charge to the Vocational Board---prescribed and implied---places it in a highly responsible position to contribute to the economic strength and the social well-being of the State and the people served by it. A further strengthening of support, financial and otherwise, for the State Board for Vocational Education, through legislative action would not only be desirable, but seems to me to be a must if the task with which this agency is charged is going to effectively be accomplished.

APPENDIX B

SUMMARY OF MAJOR PROVISIONS OF THE VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1963 (H.R. 4955) December 12, 1963

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS UNDER THE VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1963:

For grants to the States:

FY 1964 - \$60,000,000
FY 1965 - \$118,500,000
FY 1966 - \$177,500,000
FY 1967 - and for each fiscal year thereafter: \$225,000,000

Ten per cent of each appropriation is to be reserved for expenditure by the Commissioner of Education to make grants to colleges and universities, and other public or nonprofit private agencies and institutions, to State Boards (and with the approval of the appropriate State board to local educational agencies) to pay part of the cost of research and training programs designed to meet the special vocational education needs of youths. These special programs are to be experimental, developmental or pilot programs, and designed especially for youth, particularly those in economically depressed communities who have academic, socioeconomic, or other handicaps that prevent them from succeeding in the regular vocational education programs.

Authorization for appropriations for work-study programs and residential schools (for 4 fiscal years only):

FY 1965 - \$30,000,000
FY 1966 - \$50,000,000
FY 1967 - and 1968 - \$35,000,000

The Commissioner of Education shall determine the portion of such sums for each year which is to be used for work-study and residential school programs.

ALLOTMENTS TO THE STATES

Ninety per cent of the funds authorized for grants to the States will be allotted on the basis of a formula which takes into account two factors: the population by age groups 15-19 inclusive, 20-24 inclusive, 25-65 inclusive; and the per capita income in each State.

The remaining ten per cent of the authorization is reserved for expenditure by the Commissioner as outlined above.

USES OF FEDERAL FUNDS

Funds may be used to provide occupational training for persons of all ages, levels of achievement, and all occupations except those requiring the baccalaureate degree.

Teacher training, administration and supervision of programs, instructional supplies and equipment, development of instructional materials (and other such services) are recognized as necessary expenditures to assure vocational programs of high quality.

Funds may also be used to construct area vocational education facilities. The definition of "facilities" includes the vocational facilities of a comprehensive high school, specialized vocational high schools, area vocational schools, community or junior colleges and 4-year universities that offer terminal programs.

At least thirty-three and one-third per cent of each State's allotment for any fiscal year prior to July 1, 1968, must be used for construction of facilities and for post high school programs. Thereafter, 25% must be used for these purposes unless the Commissioner determines, upon request from a State, that a smaller percentage will adequately meet the two purposes.

At least three per cent of each State's allotment shall be used only for ancillary services and activities, such as teacher-training, development of instructional materials, program evaluation, etc.

STATE MATCHING

To receive funds in FY 1964, each State must spend as much for vocational education programs as it spent in 1963. Thereafter, funds must be matched dollar for dollar.

If Federal funds are used for construction purposes (in FY 1964 and thereafter), the funds must be matched by an equal amount of State and local funds.

ADMINISTRATION

The State Boards for Vocational Education will administer the vocational education programs provided for in the Vocational Education Act of 1963.

To receive funds, a State must submit a State plan which includes certain specific requirements. A new element of the State plan will be the requirement that each State receiving funds under the Act must include a plan providing for cooperative arrangements with the State public employment offices under which occupational information will be available to vocational agencies in counseling students and in determining the occupations for which persons are to be trained. Vocational education agencies would also furnish to employment offices information on the qualifications of persons completing vocational training with such information to be used by the employment offices in counseling and placing such persons.

The State plan must set forth policies for determining priority for expenditure of funds; provide for qualifications of teachers and administrators; provide for fiscal control and fund accounting; and for the necessary reports.

AMENDMENTS TO SMITH-HUGHES AND GEORGE-BARDEN ACTS

Notwithstanding anything to the contrary, the following will apply to the George-Barden and Smith-Hughes Acts:

Any funds allotted under the Smith-Hughes and George-Barden Acts (by occupational category) may be transferred for expenditure under terms of the Voc. Ed. Act of 1963 (including FY 1964) or funds may be transferred to other categories for expenditure under the Smith-Hughes and George-Barden Acts. Transfer of funds must be approved by the U. S. Commissioner of Education.

Any amounts allotted for agriculture may be used for vocational education in any occupation involving knowledge and skills in agricultural subjects, whether or not such occupation involves work of the farm or of the farm home, and such education may be provided without directed or supervised practice on a farm.

Funds allotted for home economics may be used for vocational education to fit individuals for gainful employment in any occupation involving knowledge and skills in home economics subjects; and at least 10% of home economics funds may be used only for vocational education to fit persons for gainful employment in occupations involving knowledge and skills in home economics subjects, or transferred to another allotment or both.

Funds allotted for distributive education may be used for pre-employment schools and classes organized to fit for gainful employment persons over 14 years of age who are preparing to enter upon such occupations, and such education need not be provided in part-time or evening schools.

Funds allotted for trade and industrial education may be used for classes organized to fit for gainful employment persons over 14 years of age who are in school. Such classes may be operated for less than 9 months per year and less than 30 hours per week, and without the requirement that a minimum of 50% of the time be given to practical work on a useful or productive basis if the pre-employment training is for singleskilled or semi-skilled occupations which do not require training or work of such duration or nature. Less than one-third of any amounts allotted for trade and industrial education need be applied to part-time schools or classes for workers who have entered upon employment.

EXTENSION OF PRACTICAL NURSE TRAINING AND AREA VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

The Vocational Education Act of 1963 makes permanent Titles II and III of the George-Barden Act relating to practical nurse training and to the training of highly skilled technicians. Title II authorizes \$5 million per year; and Title III authorizes \$15 million per year.

WORK-STUDY PROGRAMS AND RESIDENTIAL SCHOOLS

The Commissioner shall determine the portion of such sums as authorized and appropriated for each year which is to be used for work-study and residential school programs. (See authorization for appropriations on p.1).

To participate in the work-study program, each State must submit a supplementary plan which will include the policies and procedures to be followed by the State in approving work-study programs. Such programs must be furnished only to full-time students; compensation may not exceed \$45 in any month or \$350 in any academic year unless the student is not within reasonable commuting distance from his home; employment under the program shall be for the local educational agency or for some other public agency or institution.

Funds for work-study programs in 1965 and 1966 will be paid to the States to cover full cost of such programs, including \$10,000 (or 1% of the total amount allotted--whichever is greater) for administration of the work-study program at the State level. Thereafter, the Federal contribution will be 75% of the total amount expended for work-study programs.

The Commissioner of Education is authorized to make grants to State Boards, to colleges and universities, and with the approval of the appropriate State board, to public educational agencies, organizations, or institutions, for the construction, equipment, and operation of residential schools to provide vocational education (including room, board, and other necessities) for youths, at least 15 years of age and less than 21 years of age, who need full-time study on a residential basis in order to benefit fully from such education. These schools are to demonstrate the feasibility and desirability of residential vocational education schools for certain youth of high school age. In making grants, the Commissioner shall give special consideration to the needs of large urban areas having substantial numbers of youths who have dropped out of school or are unemployed. The Commissioner shall also seek to attain an equitable geographical distribution of such schools.

APPENDIX C

MEMORANDUM

September 4, 1964

TO: Committee on Education

FROM: Lyle C. Kyle, Director, Colorado Legislative Council

SUBJECT: Information on Vocational Education

Attached is information on vocational education prepared by the State Department of Vocational Education. This was prepared in answer to my request of July 31, which was addressed to Mr. Al Bunger and asked for answers to the following questions:

1. Total federal moneys received for vocational education in 1963-1964 and the amount designated for each specific purpose or category.
2. Total state moneys appropriated for vocational education in 1963-1964 and the amount allocated for each specific purpose or category.
3. Total of state and federal moneys (1) distributed to local districts, showing the purposes or categories for which designated; (2) distributed to institutions for education beyond high school, showing the institutions and the purposes or categories for which designated; and (3) retained for administration of the state level, showing the purposes or categories for which designated. (Please include other types of distributions if there were any.)
4. Total expenditures in the state for vocational education at the local district level, showing the purposes or categories for which expended and the proportion in each category which was financed through the federal-state distribution.
5. For each separate category of vocational education offered in the high schools, please answer the following questions:
 - (a) How many and what percentage of districts offer this type of program?
 - (b) Of the districts which offer this program, how many have high school enrollment of 100 or less? 100-200? 200-300? 300-500? 500-1000? Over 1000?
 - (c) How many and what percentage of the high school students in the state were enrolled in this program?
 - (d) Have you any information regarding the proportion of students who remain in this type of work after graduation?
6. Please explain briefly the availability and financing of vocational education programs in the various categories for dropouts, young high school graduates, and adults. What were the day-school, part-time school, and evening school enrollments in each category in 1963-1964?

THE STATE BOARD FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION
510 State Office Building
Denver, Colorado

Availability and Financing of Vocational Education Programs

Under the existing Vocational Education Acts which include the Smith-Hughes Act and the George-Barden Act with Titles I, II, and III, the type of programs that may be supported with funds made available under Federal allotments have been specifically set forth. These have included vocational agriculture, distributive occupations, vocational homemaking, trades and industries of which practical nursing has been a part, and technician training of less than college grade. Appropriations made under the authority of the Vocational Education Acts for these particular programs and monies allotted to the states have been on an earmarked basis and may not be co-mingled. The total amount of money accruing to the State of Colorado for these purposes and under the authorization of the foregoing Acts has approximated a stable figure of \$500 thousand.

Under the Vocational Education Act of 1963, there have been authorized additional appropriations and allotments to be used for the following purposes: (1) vocational education for persons attending high school; (2) vocational education for persons who have completed or left high school and who are available for full-time study in preparation for entering the labor market; (3) vocational education for persons already in the labor market and who need training or retraining to achieve stability or advancement; (4) vocational education for persons with academic, socioeconomic or other kinds of handicaps that prevent them from succeeding in regular vocational programs.

In addition to the above purposes, new allotments may be used: (1) for the construction of area vocational education school facilities; (2) for related activities including teacher training supervision, program evaluation, demonstration and experimental programs, development of instructional materials, State administration, etc.

The amount of money which might be used for any of the foregoing purposes would be determined by the State Board for Vocational Education in any given year and such determination would be based on those criteria which would reflect changing conditions and needs with particular attention given to labor market demands and employment opportunities.

Grants of funds to the states by the U. S. Office of Education will finance only a portion of the total costs, and as a condition of accepting these grants the State and/or local communities must match the funds. This system of financing applies to all

purposes for which the funds may be used as outlined above. The amount which might be required in any fiscal year from any source and for any purpose would vary depending upon the factors attendant to any situation or group of situations.

Occupational Entry of Students

The question is often raised, "To what extent do students enter and remain in the type of work for which they receive preparatory training?" Any knowledge of this kind has been gathered on a rather hit and miss basis and very few schools have maintained a system of follow-up records on their graduates which would provide this information. There have been occasional studies made in selected occupational fields in the State, but these studies are not sufficiently comprehensive to reflect a "total." The most recent of such studies was made in the field of agriculture and attached herewith are copies of this study.

Plans were developed during the past school year for the gathering of these kinds of data on an annual basis and by the type of vocational training offered in the State. The success of this plan will depend upon the willingness of local school districts to maintain follow-up records as the source of information.

DEPARTMENT OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Five-Year Survey of Receipts and Expenditures - FY 1963 Through 1967

	FY 1963	FY 1964	FY 1965		FY 1966			FY 1967		
			Ongoing	New	Ongoing	New	Total	Ongoing	New	Total
I. RECEIPTS										
A. Federal Appropriation										
1. Ongoing Program										
Agriculture	\$120,215	\$120,367	\$118,480		\$118,480	\$118,480		\$118,480	\$118,480	\$118,480
Home Economics	77,033	77,033	77,033		77,033	77,033		77,033	77,033	77,033
Distributive Education	24,460	24,439	24,136		24,136	24,136		24,136	24,136	24,136
Trades & Industry	105,286	105,286	105,286		105,286	105,286		105,286	105,286	105,286
Health Occupations	53,075	48,833	43,597		43,597	43,597		43,597	43,597	43,597
Technical	208,792	155,383	130,792		130,792	130,792		130,792	130,792	130,792
2. New Vocational Act of 1963*				998,910	998,910		1,496,258	1,496,258		1,896,665
TOTAL FEDERAL APPROP.	588,861(a)	531,341(b)	499,324	998,910	1,498,234	499,324	1,496,258	1,995,582	499,324	1,896,665
B. State Allotment										
1. Ongoing Program										
Administration & Superv.	122,698(c)	131,743(d)	135,698(d)		135,698	149,026		149,026	156,041	156,041
Reimb. to Local Areas	150,000	147,634	150,000		150,000	150,000		150,000	150,000	150,000
To Match Geo. Barden T.III	29,000	28,007	29,000		29,000	29,000		29,000	29,000	29,000
2. <u>New Program E Voc Aid 1963</u>										
Administration				103,675	103,675		132,376	132,376		137,449
Reimbursement				395,246	395,246		714,922	714,922		53,819
TOTAL STATE ALLOTMENT	301,698	307,414	314,698	498,921	813,619	328,026	847,298	1,175,324	335,041	191,268
TOTAL RECEIPTS	890,559	838,755	814,022	1,497,831	2,311,853	827,350	2,343,556	3,170,906	834,365	2,087,933

	FY 1963		FY 1964			FY 1965			FY 1966			FY 1967		
			Ongoing	New	Total	Ongoing	New	Total	Ongoing	New	Total	Ongoing	New	Total
EXPENDITURES														
A. Distribution to Loc.A.(e)														
Local Dir. Supervisors(f)				40,263	40,263		44,298	44,298		26,316	26,316			
Agriculture	94,109	90,000	88,597	24,847	113,444	88,597	152,895	241,492	88,597	152,018	240,015			
Home Economics	153,374	156,00	152,520	12,500	165,020	152,520	44,150	196,670	152,520	35,700	188,220			
Dist. Education	29,312	38,102	36,858	60,614	97,472	36,858	196,491	233,349	36,858	204,913	241,771			
Trades & Industry	118,496	128,000	122,163	470,965	593,128	122,163	901,886	1,024,049	122,163	699,562	821,725			
Health Occupations	39,260	40,699	39,196	67,518	106,714	39,082	70,022	109,144	39,082	72,246	111,328			
Technical	226,919	161,142	145,172	495,300	640,472	144,209	168,850	313,059	143,558	113,150	256,708			
Office Occupations				222,149	222,149		482,588	482,588		421,579	421,579			
Special Services (including Teacher education, guidance, Evaluation, demonstration and experimental programs, and instructional material development)							150,000	150,000		225,000	225,000			
Construction of Area Voc. School Facilities (g)														
TOTAL DIST. TO LOCAL AREAS	661,470(b)	613,943(b)	584,506	1,394,156	1,978,662	583,429	2,211,180	2,794,609	582,778	1,950,084	2,533,262			
B. Expenditures for Workshops (Payments Made to local Personnel)														
	8,808	9,892	10,000		10,000	10,000		10,000	10,000		10,000			10,000
C. Administrative Expenditures														
1. General Admin. (h)	43,159	45,745	39,799		39,799	42,327		42,237	43,543		43,543			43,543
2. Supervisor														
Agriculture	36,086	41,460	44,872		44,872	47,186		47,186	48,597		48,597			48,597
Home Economics	44,302	45,520	47,382		47,382	49,841		49,841	51,946		51,946			51,946
Distributive Ed.	15,907	16,874	19,432		19,432	22,800		22,800	22,179		22,179			22,179
Trades & Industry	36,016	39,585	41,590		41,590	44,231		44,231	46,601		46,601			46,601
Nurse Occupation	15,491	13,808	15,152		15,152	15,380		15,380	15,931		15,931			15,931
Technical (i)	18,473	12,018	11,289		11,289	12,216		12,216	12,790		12,790			12,790
OFFICE OCCUPATIONS				22,003	22,003		28,172	28,172		28,182	28,182			28,182
SPECIAL SERVICES				81,672	81,672		104,204	104,204		108,267	108,267			108,267

	FY 1963	FY 1964		FY 1965			FY 1966			FY 1967		
			Ongoing	New	Total	Ongoing	New	Total	Ongoing	New	Total	
TOTAL ADMINISTRATOR AND SUPERVISOR	209,434	214,920	219,516	103,675	323,191	233,921	132,376	366,297	241,587	137,449	379,036	
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	879,712	838,755	814,022	1,497,831	2,311,853	827,350	2,343,556	3,170,906	834,365	2,087,933	2,922,298	

See notes on separate page

*Under the terms of the new Vocational Education Act of 1963, the funds appropriated thereunder are to be spent for the following purposes:

1. Vocational education for high school students
2. Vocational education for high school graduates and dropouts available for full-time study
3. Vocational education for working adults needing further training
4. Vocational education for those with academic socioeconomic or other handicaps
5. Construction of area vocational educational school facilities
6. Ancillary services such as teacher training, demonstration and experimental programs, State administration, etc.

- (a) Includes reallocation money totaling \$89,537 over basic allotment of \$499,324
- (b) Includes reallocation money totaling \$32,107 over basic allotment of \$499,324
- (c) Includes \$3,689 of Department of Education General Activities Funds
- (d) Includes Salary Adjustment Act funds
- (e) Distribution to local areas shown in total only, including colleges. Distribution out of FY 1963 funds to colleges and local districts shown individually on Schedule B. Similar distribution figures from FY 1964 funds are not yet available, as payments are now in process of being made
- (f) Payments for local directors' and supervisors' salaries in connection with ongoing programs included in distribution by category
- (g) The Vocational Education Act of 1963 provides for and anticipates the construction of area vocational education school facilities as a means through which numerous persons of all vocational classifications would be trained. Colorado should, and no doubt will, use some of its allotments for this purpose, but this use needs to be based on a State law which provides the criteria for designating geographic areas to be served and the administrative body to govern such institutions. A very incomplete return from local school districts indicates the availability of the following amounts by years for use in construction if it could be matched and they would qualify for area school facilities:
FY 1965 - \$400,000; FY 1966 - \$430,000; FY 1967 - \$700,000
- (h) Commencing with FY 1965, 21 per cent of general administration costs charged to MDTA & ARA
- (i) Commencing with FY 1964 proration of costs for MDTA & ARA programs to those funds was effected, thereby reducing amount of supervision costs borne by Technical Division (Title III)

DEPARTMENT OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Local Expenditures by County - For Each Program - Federal State Participation

1962-63

COUNTY	Agriculture			Home Economics			Distributive Ed.			Trades & Industry			Health Occ.			Tech-Manpower			TOTAL		
	Local Expense	Fed-St Part.	%	Local Expense	Fed-St Part.	%	Local Expense	Fed-St Part.	%	Local Expense	Fed-St Part.	%	Local Expense	Fed-St Part.	%	Local Expense	Fed-St Part.	%	Local Expense	Fed-St Part.	%
<u>ADAMS</u>	\$14162	\$ 2472	17	\$44906	\$ 7775	17	\$15409	\$ 2616	17	\$11361	2058	18	-	-	-	-	-	-	85838	14921	17
<u>ALAMOSA</u>	-	-	-	5781	625	11	175	114	65	5717	868	15	-	-	-	-	-	-	11672	1606	14
<u>ARAPAHOE</u>	5623	1150	20	83929	13913	17	3670	1004	27	8708	1630	19	-	-	-	-	-	-	101930	17698	17
<u>ARCHULETA</u>	-	-	-	4584	625	14	-	-	-	185	93	50	-	-	-	-	-	-	4769	717	15
<u>BACA</u>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<u>BENT</u>	11456	2462	21	-	-	-	3499	700	20	190	95	50	-	-	-	-	-	-	15146	3258	22
<u>BOULDER</u>	8918	1409	15	18008	3431	19	960	200	20	13487	3800	28	9781	4197	43	7184	2757	38	58338	15794	27
<u>CHAFFEE</u>	-	-	-	3142	625	20	110	75	68	190	95	50	-	-	-	-	-	-	3442	795	23
<u>CHEYENNE</u>	-	-	-	4350	1200	28	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4350	1200	28
<u>CLEAR CREEK</u>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<u>CONEJOS</u>	-	-	-	5247	1250	24	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5247	1250	24
<u>COSTILLA</u>	-	-	-	8085	1600	20	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8085	1600	20
<u>CROWLEY</u>	3755	1150	31	4954	625	13	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8708	1775	20
<u>CUSTER</u>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	175	88	50	-	-	-	-	-	-	175	87	50
<u>DELTA</u>	11000	2381	22	5528	639	12	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	16528	3021	18
<u>DENVER</u>	-	-	-	158901	30021	19	48948	11207	23	289383	45676	16	38287	16660	44	71240	34124	48	606759	137688	23
<u>DOLORES</u>	3215	1200	37	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3215	1200	37

County	Agriculture			Home Economics			Distributive Ed.			Trades & Industry			Health Occ.			Tech-Manpower			TOTAL		
	Local	Fed-St	%	Local	Fed-St	%	Local	Fed-St	%	Local	Fed-St	%	Local	Fed-St	%	Local	Fed-St	%	Local	Fed-St	%
	Expense	Part.	%	Expense	Part.	%	Expense	Part.	%	Expense	Part.	%	Expense	Part.	%	Expense	Part.	%	Expense	Part.	%
<u>DOUGLAS</u>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	150	75	50	-	-	-	-	-	-	150	75	50
<u>EAGLE</u>	\$ 4368	1231	28	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4368	1231	28
<u>ELBERT</u>	-	-	-	3379	1052	31	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3379	1052	31
<u>EL PASO</u>	-	-	-	17092	3215	19	5308	1310	25	28406	8466	30	-	-	-	1077	313	29	51883	13303	26
<u>FREMONT</u>	-	-	-	10208	2250	22	-	-	-	20390	4309	21	-	-	-	-	-	-	30599	6559	21
<u>GARFIELD</u>	5219	1278	24	10389	1250	12	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15608	2528	16
<u>GILPIN</u>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<u>GRAND</u>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	589	295	50	-	-	-	-	-	-	589	295	50
<u>GUNNISON</u>	5939	1150	19	4795	625	13	-	-	-	198	99	50	-	-	-	-	-	-	10932	1874	17
<u>HINSDALE</u>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<u>HUERFANO</u>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2642	676	26	-	-	-	-	-	-	2642	676	26
<u>JACKSON</u>	-	-	-	3451	667	19	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3451	666	19
<u>JEFFERSON</u>	-	-	-	80866	19670	24	200	80	40	9521	3694	39	-	-	-	-	-	-	90587	23444	26
<u>KICWA</u>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<u>KIT CARSON</u>	5550	1150	21	11044	2250	20	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	16594	3400	20
<u>LAKE</u>	-	-	-	5947	625	11	-	-	-	4005	785	20	-	-	-	-	-	-	9952	1410	14
<u>LA PLATA</u>	-	-	-	11651	1915	16	3442	775	23	5323	746	14	4660	2097	45	-	-	-	25036	5533	22
<u>LARIMER</u>	12022	2300	19	29153	3879	13	6400	1770	28	7043	1728	25	-	-	-	-	-	-	54618	9677	18
<u>LAS ANIMAS</u>	4296	1150	27	18133	2598	14	1027	263	26	5000	667	13	-	-	-	-	-	-	28456	4678	16
<u>LINCOLN</u>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

COUNTY	Agriculture			Home Economics			Distributive Ed.			Trades & Industry			Health Occ.			Tech-Manpower			TOTAL		
	Local	Fed-St	%	Local	Fed-St	%	Local	Fed-St	%	Local	Fed-St	%	Local	Fed-St	%	Local	Fed-St	%	Local	Fed-St	%
	Expense	Part.	%	Expense	Part.	%	Expense	Part.	%	Expense	Part.	%	Expense	Part.	%	Expense	Part.	%	Expense	Part.	%
<u>LOGAN</u>	\$22797	\$	5859 26	11211	1875 17	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	34009	7734	23			
<u>MESA</u>	11865		2374 20	29248	4814 16	6659	1400 21	20581	2668 13							68351	11256	16			
<u>MINERAL</u>	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-			
<u>MOFFAT</u>	7292		1231 17	6203	715 12	3930	1060 27	-	-			200	80 40	-	-	17625	3086	18			
<u>MONTEZUMA</u>	10724		2778 26	4730	625 13	-	-	158	79 50			-	-	-	-	15612	3482	22			
<u>MONTROSE</u>	12328		2381 19	14426	1875 13	1938	700 36	107	53 50			-	-	-	-	28799	5010	17			
<u>MORGAN</u>	31748		8407 26	10684	1880 18	-	-	-	-			-	-	-	-	42433	10288	24			
<u>OTERO</u>	11932		2778 23	21778	4189 19	3071	700 23	307	154 50			-	-	-	-	37088	7821	21			
<u>OURAY</u>	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	-			-	-	-	-	-	-	-			
<u>PARK</u>	3573		1543 43	-	-	-	-	-	-			-	-	-	-	3573	1543	43			
<u>PHILLIPS</u>	13396		2657 20	5567	645 12	-	-	-	-			-	-	-	-	18963	3303	17			
<u>PITKIN</u>	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	-			-	-	-	-	-	-	-			
<u>PROWERS</u>	18803		4600 24	12508	1890 15	-	-	143	72 50			-	-	-	-	31154	6562	21			
<u>PUEBLO</u>	6920		1150 17	5490	625 11	9019	2221 25	15568	2668 17			-	-	-	-	36997	6664	18			
<u>RIO BLANCO</u>	8457		1345 16	14086	1334 9	-	-	-	-			-	-	-	-	22543	2679	12			
<u>RIO GRANDE</u>	9288		2462 27	11865	1940 16	-	-	104	40 38			-	-	-	-	21258	4442	21			
<u>ROUITT</u>	5222		1231 24	8235	1250 15	-	-	-	-			-	-	-	-	13456	2481	18			
<u>SAGUACHE</u>	3682		1368 37	1175	625 53	-	-	-	-			-	-	-	-	4657	1993	41			
<u>SAN JUAN</u>	-		-	5144	772 15	-	-	-	-			-	-	-	-	5144	772	15			
<u>SAN MIGUEL</u>	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	-			-	-	-	-	-	-	-			

COUNTY	Agriculture			Home Economics			Distributive Ed.			Trades & Industry			Health Occ.			Tech-Manpower.			TOTAL		
	Local Expense	Fed-St Part.	%	Local Expense	Fed-St Part.	%	Local Expense	Fed-St Part.	%	Local Expense	Fed-St Part.	%	Local Expense	Fed-St Part.	%	Local Expense	Fed-St Part.	%	Local Expense	Fed-St Part.	%
<u>SEDGWICK</u>	\$ 6042	\$ 1231	20	\$ 4254	\$ 625	15	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$10326	1856	18
<u>SUMMIT</u>	-	-	-	4000	625	16	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4000	625	16
<u>TELLER</u>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<u>WASHINGTON</u>	20376	4809	24	18459	3291	18	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	38835	8101	21
<u>WELD</u>	43938	8735	20	20870	3461	17	188	74	39	2606	1043	40	-	-	-	-	-	-	67602	13313	20
<u>YUMA</u>	17342	4110	24	9738	1305	13	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	27081	5415	20
TOTAL DIST.	361248	81534	22	773224	136686	17	113913	26269	23	452237	82721	18	52928	23034	44	79502	37194	47	1833053	387441	21
COLLEGES & JR. COLLEGES																					
Adams State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	439	176	40	-	-	-	-	-	-	439	176	40
Colo State C.	-	-	-	61	35	57	150	150	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	211	185	87
Colo State U	44534	11981	27	42960	11497	27	12456	2600	21	15698	6171	39	591	180	30	152082	73821	49	268322	106249	40
S. Colc. St C	-	-	-	10502	2492	24	643	217	34	88351	17144	19	14776	6485	44	82319	39356	48	196593	65695	33
Fort Lewis	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lamar Jr.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5335	786	15	-	-	-	5892	2930	50	11227	3716	33
Mesa	200	130	65	4447	1160	28	-	-	-	6740	3641	54	9240	3628	39	15379	7689	50	35706	16249	46
N. Eastern Junior	300	195	65	1490	447	30	-	-	-	360	167	47	7975	3988	50	33726	16830	50	43851	21627	49
Otero Jr.	-	-	-	-	-	-	125	75	60	550	220	40	-	-	-	33966	16976	50	34642	17272	50
Trinidad S. Junior	1027	268	26	3954	1057	27	-	-	-	47839	7469	16	4558	1944	43	70248	32121	46	127627	42860	34

COLLEGES & JR. COLLEGES	Agriculture			Home Economics			Distributive Ed.			Trades & Industry			Health Occ.			Tech-Manpower			Total		
	Local Expense	Fed-St Part.	%	Local Expense	Fed-St Part.	%	Local Expense	Fed-St Part.	%	Local Expense	Fed-St Part.	%	Local Expense	Fed-St Part.	%	Local Expense	Fed-St Part.	%	Local Expense	Fed-St Part.	%
Western State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
U. of Colo.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Colo. School of Mines	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sub Tot. Coll.	46060	12574	27	63114	16688	26	13374	3042	23	165312	35774	22	37140	16225	44	393615	189725	48	718618	274029	38
Grand Total 1962-1963	407309	94109	23	836338	153374	18	127288	29312	23	617549	118195	19	90068	39260	44	473117	226919	48	2551671	661470	26

DEPARTMENT OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Number and Types of Vocational Enrollments in High Schools - 1963 - 1964

	Agricul- ture	Home Economics	Dist Educ	Trades & Industry	Health Occupe- tions	Techni- cal	Total
(a)							
Number of High School Districts offering Vocational Programs	59	125	33	18	-	-	-
Per Cent of total High School Districts (185)	31.9%	67.6%	17.8%	9.7%	-	-	-
(b)							
Number of High School Districts offering Vocational Programs with following enrollments:							
Less than 100	14	25	-	-	-	-	-
100 - 200	12	16	-	-	-	-	-
200 - 300	11	20	1	-	-	-	-
300 - 500	8	11	2	3	-	-	-
500 - 1000	7	15	5	5	-	-	-
Over 1000	7	38	25	10	-	-	-
(c)							
Number of High School students enrolled in Vocational Programs	2436	9025	861	1046	-	-	13368
Per Cent of total High School enrollment & students in Grades 9 - 12 (121,354)	2.007%	7.43%	0.70%	0.86%	-	-	11.0%
(d)							
Number of enrollments by types of classes:							
In School							
(Day School)	2436	9025	861	1046	-	-	13368
Out of School							
(Part time School)	-	-	-	1586	415	1897	3898
Adult							
(Evening School)	817	13883	7253	14785	77	1227	38042

9/1/64

APPENDIX D

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION
Minutes of Meeting
October 29 and 30, 1964

Thursday, October 29 -- Vocational Education

Chairman Ruth Clark called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. Committee members attending the October 29 session were: Senator Fay DeBerard, vice chairman; Representatives Palmer Burch, Forrest Burns, John Kane, C. P. (Doc) Lamb, Kathleen Littler, and William Stevens; and Senators Richard Hobbs and L. T. Skiffington. Also attending were Miss Clair Sippel, Legislative Reference Office; Mr. Lyle Kyle, Legislative Council staff; and approximately 100 persons interested in the hearing on vocational education.

Chairman Clark introduced the committee and thanked the visitors for their interest, saying that their attendance and willingness to share their opinions will be a help to the General Assembly in January. She stated that the committee is interested in opinions (and especially in the reasons supporting such opinions) on each side of the question of whether to abolish the State Board for Vocational Education and place the vocational education function under the jurisdiction of the State Board of Education with a vocational education advisory committee. She said that those who support the proposed change need to show that the present system has not worked well and that consolidation would work better. The State Board of Education was scheduled for the morning and the State Board for Vocational Education for the afternoon.

Mr. Alva B. Adams, Chairman, State Board of Education

Mr. Alva B. Adams, chairman of the State Board of Education, presented the following statement:

Madam Chairman and Members of the Committee:

As Chairman of the Colorado State Board of Education, I want to thank you for this opportunity to appear here this morning. I also want to take this occasion to commend the members of this committee for the great amount of time and effort that they have taken in the last two years in revising and redrafting the school laws for the State of Colorado.

The hearing you are holding here today is on a topic of tremendous importance. I am sure we are all interested in the same objective: "How can we improve and expand vocational education so it can meet the ever expanding needs of our complex society?" We are not here this morning to criticize what has been done in the past; we are here to examine ways to improve educational opportunities for the future.

Although vocational education has made important contributions in the past, it has not lived up to its potential. We believe that one of the most serious handicaps of the past, and one that could seriously hamper efforts in the future, has been the separateness of vocational education. Philosophically and realistically, there can be no justification for separating vocational education from the rest of education. Practically every other state has recognized this and has gone to a combined board.

If the purpose of education is to help people to live richer, fuller, lives then certainly vocational education would fit into this category with the rest of education. Anything which tends to divide education and make for disunity does a disservice to all of education.

A basic principle of administration as well as of government is that there should not be two agencies or offices at the same level trying to do the same job. Having a separate State Board for Vocational Education in addition to the constitutional State Board of Education promotes unnecessary and undesirable duplication of work and effort. Coordination of the work of the staffs in the Department of Education and the Office of Vocational Education is highly desirable, but is virtually impossible under the present organization.

The success or failure of any educational program in Colorado is dependent on local boards of education and local school administrators. Well over 90 per cent of the Superintendents of Schools in Colorado strongly urge the combination of the two boards involved in education. Many of them have indicated their interest and concern over this problem by their attendance here today. There are a large number of the 196 local Colorado superintendents and board members in the audience here today.

The Colorado Association of School Boards has passed a resolution calling for a combination of the boards. The Colorado Association of School Administrators, the Colorado Education Association, the Colorado Congress of Parents and Teachers, and other organizations have also passed resolutions supporting this action.

There is nothing desirable which can be accomplished by two boards which cannot be accomplished by one board. On the other hand, there are problems inherent in having two boards which can be solved by having one board.

As a businessman and a banker, as well as a citizen interested in education, it seems to me that economy,

efficiency, and the expansion and improvement of vocational education would be furthered by this action.

Thank you very much.

Mr. Adams then stated that at one time, the staff of the State Board for Vocational Education recommended transferring vocational education to the State Board of Education. He read the following excerpts from the minutes of the meeting of the State Board for Vocational Education held on November 13, 1961:

The Board then invited the Directors of each Division into the meeting to discuss their proposal for the amalgamation of the State Board for Vocational Education with the State Board of Education, which was submitted to the Board and discussed in the October meeting. The Director reviewed the events leading to this proposal. Following is the proposal of the staff members which the Board directed them to prepare:

It is the unanimous opinion of the Divisional Directors of the Office of Vocational Services that the State Board of Education should be designated as the State Board for Vocational Education,...

The Director reported that Dr. Walter Arnold, Acting Assistant Commissioner for the Division of Vocational Education, U. S. Office of Education, was in Denver on Friday, November 3, and visited briefly with the Staff at that time. This issue was discussed with Dr. Arnold who indicated that he thought the proposal developed by the Staff would provide for one of the soundest state administrations for vocational education in existence anywhere in the country. He even expressed the feeling that if such a plan were adopted, it might serve as a pattern for many other states....

Nevertheless, the State Board for Vocational Education rejected the proposal, Mr. Adams said.

Representative Clark asked Mr. Adams if he could be more specific on what the State Board of Education has in mind if vocational education is transferred to its jurisdiction. Mr. Adams said that, being a layman and not an expert, he could not give details at this time.

Mrs. Anna C. Petteys, a member of the State Board of Education, was asked if she had anything to add to Mr. Adams' statement. She expressed concurrence with what Mr. Adams had said and stated that she did not have anything to add at the moment.

Mr. Wayne Van Arsdale, Colorado Committee on Educational Legislation

Mr. Wayne Van Arsdale, President of the Jefferson County Board of Education, appeared on behalf of the Colorado Committee on Educational Legislation. He spoke in favor of placing vocational education under the jurisdiction of the State Board of Education. He said that automation and technological advances have underscored the need for integrating technical and vocational education into the broad educational picture. There has been a decrease in the number of unskilled jobs and an increase in the number of jobs requiring more educational background. Three recent publications discuss the implications of these developments for vocational and technical education: (1) Education for a Changing World of Work, the report of the President's Panel of Consultants on Vocational Education; (2) Man, Education and Work, written by Dr. Grant Venn and published by the American Council on Education; and (3) A Program for the Development and Coordination of Higher Education in Colorado, 1964-1970, a report of the Association of State Institutions of Higher Education in Colorado.

Young people today need a basic general education more than ever before, Mr. Van Arsdale continued. They need more English and communications, more mathematics, and more familiarity with the scientific aspects of the work world. They need to develop the basic thinking skills which will enable them to adjust easily when transfers from one specific vocation to another become necessary or desirable. Broad general knowledge is needed by all, and the present philosophy -- that education for work is different -- is outdated, Mr. Van Arsdale asserted.

He said that, in his opinion, transferring vocational education to the State Board of Education would be an improvement for education in Colorado. The present separation of the two boards has resulted in duplication, competition, and conflict for available funds. Local districts must look to two separate boards for direction -- boards which are not always in agreement. Present requirements (e.g., for certification of vocational teachers and for the number of hours to be spent in vocational subjects) are not flexible enough to keep pace with current needs. Also, local districts are not currently afforded adequate opportunity to be heard on vocational matters, he said.

Representative Stevens asked Mr. Van Arsdale if he feels that all vocational training should occur after high school. Mr. Van Arsdale replied that high schools should have vocational education, but it should be broader in scope and integrated into the over-all program, and possibly should give more emphasis to academic training. Generalized teaching in vocational areas (such as mechanics, office practices, etc.) has a place in the high school curriculum, but highly specialized technical training should be reserved for the post high school level. High school students will benefit most from a general background which will enable them to go into any of a number of segments of the work field, Mr. Van Arsdale stated.

Senator DeBerard asked Mr. Van Arsdale if this proposal would cause more students to drop out of high school. Mr. Van Arsdale stated his hope that the opposite would happen. By taking in the whole broad spectrum of the work field and offering opportunities to explore a wide variety of possibilities, the schools should be better able to generate and retain the interest of the non-college-bound student.

Representative Clark asked for specific examples of the problems which Mr. Van Arsdale mentioned as existing under the present administrative structure. Mr. Van Arsdale replied that the vocational programs which many people have considered desirable have not been able to be implemented with the available funds. Also, some of the rules and regulations imposed on local districts have hampered the development of up-to-date programs, he said.

Mr. John T. Dunlap, Superintendent, Pueblo District 60 (City)

Mr. John T. Dunlap, Superintendent of Schools in Pueblo, spoke in favor of placing vocational education under the State Board of Education. He said that separation of the two boards was probably appropriate during the years when general administrators did not have the depth of understanding of vocational education which vocational educators had. But the time has now arrived for vocational education to be integrated with general education. School administrators and the State Board of Education are now trained and equipped to give proper attention to vocational education. In fact, Mr. Dunlap said, the positions of general educators and vocational educators have been somewhat reversed from what they were 35 years ago. Vocational educators today tend to think purely in terms of vocations, whereas general educators are interested in educating the child as a total individual, including both academic and vocational needs. The child's vocational needs should not be treated separately, but rather as an integral part of the whole, Mr. Dunlap said.

Representative Clark asked if vocational education would tend to be neglected under the proposed merger. Mr. Dunlap replied that he recognizes the existence of this fear but does not feel it is justified.

Mr. Lawrence Meier, Director of Technical-Vocational Education, Jefferson County

Mr. Lawrence Meier, Director of Technical-Vocational Education in the Jefferson County schools, told the committee about his experience with technical-vocational education in the Air Force, where he has recently completed 24 years of service. He said that in most cases where boys came into the Air Force following high school vocational training, it took about 36 weeks of the first year just to break down the vocational specialization (such as woodworking) they had received. He noted particularly their weaknesses on the academic side -- vocabulary, for example. Representative Clark asked if these same young men would have done any better had they received general education. Mr. Meier replied that they would probably have been able to adjust better.

Mr. Meier feels that employers would rather hire someone with a general education which includes familiarity with the terms and concepts of several general vocational areas, than someone who has several years of vocational training in a single area but has little general knowledge and little ability to transfer the specialized training to a job in a different but related area.

Representative Clark said that vocational education is offered to provide additional opportunities for students who have a hard time with English, mathematics, and other academic subjects, but Mr. Meier seems to be saying that academics have actually been neglected because of the vocational program. Mr. Meier replied that his point was not so much that the vocational has been over-emphasized as that it has been over-specialized. He repeated his feeling that vocational education should be broader and less specialized, covering many areas of knowledge.

Representative Stevens asked if Mr. Meier would suggest transferring some of the vocational education funds to the academic side. Mr. Meier stated that perhaps this would be a way to encourage the schools to provide a broader base for preparing students to face employment. He added that he does not mean to imply that there should be no vocational-technical training at all at the high school level. It should be included as a unit in the general academic package but with less specialization and proportionately less time. Funds should be spent for basic equipment in several areas rather than for elaborate equipment in a single area.

Representative Stevens then asked at what point a student would receive the more technical and specialized training. Would it be after high school, and if so, where would the funds come from? Mr. Meier answered that most technical training should be beyond the high school. The K-12 years should be devoted to general education. Representative Stevens asked if Mr. Meier would suggest placing vocational education under a junior college board rather than under either the State Board for Vocational Education or the State Board of Education, and Mr. Meier replied that this might be the appropriate place for it.

Senator Skiffington questioned Mr. Meier about the students who are not interested in the academic subjects. Mr. Meier said that he feels these students will become more interested as their perspective is widened and they begin to see practical uses for such things as science and mathematics.

Senator DeBerard expressed the opinion that waiting until beyond high school for technical training would deprive many young people of the opportunity for it. He feels that the vocational programs do help keep students in school. If vocational training were not available to keep up their interest, more students would drop out even before completing high school.

Mr. Howard N. Yates, Executive Vice President, Colorado State Chamber of Commerce

Mr. Howard Yates of the State Chamber of Commerce told the committee that from a business point of view the merger of the two boards seems to make sense. He said he would like to alleviate the fear that vocational activity would be neglected under the proposed change. Employers will not allow this to happen. They will speak up if they feel that young people are not receiving the proper education and training. He cited the example of the changes which followed his complaints when he found that the business school at the University of Colorado was not requiring its graduates to take a single course in business English.

Representative Clark asked Mr. Yates whether he feels either vocational education or academic education has been neglected or over-emphasized in the past. Mr. Yates answered that a mixture of both is needed and certainly vocational education should not be neglected. He feels that in some areas vocational education may have been neglected in the past.

Mr. E. L. King, Pueblo

Mr. E. L. King, who operates a private school in Pueblo, stated that he had been wondering during the preceding discussion if he should lock the doors of his school, thinking the concept of vocational education has changed, but now he feels he can continue. He posed the question whether an executive wants a secretary who has a general knowledge of typing and shorthand etc., or one who can do the work. He also said that in his opinion there is nothing basically wrong with our public school system except that there is a lack of money.

Mr. George Lemons, Superintendent, Park County Re-2, Fairplay

Mr. George Lemons, superintendent at Fairplay, stated that small schools such as his need more flexibility in order to make better use of available teachers. He feels there would be fewer restrictions and more flexibility if vocational education were under the State Board of Education. He said that he has a teacher who is qualified to teach both agriculture and industrial arts but in order to be eligible for reimbursement for the agriculture program under present restrictions the teacher must teach so many hours of agriculture that the school cannot use him for as many hours of industrial arts as desired.

Representative Clark said she would like to know for certain whether the restrictions referred to are imposed by the federal government or the state. Mr. Bunger said that the rules and regulations are contained in the State Plan. They are not federally imposed but must comply with federal policies. Each State Plan must follow the federal policy bulletin issued by the U. S. Office of Education. The State Board of Education would also have to comply with these federal policies if vocational education were transferred to its jurisdiction, Mr. Bunger stated.

Colorado's State Plan was originally developed about 12 years ago but it has been revised several times. One of the most recent revisions was the adoption of optional plans for agriculture programs, Mr. Bunger said. Senator Skiffington asked if the Colorado State Plan is over-oriented toward agriculture. Mr. Bunger replied that he does not feel that it is.

Mr. John S. Mall, Superintendent, Walsenburg

Mr. John S. Mall, superintendent at Walsenburg, pointed out that a course may be either "vocational" (meeting requirements for reimbursement) or "non-vocational" (not meeting requirements for

reimbursement). He said that Walsenburg, for example, does not receive reimbursement for all courses offered in its Trade and Industry auto shop. The school runs one 3-hour "vocational" course and two 1-hour "non-vocational" courses under the same teacher and in the same shop; only the 3-hour course is reimbursable.

Mr. Cecil Mullins, Superintendent, District 70, Pueblo (Rural)

Mr. Cecil Mullins, superintendent of Pueblo District 70, said he feels the committee's question (has the present State Board for Vocational Education done its job well and could the State Board of Education do it better) is unfair. He has worked with the department of vocational education for a long time and feels that they are a group of dedicated educators and have done a good job. Even so, both vocational education and general education would benefit from the proposed consolidation, he said.

It should be remembered, he continued, that up until a few years ago the department of education did not give very effective direction to education in the state. At that time the two departments were very far apart -- perhaps justifiably so. But times have changed and in recent years there has been good cooperation between the two. However, the cooperation is on a voluntary basis and it is entirely possible that it might fail. Structural unity would help to assure continued cooperation.

Vocational supervisors at the present time work with the non-vocational as well as vocational programs in their respective fields. For example, only one of the five home economics departments in District 70 is vocational; yet the supervisor works with all five. This type of arrangement could be broadened through the proposed merger.

Representative Clark agreed with Mr. Mullins that the issue may have been stated too harshly, but she explained that it was done in order to facilitate a decision. Whatever is done, she said, we know Mr. Bunger will make it work.

Mr. Cyril Conway, Superintendent, Mancos

Mr. Cyril Conway, superintendent at Mancos, asked Mr. Bunger who writes up the State Plan and whether it is a dictatorial plan. Mr. Bunger replied that the last State Plan was developed through a series of regional meetings of administrators -- school superintendents, curriculum directors, etc. It was not developed by the director or the staff.

Mr. Conway said that Mancos has a flexible scheduling process and cannot meet the requirements for reimbursable vocational education. He feels that more allowances should be made for differences between districts. Local districts should be permitted to determine the amount of time to be spent in vocational as well as other subjects.

The San Juan Basin has been working on plans for an area vocational-technical school which could make use of some of the federal funds under the Vocational Education Act of 1963. Colorado must take action to permit this sort of arrangement or we will be left behind and not be able to use the available federal funds, Mr. Conway concluded.

Representative Clark asked if Mr. Conway has requested the present Board for Vocational Education to consider the problems he described and if placing vocational education under the State Board of Education would change anything. He replied that the Board for Vocational Education is aware of the problems but has not done anything about them.

Mr. Robert Sinn, High School Instructor, Crowley County

Mr. Robert Sinn, who is a teacher in Crowley County, told the committee that he teaches both academic and vocational subjects. He teaches two hours of auto mechanics and three hours of science each day. The program in auto mechanics is not reimbursable. If it were to be expanded to meet vocational requirements for reimbursement, he would have to give up some of his science hours. Perhaps this could be remedied if the vocational education program were under the State Board of Education, he said.

NOON RECESS

Mr. Fred M. Betz, Chairman, State Board for Vocational Education

Mr. Fred Betz, chairman of the State Board for Vocational Education, stated his board's position that an appointive board representing different segments of the economy can best serve the interests of vocational education. Some people in the academic field maintain the idea that vocational education is a secondary field, he said, and if vocational education were placed under the State Board of Education it probably would not be given the impetus it would have under the State Board for Vocational Education. Mr. Betz does not believe there would be any financial saving from combining the two boards.

The philosophy of vocational education was established by the federal government and has been with us for a long time, he continued. In the beginning it was primarily vocational agriculture and home economics, but it has now been broadened to include many other areas.

In 1961 the late President Kennedy appointed a Panel of Consultants on Vocational Education to study what vocational education can do toward lessening the problem of unemployment and to make recommendations for improving and redirecting the vocational education program. The panel worked for a year and prepared a comprehensive report which served as the basis for the Vocational Education Act of 1963. (See Appendix B for a summary of this Act.) The 1963 act offers greater flexibility and additional federal funds for vocational education in states that want to do something about it. It also opens up a new field of vocational education -- the area technical school.

The State Board for Vocational Education is working on plans to implement the 1963 act in Colorado, Mr. Betz said.

Senator Skiffington asked whether the advisory board under the proposed merger could in effect do what the State Board for Vocational Education does now. Mr. Betz expressed his fear that an advisory board would not be very effective.

Mr. Ray Williams, Pueblo

Mr. Ray Williams, a Pueblo businessman who has served on the Advisory Committee for Distributive Education, spoke on behalf of himself and Mr. Tommy Thompson of the Pueblo Chamber of Commerce. He supported the distributive education program and emphasized the need for young people to learn how to conduct themselves in business. The program is an important thing in Pueblo, he said. It offers the kind of training the young people there should have. The State Board for Vocational Education has been working to encourage this program.

Mr. Williams is impressed by the fine type of young people who take part in distributive education programs. He said that businessmen can offer opportunities for practical experience which could never be gained from classroom instruction.

Mrs. R. M. Hudspeth, Member, State Board for Vocational Education

Mrs. R. M. Hudspeth, homemaking member of the State Board for Vocational Education, is a former vocational home economics and science teacher. She said she was surprised to find that a defense of the philosophy of vocational education is needed. She defined vocational education as "specific training for a specific job." If it does not prepare the student for a specific job it is not vocational, she said. Most vocational education takes place during the last year of high school or beyond. It touches all of society, not just those in the elementary and secondary schools.

Mrs. Hudspeth feels that general administrators are not acquainted with vocational education -- what it is striving for and how to get it. If the two boards are combined as proposed, the local school administrator would be the vocational education administrator. And school administrators might not think in terms of retraining and the functions of vocational education in working with people and projects outside the public school system, she contended.

We do have and are facing a new concept in vocational education, Mrs. Hudspeth continued. Revisions are needed and they are being made. The State Board for Vocational Education is best equipped to meet the new needs. Vocational education should not be placed in the hands of those who do not understand it, she concluded.

Mr. Irwin MacKay, Rocky Mountain Management Club

Mr. Irwin MacKay spoke on behalf of the Rocky Mountain Management Club, a group of approximately 400 supervisors in the Denver area whose purpose is to encourage the training of better

supervisors. His group favors retention of a separate Board for Vocational Education. They wish to continue the close cooperation and the excellent training programs that have been developed under the State Board for Vocational Education. They feel that representation from all segments of the economy is needed on the board which supervises vocational education.

Mrs. Allegra Saunders, Member, Board of Education, Denver

Mrs. Allegra Saunders, former state senator, former member of the State Board of Education, and presently a member of the Denver Board of Education, opposed consolidation of the two boards. She feels that there should be more, not less, emphasis on vocational education. Development of this side of education for the student who is not college-bound will help reduce the number of school drop-outs and the number of persons on welfare rolls, she said. The State Board of Education has enough other matters to take care of without adding vocational education to the list, she concluded.

Mr. Richard Rapp, Vice President, Colorado Federation of Teachers

Mr. Richard Rapp, representing the Colorado Federation of Teachers, stated the position of that organization as formulated at its recent convention. They feel that vocational education needs emphasis and they favor continuing the State Board for Vocational Education with some internal reorganization. Mr. Rapp stated that in his opinion a case has not been made for dissolving the State Board for Vocational Education, although a case may well have been made for reorganization within the present framework.

Mr. Eddie Klune, Member, State Board for Vocational Education

Mr. Eddie Klune, a machinist who is the employees' representative on the State Board for Vocational Education, stated his feeling that autonomy for vocational education is essential. He said he has talked with vocational educators from states with combined boards and most of them will admit privately that they are treated as second class citizens.

Mr. Klune feels that vocational education goes far beyond general education. Of course we need reading, writing and arithmetic, but vocational education is more than that. It is education to serve a specific need, and employers have a right to ask the vocational education people to provide what they need.

About three years ago Mr. Klune heard a prediction that when more money becomes available for vocational education, the general educators will want in on it. Now, he said, it is happening.

Mr. David Rice, Executive Vice President, Colorado Cattlemen's Association

Mr. David Rice reported that representatives of the Cattlemen's Association, the Farm Bureau, the Grange, and the Wool Growers'

Association met to try to analyze whether vocational education would be better served if the two boards were combined. The conclusion was that the State Board for Vocational Education, representing the various vocational fields, has done a good job and should be retained as is. Vocational training for farmers, ranchers and homemakers has served our needs well, Mr. Rice said, and there should be no change in the administrative structure at the present time.

Mr. L. V. Toyne, Executive Vice President, Colorado Farm Bureau

Mr. L. V. Toyne of the Farm Bureau stated that there has been conflict between the two boards recently because of this issue, but there is really no need for conflict at all. There has been an unfortunate lack of communication about this problem, he feels. The State Board of Education needs to put down on paper what it proposes to do if vocational education is placed under its direction. Otherwise we have only the past as a guide, and in the past vocational education has been looked down on by administrators. If there is to be a change, it should be for the better, and on the basis of past experience we cannot see that the change would improve on the fine job now being done by the State Board for Vocational Education. Therefore, Mr. Toyne said, the Farm Bureau opposes the proposed merger under present conditions.

Mr. Ray Obrecht, Master, Colorado State Grange

Mr. Ray Obrecht of the State Grange added his support to the statements of Mr. Rice and Mr. Toyne. He said that the Grange favors expansion of vocational education, but under the present State Board for Vocational Education, not under the State Board of Education.

Mr. Charles Kimzey, Member, State Board for Vocational Education

Mr. Charles Kimzey represents agriculture on the State Board for Vocational Education. He spoke in favor of continuing the separate vocational education board. He described the effectiveness of the expanded role of vocational education in agriculture. Vocational agriculture has been and is being updated to include much more than training in the mechanics of farming or ranching, he said. It now includes a variety of agriculturally related activities and occupations -- the wide range of activities encompassed by the new term, "agribusiness." The present State Board for Vocational Education is encouraging programs of this type which meet the needs of youth in agricultural areas, he concluded.

Mr. Richard Taylor, Superintendent, Security

Mr. Richard Taylor, superintendent at Security, said that he is a former vocational agriculture teacher who became an administrator and he feels he understands both points of view. He favors consolidating the two boards in order to coordinate and simplify the administration of public education at the local district level. He told the committee that vocational education would not be tossed out if this were done.

It is a matter of economy in time and money, he said. The number of forms and reports required of local school districts could be reduced, for example, and scheduling could be simplified.

Mr. John Harvey, Colorado Vocational Association

Mr. John Harvey, legislative committee chairman of the Colorado Vocational Association, spoke against consolidation. The present system is working well, he said, and a change to an elected board might set us back. He feels that there is more to lose than to gain by adopting the proposed change.

Mr. Harvey expressed the fear vocational educators have of the philosophy prevalent among many school administrators and general educators. As an example he quoted from a newspaper article which reported the philosophy of one of the metropolitan area school districts -- that training in home economics and marketable skills are not the purpose of education.

Mr. Lyle Carpenter, Former FFA National President

Mr. Lyle Carpenter, who served as national president of the Future Farmers of America about two years ago, described the youth programs developed under the State Board for Vocational Education. These include the Future Farmers of America, Future Homemakers of America, and Distributive Education Clubs of America. Such organizations provide young people with opportunities for personal development which they might not otherwise have, he said.

Mr. Carpenter opposes consolidation of the two boards. He stated that if dedicated people like the present members of the State Board for Vocational Education are willing to contribute their time and efforts to the cause of vocational education, their prestige and authority should not be lessened. He favors strengthening vocational education and its related youth programs and feels that this can be accomplished best under the present administrative structure.

Mrs. Olga Miercourt, Practical Nurse Association

Mrs. Olga Miercourt spoke on behalf of the Practical Nurse Association and described the program in practical nursing, which is part of the state's vocational education program. She reported that her association favors retaining the State Board for Vocational Education as it is. She feels that the present arrangement is better suited to the supervision of practical nurse training than the proposed change.

Mr. Herbert Benson, Head, Department of Vocational Education, Colorado State University

Mr. Herbert Benson of Colorado State University said that he had the feeling during the morning session that a person must be on one side or the other -- either general or vocational. This is a mistaken impression; there need not be such a division, he said.

He defended the high standards set for vocational programs. Standards must be high enough to meet the needs; if they were lowered (as has been suggested in some instances), the quality of the programs would be lowered.

Mr. Benson reminded the committee that over fifty per cent of vocational education is carried on outside the public schools. The practical nurses' and supervisors' training programs described by Mrs. Miercourt and Mr. MacKay are examples of programs outside the secondary schools.

Mr. Benson opposes the proposal to consolidate the two boards. He has spoken with people from other states who comment on how lucky Colorado is to have a separate board for vocational education. Wisconsin is one of the few states still having a separate board, and it is considered to have the best vocational education program in the United States.

Senator DeBerard said that his school district in Kremmling cannot offer reimbursable vocational education programs because of the strict requirements on the number of hours. Therefore the district pays for its programs without any reimbursement. He commented on the lack of cooperation from the State Board for Vocational Education on this problem and asked if cooperation will be improved in the future. Mr. Benson replied that the problem is one of standards. If sub-standard programs are permitted in some schools, the students from those schools will be at a competitive disadvantage, he stated. However, the new federal law provides for area schools which will help solve the problem of the small rural school.

Mr. Robert Datteri, President, Colorado Vocational Association

Mr. Robert Datteri is the president of the Colorado Vocational Association, an organization of teachers, coordinators, directors, and supervisors of vocational education. His association opposes abolishment of the State Board for Vocational Education and will continue to oppose it until they believe that a change will improve the situation. They feel that the separate board can best serve the needs of the state and the needs of industry, and they doubt that one board could effectively and conscientiously administer both general and vocational education. They are against placing vocational education in the hands of persons who are unfamiliar with it.

Mr. Hubert R. Moody, Industrial Trainer

Mr. Hubert R. Moody has recently completed five years' service as training officer for the City and County of Denver. He said that vocational education involves detecting the needs of industry and then directing training to meet the needs. The yardstick is, does it produce results? This is not the same type of yardstick used with regard to general education -- results are not as immediate or as tangible where general education is concerned. If vocational education were placed under the jurisdiction of the State Board of Education, there would be a lack of understanding of the purposes for which the vocational training is given. This would be detrimental to the vocational program, he said.

Mr. Carol Simons, Superintendent, Kit Carson

Mr. Carol Simons, superintendent at Kit Carson, expressed his puzzlement at the lack of confidence in the State Board of Education and local boards of education. He said that he does not understand either why the vocational education people feel that they are under attack.

He commented that the vocational people have advocated the establishment of advisory committees at the local level, yet they have said today that an advisory committee at the state level (as proposed under the consolidation) would be ineffective.

Mr. Simons stated that the present situation with general and vocational education is a question of the whole becoming subservient to the part. Sources of financing are becoming more and more restrictive. Vocational teachers receive more salary while English teachers, for example, receive no subsidies for their extra pupil contact.

He discussed the matter of lack of communication, stating that the vocational people often leave local administrators out of orientation conferences on vocational education. Also, the State Board for Vocational Education does not hold regional conferences comparable to those held by the State Board of Education.

Mr. H. M. McMillan, Superintendent, Dolores

Mr. H. M. McMillan, superintendent at Dolores, brought up the proposed area vocational school for the San Juan Basin. He said that the project requires the cooperation of several local school boards and may require enabling legislation. He feels that the cooperative program could be administered more easily under the State Board of Education, because local boards are more in communication with the Commissioner of Education.

Dr. Byron Hansford, Commissioner of Education

Dr. Byron Hansford, Commissioner of Education, expressed his hope that vocational education is not on trial. The question is how to expand it and make it more effective, he said.

There has been a constant lament, perhaps with some justification, that local school boards and school administrators do not understand vocational education. Yet the success or failure of vocational education is dependent on these people. What is needed is better understanding and improved working relationships with them, Dr. Hansford stated, and the State Board of Education is better equipped to provide this.

Dr. Hansford explained why voluntary cooperation between the two boards will not work. He said that he worked for passage of the new Vocational Act of 1963 and was interested in participating in the development of new plans to implement it. The State Department of Education's Administrative Council, on which the Director of Vocational Education has served for the past four years, asked that

the Department of Education be included in the planning. But even after repeated requests, there was never an invitation to the Commissioner to participate in the discussions or planning sessions. Dr. Hansford feels that the Department of Education should have been included. The new law involves matters that should be planned in close cooperation with the State Board of Education -- area vocational schools, for example, which may affect school district boundaries and might involve super-imposed taxing districts.

Representative Clark asked Dr. Hansford what specific plans he has if vocational education is transferred to the State Board of Education. Dr. Hansford answered that detailed plans have not been worked out. He said that the 1963 act, which he supported, provides financing and flexibility and offers a means of developing an improved program.

Representative Clark asked if the State Board of Education ever meets with the State Board for Vocational Education, and Dr. Hansford said that they do not.

Mr. A. R. Bunger, State Director of Vocational Education

Mr. A. R. Bunger, Director of Vocational Education, said that he was bothered about discussing the philosophy of vocational education when the basic issue is really the administrative structure.

Vocational education is for all persons, in and out of school, he said, and it is not a substitute for general education. It goes beyond that. Its objective is to prepare the student to make an entry into the world of work or to improve his employment status.

Mr. Bunger stated that he had enjoyed the cooperation which had developed in the last few years between his department and the Department of Education and he felt they were making great strides. But the cooperation came to a sudden halt in August.

Concerning Dr. Hansford's statement on being denied the opportunity to participate in the development of the new plan, Mr. Bunger said that the plan was discussed at public meetings involving selected school administrators and directors of vocational and adult education. Although it is true that the Commissioner was not specifically invited, Mr. Bunger said he felt that the administrators and general educators had been adequately represented.

Mr. Bunger pointed out that his responsibility is to the State Board for Vocational Education and he proceeded to develop the plan on the basis of their direction. The new plan is not yet an accomplished fact, he said.

Friday, October 30

The committee convened at 9:00 a.m. with the following members present: Representative Clark, chairman; Senator DeBerard, vice chairman; Representatives Burns, Kane, Littler, Orcutt, and Stevens; and Senators Hobbs and Skiffington. The committee discussed the vocational education question prior to the beginning of the hearing on school bonds at 10:00 a.m.

Representative Littler moved that the committee recommend no change in the administrative structure for vocational education until such time as the final decisions are made regarding junior colleges. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously. (Representative Orcutt abstained from voting because he had been unable to attend the Thursday hearing.)

The staff was directed to prepare a draft of the committee report to be mailed to committee members prior to the final meeting on November 16.

The committee then proceeded with the hearing on school bonds.